

the "Irish pendants" which flutter from this case is in the open inquiry for which Arnheiter begs, for which Captain Alexander sacrificed his career, and which the Navy adamantly and arrogantly refuses to conduct, even at the joint request of 86 Members of Congress.

Consider the unpredictability in command shown by Arnheiter's seniors. Consider the Navy's demonstrated lack of integrity in false and deliberately misleading statements exemplified by the initial assertion that there was no connection whatsoever between Captain Alexander's firing and the Arnheiter case. Consider the faulty judgment and leadership of the Navy officials who improperly—with respect to procedure—fired Arnheiter and have since been burying the Navy's honor and integrity in the hole intended to cover up this case.

This case has left an impression on countless thousands of Navy enlisted men, midshipmen, and officers. As a result, the Navy will never be the same.

#### COTTON TALKS

#### HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1968

**Mr. GATHINGS.** Mr. Speaker, Mr. Donald A. Johnson, executive vice president of the Plains Cotton Growers Organization of Texas, who recently served as producer adviser to the U.S. delegation at meetings of the International Cotton Advisory Committee and the International Institute for Cotton in Athens, Greece, has made a report on the meetings that will be of intense interest to the Congress, for Mr. Johnson comments on the international view that only American cotton producers should curtail their production and only the United States should not share in the growing market for cotton textiles and materials.

I share the view expressed by Mr. Johnson that this notion should be corrected in the minds of our foreign friends. We should not penalize our U.S. growers further and that we need to work to expand markets for American-

grown cotton. For too long we have held an umbrella over the foreign cotton producer and protected him while requiring U.S. growers to curtail their production.

The June 21 "Cotton Talks" issued by the Plains Cotton Growers comments on Mr. Johnson's impressions, as follows:

#### COTTON TALKS

LUBBOCK, Friday, June 21, 1968.— "The rest of the world seems to believe the United States has the sole responsibility for maintaining a balance between cotton supply and demand and that we should sacrifice our own interests to carry out that responsibility."

This is the impression gained by Donald A. Johnson, Executive Vice President of Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., who just returned from Athens, Greece, where he attended meetings of both the International Cotton Advisory Committee and the International Institute for Cotton. Cotton leaders and government officials from some 50 countries were on hand.

Johnson said "Liberal U.S. foreign aid and trade policies of the past have led other cotton producing countries to feel we have an almost moral obligation to protect their cotton markets, whatever the cost to U.S. cotton producers, processors or taxpayers."

"And until we take the actions necessary to dispel that notion it is going to be extremely difficult for us to share in the world's increasing demand for textile fibers."

The ICAC is an association of governments having an interest in the production, export, import and consumption of cotton. It is designed to promote cooperation in the solution of cotton problems, particularly those of international scope and significance. It now has 42 member countries.

Johnson was invited by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to attend the Athens meeting as producer adviser to the official U.S. delegation.

"Despite a firm and highly commendable U.S. Cotton Policy Statement to the contrary, most of our foreign competitors are convinced we will continue to adjust our production in this country to suit the production plans of the rest of the world," Johnson observed.

The U.S. policy statement, presented by USDA's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service Administrator Horace Godfrey, pointed out that the U.S. has been almost totally responsible for bringing world cotton carryover down to a "reasonably satisfactory" level.

On August 1, 1966 cotton carried over by all countries totaled 30.5 million bales. The figure is expected to be down to 20.5 million by August 1 of this year, largely as a result of reduced production in the U.S. from almost 15 million bales in 1965 to 9.7 million in 1966 and about 7.5 million last year.

"This adjustment program has required severe sacrifices in the United States," Godfrey said. "The reduction has had widespread community effects, especially in reducing the volume of business for ginners, buyers, machinery dealers, fertilizer and pesticide firms and cottonseed oil mills."

Later in his report Godfrey said "The United States has every intention of sharing in the improvement of the world cotton situation which has been brought about to such a significant extent through our own efforts. We are not satisfied with the current level of U.S. cotton exports. We intend to continue to take vigorous steps to export more cotton in the future."

If taken at face value this should put foreign cotton producing countries on notice that the U.S. will no longer be content to remain the "residual supplier" in world markets.

But Johnson does not believe this statement of policy alone is going to convince anyone.

"We've got to show the rest of the world we mean business. We've got to produce enough cotton to meet a larger share of world demand and we've got to adopt what some will call cold-blooded sales policies that will move our production into world markets. If we do this we can return to a more normal level of production in the U.S. without creating a surplus, and other countries will be obliged to accept their part of the responsibility for maintaining a supply-demand balance."

Specifically, Johnson referred to the need for improvements in U.S. cotton quality, bale packaging, credit arrangements, arbitration procedures, technical services and the expanded use of trade teams.

He said "When we begin to use these sales tools to the fullest we may be able to convince foreign cotton producers that we are in the export market to stay and that we aren't going to sacrifice our own producers and processors to their expansion plans."

The International Institute for Cotton, an organization of cotton exporting countries who contribute \$1 per bale on exports toward international cotton research and promotion, held its annual meeting immediately prior to the ICAC meeting.

Johnson was favorably impressed with IIC reports on programs of technical and market research, promotion and public relations.

He said "Several of the programs started by IIC have been adopted by large fabric and apparel merchandisers in Japan and other countries, and that is about the finest compliment IIC could have."

On the return trip from Athens Johnson visited with cotton and textile leaders in Milan, Italy; Zurich and Winterthur, Switzerland; Amsterdam, Holland; Bremen, Germany and London, England.

## SENATE—Tuesday, June 25, 1968

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

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

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, we acknowledge that God is our strength and courage, making us equal to the tasks of the day. Your strength within us gives us power, understanding, and the balance of love.

We are grateful for the power of a moment of prayer. Physical strength is increased, mental stability is possible, emotional serenity is ours as we meet any experience with Your presence in us.

The Psalmist sang the affirmation: *The Lord is the stronghold of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?*—Psalm 27: 1.

May this also be our deep affirmation.

For national and international leaders, for responsible citizens, we pray. Give guidance and strength during these hours of tension. May life, courage, persistence, and fearlessness for the right be gifts of God upon these to whom we look for leadership this day.

We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of

Monday, June 24, 1968, be dispensed with.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16913) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related 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. NATCHER, Mr. HULL, Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. MAHON, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. HARRISON, and Mr. JONAS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed severally to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H.R. 14907. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act;

H.R. 15345. An act to provide security measures for banks and other financial institutions; and

H.R. 16162. An act to enable the Export-Import Bank of the United States to approve extension of certain loans, guarantees, and insurance in connection with exports from the United States in order to improve the balance of payments and foster the long-term commercial interests of the United States.

#### LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

#### OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, by request I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the calendar.

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

#### JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler to be Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

#### U.S. AIR FORCE

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

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

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

#### U.S. ARMY

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

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

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

#### U.S. NAVY

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

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

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army and the Marine Corps which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

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

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

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

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

#### TWENTY-FIVE-BILLION-DOLLAR DEFICIT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is interesting to note in the press this morning that yesterday financial authorities of the administration predicted the deficit in the Federal budget for this year—the year ending at the end of this month—may total \$25 billion.

In a news conference on May 30, 1968, the President stated:

I believe that the national interest requires the tax increase as soon as possible.

Therefore, if the Congress will vote for the conference report containing the tax increase and the \$6 billion expenditure cut, I shall approve it.

The conference report was agreed to and is now law.

In the same news conference, in reply to a question, the President stated:

We generally feel that they will be divided in non-Vietnam defense expenditures and other budget expenditures.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent that an article by John Finney, published in the New York Times this morning, entitled "Senate Defeats a Move To Delay Sentinel System," be printed at this point 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 25, 1968]  
SENATE DEFEATS A MOVE TO DELAY SENTINEL SYSTEM—VOTES \$227 MILLION TO START DEPLOYMENT OF MISSILES AS A NUCLEAR DEFENSE

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, June 24.—The Senate, responding to Administration pleas on the need to develop a defense against Chinese and Soviet nuclear threats, defeated today a move to postpone deployment of the Sentinel missile defense system.

By a 52-to-34 vote, the Senate rejected a motion to eliminate \$227 million from a military construction authorization bill to start the \$5.5-billion Sentinel system.

The motion, a direct challenge to Administration defense policy, was offered by a bipartisan coalition headed by Senators John Sherman Cooper, Republican of Kentucky, and Philip A. Hart, Democrat of Michigan.

#### ABSENTEEISM NOTED

In its challenge, the coalition was weakened by absenteeism. Several Senators who had been expected to vote for the motion stayed away from the Senate floor because of apparent political concern over seeming to vote against the defense of the American people against a missile attack.

It was this concern that the Administration and its supporters in the Senate played on in swinging what had been expected to be a close vote.

Reflecting past arguments of the Defense Department, leaders of the coalition argued that it was impossible to build an effective defense against a large-scale missile attack. In response, Administration supporters argued that any system that would save American lives was a "sound investment."

In defeat, however, the coalition, by its challenge, appeared to have altered the Administration's basic premises, both politically and strategically, in proceeding with an antiballistic missile system.

#### STRESS PUT ON SOVIET

The Administration, which originally advanced the Sentinel system as a defense against the emerging Chinese missile threat, was driven to justify the step as a defensive move against the Soviet Union.

In announcing the Sentinel deployment decision last fall, the Administration explained that the system was designed to provide a "light" defense against a small-scale missile attack, such as Communist China might be capable of launching in the mid-nineteen-seventies.

But as the challenge developed in the Senate, the Administration and its Senate supporters more and more shifted to the argument that the Sentinel system could also protect Minuteman missiles and save American lives against a large-scale Soviet attack.

In the process of this shift in rationale, the Administration, which initially contended there were only "marginal" reasons for proceeding with an anti-Chinese system, began stressing that an ABM system was essential to national security.

As a result, the Administration, which is looking for ways to economize in the defense budget, will now find it politically difficult to take money away from the Sentinel system. Richard M. Nixon, the leading Republican Presidential nominee, has already begun raising charges that the Administration was intent on swinging the "economy ax" against the defense budget—a charge that is believed in Senate circles to have influenced that Ad-

ministration to its defense of the Sentinel deployment.

With its new anti-Soviet justification, the Administration also appeared to have opened the door to proceeding with a "thick" system costing at least \$40-billion.

In the Senate debate, Administration supporters abandoned the past argument that the Sentinel system should not be viewed as a "building block" to a bigger, far more costly ABM system. As the three-day debate closed, Senator Richard B. Russell, Democrat of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, told his colleagues there should be "no doubt but that this is the first block in a system to defend against a Soviet missile attack."

#### WHY IT IS ADVISABLE TO REDUCE OUR TROOPS IN EUROPE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I was interested in the statement made on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished majority leader on June 19 regarding the new offset agreement with West Germany. I am in complete agreement with his views, and would add my support to his statement and conclusions.

It is disturbing to note that the new offset agreement with West Germany means that, in the fiscal years 1968 and 1969, the United States will pay an estimated \$70 million in interest payments on the Treasury bonds sold to the Germans for the ostensible purpose of neutralizing the foreign exchange costs incurred in maintaining our troops and their dependents in Europe.

Furthermore, it is our understanding that above and beyond these bond purchases, and the purchases of military equipment and civilian aircraft, at least \$100 million of our foreign exchange costs will not be covered in any way—not even by bonds on which we will pay interest.

The views of the majority leader—views shared by many of us in Congress—are being vigorously disputed by certain people in the executive branch. As an example, in the Washington Post of June 18, Chalmers Roberts reported:

A top State Department official has been working hard on Capitol Hill to head off a Senate move which would force a huge cut in American military forces in Europe.

The article continued:

He is Ambassador-at-Large George C. McGhee, until recently American envoy to West Germany.

The focus of McGhee's attention has been a threat by Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.) to attach to the multi-billion dollar military appropriation bill a rider to limit the use of funds to pay for no more than 50,000 troops.

Ambassador McGhee is an attractive gentleman. He did call on me to promote his position.

The first person I remember recommending a heavy reduction in our troop strength in Europe was President Eisenhower. That was some years ago.

As NATO's Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, General Eisenhower spent his years in Paris, whereas Ambassador McGhee spent his in Bonn. Nevertheless, I believe it fair to say that the General knows as much about European military matters as does the Ambassador.

When we talk about the disposition of

American troops, we are talking about enormous numbers of American men and vast amounts of American money. We now have over 1.2 million military men abroad, far more than any other country in the world. There are some 340,000 in Europe, accompanied by over 250,000 dependents. Actually, there are over 2 million military-connected Americans living abroad at the taxpayer's expense.

We are also talking about a balance-of-payments deficit of \$3.5 billion, on a liquidity basis, in the calendar year 1967; and we are talking about a loss of gold reserves from \$13.2 billion on January 1, 1967, to \$10.7 billion at the end of the first quarter of 1968.

Naturally, the West Germans and their advocates over here do not want our forces reduced in West Germany. Nor do most other Western Europeans.

Why should they? They save money because we carry much of their defense burdens; and they can thus reduce their defense expenditures. Furthermore, they earn a great deal of money from having our troops present in their countries.

At the same time, few in Western Europe believe that there is any danger of a massive Soviet attack. Even if there were, if the Soviet Union were determined to sweep across Western Europe, 220,000 American troops would be unable to prevent them from doing so.

Surely, 50,000 American troops would be sufficient to make sure that no Soviet probe could succeed in Berlin or elsewhere in Europe without a direct confrontation with the United States.

The Western Europeans know the logic of this position. The Soviets know it. Why are we so blind about it?

It is argued—and I gather this is official policy—that we should not reduce our forces in Europe unless the Soviets also reduce. But if we wait for the Soviets to reduce their forces in Eastern Europe, we will be waiting—and spending ourselves deeper and deeper into debt—for a long, long time.

Given the present state of affairs in Eastern Europe, do we really think that the Soviets could begin to reduce their forces in East Germany, Poland, or Hungary, now or in the immediate future?

What would be the internal effects in these Eastern European countries—and especially in East Germany—if the Soviets were to begin to reduce?

Are we saying, in effect, that we cannot reduce our troops until the Soviets are willing to see the East German Government—and perhaps other Communist governments—replaced?

Is that a reasonable position for us to take, or even a position that safeguards our interests?

I do not believe anyone who makes this argument is being candid with the American people.

Mr. President, on April 19 I submitted an amendment to the defense procurement bill stipulating:

After December 31, 1968, no appropriation authorized by this or any other Act may be used to support more than 50,000 members of the Armed Forces of the United States on the continent of Europe.

I was urged by many of my colleagues in the Senate, including the chairmen of

several important Senate committees, not to withdraw it.

At the request of the leadership, however, I did withdraw this amendment, saying at the time that it would be taken up again when military appropriations came before the Senate.

Let us note that it was clear, when this matter came up last April 19, that the reduction stipulated in my amendment would have passed the Senate.

The motivation for the amendment was simple. We continue to show more concern for the problems of others than for our own; and it is time we stopped having our policy dictated to us by any foreign government, or by the NATO Council.

We should do what is reasonable, proper, and right to do for our allies. But is it not fair to say that we have always done a very great deal and are now in serious financial trouble ourselves?

It is difficult to understand why American citizens should forego travel to Europe, why American industry should not be permitted to invest in Europe, why Americans should pay higher taxes, and why American families should be disrupted by the callup of some 40,000 reserves this year, so we may keep the present number of U.S. troops in Europe—troops which are not there to meet an immediate military threat, at least in European eyes, but rather for psychological assurance purposes and the financial benefit of the countries in question.

It is time, in fact, long past time, for us to begin to control our overseas commitments; and to stop permitting these commitments to control us.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to express my full accord and approbation with respect to what the distinguished Senator from Missouri has just said. I do not think that, however, he has told the whole story.

It is true that the Germans are going to buy some of our bonds bearing 5-percent-plus interest and we will, of course, have to carry that amount. These are, I understand, short-term bonds. It is true that in buying these bonds the Bundes Bank, as well as the commercial banks and the Lufthansa Aircraft Corp.—also buyers—will receive a profit from the purchase of these bonds as well as the assurance that American troops and their dependents will continue, in effect, as occupation forces in Europe now almost 25 years after the Second World War ended.

The Senator indicated that there are approximately 2 million U.S. soldiers and dependents stationed throughout the world. That is an approximate figure. Most of them have been in many of these areas since the end of the Second World War. I would like to add one figure, which I am recalling from memory. We have American military forces and dependents stationed in roughly 132 areas throughout the world.

We are not the world's policeman. We cannot continue to carry such a burden. The Senator indicated the financial

plight in which this country finds itself and what this Congress has done to bring about an amelioration of the economic difficulty which confronts us at this time.

I understand, on the basis of information furnished to me by someone who should know the facts, that last year it cost \$2.7 billion to maintain the U.S. establishment in Western Europe. That is an awful lot of money and goes far beyond the \$800 million figure which is usually given to us by the Department of Defense and the press.

Mr. President, if we believe what we say, that expenditures should be cut, here is one way in which we can take a decisive step forward. May I say for the record that in this respect no one has taken a greater or more persistent initiative than has the Senator from Missouri.

When the Senator from Missouri said his amendment calling for a troop reduction down to 50,000 by the end of this year, offered to the Department of Defense authorization bill would have carried at that time, he speaks the truth. I doubt that there would have been 10 votes against it.

I would hope, if the administration does not take the hint and does not do something to bring about a lessening of our commitments in troop strength, that the Congress itself will face up to this responsibility and do it before too long.

I do not believe that the way to bring about this reduction of U.S. military forces and their dependents in Western Europe is by sending emissaries up to Capitol Hill to tell us the other side of the story. We know the other side of the story. We wish they would look at our side of the story, because we think we represent what the American people think, and I am certain that is an accurate statement.

Again, I command the Senator. He has performed a public service, and I hope he continues in this vein, he has been carrying the ball so well on this matter through many years.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished majority leader for those comments. He is my leader in this, and has been so right for many years, and I am only sorry that those people who could do something about this tremendous financial drain stay rigid in their disapproval.

I was also impressed with the Senator's statement against our continuing to try to be the world's policeman. For some reason, at the same time we constantly protest we do not want to assume that role, we continue by our actions to belie our words.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am impressed also by what the Senator said about the gigantic cost. Most countries proceed with their inflation by printing money. They use printing presses to issue paper gold. We, however, have adopted a new policy, just as bad, in fact, worse. We

use the printing presses to print bonds and the bonds carry interest, which the paper money does not.

Again, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

#### METROPOLITAN POLICE, U.S. PARK POLICE, AND U.S. CAPITOL POLICE MERIT OUR COMMENDATIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Metropolitan and U.S. Park Police merit our commendations for their swift action in closing down Resurrection City yesterday and for the calm manner in which they took into custody the remaining holdouts of that festering abcess of filth, hooliganism, and iniquity, which never should have been built.

Commendations are also due to Metropolitan and Capitol Police for the equally orderly termination of Mr. Abernathy's march on the Capitol yesterday.

I compliment Mayor Walter Washington for moving promptly last night to establish a curfew, possibly averting another outbreak of mass looting and burning like that which we experienced in April.

A prompt show of force yesterday prevented, for the time being at least, a repetition of the costly April disorders. Had the same firm and prompt action been manifested in April, the city and Washington's business community would have been spared the looting, the arson, and the destruction suffered. In this regard, I ask unanimous consent to insert an editorial from today's Washington Daily News entitled "Swift Action at Last."

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

#### SWIFT ACTION AT LAST

No one will ever know for certain whether or not the Inner City stood on the brink of anarchy again late yesterday and last night.

But the fact remains that in the wake of the swift shut-down of Resurrection City in the morning, order was maintained.

For this, every law-abiding citizen of the Federal City owes a debt of gratitude to Mayor Walter Washington, the police department and the National Guard.

Nearly three months ago, during the days of outrageous rioting that wreaked so much havoc here, this newspaper was the first voice to suggest—somewhat stridently, perhaps—that the call to the D.C. guardsmen and Federal troops had been delayed too long. Whoever was responsible for that delay seems to have learned the obvious lesson well.

In addition to preventing any major outbreak yesterday, the decision to use firm force at the outset must surely serve as an object lesson to the irresponsible and criminal forces that may have some ideas for the future. If these, too, have learned the lesson that was spelled out on our streets in the last 24 hours, the Federal City may yet find that a long, hot summer is something that can be enjoyed in peace by all of us who live and work in this city we love.

#### THE BERLIN PROBLEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the June 21 issue of the New York Times carried an article by the well-known columnist, C. L. Sulzberger, entitled "Foreign

Affairs: The Old Berlin Squeeze." I was interested to see that Mr. Sulzberger devoted the last third of his column to the views of one of our colleagues, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL].

Mr. Sulzberger noted that 4 years ago Senator PELL had written to him suggesting a new approach to the problem of Berlin. The Senator had proposed that all-German commissions be established for such matters as cultural activities, transportation and fiscal matters in order to provide "porosity" in relations between the two Germanys and the two Berlins.

Senator PELL's proposals, which he first advocated on the Senate floor on August 22, 1961, and has repeated often since, would provide the West with a secure ground corridor of access to Berlin. His plan would thus remove the most dangerous trouble spot in Europe.

Even the leaders of the West German Government are tending in this direction. In an article in the Washington Post on June 21, Dan Morgan, writing from Bonn, quoted Chancellor Kiesinger as saying, in support of continuing his country's policy of detente despite East German provocations:

We will not allow ourselves to be provoked by the East Berlin measures into false, and perhaps expected measures. Our policy of relaxation and cooperation with the East European states will be continued. Our offer of understanding includes as always the other part of Germany.

Mr. President, some movement in the direction suggested by the Senator could well have spared us many of the difficulties of the past and many of the problems of the present. For as Mr. Sulzberger has commented, in concluding his article:

There is no doubt that it would help an uneasy world were some kind of Berlin understanding arranged. The generation born since Germany and Berlin were bisected has other urgent problems on its platter.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the articles by Mr. Sulzberger and by Mr. Morgan, referred to above, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1968]

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS: THE OLD BERLIN SQUEEZE

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—The new Berlin crisis—or non-crisis—can obviously not be separated from other crises, real or potential, in our complicated world. Although the fact is rarely mentioned nowadays, Berlin remains an ultimate touchstone.

Many years ago, Ernst Reuter, West Berlin's most famous Mayor, told me: Berlin is the final test. If West Berlin remains free, West Europe remains free. If West Europe remains free, the United States remains free. If West Berlin crumbles, the whole Western world will crumble—or there will be war."

Once again the Soviet bloc—or what is left of it—seems to be putting pressure on West Berlin. The East German Government has begun the old, familiar squeeze play of tightening the access faucet.

Both Moscow and Washington—which remain the ultimate power centers—have been playing this new Berlin game with delicate caution. Each super-capital seems to have become used to the other's ruses and also to the way one or the other links Berlin to

remote political issues such as Cuba or Vietnam.

At this moment nobody can say with assurance whether the Communists have reheated Berlin for purely German reasons or because the Kremlin wished to rally the uneasy Poles and Czechs against the old Teutonic menace. It is even conceivable that Russia's geopolitical thinkers might consider revived Berlin alarms could force the United States to weaken its Vietnam position.

#### A BAD POSITION

There isn't the slightest doubt that the allies—meaning the U.S.A.—should never have allowed themselves in the position of having a piece of Berlin under Western rule cut off from easy Western access. Certainly it is time for a qualified historian to compile a hard-boiled record of the circumstances.

Eisenhower blames Churchill for the situation. He believes Churchill never had adequate faith in the Normandy invasion and the West's ability to move on to the Continent in sufficient force and with sufficient speed to reach the German capital before the Russians. Therefore, according to Eisenhower's recollections, the Western Allies had already moved far to the east of the needlessly modest frontier fixed as a meeting place between Soviet and Western forces inside Germany.

#### CHURCHILL'S STAND

The Eisenhower analysis concludes that Churchill refused to accept the immense possibilities of a trans-Channel invasion and insisted on a political line that was far to the west of where the armies actually met; that Anglo-American forces could easily have entered Berlin before the Nazi surrender.

Nobody can deny that the present partition of Berlin inside a partitioned Europe is a nuisance, tempting the Soviet military alliance to tough talk when it wants to shore up its membership and prompting the American military alliance to resolution when it wants to reassure friends.

Four years ago Senator Claiborne Pell wrote me suggesting a new Berlin approach by gentle steps. His idea was that each side should seek to relax tensions and increase the obvious homogeneity of the German people by encouraging various "all-German" committees."

He proposed all-German commissions for relatively lesser matters such as cultural activities and transportation or fiscal problems. His idea was that the "porosity" in relationships between the two Germanys and the two Berlins should be promoted at every opportunity, "particularly on such matters as Berlin access."

Pell wanted the three Western powers to maintain limited troops in West Berlin and to encourage "international administration of the autobahn" between Germany's separated segments, granting *de facto* recognition to East Germany in administrative arrangements. He thought such a formula might be signalized by an "enabling treaty" renegotiable every five years.

Whether or not this is a useful thought is subject to discussion. There is no doubt that it would help an uneasy world were some kind of Berlin understanding arranged. The generation born since Germany and Berlin were bisected has other urgent problems on its platter.

[From the Washington Post, June 21, 1968]

#### BONN LEADERS UPHOLD POLICY OF EAST EUROPEAN DETENTE

(By Dan Morgan)

BONN, June 20.—West Germany's chief political leaders pledged today to continue their bipartisan policy of East European detente despite the "provocations" of the East German Communists on Berlin.

The day-long debate in the Bundestag

(lower house of parliament) was the first decisive test of the country's political mood since the East Germans imposed travel controls on the Berlin access routes a week ago.

It brought an outpouring of frustration and outrage, but there was no significant hardline anti-Communist opposition to the policy of moderation being followed by Bonn and the Allies.

Speaking for the Christian Democrat-Social Democrat coalition government, Chancellor Kiesinger said:

"We will not allow ourselves to be provoked by the East Berlin measures into false, and perhaps expected measures. Our policy of relaxation and cooperation with the East European states will be continued. Our offer of understanding includes as always the other part of Germany."

Foreign Minister Willy Brandt declared that East German leader Walter Ulbricht "will not force us to hasty action."

West Germany's "Ost Politik," he said, was based on the long term, and what was now at stake was the "credibility of our government in East-West" matters.

Referring to the East German leaders, he declared. "They can create tension. They can hurt the government of the Federal Republic. They can be international disturbers of the peace. We can't hold them back from this. But they won't have the strength to stick by this position."

Brandt, whose Social Democratic party bears most of the credit and the risks of the Bonn's policy of detente with East Europe, raised his standing Tuesday by slipping secretly into East Berlin for talks with Soviet Ambassador Pyotr Abrasimov.

In what seemed to be an effort at reassuring the Soviet Union two days after his secret mission to Abrasimov, Brandt said Bonn understands that Czechoslovakia wishes to retain its alliance with the Soviets, and West Germany has no desire to "break any country out of its security system."

Speaking for the Christian Democrats, Berlin Deputy Johann-Baptist Grasl called the East German measures "a new aggression" and said:

"We shouldn't deceive ourselves about what kind of a man we are dealing with. There is a primitive equation between Ulbricht and Hitler."

Christian Democratic floor leader Rainer Barzel, who is rapidly emerging as spokesman of the Party's rigidly anti-Communist element, stopped short of criticizing government policy in his speech today, but again hinted that the Soviet policy in approving the travel measures raised doubts about its dependence as guarantor of European security under the proposed nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

Finance Minister Franz Josef Strauss, the Bavarian conservative leader, has not yet taken a clear stand in the Berlin debate, although he must be counted among the ranks of strong German anti-Communists. Strauss's wish for a unified, Gaullist-style Europe has led him to accept the broad outline of Bonn's eastward policy, provided no appeasement is involved.

Observers believe his political purpose is now served best by keeping private his objections on the Berlin matter, thus maintaining his maneuverability for the 1969 elections.

News agencies reported these related developments:

West Germany offered today to subsidize its citizens' flights to West Berlin to circumvent East German restrictions on land travel. The government asked the German managers of Pan American World Airways, British European Airways and Air France, who have flights to and from West Berlin, to provide hourly flights at rates equal to present train fares.

East Germany, meanwhile, enacted the second part of its new program of restrictions. West Berlin police reported that the daily minimum fee of \$1.25 charged for West Germans and foreigners staying overnight in the city has been doubled. The money is exchanged at the border and can only be spent in East Germany. It cannot be reconverted.

In Washington, U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk was reported to be considering stopping off in Bonn for a few hours next week, on his return from the NATO Foreign Ministers' conference in Iceland.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### AMENDMENT OF TITLE V, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1285, S. 3672.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. S. 3672 to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for additional positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18; to promote the efficient use of the revolving fund of the Civil Service Commission, 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, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3672

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 5108(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "2,577" and inserting in lieu thereof "2,852".*

(b) Section 5108(b)(2) of such title is amended by striking out "28" and inserting in lieu thereof "44".

(c) Section 5108(c) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking out "64" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "90";

(2) by striking out "110" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "140";

(3) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (8);

(4) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(5) by adding after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

"(10) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia, subject to the procedures prescribed by this section, may place a total of 45 positions in the government of the District of Columbia in GS-16, 17, and 18."

SEC. 2. Section 5317 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "34" and inserting in lieu thereof "40"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence "or the government of the District of Columbia".

Sec. 3. Section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide certain administrative authorities for the National Security Agency, and for other purposes", approved May 29, 1959, as amended (50 U.S.C. 402, note), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. The Secretary of Defense (or his designee for the purpose) is authorized to—

"(1) establish in the National Security Agency (A) professional engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and (B) professional positions in the physical and natural sciences, medicine, and cryptology; and

"(2) fix the respective rates of pay of such positions at rates equal to rates of basic pay contained in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

Officers and employees appointed to positions established under this section shall be in addition to the number of officers and employees appointed to positions under section 2 of this Act who may be paid at rates equal to rates of basic pay contained in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of section 5332 of such title."

Sec. 4. (a) Section 1304(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) A revolving fund of \$4,000,000 is available to the Commission, without fiscal year limitation, for financing investigations, training, and such other functions as the Commission is authorized or required to perform on a reimbursable basis. However, the functions which may be financed in any fiscal year by the fund are restricted to those functions which are covered by the budget estimates submitted to the Congress for that fiscal year. To the maximum extent feasible, each individual activity shall be conducted generally on an actual cost basis over a reasonable period of time.

"The capital of the fund consists of the aggregate of—

"(1) appropriations made to provide capital for the fund; and

"(2) the sum of the fair and reasonable value of such supplies, equipment, and other assets as the Commission from time to time transfers to the fund (including the amount of the unexpended balances of appropriations or funds relating to activities the financing of which is transferred to the fund) less the amount of related liabilities, the amount of unpaid obligations, and the value of accrued annual leave of employees, which are attributable to the activities the financing of which is transferred to the fund.

"The fund shall be credited with—

"(1) advances and reimbursements from available funds of the Commission or other agencies, or from other sources, for those services and supplies provided at rates estimated by the Commission as adequate to recover expenses of operation (including provision for accrued annual leave of employees and depreciation of equipment); and

"(2) receipts from sales or exchanges of property, and payments for loss of or damage to property, accounted for under the fund. Any unobligated and unexpended balances in the fund which the Commission determines to be in excess of amounts needed for operations financed by the fund shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. The Commission shall prepare a business-type budget providing full disclosure of the results of operations for each of the functions financed by the Commission under the revolving fund, and such budget shall be transmitted to the Congress and considered, in the manner prescribed by law for wholly owned Government corporations.

The Comptroller General of the United

States shall, as a result of his periodic reviews of the activities financed through the revolving fund, report and make such recommendations as he deems appropriate to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives at least once every three years."

(b) Section 1304(f) of such title is amended by striking out the words "investigations made" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "investigations, training, and functions performed".

Sec. 5. (a) The Federal representative to the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission appointed under section 2 of the Act of September 23, 1959 (Public Law 86-375; 73 Stat. 698) is hereby covered into the competitive service under title 5, United States Code. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the provisions of section 2 of such Act relating to the compensation of such representative.

(b) The Federal representative to the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission shall be subject to the provisions of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and to the provisions of chapter 87 and chapter 89 of such title, relating to life insurance and health insurance.

Sec. 6. The government of the District of Columbia, and the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government of the United States receiving the additional positions authorized by sections 1 through 3 shall absorb the increases in salary costs resulting from such additional positions. No request for additional or supplemental appropriations to meet such increases in salary costs shall be transmitted to the Congress unless it is accompanied by a certification of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that the amounts requested are necessary to provide for the continued execution of essential functions of the department, agency, or instrumentality concerned.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1306), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

#### PURPOSE

This legislation would authorize 392 new administrative, policy and program positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule, commonly known as supergrades.

The distribution of these new positions is as follows:

Two hundred and seventy-five will be allocated to the Civil Service Commission for distribution under regular Commission procedures to Federal agencies which have an immediate need for supergrade personnel;

Forty-five positions will be specifically allocated for the District of Columbia government, under the supervision and control of the Civil Service Commission regarding the classification of positions and qualifications of appointees;

Twenty-six positions for the General Accounting Office;

Thirty positions for the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

Sixteen positions for the Library of Congress.

In addition, the committee has approved the six additional positions at levels IV and V of the executive schedule (level IV positions pay \$28,750 and level V positions pay \$28,000). The committee recommends that these positions be assigned to the District of Columbia government.

The committee has approved an exemption for the National Security Agency so

that supergrade positions for engineering and scientific personnel will not be subject to the numerical limitations contained in section 5108 of title 5, United States Code.

The committee has included language requiring that the executive agencies shall absorb the cost of additional supergrade positions authorized by this legislation.

#### JUSTIFICATION

There is an immediate and pressing need in the executive branch of the Government for at least 245 additional positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18. Since the enactment of Public Law 89-632, October 8, 1966 (which authorized an additional 177 positions for allocation by the Civil Service Commission), the Congress has enacted a substantial number of programs to be administered by existing Federal agencies; has created a new Department of Transportation; and has conferred on the executive branch significant new authority and powers for Government administration which require excellent leadership. The only way to get capable personnel to serve the American public effectively in Government positions is to pay salaries commensurate with private enterprise at comparable levels of responsibility. The allocation of 275 supergrades in this legislation for general executive branch use will help meet this need.

#### THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Secretary Alan S. Boyd of the Department of Transportation testified before the committee on the immediate needs for supergrade personnel in the Office of the Secretary, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, and the Federal Railroad Administration. These needs result from new responsibilities and the critical shortage of supergrade positions in the constituent agencies which were combined to make up the Department of Transportation.

There have been hardships within the Department because of the shifting or prolonged detail of key employees. In some instances, the lack of supergrade positions has required the use of extended details where a formal transfer was appropriate. Some positions properly classified at GS-16, 17, or 18 have been filled on an interim basis at the GS-15 level.

At the present time, the Department of Transportation has 170 supergrade positions acquired from constituent agencies. Twenty-seven additional positions were allocated on a temporary basis to the Department by the Civil Service Commission in 1967, making a total of 197 supergrade positions.

The administrations are also attempting to cope with many new activities and projects which impose an additional need for key talent on them. Among the examples of programs which are of recent origin are: The supersonic transport development program (FAA), the merchant vessel documentation program (CG), the highway and motor safety program (FHWA), the improvement of highway efficiency (FHWA), and the development of high-speed ground transportation (FRA).

Consequently, the work in the previously established organizations has generated a need for additional supergrade positions in addition to the new requirements arising out of the creation of the Department.

These additional requirements are shown on the first chart to reflect the specific numbers needed in the new elements; that is, the Office of the Secretary, the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Railroad Administration, and the National Transportation Safety Board. The second chart reflects the current operational components of the Department showing the department or agency from which certain elements were transferred, and also indicating which components are new organizations.

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—QUOTA SUPERGRADES

Organization	Transfer of function Apr. 1, 1967	Number	Received from CSC Apr. 1, 1967, to Feb. 23, 1968	Transfer from within DOT	Total	Unmet needs	Proposed total
Office of the Secretary	From Commerce	16	19	+1	26	44	70
National Transportation Safety Board	From CAB	14	4	0	8	1	9
Federal Aviation Administration	From FAA	107	0	0	107	33	140
Federal Highway Administration	{ From Commerce From BPR From ICC	16 29 1	2	0	48	12	60
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>46</b>					
Federal Railroad Administration	{ From Commerce From ICC	2 1	2	0	5	9	14
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>3</b>					
U.S. Coast Guard	From CG: Treasury	2	0	0	2	1	3
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	From SLS	2	0	-1	1	1	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>170</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>298</b>

<sup>1</sup> The 30 positions transferred to new organizations.

<sup>2</sup> Space transferred to OST.

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—ORIGIN OF MAJOR COMPONENTS

Major component	Origin
Secretary of Transportation	Public Law 89-670, Department of Transportation Act. New organization.
Office of Secretary	Do.
Federal Railroad Administration Administrator and staff offices	From Department of Interior.
Alaska Railroad	From Interstate Commerce Commission.
Bureau of Railroad Safety	New organization.
Office of High Speed Ground Transportation	From Department of Commerce.
Federal Highway Administration: Administrator and staff offices	New organization.
Bureau of Public Roads	From Department of Commerce.
National Highway Safety Bureau	Do.
National Traffic Safety Bureau	Do.
Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety	From Interstate Commerce Commission.
Federal Aviation Administration	Independent agency.
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	From Department of Commerce.
U.S. Coast Guard	From Treasury Department.
National Transportation Safety Board: Chairman, board members, staff offices	New organization.
Bureau of Aviation Safety	From Civil Aeronautics Board.
Bureau of Surface Transportation Safety	New organization.

## THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The expanded responsibilities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reads very much like a list of the legislation by Congress to provide additional programs to improve the health, education, and welfare of the American people in the 89th and 90th Congresses.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Manpower Act of 1965, the Water Resources Planning Act, the Medical Care Under Social Security Act of 1965, the Water Quality Act of 1965, the Medical Library Assistance Act, the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act amendments, the Highway Safety Act of 1966, the Clean Air Act amendments of 1966, the Veterinary Medical Education Act of 1966, the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1966, the Mental Health Amendments of 1967, and the Older Americans Amendments of 1967, the Public Broadcasting Amendments of 1967, the National Commission on Products Safety, are just a few of the many programs which Congress has enacted and bestowed responsibility in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for administration. This cannot be done effectively unless additional positions at high levels of responsibility are provided.

In the brief period from 1960 to 1968, 150 new programs have been assigned to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by congressional enactments. This tripled the number to a current level of 200 programs for which the Department is responsible. During the same time the budget of the Department has increased from \$16.5 to \$45.5 billion for fiscal year 1968, including Social Security trust funds.

The Department has an immediate need

for 112 new supergrade requirements. Forty-six for Social Security Administration; 25 for the Office of the Secretary; 15 for the Office of Education; 11 for the Public Health Service; eight for the Food and Drug Administration; and seven for the Social and Rehabilitation Service.

## THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

At the present time there are 64 supergrade positions for the use of the General Accounting Office. Although these positions are allocated to the GAO independent of the general pool superintended by the Commission, all appointments and position classifications are subject to the approval of the Commission. The present bill will add 26 positions to the number allocated for GAO use, making a total of 90 supergrade positions for the GAO. Of the 26 new positions, 14 will be used for accounting, auditing, and investigative responsibilities on a Government-wide basis, and 12 will be assigned for legal, policy, technical, and administrative functions.

The committee believes that no money is better spent than that allocated to the General Accounting Office for its extremely effective work in auditing the books of the Government and in ascertaining that the policies and programs designed by the Congress are properly, fairly, and efficiently administered by the executive branch.

Budget outlays for fiscal year 1969 are estimated at \$186 billion. This represents an increase of \$88 billion since 1961, or nearly 90 percent in the past 8 years. During this period, the GAO budget has increased 41 percent.

The General Accounting Office has been confronted with an increasing workload in major civilian agencies stemming directly from a growing economy and increasing requirements relating to space, research,

atomic energy, education, postal services and operations, commerce, science, transportation, power and water resources, and other significant activities of Government-wide services.

The magnitude and complexity of the operations of the Department of Defense requires that GAO place extremely heavy responsibilities upon staff. For example, one Associate Director, GS-16, is responsible for our reviews of all procurement activities in the Department of Defense, including procurement planning, contract awards and negotiations and contract administration. This represents \$37.3 billion in current expenditures.

In the civil division, one Associate Director, a GS-16, is assigned the operating responsibility for all work in the Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Department of Transportation.

Each of these major agencies represents an extremely heavy responsibility since both the size and importance of the programs are matters of major dollar impact and congressional interest. During the current 6-month program period, this associate director is responsible for the planning and supervision of nearly 80 major reviews of programs and operations in these agencies. This includes formulation, execution, and preparation of reports to the Congress on nearly 40 reviews and audits which are directly related to either the legislative or oversight activities of the committees having jurisdiction of these matters.

## THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The committee has authorized 30 additional positions for the use of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The FBI is not responsible to the Civil Service Commission for the approval of its nominees or for the classification of its positions. The Director of the FBI has sole responsibility for these actions. At the present time the FBI has 110 supergrade positions. The committee believes that an increase of 30 is justifiable because of the immense responsibility which the FBI has in crime control and law enforcement.

## THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The committee has allocated 16 additional positions to the Library of Congress, making a total of 44 positions. The Library requested an additional 32 positions but the number has been reduced by the committee in an effort to achieve the most efficient and effective utilization of supergrade positions this year.

The Library of Congress is the national library of the United States and the research and development laboratory in library technology. It is of vital importance to the development of our intellectual community that this Library have the executive talent necessary to make it the finest library in the world. The use of automatic data processing equipment, inaugurated in 1963, is at a crucial period of development. Its successful development will make educational and library materials available on a nationwide basis so that in communities all over America research material and original manuscripts can be made available to scholars, scientists, students, and ordinary citizens immediately and inexpensively. The ancient process of traveling to Washington to study the original manuscripts in the far corners of the Library will become a practice of the past if this new automation program can develop successfully.

As a result of the Library's acquisition programs, as well as the steady and ever-increasing operation of the printing presses in this country, one item every second of the day is received at the Library of Congress, 3,600 items each hour.

This material would be worthless to the Congress and to scholarship without ade-

quate bibliographic control. In addition to regular channels of acquisition, including international exchange and Public Law 480 book procurement program, title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965 charged the Librarian of Congress with the responsibility to acquire copies of all published material of value to scholarship throughout the world, to catalog this material promptly, and to make the cataloging information available to other libraries through printed catalog cards or through other means, such as magnetic tape.

Ten offices have been established on three continents to acquire the material as well as to utilize the cataloging information done in the country of origin in order that printed cards may be available to college and university libraries.

As funds become available, this program will expand. University administrators, librarians, and scholars who use research libraries have proclaimed it to be the single most important advance in librarianship in this century. College and university librarians are reporting large savings in their cataloging of materials.

In addition, because of the scarcity of skilled catalogers with linguistic abilities, materials that heretofore have not been under bibliographic control in many libraries are now available to those institutions' users.

The Library of Congress cannot acquire an expert cataloger conversant in several foreign languages and a master of the librarian's art at a salary or grade below supergrade classifications.

#### THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

The committee has allocated 45 supergrade positions for the separate use of the District of Columbia government and has approved six positions in levels IV and V of the executive schedule intended for the District of Columbia government.

At the present time there are two positions in the District government in the executive schedule; the Commissioner is a level III Presidential appointee, and the assistant to the Commissioner is a level V Presidential appointee. There are 31 supergrade positions scattered throughout the District government.

The District of Columbia government employs more than 35,000 people and is a separate legal entity from the U.S. Government. Unfortunately, its unique relationship to the Federal Government has not always worked to its advantage, particularly in the allocation of supergrades. The District government has 1 supergrade position for every 1,000 employees, a ratio of 0.10 of total employment. This does not compare favorably to Federal agencies whose supergrade ratio ranges from 0.18 in the Department of Agriculture to 14.2 in the Bureau of the Budget. It is unfortunate but true that in the allocation of supergrades, the District of Columbia government has not always done well when competing against Federal agencies with national responsibilities.

To resolve this problem, the committee recommends that a separate pool of supergrades be allocated for the specific use of the District of Columbia government. This is exactly the method used in allocating supergrades to the General Accounting Office, which is not an agency of the executive branch. The Civil Service Commission will retain control over the classification of positions and qualifications of appointments.

The committee has also approved six executive positions at levels IV and V for the use of the President. Under the provisions of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 (5 U.S.C. 5317), the President is authorized to establish and from time to time revise a total of not more than 30 positions in levels IV and V for various Federal agencies. The Committee adds six to this number and recommends that the President allocate the six additional

positions for the use of the District of Columbia government.

#### OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

In its 7 days of hearings on supergrades, the committee also heard the views of the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Housing and Urban Development and studied carefully the needs of the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, the Post Office Department, the Department of Justice, the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget, and several other Federal agencies which have an immediate need for additional supergrade positions.

The Civil Service Commission originally proposed that the committee approve 345 additional supergrade positions, 245 for immediate use and 100 as a pool for use in the next year to 18 months. The committee, mindful of the budgetary problems which our Government faces and the need for absolute economy in all Federal functions, has reduced this request from 345 to 275 positions. This will meet the present needs and provide an additional 30 position for allocation by the Civil Service Commission during the remainder of the year. In addition, however, the Civil Service Commission pool will benefit by the assignment of 45 separate positions to the District of Columbia government because the 31 supergrade positions which are now used by the District government will be returned to the pool. The net increase in actual supergrade positions available for use, therefore, will be 306, although the net increase in the number of positions created by law will be only 275.

#### THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

The committee has approved an exemption for the National Security Agency which removes the numerical limitations on the number of supergrade positions for engineering and scientific purposes.

In 1962, Congress approved in Public Law 87-793 a provision of the Classification Act (5 U.S.C. 5108) which removes any numerical limitation on "engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and professional positions in the physical and natural sciences and medicine." Thus, the numerical limitation applies to administrative, program, and policy positions in the Federal Government and does not apply to scientific positions, most of which are in NASA, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Defense, the National Institutes of Health, and the Veterans' Administration. There are 2,930 such scientific positions in the Federal Government at the present time.

The Classification Act does not apply to the National Security Agency and therefore the scientific exemption contained in the Classification Act does not apply to NSA. NSA presently has 90 supergrade positions involving research and development functions—mainly cryptology—in the agency.

The committee recommends that the numerical limitation be removed and that this agency enjoy the same scientific exemption from the numerical limitation which all other agencies of the Federal Government now enjoy. In order to qualify, the Secretary of Defense will have to approve the positions placed in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 by NSA and the qualifications of the proposed appointee.

#### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REVOLVING FUND

In 1952, Congress authorized the Civil Service Commission to operate a \$4 million revolving fund for the specific purpose of financing full-field investigations conducted by the Commission for other departments and agencies. The revolving fund is reimbursed for the cost of the investigations by the departments and agencies served. Since 1952, the Civil Service Commission has assumed a number of additional reimbursable

services for other departments and agencies, such as training, examinations, and seminars.

The purpose of section 4 is to expand use of the Civil Service Commission's revolving fund to permit financing of all reimbursable services performed by the Commission which have been budgeted by the Congress for other departments and agencies of the Government.

There is no cost. The new authority is designed to improve financial management and produce better accounting to the Congress and the public.

The provisions recommended by the committee are identical to legislation ordered reported by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service which held public hearings on the bill May 22, 1968. No opposition was expressed to the legislation in those hearings.

#### FEDERAL REPRESENTATIVE TO THE WABASH VALLEY INTERSTATE COMMISSION

The committee has included language conferring competitive civil service status upon the Federal Representative to the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission. This Presidential appointee, established under the act of September 23, 1959, is a Federal employee paid at a per diem rate of \$100 for not in excess of 150 days a year. The provisions of section 5 will give him civil service benefits, including contributory retirement and insurance protection.

A similar provision was approved by the Senate in 1967 in H.R. 7977, the Postal Rate and Federal Employees Salary Act, but was not approved in conference with the House of Representatives.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 322) to restrict the disposition of lands acquired as part of the national wildlife refuge system, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 3136) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States, 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. 3159. An act authorizing the trustees of the National Gallery of Art to construct a building or buildings on the site bounded by

Fourth Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, Third Street, and Madison Drive Northwest, in the District of Columbia, and making provision for the maintenance thereof;

S. 3363. An act to name the U.S. customhouse, Providence, R.I., the "John E. Fogarty Federal Building";

H.R. 15345. An act to provide security measures for banks and other financial institutions, and to provide for the appointment of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as receiver; and

H.R. 16162. An act to enable the Export-Import Bank of the United States to approve extension of certain loans, guarantees, and insurance in connection with exports from the United States in order to improve the balance of payments and foster the long-term commercial interests of the United States.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 3136) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### SAFETY STANDARDS FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal Public Law 88-515 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

#### PROPOSED WATERWAY USER ACT OF 1968

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the imposition of waterway user charges and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

#### REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need to improve management of Army supplies in Vietnam, Department of the Army, dated June 21, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### APPLICATION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL LOAN BY THE KING HILL IRRIGATION DISTRICT, KING HILL, IDAHO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an application by the King Hill Irrigation of King Hill, Idaho, for a supplemental loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME

A letter from the Executive Vice President, Agricultural Hall of Fame and National Center, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the annual audit and report to the Board of Governors for the period September 1966 through August 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### WAGE RATES PAYABLE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN CANAL ZONE

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a summary statement pertaining to the report on the Panama Canal Zone Study (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### PROPOSED HIGHWAY RELOCATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1968

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for effective relocation for those displaced by real property acquisitions for the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

#### PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT UNDER PROVISIONS OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement which have been prepared under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Public Works.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

##### By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

##### "MASSACHUSETTS RESOLUTION"

Resolutions memorializing Congress to hold public hearing prior to enactment of legislation which would affect the tax-exempt status of any securities issued by State and local governments

"Whereas there is legislation now pending in the Congress of the United States which seeks to restrict the issuance of tax-exempt Industrial Development Bonds; and

"Whereas United States Treasury Department officials have publicly stated that such legislation and regulations are not intended to be limited solely to industrial development problems; and

"Whereas there is now pending in Congress a number of bills the purpose of which would not only erode but could ultimately eliminate all financing by public bodies through the issuance of tax-exempt securities, simultaneously destroying the financial independence of state and local governments, thereby placing state and local government programs under Federal control; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts that the States be afforded the opportunity to express their positions in full Congressional hearings in accordance with due legislative process; and

"Whereas such Congressional hearings have not been held to date; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts urgently requests the Congress to hold public hearings prior to the enactment of legislation which would affect the tax-exempt status of any securities issued by state and local governments; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth send copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate and to each Member of Congress from this Commonwealth.

"House of Representatives, adopted, May 28, 1968.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,  
"Clerk.

"A true copy. Attest:

"JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,  
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; ordered to lie on the table:

#### "HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 158"

"Concurrent resolution to extend an invitation to all major candidates for the office of President of the United States to speak before the assembled houses of the Legislature of Louisiana

"Whereas the state of Louisiana has been vitally concerned in taking its place as a leader among the several states of this nation; and

"Whereas it is recognized that the office of the President of the United States is a position of the most significant import to the public weal; and

"Whereas the members of the Legislature of Louisiana, as elected public servants, of the citizens of the state would be honored to be addressed by any and all of the major candidates for the office of President of the United States, concerning the vital issues facing this nation: Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana (the Senate thereof concurring), That all major candidates for the office of President of the United States are hereby respectfully and cordially invited to address the houses of the Legislature of Louisiana in joint session when and if such candidates, in their public or private travels, are in the capital of the state of Louisiana while the Legislature of Louisiana is assembled in annual session; be it further

"Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit a copy of this Resolution without delay to all major candidates for the office of President of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; ordered to lie on the table:

#### "SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2"

"Concurrent resolution in memory of Hon. John Nance Garner

"Whereas, The death of Honorable John Nance Garner, just short of his 99th birthday anniversary and only slightly more than a year until he would have realized his hope of attaining the century-mark, saw the passing of a great American, a great representative of the era of 'rugged individualism,' a practitioner of personal and political honor and a devotee of constitutional integrity, whose life gave joy to his Creator; and

"Whereas, Mr. Garner, later to become known throughout the country as 'Cactus Jack,' but never so addressed, was born at Blossom Prairie, Red River County, Texas, November 22, 1868, and grew up through the unconstitutional and illegal debauchery and frenzy of carpetbag reconstruction days. Upon being told that he had contracted tuberculosis, he came to Uvalde in December 1892, in search of health. He resided there until he was gathered unto his fathers on November 7, 1967. His long eventful life and talents were devoted to the land which restored his health and which he was destined to serve, long and well, from the Courthouse to the Statehouse in Austin, and thence, to the Nation's Capitol, covering a period of 46 years, from which he returned to his homeland after a life crowded with deeds and crowned with honors'; and

"Whereas, His career of public service began with his appointment to serve an unexpired term as County Judge of Uvalde County, in 1895, and his subsequent candidacy therefor, which was hotly opposed by Miss Mariette Rheiner, who lived on a ranch in the Sabinal area. Miss Rheiner denounced the candidate as a pokerplayer and being unfit for the bench. Suffice it to say that Mr. Garner and Miss Rheiner celebrated the nuptials on November 25, 1895 and their only child, Tully, who survives, was born on September 24, 1896, and is now a retired banker of Uvalde, 'Miss Ette,' as she became, and was familiarly known to her host of friends and associates, preceded her famous husband in death on August 17, 1948.

Their married life coincided with Mr. Garner's membership in the State Legislature, beginning with his election thereto in 1898 and continuing for two terms. During this time he championed some remarkable losing causes, such as dividing Texas into five States so as to give the area ten United States Senators, as authorized by the Joint Resolution of the Congress of the Republic of Texas, approved June 23, 1845, giving its consent to the annexation of the Republic of Texas to the United States. Also, he earned his nickname by nominating the cactus bloom, not the bluebonnet, as the State Flower. It was while a member of the State House of Representatives that he literally carved himself a district in which to run for the National Congress. He frankly admitted such and after a hard fought and bitter election contest with then State Senator J. B. Dibrell of Seguin, who subsequently withdrew from the race, in which 'blood, hair and the ground was tore up,' Mr. Garner entered the Congress of the United States in 1903 and was consistently reelected without making a campaign speech for the ensuing 25 years; and

"Whereas, Mr. Garner's platform included a remedy for trust evils, then so prevalent in the areas of oil, railroading and banking; opposition to imperialism; support of irrigation for the Rio Grande Valley; the construction of the Intercoastal Canal; denunciation of both the doctrine of free raw material and Republican reciprocity and endorsement of the construction of the Panama Canal, all of which made him the hero of the hour. By dint of hard work, energy, common sense, devotion to duty and country, so ably assisted by his devoted and intelligent helpmate, 'Miss Ettie,' his secretary and closest adviser, the young Representative increased his popularity among his colleagues and rose to the position of Minority Leader of the 71st Congress, then presided over by his personal friend, Speaker Nicholas Longworth, Republican, the husband of the vivacious Alice Roosevelt Longworth, daughter of 'Teddy' Roosevelt who was President of the United States when Mr. Garner entered the Congress—there to remain through the succeeding administrations of Presidents Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover and two terms of the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Congressman Garner was elected Speaker of the House in the 72d Congress in 1931, when the Democratic Party, of which he was a life-long, loyal member, gained control, which position he retained until he was elected Vice President of the United States in 1932 to serve for eight years as the 'right hand' of President Roosevelt, whom he affectionately called 'Boss.' Mr. Garner was the first Texan to become Vice President of the United States and lived to be the longest-lived former Vice President in the Nation's history. He also had the distinction of being the only man in the country's history ever to step on the same day from the presiding chair of the Speaker of the House to that of the Senate as its President and presiding officer when he assumed the Vice Presidency. True to principle, he 'broke' with President Roosevelt over the 'third-term issue,' as did his old friend and colleague, 'Big Jim' Farley, Postmaster-General, and after swearing in his successor, Henry A. Wallace, he left Washington in 1941, vowing to never cross the Potomac again. He never did; and

"Whereas, Through his adherence to principle, honor and integrity he became legend throughout the land. His 'break' with the 'Boss' included other issues such as the Court-packing Bill, the 'Administration' handling of sit-down strikes—an innovation, at that time, in the labor movement—which together with the lashing out of John L. Lewis with the charge against him as being a 'labor baiting, whiskey drinking, poker playing, evil old man,' constituted major 'in-

cidents' in Mr. Garner's life. The Lewis blast was considered by conservatives as adding luster to the Vice President's name, and so it did. Mr. Garner's unwavering devotion to duty, his patriotism and his expert knowledge of parliamentary procedure prompted President Hoover to acclaim him thusly: 'John Garner knew how to play politics, and he was a master of that game. But he was a true patriot, a sound thinker and absolutely trustworthy in his engagements.' The mutual admiration these great leaders had for each other was reflected in the statement of Mr. Garner when he said 'I never reflected on the personal character of Herbert Hoover. I never doubted his probity of his patriotism. In many ways he was superbly equipped for the Presidency . . . I think Herbert Hoover today is the wisest statesman on world affairs in America. He may be on domestic affairs, too'; and

"Whereas, His Congressional service is replete with interesting and noteworthy accomplishments, some of which were characterized by the 'salty' humor for which he became so well known. Representing, as he did, the largest sheep and goat producing area in the country, he was the target of a good-deal of 'ribbing' by his colleagues from the manufacturing and industrial states of the North and East, particularly about his work on the tariff bills involving wool and mohair. It was on one of these occasions that Representative Payne, Republican from Pennsylvania and co-author of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff bill, arose in the House in a great forensic effort, perhaps his greatest, to say that 'this bill taxes mohair while exposing shorn sheep to the boreal blasts of free trade' as the result of Mr. Garner's handiwork. It was thus that while 'The Garner goat was reviled in prose it was to be immortalized in epic doggerel, according to a Garner biographer. The learned and pompous Representative from Pennsylvania—a high tariff protectionist—State for manufacturing interests—Honorable J. Hampton Moore, arose in the House and recited, with great emphasis and fervor, and with much bombast, the following verse of his own composition:

"Of all the creatures in the land,  
Of pedigrees supremely grand.  
There's none that do respect command.  
Like Garner's goat of Texas.

"The modest sheep may browse around  
From Maine way to Puget Sound  
But they don't count a cent a pound  
With Garner's goat of Texas.

"If you want wool, the wool is fair;  
If you want hair, the wool is hair;  
If you want meat, the meat is there;  
That's Garner's goat of Texas.

"So while you kick the wool off sheep,  
And beef and mutton make so cheap,  
Protective tariff now will keep  
The Garner's goat of Texas.

"Browse on, thou mild-eyed ruminant  
Thou are the casual nexus  
That binds protection to free trade  
Thou Garner goat of Texas.

"Oh, wondrous breed of Lone Star State,  
Premier of wool and hair, they rate  
Of 10 per cent is truly great—  
Thou Garner goat of Texas."

*That this occasion demanded a reply in kind was freely admitted, and as the laughter died down, Mr. Garner went to the cloakroom to prepare his reply. Soon the able and ready 'Sage of Uvalde,' as representative of the sheep and goat country, came forth with his 'sling-shot response' to answer the Goliath of the Quaker State, in what was the shortest speech ever therefore made in the House of Representatives when, following his recognition by the then Speaker, Champ Clark of Missouri, Mr. Garner said:*

"Mr. Speaker, Hampsie Moore is a hell of a

poet. He don't know the difference between a sheep and a goat."

"The devastation was complete, and with this brightening up of an otherwise dull, and perhaps, uninteresting debate on the tariff question, to many, a 'ceremony' was held on the Capitol steps at which 'ritual' newspapermen presented Mr. Garner with a flag of 'The Triumphant Goat' and invested him with the title 'Patron Saint of Angora'; and

"Whereas, Following his return to his tree-bedecked homeland, he and Mrs. Garner began preparations for bestowing benefactions upon various projects in the area they so long had served. After the passing of Mrs. Garner in 1948; he conveyed the brick home they had built in 1921 on Park Street in Uvalde to the City as a museum in memory of his beloved 'Ettie' where today is housed innumerable mementos of their happy and productive years together, including the first Vice President's flag ever used, it having been designed for him by Franklin D. Roosevelt. With education of particular interest to the Garners, he was to make Southwest Texas Junior College, located in Uvalde, his special beneficiary with gifts totaling well over \$1,000,000.00 in cash and good securities. Other philanthropies were many, but little publicized as he would have it; and

"Whereas, Mr. Garner spent his last years in the quiet of a small house, just to the rear of the 'Ettie Garner Museum,' amid the beauty of stately liveoak and prolific pecan trees, flowers and shrubbery surrounding it where he enjoyed the fellowship and visitations with his family, friends and high-ranking officials and politicians who came to pay their respects and seek his advice. There is an atmosphere of serenity, with a life characterized by splendid manhood, he walked in the sunlight and let the shadows fall behind him. Mr. Garner was free from bitterness toward his fellow man and was 'blind alike to the good qualities of his friends and to the bad qualities of his enemies,' and as was said of Elder Statesman Benjamin Franklin, 'He represents the nobility of Nature, not perfection'; and

"Whereas, It is the desire of the Senate of Texas, the House of Representatives concurring, to recognize the life and achievements of the Honorable John Nance Garner and to express their sympathy to the surviving members of Mr. Garner's family; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, by the Senate of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That they do hereby recognize the life and achievements of Honorable John Nance Garner and do hereby express their sympathy to the surviving members of Mr. Garner's family; namely, his son, Honorable Tully Garner of Uvalde; his granddaughter, Mrs. John (Genevieve) Currie; and his great-grandchildren, John Currie, Tully Currie and Ginger Currie, all of Amarillo; and, be it further*

*Resolved, That copies of this Resolution, under the Seal of the Senate, be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate to each of the members of the surviving family and to the 'Ettie Garner Museum'; the City Council of the City of Uvalde; the Commissioner's Court of Uvalde County; Southwest Texas Junior College; Uvalde High School; Uvalde County Historical Survey Committee; First State Bank; Chamber of Commerce; News-Leader; and the Uvalde County Bar Association, all of Uvalde, Texas; to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; and to the Vice President of the United States, in recognition of the outstanding contributions to the area, his State and his country, by Mr. Garner who was true to the people and faithful to every trust; and that a page in the Journal of each House be set apart for this Resolution; and that when*

each House adjourns today, it do so in memory of Honorable John Nance Garner."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to local residency requirements for certain public welfare recipients; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Charles A. Peterson, of Fullerton, Calif., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relating to extensive restriction on ownership of guns and ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Mrs. Myra Kronengold, of New York, N.Y., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to gun control; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of S. L. Elliott, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for a redress of grievances; ordered to lie on the table.

#### REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 1514. A bill relating to the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1318);

H.R. 3931. An act to amend the act of April 3, 1952 (Rept. No. 1319); and

H.R. 8581. An act to amend section 11-341 (b) of the District of Columbia Code which relates to the sales price for the reports of the opinions of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (Rept. No. 1320).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 1628. A bill to authorize suits in the court of the District of Columbia for collection of taxes owed to States, territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, when the reciprocal right is accorded to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1321).

#### AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1322)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (H.R. 17268) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with my individual views, and the supplemental views of Senators BENNETT, TOWER, HICKENLOOPER, BROOKE, and PERCY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 3679. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1968 (Public Law 351, 90th Congress); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3680. A bill for the relief of Dr. Giocrito G. Sagisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 3681. A bill to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3682. A bill for the relief of Lau Shek Tung, and Cheung Stz Chi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3683. A bill to establish in the District of Columbia a unified court system in order to provide increased attention to family problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3684. A bill for the relief of Laurence M. Picard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### S. 3681—INTRODUCTION OF BILL PROVIDING PENALTY OF UP TO LIFE IMPRISONMENT FOR MIS-USE OF FIREARMS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide an added penalty up to life imprisonment for use of any kind of firearm in a Federal crime of violence.

The measure which I propose today for national application is the same approach, insofar as practicable, as that approved by Congress just 6 months ago as the new crime law for the District of Columbia.

It is not a complicated proposal. Rather it is couched in simple, straightforward language which the criminal can understand.

I believe, and my bill therefore provides, that any person who uses a firearm to commit certain Federal crimes of a violent nature should in addition to the punishment provided for the crime, be punished by imprisonment for an indeterminate number of years up to life as determined by the court; if convicted more than once, be precluded from receiving a suspended or probationary sentence.

Mr. President, the word must go out and the message must be clear that the criminal who would use a fireman to commit a crime in America runs the risk of imprisonment for life.

This bill is meant for those who have found power in a gun, but have forgotten what is right.

There was a time when I thought the impact of such a proposal minimal, but that time has passed.

I am aware that, relatively speaking, there are a rather limited number of Federal crimes for which this would be useful. However, justice is not dependent on numbers. By limiting the bill's application to these Federal crimes, we respect and preserve the traditional demarcation between State and Federal law enforcement.

My bill should serve as a catalyst to State and local legislative bodies to initiate similar legislation for their more numerous State and local crimes. I urge them to do so.

It strengthens the tools of law enforcement while maintaining flexibility and discretion in the sentencing process. In this manner, the judges of our courts are authorized to handle each case as the circumstances may require.

I recognize the need, as do the American people, for better enforcement of existing laws. That is a matter for the executive, not the legislative, branch of Government. I recognize the need for obtaining solid convictions of offenders, and hope that our recent modifications of Supreme Court decisions on the admissibility of confessions and other evidence will assist to that end. But I also recognize the need for stamping out violence by getting at those who perpetrate it.

Now we have a Presidential Commission on Violence, but the private citizen who recalls the old days when he could live in his home, walk on the streets, and go about his business, all without fear, cannot expect Congress to sit idly by awaiting another study. This bill can provide some meaningful action today.

Let us have the courage and the foresight to provide for all Americans the same protective measure we have so recently given to residents of the Nation's Capital.

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

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

The bill (S. 3681) to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3681

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after chapter 115 the following new chapter:*

*CHAPTER 116.—USE OF FIREARMS IN THE COMMISSION OF CERTAIN CRIMES OF VIOLENCE*

*“2401. Use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence.*

*“2402. Definitions.*

*“§ 2401. Use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence.*

*“Whoever, while engaged in the commission of any offense which is a crime of violence punishable under this title, is armed with any firearm, may in addition to the punishment provided for the crime be punished by imprisonment for an indeterminate number of years up to life, as determined by the court. Upon a subsequent conviction under this section by the same person, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not suspend the sentence of such person or give him a probationary sentence.*

*“§ 2402. Definitions*

*“As used in this chapter—*

*“‘Crime of violence’ means any of the following crimes or an attempt to commit any of the following crimes: murder; voluntary manslaughter; Presidential assassination, kidnaping, and assault; killing certain officers and employees of the United States; rape; kidnaping; assault with intent to kill, rob, rape, or poison; assault with a dangerous*

weapon; robbery; burglary; theft; racketeering; extortion; and arson.

"Firearm" means any weapon (including a starter gun) which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive; the frame or receiver of any such weapon; or any firearm muffler or firearm silencer; or any destructive device.

"Destructive device" means any explosive, incendiary, or poison gas bomb, grenade, mine, rocket, missile, or similar device; and includes any type of weapon which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of any explosive and having any barrel with a bore of one-half inch or more in diameter."

(b) The analysis of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the last item the following:

"116. Use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence... 2401".

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3640) to establish a commission to study the organization, operation, and management of the executive branch of the Government, and to recommend changes necessary or desirable in the interest of governmental efficiency and economy.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. On behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3126), to provide for the regulation of present and future surface and strip mining, for the conservation, acquisition, and reclamation of surface and strip mined areas, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 94) to create a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime.

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

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 306—RESOLUTION TO CONTINUE THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and myself, I am submitting today a resolution to continue the Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress until such time as the House of Representatives completes action on the pending congressional reorganization bill (S. 355) which passed the Senate last year by an overwhelming majority.

We introduce this resolution at this

time because of the imminence of the expiration of the committee at the end of this month and the need for prompt action to enable the Senate Rules and Administration Committee to consider the resolution at its meeting tomorrow.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROEY], who is chairman of the Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress, is necessarily absent today, but plans to return shortly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 306) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

#### S. Res. 306

*Resolved*, That S. Res. 247, agreed to March 15, 1968, is amended—

(1) by striking out in the first section thereof "June 30, 1968", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the earlier of the following two dates: (1) the thirtieth day following the date on which the bill entitled 'An Act to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes' (S. 355, 90th Congress, 1st Session, passed by the Senate March 7, 1967) is enrolled as an enactment for transmittal to the President after passage by both Houses of the Congress; and (2) the date on which the second session of the Ninetieth Congress is adjourned sine die";

(2) by striking out in section 2 thereof the date "June 30, 1968" wherever it appears in that section, and inserting in lieu thereof "the date specified in the first section of this resolution"; and

(3) by striking out in section 2 thereof "\$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$70,000".

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 307—RESOLUTION ASSIGNING THE SENATOR FROM MINNESOTA, MR. MONDALE, TO THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 307) assigning the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which was considered and agreed to.

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

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 290) requesting the Small Business Administration to undertake a study and offer recommendations for assistance to small businessmen in meeting the standards of the Wholesome Meat Act.

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

#### EXTENSION OF LEGISLATION RELATING TO MAINTAINING FARM INCOME—AMENDMENT

##### AMENDMENT NO. 869

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed

by him, to the bill (S. 3590) to extend and improve legislation for maintaining farm income, stabilizing prices and assuring adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 25, 1968, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 171. An act for the relief of Timothy Joseph Shea and Elsie Annet Shea; and

S. 1028. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain benefits to former employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes.

#### NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the following nominations:

Samuel C. Adams, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Niger.

Carter L. Burgess, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

Thomas W. McElhiney, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana, vice Franklin H. Williams.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

#### KARL RANDALL—"BLIND WORKER OF THE YEAR"

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, visiting in the Capitol today is Karl Randall, of Minnetonka, Minn. He has been awarded the designation—and properly so—of "Blind Worker of the Year" by those persons who, within the executive council of the National Industries for the Blind, know of his skills and attitudes.

During my years in Congress, I have been active in many fields of endeavor, but none has given me more satisfaction than my work with and for the blind. Many of you remember the late, great Chairman of the President's Committee, Marine Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, of Minnesota, who gave leadership to the national program of jobs for the handicapped, during the years when he was totally blind. Mel Maas would have been happy to be with us today as we honored the Blind Worker of the Year, from his home State of Minnesota, Karl Randall of Minnetonka, Minn.

Mr. Randall was accompanied by his devoted wife and by Robert Goodpasture, executive vice president of the National

Industries for the Blind—the organization which selected Mr. Randall as the Blind Worker of the Year.

Minority leader, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, who was stricken with partial blindness many years ago and who fully recovered, joined the junior Senator from Minnesota, WALTER MONDALE, and me, in welcoming the Randalls and their party to Capitol Hill to receive the award named after one of the pioneers in the blind movement, Peter J. Salmon, of the Industrial Home for the Blind in Brooklyn.

Mr. Randall works at the Minnesota Society for the Blind Workshop in Minneapolis. This is one of 80 workshops affiliated with the National Industries of the Blind in making items for sale to government or private outlets.

Recently at a National Meeting of Board Members from NIB affiliated agencies here, Jansen Noyes, Jr., NIB board chairman and a partner of Hornblower, Weeks-Hemphill & Noyes, stated that of the 400,000 legally blind in our country, 172,000 are of working age. He said that of this group the best estimate was that 70 percent should not be considered employable, including housewives, those medically incapacitated and those he termed "a distressing percentage who are in mental institutions." Noyes further stated:

Hopefully, over the years ahead, as a result of improved rehabilitation processes, a growing proportion of this latter group can be brought into shops as contributing members of our society.

He continued:

As of today, I am advised that only about 30 percent of the working blind population is employable. Of this group, approximately one-third is self-employed in a multitude of occupations ranging from news-stand operators (through the Randolph-Sheppard Act) to university professors. The remaining 20 percent represent 35,000 blind people who are capable of employment in sheltered or commercial shops.

I have studied a dynamic document, "Blind Manpower," a profile of National Industries for the Blind. In addition, I have read excellent recent speeches by Miss Mary Switzer, the capable Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Services Administration, and by the Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Harold Russell, before the NIB meeting last month. They underscore the progress made and the hope for the future in providing blind citizens with employment.

I am reminded how much easier and more productive life would be for the blind and seriously handicapped if we could eliminate the unnecessary barriers to their pleasure, work and worship. May I commend this thought to my colleagues as we shortly consider Senator BARTLETT'S architectural barriers bill recently sent over by the House. Karl Randall did not need such a bill to be self-supporting, but countless other thousands may. In acting promptly on this bill, we will be honoring Mr. Randall.

This blind worker has given more than 500 talks to youth groups in the Northwest and Canada. The story of his life is most interesting, and I desire to in-

corporate with these brief remarks of commendation of his leadership certain documents, including a statement dated June 12, 1968, from President Lyndon Johnson; a brief biography of Robert C. Goodpasture, who has worked in the organization of the National Industries for the Blind; and certain interesting information as to the life of this very worthwhile man, Karl Randall, of Minnesota.

I ask unanimous consent to have these documents printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, June 12, 1968.

Thirty years ago Congress acted to help the blind become more self-sufficient citizens. The Wagner-O'Day Act of June 25, 1938, provided priority purchases by government agencies of certain products made by the blind.

The demand for these goods fostered jobs for thousands of blind people, who were enabled to prove their ability to overcome handicaps and lead productive lives. Their courage and contributions have been great.

A direct outgrowth of the Act was National Industries for the Blind, which now channels contracts to 78 workshops for the blind. These shops employ 4,600 workers and produce 300 different items. Many skilled employees in American industry today were first trained in these shops before entering private business.

This success is matched only by the future ambitions of the National Industries for the Blind and its affiliated workshops in 35 states. They plan to provide 16,000 blind workers with steady jobs in sheltered workshops during the decade ahead.

This optimism and determination preserves the spirit of the Wagner-O'Day Act and deserves the unmeasured support of labor, business, and the consuming public.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

ROBERT C. GOODPASTURE

Mr. Goodpasture, Executive Vice President of NIB, has been the guiding spirit of NIB since joining the organization in 1960 as General Manager. Under his stewardship NIB's affiliated workshops have increased from 56 to 78 employing 4600 blind workers located in 34 states and Washington, D.C.

Mr. Goodpasture was appointed by Secretary Gardner to HEW's National Policy and Performance Council in 1966 and by Secretary Wirtz to the Department of Labor's Advisory Committee on Sheltered Workshops in 1968. He is also on the Board of Directors of the National Accreditation Council.

Prior to joining NIB he was an engineering consultant to three prominent New York firms and had done engineering field work in 18 states and 3 foreign countries. An alumnus of Yale University with both Bachelors and Masters degrees in engineering, he also taught civil engineering there. He is the editor of the book "Engineers and Ivory Towers."

Twenty-eight-year-old Karl Randall lives at 10209 Minnetonka Boulevard in Minnetonka, Minnesota. He is married and has a 4 year old and a three-month old daughter. His wife and daughter are sighted.

Randall is employed at the Minneapolis Society for the Blind workshop in Minneapolis. He works in the packaging section of the sub-contract department, and is an expert repairman of complex machines.

Because of his work skills, work attitudes and manner in which he has been able to overcome the handicap of blindness, the supervisors of the Minneapolis workshop named him their "Blind Worker of the Year".

As such, he became eligible for the newly-created Peter J. Salmon Award given to the national "Blind Worker of the Year", by the Executive Council of the National Industries for the Blind.

After considering the merits of contestants from 78 NIB-affiliated workshops all over the country, the Executive Council voted Karl Randall the first-ever national "Blind Worker of the Year".

Karl's life story is loaded with drama. In 1957, at the age of 17, he dropped out of high school. Shortly afterwards, he was involved in a drinking escapade with some teenage friends which culminated in an automobile chase by the police. There was an accident and Karl lost his sight. He has been totally blind ever since.

Sometime after the accident, Randall got to know Sheriff Lester Malkert of Carver County, Minnesota, and Mr. Ty Abel of Wayzata, Minnesota, a prominent businessman and nationally-known official of the Lions Club. They encouraged Karl to go back to high school, which he did, graduating in 1961.

After graduation, he enrolled in the Stevenson Auto and Electrical School in Kansas City, Missouri, from which he graduated a Gold Star student.

Meanwhile, Sheriff Malkert inspired Randall's interest in the problems of traffic safety and respect for authority which prompted Randall to decide to devote his life to helping American youth avoid the tragedy that befell him.

Over the last several years he has carried on this crusade by giving some 500 talks before youth groups in the Northwest and Canada.

Since 1962, he has been a member of the South Tonka Lions Club of Excelsior, Minnesota. He is presently board chairman, after serving as immediate past president.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICY TOWARD DE GAULLE HAS PAID OFF

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in recent years, on numerous occasions, General de Gaulle has taken actions or enunciated policies which were contrary to what we considered to be our national interests. NATO, Vietnam, and the gold problem are but a few examples. On each occasion, many people thought the United States should lash out in retaliation at General de Gaulle.

Fortunately, President Johnson recognized that such a course of action, although temporarily giving us some satisfaction, would, in the long run, be counter to the interests of both the United States and France. The President knew that on the matter of world peace, France stood side by side with America. The well-known journalist, C. L. Sulzberger, writing in the New York Times, now reports that as a result of President Johnson's policy of patience and restraint, America is held in higher esteem in France than at any time in recent years. Furthermore, there is no question that France played a helpful role in getting Vietnam peace talks started in Paris. All in all, President Johnson's policy toward General de Gaulle has served the entire free world.

For this—

Sulzberger says—

the President merits full credit for personal wisdom during a trying time.

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:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: JOHNSON AND DE GAULLE  
(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—The United States is not an issue in the French national elections and, with the exception of the Communists, none of France's politicians are showing active hostility to America. This is remarkable if for no other reason than the fact that when spring started Uncle Sam's name was mud.

One reason for the change in atmosphere is that foreign policy—General de Gaulle's favorite field—is not a major campaign issue. Even the famous *force de frappe*, a pet oppositional whipping boy, isn't often featured in debates.

#### CAMPAIGN ISSUES

The contest is being fought on internal social problems and the ideological warning, underscored by Gaullists, that if the general's party isn't returned to power the Communists will dominate any successor government. For the first time in years, de Gaulle himself has been talking an old-fashioned cold war line.

Another, less obvious, reason for the disappearance of any artificial "American" electoral issue is, however, directly attributable to President Johnson's personal French policy. Despite frequent exhortations from some of his leading advisers during the past four years, when American anti-Gaullists wanted the President to strike back at the general, Johnson refused to listen.

In 1966, after de Gaulle had ordered the expulsion from France of various NATO headquarters, former Secretary of State Acheson, Secretary of State Rusk and Under Secretary Ball all urged some kind of retributive action. The President refused. When Ball made a speech criticizing French policy, Johnson commanded his top counselors to avoid such public criticism in the future.

At various times, from 1965 on, the President was urged to select an issue such as strategy or fiscal matters and, at a moment of his own choosing, to provoke a confrontation with France. He spurned such advice. In this major decision he followed his own wise judgment and, furthermore, echoed the opinion of his brilliant, levelheaded Ambassador in Paris, Chip Bohlen.

In the spring of 1965 the President was asked whether the United States was considering reclassifying France as no longer a "friend" and "ally." He refused to contemplate such an attitude. He admitted certain things were being done by France that the U.S.A. would prefer were not done, but he acknowledged that this was clearly the privilege of Paris.

The President has often received less credit than he deserves for his judgment of international affairs and his conduct of foreign policy. The case of France is an outstanding example. During the past three years he has steadfastly adhered to the view that there was no point feuding with de Gaulle, a proud and nationally minded man.

He was grateful that France had recovered its pride and sense of nationalism. Despite any inconveniences, a stable France was a more valuable asset to the Western community than a French in which governments changes every few months.

Johnson made a point of reminding his advisers that de Gaulle had stood fast beside the United States during the great Cuban showdown with Russia. He would sometimes conclude discussions by telling anti-Gaullists around him that if the general "threw his fast ball" (a simile difficult to imagine), he (Johnson) would simply "step aside."

#### A PHILOSOPHIC APPROACH

Even after the NATO crisis caused by de Gaulle's expulsion order, the President in-

sisted that the United States loved France and looked upon development with sorrow, not with anger. He philosophically hoped the French people would not always feel about the United States the way their Government seemed to feel and that the general would find there were some burning problems he could work out with Washington.

As a matter of fact, this calm approach had already paid off prior to the current French crisis. Had it not been for Johnson's unflappability it is unlikely that France could have been persuaded to help initiate Vietnamese peace negotiations or that talks would have started in this city.

#### FRANCE'S OLD FRIEND

The United States seems to be resuming its familiar position as France's old friend. The stars and stripes was cheered during recent pro-de Gaulle demonstrations. No non-Communist has, to my knowledge, attack America in an otherwise uninhibited electoral campaign.

Obviously Johnson had nothing to do with the dramatic change in France's internal situation that provoked this crisis and which seemingly buried, at least for the nonce, previous official coolness. But, during the hard times, Johnson certainly preserved every possible vestige of cordiality. For this the President merits full credit for personal wisdom during a trying time.

#### THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] had intended to make yesterday when the Senate passed, with amendments, H.R. 16819, to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. He is necessarily absent.

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

#### A MINIMUM INVESTMENT FOR MAXIMUM BENEFITS

(Statement by Senator BARTLETT)

I support H.R. 16819, the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968, a bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend the authorization of grants to States for rehabilitation services, and to broaden the scope of goods and services available under that Act for the handicapped. The bill is of particular importance to my State. Alaska is a large State with a relatively high per capita income, but on the other hand, the smallest population of all the States. As a result, Federal grants-in-aid to the State which are made on the basis of per capita income and population often times fall far short of the amount needed to provide a workable program with the State. However, by the recent action of the Select Subcommittee on Education, whose chairman is the respected Representative from New Jersey, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, and the full House, this special problem of the underpopulated States has, at long last, been recognized. Thanks to the action of the House, the bill before us sets a minimum of \$1 million in assistance to each and every State. This will afford the assistance necessary to each State as it works to increase efficiency, expand rehabilitation operations and to extend services to a greater portion of its citizens.

The attention of the Select Subcommittee on Education was first drawn to this problem by the testimony of the Representative from Alaska, Mr. Pollock, the Representative from Nevada, Mr. Baring, the Representative from Delaware, Mr. Roth, and the Representative from Wyoming, Mr. Harrison. They proposed that the subcommittee con-

sider establishing a minimum percentage as a determinant of the federal contribution. The subcommittee, after a good deal of study, decided and I feel, decided wisely, to provide instead for a flat minimum allotment of \$1 million. I congratulate the subcommittee on its work, on its leadership and on its willingness to undertake a review of a problem which, although it has not concerned the many, has certainly harmed the few.

Without the inclusion of this minimum allotment provision, the State of Alaska would be the hardest hit of the smaller states. Alaska would receive but \$438,921 in federal allotments for fiscal year 1969. This would just not be enough—not even with the State's share of matching funds—to provide a meaningful or a useful program. The Daniels' amendment will mean that allocation adjustments must be made proportionately in the amounts available to other states but those adjustments will be small compared to the vast benefits to be derived by the citizenry of Alaska, Nevada, Delaware, and Wyoming.

I urge the Senate to follow the example of the House and to act favorably on the measure.

It is my intention in the new year, with the new Congress and a new administration to request the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a general review of all its grants-in-aid programs. The hardship and the unfairness of the method hitherto used in determining allotments under the vocational rehabilitation program is not limited to that program alone. Alaskans and citizens of other states of low population and relatively high per capita income are faced with a similar problem in virtually every grant-in-aid program administered by the department. I am hopeful that a general review will produce general legislation and that this legislation will receive the approval of Congress so that the small States will no longer be at the mercy of their inadequate allotments.

#### CLEARFIELD, UTAH, JOB CORPS CENTER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in April 1966, it was announced that Thiokol Chemical Corp. would operate an urban Job Corps center for 1,300 trainees at the site of the former Clearfield Naval Supply Center in Clearfield, Utah.

The announcement was met with less than enthusiastic support from surrounding communities. In fact, there was intense opposition to the establishment of the center.

Six months later, on October 4, 1966, when the first 14 corpsmen arrived, the situation had not improved very much in spite of hard community relations work on the part of Thiokol officials.

But as the corpsmen increased in number and finally reached the 1,300 level in May of 1967 and the surrounding communities had the opportunity to see the center in operation and observe the young trainees as they visited the local communities, the opposition gradually decreased.

Today, not everyone is a 100-percent supporter of the program, but the tone and extent of the opposition in Utah has decreased dramatically. Especially among the local elected officials and law enforcement officers, the switch from opposition to support has been most encouraging.

People soon discovered that the young men in Job Corps were seeking an opportunity to obtain the necessary skills

so that they could obtain and hold a meaningful job and earn their own way in society. They discovered that the young men were willing and eager to be accepted as members of the community and that they would donate hundreds and hundreds of man-hours working on local community service projects.

There were scattered incidents and some trouble in the community, mostly between the Job Corps men and local youths, but statistics soon proved the corpsmen offered less trouble to law enforcement officers than the same number of local youths. Some officers have said they would rather deal with the corpsmen than some of the local young people.

The Clearfield Job Corps Center recently graduated the 2,000th corpsman. He was Matthew Washington, age 20, from Baton Rouge, La. He is now working as a hospital services worker in the pediatrics division of St. Benedict's Hospital in Ogden, Utah. He plans to continue his education, enter Weber State College and eventually become a medical technician.

He was one of 116 graduates honored at a recent graduation. At the same time the center's fieldhouse was dedicated to the memory of and renamed in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King.

At the time of Dr. King's death, the trainees at the Clearfield Center established a Martin Luther King Scholarship Fund to be used to finance college training for deserving graduates from the Clearfield Center. At this same graduation ceremony, \$3,400 which had been raised by donations from the center trainees and Thiokol employees was presented to officials of Weber State College.

This center is one of the success stories in the Job Corps program. I am proud of my association with the center since its beginning more than 2 years ago. Many of the 2,000 young men who have graduated from the center literally had no hope of holding a meaningful job before receiving this training. Now they are working as productive citizens, and through their income tax are already repaying the American taxpayers and are also helping to provide the same opportunities for other young persons.

The Salt Lake Tribune published an article covering the ceremony I have described. 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:

**CLEARFIELD CENTER CEREMONIES GRADUATE 2,000TH CORPSMAN**  
(By Darlene Galbraith)

**CLEARFIELD.**—A dream of a future career as a medical technician came a step closer to reality Tuesday for the 2,000th graduate of the Clearfield Job Corps Center.

Matthew Washington, 20, Baton Rouge, La., will begin full-time employment Thursday as a hospital services worker in the pediatrics division at St. Benedict's Hospital, Ogden.

The youth was one of 116 corpsmen who received graduation recognition in ceremonies at the Job Corps Center. The outdoor rites also included dedication of Martin Luther King Fieldhouse and presentation of a \$3,400 memorial scholarship to Weber State College, Ogden.

#### PREDICTS BRIGHT FUTURE

For young Washington, completion of the course marked the beginning of what he hopes will be a life-long career. He plans to "complete requirements for a high school diploma, enroll at Weber State College and study to become a medical technician."

Charles J. Moxley, center director, predicted a brighter future than would have been possible without the training program for all of graduating corpsmen. Of the 116 total, 33 already have left the center for job placement, 50 were awarded full-course graduation diplomas, 27 received General Equivalency Diplomas and six completed graduation requirements in the adult high school program at Davis High School, Mr. Moxley said.

The director expressed pride in the 2,000 youths who have completed the training program since the first corpsman arrived at the center on Oct. 4, 1966.

"You have your diplomas, your knowledge is there, no one can take it away," John Burgess, associate director of operations, National Job Corps, Washington, D.C., told the graduates.

#### FIELDHOUSE DEDICATION

In ceremonies dedicating the fieldhouse in memory of the slain civil rights leader, Robert L. Marquardt, vice president in charge of Thiokol's economic development operations, told the corpsmen, Dr. King "stood for what you wanted: Free opportunity."

The fieldhouse has area for basketball and handball courts, arts-and-crafts area, a four-lane bowling alley, an Olympic-sized swimming pool and a boxing arena. It is the only new building constructed at the Clearfield center, Mr. Moxley said.

Dr. James Foulger, WSC vice president, accepted the \$3,400 Martin Luther King Scholarship Fund on behalf of the school. Funds to be used by center graduates were donated by corpsmen, center officials and workers from all Thiokol divisions.

#### THIRTY-FOUR NOW COLLEGIANS

Corpsmen Jim Harvey and Leonard Nielson, who have been accepted for enrollment at the University of Utah, were honored representing the 36 corpsmen attending area colleges.

At a luncheon preceding the ceremonies, James L. Barker Jr., Salt Lake City commissioner, told a group of trade-journal editors, business and community leaders, "I was antagonistic when the center was first proposed, but since have changed my mind. When you invest taxpayers' money in making people respected members of the community, you are getting a return."

#### PASSAGE OF THE MONDAY HOLIDAY BILL

**Mr. SMATHERS.** Mr. President, as one who has long supported the Monday holiday bill, I am pleased that the Senate took prompt action to pass the pending legislation and send it to the President. Appropriately enough, the Senate vote came on a Monday.

I commend the distinguished majority leader for his prompt action on the bill (H.R. 15951) to provide for the uniform annual observance of certain holidays on Mondays.

I would also like to thank the distinguished minority leader, who so graciously consented to hold hearings on, and lend his support to, S. 1217, a bill which I introduced which was similar in intent to the one just passed by the Senate.

While my own bill differed from the

House bill in some respects, I felt that we would be better advised to accept that version as a compromise measure. For a number of years there has been a growing interest among business and professional groups, organized labor, and individual workers, as well as a number of our colleagues in both Houses, in adopting a commonsense plan for the observance of certain holidays. All recognized the shortcomings of our existing system, but were unable to reach a consensus on a single plan. However, in working together we now have achieved a plan which proved to be acceptable to the majority of those who have labored so long to make our holidays rational as well as national.

Mr. President, employer and employee alike, as well as the general public, will benefit from this legislation that regularizes the observance of Washington's Birthday, Veterans Day, and Memorial Day so that they will occur annually on Mondays. Also, the establishment of Columbus Day as a national holiday, not only pays tribute to those Americans of Italian descent who followed their great countryman, Christopher Columbus, to America, but underscores the fact that we are a nation of immigrants. This observance establishes a new Monday holiday, thus creating four, 3-day "vacationettes."

Briefly, as a result of the bill, the individual worker and his family will benefit from increased time to spend together, visit relatives or friends, travel or just take it easy and relax at home. Also, a 3-day weekend will provide time for family pilgrimages to historic sites, making the observance of these holidays educational and more meaningful. A 3-day holiday also provides an opportunity for participation in a wider range of educational and recreational activities for the whole family.

Commerce and business will benefit from the uninterrupted workweek. Mid-week holidays often cause absenteeism, inefficiency, and malingering, in addition to costly shutdowns, production interruptions, and delays.

As passed, the measure will not become effective until January 1, 1971, which in my view will give the various State legislatures ample time to adopt legislation governing the State observance of these four national holidays.

By so doing, we will have moved the Nation to a more logical position as regards the observance of holidays, a position that will prove to be one which accords ample respect to our traditions and history, yet gives to our citizens a more generous portion of time in which to celebrate these holidays.

Mr. President, I am gratified that this beneficial legislation has cleared the Senate with such dispatch, and it is my sincere hope that the President will see fit to sign the bill at his earliest opportunity.

#### BILINGUAL EDUCATION—UNFULFILLED PROMISE

**Mr. YARBOROUGH.** Mr. President, in the May 27 issue of the Legislative News-

letter, the Americans for Democratic Action state:

Having approved a program to provide education mainly to Spanish-speaking children, the Administration is now starving the program. Although \$30 million was authorized when the program was approved, the Administration is seeking only \$5 million for fiscal 1969. Of the three million children who need help under the bilingual education program, only about 142,000 are getting it. Even the full \$30 million will help only 215,000 more. *This much should be approved.*

As author of the Bilingual Education Act, and as this RECORD has made abundantly clear thus far, I agree that this urgently needed legislation should be funded fully. But now the House of Representatives has voted to deny even \$5 million to these deprived schoolastics.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the editor of the Corpus Christi Caller of May 21, written by I. O. Calvillo, a ninth-grade student from Edinburg, Tex., be printed in the RECORD at this point. The letter goes far to explain the hope that the Bilingual Education Act holds out to our non-English speaking youngsters.

I further ask unanimous consent that a self-explanatory letter from Mr. Richard M. Clowes, superintendent of schools of the County of Los Angeles, Calif., dated May 29, 1968, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STUDENT PRAISES BILINGUAL TEACHING  
EDITOR, THE CALLER:

In your letter, A.W.E., of May 6, about the bilingual program, you asked, "What good does the bilingual program do?"

In my belief, the bilingual program is very good. For instance, the bilingual program helped me learn more words for a better vocabulary. It helped me understand the things I read.

The bilingual program also helps small, Spanish-speaking children understand and listen to the teacher better. If a small boy starts going to school and the teacher starts speaking to him only in English, he thinks that his teacher is "nuts."

Now, many jobs pay more to the bilingual secretary than to an ordinary one. Many businessmen in the Southwest, Texas, Louisiana, etc., carry on transactions with businesses south of the border. A knowledge of both languages is not only needed in office work, but in many other jobs.

Besides, we are Spanish-speaking people, even though we live here in the United States. We speak English just as anyone else, but we also want to learn how to speak and write it correctly. Many people don't understand what being bilingual means.

It means having the opportunity of getting ahead in both the English and Spanish-speaking worlds. I hope that with these few reasons, you will change your mind about the bilingual program.

I. O. CALVILLO,  
Ninth-Grade Student.

EDINBURG.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,  
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,  
Los Angeles, Calif., May 29, 1968.

Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,  
Senate Appropriations Committee,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: The Los Angeles County Board of Education took action to send this communication, which is being

addressed to all members of the Appropriations Committee, urging your support of the appropriations for the Bilingual Bill in the full amount specified in the bill.

It is the belief of this body, which represents 95 school districts in Los Angeles County, that this measure is one of the most important new pieces of legislation to come before Congress in recent years. It is impossible for us to measure the benefits we believe that would be derived from the implementation of the provisions of the Bilingual Bill which affects so much of the population of this County. We trust that the long-range influence such a bill can have on students now in school is fully understood and that we can rely on your full support as appropriations are being considered.

Sincerely,

RICHARD M. CLOWES,  
Superintendent.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this legislation was vital and urgent. Full funding is even more important. The necessities of the times and the call of Western civilization demands that these children have a chance at last. The time for bilingual education was a hundred years ago. Its fulfillment comes late. We need to vote the money this year.

#### THE POOR PEOPLE'S MARCH NOT THE ANSWER

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, it has often been observed that as events seem to overwhelm us, the difficulty one has in keeping his perspective increases accordingly.

Thus, I find the words of a Cheyenne minister, a Negro, to be very helpful.

The Reverend C. B. Beamon said in Cheyenne recently—where he is pastor of the African Methodist Church:

I am afraid it (the march) displays something less than true intelligence. I think we need to show not how low we are, but how high we would like to reach.

We've been in the gutter long enough. If we emphasize poverty we will continue to remain on the poverty list.

Let us emphasize better and higher things, and when we lift our minds in that direction we sooner or later will live that way . . . as a man thinketh not only so is he, but so will he live.

It is the responsibility of all Americans to do everything we can to improve our society. Sometimes the most important contributions we can make may not be in trying directly to relieve the poor through Government largess, but by setting and encouraging through example a purpose and a determination to improve our own lot.

No healthy person can be helped permanently by being made the recipient of gratuities.

So I take pleasure and satisfaction, Mr. President, in saluting my fellow Wyomingite, Mr. Beamon, for his clear analysis of a responsible reaction to poverty.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article published in the Wyoming State Tribune, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PASTOR HERE INDICATES MARCH NOT SOLUTION  
(By Lynn M. Kelly)

The pastor of the Cheyenne African Methodist Church said today he didn't know of

anyone in Cheyenne interested in joining the Poor People's March in Washington. He said he believed the march and Resurrection City are not the means for poor people to get what they need.

The Rev. C. B. Beamon, a Negro, said, "I am afraid it (the march) displays something less than true intelligence. I think we need to show not how low we are, but how high we would like to reach. We've been in the gutter long enough. If we emphasize poverty we will continue to remain on the poverty list. Let us emphasize better and higher things, and when we lift our minds in that direction we sooner or later will live that way . . . as a man thinketh not only so is he, but so will he live."

The pastor of the 100 member, predominantly negro church said he didn't know of anyone going to Washington from Cheyenne to participate in the march, and said, "I don't know of anyone who even seems to be interested."

He said, "I believe education is the key to solving poverty, but not the Resurrection City kind of education."

"I don't want to be educated on how low I am. I want to be educated on how high I am," he said. "This type of education, thinking in terms of what we can do about lifting ourselves in this world, will get us what we need, but it is the personal responsibility of every person of every race, creed and color."

Beamon said he believes the idea of federal aid "is a wonderful thing, but the bad things about it are the way it is distributed and the callousness of the people who handle it in finding the right place to distribute it."

"A handout to any people has always been one of the worst things in the world," he said.

"Give my people a job and give them an opportunity. Move back out of the way and let me work for my living and I can stand up with dignity and pride and I can walk before the public with an uplifted head," he said.

"But if I have to look around at the faces of those who have been giving me my living on a platter, I can think very little of it," he said.

"True men don't beg. They have no need to beg. They either find something already available to make a living or are instrumental in helping to bring about or develop ways to do it. They make something of their own," he said.

"When this is done, and when this has been considered, especially among those who are so glibly ready to pass out aid and brag about what the government is doing for the country, we will be much better off," he said.

"I think we should be able to stop asking 'what do you have to offer me' and ask instead 'what do I have to offer that will make me worthy of the space which I hold,'" he said.

The pastor said he believes it is the personal responsibility of each person to lift himself to a level of higher attainment.

"It is impossible to throw a barrel of fishhooks in the river and think you're going to catch fish," he said. "We should make ourselves the first example and each community, county and state should do the same."

Beamon said he believes if all persons would follow the same steps and follow the same laws in lifting themselves to a higher level, "We would soon find ourselves at a point where we can live like brothers and sisters."

#### GOURMAN REPORT VALUABLE NEW TOOL IN SELECTING COLLEGES

Mr. PROXMIKE. Mr. President, most professional educators, many parents

and an increasingly large number of college-bound youngsters have pondered the difficult question of academic and administrative excellence in our Nation's 4-year colleges. Any parent or high school counselor who has gone through the agonizing process of determining which institution excels in a given area of study or in such essentials as library facilities and ratio of staff to students knows how difficult it is to arrive at any sort of an objective determination.

Last year a report rating 1,187 American colleges, compiled by Prof. Jack Gourman, not only graded colleges on their excellence in areas ranging from French to financial aid but also gave overall numerical ratings. As a Yale graduate I would have to question the total objectivity of a report which relegated Yale to third place in the national rankings. But, quite seriously, I have yet to see as thorough and valuable a summary of college strengths and weaknesses as the Gourman report presents.

I urge my colleagues to give the report careful study, for it tells us a great deal about the condition of American education today. It also may play an increasingly important role in encouraging our institutions of higher learning to upgrade the quality of their instruction, administration and physical plant in the knowledge that such upgrading will have a substantial impact on their standing in this national rating system—a system which will continue to be refined and updated as the years go by.

#### CIP—AN OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY PROJECT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Cleveland International Program for Youth Leaders and Social Workers, Inc., will be celebrating its 10th anniversary this August. The goals of this outstanding organization, formed in Cleveland, Ohio, have always been to enhance international relations through person-to-person understanding. This organization, known as CIP, has dealt with small but carefully selected groups of social workers and youth leaders who have been brought from nations the world over to Cleveland to study at Case Western Reserve University, to live with families in the Cleveland area, and to learn to know America through summer work experience in camps, settlement houses, and similar institutions.

This summer a new high of 86 participants from 40 different countries have been enrolled in the program. Dr. Henry Ollendorff, CIP's director and founder, reports more interest abroad in the program than ever before. Sweden and France, for example, have increased their support—Sweden with a direct cash contribution and France with a reciprocal offer to American youth leaders. Israeli and Jordanian alumni have maintained mutual interest in the program.

This is an excellent example of how we can bring about a better understanding of America in other nations through action on the local level. It is a fine means of furthering the cause of mutual understanding and eliminating un-

founded fears and distrust. Cleveland and the Nation can be proud of the influence which this project has had toward building world peace through understanding of global problems on the basis of firsthand knowledge.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the Committee on Appropriations will again provide adequate funds for programs of this nature. The State Department has asked that \$5 million of the \$15 million cut by the House of Representatives be restored for exchange programs for foreign visitors to the United States which will not require dollar expenditures abroad. CIP funding is included in that area, and I urge the committee to restore these funds which more than justify themselves in the cause of world peace.

#### U.S. CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the latest issue of Time magazine reports:

As of midnight on Sunday, June 23, the Vietnam conflict became the longest war ever fought by Americans.

The Time article added:

It was 2,376 days since December 22, 1961, when Viet Cong bullets killed the first American soldier.

Mr. President, I have received the latest Department of Defense release showing our casualties in Vietnam from

January 1, 1961, through June 15 of this year. In that period, we have suffered 25,068 deaths. This total is composed of those killed in action and those who have died of wounds, died while missing, or died while captured or interned. In addition, 81,788 Americans have suffered non-fatal wounds requiring hospital care and 73,509 nonfatal wounds not requiring such care.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the Department of Defense news release, dated June 20, 1968, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[A news release from the Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), Washington, D.C., June 20, 1968]

#### VIETNAM WEEKLY CASUALTIES STATISTICAL SUMMARY

The Department of Defense released today the weekly casualties reported in connection with the conflict in Vietnam, as of June 15, 1968.

#### A. U.S. CASUALTIES RESULTING FROM ACTION BY HOSTILE FORCES

Total U.S. deaths from actions by hostile forces is the sum of the following categories: killed in action, died of wounds, died while missing and died while captured. Lines 1 through 4 subdivide casualties by cause or category. Lines 5 provides an additional breakdown of the same totals by environment (air or ground). Totals are cumulative from January 1, 1961 through June 15, 1968.

	Army	Navy <sup>1</sup>	Marine Corps	Air Force	Total
1. Killed	12,390	609	7,469	283	20,751
2. Wounded or injured:					
a. Died of wounds	1,573	75	866	27	2,541
b. Nonfatal wounds:					
Hospital care required	48,451	1,913	30,963	461	81,788
Hospital care not required	44,909	3,093	23,984	1,523	73,509
3. Missing:					
a. Died while missing	1,394	119	5	248	1,766
b. Returned to control	44	7	6	19	76
c. Current missing	214	106	104	501	925
4. Captured or interned:					
a. Died while captured or interned	9				10
b. Returned to control	11	1	4	2	18
c. Current captured or interned	24	123	17	122	286
5. Deaths:					
a. From aircraft accidents/incidents:					
Fixed wing	57	133	80	438	708
Helicopter	663	34	210	15	922
b. From ground action	14,646	636	8,050	106	23,438
Total deaths <sup>2</sup>	15,366	803	8,340	559	25,068

#### B. COMBAT DEATHS FOR OTHER FORCES IN VIETNAM SINCE JAN. 1, 1961

Force	RVNAF <sup>3</sup>	Other free world forces	Enemy <sup>4</sup>
6. Total deaths	66,818	2,269	363,935

#### C. U.S. CASUALTIES NOT THE RESULT OF ACTION BY HOSTILE FORCES SINCE JAN. 1, 1961

	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force	Total
7. Current missing	58	5	1	2	66
8. Deaths:					
a. From aircraft accidents/incidents:					
Fixed wing	162	76	28	153	419
Helicopter	613	20	152	139	787
b. From other causes	1,619	391	648	139	2,797
Total deaths	2,394	487	828	294	4,003

<sup>1</sup> Navy figures include Coast Guard.

<sup>2</sup> Sum of lines 1, 2a, 3a, and 4a.

<sup>3</sup> Does not include paramilitary losses.

<sup>4</sup> Includes adjustments from previous period.

## THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues two significant articles on the subject of occupational health and safety—a subject that is embodied in S. 2864 which is pending before my Subcommittee on Labor.

Mr. President, today's industrial casualty list—like yesterday's tomorrow's, and every working day's—is 55 dead, 8,500 disabled, and 27,200 hurt. The yearly figures come to 14,000 to 15,000 dead, over 2 million disabled, over 7 million hurt. These figures are alarming when viewed in their totality.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full in the RECORD an article by John Herling titled "Time for Safety," which appeared in the Ironworker of June 1968, and an article by Ralph Nader and Jerome Gordon which appeared in the New Republic of June 15, 1968.

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

[From the Ironworker, June 1968]

## TIME FOR SAFETY

(By John Herling)

It's long overdue, this new awareness of protection of workers on the job.

More than fifty years ago, Congress passed its first law to stop the "frightful diseases" which came from the use of phosphorus in watches. Later on, some legislative action was taken to cover injuries to miners and longshoremen. Under the Walsh-Healey Act, 30 years ago, a pretense of protection was held out to workers injured on jobs under government contract.

For almost half a century the federal government slowpoked along in this area. This was not because industrial accidents or diseases took a holiday—as Labor Secretary Wirtz pointed out—but because the responsibility was shuttled around in the twilight zone between federal and state jurisdictions.

In this area, the theory of states rights were used to maintain the practice of workers' wrongs. Before the states were induced to move to enact industrial safety acts, great disasters had to occur.

In the terrible Triangle fire of March 1911, 146 women were burned or jumped to death in New York City. Frances Perkins, then a young woman, witnessed the holocaust. After the fire, the state legislature, its conscience singed, passed some legislation. Years later, as Secretary of Labor, Miss Perkins talked about the tragic human cost which has resulted from America's willingness to let the need for industrial safety and health get shot down in the crossfire between state and federal authority. The problem of too little too late has remained with us.

What is the situation today?

Each year in this advanced industrial society, 14,500 workers are killed on the job. Over 2,200,000 workers suffer disabling injuries. \$1.5 billion in wages are lost. 250 million man days of productivity are wasted—nearly 10 times the days lost due to strikes and other work stoppages. All in all, the economy suffers a \$6.8 billion setback every year because of accidents.

To counter this challenge of suffering, state governments carried—often insisted on carrying—the primary responsibility. Sometimes, benefits have resulted, but not nearly enough. Why? Because the needs are too great and state governments vary in their interest and their competence to cope with the vast problem.

On the federal side, the situation had not for a long time been much better. Programs have been inadequate and fragmented. Safety has been a matter of bits and pieces, lacking continuity, conformity and clearly place responsibility.

Nevertheless, in some cases, when the federal government was empowered to tackle the problem—as in shipbuilding and longshoring—the accident rate was brought sharply down in a period of six or seven years.

In those states, where programs have been mounted with determination and better financed, the death rate from work accidents is 19 deaths per 100,000 workers. By contrast, in the ten states with the smallest programs, the deaths average 110 per 100,000 workers—or more than 550 percent higher!

Under the new proposed federal law, a general partnership of federal and state action is planned. The federal responsibility will operate to the limits of constitutional powers covering industries in interstate commerce. The whole purpose of the legislation (H.R. 14816) is to develop comprehensive and binding federal-state relationships to give new meaning to the concept of creative federalism.

In addition, the bill calls for a step-up in safety research and in cooperation with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. To give precision and priority to this federal responsibility, the Secretary of Labor would be given the power to establish mandatory federal standards.

Enforcement is placed in the hands of the Secretary of Labor who will hold hearings where there seems no immediate threat to life and limb. Where there is, however, he will be empowered to go directly to a Federal District Court for injunctive relief to stop the dangerous practice.

Moreover, if an employer operating under a government contract violates the provisions of the proposed law, the Secretary of Labor may declare him ineligible to receive Government contracts until he complies with the act. The Secretary, indeed, can get even tougher: he could recommend the suspension or cancellation of any contract held by a violating employer.

All in all, the Johnson administration, with the support of the labor movement, is determined that our much advertised national affluence should no longer endanger the human beings and their families who by their labor make possible the advantages of our industrial society.

[From the New Republic, June 15, 1968]

(By Ralph Nader and Jerome Gordon)

"Imagine yourself sitting in your office a few months from today. A young man barges in. You recognize him as a man you once refused to hire. He had no education and no potential you could use. His main experience consisted of cashing welfare checks. But he shows you he's now a representative of the federal government—an inspector with the Department of Labor. And he threatens to padlock your gates and have you fined \$1,000 a day if you don't do as he says."

With minor historic adjustments, the foregoing remarks could have issued from the business barons of the McKinley era. Actually, they were written two months ago by the US Chamber of Commerce as a call to obstruction by US business of the Johnson Administration's worker health and safety bill. With a lobbying effort, in conjunction with such other major trade associations as the National Association of Manufacturers, that has led the Chamber to unfurl its true colors, there is a growing probability that Congress will not act by the end of this session. That would mean another year without a comprehensive federal program designed to end colossal inaction and penury by our society in dealing with the following conditions:

Every working day 55 workers die, 8,500 are

disabled and 27,200 are injured (a case can be made that these data are underenumerated by at least 25 percent annually).

Unlike traumatic injuries which are relatively visible, the longer range injuries causing insidious deterioration of the human body come from exposure to coal dust, asbestos, lead, cadmium, beryllium, cotton dust, carbon monoxide, chemicals, dyes, radiation, pesticides, benzene and thousands of other toxic materials. Industrial uses of chemicals are growing so rapidly that voluntary exposure limits have been set for only 400 of the 6,000 chemicals in substantial use.

The Federal government at present has no authority to issue mandatory safety standards for various private occupations, with few exceptions like longshoremen, stevedoring, maritime and to a smaller extent, coal miners and soon, uranium miners. Adverse health and safety conditions have been worsening in the past decade, while workmen's compensation benefits have not kept up with living costs. (One third of the labor force is not covered by any workmen's compensation).

Paralleling this deterioration is the pathetic and industry-indentured performance of the states, who traditionally have had exclusive jurisdiction over worker health and safety. Only 1600 state safety inspectors are around, some tied by ambition, laziness or lucre to winking at violations. By contrast, the states retain at least double that number of fish and game wardens. Overall, the states' worker safety programs spend an average of 40 cents a year per non-agricultural worker, with Texas and Oklahoma, for example, spending about two cents per non-agricultural worker. Further, of the 1600 state inspectors, about 700 inspect boilers, elevators and mines, leaving the remainder for general safety inspection, construction, safety promotion and education, health and industrial hygiene. Four states have no inspection staff at all, 17 states have fewer than 11 safety inspectors. More dismaying, only three states have staff specializing in the area of occupational health and industrial hygiene.

Over, underneath, and around this fragile state framework are the representatives of industry and commerce making certain that there is no applied sanctions to even the meek laws and controlling the process of developing standards, through their so-called United States Standards Institute of America (until 1966 the American Standards Association) whose promulgations are hurried into state statutes or regulations. Even data collection reflects the omnipresence of business: in 1966, less than half the states required employers to report all accidents and less than two-thirds of the states require employers to keep accident records. Just what constitutes work injury is defined for states by industry through the USA Standards Institute (USASI). The present standard 216.1 vests considerable authority in plant medical personnel in determining whether an injury constitutes an "injury," and does not count third-party fatalities in an industrial catastrophe as "industrial fatalities," even if they were employees in nearby establishments.

The factory climate surrounding data collection makes deep skepticism the minimal response to the Chamber of Commerce's claims of progress and superiority over other industrial nations. Accident and injury reporting in many industries, such as steel and autos, is deliberately aborted in numerous cases. Testimony before the House Education and Labor Subcommittee earlier this year by Public Health Service employees and medical professors cited cases such as a man bodily carried from his hospital and given a bed at the work place in order to eliminate lost time accidents. Less extraordinary but far more frequent are "make work" activities after injuries or "no-work" such as sitting the worker at a table doing nothing.

Data on occupational diseases such as respiratory and liver ailments from toxic exposures are woefully incomplete, according to a report by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

One of the major canons of medical science—free communication—is severely undermined by the subordination of professional dictates to corporate expediencies. Dr. Hawey A. Wells, a pathologist and professor at the University of West Virginia Medical School, offers two illustrations of little-known corporate censorship:

"A Dr. John Zalinsky told us about 30 cases of a chronic lung disease caused by exposure to 'safe' levels of beryllium dust. He was told by his company's management that if he published these cases in the medical literature he would have to look for another job. He was torn between professional honesty and personal security—he had had one heart attack and would have difficulty in finding another job. Before he was able to resolve this dilemma, he died from another heart attack. His material has never been published.

"I have personal knowledge of a plant which uses manganese, long known to be a toxic metal. Through bitter experience, management recently found that it poisoned the nervous system, causing permanent brain damage in exposed workers. They are now using a simple test, no more complicated than a prick on the finger to detect exposure to manganese long before permanent nerve injury occurs. Hundreds of other companies who now use manganese do not have the advantage of knowing about this simple test because it has not been published in this country."

"Unless each physician, each industrial hygienist, and safety engineer has available to him the research experience of all of those who preceded him in his profession, he must duplicate the research in every case, often at the cost of human life."

Under-reporting of occupational diseases is also related to inadequate state laws permitting health officials to have a right of entry into the plants. One plant in Pennsylvania (a right of entry state) was using the chemical beta naphthylamine, which a health specialist learned was causing carcinoma of the bladder. The plant promptly moved to Georgia (no right of entry state) and resumed operations unhindered.

Under-reporting has other harmful consequences. Not knowing the patient's occupational exposure, a physician can produce a mistaken diagnosis. For instance, the Public Health Service two years ago reported three "pneumonia" deaths that were later traced to the use of silver solder containing deadly cadmium.

Definitional absurdities have resulted in these abuses uncovered by the N.Y. State Department of Labor:

A plant employing over 2,000 persons did not consider reportable any injuries that did not entail lost time, nor did it report any temporary injuries that fell within the seven-day workmen's compensation waiting period. The corrected injury frequency rate was almost triple that originally reported by the firm.

Another firm, employing over 10,000, was reporting a low rate of injury by comparison with the rest of the large companies in the same industry, until it was discovered that it was reporting only compensable cases. This practice may require a revision of the facile assertion that big plants are safer than small plants.

With both industry and the states grievously deficient in defining new hazards and in collecting adequate data, the cumulative toll annually of 500,000 disabled by occupational diseases, over two million disabled by occupational accidents and over seven million injured must be considered a substantial understatement. And we haven't begun to

measure the deleterious effects of noise, artificial light, vibration and other assaults on man's physiological integrity.

The insurance industry, taking in \$2.3 billion in workmen's compensation premiums in 1967, spent an unspecified \$35 million on industrial safety and inspection. This relatively tiny sum has resulted in little loss prevention work and no significant contributions to data collection and retrieval. Contrary to popular impression, workmen's compensation insurance is enormously profitable to most companies with a range of between 10 and 35 percent gross margin profits in the past 20 years. Their public relations to the contrary, such insurance carriers have not been eager to publicize new worker hazards in any forum and have not shared their knowledge with governmental authorities as befits good corporate citizenship. The highly touted safety record adjustment or "merit rating experience" applies for only 20 percent of all insurance risks. The underwriters have shown almost no interest in plugging loopholes in state laws—for example, only 18 state laws cover all employment. Others have exemptions of varying scope, such as all work activity *except* mining and construction.

Against such a background, it is not surprising that the Chamber and the National Association of Manufacturers are moving to block the federal bill by delaying it through the session or proposing a study commission in the alternative. Failing that, they will strive to strip it of meaningful penalties, surround it with advisory committees and demand usage of industry standards via USASI. Big business benefits from the do-little symbolic state laws with their financially starved administrators, and from the lower costs of insuring against risks of industrial injury that are possible with incomplete accident-injury-disease reporting.

As now proposed by the Administration, the worker safety and health bill provides for setting mandatory standards applicable to employers affecting interstate commerce (roughly 50 million employees). The bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to inspect the premises, issue cease and desist orders, and invoke other civil and criminal sanctions where necessary. Compliance with such standards can be made a condition of continuing federal contracts with the firm. The bill provides for grants up to 90 percent of the cost to the states to upgrade their role in data, inspection, enforcement and general administration. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is given a mission in research, training of personnel and developing safety criteria. The projected total cost over the next five years is estimated at \$300 million, or approximately \$30 million a year beyond current levels. This sum toward prevention can be compared with the cost in 1966 from work accidents and illnesses of \$6.8 billion.

Americans far from the blue-collar world have absorbed a decisive image of industry as gleaming, one-story, antiseptic space-age firms where rates of injuries and disease are not far from zero frequency. Unfortunately, work is getting more complex and dangerous all the time, not just for the blue-collar worker but for the white-coated scientist or laboratory technician handling exotic materials. Dr. Miriam Sachs told the House Subcommittee in February something of this trend when she described the "shift from a mechanical to a broadly diversified array of new hazards," including many new agricultural hazards flowing from the use of synthetic chemicals as fertilizers or as pesticides.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz, in perhaps the most feeling testimony of his career, told the Senate Subcommittee on Labor what the grisly evidence points to as the central issue:

"It is whether the Congress is going to act

to stop a carnage which continues for one reason, and one reason only, and that is because the people in this country don't realize what is involved, and they can't see the blood on the food that they eat, and on the things that they buy, and on the services they get."

Secretary Wirtz has the facts, enough in themselves for action, but pointing to a larger dimension of industrial neglect than was thought possible a year ago. One datum in his testimony: half of the nation's 137,000 coal miners suffer from the cruel dust disease—pneumoconiosis of the lungs; they breath with difficulty and spit black sputum daily. Not many Americans know of this human depletion when they receive the benefits of coal energy. That's what Secretary Wirtz is talking about and that is what the Chamber of Commerce doesn't want us to hear.

#### U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IMPLICITLY DENIED BY SENATE FAILURE TO RATIFY RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate by failing to ratify the various Human Rights Conventions has implicitly denied the declared and very successful foreign policy of the United States.

Since World War II, and somewhat before, the United States has had a foreign policy that is motivated by both altruism and enlightened self-interest. We, as a nation, are interested in other nations and other peoples because we had learned be it ever so tenuously, that respect for the rights of individuals and nations served our sense of the humane and civilized as well as preserved the peace.

But with what are we confronted today by Senate inaction on the Human Rights Conventions? We are faced with a default-declaration to the world that the rights U.S. citizens enjoy by virtue of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are not to be construed as belonging to the rest of mankind. We have in other words announced to the world the conundrum of the ages: The United States will spend hundreds of billions of dollars, send our sons to die for other peoples, fight in every international forum for the rights of peoples everywhere and dictate to the rest of the world's community of nations how they should treat their citizens and yet we refuse to ratify the Human Rights Conventions which declare far less than we are doing in reality.

Mr. President, this is an amazing example of a nation not preaching what it practices. We are hiding our light under a bushel, as the Scriptures say and we are also giving our adversaries the opportunity to use our failure in this field as a propaganda tool. And I assure this body that millions of less sophisticated people around the world think that the United States does not believe in nor protect these human rights because the U.S. Senate has not formally ratified the international treaties that guarantee them.

Mr. President, the Senate of the United States must erase this distortion in the minds of many. We must remove this anti-American propaganda tool which makes us seem the international hypocrite of the ages. Continued failure to ratify obviously denies both the principles enunciated in our various aid pro-

grams and makes incomprehensible the great good we are doing around the world to assure for all men a life not only of freedom from terror and want and early death but a life of quality—a life of contentment—a life that will not be motivated with hate and the desire to destroy a world of plenty in which they have no share.

#### GUN CONTROL BILL

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, WNHC-TV, channel 8, in New Haven, Conn., does not hesitate to speak out on the vital issues of the day.

WNHC-TV editorials are timely and reflect the community concern of the station management.

Recently, channel 8 presented two editorials on the subject of gun control legislation.

The editorials offer logical, fair, and objective reasoning as to why stronger gun control legislation is needed.

I believe the editorials will be of interest to other Senators.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the two editorials of June 10 and June 11.

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

EDITORIAL TELECAST BY CHANNEL 8,  
JUNE 10, 1968

Reflecting on days of tragedy and grief there is one area which must not escape critical concern.

We see a nation aroused over gun control. The President has called for a far stronger law, even, than Senator Dodd's. The Senator, himself, was quick to tell TV-8 last week that a newer, far more effective law was needed. He will press now for total registration of all firearms.

The last Connecticut General Assembly required those buying small arms to apply for police screening. The state police report processing applications at the rate of almost 400 a week and there is no record, or control, over purchase of rifles or shotguns. By mail, or in person, the unbalanced, the under-age, the criminal may have easy access. The pro-firearms lobby is powerful. Any real action has long been stymied.

Let it be understood we certainly recognize no legislation will ever completely prevent gun traffic into the wrong hands. But equally true is that "control", as it stands today, is sadly and tragically deficient. We call for rigid control of all sales of all firearms; for application, and for screening. We call for registration of existing firearms. The citizen can speak out both at the state level, and more broadly. More on that, tomorrow night.

EDITORIAL TELECAST BY CHANNEL 8,  
JUNE 11, 1968

Last night, TV-8 endorsed the strongest approach to gun control legislation. Registration of all existing firearms; an extension of need for application and police screening to purchasers of rifles and shotguns, as well as handguns. Seeking effective gun control, of course, has long been an exercise in futility because of the vocal strength of the minority in opposition.

So there is now an urgency to the need for the public to speak its voice—to fill in the "in-baskets" of government leaders. This has to be at two levels. First, Governor Dempsey has quickly responded to the issue—directing an immediate study of the existing state laws. But state and local laws can only be of limited value, without effective control in other states, and over mail-order.

Congressmen and Senators, as well as the state government, must be reached. The time to write is now. For those wishing to send these two TV-8 editorials, copies are available, for a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

#### LITTLE AMERICA STATIONS, INC., REOPENS OIL REFINERY AT CASPER, WYO.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, recently it was announced that Little America Stations, Inc., had purchased a closed-down refinery at Casper, Wyo., from the Mobil Oil Co., and was entering into the business of refining petroleum. It was good news, indeed, to the city of Casper, often known as the "Oil Capital of the Rockies," since the closure of the Mobil facility, along with the transfer of other petroleum industry employees in recent years, had required considerable adjustment on the part of Casper area residents. Things are looking brighter today, thanks in part to the reopening of this facility.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial about this development published in the Casper Star-Tribune of May 24, 1968.

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

#### AN ECONOMIC BOOST

For years the smaller independent oilman has beat the drums for Government to curb the flood of cheap foreign crude oil imports which he fears might put him out of business. And that would be a blow to the domestic petroleum industry.

The IPAA and other domestic oil groups have fought for years to curb foreign oil imports, pointing out that a strong industry at home is needed to develop reserves and keep this country from the danger of becoming too dependent on foreign sources of supply.

The administration has imposed import controls, not strict enough to satisfy the independents, nor liberal enough to make the major importers too happy. But there are controls, meaning import quotas for each company which refines foreign oil in the U.S.

Since foreign oil is always a threat to exploration in the Rockies, it comes as a surprise to find that the rebirth of the former Mobil Refinery in Casper hinged on securing a foreign oil import quota for the purchaser, Little America Stations, Inc.

Obviously, ocean-going oil tankers can not navigate the North Platte River to bring foreign crude to Casper, even if we import water from the Columbia.

The necessity of a foreign oil quota for the Casper refinery seemed obscure at the outset, but Earl Holding, owner of Little America Stations, put it this way:

"We can use this import quota of foreign oil in a trade with major oil firms for their domestic crude here in Wyoming. This gives us a competitive advantage, without which we could not buy and operate the refinery at a profit."

Naturally so many barrels of cheaper foreign oil will buy an equal number of barrels of Wyoming oil—hence the competitive advantage.

This is the first case coming to mind of foreign oil imports actually helping the domestic oil industry.

Sen. Gale McGee prevailed on Interior Secretary Stewart Udall to grant the quota, and no doubt the decision was based on the economic need of industry in Wyoming.

This is the way the system works in this era of complex international economics. The majors which are bringing in the foreign crude to their seaboard refineries (like Mobil)

also are developing new sources of domestic crude. They are better able to do this because their profit picture is improved by overseas income.

We cannot criticize foreign crude imports in this instance, since they mean 100 full-time jobs and a million-dollar payroll for Casper. Residents of this community welcome the Little America Refinery and are keenly aware of its importance to the local economy. Both Senator McGee and Governor Hathaway are to be commended for their untiring efforts to bring about a revival of the plant.

With many other business barometers showing a distinct upswing, Casper has good reason for its optimism.

#### FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, just as Texas has grown to be by far the Nation's most important cotton State, so have Federal Crop Insurance Corporation benefits become increasingly important in recent years to the cottongrowers of Texas.

Last year Texas farmers in 66 counties carried more than \$25 million total in all-risk Federal Government insurance on their crops of either cotton, grain sorghum, or wheat. More than 6,000 cottongrowers are policyholders. Last year the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation paid more than 2,000 of these Texas cottongrowers nearly \$1,800,000 in loss payments for weather damage to their crops.

The 2,677 losses which the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation of the U.S. Department of Agriculture paid in Texas on all three crops in 1967 totaled \$2,282,688 in loss payments. This money came from premiums which farmers previously had paid in, money which helped many local businesses which rely on farmers for patronage—money which, in many cases, paid off operating loans for farm families which otherwise might have been squeezed out of business.

In only 4 other years of the last 20 has FCIC paid Texas farmers more in loss payments than last year: \$4 1/4 million in 1951; \$3,638,000 in 1953; \$2,878,000 in 1955; and \$2,615,000 in 1951. The yearly average total of statewide FCIC loss payments in Texas over two decades has been nearly \$1 1/2 million—and the total for 20 years has been more than \$29 million.

With this fine record in Texas, I am not surprised to learn that FCIC, which was established by Congress 30 years ago, has grown steadily, and doubled its scope of operation in the last 6 years. Nationally, about one-third of a million farmers in 39 States now carry more than three-fourth of a billion in FCIC protection on 25 different crops.

One reason for FCIC's growth, I know, is the increasing credit value it has for farmers—in both good weather years and bad—as collateral for bigger bank loans to finance higher production costs and farming expansion.

During the last quarter century, FCIC's loss payments to Texas policyholders have been 46 1/2 percent for drought, 20 percent for insects, 10 percent for excess moisture, 8 percent for wind, and the remainder for several other lesser causes of loss.

The important thing to Texas farmers, however, and to their families who rely on farming success for a good home and an education for their children, is that no one knows when, or in what locality, or to what crop weather disaster will occur—and that crop insurance takes this major uncertainty out of a business which is financially risky at best.

I commend the USDA and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for doing a good job in offering such a worthwhile program on such a businesslike basis that it has been able, I understand, to pay all its losses out of premium income over the last 20 years.

#### BREAKING THE CIRCLE OF DESPAIR—ADDRESS BY ALFRED VAN SINDEREN

MR. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a speech entitled "Breaking the Circle of Despair," by Alfred Van Sinderen, president of the Southern New England Telephone Co.

Mr. Van Sinderen demonstrates in his speech a keen understanding of the problems of our urban centers, and the importance of involving the businessman in solving the problems. In his address before the Connecticut Banking Association's bank directors conference, Mr. Van Sinderen said:

If any group should be predominantly realistic, certainly it should be us. But are we? Are we facing up to what is and what's coming right here? Or are we whistling in the graveyard of perhaps the greatest idea in the whole history of ideas—the idea of equal worth, equal dignity, equal rights and equal opportunity for all our people.

The ideal is not yet realized, of course. But that is no reason for abandoning the dream."

Mr. Van Sinderen's speech is excellent reading. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

##### BREAKING THE CIRCLE OF DESPAIR

(NOTE.—The Negro poor of our cities are trapped in a circle of despair—a situation from which they cannot escape by themselves. Nor can government free them by itself. The job will take every segment of society, including business.

(What is the circle of despair? Why must business try to break it? What can it do? In his talk, delivered at the Bank Directors Conference of the Connecticut Banking Association, Mr. Van Sinderen answers these and other questions. The speech was given last April, but the points it covers will be pertinent for a long time to come.)

(Speech by Alfred Van Sinderen)

Gentlemen, I am grateful for the opportunity to be with you today, particularly in that it affords me a chance to talk about a subject very much on my mind and very close to my heart.

But, frankly, I am a bit dismayed at the odds against my setting anyone on fire here today. Conferences, even the most splendidly arranged, take their toll of our alertness and our powers of attention. And I would be naive were I to think that my own view of the problems confronting Connecticut—and their remedies—was universally popular.

You are practical men. By training, if not by nature, you are inclined to make judgments based on fact—facts that can be

measured, charted, analyzed and tabulated. And that is exactly right for men with your responsibilities.

But, gentlemen, how do you measure hopelessness? How do you tabulate despair? And how, in the face of history, tradition and human nature, does not motivate people—Establishment people, nice people, comfortable people—to act on problems that are, to them, remote, ill-defined and somehow not quite relevant to their own experience, their own situation? I wish I knew.

One principal barrier to motivating the Haves to take an enlightened interest in the Have-Nots is communication. Oddly enough, I think it is a matter of too much communication. We are surfeited with studies, articles, committee reports—and yes, speeches.

We are hit so often with crisis-type headlines and newscasts, that we are saturated. We are numb. And our responses, I believe, has been to make islands for ourselves, to dig moats and erect walls so that events occurring even as close to us as New Haven or Norwalk—or even across town—can be seen as foreign, and therefore, less threatening.

We seem to be developing withdrawal symptoms, and this is not healthy. If any group should be predominantly realistic, certainly it should be us. But are we? Are we facing up to what is and what's coming right here? Or are we whistling in the graveyard—or what may well become the graveyard of perhaps the greatest idea in the whole history of ideas—the idea of equal worth, equal dignity, equal rights and equal opportunity for all our people?

The ideal is not yet realized, of course. But that is no reason for abandoning the dream. We have progressed. We have come a long way from those days when one had to be a landowner in order to vote. We have made significant gains in the area of religious tolerance. Indeed, we have seen a Jewish newsboy from New Britain become a United States Senator, and an Irish Catholic from Massachusetts become President.

We have carried out one of the most amazing exercises in democracy the world has ever known, that of mass education. In our day, we see the sons of mechanics and laborers advance to the front rank of business and the professions—something that would have been almost impossible in our grandfather's day.

We have realized solid advances in many areas of human betterment. The poorhouse is extinct. Exploitation of workers is nearly so. The goal of a living wage has been displaced by that of a saving wage, and the vast majority of our people are better fed, better housed, better educated. There is more to do, but there is no reason to believe that it will not be done.

Yet, there remains this matter of race. And there are some who have become despondent, who have thrown up their hands, who have said, in effect, "It's hopeless."

I cannot believe that. I will not believe it. I refuse to believe that a people such as we are, a people that have come so far and done so much in less than 200 years, will come to ruin over so foolish a difficulty as black-and-white relations. And it is foolish when measured against the storms we have weathered even in the lifetime of most of us here.

No one can persuade me that this people—a people who endured and survived the deprivation of the thirties, who responded so heroically to the horrors of the forties, who almost alone restored not only our allies but our former enemies, who have made this nation the wonder and the envy of friend and foe—will just lie down and quit in the face of today's challenge. Nonsense.

We have been challenged in every decade of our existence, and our progress is measured in challenges met and overcome.

We can handle this one, too. If we do not, it will not be for lack of ability, but for lack of will. And if the will is lacking, then it is fair to ask whether we deserve to keep our inheritance.

Here in Connecticut, there is work to be done. And here in Connecticut there are men fit for the work. We are able, we have resources, we have certain skills and certain experience that equip us for the work. Have we the will? Gentlemen, I think we do.

One thing I learned with repeated emphasis in my work with the Governor's Conference of Human Rights and Opportunities—and that is: We must break the circle of despair.

What is the circle of despair? Well, it starts, if a circle can be said to start anywhere, with the absence of hope. Without hope, there is no ambition. Without ambition, there is no incentive to stay in school or to acquire new skills. Without skills and learning, there is no opportunity. Without opportunity, there is a scant earning power. Without earning power, there is no chance of a decent home in a decent neighborhood, no prospect of a better tomorrow—in short, no dream. And where there is no dream, there is no hope. This is the circle of despair.

And for the desperate, that circle becomes a ring of iron. It will not bend; it will not break. It rings them in as effectively as any prison, and many have concluded that they were sentenced for life.

We are, as I have said, realists. And the reality of this situation is that vast numbers of our black neighbors just cannot break the circle without help . . .

Let us apply reason. I have been out and about in the less lovely areas of this state. I have seen where and how these people live. And reason tells me that no one but a saint, a hippie or an out-and-out masochist would live in these circumstances if he could help it. Reason tells me that no parent wants to try to raise his children in that kind of environment. Reason tells me that no woman wants to come home to that kind of dwelling after a day spent cleaning and cooking for a white lady in the suburbs. Reason tells me that no man can feel that he is much of a man if he is doomed to live less well than, say, a saddle horse stabled in Farmington—or even the chickens and the dairy cows at our state university.

Gentlemen, this is real. This is fact. These people need help. And we can help them. Together, we can break that circle of despair. And we had better do it.

Why should we?

Well, I can marshal a host of reasons, but I will limit myself to the practical.

The practical fact is that if we do not help these people, we will lose the peace, the comfort, the security, the prosperity that we have achieved—or that was achieved for us. If we do not help these people, we will pay a tremendous amount of dollars for added police protection, for riot control, for prison expansion, for ever-growing welfare costs. If we do not help these people, we will carry an ever-increasing weight of taxes to maintain an ever-enlarging segment of the population that is an unproductive liability on our economy. And if we do not help these people, we will be encouraging a degree of wastefulness that should be abhorrent to any prudent man.

You know, it's interesting to me as a man whose commitment lies in the business sector to see how Quixotic businessmen can be. For as long as I have been in business, it has been fashionable to decry the encroachment of big government on our turf. For years we've been saying to government, "Stop cramping our style. Leave it to us. We'll handle it, and make a profit on it in the bargain."

Some of us were unhappy with the Social Security tax. Some of us were unhappy with the unemployment tax. And a lot of us are pretty sour over income taxes, surtaxes and excise taxes. Not all of us are joyful over Medicare, and many of us exhibit a kind of conditioned response—a negative response, need I add—to the avalanche of social legislation pouring out of Washington.

And yet, do we ever ask ourselves how such legislation comes into being? Or rather, why? Is it because other sectors of our society—and that includes business and labor and the church and the state and local governments—leave undone tasks that cry out to be done? Society, like nature, has no love for vacuums. When a vacuum occurs, it will be filled. And in our time it seems to be the practice to let big government do the filling.

We say people shouldn't look to government for all the solutions of all the problems. Fine. Now government is saying the same thing. The laws are there in abundance. More are coming. But what is needed now is a commitment to the spirit of the law, not the letter only, but the spirit. And that commitment is one that government is asking us to make. What is our answer?

In my own company, we are trying to develop an affirmative response. We have a long way to go. We feel that there are two main areas where we can be useful—employment and education—employment, because we are one of the largest employers in the state, and education because we have unique resources and experience in the area of training. And it is to those two areas that we have begun to address ourselves.

Where hiring is concerned, we are an equal opportunity employer. We have been all along. But we have been rather passive about it, as evidenced by the facts—the number of Negroes on our payroll and the number of Negroes in supervisory jobs. And passive virtue is only a little better than none.

We know that we have got to find ways to actively recruit from the ranks of the city's forgotten people, and we have got to make certain that, once hired, these people will have the opportunity to move up—as far up as their ability and their drive will take them.

We have made a start. Of 798 people we hired in the first quarter of this year, 171—or 21 per cent—are non-white.

In New Haven, we have been in conversation with representatives of Operation Breakthrough, a Negro self-help organization. We told them what we look for in new hires, and they have assured us that they can find people in the Negro community who can meet those qualifications. Not only will they seek out these candidates, they will work with us to keep these people motivated, to help them develop and maintain good work habits and a good attitude concerning their jobs.

Will it work? I don't know. But we are going to try.

In the area of education, we have a program in New Haven where we are training 12 high school boys in the intricacies of telephone switching equipment, its operation and maintenance. These youngsters, recruited for us by the Urban League, come to us on their own time, after school. If they make it, they are assured of part-time work while they are in school, summer work, and—following graduation—a job with us that offers opportunities for advancement and personal fulfillment.

Will it work? I don't know. But we are going to try.

There are other things we might try, depending on what we learn from our dialogues with the Negro community. For example, it may be that we could work with high school dropouts.

We could, I imagine, develop a work-study program in which the youngsters would spend so many hours on the job and so many in company classrooms prepping for a high school equivalency diploma.

This has particular appeal in that we would not be lowering our hiring standards, rather we would be helping young people to come up to our standards. And who knows? With the right motivation, with a taste of achievement and success, some of these young people may discover wonderful new things about themselves. They may begin to believe in themselves. They may aspire

to go beyond the equivalency diploma. They may develop a whole new set of personal standards and a new sense of worth and self-respect.

One other point in the matter of education: While it is wise and right for business and industry to participate in the work of helping people to upgrade their skills and their potential, the principal responsibility rests with our schools. Let me stress our schools, because whether or not we have youngsters in public schools, we have a great stake in the success of the school—and we have the right and the responsibility to promote excellence in public education.

The responsibility is ours as much as anyone's. Perhaps if we had been more diligent in our efforts to respond to that responsibility we might not now be so heavily committed to the tasks our schools have left undone.

As I see it, we have no choice now but to move ahead with our own educational programs. But we can also work corporately and individually with our schools even as we take on this added responsibility. We can and we must.

As I have mentioned, we do have some programs under way in our business. These are merely beginnings. There is much more to be done. Just what we will do remains to be seen. We have, as I have indicated, much to learn. But we are willing to learn.

By working through existing agencies, such as C.P.I., the Urban League and the Chamber of Commerce, we can compensate for our lack of knowledge and insight where urban affairs and racial problems are concerned. And by applying our resources and our good will, we can—we hope—make some solid progress toward a better society.

But what part can you in the banking community play in correcting the growing imbalance between black and white?

Certain obvious things suggest themselves—such as an enlightened lending policy for employed ghetto-dwellers who could meet the monthly costs but who just can't get up a down payment on a home; or a willingness to take risks on the small businessman with the big idea; or a review of hiring and promotion policies. To insure that tokenism does not displace real opportunity; or loans for vocational training on terms comparable to college loans; or investment in slum properties to be rehabilitated and made eventually profitable.

There is risk in all of these suggestions, of course. But I think that there is far greater risk in doing nothing.

I believe that, individually or in pools, the banking community must take the shrewder risk. And it will not be enough to say that these opportunities are available. You will have to get out and promote them in the black community. The disadvantages are not likely to come to you. It would not occur to most of them to try. They don't know you, except in stereotype. There is no reason for them to think that they will be received cordially or that there is much likelihood of their getting any practical help from you.

On a more positive note, I am aware of an outstanding contribution the banking community has made in Hartford with the establishment of the Connecticut Savings and Loan Association in Hartford's North End.

This Association was conceived by local Negroes, and I understand that area lawyers, bankers and businessmen were most generous with counsel and practical support. Banks contributed money, and deposited funds in the new Association, knowing that it would be several years before they would begin receiving interest.

The banks offered to lend people, too. One bank loaned their head teller for a year—and they are picking up her salary for that period. Other banks have offered to interview, test and train people to staff the Connecticut Savings and Loan Association.

This new bank expects to open for business in the near future, serving the people in the North End. Of course, they will evaluate risks the same as any other bank, but because they know the people and the community, they will be in a unique position to weigh the considerations—considerations that downtown banks might not even be aware of, even assuming that a North End resident would go to a downtown bank and apply for a loan in the first place.

And in New Haven, five banks have established a million dollar high risk loan pool. The money will be made available to people who have the courage and the brains to start a business, but who lack the wherewithal and the credit rating needed to get it.

Loans are available over a period of up to 15 years, and no collateral is needed. The New Haven Chamber cooperates by offering the services of volunteer advisers to answer borrower's questions and to counsel them on business matters.

Loans are guaranteed by the Small Business Administration, but the banks pay the full cost of administering the loans. And you can be sure that, even though no collateral is required, these loans are very carefully considered and weighed before anybody signs anything.

Even so, this is an excellent example of the kind of thing that is being done, that can be done more widely. Already, several New Haven area Negroes are now in business through this program—businesses that range from a name plate company to a flower shop. Perhaps some will fail; perhaps the banks will, in some cases, forfeit the administrative cost of the loans; but some, maybe most, will make it. And their success will be a tribute to the courage and concern of those banks and that Chamber.

Most encouraging to me in these two instances is the response of the Establishment, as represented by bankers, lawyers and businessmen. It tells me that we can still muster men of good will, practical men to be sure, but men of vision, men of courage, the kind of men who can say to government, "We'll handle it."

Gentlemen, the dimensions of the problem are vast, the time is short, the need for practical action is critical. And I believe that we can and must and will act. Connecticut people are not a "do-nothing" people. We may drag our feet sometimes, and sometimes we make of caution a cardinal virtue. But when we turn our hands to a task, we generally complete it—and we generally do it uncommonly well. I am confident that this task is not beyond our powers.

Historically, each generation of Americans draws an assignment—be it to build a nation or preserve it, to win a war or prevent it, to achieve peace or maintain it. We have our assignment. It may not be the assignment we would have chosen, were we given a choice, but it is ours—and our children will judge us by our response to it.

Gentlemen, we who represent the Establishment have made certain promises—or at least we have promoted certain big words and big ideals that imply promises of a life that is worth living, a life endowed with fundamental dignity, a life that can be made increasingly better within the framework of our laws and our society.

Now, either we believe in the big words or we don't. If we don't, we can retreat to the suburbs and prepare for the biggest shoot-out this nation has seen since 1861.

But if we do believe in the big words and the big dream, we must move now to give them meaning and substance in the lives of all the people.

As one committed American said, "Out of the mountain of despair, let us carve the stone of hope."

Gentlemen, this is our task, too. We had better begin.

**THE PUBLIC DEMANDS EFFECTIVE GUN-CONTROL LEGISLATION**

**MR. DODD.** Mr. President, the function of the Congress is to translate the will of the people into effective legislation. If the national legislative body does not serve this objective, then the people lose faith in the democratic process.

Specifically, they lose faith in their ability to work their will through the House and the Senate. If the day should ever come when the majority of Americans feel that the Congress is not responsive to their wishes, then our constitutional democracy will be in danger of collapse.

For three decades public opinion polls have consistently shown that most Americans are in favor of gun-control legislation.

The President of the United States has urged Congress to enact gun-control legislation. I might add that the President speaks from a position he won by the largest landslide vote in American history. In all modesty I can say that I have devoted a good part of my time and energy to the problem of gun control. Still, effective gun-control legislation has to face battle after battle in its slow and tortuous path to enactment.

This has been true even though editorial opinion throughout the Nation supports the need for effective gun legislation. These editorials are not the result of an organized campaign by self-serving interests. The editorials represent thoughtful comments by responsible men who understand the will of the community and the need of the Nation.

Let us stop and listen to this overwhelming expression of opinion. I want to quote from a group of editorials which discuss gun-control legislation:

**From the Philadelphia Inquirer:**

Those who see public "hysteria" as the reason for the demand for stiffer gun legislation, in the wake of assassination after assassination in this country, are overstating the case. The public has simply been given a surfeit of evidence that controls are needed now that never used to be. It is not hysteria, but recognition that times obviously have changed.

**From the Baltimore Sun:**

The pattern of violence in the United States may be beyond change, but the means of violence can be curbed.

**From the Denver Post:**

With opinion as strong as it is, Congress should realize the enactment of a registration law is inevitable. Such a law can be passed now—or Congress can wait until additional assassinations have plunged the country into even greater depths of tragedy and grief.

**From the Des Moines Register:**

The country's mad gun permissiveness encourages slaughter and armed lawbreaking.

**From the Houston Chronicle:**

As Senator Dodd points out: "No law-abiding citizen has anything to fear from registration. We register our cars. We register our dogs. We even register a child's bicycle in some cities. Why then should anyone object to the registration of guns in the interest of the community?"

**From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin:**

No one wants to deprive the hunters of their sport in woods and fields but it is time for law-abiding America to show that it wants and demands realistic controls over the possession of firearms.

**From the Cleveland Plain Dealer:**

Pollsters sample the national temper and discover that most Americans want tight federal controls. But from there the protest against inadequate controls goes nowhere. Apparently it does not reach the ears and minds of those who make the laws.

**From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin:**

Everyone interested in the safety of his family and his neighbor should write to his U.S. Senator and Representative and ask, as has Mr. Johnson, "what in the name of conscience will it take to pass a truly effective gun control law in the Congress?"

**From the Christian Science Monitor:**

Guns have killed more people in the United States in this century than have died in all the wars it has fought since 1900. Yet, in America the procedures for regulating firearms are, at best, casual; at worst, a shambles. In every other advanced country on the globe, firearms are covered by stringent government regulations.

**From the Wall Street Journal:**

It is true enough, no doubt, that a gun control law will not prevent violence by gunfire, whether by the criminal minded or the just plain fools. No more does an automobile licensing system prevent mayhem on the highway, nor a narcotics control law the existence of dope addicts, yet no one proposes that any fool be allowed to drive a car or that heroin be sold like chewing gum at the corner store.

**From the Baltimore News American:**

Truly effective gun controls have been blocked repeatedly by the lobby of the National Rifle Association on grounds that all Americans have a Constitutional right to bear arms. That is wicked nonsense. The Constitution clearly indicates that such right is directly connected with the early American need for a citizens' militia—a need long since passed.

**From the Washington Post:**

The tide of public sentiment about guns has risen. Let Congress move with it now—not grudgingly or reluctantly but with a recognition that it reflects a coming of age in America and the upsurging common sense of a free people.

**Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the complete text of the editorials inserted in the RECORD at this point.**

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

[From the Des Moines Register, June 12, 1968]

**HOLSTERING U.S. GUNS**

"The summary of gun control laws in Great Britain, France and Japan printed on this page illustrates how abysmally this country lags the rest of the civilized world on control of deadly weapons. Scarcely any American city or state comes close to enforcing restraints that are routinely applied to millions of foreign citizens. [The country's mad gun permissiveness encourages slaughter and armed lawbreaking.]

In the United States during 1965 firearms figured in 5,600 murders, 34,700 aggravated assaults and more than half of the 68,400 armed robberies. All but 10 of the 278 law enforcement officers murdered during 1960-65 were killed with firearms.

The evidence is clear that effective control can reduce criminal use of guns. Countries with strict gun control laws have far fewer crimes committed with firearms. The few American cities that have adopted strict controls have shown striking results. In New York City, which enforces the toughest gun controls of any major American city, only 25 per cent of homicides are committed with firearms. In cities with weak gun control laws, guns figure in from 66 per cent to 72 per cent of homicides. The homicide rate in New York City in 1966 was 6.4 per 100,000, compared with 7.2 in Phoenix, Ariz., and 11.4 in Dallas, Tex., two cities with especially weak gun-control laws.

The President's Crime Commission stated the obvious and inescapable conclusion:

"As long as there is no effective gun control legislation, violent crimes and the injuries they inflict will be harder to reduce than they might otherwise be."

The crime control bill recently voted by Congress is not the answer. It is a puny beginning, applying control primarily to the sale of handguns to minors. The access of millions to guns remains virtually unchecked.

The failure to adopt realistic restraints has resulted in the private ownership of an estimated 50 million guns. Overcoming the years of neglect to limit gun ownership to responsible persons will be no simple task. Americans have said in poll after poll that they want this job done. Congress and state legislatures must respond by giving Americans the benefit of effective gun licensing and registration laws which other countries have had the good judgment to adopt.

[From the Houston Chronicle, June 11, 1968]

**WHO OPPOSES GUN CONTROL?**

Why do the opponents of tighter gun laws react so emotionally every time the subject is mentioned? We find it hard to understand.

The Chronicle has editorialized for years for intelligent and effective gun legislation as one means of curbing violence and crime in our city and in our nation.

Each time we publish such an editorial, we receive letters and telephone calls from misguided readers who accuse us of wanting to take away the guns of law-abiding and honest citizens.

We want no such thing and we have said so repeatedly. What we do want, and what a majority of the American people want, is effective control of the sale and the proper registration of death-dealing weapons. This would not take away the firearm of the homeowner who keeps a weapon for self-defense, nor of the merchant who feels the need of a weapon for self-protection, nor of the sportsman whose hobby is hunting or trap-shooting.

We do favor a federal law which would prohibit mail-order sale of handguns, shotguns or rifles. We also favor a law that would prohibit over-the-counter sale of such arms to a juvenile, a psychopath or a known criminal.

We do favor the registration of all weapons, as proposed by Sen. Thomas Dodd and Sen. Edward Kennedy.

We do favor passage of legislation at the state level to crack down on known criminals or drug-users who carry firearms, and on anyone who carries a weapon into a beer tavern where so many Houston murders occur, or on anyone who uses a firearm against a policeman in the performance of his duty. The penalties should be directed at those who misuse firearms.

And we fail to see how any law-abiding gun-owner would object to such legislation. If he is law-abiding, then he will sacrifice no rights or privileges under such legislation.

As Sen. Dodd points out: "No law-abiding citizen has anything to fear from registration. We register our cars. We register our

dogs. We even register a child's bicycle in some cities. Why then should anyone object to the registration of guns in the interest of the community?"

The Chronicle has never suggested that gun-control is the cure-all to crime and violence. Indeed it is not. The problem goes much deeper. It involves the proper upbringing of children, the effectiveness of our system of justice, the public's respect for authority, and our seeming fascination with violence on television, in movies and in print.

The Gallup Poll reports that 84 percent of the American people favored stricter gun laws in 1938 and 85 percent favor them in 1967. And why not?

As Sen. Dodd points out: "As incredible as it may seem, far more people have been killed by firearms in our country since the year 1900 than have died in all of our wars from the Spanish-American war to Vietnam."

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, June 12, 1968]

#### CRACKDOWN ON GUNS

It is a strange argument that the nation and the states should have weak gun laws because there's no "cure-all" against the criminal misuse of firearms and no way to prevent political assassination by the mere passage of laws.

When will congressmen and Pennsylvania legislators understand that the public is tired of gun laxity that aids and abets violent men in bringing death and injury to citizens in their homes, in places of business, on the streets; in turning public disorders into small wars; in jeopardizing the lives of law enforcement officers?

No one argues that better gun laws will be a magic solution, but they can make it less convenient for criminals and irresponsibles to acquire firearms. They can help police to track weapons used in crime. Strictly enforced, they can put the criminal, the delinquent, and the violent on notice that America has stopped playing in its condemnation of gunplay.

Voters in favor of more adequate gun legislation, which would certainly include extending the mail-order ban and gun registration, should let Congress and the Pennsylvania legislature know how they feel. In the meantime, it is encouraging that District Attorney Specter has ordered prosecutors here to press for stern penalties against those convicted of violating present gun laws. The appeal of Council President D'Ortona to Philadelphia citizens to turn in unwanted guns, no questions asked, offers a chance to get rid of these weapons without embarrassment. Both Police Commissioner Rizzo and Mr. Specter back this voluntary move.

No one wants to deprive the hunters of their sport in woods and fields but it is time for law-abiding America to show that it wants and demands realistic controls over the possession of firearms.

[From the Evening Bulletin, June 7, 1968]

#### MAIL ORDER MURDER

The firearms control measure included in anticrime legislation enacted yesterday in Congress is woefully inadequate.

It covers only handguns and, as President Johnson said in urging a strong and effective control law governing the full range of lethal weapons, it does not meet the need to eliminate the dangers of mail-order murder in this country.

As never before, the American people should now be aware of the necessity for barring the sale of rifles and shotguns as well as revolvers and pistols by mail. Why is greater proof needed for restraints on the traffic in such weapons than two graves on the hillside in Arlington?

Mr. Johnson has pleaded again, as have others including the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, for controls to keep deadly weapons from the hands of those obviously unfit to

possess them. It is difficult to see how anyone can any longer object to the registry of weapons.

President Johnson deserves the support of the entire nation in his demand that "the voices of the few must no longer prevail over the interest of the many."

Everyone interested in the safety of his family and his neighbor should write to his U.S. senator and representative and ask, as has Mr. Johnson, "what in the name of conscience will it take to pass a truly effective gun control law in the Congress?"

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 7, 1968]

#### MAYHEM IN THE UNITED STATES—GUNPLAY EXCEEDS WARFARE TOLL

(By William C. Selover)

Guns have killed more people in the United States in this century than have died in all the wars it has fought since 1900.

Yet in America the procedures for regulating firearms are, at best, casual; at worst, a shambles. In every other advanced country on the globe, firearms are covered by stringent government regulations.

In the United States it is confirmed beyond any reasonable questions, anyone—a criminal, a juvenile, or a madman—can clip a flimsy coupon from any of several magazines on any corner newsstand, send a few dollars off to a dealer in a distant city and after a few weeks, receive an amazing variety of guns through the mails with no checking.

For some months Congress has been working on the problem of gun control but with little success. The assassination of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy—who with his brother, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, worked so hard for gun-control legislation—may have spurred some action.

The House seemed on the verge of passing a bill Thursday that would ban interstate mail-order sales of pistols.

Meanwhile, several hundred demonstrators marched outside the headquarters of the National Rifle Association, a 980,000-member organization which has opposed federal control of firearms for years.

Switzerland is perhaps typical of the way other civilized countries of the world regulate the sale and possession of guns.

In that country, which maintains a citizen militia system of able-bodied males who keep their own guns at home, every gun is registered, and the ration of ammunition must be accounted for down to the last bullet. The soldier may not use his gun except with specific permission for military-training excise.

Otherwise, in Switzerland, a person desiring to purchase a gun for hunting must get a permit from the local police. Permits are denied to people who have criminal records or who are under 18. They are also denied to people who have backgrounds of drunkenness, emotional or mental instability.

In the United States, there is presently no national law which protects society against the purchase of guns by criminals and lunatics. The state laws that are on the books have been circumvented regularly. Some are weak and unenforced. Some are unenforceable because of the proximity of other states or localities where gun laws are lax or nonexistent.

#### GUNS FOR CRIMINALS

A convincing study conducted by the Senate juvenile delinquency subcommittee in 1965 showed that of 4,069 Chicago mail-order guns consigned from two dealers, 948 had prior criminal records, which would have kept them from buying guns in that city. Thus, one-quarter of the total number of orders sent out went to criminals.

This experience was repeated in city after city.

For example, in Washington, D.C., 25 per-

cent of the mail-order gun recipients had criminal records prior to ordering and receiving mail-order guns.

The commissioner of public safety of Massachusetts has testified that over a 10-year period the state police had traced 87 percent of the 4,506 guns that had been used in crimes in Massachusetts to purchases outside of the state.

While Massachusetts requires a permit to purchase a handgun, neighboring states have no such requirements. Thus the Massachusetts law was made ineffective.

These statistics make one fact abundantly clear, guns are easily available in the United States.

The fact, says Federal Bureau of Investigation Director J. Edgar Hoover, makes crime figures rise.

"A review of the motives for murder," he says, "suggests that a readily accessible gun enables the perpetrators to kill on impulse."

It is little wonder that reasonable men the world over recoiled in horror at the latest evidence of American gunplay.

The world will be watching to see if Americans will finally move to put an end to this wanton mayhem.

#### CONTRASTING RATES

Congress and all Americans will have to ponder carefully these statistics in the weeks and months ahead:

Between 1900 and 1966, guns were involved in 280,000 murders, 370,000 suicides, and 145,000 deaths by accident. That comes to 795,000 since the beginning of this century.

In all this nation's wars, since the Spanish-American war to Vietnam, the war dead totals 550,000.

Besides this, many, many thousands are wounded, maimed, or assaulted by firearms each year. In 1966 the estimated figure was 100,000.

In a study done by the Library of Congress, the rate of homicides by guns was found in 1963 to be 2.7 per every 100,000 population.

By contrast, in Britain, the rate was 1/55th the American rate. In Germany, it was about 1/25th the American rate. In Japan, it was 1/65th, and in the Netherlands, it was 1/90th.

In fact, for a period of three years in the Netherlands, there was not a single murder by gunfire. The average rate in Britain and Japan in those years was about 30 cases per year.

That's about the number of murders committed in this country by guns every two days.

Furthermore, the suicide rate in this country by guns stands at 5.1 per 100,000—roughly 10,000 a year.

Again, by contrast, this American rate is 15 times the rate for Britain, 8 times the rate for Germany, 50 times the rate for Japan, and about 55 times the rate for the Netherlands.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 12, 1968]

#### ARMS AND MEN

Let it be said straightaway that we have long been, and still are, in favor of regulating and controlling the indiscriminate sale and ownership of firearms. Most of the arguments against a gun control law strike us as either specious or irrelevant.

It is true enough, no doubt, that a gun control law will not prevent violence by gunfire, whether by the criminal-minded or the just plain fools. No more does an automobile licensing system prevent mayhem on the highway, nor a narcotics control law the existence of dope addicts, yet no one proposes that any fool be allowed to drive a car or that heroin be sold like chewing gum at the corner store.

It is equally true that our Constitution protects the right of the people to bear

arms. But that imposes no Constitutional bar to the regulation of firearms. There is already a Federal statute that imposes some limitations on their sale and distribution, and a number of states have fairly strict laws with regard to pistols and other small arms, all of which have been cleared by the Supreme Court.

The question then, or so it seems to us, is not whether a Federal gun control law is necessary and proper; we might better have had one long since. The question is what kind of a gun control law. And here it seems to us that there is some risk of over-reacting in the emotional aftermath of the latest political assassination. A bad law could result not in less but in more lawlessness.

At any rate, some of the things being said by the proponents of gun control strike us as specious as the arguments of its opponents. It's most unlikely, for example, that Congress' reluctance to act is just due to the skill of some mysterious "gun lobby," or even to some mystical attachment to a frontier tradition. It's far more likely that the people are fearful of having their right to protect themselves taken away entirely.

This is not beyond understanding. The proprietor of a small city shop, robbed and beaten in the middle of the night, is not persuaded that he will be safer when the law ostensibly disarms the robber. Nor is the lonely rural householder. Nor, for that matter, are the city dwellers not knowing when some irate mob will overrun their homes or apartments. To many people the right to protect themselves and their families is not a romantic tradition but a present imperative.

These people know that the lawless who want guns will get them, law or no law. The risk in a bad control law is that if it penalizes the law abiding it will tempt these decent citizens to violate the law out of fear and frustration. They will feel, and with some reason, that the Government has no right to leave them helpless against marauders.

This by no means leaves the Congress powerless to put some sanity into our arms laws. There should certainly be a bar against the indiscriminate sale of all types of guns by mail where even minors and certified lunatics can now buy them. There could well be a careful licensing system which would, at the very least, require the registration of all guns whether for hunting, skeet shooting or whatever. There might even be provisions to bar licensing to some persons for specific reasons, provided always that any denial would be subject to review and appeal to prevent pure arbitrariness on the part of the police authorities.

So let us have some such regulations because they are reasonable and will have justified themselves if they prevent one fool, in a moment of madness, from shooting up a city street, or if they help the police trace one murder. Only let's not bemuse ourselves with the thought that we thus remedy our age of violence, if that's what it is.

It is not arms races that breed wars but the desire for war that puts arms to use, and murderers are not made by pistols in a shopkeeper's cash drawer. So long as some men or nations be violent, it is futile to expect the others to disarm themselves to defenselessness.

[From the *News American*, June 9, 1968]  
THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE: 99.5 PERCENT OF AMERICANS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—In proclaiming today a national day of mourning for Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, President Johnson paid an astute tribute to the man who had been his bitterest political rival.

"Robert Kennedy," he said, "affirmed this country—affirmed the essential decency of its people."

"He never abandoned his faith in America. He never lost his confidence in the spiritual strength of ordinary men and women."

One wonders, in reflecting on these true words, how Robert Kennedy might have viewed the extraordinary outburst of attacks on our society which exploded immediately after the tragedy in Los Angeles.

From all directions, and from all over the world, came a deluge of ranting on the same general theme—the United States has gone plumb to hell and should hang its head in shame.

I suspect Robert Kennedy would have found the outburst as sickening and unjustified as I did.

It is understandable how our enemies and other jealous nations of the world would rush forward to condemn us as a morally-bankrupt country, rotten with violence and self-indulgence.

But it is less easy to understand why so many of our own public spokesmen would join the chorus, beating their breasts in guilt and howling their agreement that we are a disgrace to civilization.

In this case I do not believe for a minute that these doomsayers are actually speaking for the public—whether they are ministers, elected officials, editorial writers or those perennial fault finders, our self-proclaimed liberals.

If this country were really cracking up morally, the public wouldn't give a damn one way or the other when some crackpot shoots a political leader.

But that's not what happened. Instead, once again, the great mass of the American public reacted to a supreme act of lawlessness with a deep feeling of affrontation and genuine shock.

The great mass of the American public was shaken to its core by the murder of Robert Kennedy, just as is was shaken by the murders of President Kennedy and Martin Luther King.

Fundamental values by which that public lives were upset in each instance, and in each instance the public was aghast.

I have still to hear or to meet a single person who reacted any way other than with shock and revulsion.

That's why I do not believe the breast beaters are speaking for the majority of our citizens when they accuse our whole society of being sick, sick, sick.

They do not speak for me.

And they certainly do not speak for Robert Kennedy. Unlike the critics, he was a man who never abandoned his faith in America nor lost his confidence in its people.

By no means am I trying to suggest that American society has never been more hale and hearty. It has—and we today do have much to be ashamed of and to deplore.

There is a frightening climate of crime and violence hanging like a pall over this nation.

There is a distinct erosion of moral values. And there is a dangerous trend in many circles—from students to social activists—to deliberately defy laws with which they do not agree.

What I want to say is that these ills while grave, should be kept in perspective when talking about the totality of America and its people.

It is this perspective which has been missing from the critical lamentations of the last four days.

It is this perspective I would like to help restore.

President Johnson, in his national TV address on the Kennedy shooting, also emphasized the need for a balanced view of the tragedy. Here is how he put it:

"Tonight, this nation faces once again the consequences of lawlessness, hatred and un-

reason in its midst. It would be wrong, it would be self-deceptive, to ignore the connection between lawlessness and hatred in this act of violence.

"It would be just as wrong and just as self-deceptive to conclude from this act that our country itself is sick, that it's lost its balance, that it's lost its sense of direction, even its common decency.

"Two hundred million Americans did not strike down Robert Kennedy any more than they struck down President John F. Kennedy in 1963, or Dr. Martin Luther King in April of this year."

That's the perspective we need. In each instance the assassin was a lone gunman—two of them obvious nuts and one a known criminal. And in each instance the great mass of law abiding Americans were appalled.

A careful study of these three atrocious shootings will show that they have only two common denominators.

All were done with guns which can easily be acquired because of the lack of really rigid firearms control laws. And all were done by persons convinced that their beliefs were more important than the elemental rules of society.

Both of these facts reflect basic flaws in our social structure.

On the first point, [truly effective gun controls have been blocked repeatedly by the lobby of the National Rifle Association on grounds that all Americans have a constitutional right to bear arms.

That is wicked nonsense. The constitution clearly indicates that such right is directly connected with the early American need for a citizens' militia—a need long since passed.]

Yet the NRA continues to have its way and as a result some 5,600 Americans died of gunshot wounds last year. By contrast there were fewer than 30 in Great Britain, fewer than 20 in France and less than 12 in Belgium.

It is outrageous that Congress refuses to do its clear duty and clamp down on the sales of all guns of any description.

The second point—self-justified defiance of law—has much wider implications. Assassination is only the most extreme form of the illegal violence which tends to develop in an atmosphere of extremism coupled with permissiveness.

Robert Kennedy declared: "If there is one thing we have learned in the 60's it is that violence and defiance of the law accomplish nothing and are never justified."

And that says it. There is no reason under heaven why any premeditated flaunting of the law or any illegal act of violence should ever be condoned.

Yet some have been condoned, and even encouraged.

Crime and violence have been encouraged by our courts through decisions which make law enforcement more difficult and the acts of criminals easier.

Lawlessness has been encouraged by left-wing "thinkers" who seek to undermine our society by promoting challenges to its rules—shrieking "police brutality" whenever officers do their duty.

And it has been encouraged by all those authorities everywhere who have failed in any way to meet those challenges vigorously and at once.

The results have weakened America, and the results are shameful.

At the same time, they are not results created by the 99.5 percent of Americans who love their country and honor its laws.

Thanks to them, this nation is far from going to pot.

[From the *Washington Post*, June 14, 1968]  
COMING OF AGE

Two major gun control bills have now been presented to Congress. There is no need to choose between them; they are comple-

mentary, and both of them are needed to deal effectively with the gun menace.

One measure, proposed by President Johnson and introduced by Senator Dodd, would simply apply to the sale of rifles and shotguns the same sensible restrictions that Congress has already applied to the sale of pistols and revolvers. It represents a recognition that although rifles and shotguns have some innocent and legitimate uses for hunting and target shooting, they are, nevertheless, lethal weapons that ought to be kept out of the hands of criminals, mental incompetents, habitual drunkards and children. The bill would help to keep guns out of such hands by ending mail order purchase of them and by requiring purchasers to buy them from licensed dealers in their home states. There is absolutely nothing in this that would limit responsible, law-abiding adults from keeping and purchasing all the weapons they wanted.

But the gun peril grows not only out of the indiscriminate sale of deadly weapons but out of the proliferation of them in irresponsible and dangerous hands. No one really knows how many firearms are loose in the United States, but the estimates run as high as 200 million. Senator Tyding's bill is directed toward the resolution of this problem. It would require registration of every firearm and a license for the purchase or possession of firearms and ammunition. It is designed to encourage states to provide these protections but would authorize Federal action if the states fail to act.

Under the Tydings proposal, licenses would be denied to aliens, alcoholics, narcotic addicts, mental incompetents, juveniles and anyone convicted of a felony or a crime of violence. Again, it should be clear that this legislation would not in any way limit responsible, law-abiding adults from keeping and purchasing all the weapons they wanted. As the Senator said in introducing his bill, "it will impose no significant burden on law-abiding gun owners, hunters, hobbyists and sportsmen."

These two measures, taken together, provide in our judgment, reasonable and moderate control of firearms that would result in the saving of many human lives. They are lacking, however, in one significant form of control: they would do little to reduce the tragic toll of firearm "accidents"—2300 killed and more than 100,000 injured in the United States each year. We believe that legislation ought to restrict the possession of handguns to military personnel, law enforcement officers, bona fide collectors and those individuals whose peculiar circumstances and occupations give them a genuine need, in the judgment of the police authorities, to possess a pistol for self-protection; and we believe that those possessing long guns should be required by law to observe strict safety precautions.

The tide of public sentiment about guns has risen. Let Congress move with it now—not grudgingly or reluctantly but with a recognition that it reflects a coming of age in America and the upsurging common sense of a free people.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 15, 1968]

#### KEEP UP GUN-CONTROL PRESSURE

We hope that the outpouring of mail, to legislators in Washington and other authorities in all the States, demanding stiffer controls over lethal firearms, will continue until more positive results are visible.

According to last Thursday's column by Jerome S. Cahill, of our Washington Bureau, not a few Senators and Congressmen are already changing their minds—and presumably their votes—from the feeble strictures they included in the Safe Streets Bill a short time ago. This would only have prevented the mail-order sale of various handguns.

The Post Office Department's new ruling

on labeling firearms as such, when they are placed in the mail, and notification of local law enforcement officials before they are delivered, can only be viewed as an interim measure which may or may not stand up under legal challenge. It is, in effect, a rough and ready form of gun registration on new weapons; it obviously has no effect at all on rifles, shotguns and pistols already in private hands, nor on those firearms which are readily delivered by means other than mail.

Despite the National Rifle Association's outcry against the registration of all weapons, we see no more harm in it than does Pennsylvania's Governor Shafer. It does not, in our view, mean ultimate confiscation; it only means that a possession even more lethal than the family car ought to be a matter of equally public record.

Those who see public "hysteria" as the reason for the demand for stiffer gun legislation, in the wake of assassination after assassination in this country, are overstating the case. The public has simply been given a surfeit of evidence that controls are needed now that never used to be. It is not hysteria but recognition that times obviously have changed.

It seems to us that those who deny this plain fact may well be the "hysterics."

[From the Baltimore Sun, June 16, 1968]

#### NEWS FROM HOME

(By Thomas O'Neill)

A querulous, do-little Congress is getting more heat than it likes as an election approaches, and feels driven to do something it dislikes almost as much, which is act against the easy access to weapons of assassination.

The heat is in the mail from back home demanding genuine curbs on the distribution of firearms. It is arriving in a volume that for the first time exceeds that from gun fanciers opposing restrictions. Hitherto, the pro-gun mail warning the lawmakers to keep hands off often ran 10 to 1 ahead of that asking for controls.

How long the lawmakers continue to feel pressed to act probably depends on how long the rush of mail continues. There is ample opportunity for stalling in a legislative session due to expire in seven weeks.

In the past Congress has responded to public concern by presenting the facade of control legislation, later experience revealing it to be wholly empty. The rainmakers (they put out brushfires) of the National Rifle Association, the biggest lobby operating in Washington, have regularly dampened congressional enthusiasm for effective action. The most recent law, dating from the Thirties, set out as a gun control measure and ended insipidly licensing gun dealers at \$1 a year. It became highly popular when thousands of marksmen discovered that with the \$1 license they became eligible to buy weapons at the dealer discount.

Between the political assassinations of Martin Luther King and Robert F. Kennedy, Congress adopted a weakling act outlawing the mail-order sale of pistols alone, excluding rifles and shotguns. The King murder was by rifle, as was that of President Kennedy in 1963.

Outlawing only mail-order pistols, most of which are imported, was upheld as curbing a big source of the weapons most used in crime, the handgun. It is no more than a finger in a collapsing dike, as is shown by figures unearthed in California following the death by pistol shot of Senator Kennedy.

Legal gunshop sales of pistols in California during the first four months of the year reached 74,241, enough to keep quite an army of the evilly disposed in arms. The snub-nosed .22-caliber pistol in the slaying of Senator Kennedy was sold legally in a Pasadena gunshop in the 1950's, had since changed hands half a dozen times. No supervision is maintained over such private sales.

Guns are plentiful in the United States and because they last a long time it is customary to look with pessimism upon the chance that even a strong gun law could do much to deny weapons to the criminal, who could steal them. Even family heirlooms can be put into working order.

Something new has been added since that argument was first made. The Supreme Court has given its assent to stop and frisk. Any good policeman knows pretty well who in his bailiwick is likely to be carrying a concealed weapon. Now that the cops can fan suspicious characters the supply of illegal weapons might be expected to start drying up. It is even possible that armed robbery might fall into a decline, an urgently needed decline.

A full 30 years ago the Gallup pollsters found a big majority of the public in favor of stiff gun laws.

Until this year, when it passed the feeble prohibition on mail-order pistols, Congress did nothing. Only hours prior to the killing of Martin Luther King the Senate Judiciary Committee by a lopsided majority, rejected gun controls asked by President Johnson as part of his anti-crime program.

Police records contain the unexpected intelligence that a large proportion of those who kill with firearms have no other criminal record. The authorities draw the conclusion that murder is too often a spur of the moment reaction induced by passion and made possible by a gun within handy reach.

President Johnson is asking Congress to try again. The Administration supports strongly worded legislation limiting the sale of all firearms, and ammunition as well. The outpouring of public expression for a law with teeth appears to bolster the measure. The pattern of violence in the United States may be beyond change, but the means of violence can be curbed.

Four Presidents have been assassinated in American history, all by gunfire. The roster of political assassination could be longer. A gunman shot at Andrew Jackson, and missed, in 1835. An attempt on the life of President Truman was made in 1950.

[From the Denver Post, June 11, 1968]

#### ALL-GUN REGISTRATION A MUST

If Congress is as responsive to the wishes of the people as it should be, a law requiring the registration of all guns will be passed within a few weeks, before adjournment for the national political conventions.

As long as 30 years ago, according to the Gallup Poll, the public had been overwhelmingly in favor of the registration of hand guns. The day Sen. Robert F. Kennedy was shot a new poll showed a heavy weight of sentiment in favor of the registration of both long guns and hand guns.

With opinion as strong as it is, Congress should realize the enactment of a registration law is inevitable. Such a law can be passed now—or Congress can wait until additional assassinations have plunged the country into even greater depths of tragedy and grief.

The choice should be an easy one to make. In fact, there can be but one course to take. It is time to ask all senators and representatives to stand up and be counted, now, before the fall elections.

In the matter of gun control, Congress has let itself become bogged down in endless complexities and intricacies.

Instead of taking the direct, effective, simple approach, it has argued over proposals to deal with partial solutions—whether to ban mail order sales of all guns or merely hand guns, whether to permit mail order sales of police departments are notified in advance of the identity of the prospective purchasers, whether to put restrictions on mail order sales of ammunition, etc., etc.

Disputes over details have fractionalized support for various measures in the House and Senate and played into the hands of the

June 25, 1968

powerful gun lobby which is opposed to any really effective controls.

The ban on the mail order sale of hand guns which was included in the recently passed anticrime bill was a pitifully meager effort to deal with a shocking problem of nationwide concern.

No one really expects it to accomplish anything. President Johnson has denounced it as not going far enough. The most recent Gallup Poll shows the public has not been fooled either and won't be satisfied with anything short of a comprehensive registration law.

Such a law would, of course, contain stiff penalties for owning or having in one's possession an unregistered gun. It would prohibit anyone under the age of 18 from owning a gun.

It would forbid the registration of guns by persons with criminal records, the mentally disturbed and other unfit persons.

Persons desiring guns for legitimate purposes, for hunting, target shooting and defense of their homes, would have nothing to fear from such legislation.

Opponents of registration argue that criminals would still get guns, as by stealing them. They undoubtedly would to some extent.

But a registration law would, as a minimum, give the country a new, enlightened attitude toward guns. Owners would feel a greater responsibility for the guns registered in their names. They would be more inclined to keep guns locked up, to keep them from being filched or misused.

They would be impressed by the fact that the public interest is involved in gun ownership, just as it is involved in automobile ownership. Gun ownership would be looked upon as a privilege, not to be abused.

It would be a mistake to expect too much, too soon, from a gun registration law, but it would be a greater mistake to assume that our society will continue much longer to permit the free and easy access to guns which has added so much to violence and crime.

Congress should not fall into such a grievous error.

#### A TRIBUTE TO CYRUS VANCE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, without a doubt one of the Americans who has most distinguished himself in unselfish service to his Nation is my fellow West Virginian, Mr. Cyrus Vance, of Clarksburg.

In a fine feature article about our No. 2 man at the Paris peace talks, Parade magazine last Sunday described Mr. Vance as the Nation's top troubleshooter and as "the American version of a man for all seasons."

The reference seems quite well chosen for this West Virginian who was described in the article as "modest, unassuming, polite, strong, and sympathetic, and a man of complete integrity."

Mr. Vance has served his country as Secretary of the Army and Deputy Secretary of Defense and has been called upon repeatedly to restore order in strife-torn areas.

Mr. Vance was on the scene during domestic strife in Detroit last year and Washington this year but he is equally at home abroad, having been injected into the crises involving the *Pueblo*, Cyprus, and the Dominican Republic.

Mr. President, the Parade profile was a richly deserved tribute for Mr. Vance, a man of whom all West Virginians can be very proud.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be placed in the RECORD.

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

#### CYRUS VANCE: THE NATION'S NO. 1 TROUBLE-SHOOTER

(By Lloyd Shearer)

Suggestion: stop three pedestrians in your hometown and ask them this question: "Who is Cyrus Vance?"

I did this in Los Angeles several weeks ago when Vance's name was appearing in the nation's press each day, and his picture was being telecast by the TV networks each night.

These are the answers I obtained. From a middle-aged housewife: "I know Mr. Vance very well. I shop in his store. He runs a delicatessen on Fairfax near Beverly."

From a telephone repairman: "His name sure sounds familiar. I think he's a politician."

From a cab driver: "His name don't ring no bell with me, except there used to be a goofy guy named Dazzy Vance who pitched baseball for the old Brooklyn Dodgers. Is that the guy you mean?"

I repeated the question in several other cities—San Antonio, Dallas, Johnson City, Memphis, Chicago, Oakland, New Haven, and San Diego. The results were much the same. At a time when Cyrus Vance was being publicized as Averell Harriman's co-negotiator at the Paris conference with the North Vietnamese, and his background as America's number-one troubleshooter was being delineated and explained, most of the people couldn't identify him.

At 51, Cyrus "Spider" Vance has become chief of Lyndon Johnson's fire department. In the past few years the President has dispatched Vance to extinguish the emergency flames in the hottest of the hot spots. Tall, handsome, blue-eyed and pacific, lawyer Vance negotiated a peace among the warring factions in the Dominican Republic. He soothed ruffled feelings in the Greece-Turkey crisis over Cyprus last November, helped get the Detroit riots under control last July, talked the outraged South Koreans out of going to war against the North Koreans at the time of the *Pueblo* incident in February, diplomatically handled the Washington, D.C., riots following the Martin Luther King assassination in April, and is at the moment of this writing hard at work in Paris, trying to talk some sense into the intransigent North Vietnamese negotiators in Paris.

Surely, such a fireman should be better known than he is. Why is he not?

Originally from Clarksburg, W. Va., where he was born on March 27, 1917, to a father who sold insurance and a mother who is remembered as one of the most brilliant, talented women in the community, Cy Vance is basically a shy, privacy-loving man who has never cherished political office or developed the charisma frequently necessary to achieve it. The charm he has for women and the friendship he generates for men seem innate rather than acquired characteristics.

#### STRONG AND SYMPATHETIC

A classmate who once played with him on the Yale University hockey team, says, "Cy is by nature a modest, unassuming guy. He is polite not political, strong yet sympathetic. Just see how snugly he fits in with Averell Harriman in Paris. Technically Cy and Harriman are both President Johnson's personal representatives and therefore equal, but Cy naturally defers to Harriman who after all is 76 and has been in government since 1933.

"He lets Harriman take all the leads, do most of the talking, set the style and set the pace. He plays the role of the disciple learning from the doyen without appearing cloying or sycophantic. Yet I predict if the negotiations ever bear fruit that Cy will have con-

tributed the lion's share, because after all he is a trained lawyer and Harriman is not.

"Cy's great advantage," his classmate (Yale, '39) points out, "is that he has never hungered for fame or recognition, just solid achievement. Because of that he is more secure than most men."

Vance, who retired from the Defense Department last summer to his old-line New York law firm of Simpson, Thacher, and Bartlett, has been known in Washington, D.C., for the last seven years as "a loner of sorts," as a man who eschewed the gossip of the cocktail party circuit in favor of the comforts and companionship provided by his wife, the former Grace Sloane (her father, John, was a partner in the W. & J. Sloane home furnishings company) and their five children.

"Neither Cy Vance nor Gay (which is what almost everyone calls Mrs. Vance) ever believed in fishbowl-living or playing the social game down here," confirms one female capital columnist. "Even when Gay took over the Widening Horizons program from Margie McNamara—that's a program for underprivileged teenagers—she managed pretty well to stay out of the public press. None of the Vances believe in self-advertising or publicity.

"Cy is just one of those rare birds in government service who never came down with Potomac fever. I guess he just doesn't take enough vitamins. He simply doesn't want to become President of the U.S. Maybe that's what a bad back does for you."

#### BOUT WITH SURGEONS

In 1962 when Vance was appointed Secretary of the Army, he ruptured a spinal disc one afternoon while rising from his desk chair. The surgeons removed it. Four years later, however, he tore a cartilage in his right knee and for a while hobbled about on crutches. Subsequently the undue pressure and imbalance on his spinal column caused another disc to rupture, and he was scheduled for additional surgery when President Johnson phoned and asked if he wouldn't fly to Detroit immediately. This was last summer when the riots had erupted there, and Johnson wanted an accurate and judicious survey of the situation before he ordered the troops in.

Anyone who has suffered the disc syndrome knows how acutely painful it can be, how so simple an exercise as walking becomes almost impossible without wearing a tightly-fitted back brace, but Vance agreed to go providing he could take his wife along. Unable to bend down, he needed her to tie his shoe laces.

"It was primarily for that purpose," she discloses, "that I went with him. Cy could slip into his shoes without bending, but he couldn't bend down to tie the laces. Unfortunately for me he's now improved to the point where he can. Otherwise he might have taken me to Paris as his official shoe lace-tier."

Last year when President Johnson decided to replace Robert McNamara as his Secretary of Defense—McNamara had become too much of a dove in opposition to Dean Rusk and Walt Rostow—he offered McNamara's job to Vance. Troubleshooter Vance, McNamara's deputy for years, turned it down because of his bad back whereupon Johnson pressured Clark Clifford into taking the position.

Vance, who is a conservative Democrat—his cousin, John W. Davis ran unsuccessfully for the presidency in 1924 with Franklin D. Roosevelt as his running mate—has from time to time been hushed about in Democratic Party circles as possible presidential timber, but he shows no evidence of ever having been infected with the political virus.

"I don't want to sound corny," declares White House Press Secretary George Christian, "but the only thing Cy Vance is running for is the United States of America. I

don't believe I've ever met a finer, more balanced fellow. He's got more common sense on more touchy subjects than any man I've ever seen. He can handle anything from a riot to the most delicate kind of diplomacy, and that's why the President calls upon him. He is this country's number-one trouble-shooter in all respects, and the President's faith in him is complete. Cy is the kind of fellow who justifies it."

Vance is also that rare man in high places who inspires a unanimity of praise. It is well-nigh impossible to find a member of the New York bar who has dealt with him or anyone in Washington, D.C., who has worked with him, who will criticize him adversely. All judgments of his personality and performance approach hyperbole.

Listen, for example, to Robert McNamara, a shrewd, perspicacious judge of people who introduced a whole flock of so-called "whiz-kids" into the Pentagon reorganization in 1961.

"What Cy Vance has," he asserts, "is integrity, honesty, a quiet, steadfast courage of his convictions. He also has a warm, wonderful way of dealing with people, of drawing from them their utmost support and contribution to a common effort. He has a strong personality but it is never abrasive. It expresses itself in terms which other people find acceptable."

"This combination of qualities, of honesty and integrity is fundamentally important in negotiating. The other side must have confidence in you, and Cy has the sort of integrity which builds confidence. He knows how to examine problems from the other person's point of view, but still because of his persuasiveness he can ultimately achieve an agreement which others might not. I think that Vance and Harriman make the ideal, the perfect negotiating team. We're lucky in having them."

#### COMPLETE INTEGRITY

Adam Yarmolinsky, now a Harvard law professor but formerly a special assistant in the Defense Department, says, "The noun which comes quickest to mind when you mention the name, Vance, is integrity, complete integrity. Vance is a man with a fine sense of the limits of the possible. He has extraordinary judgment of what can be done and how to get it accomplished."

"He's an excellent negotiator, because he has perception, persistence, and tolerance. He is not going to give anything away to the North Vietnamese merely because they filibuster or try to wear him down or threaten to walk out or do walk out."

A White House insider adds that Vance is a man who never loses his cool, never communicates panic to a situation, instead lends to it an air of calm and reason. He also sees to it that his adversary never loses face.

"I remember," this source recalls, "when the President sent Cy to Korea this past February, Kim Il Sung's commandos from North Korea had invaded Seoul to assassinate President Park, and South Korea was determined to go to war against North Korea or at least to mount a retaliatory attack. North Korea has a mutual aid treaty with Soviet Russia which calls for the Soviets to come to their aid in the event of war. We have an understanding with South Korea. It was a powder keg situation which could have blown into World War III."

"Cy flew to Korea, spoke to President Park, assured him that we would not let him down. He explained that President Johnson would ask Congress for \$100 million in extra military assistance for the ROKS (Republic of Korea's army). He invited Park to discuss his troubles face to face with the President. In his own sincere way he put out the fire."

"If the Paris conference with the North Vietnamese lasts—who knows if it will and for how long—Cy Vance will be the man who commutes between Paris and Washington to

brief President Johnson from time to time. He's the best traveling fireman we've got."

Friends and relatives who know Vance well enough to explain him, believe that he owes much of his winning personality and overriding sense of duty to his mother, the late Amy Roberts Vance.

"She was really something," a member of the family exclaims, "a churchgoer, a civic-minded activist who organized the first symphony concerts in Clarksburg, an organization called the League of Service. She was chairman of the library and pretty nearly everything else. She was a wonderful woman who was determined to leave Clarksburg a better place than she found it, and she did."

"Her husband died of pneumonia when Cy was 5 and his brother John 8. And all you have to do to see what a great job she did is to look at Cyrus and John. Both are prominent lawyers, John in Charleston and Cyrus in New York. She inspired people to serve their communities, and she inspired her son by example."

As a boy Cy Vance was sent off to Kent School in Connecticut where he played football and hockey, was elected senior prefect of the student body. "He was all legs and arms on the ice rink," one schoolmate fondly remembers, "which is why we began calling him 'spider'."

From Kent, young Vance moved a stone's throw over to Yale where he quickly became a member of the undergraduate establishment along with McGeorge Bundy, Sargent Shriver, and several others who later were to serve the Kennedy Administration. At Yale Vance played varsity hockey, made Scroll and Key, won his B.A. in economics. In 1939 he entered Yale Law School and after graduating with honors, enlisted in the Navy. Assigned to destroyer duty he saw action in the Atlantic and Pacific, took part in operations at Bouganville, Tarawa, Saipan and Guam.

When finally he was discharged in 1946 at age 29 he decided that he had best start working for a living. First he obtained a job as assistant to the president of The Mead Corporation, manufacturer of paper products. But after a year left to marry Grace Sloane and join the New York City law firm of Simpson, Thacher and Bartlett, where he is now a senior partner.

It was while he was specializing in civil litigation that Vance also began serving in various government positions, working as special counsel to several Senate investigating subcommittees. In 1961 Bob McNamara prevailed upon him to enter the Defense Department as General Counsel and help reorganize the jungle which by then the Pentagon had become.

A year later McNamara helped make him Secretary of the Army and subsequently his Deputy Secretary of Defense, grooming him as his successor.

There is little doubt that McNamara had influenced Vance more than any other individual in government. "When Vance first came to Washington," says an intimate, "he was essentially the man in the Brooks Brothers suit, a conservative member of the Eastern establishment. McNamara broadened his horizons, broadened his perspective and philosophy. Both men have gained considerably from their friendship, and it's no secret that McNamara expected Cy to inherit his job one day."

#### BACK TO LAW PRACTICE

Last July, however, having rapidly depleted his savings via eight years of government service, faced with the mounting educational expense of sending his five children to Vanderbilt, Mt. Holyoke, Foxcroft, Westover and Buckley, Vance decided to move back to New York and resume his more remunerative law practice. Thus, when Johnson offered him the McNamara berth, he turned it down on two grounds of finance and health.

Vance is constitutionally unable however to resist any pleas for emergency duty from the Lyndon Johnson fire department.

"He has always," declares the President, "placed his country before himself. Whenever I have called him to serve since he left the Department of Defense, he has served the U.S. with remarkable skill. He is a man of energy, uncompromising intellect and remarkable wisdom. I can think of no man better qualified to represent effectively and fairly this nation's interest in any negotiations either at home or abroad."

In a sentence Cyrus Roberts Vance is the American version of a man for all seasons.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

#### CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

THE ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 16703, to authorize certain construction at military installations, 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 suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be charged to both sides on the pending amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. How much time do I have left?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 21 minutes remaining.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

MR. President, yesterday, late in the day, as reported on page 18415 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 24, I called up the pending amendment and explained that its purpose was to reduce the bill by the amount which would result in taking the lower of two figures as between the House and Senate on each item in which there is a difference between the two.

The net result of the 44 separate changes made by the amendment would be to reduce the authorization by some \$48 million.

As I said yesterday, since we passed the surtax-and-appropriation-cut bill requiring the Congress to cut \$6 billion out of total spending this year, it is my view

that we should take as much as is sound and wise and safe out of military authorizations and military appropriations.

I believe the cut proposed by this amendment is modest. It has already received the approval of either the House or Senate. I, therefore, hope the amendment will be adopted.

I say to my good friend that I would

like the yeas and nays on this amendment in due course. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I shall respond very briefly.

Mr. President, the adoption of this amendment would affect each title of the bill relating to our Active Forces, the defense agencies, and Southeast Asia.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a list of projects so affected, so that every Senator will understand what he is voting on.

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

ARMY		
[In thousands of dollars]		
Name of facility	Item	Amount
Ft. Benning, Ga.	Improvement-on-post roads	1,560
Hunter-Liggett MR, California	Electricity distribution system	378
Pueblo AD, Colo.	Water supply/storage/distribution systems	1,542
Savanna AD, Ill.	Ammo storage mechanization	301
Volunteer AAP, Tenn.	Ammo demo ground fac.	167
Fort Wingate AD, N. Mex.	Water poll treatment	1,028
Kwajalein Atoll	Insp. area and entr road	162
North Baden District, Germany	A/C transient quarters	168
	Aircraft maintenance facilities	390

  

NAVY		
[In thousands of dollars]		
Name of facility	Item	Amount
NAS, Brunswick, Maine	Ground improvements	75
NPWC, Newport, R.I.	Incinerator	2,874
NSD, Mechanicsburg, Pa.	Electricity distribution system improvements	305
NATC, Patuxent River, Md.	Aircraft parking apron	1,219
NAS, Oceana, Va.	Fleet air operations	1,565
NSPt. Act, New Orleans, La.	Barracks	1,538
MOMTF, White Sands, N. Mex.	Troop housing	400
NPWC, Great Lakes, Ill.	Missile test site	698
NAVAMPH Base, Coronado, Calif.	Air pollution abatement, boiler fuel conversion	667
FTC, San Diego, Calif.	Boat repair facility	2,140
NWS, Concord, Calif.	Air pollution abatement, firefighters' school	1,200
NSY, San Francisco, Calif.	Sewage treatment plant	376
MCAS, Cherry Point, N.C.	(M.I.) Secondary sewage treatment facility	600
MCAS, New River, N.C.	Industrial waste treatment facility	285
MCAS, Yuma, Ariz.	Warehouse	362
NCS, North West Cape, Australia	Wheels up wave-off lighting	108
NAS, Atsugi, Japan	Warehouse	558
	A/C maintenance hanger alt.	869
	Operations control center	126

NAVY—Continued		
[In thousands of dollars]		
Name of facility	Item	Amount
NAF, Naha, Okinawa	Survival equipment shop	202
Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.	Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.	1,000
AIR FORCE		
Duluth IAP, Minn.	Lighting approach	408
Logan Field, Mont.	Lighting airfield special	86
Richards-Gebaur AFB, Mo.	Electric emergency power plant	46
Stewart AFB, N.Y.	Steam heat maintenance	146
Tyndall AFB	Lighting airfield special	50
Kelly AFB, Tex.	Flight line fire station	175
Newark AFB, Ohio	Logistics facility, depot	298
Robins AFB, Ga.	Logistics facility, base	400
Tinker AFB, Okla.	Technical laboratory	35
Arnold Engine Development Center, Tennessee	Logistics facility, depot	198
Kirtland AFB, N. Mex.	Propulsion engine test cell, alteration	3,577
Laredo AFB, Tex.	Water supply and treatment	360
Malmstrom AFB, Mont.	Pad Power check	49
Offutt AFB, Neb.	Shop, parachute and dinghy	154
McConnell AFB, Kans.	Officers quarters	151
A.C. & W. Various	Target materiel center	717
Benton AFS, Pa.	Squadron operations	748
Calumet AFS, Mich.	Auto storage, heated	57
Custer AFS, Mich.	Auto storage, heated	72
Finley AFS, N.Dak.	Auto storage, heated	158
	Auto storage, heated	60
DEFENSE AGENCIES		
Section 402—emergency constr.		
		10,000

#### SOUTHEAST ASIA—TITLE V

Army:		
Vietnam	\$3,234,000	
Thailand	327,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,561,000</b>	
Navy:		
Vietnam	3,199,000	
Thailand	144,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,343,000</b>	
Air Force:		
Vietnam	1,117,000	
Thailand		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,117,000</b>	
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>8,021,000</b>	

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the amendment would further reduce the bill by \$48 million. In effect, it would adjust the bill to the lowest figure for each base or installation approved by either the House or the Senate. To approve the same would be fallacious. Any one familiar with legislation of this magnitude, involving many dozens of installations and many hundreds of individual line items, would know that there are many program changes and adjustments that must be made after the bill is submitted to the Congress, and many times after one House or the other has acted upon the bill. Therefore, some important projects and adjustments may appear in the product of one House and not in that of the other, and must be adjusted in conference. This amendment gives no consideration to this important factor.

The authorization for the two bases

the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has referred to, namely Fort Benning, Ga., and the Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, fall within this category. The badly needed road improvement project is included in the Senate bill for Fort Benning, as is a security fencing project for the Naval Air Station at Brunswick, Maine, which were not considered by the House.

These are both late requests, and there are others. For example, the Senate bill provides \$400,000 for troop housing in New Orleans that is not in the House-passed bill. This project will permit the renovation of certain abandoned barracks structures and a mess hall to provide quarters for naval personnel that must be temporarily assigned to this naval installation that now must be quartered on the economy under a per diem allowance. This, too, was a late request and is supported by General Accounting Office report clearly reflecting that the renovation of these facilities will result in a substantial savings to the Government.

There are other factors that creep into a bill of this size. At the Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana a bachelor officers quarters was included in the original request to the Congress and was approved by the House of Representatives. It subsequently developed, however, that this base was more in need of an airmen's dormitory, since many airmen are presently quartered off base. The committee did not feel that both projects

could be approved this year and accordingly substituted the dormitory for the BOQ.

If the amendment before us were adopted, it would in effect approve the BOQ and not the dormitory. Through perhaps a printer's error, a vital and badly needed boat facility for the Naval Amphibious Training Center at Coronado, Calif., was omitted from the line item in the House-passed bill, although it was included in the total of the bill. The Senate version of the bill corrects this error, but again if this amendment is adopted the error will stand.

Now, Mr. President, neither of these examples I have mentioned, and there are others, will be items in conference if the proposed amendment is adopted. I shall not attempt to evaluate the importance of the many items affected by this amendment, but I have already submitted for the RECORD a list of these projects and their locations.

May I further observe that, as the junior Senator from Washington mentioned in the debate yesterday, the Secretary of Defense has announced that he is now reviewing projects within the Department of Defense for possible inclusion in defense expenditure reductions within the Pentagon.

I want to remind my good friend from Pennsylvania that the Secretary of Defense pointed out that under present considerations the minimum expenditure reduction will be \$2 billion, the maximum \$3 billion. That is a sizable amount.

I will say, in all fairness to my friend from Pennsylvania, I anticipate that included in this bill will be items that undoubtedly will be deferred, but this is true of all authorizations and appropriations going through Congress this year, in light of the action taken by the House and Senate.

I need not remind the Senator from Pennsylvania that we made substantial cuts in the pending bill. I think the Senator will find that the bill, as it was reported from the Senate Armed Services Committee and as it is now before the Senate, is a sensible and prudent bill. We have certainly tried, as best we could, to save as much money as possible.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks. I see no need for further comment. I thought the RECORD ought to disclose what the situation is.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, for the purpose of bringing enough Senators to the floor to get the yeas and nays, we may have a quorum call, which will not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

In response to what the Senator from Washington has said, I am interested indeed, to learn that the Secretary of Defense is making an investigation to enable him to cut somewhere between \$2 and \$3 billion from the total military budget of some \$82 billion. I commend him for that effort, Mr. President, but I do not think it is enough or nearly enough. I would hope that the military budget could be shrunk by a total of somewhere in the neighborhood of 10 percent, which would give us a good deal more than the \$6 billion which we voted the other day should be cut from the budget.

I think it is quite unfair to ask the President to make these cuts. I think Congress should make them. It is with that view that I have proposed the various amendments now under consideration in connection with this military construction bill, which represents a relatively small part of the total military authorization. While I realize there are some technical difficulties involved in this method of approach, I do not believe they are serious, and I think that when one body or the other has fixed a lower figure for each of the various items in these authorizations, the Senate, in its zealous desire to cut expenditures, should take this opportunity to cut \$48 million from the total amount of this bill. I therefore urge the acceptance of my amendment.

If I may have the attention of my friend from Washington, is he prepared

now to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROEY], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 192 Leg.]  
YEAS—25

Bayh	Hart	Smathers
Brooke	Hatfield	Spong
Burdick	McGovern	Symington
Byrd, Va.	Mondale	Tydings
Case	Morse	Williams, N.J.
Clark	Moss	Williams, Del.
Cooper	Nelson	Young, Ohio
Gore	Percy	
Griffin	Proxmire	

NAYS—57

Aiken	Bible	Carlson
Anderson	Boggs	Cotton
Baker	Byrd, W. Va.	Curtis
Bennett	Cannon	Dirksen

Dodd	Jackson	Muskie
Dominick	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Eastland	Jordan, Idaho	Pearson
Ellender	Kuchel	Pell
Fannin	Lausche	Prouty
Fong	Long, La.	Randolph
Hansen	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Harris	Mansfield	Russell
Hayden	McClellan	Scott
Hickenlooper	McGee	Smith
Hill	McIntyre	Sparkman
Holland	Metcalfe	Stennis
Hollings	Miller	Thurmond
Hruska	Mundt	Yarborough
Inouye	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—17

Allott	Gruening	Monroney
Bartlett	Hartke	Montoya
Brewster	Javits	Morton
Church	Kennedy	Talmadge
Ervin	Long, Mo.	Tower
Fulbright	McCarthy	

So Mr. CLARK's amendment (No. 859) was rejected.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. James Luce, of my staff, be permitted to have the privilege of the floor during consideration of the pending measure.

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

OBJECTION TO SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to complete testimony of the Pennsylvania insurance commissioner, Mr. McIntyre. This has been cleared with both sides.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am at a loss to understand why we give consent to this committee to meet and consent is not given to other committees. I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Education. We are under great pressure to complete action on education bills, and we were counting on today and tomorrow. My committee was prevented from meeting this morning.

I see no reason why we should give consent to one committee while the other committees are discriminated against. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I have a similar request from the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Washington cooperate with me in offering a new unanimous-consent request?

We are in a tight time bind. Let us face it. Senators cannot do the committee work and be on the floor of the Senate at all times. If a Senator must be on the floor, he must be here. I do not know what can be done about the committees and the work that confronts them between now and adjournment, if

the committees are not permitted to meet.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time is under control. Who yields time?

**MR. JACKSON.** I yield time for this purpose, Mr. President.

**MR. MORSE.** I am pleading on behalf of my committee, the Subcommittee on Education. I do not know where one can find a group of men who work harder, and they should be allowed to complete action on the education bills.

I do not believe anyone wants the Senate to adjourn without action completed on the education bills.

**MR. CLARK.** Mr. President, objection was raised this morning to the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty meeting this afternoon. The subcommittee has very important measures pending. We have had great difficulty arranging a meeting of the committee. I had cleared it with one member of the subcommittee, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] who raised no objection. Someone else objected.

I shall have to object to the meeting of any committee unless the Subcommittee on Education, on which I also serve, and the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, of which I am chairman, are permitted to meet.

**MR. JACKSON.** Mr. President, on my time, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

**MR. McCLELLAN.** Mr. President, a number of witnesses are here from Chicago. They are here at Government expense. We are in the process of conducting a very important investigation. I hope we will be permitted to continue. If not, of course, we will suspend until the Senate is not in session. In the meantime, it will be at the expense of the taxpayers and at no personal inconvenience to me.

I hope my colleagues will permit us to proceed with this work.

**MR. DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**MR. JACKSON.** I yield.

**MR. DIRKSEN.** In the first place, the minority leader made no objection. In the second place, when the Senator from Arkansas came into the Chamber, he said he had out-of-town witnesses present, and the same was true with respect to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. They can finish with their out-of-town witnesses in an hour or two. I was not going to interpose an objection. But I did refer it to the Senator who did object to the committee meetings because of the work on the floor. If there are out-of-town witnesses, I believe an exception can be made, even though there is overall objection.

**MR. MORSE.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**MR. JACKSON.** I yield.

**MR. MORSE.** I do not know whether the Senator from Illinois is laboring under the impression that I made any charge against him. I do not know who objected. I am simply saying that we have a job to do.

I do not believe it makes the slightest difference whether one committee has some witnesses from out of town and

another committee has no witnesses from out of town but is under the pressure of getting vital measures to the floor of the Senate. We cannot report the education bills if the subcommittee is not permitted to meet. The Senate will be in session practically every day from now until adjournment.

I just want to get a policy established as to whether or not we are going to be able to do our committee work. We are not going to be able to do it if we are not permitted to meet. If my committee is not going to be permitted to meet, as far as I am concerned, no other committee is going to meet.

**MR. DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, when Members are serving on many subcommittees that meet at one and the same time, and they are tremendously interested in a committee meeting they cannot attend because of a commitment to another committee, I think a decision can be made, and probably that entered into the picture this morning.

**MR. MORSE.** My committee is tied up. A Senator must use his parliamentary rights here to protect himself, and I am going to use mine. Unless we can get an agreement, I am going to object.

**MR. JACKSON.** Mr. President, will the Senator make his request?

**MR. MORSE.** Mr. President, WAYNE MORSE has no right to make a special request for his committee. I am seeking a uniform rule to govern all committees. I do not think that the floor of the Senate is going to be interfered with by work done in committee.

**MR. CLARK.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees of the Senate may be permitted to meet this afternoon and tomorrow while the Senate is in session.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair).** Is there objection?

**MR. HRUSKA.** I object.

**MR. JACKSON.** Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

**MR. McCLELLAN.** Mr. President, do I understand that committees have permission to meet?

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** No. Objection was heard.

Who yields time?

**MR. McCLELLAN.** Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that this is being done at the taxpayers' expense and not at any inconvenience to the chairman of the committee personally.

**MR. MORSE.** Mr. President, I am trying to save the expense of schoolchildren to get an education.

**MR. McCLELLAN.** This saves money for them, I am sure, by spending more.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

**MR. KUCHEL.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**MR. JACKSON.** I yield briefly to the Senator from California.

**MR. KUCHEL.** Mr. President, I sought recognition in order to be permitted to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the time has come out of the time controlled on final passage.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from California is recognized.

#### RETIREMENT OF BRIG. GEN. JAMES STEWART FROM U.S. AIR FORCE RESERVE

**MR. MURPHY.** Mr. President, on May 31, 1968, James Stewart, formally retired as a brigadier general in the U.S. Air Force Reserve. Gen. J. P. McConnell, Air Force Chief of Staff, conducted the retirement ceremony, during the course of which he presented to General Stewart the Distinguished Service Medal "for exceptionally meritorious service to the United States." This is only the second time in history that an officer in the Air Force Reserve has been so honored.

As one who has long considered Jimmy Stewart his friend, I am proud of the matchless record he has compiled of service to our Nation and to the motion picture industry.

In the course of his exceptional acting career, Mr. Stewart has appeared in 73 motion pictures. His face and his voice have become known to people in every country of the world and he has, through his profession, become one of the best international ambassadors of good will we could present abroad. An Academy Award winner and one of the world's most admired and respected actors, Mr. Stewart has still found time to perform noteworthy service in many other fields. He served for 4 years as a member of the board of trustees of his alma mater, Princeton University. Presently he is a trustee of Claremont Colleges and of Project Hope. He has been active for many years in the Presbyterian Church and the Boy Scouts of America, among many other worthy causes.

General Stewart's military career began during World War II, when he served on active duty from March of 1941 until October of 1945. During that time he rose from the rank of private to colonel, flying 20 missions over Germany with the 8th Air Force.

Mr. President, I congratulate our good friend, Gen. Jimmy Stewart, on his outstanding contribution to our people and our Nation. In closing, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the citation which accompanied the award of the Distinguished Service Medal to James M. Stewart.

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

**CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL TO JAMES M. STEWART**

Brigadier General James M. Stewart distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the United States in his mobilization assignment as Deputy Director, Office of Information, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force from 17 July 1959 to 31 May 1968. During this period, General Stewart selflessly devoted his time, knowledge and broad experience in a concerted effort to publicize the Air Force contribution to our nation's security. As a result of his personal efforts he has brought about a greater awareness, throughout the nation, of the significant contributions Air Force personnel have made toward our country's defense. His sincerity, dedication and ability to communicate to people young and old, were significantly responsible for the general public's appreciation of the Air Force role in safeguarding freedom throughout the world. The singularly distinctive accomplishments

of General Stewart culminate a long and distinguished career in the service of his country, and reflect the highest credit upon himself and the United States Air Force.

#### CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16703) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 857

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment (No. 857), and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 81, strike out lines 17 and 18.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the two lines which this amendment would strike out read as follows, under the heading "U.S. Army, Europe":

Germany, various: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$17,384,000.

Mr. President, I think this amendment raises the entire question as to whether we are going to continue to expand our installations in Germany or whether, as so many Senators have indicated by speeches in the Chamber and elsewhere, we are going to cut back on our commitment in Germany and bring a number of our troops home.

This amendment is a good and a simple way to raise that issue. The amount involved is relatively small, being \$17,384,000.

The amount is for additional operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities. I think it is time we started the cutback on our commitments in Germany for the following reasons: First, it would help our balance of payments; second, it would help our tax situation; third, it would contribute, although in a small way, to the saving of \$6 billion we are committed to make as a result of the legislation we passed last week.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the total Army request for Germany was \$18,575,000. The committee denied projects totaling \$1,191,000.

Mr. President, I hope that Senators will pay close attention to this explanation because the amendment would achieve the opposite result from the one the Senator from Pennsylvania has in mind. The remaining \$17,384,000 which this amendment would delete would completely deny our forces deployed in Germany any military construction funds this year. The amount approved by the committee is for highly important projects essential to carrying out our mission, some of which relate to highly classified programs that cannot be discussed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I would like to give you a brief résumé as to what we tamper with if this amendment stands: \$10,192,000 is for specially sealed prefabricated storage buildings for the storage of some \$200 million worth of valuable prepositioned equipment as a result of the Reforger program.

This is the redeployment of American troops back to the United States. If these facilities are not provided this valuable equipment will soon deteriorate in open storage and the purpose of Reforger will be defeated. Another \$5 million is for a classified depot facility made necessary by our eviction from France. The remaining \$2.2 million consists of five other projects relating to our strategic communications, tank and aircraft maintenance facilities, and vital fuel storage, again absolutely essential because of our relocation from France.

Mr. President, these are bare essentials to maintain our Army forces in Germany and it would be foolhardy to deny them. Each individual project has been carefully screened and I can assure you there is no fat whatever in this program.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Washington.

Is it not true that very frequently when we change these military programs, even for a lessening of the program or a diminution of the program, it necessarily requires some change in the military construction, that is, the facilities to carry out the change?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. The Senator was the chairman of this subcommittee for many years and he is very familiar with it. The Senator makes a very good point.

Mr. STENNIS. While it is a voluntary change, like switching a program, or an involuntary program, like getting out of France, extra construction is required just the same. Is that not true?

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

Mr. STENNIS. Is that not true? It is analogous to a change in policy in a factory, in an industry, or anything else.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. That is all that is involved in the major part of this amendment, as I understand it; is that not correct?

Mr. JACKSON. That is essentially correct. In addition, of course, the President announced the redeployment of approximately 33,000 troops back to this country. In order to be able to redeploy those troops back to the United States, we have to have dual bases. \$10 million of the \$17 million involved will provide storage facilities essential for the pre-positioning of supplies and equipment to support those troops, should they be returned to Germany.

Mr. STENNIS. Another case, then, if I understand it correctly, is of changing policy and it is really a diminution of the program in Europe?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The net result, having in mind the expenditure of \$10 million for storage housing, and having in mind the recall or redeployment of about 33,000 troops, will be an increased expenditure or a decreased expenditure?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from Washington will respond in this way: It will cost more in American dollars to redeploy troops back than it would be to keep them there. On the other hand, it would save dollars from the standpoint of our balance-of-payments situation. I emphasize that all the talk about redeployment of troops back to the United States entails an additional dollar expense; but what we are trying to save is on the balance of payments. So the Reforger program is directed at the part of our effort which is to improve the standing of the American dollar by bolstering our situation as it relates to the balance of payments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How many troops will we have left in Germany if the 33,000 are recalled?

Mr. JACKSON. It is my understanding that with the redeployment of about 33,000 troops, the total of U.S. military personnel in Germany will be about 212,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the recall of the 33,000 does correspond with the arguments which have been made that savings can be achieved by withdrawing troops from Europe?

Mr. JACKSON. Savings on our balance of payments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Save on our balance of payments, yes.

Mr. JACKSON. But remember, when we redeploy troops back to this country, we have the additional expense of dual bases, and dual equipment. It means that we have to have in Europe two things: one is equipment, and the other is storage facilities. In the United States we have to have the equipment so that the troops can train, and, of course, the bases to go with it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The cost of the troops continues whether they are in Europe or in the United States; is that not correct?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator's point is right on that matter.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have been a long-time exponent of reducing the size of our forces in Europe, as the distinguished Senator from Washington knows.

Mr. JACKSON. I am very well aware of that.

Mr. DOMINICK. We had quite a debate on the floor of the Senate on that, one day. It is my understanding that this money, which the Senator from Pennsylvania seeks to strike, is connected with maintaining our forces now in Germany; is that not correct?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is partially correct; \$10,192,000 of the \$17,384,000 which would be eliminated relates to

the Reforger program. As the Senator knows, that is the big program that covers the redeployment of approximately 33,000 troops back to the United States. The \$10 million item is in connection with the pre-positioning of supplies and equipment, and provides for the necessary prefabricated storage buildings to house some \$200 million in equipment which has heretofore supported the 33,000 men in Europe.

To deny this would make ineffective the previously announced decision on redeploying the 33,000 troops.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am not quite sure I follow the Senator on that.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator understands that we have to have dual bases in connection with the troop redeployment. The Senator is aware of that. In other words, we have to have a base for supplies and equipment both in Europe and in the United States. What we are doing here is putting in storage the equipment which supports the 33,000 men being redeployed to the States.

Mr. DOMINICK. Is it not a fact that Germany at the present time has not met its troop commitment or supply commitment under the NATO agreement?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not want to get into a long discussion at this time, because of limited time, as to the troop situation in Europe. I think, technically speaking, most of the NATO nations have not met their previously planned-for troop commitments. It all depends on what commitments, over the last years one is referring to.

I want to point out that Under Secretary of State Rostow has just completed talks in Germany, and I believe some substantial progress has been made with respect to our balance-of-payments picture in Germany, so that there will be improvement in that area. I do not have the immediate figures.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. But this amendment would do violence to the redeployment program, previously announced, of approximately 33,000 U.S. troops.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question on the pending amendment?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice in the House bill that there were individual authorizations for various facilities for the National Guard. In the Senate bill, those individual authorizations are not in evidence. Does that mean that they are consolidated in some other part of the bill which the Senate reported?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from Vermont asks a very good question. What we have done here is to handle the National Guard facilities on a lump-sum basis. This is the program we have followed in the past. We tried the line item approach from 1959 to 1962, which was not at all successful.

Instead, we felt that, contrary to the action taken by the House, this matter should be handled on a lump-sum basis with the priority lists that they come up with each year. I might say that we are way behind on the funding in connection with the programs previously au-

thorized. Particularly for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve there is substantial carryover.

The way the bill is being presented on the floor here is that we have met all of the requests the Department has submitted for authorizations. The problem that the States face, I will say to the Senator, comes when it relates to the appropriation bill on the actual funding of projects previously authorized.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason I ask the question is that some of the National Guard people seem to have the impression the Senate had cut them out.

Mr. JACKSON. No, sir. We are not knocking out their projects. The report on page 41 makes that very clear. The House did add, for example, in the Army National Guard, \$10,617,000, and \$7,900,000 for the Reserves. But our position was that until we use up the previous authorization, there was no point adding more authorizations. Thus, the problem that the National Guard is raising generally, as well as the Reserves group, relates to the appropriation bill, which will come up later.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the problem of the Guard is to get their priorities established for their particular units, and then get the appropriation.

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct. I know that the Senator from Vermont has taken a keen interest in this matter. Let me say that I shall be very happy to work with him and help him in any way that I can in connection with the individual projects he has in the State of Vermont. I wish to assure the Senator from Vermont on that point.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that the Senator's assistance will be very valuable.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from Washington will be very happy to assist him.

I am now happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. I would like to return to this amendment. Is it not correct to say that, in chief, the money authorized, or proposed to be authorized, would accomplish two things? One, to pay for at least part of the cost of the facilities which must be relocated because of De Gaulle's decision that our forces and all NATO forces should move out of France?

Mr. JACKSON. His eviction notice.

Mr. COOPER. Part of that money would go to build facilities in other countries?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Second, is it correct that our country has agreed to return to the United States about 33,000 troops, and in order to carry out this commitment—or at least the agreement was made, subject to the money being appropriated—we must not only return them, but we must have facilities available in Europe and weapons for their use whenever necessary to send them back, in the event of war?

Mr. JACKSON. We are redeploying approximately 33,000 troops. When we embark on this kind of program, which has been referred to as the Reforger program, we must have dual basing.

Mr. COOPER. Returning the 33,000 men is the first step toward what may be an agreement among the NATO countries on the level of forces?

Mr. JACKSON. As the Senator knows, the NATO Foreign Ministers have been meeting in Iceland for two days and are discussing a program which NATO can agree upon for a mutual reduction of NATO and Warsaw Pact forces—a program for a reciprocal East-West reduction of armed forces. This is being discussed, as I understand, at the current meeting of Foreign Ministers.

Mr. COOPER. I support this authorization.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on my time?

Mr. JACKSON. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to ask the Senator where this material and equipment of a highly secret nature, which it is intended to store, and the facilities to be built as a result of this authorization, have been stored since we were kicked out of France and since we decided to bring the troops home?

Mr. JACKSON. I must point out to the Senator that they have been using temporary facilities in connection with much of the equipment that has been moved from France. The situation with reference to the equipment which must be prepositioned is that it cannot be maintained and protected with existing facilities, because it is necessary that it all be put into air-conditioned facilities. At the present time, the bulk of it is out in the open, as the Senator knows, with the troops in the field. This equipment cannot be maintained in the open with no use being made of it.

Mr. CLARK. Why can we not keep them with the troops in the field? Certainly we are not going to bring all the troops home.

Mr. JACKSON. The equipment we are talking about relates only to the equipment needed to support the 33,000 troops—that is a little over a division—and we are talking about \$200 million in equipment. It is very expensive to support men in the field, as the Senator knows. This program which I mentioned specifically, relating to storage facilities, which are of an especially prefabricated nature, will cost \$10,192,000. The estimate given to us previously was that the program would entail about \$40 million.

Mr. CLARK. Why is it necessary to air-condition facilities in Germany?

Mr. JACKSON. As the Senator knows, when equipment is stored, there must be what is commonly referred to as a dehumidification program. The dampness must be taken out of the air. When I said "air conditioning," I included dehumidification. It prevents rust and other types of trouble that we run into in the storage of equipment, which the Senator knows is becoming more and more sophisticated.

Mr. CLARK. Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities. That does not sound to me much like buildings to store equipment. Is that what it is?

Mr. JACKSON. That may not be accurately descriptive from an understandable point of view to those of us who are in the laity, but my staff expert tells me it is the proper categories to cover the requirements to meet the needs for the prepositioning of the equipment and supplies to support the 33,000 troops we are redeploying.

Mr. CLARK. It would look to me as though operational facilities were for new equipment, supplies, facilities, and the like to make our operational forces more efficient. Maintenance facilities would be to maintain equipment already over there. I do not know what supply facilities.

Mr. JACKSON. An operational facility can include communications. It can include supplies and a long list of things. As I said, it could be more accurately descriptive, in a more detailed way. It would be nice if there were a complete bill of particulars, as we lawyers say, of all the items; but I assure the Senator this program is directly tied to the announced decision to redeploy troops back here.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have been very interested in the colloquy that has been going on on this particular amendment. For a long time I have been in favor of reducing our troops and our defenses in Europe as rapidly as possible. We have about 350,000 persons in Europe more than 20 years after World War II. It does not seem to me that, on a continent where there is probably the most economically productive group of nations in the world outside of the North American Continent, we should continue to have that type of force level.

I was extremely interested in listening to the colloquy. I listened to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] say, "Well, is not this a part of our NATO commitment?" The cost of the NATO commitment is not affected by this amendment. That comes from line 19 to the end of the section, and is not affected by lines 17 and 18.

The other thing that I think is important is that it is going to require us to spend \$10 million to take 33,000 troops out. Do we automatically assume that if we take all of them out it is going to cost us ten times that much, and therefore it would be more expensive to take them out than to leave them there? I cannot follow that type of logic or mathematics. It does not make sense to me—particularly at a time when our balance of payments is so acute that the administration has asked us to tax tourists and has asked us to put a travel tax into effect and has just finished putting a surtax on everybody in this country. Yet the administration is saying in effect that we must maintain people there and we have to put another \$17 million into doing something that I think was a wrong policy matter to begin with.

I discussed this matter at length during the committee hearings, and reserved my right to discuss it on the floor. I am delighted the Senator from Pennsylvania has brought up this particular subject.

I do not see why it is absolutely necessary for us to go forward with the dehumidification expense and all the other expenses of maintaining our supplies and equipment, if we are going to bring our men back here. Germany, which is largely relying upon us, along with some of the other countries in Europe, is apparently unwilling either to buy the equip-

ment or to maintain it at its own expense.

It would seem to me that if we are finally going to follow the example of England, France, Germany, and all the other countries that have failed to fulfill their NATO obligations, and as long as we are still willing to fulfill ours, as we can do, by the use of our Polaris submarine and by redeploying our troops if necessary for fast airlift, that the very least we could ask our European allies to do would be to take on the expense of maintaining the bases in a state of readiness, so that we could come to their defense when and if they need it.

So, Mr. President, I believe the amendment is a good one, and I shall be happy to vote for it.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, before yielding back the remainder of my time, I ask unanimous consent that on the next amendment, No. 858, to be offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, the rollcall take place not sooner than 1:30 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Does the Senator mean the rollcall on the pending amendment, or the next?

Mr. JACKSON. No. After the pending amendment has been voted upon, the Senator from Pennsylvania will offer amendment No. 858. I ask unanimous consent that the vote on that amendment not take place prior to 1:30 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered, and cannot be ordered before the amendment is offered.

Mr. CLARK. We will ask for them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator include in his request that the vote take place at 1:30 p.m. if the yeas and nays are ordered?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct. Not earlier than 1:30 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield briefly to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to correct a statement of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. He said the pending amendment would not affect our NATO commitment. That is not true. The following portion of the bill relates to the NATO commitments at the NATO headquarters. This portion relates to the military construction program, and the provisions in these two lines relate directly to a part of our NATO commitments; that is, to the troop level we are maintaining now.

I have supported, as has the Senator from Colorado, bringing home some of the troops we have over there, because to do so would help us with our balance-of-payments problem.

But if we are going to bring them home, the decision that was made to bring 33,000 home included a decision to pre-position that equipment over there, so that if the troops had to be moved back quickly by airlift, they could have the equipment there, ready for them to use when they take to the field.

This \$10 million construction item is an item to dehumidify the containers, so to speak, or the warehouses that this

equipment is to be put into, to keep the equipment from rusting and deteriorating and to make the maintenance problem simpler for the people who are to keep the equipment ready for us. So it is really in support of our bringing back a part of the troops and reducing the troop level over there, which I certainly favor, as does the Senator from Colorado. But I am not in favor of leaving that equipment out in the weather, so that, if troops do have to be redeployed, it will not be usable.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for making the point. I point out, however, that on the lines following the language which would be stricken by the pending amendment, the bill reads:

For the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area, \$55,000,000.

So this amendment does not affect those facilities.

Mr. CANNON. That is correct. That portion is a part of our infrastructure to the NATO headquarters, and the operation of the NATO infrastructure area, and this part has to do only with maintaining our own equipment, that would be needed there should we have to redeploy our troops over there in support of our overall NATO goals.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Nevada. It still seems to me that if we are going to bring our troops back, it ought to be the obligation of the host countries to maintain the bases and equipment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I do not agree with the argument of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Nevada in regard to leaving the equipment over there. If the equipment is to be left there, we ought to make that the choice of Germany, and let Germany maintain it. Germany has never fulfilled her commitments. In fact, most of the members of NATO have never fulfilled their commitments. Only the United States. We have maintained our manpower commitments from the beginning. Other nations have not. Let us bring our troops and equipment home, and let them supply the troops and equipment, if any more are needed. It is about time we stopped being played for suckers by NATO, in regard to supplying all the troops and equipment.

Of course, the Germans do not favor that. They know what that means: They will not get them back again as quickly as they would like. But I say, let them pay the cost of maintenance over there. It is about time we lay it on the line to Germany. I support the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 857) of the Senator from

Colorado. 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 Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 62, as follows:

[No. 193 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Baker	Dominick	Moss
Bayh	Hart	Neison
Brewster	Hatfield	Proxmire
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	McGovern	Tydings
Clark	Morse	Young, Ohio

NAYS—62

Aiken	Hansen	Mundt
Anderson	Harris	Murphy
Bennett	Hayden	Muskie
Bible	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Boggs	Holland	Pearson
Brooke	Hollings	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Percy
Cannon	Inouye	Prouty
Carlson	Jackson	Randolph
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Cooper	Kuchel	Smith
Cotton	Lausche	Sparkman
Curtis	Long, La.	Spong
Dirksen	Magnuson	Stennis
Dodd	Mansfield	Symington
Eastland	McClellan	Thurmond
Ellender	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Fannin	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Fong	Metcalfe	Yarborough
Gore	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Mondale	

NOT VOTING—19

Allott	Hill	Morton
Bartlett	Javits	Russell
Church	Kennedy	Smathers
Ervin	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tower
Gruening	Monroney	
Hartke	Montoys	

So Mr. CLARK's amendment (No. 857) was rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute on the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the next amendment, when it is called up, not take place before 1:30, but, hopefully, very shortly thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That request has already been granted.

AMENDMENT NO. 858

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment (No. 858), and ask that it be read, and when it is read, I desire to modify it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 135, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"Sec. 808. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount authorized to be appropriated to or for the Department of the Army under title I of this Act is hereby reduced by 10 per centum."

On page 135, line 13, strike out "Sec. 808" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 809".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to modify the amendment by inserting in line 5, after the word "act" and before the word "is," the following: "for expenditure within the United States".

I yield myself such time as I may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. CLARK. The purpose of this amendment is to reduce the amount of the authorization by \$36,598,100 by taking a 10 percent cut out of the total under "Title 1—Army," where the amount inside the United States is set forth as \$365,981,000.

Senators will note that there is a "Major command summary" about the middle of page 10 of the report, and I ask that the "Major command summary," down to and including the line "Subtotal inside the United States," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

*Major command summary*

*Continental Army Command:*

1st Army	\$11,345,000
3d Army	30,661,000
4th Army	5,860,000
5th Army	6,408,000
6th Army	6,564,000
Military District of Washington	167,000

CONARC subtotal	61,005,000
Army Materiel Command—CONUS	29,831,000

Army Air Defense Command and Sentinel	227,460,000
Army Strategic Communications Command—CONUS	9,115,000

U.S. Military Academy	16,000,000
The Surgeon General	20,401,000

Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service	1,124,000
Alaska	112,000

Hawaii	933,000
Subtotal inside the United States	365,981,000

Mr. CLARK. Senators will note that the various categories for authorization for the Army within the United States include sums for the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, and 6th Armies, the Military District of Washington, and for various other Army installations, including, among others, Alaska, Hawaii, the U.S. Military Academy, and Surgeon General—this being exemplary and not complete.

It is my view that, in our effort to provide at least the \$6 billion of cuts in expenditures to which the Senate is committed, we should attempt to cut, on an overall basis, those elements of the Defense Establishment which are susceptible to being cut without injury to our national security. I suggest that the pending amendment is one such instance.

I have excluded from the proposed amendment the expenditures for the Army outside the United States, which appear on page 10 of the report, totaling \$85,610,000, because I am aware of the sensitivity of many Senators toward cuts which might even remotely have any impact on our operations in Vietnam and perhaps elsewhere overseas.

Mr. President, in summary, I urge that the Senate agree to the amendment. I believe it is a moderate amendment. I believe there is enough fat in the military construction bill so that this cut can be absorbed without any danger whatever to our national security. In the last analysis, Senators must make up their minds whether they are going to take this \$6 billion cut out of programs for children, education, and our various domestic programs which have been lumped together under the title of Great Society programs, or whether they are going to go after the \$82 billion military budget which I am convinced contains an enormous amount of fat, and particularly in light of the fiscal situation, the condition of the dollar, our balance of payments, and our monetary and fiscal problems.

Mr. President, I urge that the Senate agree to the amendment. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, this year's construction program is an austere one. Most of the authorization requested is devoted to special projects of major importance. For the Department of the Army the committee approved a total of \$451,591,000, which is \$11.8 million below the amount requested. Each individual project was carefully reviewed and if any fat remains in the program I do not know where it is, and this statement equally applies to each of the titles of this bill. Over 62 percent of the Army program is earmarked for two special programs; namely, the Sentinel system and NATO infrastructure, leaving only \$169.3 million for essential brick and mortar projects at the numerous Army installations.

Now within the past few days a few remarks have been made on this floor concerning the Sentinel system, and now that the matter has been disposed of, the \$36.5 million that would be taken out of the Army overall program would have to come from the remainder. This would leave less than \$170 million to provide for absolutely hard core requirements at some 56 permanent Army

installations. A goodly portion of this sum is set aside for barracks and related facilities. These have already been reduced below the amount requested by the Department of Defense. I must point out that the approval of this amendment will in effect deprive our troops of badly needed housing and mess facilities, training facilities, medical and dental care, and most important, repair facilities to keep their overtaxed equipment operating. We have already taken out of this bill every project we could find that did not get into the bone and sinew of the program.

Finally, Mr. President, I might point out that if this amendment is adopted it will reduce the authority to be granted the Army by about \$30 million more than the first amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

The position of the Senator from Pennsylvania is not valid in another regard. The Senator has heretofore said, "Let us take all of the money out of Germany." He was trying to strike \$17 million in Germany. Then, he said, "Take 10 percent out of all overseas and U.S. installations." But he has modified his position now to say, "Leave it all overseas," and he has eliminated from the amendment the items in the Pacific, the Southern Command, the Materiel Command, the Army Security Agency overseas, in Europe and in Germany, and the Army Strategic Communications overseas. He has eliminated all those items.

Instead of saying it should be taken out of funds for overseas, he now wants to take it out in the United States at the many installations that badly need some of these construction facilities. This is being pound wise and penny foolish. I hope the Senate does not agree to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada just stated that this amendment would embrace a cut of \$30 million more than was provided in the proposal the Senator from Pennsylvania previously offered. Will the Senator from Nevada elaborate on that point?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator from Pennsylvania initially offered an overall amendment that would have cut out \$5.69 million. That amendment was offered earlier today.

Now, in this amendment he has proposed a \$36.5 million reduction directly for the Army in the face of his previous amendment which provided for a reduction of \$5.69 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. By how many millions of dollars does this amendment exceed the previous amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, which was rejected?

Mr. CANNON. For the Army, and it related only to the Army, it is a little over \$30 million more than the amendment he previously offered for the Army. It is slightly over \$30 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we have an agreement not to vote before 1:30, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be charged against my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the time of the opponents on the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding the Senator from Pennsylvania is prepared to yield back his time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROEY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 194 Leg.]

YEAS—21

Bayh	Hathfield	Pell
Brooke	Jordan, Idaho	Proxmire
Burdick	McGovern	Randolph
Clark	Mondale	Ribicoff
Cooper	Morse	Symington
Gore	Moss	Tydings
Harris	Nelson	Young, Ohio

NAYS—60

Aiken	Fong	McIntyre
Anderson	Griffin	Metcalf
Baker	Hansen	Miller
Bennett	Hart	Mundt
Bible	Hayden	Murphy
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Brewster	Hill	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Pearson
Byrd, W. Va.	Hollings	Percy
Cannon	Hruska	Prouty
Carlson	Inouye	Scott
Case	Jackson	Smith
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Curtis	Kuchel	Spong
Dirksen	Lausche	Stennis
Dodd	Long, La.	Thurmond
Dominick	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McClellan	Yarborough
Fannin	McGee	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—18

Allott	Hartke	Montoya
Bartlett	Javits	Morton
Church	Kennedy	Russell
Ervin	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Fulbright	McCarthy	Talmadge
Gruening	Monroney	Tower

So Mr. CLARK's amendment (No. 858), as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

#### APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR MONDALE TO THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 307

*Resolved*, That Mr. Mondale, of Minnesota, be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in lieu of Mr. Kennedy, of New York, deceased. Mr. Mondale having resigned from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 307) was considered and agreed to.

#### CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16703) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 864

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment (No. 864), and ask that it be stated.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 135, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"Sec. 808. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount authorized to be appropriated to or for each military department for housing under title VI of this Act is hereby reduced by 10 per centum."

On page 135, line 13, strike out "Sec. 808" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 809".

**MR. CLARK.** Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

**MR. CLARK.** Mr. President, if Senators will refer to page 33 of the committee report, they will see there under the heading, "Title VI, Military Family Housing," a tabulation showing a series of expenditures for military family housing totaling \$586 million. And for each military department there is a subtotal, and there is a total appropriation granted for construction of \$48,740,000. It is to that amount that the pending amendment is directed and not to the authorizations for operating expenses, leasing maintenance, debt payment, and the like.

The end result of the pending amendment would be to cut \$4,874,000 from military family housing.

I have considered moving an amendment to prevent the construction of any further units of new housing, totaling 2,000 units. Actually, I believe in view of our other national priorities—including aid to education, the poverty program, and the other Great Society programs which have already been drastically cut back and will be further cut back in the ensuing months—it would be quite justifiable to move to eliminate all new construction.

It would seem that the construction of military family housing is something which could well be postponed for at least a year and that our armed services personnel could get along without these 2,000 new units in order that we may feed the hungry, educate our youth, and make some dent in the frightening problems of our slum areas, rural as well as urban.

I concluded, however, because of the chilly reception which has greeted the other amendments, that I would confine this cut to 10 percent of the total amount of \$48 million in the hope that Senators will at least make this modest contribution toward those savings which we in the Congress have voted as essential, totaling \$6 billion.

Mr. President, I hope therefore that this modest amendment, which as I say would only reduce the total amount of the pending bill by \$4,874,000, will be approved by the Senate.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

**MR. JACKSON.** Mr. President, the committee has approved \$586,700,000 for the military family housing program. For the coming fiscal year—and I emphasize

this—only \$48,740,000 of this amount is for new construction, consisting primarily of 2,000 units of family housing within the United States. This seems to be a very modest request against the retirement of an existing deficit of around 52,000 units and when compared to the yearly increment of 12,500 units usually requested. We have, in other words, eliminated on the average of 10,500 units as compared to the number requested last year.

Mr. President, in recent years we have required all costs of the family housing to be authorized in the military construction bill. What I am about to say is very important. Lest any Senator get the idea that what we are talking about here when we mention \$586.7 million is all for housing, I want to make the point crystal clear.

Mr. President, as we know, in recent years we have required all costs of family housing to be authorized in the military construction bill. Therefore, \$537,960,000 of this year's request relates to operating expenses, the leasing of housing, the maintenance of existing property, debt payment on existing mortgages, mortgage insurance premiums, and servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums.

It can be seen that much of this portion of the request consists of fixed charges, and to reduce the amount by 10 percent is somewhat tantamount to making a general reduction in the funds to pay the interest on the national debt.

If this amendment is adopted, it will reduce the housing request by \$58.7 million, thus eliminating entirely the new construction program, and will cut into vitally needed operation and maintenance funds.

**MR. CLARK.** I am afraid that the Senator's staff assistant has misinterpreted this amendment. I am not asking for a \$58 million cut at all. I am asking for a cut from 2,000 units in the ancillary expenditures there to what amounts to 1,800 units. I stated in my opening remarks that the total cut would be \$4,874,000.

**MR. JACKSON.** I shall read the Senator's amendment; and if I do not understand it, perhaps the Senator can explain it to me:

On page 135, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"Sec. 808. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount authorized to be appropriated to or for each military department—

**MR. CLARK.** "Each military department."

**MR. JACKSON.** That is right. "for housing under Title VI of this Act is hereby reduced by 10 per centum."

Mr. President, in title VI of the bill we have all of the military departments. The Senator's amendment would reduce by 10 percent the amount authorized, and the amount authorized for housing is \$586,700,000. That is precisely the result here; namely, a reduction of \$58.7 million.

**MR. CLARK.** I quite disagree with the Senator about the interpretation of my amendment. If there is any doubt, let

us modify it so as to make clear that what I am trying to cut are the items totaling \$48,740,000.

**MR. JACKSON.** I wish to be fair to the Senator, but where in his amendment does such a proposal appear?

**MR. CLARK.** "Each military department for housing."

**MR. JACKSON.** So that the Senator understands, when he talks about housing in title VI, it covers all aspects of housing.

If Senators will refer to page 33 of the report, in connection with title VI, it will be apparent. On page 33 of the report is broken down what we say about title VI. Senators will find there a complete bill of particulars.

What the Senator proposes to do by his amendment—if the English language still has some meaning—is to reduce all the items appearing on page 33 of the report by 10 percent. One cannot come to any other conclusion.

**MR. CLARK.** I believe I have the right to modify my amendment.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The yeas and nays have been ordered.

**MR. CLARK.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to modify my amendment by inserting on line 5, after the word "for" and before the word "housing," the word "new."

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

**MR. SYMINGTON.** Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—what will be the difference in the amount of money involved in this case?

**MR. CLARK.** As the Senator from Washington interprets my amendment—and I disagree with him, in all good humor—it is the difference between \$58 million, which the committee amendment calls for, and a cut of \$4,874,000, which my amendment calls for. It is to cut the new housing units by 10 percent. Actually, it is a difference of approximately \$54 million.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Will the Senator restate his modification?

**MR. CLARK.** I ask unanimous consent that my amendment No. 864 be modified by inserting on line 5, after the word "for" and before the word "housing," the word "new."

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be so modified.

**MR. JACKSON.** Mr. President, the effect of the Senator's amendment, as modified, would be to reduce the housing figure for the 2,000 units by 10 percent. The total amount that has been authorized is \$42,850,000. So this would reduce it by \$4,285,000.

**MR. CLARK.** I would include the minor construction planning and the rental guarantee payments, because they are part of the new units.

**MR. JACKSON.** No; they are not.

This is the trouble, Mr. President. When we try to draft legislation on the floor of the Senate, we get into a mass of confusion.

I wish to make it very clear that the report, on page 33, refers to new hous-

ing, and that item amounts to 2,000 units, at \$42,850,000. In addition, we have minor construction and planning.

Mr. CLARK. It is planning for new housing.

Mr. JACKSON. Planning for new housing, and the Senator proposes to reduce that—

Mr. CLARK. No. If the Senator will look at the line "total authorization for appropriations granted, construction," it is the construction of new housing, including the planning, that I desire to reduce by 10 percent. I believe it is as clear as it can be that that is \$48,740,000, and I want to cut that by 10 percent.

Mr. JACKSON. The junior Senator from Washington has been away from the practice of law for a long time.

Mr. CLARK. So has the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JACKSON. Perhaps even longer than the Senator from Pennsylvania. But, on the total figure of \$48,740,000, on which I understand the Senator is now relying—is that the Senator's new figure?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Under that, if the Senator will go back, there is "minor construction." "Minor construction" relates to improvements on old housing. The Senator's amendment refers to new housing. Will the Senator explain how his amendment would cover that?

I am not trying to be picky.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest that the Senator from Washington is trying to be picky, not intentionally. If the Senator would be happier if we put another subtotal in the report and make it \$42 million, I will not argue.

Mr. JACKSON. Does not the Senator's amendment say "new housing"?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. But it says construction of new housing.

Mr. JACKSON. I am trying to point out that the "minor construction" item does not relate to construction of new housing. It relates to the remodeling of old housing or housing that is already in existence. How can that be new housing?

I am not being picky. This is not complicated; it is pretty clear.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator thinks it is worthwhile to take the time of the Senate to argue over the matter of some \$400,000, I am willing to modify my amendment again to make it conform with what the Senator from Washington would like to have it mean, and then he can tell us why he objects to that.

Mr. JACKSON. It is not my amendment. I am just trying to interpret it.

In order to get the record straight, let me explain that last year the Congress approved 10,609 family housing units out of 12,500 requested. We have reduced it this year to 2,000.

I must say that the men who serve in the Armed Forces of this country—and the bulk of them are there involuntarily—are entitled to a preference, a priority, on housing. When we reduce it from 12,500 units to 2,000, I believe we have come a long, long way. And I believe we really are getting picky when we try to reduce it from 2,000 units to 1,800. If Members of the Senate went around this country and saw the prob-

lem we have in housing, they would say that the men serving in the Armed Forces are entitled at least to a small percentage of the tremendous demand. The outright commitment at the present time is around 52,000 units, in order to meet minimum requirements, and we are providing only 2,000.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. With due respect to the Senator from Washington, he is arguing against the substance of the amendment—and I shall not vote for the amendment, either. But the amendment is in proper form, because it says 10 percent of new housing. If anything in here is old housing, it is not included in the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JACKSON. I agree.

Mr. PASTORE. Senators can stand up and vote against it, and I shall vote against it. However, the amendment is in proper form.

Mr. JACKSON. It is in proper form as I interpret what it would do, but I say to my friend from Rhode Island that he said that the Senator from Pennsylvania said it is also going to include minor construction which is not new construction. I say that it would not.

Mr. PASTORE. No; and his amendment would not include it because it provides for "new construction."

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct. I was trying to explain that his amendment would not do what he had said it would do.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JACKSON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 864) of the Senator from Pennsylvania. 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 Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 195 Leg.]		
YEAS—14		
Bayh	Hart	Scott
Boggs	McGovern	Smathers
Burdick	Morse	Williams, Del.
Clark	Nelson	Young, Ohio
Cooper	Proxmire	

NAYS—64		
Aiken	Hansen	Moss
Anderson	Hatfield	Mundt
Baker	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Bennett	Hill	Muskie
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Brewster	Hollings	Pearson
Brooke	Hruska	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Percy
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Prouty
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Case	Kuchel	Smith
Cotton	Lausche	Sparkman
Curtis	Long, La.	Spong
Dodd	Magnuson	Stennis
Dominick	Mansfield	Symington
Eastland	McClellan	Thurmond
Ellender	McGee	Tydings
Fannin	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Miller	
Griffin	Mondale	

#### NOT VOTING—21

Allott	Harris	Monroney
Bartlett	Hartke	Montoya
Church	Hayden	Morton
Dirksen	Javits	Russell
Ervin	Kennedy	Talmadge
Fulbright	Long, Mo.	Tower
Gruening	McCarthy	Yarborough

So Mr. CLARK's amendment (No. 864) was rejected.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENTS NOS. 861 AND 862

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendments (Nos. 861 and 862), and ask that they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc and will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The BILL CLERK. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] proposes two amendments (Nos. 861 and 862). Amendment No. 861 reads:

On page 135, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"Sec. 808. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount authorized to be appropriated to or for the De-

partment of the Navy under title II of this Act is hereby reduced by 10 per centum."

On page 135, line 13, strike out "Sec. 808" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 809".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield so I may ask for the yeas and nays? I consider these amendments to be very important.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon, but it has not been my intention to ask for a roll-call vote on these two amendments simply because they would do for the Air Force and the Navy what I was so conspicuously unsuccessful in trying to do for the Army.

However, if the Senator from Oregon wishes to ask for a rollcall vote, I certainly have no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield me 30 seconds, I think it is very important to have a record vote on these two amendments. They are very important amendments and the record should be made.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senate acts on the request of the Senator from Oregon, the Chair would request that the clerk read the second amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania so that his request to have them considered en bloc may be honored.

The BILL CLERK. Amendment No. 862 reads:

On page 135, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"Sec. 808. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount authorized to be appropriated to or for the Department of the Air Force under title III of this Act is hereby reduced by 10 per centum."

On page 135, line 13, strike out "Sec. 808" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 809".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the request of the Senator from Oregon who asked for the yeas and nays, is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, the amendment dealing with the Department of the Navy would cut a total of \$23,402,500 from the amount authorized, as appears on page 14 of the committee report.

Of the \$234,025,000, the amendment which pertains to the Department of the Air Force—if Senators will turn to page 22 of the committee report—would cut a total of \$19,248,000 from a total authorized of \$192,481,000.

The purpose of these two amendments is to make the same percentage cut in the authorizations for the Navy and Air Force as an earlier amendment attempted to do for the Department of the Army.

The arguments in favor of cutting the authorization for the Navy and Air Force are largely identical with those which applied to the Army.

I do not believe that a detailed discussion is presently in order. The philosophy behind it is that there is a lot of fat in the bill, just as there is a lot of fat in all military appropriations and authorization bills.

Ten percent is quite a modest cut. We are engaged in priority competition as

to where the \$6 billion cut which we have directed be made can take place. My own view is that cuts of 10 percent in all military appropriations bills can be made without any undue influence upon our national security, and should be made before we cut back further on Great Society programs for education, poverty, and the like.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I press these two amendments and reserve the remainder of my time.

#### SECTION 808—NAVY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, my remarks in relation to the Army program as to austerity and bare essentials are equally applicable to the Navy program. This year the Navy requested \$269.6 million approximately, and the committee in reviewing the request reduced it by \$35.5 million, the largest reduction made for either of the three services. This was not because the Navy program was more loosely woven, but we found a few more projects, though valid and needed, could be deferred in light of today's circumstances, such as a new library for the important Navy postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., the start of a second male recruit camp at the Naval Training Center, Orlando, Fla., and an aircraft maintenance hanger for the Arctic Research Laboratory at Barrow, Alaska.

This year the Navy request for troop housing was the largest of the three services because this important program in the past has been secondary to badly needed naval operational requirements. Many naval installations are in bad shape for adequate troop housing and some examples coming to my attention have been rather shocking. I believe the Navy program this year has been cut to the quick and any further cuts could be crucial.

The amendment before us now would reduce the Navy program around \$6 million more than the first amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### SECTION 808—AIR FORCE

Mr. President, the Air Force program this year is the smallest of the three military services—\$192.5 million—and provides for the most essential requirements of around 120 major Air Force bases throughout the world. This is the smallest and the most austere program for the Air Force that I can recall in many years. Here again my remarks pertaining to the Army and the Navy portion of the bill apply. The bulk of the program consists of such basic and critical items as airfield lighting—there are 18 of these projects—which provide elementary safety. Shall we make it 10 percent less safe for military aviators? There are four vital control towers in the bill and eight flight simulators to support our expanding training programs. To continue, there are six fire stations and 13 aircraft maintenance docks—need I go further? It can be seen that the Air Force requirements are basic and essential. This program cannot absorb a further reduction of \$19 million.

This amendment would reduce the Air Force program by about \$11 million more than the first amendment offered.

Mr. President, having just made the

above two statements, suffice it to say that the committee has made a very substantial cut in the pending measure. I should point out that the military construction bill this year is one of the most austere bills we have ever submitted to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. How much below the budget is the amount authorized by the committee report?

Mr. JACKSON. Does the Senator mean the entire program?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; for military construction.

Mr. JACKSON. We have cut it about \$89 million.

Mr. CLARK. It is about 5 percent below the budget; is it not?

Mr. JACKSON. The total request was \$1,895,999,000. We have cut it about 5 percent.

Mr. CLARK. So that the total recommended by the committee is still \$1.8 billion.

Mr. JACKSON. The point I think the Senator misses is that had he gone through the bill—and we reported unanimously, a bipartisan bill—he would see that when we add up the fixed costs, there is not much we can really cut without getting into the muscle. We have tried to use prudently a surgeon's scalpel, cutting the fat and not the muscle. I must say I think the cuts are as prudent as can be made under the circumstances.

I want to reiterate, as I did on the floor yesterday, the statement of the Secretary of Defense. He made it clear, in his news conference last week, that they have under review now a cut of a minimum of \$2 billion in expenditures—let us face up to the fact that we are talking about \$6 billion in appropriations—up to a maximum of \$3 billion in expenditures, which may well be \$9 billion in appropriations.

To the extent that we turn around and make his task of exercising his discretion more difficult, I do not think we are really doing the best job of economizing. We have tried to defer everything we could in the bill. Surely, there are items that will be deferred by the Secretary of Defense, but I am confident, in light of the decision made by the Congress, that the Executive must find the \$6 billion. It makes our task pretty difficult when we want to go in here now and willy-nilly go through the budget and start pulling items out.

We have reached our conclusions after a careful review of the budget. I think the items we have cut represent the best judgment that one could exercise under the circumstances.

I hope the amendments will be rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

In response to the Senator from Washington, let me say that, in my opinion, a cut below the budget from \$1,890 million to \$1,807 million is so small as to be hardly recognizable, and certainly not nearly enough to take out of this bill that share of the \$6 billion saving which we are committed to make.

It is all very well to pass the buck to the Secretary of Defense, but I am one who holds the view that it is Congress who controls the pursestrings, our Constitution so provides, and I hope it always will, and it is our obligation, as it is that of the Executive, to prune the budget down to the point where we can make the \$6 billion cut in expenditures that we have pledged ourselves to. I think it is of the highest priority that we cut back our military expenditures—and I think the military construction bill is one good place to do it—while still enabling us to carry out our obligations. Therefore, I believe it within our competence to cut the authorizations for the Air Force and Navy back by 10 percent. I am confident that this can be done without real danger to our national security.

Mr. President, if the Senator is prepared to yield back the balance of his time, I am ready to do so.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendments is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Pennsylvania. 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 Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] is detained on official business, and if present and voting, would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator

from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 196 Leg.]

YEAS—16

Bayh	Hatfield	Proxmire
Brooke	McGovern	Smathers
Burdick	Mondale	Tydings
Clark	Morse	Young, Ohio
Cooper	Moss	
Harris	Nelson	

NAYS—61

Alken	Griffin	Muskie
Anderson	Hart	Pastore
Baker	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Bennett	Hill	Pell
Bible	Holland	Percy
Boggs	Hollings	Prouty
Brewster	Inouye	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Scott
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Smith
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Sparkman
Carlson	Kuchel	
Case	Long, La.	Spong
Cotton	Magnuson	Stennis
Curtis	Mansfield	Symington
Dirksen	McClellan	Thurmond
Dodd	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Dominick	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Metcalfe	Yarborough
Fannin	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Mundt	
Gore	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—22

Allott	Hartke	Monroney
Bartlett	Hayden	Montoya
Church	HRuska	Morton
Ellender	Javits	Russell
Ervin	Kennedy	Talmadge
Fulbright	Lausche	Tower
Gruening	Long, Mo.	
Hansen	McCarthy	

So Mr. CLARK's amendments (Nos. 861 and 862, consolidated) were rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were rejected.

Mr. JACKSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield briefly, on the bill, to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN MARITIME PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 15189.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15189) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HART, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. GRIFFIN, and Mr. PROUTY conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills:

H.R. 10480. An act to prohibit desecration of flag, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 16819. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend the authorization of grants to States for rehabilitation services, to broaden the scope of goods and services available under that act for the handicapped, and for other purposes.

#### CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16703) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 855

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 855, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 109, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

"Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, \$280,000."

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] be added as a cosponsor of this amendment.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this amendment will provide a much needed fire station at Charleston Air Force Base in Charleston, S.C. A situation has developed at Charleston Air Force Base that requires immediate action. In fiscal year 1968, the Congress authorized an addition to the base fire station. When planning for that action was fully evaluated, it became apparent that it would be unwise to put a new addition on an old World War II fire station. The existing station is antiquated and inefficient in several major aspects. The firetruck stalls, of which there are eight, were sized for equipment in use in the early 1940's. When present-day equipment is placed in these stalls, there is only a 5-inch clearance. Men cannot work around the vehicles while they are inside, and maneuvering the vehicles into these tight quarters is a feat in itself. An average of 35 men per shift are on duty at the station, yet there are no kitchen facilities. Meals are carried in by vehicle from the nearest dining hall. While the men on shift are required to be in or near the building, there is no dayroom or reading room space, and the building is not air conditioned.

Rather than build the additional three stalls authorized and funded in 1968, and then come back at a later date to replace the eight existing substandard equipment stalls and the station office, it would make more sense, and be more economical to build the entire station as a single job.

To achieve the economies of this commonsense approach, we should add to this bill a project to build a fire station with eight equipment stalls at Charleston Air Force Base. The cost of this facility is \$280,000. The Air Force is temporarily holding construction of the small addition approved in 1968 to see if the entire station can be built at one time. That addition, when combined with this proposed station will provide a complete modern fire station that will adequately house the men and equipment for this vital base fire station.

Mr. President, the Assistant Secretary of Defense has requested the amendment. It is his desire that action be taken at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, in the last fiscal year we authorized the sum of \$71,000 for an addition to the fire station referred to by the senior Senator from South Carolina. It turns out that the fire station is a World War II facility and that it would not be prudent to make the addition to that facility. Instead, it is the judgment of the Air Force that a new facility in the sum of \$280,000 should be included in the pending bill for this purpose.

The decision was made after the bill had been reported, so that there was not time to consider it in the Armed Services Committee.

I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, is there a budget request on this item?

Mr. JACKSON. There is no budget request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the manager of the bill yield me 10 minutes against the bill?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am at a complete loss to understand the pending amendment being brought to the floor of the Senate at this time. In the consideration of the pending bill, we have been told by the manager of the bill over and over again of the great care with which the committee has gone into the measure.

He says now that there was not time to consider the pending amendment. There was plenty of time to reconvene the committee.

I would like to have the Members of the Senate turn to page 50 of the committee report. We find listed there the following:

Army: Fort Jackson	\$1, 661, 000
Navy:	
Fleet Ballistic Missile Submarine Training Center, Charleston	2, 540, 000
Fleet Training Center, Charleston	180, 000
Naval Hospital, Charleston	13, 456, 000
Naval Shipyard, Charleston	4, 180, 000
Naval Station, Charleston	1, 487, 000
Naval Weapons Station, Charleston	4, 734, 000
Naval Schools Mine Warfare, Charleston	1, 639, 000

Air Force:  
 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base,  
 Myrtle Beach..... 254, 000  
 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter..... 614, 000

A new amendment is now proposed: Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, S.C., operational facilities, \$280,000. That is a very consuming budget appetite, I want to say. And let us face up to it.

Here is something that can be postponed. There is one construction item after another in the pending measure that could be postponed for a year, and it would be of much greater benefit to the fiscal welfare of our economy than a good many of the expenditures that are in here and are not being postponed. And here is one in which there is not even a budget request. Here is one in which the committee presents no report.

What do we want to do? Do we want to turn this into a grab bag in the last hour or two of the debate? I suppose that other Senators can envision some proposals for additions in the appropriation bill, if we want to start this Christmas tree approach.

I want to say in all commonsense that we have reached the point where we ought to stop. We certainly should not be adding to the pending bill now another \$280,000, and certainly not in South Carolina.

I simply think this is going too far. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the pending amendment did not originate with me. The Assistant Secretary of Defense wants this amount appropriated because he says that it means economy and that a new fire station is needed. I would have suggested the amendment in the committee if I had known of it at that time. However, I did not know of it. The Assistant Secretary of Defense is asking for this amount because he says it is needed. He also says that it will save money in the end.

I am surprised at the senior Senator from Oregon trying to go into every detail about stations located in South Carolina. I presume that the Army and the Air Force and the Navy have made their own evaluations.

In the committee I did not make one motion to add an item to that recommended by the Defense Department. Every item that is in the pending bill for South Carolina was recommended by the Defense Department. This item was recommended by the Defense Department, and that is the only reason I have offered the pending amendment. It will save the Government money in the end.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the senior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have heard the manager of the bill point out how they have cut out of the bill the amounts recommended by the Defense Establishment. I find no merit in the argument of my good friend, the senior Senator from South Carolina, that the

Secretary of Defense wants this item. It is another item that ought to have been cut back if he had asked for it in the first place.

There is not any justification for continuing to add to the bill, particularly in view of the fact that we have not cut back on a good many construction items that could have been postponed.

I repeat, I hope the amendment is rejected.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not know anything about the merits of the proposed amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina. Knowing him as I do and his consistent recommendations for economy, I would assume that the pending amendment on the merits might be a proper one. However, I thought I would take 2 or 3 minutes to give the reasons why I have been voting for these decreases.

It is impossible to know everything that is in a bill like this. I know it has been developed under the able leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from Washington. However, I do remember last year when the military construction bill was being considered that I looked at the bill and thought, "Here are items—brick, mortar, steel, and stone—which could be postponed because of our financial situation, or eliminated." I voted against the bill last year, along with four or five other Senators.

In looking through the bill today, I find that only \$215 million is for use in Vietnam. It is possible that some additional sums are classified; but in my brief study of the bill, I note that probably not over \$300 million of the total of nearly \$2 billion is for use in Vietnam.

The Senate has passed upon the ABM system, and that is not my reason for raising the issue now, because there will be another occasion on which that can be tested.

But it has occurred to me that because these items are for the construction of barracks, mess halls, bachelor officers' quarters, and theaters—I am sure there are many worthy items—these physical structures could be deferred, or at least the total bill could be cut.

That is why I have been voting for these cuts, and that is why, despite my regard for my dear friend the Senator from South Carolina, I shall vote against this amendment.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I do not know why the distinguished Senator from Oregon is so surprised at the things that are moving to South Carolina. His very charming daughter had the intelligence to marry a South Carolinian and move there herself. I am sure it was not a grab-bag approach that resulted in her locating in Hartsville.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am willing to take ju-

dicial notice that my daughter, if she were here, would vote against this amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLINGS. I believe if we were to develop a grab bag approach, it would be something other than a fire station.

The C-5A, the largest transport plane in the air history of this Nation, will be located there this time next year. The plane was tested last week. They will need these fire facilities, I am told by the Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Therefore, I urge the support of the amendment, not only in the matter of economy but more particularly in the matter of need.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 48, as follows:

[No. 197 Leg.]

YEAS—34

Allott	Dodd	Hollings
Baker	Eastland	Jackson
Bennett	Fannin	Jordan, N.C.
Byrd, Va.	Fong	Magnuson
Byrd, W. Va.	Hansen	Mansfield
Carlson	Hayden	McClellan
Cotton	Hickenlooper	Miller
Curtis	Hill	Mundt
Dirksen	Holland	Murphy

Russell	Sparkman	Young, N. Dak.
Smathers	Stennis	
Smith	Thurmond	

NAYS—48

Alken	Harris	Pastore
Anderson	Hart	Pearson
Bayh	Hatfield	Pell
Bible	Inouye	Percy
Boggs	Jordan, Idaho	Prouty
Brewster	Kuchel	Proxmire
Brooke	Long, La.	Randolph
Burdick	McGee	Ribicoff
Cannon	McGovern	Scott
Case	McIntyre	Spong
Clark	Metcalf	Symington
Cooper	Mondale	Tydings
Dominick	Morse	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Moss	Williams, Del.
Gore	Muskie	Yarborough
Griffin	Nelson	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—17

Bartlett	Hruska	Monroney
Church	Javits	Montoya
Ervin	Kennedy	Morton
Fulbright	Lausche	Talmadge
Gruening	Long, Mo.	Tower
Hartke	McCarthy	

So Mr. THURMOND's amendment (No. 855) was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield back 16 minutes and I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is very difficult for me to compete with these attachés who are standing in the rear of the Chamber out of curiosity and not helping any Senator. I ask the Chair to order them removed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will attachés whose presence is not required please leave the Chamber. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, 5 years ago in the Senate there was a debate and vote on ringing our cities with Nike-Zeus missiles and reference was made to Nike-X as a successor to the Nike-Zeus system. At that time practically the same Senators, with one notable exception, who are now proponents of the so-called thin anti-ballistic-missile defense are the ones who succeeded in having enacted into law appropriations for Nike-Ajax missile systems at a cost of more than \$1,250 million. Then Nike-Hercules on which more than \$2 billion

of taxpayers' money was wasted, then Nike-Zeus on which more than \$1,370 million was spent and following that, Nike-X. This is taxpayers' money down the drain, utterly wasted. The one notable exception, and I express my admiration to her, is the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the ranking Republican member on the Senate Armed Services Committee, who yesterday spoke and voted in favor of the Hart-Cooper amendment.

These anti-ballistic-missile systems were ineffective and useless even at the very time they were completed. There has been and is no effective anti-CBM missile system. Our defense against any possible nuclear attack is our greatly superior offensive nuclear capability. Those same Senators whose voice and views prevailed in this debate all voted and spoke out for these systems which we now know to have been utterly useless boondoggles costing our taxpayers billions of dollars; very definitely, in excess of \$5 billion.

Experience keeps a dear school. It seems shocking and startling that those same Senators who in 1963 talked so boldly and eloquently in support of ringing around some of our cities with these expensive anti-ballistic-missile installations have not concluded it is high time to profit by the mistakes of the past. Those anti-ballistic-missile defenses, so called, were worthless and obsolete from the time they were installed. We should not perpetrate further boondoggles of this sort. My vote will be cast against this bill containing this Sentinel, this anti-ballistic system, so called.

Patrick Henry on a historic occasion said:

There is but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way to judge of the future but by the past.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the genial Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I, too, regret the decision of the Senate to continue what is, to my way of thinking, a foolish authorization for the ABM system. I believe the Senate will regret its decision in the future as it has regretted the enormous sums of money it has spent on equally ineffective efforts to defend our country against oncoming missiles in the past.

I further regret the fact that the Senate is unwilling to shave the amounts contained in the bill, as requested in the amendments which I submitted and which were defeated. It seems to me that to reduce the bill below the budget, from \$1,890 million to \$1,807 million, is a far cry from the kind of cut we should make if we are going to get a fair share of the \$6 billion we have pledged ourselves to cut expenditures out of the military authorizations and appropriations.

Nevertheless, this bill to continue authorizations is vitally necessary to the

security of the country, and I cannot with confidence vote against it as such, despite my disappointment at the actions of the Senate on the various amendments.

Accordingly, I shall vote for the bill.

**THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT**

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the distinguished minority leader yielding to me to address my colleagues. I do so, not to discuss the pending bill, but to invite attention to the fact that 30 years ago today, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed into law the Fair Labor Standards Act. Our President now, Lyndon B. Johnson, cast his vote for its passage. He was then a Representative from Texas.

The honored Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], was one of those Members then serving in the House—as was I—who voted for that pioneering legislation. It was my privilege, as a member of the Labor Committee in the House, to have had a part in its drafting.

There are two other Members of this body who voted, on May 24, 1938, as Members then in the House, for the measure when it passed the other body by a vote of 314 to 97. I refer to Senators Hill and Magnuson.

I remember very well that we were fighting, in those times, to secure a minimum wage of 25 cents an hour. I recall the opposition to the proposal from some of those who were perhaps, well-meaning but failed in what I believed to be their concern for the well-being of the American worker.

Now, through the continuing years, as we have amended and strengthened the legislation, I commend the American worker, and I commend also American industry and business which have realized the importance of men and women being well paid for their labor. This has been the means, in part, of bringing into being a more productive society.

**CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS**

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16703) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I find it significant and perhaps even prophetic that Senate passage of the bill authorizing a beginning ABM system should fall on this particular day. On June 25, 1876, one of the great military disasters in American history occurred. This disaster has come to be known as Custer's last stand. If historical accounts are accurate, that defeat occurred as a result of underestimating the offensive capabilities of the enemy. I believe that many

in this body have underestimated the offensive capabilities of some of our potential foes.

The step we are taking here today will not guarantee the protection of any individual. For, indeed, these guarantees are impossible. However, I, for one, shall be a bit more secure in the knowledge that we have taken a beginning step in that we have set in motion the machinery for beginning the deployment of an ABM system—a system that, in my opinion, will not only be workable but will advance the cause of peace, because history has demonstrated graphically time and again that the only defense against tyranny and the only assurance of peace is a strong defense.

It has been said that the cost will be high, but as a former Senator from South Carolina, John C. Calhoun, said:

Those who would enjoy the blessings of liberty must be willing to undergo the hardship of sustaining it.

I believe that the action we are taking today will be a beginning toward insuring against a modern day "massacre at the Little Big Horn," and I applaud the action.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has now been yielded back.

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 assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD, of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHEL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYAL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHEL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 3, as follows:

[No. 198 Leg.]  
YEAS—78

Aiken	Fong	Mondale
Allott	Gore	Moss
Anderson	Griffin	Mundt
Baker	Hansen	Murphy
Bayh	Harris	Muskie
Bennett	Hart	Pastore
Bible	Hatfield	Pearson
Boggs	Hayden	Pell
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Percy
Brooke	Hill	Prouty
Burdick	Holland	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Ribicoff
Cannon	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Clark	Kuchel	Sparkman
Cooper	Long, La.	Spong
Cotton	Magnuson	Steinle
Curtis	Mansfield	Symington
Dirksen	McClellan	Thurmond
Dodd	McGee	Tydings
Dominick	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Metcalf	Yarborough
Fannin	Miller	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—3

Morse	Nelson	Young, Ohio
-------	--------	-------------

NOT VOTING—18

Bartlett	HRuska	Monroney
Church	Javits	Montoya
Ervin	Kennedy	Morton
Fulbright	Lausche	Smathers
Gruening	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Hartke	McCarthy	Tower

So the bill (H.R. 16703) was passed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. TOWER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has once again demonstrated his deep interest in and broad knowledge of the vital needs of our military. He handled this construction authorization with outstanding skill and ability. It is a fine achievement; one that he can add to his already abundant record of public service. Joining Senator JACKSON to obtain this overwhelming success was the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], whose devotion to the national security interests of this Nation is unsurpassed. We are again indebted for his contribution.

Other Senators are also to be commended for their strong support and contribution to this discussion. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] all deserve our thanks.

Noteworthy also was the contribution of the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and Michigan [Mr. HART] who

together directed a far-reaching and high-level discussion concerning the anti-ballistic-missile system that has received so much attention. They certainly deserve commendation for leading this discussion and for raising some pertinent questions. The Senators from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are also to be commended for offering their strong and sincere views.

Finally, I personally wish to thank all Senators who participated in the debate for assuring an overall discussion that falls within the best traditions of the Senate.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 1247, 1292, 1293, 1294, 1295, and 1296 in order.

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

#### ST. LOUIS-SAN FRANCISCO RAILWAY CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 17320) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on June 10 I introduced a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co. An identical bill, H.R. 17320, approved by the House on June 19, has now been reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and is now on the Senate Calendar.

A question has arisen as to the meaning of the provision in the bill calling for "payment of adequate compensation" by the railroad for the easement. The adequate compensation called for in the bill is in fact the fair market value of the property in question. In order to clarify and to expedite this matter I asked the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture for the method used to calculate adequate compensation and have received a reply.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me affirming the fact that compensation is calculated at fair market value.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
FOREST SERVICE,  
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1968.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,  
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: This is in reply to your inquiry concerning determination of the consideration to be paid for the easement to be granted to the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company in accordance with the provisions of proposed H.R. 17320.

The proposed bill calls for "payment of adequate compensation." The Forest Service has made an appraisal of the easement employing accepted appraisal methods for determining fair market value of real property. In this instance the fair market value included the value of the land occupied by the

easement as determined from transactions in similar land plus severance damage to adjacent Federal lands resulting from construction and operation of the railroad.

The Forest Service has considered "adequate compensation" to be synonymous with fair market value.

Sincerely yours,

M. M. NELSON,  
Deputy Chief.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, I customarily have objected to giving unanimous consent for the Senate passage of transfer measures involving Federal property which do not include compensation to the Government for its value. This objection has become known as the application of the Morse formula. In essence, it provides that when the transfer of surplus Federal property is to be made to a public body, that public body shall pay 50 percent of the fair market value, and when it is given to a private body, that private body shall pay 100 percent of the fair market value.

Based upon the formula, devised years ago—in fact, 1946—for disposal of surplus war property, I have asked that when Federal property is turned over, in any form, to private use the Government receive the full fair market value for it; and when it is turned over to a State or local government for public use, the Government receive half the fair market value.

I look to the reports of the Senate committees to determine whether a bill so provides. In the case of H.R. 17320, which grants an easement to a railroad across a national forest in Missouri, the bill calls for payment of "adequate compensation," but the committee report is silent on what constitutes adequate compensation.

However, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who always cooperates closely with the Senator from Oregon in this and other matters, has obtained from the Department a letter clarifying the matter. I want the Senator from Missouri to know that I appreciate the trouble to which he has gone to obtain this information from the Forest Service, and I thank him for making the letter available to me and inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so it will be clear that the taxpayers are receiving the full fair market value for this easement.

Therefore, Mr. President, because the bill complies with the Morse formula, I have no objection to it on third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 17320) was read the third time, and passed.

#### SERVICES AND RELATED SUPPLIES

The bill (H.R. 15789) to amend section 2306 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain contracts for services and related supplies to extend beyond 1 year was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CONFINEMENT AND TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS

The bill (H.R. 5783) to amend titles 10, 14, and 37, United States Code, to

provide for confinement and treatment of offenders under the Uniform Code of Military Justice was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### INCREASE IN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY

The bill (H.R. 13050) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize an increase in the numbers of officers of the Navy designated for engineering duty, aeronautical engineering duty, and special duty was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ALTERNATES FOR MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE ACADEMIES

The bill (H.R. 13593) to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the number of congressional alternates authorized to be nominated for each vacancy at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### FAILURE TO REMIT POSTAGE DUE COLLECTIONS

The bill (H.R. 17024) to repeal section 1727 of title 18, United States Code, so as to permit prosecution of postal employees for failure to remit postage due collections, under the postal embezzlement statute, section 1711 of title 18, United States Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

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

#### SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1248, H.R. 17734.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 17734) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, 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, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Rhode Island may suggest the absence of a quorum without losing his right to the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

**UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT**

**MR. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow, the time be equally divided between the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], who will shortly offer an amendment, and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the manager of the bill, and that the vote on the Proxmire amendment take place not later than 2 p.m.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

**UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT**

**Ordered,** That the Senate proceed to vote not later than 2 o'clock p.m. on Wednesday, June 26, 1968, on an amendment (No. 856) by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to H.R. 17734, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

**Provided further,** That during its further consideration, after the transaction of morning business on Wednesday, June 26, until the vote, debate on the amendment shall be equally divided and controlled between the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

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

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

**MR. PASTORE.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

**MR. PASTORE.** Mr. President, the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968, H.R. 17734, was received in the Senate on June 12 and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. It is an urgent deficiency appropriation bill. This bill includes, in addition to new obligatory authority, other types of language which result in additions to expenditures. You will recall that last fall there was enacted into law a continuing resolution which carried with it a provision reserving appropriations which had been made in the regular appropriation bills. It is Public Law 90-218. Under the provisions of this reservation of obligations procedure, a total of \$6,100,000,000 was reserved. This bill releases \$2,687,000,000 of the reservations. In addition, in several accounts where expenditure authority existed which would not be required in fiscal year 1968, language is included in the bill transferring these funds for use for essential requirements.

As a result, this bill contains new obligatory authority, release of reserves under Public Law 90-218, and transfers of funds. The grand total of all of these amounts in the bill is \$9,110,000,000. This is a reduction of \$607 million under the budget estimates, but it is an increase of \$50 million over the House bill. The largest amounts in this bill are for the Department of Defense and, including all three types of authority, the bill contains \$6,673,000,000 for the Department of Defense, including \$6,055,000,000 for the Southeast Asia Emergency Fund. The bill contains \$100 million for the military assistance program to Korea and \$5.5 million for grant aid to the Ryukyu Islands.

As I stated above, Mr. President, of the total new obligatory authority of \$6.4 billion recommended by the committee, \$3.7 billion is the new obligatory authority required by the Department of Defense to meet unfunded fiscal year 1968 requirements stemming from the war in Southeast Asia and the *Pueblo* incident.

The Department of Defense submitted to the Congress additional requirements for fiscal year 1968 of \$4.9 billion. These requirements were identified as follows:

Requirements identified prior to the Tet offensive and seizure of the <i>Pueblo</i> -----	\$1,695,600,000
Callup of Reserves and additional deployments to South Vietnam-----	399,600,000
Response to the <i>Pueblo</i> incident-----	232,300,000
Response to the Tet offensive of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese-----	1,907,500,000
General strengthening of defense posture-----	356,800,000
Allowances for unforeseen requirements-----	340,700,000
Total-----	4,932,500,000

After a careful review of these requests, it was the judgment of the committee that a net reduction of \$189.2 million could be made, and the committee so recommends; \$108.9 million of this reduction represents the action of the House, and an additional \$80.3 million reduction was recommended by the committee in those funds proposed for transfer to the various military construction appropriation accounts. It was the view of the committee that this reduction could be made without any serious impairment to military operations in Southeast Asia.

Supplemental estimates were received by the committee after the bill passed the House.

For the District of Columbia, it was found that an additional \$7 million in the form of a capital outlay loan was required to help finance approved projects, and the committee has approved this loan authorization. In addition, a supplemental budget estimate in District of Columbia funds was received in the amount of \$10.9 million and the committee has approved this item in full. Included in the increase is \$297,000 for the summer enrichment program; \$350,000 for the special summer school program; \$1,474,000 for the neighborhood youth program; and \$336,000 for the Headstart program. The committee allowance, together with

available Federal grants, will provide a full summer program for children and youth of the District with emphasis on those most disadvantaged. The details of these items are found beginning on page 15 of the committee report.

A total of \$3.1 million was added to the bill under General Services Administration for necessary changes in the Forrestal Building, which is under construction here in Washington. This sum is required by reason of changes required by the Department of Defense.

Several items were dealt with under the Department of the Interior, which are described fully in the committee report beginning on page 20. The principal item is \$6.9 million for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands as a result of typhoon damage—and as a related agency under this chapter, the committee recommends \$225,000 to launch the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, which is preparing plans for the celebration in 1976.

The House of Representatives voted into this bill \$90,965,000 for payments to school districts for operating expenses. The committee concurs in this recommendation and has included language in the bill extending the date during which the funds will be available until July 31, 1968.

An additional \$13 million, by transfer, has been included in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare chapter of this bill for rat control grants. The committee was informed that the Public Health Service has 46 applications on hand calling for \$26 million, and concludes that \$13 million of projects among this group could be processed in the near future. The funds are allotted on a project basis, with the grantee being required to pay a part of the cost.

During the full committee markup of this bill, \$75 million was included for the summer job program under the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor. The Senate will recall that a previous supplemental conference report was rejected, and this amount was voted by the Senate and sent back to conference where it still lingers. Committee action continued these funds available through August 31, 1968. The committee believes that the additional \$75 million for the summer job program will enable it to tactfully be brought up to the 1967 level and expanded where most needed.

The committee recommends \$25 million to carry out Headstart programs for economically disadvantaged preschool children, which provides school year and summer programs for children between the ages of 3 and 5 years. In fiscal year 1967, Headstart was funded at a level of \$352 million. The Office of Economics Opportunity appropriation passed in December 1967 provided \$327 million—a reduction of \$25 million and 10,600 opportunities. Headstart operates on a forward-funding basis, with funds being obligated for programs that will operate in the future. The additional language provides that funds can be obligated until August 31, 1968, thus enabling directors to establish programs, hire teachers, and enroll children in time to begin in Sep-

tember. The amount of \$25 million is identical with that added by the Senate to the urgent supplemental appropriation bill (H.R. 15399), which has been in conference since March 18, 1968, with this item in disagreement.

In addition, Senator HART, of Michigan, brought to our attention the recently enacted amendments to the National School Lunch Act, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children and proposed that we include \$32 million in the bill for this activity. This new law is Public Law 90-302 and was signed by the President on May 8, 1968. In view of the urgent need to initiate the pilot special food service program as soon as possible, the committee has recommended an appropriation of \$32 million to be included in this bill for use during fiscal 1969. The urgent need is justified on the basis that improved nutrition programs for children in low-income families and children in areas with high concentrations of working mothers in day-care centers for handicapped children show that as of March 1965 there were 4.5 million children under the age of 6 who had working mothers; mothers of almost 6.5 million more children between the ages of 6 and 11 held jobs; 725,000 children under 6 were in families with less than \$5,000 annual income; and almost 1 million more children in these lower income families were in the age group 6 through 11.

In order to participate in the Osaka Fair to the fullest extent, the committee has included an additional \$4 million under the U.S. Information Agency, for a total of \$13,307,000, of which at least half must be used to purchase blocked yen owned by the U.S. Treasury.

It was found during the detailed examination of this bill in the committee that certain reductions could be effected. Accordingly, \$80.3 million was cut from the bill under the head of Emergency Fund, Southeast Asia, as I have already explained, and this reduction relates to military construction which had not been fully planned or which had not been definitely decided upon, and for which the funds are not needed at this time. In addition, under increased pay costs, a total of \$35 million has been cut from the Department of Defense portion of the bill in title II. Likewise, under the post office item, it was found that a reduction in new obligational authority of \$22 million could be effected, which has been done by the committee. The accompanying report, which is quite lengthy, gives complete information on each item in the bill.

I will be glad to answer any questions any Senator may have. In the meantime, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, 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 this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 4, after line 3, insert:

**"SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM"**

"For an additional amount for 'School lunch program', fiscal year 1969, for the special food service programs for children, including State and Federal administrative expenses therefor, pursuant to the Act of May 8, 1968 (Public Law 90-302), \$32,000,000."

On page 9, line 22, after the word "Asia", strike out "\$3,791,100,000" and insert "\$3,710,800,000"; and on page 10, line 3, after the word "costs", insert a colon and "Provided, That funds made available under this head may also be used in connection with military activities in the Republic of Korea."

On page 10, after line 19, insert:

**"LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY"**

"For an additional amount for 'Loans to the District of Columbia for Capital Outlay', \$7,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be advanced upon request of the Commissioner to the general fund."

One page 11, line 5, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$535,558" and insert "\$2,992,558"; and in line 8, after the word "fund", insert a colon and "Provided, That \$2,457,000 of this appropriation shall remain available until September 30, 1968, for the purpose of conducting a summer program for children and youth".

On page 11, line 13, after the word "safety", strike out "\$1,611,076" and insert "\$8,237,076".

On page 11, line 18, after the word "Education", strike out "\$790,000" and insert "\$5,690,000".

On page 11, line 24, strike out "\$2,214,000" and insert "\$2,222,000".

At the top of page 12, insert:

**"Highways and Traffic"**

"For an additional amount for 'Highways and Traffic', \$28,000, of which \$18,000 shall be payable from the highway fund."

On page 12, after line 4, insert:

**"Sanitary Engineering"**

"For an additional amount for 'Sanitary engineering', \$75,000, of which \$6,000 shall be payable from the water fund, and \$4,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund."

On page 12, after line 14, strike out:

"For an additional amount for 'Capital outlay', to remain available until expended, \$847,000, of which \$77,000 shall be available for construction services by the Director of Buildings and Grounds or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Commissioner."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Capital outlay', to remain available until expended, \$898,000, of which \$50,000 shall be payable from the highway fund: Provided, That \$77,000 of this appropriation shall be available for construction services by the Director of Buildings and Grounds or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Commissioner."

On page 13, line 13, insert:

**"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL"**

**"RYUKYU ISLANDS, ARMY"**

**"ADMINISTRATION"**

"For an additional amount for 'Administration', \$5,500,000."

At the top of page 14, insert:

**"GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION"**

**"REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES"**

**"CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS"**

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, public buildings projects' for construction of Federal Office Building Numbered 5, District of Columbia, \$3,100,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That, in addition, savings effected in other projects under the appropriation for 'Construction, public buildings projects' shall be available for the foregoing project but in an amount

not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated herein."

On page 15, line 17, after the word "services", strike out "\$3,107,000" and insert "\$6,099,000".

On page 15, line 20, strike out "\$2,172,000" and insert "\$1,972,000".

At the top of page 16, insert:

**"OFFICE OF TERRITORIES"**

**"TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS"**

"For an additional amount for 'Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands', \$6,900,000."

On page 16, line 8, after the word "protection", strike out "\$4,046,000" and insert "\$4,182,000".

On page 16, after line 8, insert:

**"CONSTRUCTION"**

"For an additional amount for 'Construction', to remain available until expended, \$560,000, to be derived by transfer from balances remaining unobligated on June 30, 1968, in annual appropriations to the Department of the Interior."

On page 19, after line 6, insert:

**"HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS"**

**"AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION"**

**"SALARIES AND EXPENSES"**

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of July 4, 1966 (Public Law 89-491), as amended, establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, \$225,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 19, after line 14, insert:

**"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR"**

**"MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION"**

**"MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES"**

"For an additional amount to carry out the provisions of section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, \$75,000,000, to remain available until August 31, 1968."

On page 20, line 9, after the figures "\$90,965,000", insert a comma and "to remain available until July 31, 1968".

On page 21, after line 14, strike out:

"For an additional amount for 'Comprehensive health planning and services', \$60,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved, under the appropriation granted under this head, pursuant to Public Law 90-218."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Comprehensive health planning and services', \$10,187,000, to be derived by transfer from the amounts reserved, pursuant to Public Law 90-218, under the appropriation for 'Elementary and secondary educational activities', which together with not to exceed \$2,873,000 of the amount reserved under the appropriation granted under this head, pursuant to said public law, shall be available for the purpose of such association."

On page 22, line 6, after the word "Administration", strike out "\$84,928,000" and insert "\$33,828,000".

At the top of page 24, insert:

**"EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT"**

**"OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY"**

**"ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM"**

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary to carry out Headstart programs provided for by law pursuant to section 222(a)(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, \$25,000,000, to remain available until August 31, 1968."

On page 24, after line 10, insert:

**"SENATE"**

"For payment to Ethel Kennedy, widow of Robert F. Kennedy, late a Senator from the State of New York, \$30,000."

On page 24, after line 14, insert:

**"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE  
"INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS**

"For an additional amount for 'Inquiries and Investigations,' fiscal year 1968, \$365,000."

On page 27, line 15, after the word "expended", strike out "\$9,307,000" and insert "\$13,307,000".

On page 29, at the beginning of line 18, strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$350,000".

On page 31, after line 11, insert:

**"SENATE**

"Compensation of the Vice President and Senators, \$1,305.

"Salaries, officers and employees, \$315,689.

"Office of the Legislative Counsel, \$10,955."

On page 31, after line 16, insert:

**"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE**

"Senate policy committees, \$13,240.

"Automobiles and maintenance, \$1,200.

"Inquiries and investigations, \$174,990, including \$6,020 for the Committee on Appropriations.

"Folding documents, \$1,105.

"Miscellaneous items, \$38,090, including \$6,000 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87-82, approved July 1, 1961."

At the top of page 34, insert:

"Senate garage, \$2,000."

On page 40, line 14, after the word "Army", strike out "\$90,000,000" and insert "\$65,000,000".

On page 40, line 17, after the word "Navy", strike out "\$110,000,000" and insert "\$105,000,000".

On page 41, line 1, after the word "Air Force", strike out "\$70,000,000" and insert "\$65,000,000".

On page 55, line 18, after the word "operation", strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000".

On page 55, line 20, after the word "Operations", strike out "\$110,000,000" and insert "\$89,000,000"; and in line 21, after the word "addition", strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$34,000,000".

On page 58, line 11, after the word "Operations", strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$12,000,000".

On page 62, after line 7, strike out:

**"NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES**

"Salaries and expenses", \$5,000."

**AMENDMENT NO. 856**

**Mr. PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, I call up my amendment (No. 856), and ask that it be stated.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 9, line 22, strike out "\$3,710,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,442,800,000".

**Mr. PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, the Senate now has before it a supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1968 containing \$6,225,127,000 for the Department of Defense. The total of both new obligatory authority and releases from the reserve of the emergency fund for Southeast Asia is \$6,055,800,000. This is broken down into \$3,710,800,000 in new authority and \$2,345,000,000 released from the emergency fund.

Mr. President, my amendment proposes a cut from this \$6 billion appropriation of only \$268 million. These savings would be achieved through cutting back funds for increased—I stress "increased"—escalation of B-52 bombing in Vietnam.

I propose a saving of \$268 million to

be taken from the new obligatory authority of \$3.7 billion contained in this bill.

I do not propose to change the amount stated for release from the reserves of the emergency fund.

I refer to page 209 of the hearings, and I quote Secretary Nitze:

About \$268 million more will be needed in fiscal year 1968 to support the larger B-52 bombing program now projected. By far the largest item involved is the procurement of nearly (deleted) MK-82 500-pound bombs and (deleted) M-117 750-pound bombs. In addition, the higher sortie rates now in effect and planned for the future involve higher operating costs; that is, depot maintenance of aircraft, aircraft spares, POL, and so forth. Finally, (deleted) more B-52's will be modified to give them a conventional bombing capability.

I propose in this amendment to cut back the entire amount of \$268 million.

Mr. President, I submit to the Senate that Secretary Nitze could not have made clearer the element of escalation contained in this paragraph. The Secretary used the words "higher," "larger," "more."

Mr. President, in the hearing I questioned Secretary Nitze about these statements that explicitly outlined a major escalation of our bombing.

The Secretary stated that our escalation was a response to the heightened activity around Khesanh, the Tet offensive, and the increased ground activity in infiltration routes and around Saigon. However, I must point out that these episodic increases in hostile activity are being used to justify an escalation that is prolonged beyond the immediate retaliatory needs of the tactical situations I have just mentioned.

Mr. President, the Secretary says, and justly so, that the increases requested to finance additional B-52 sorties are needed because Khesanh is again threatened and activity in the environs of Saigon demand air bombardment. But why tack this clearly fiscal 1969 need to a 1968 supplemental? By the time the President signs this bill into law, there cannot remain more than 4 days of fiscal 1968. And I defy the Department of Defense to expend the \$268 million for additional B-52 bombing alone in 4 days. As a matter of fact, we could act on this tomorrow, as I understand it, and that would mean that 3 days would be left.

Mr. President, this supplemental for Defense purposes is clearly a fiscal 1969 supplemental. It is being requested in addition to the billions and billions already contained in the 1969 budget authorizations for DOD.

I know it will be said that this amendment would interfere with the authority of the President to determine the tactical course of the war.

My answer is that it certainly would, and that is precisely the intention of the amendment.

It would do so in one very limited respect and in one respect only. It would stop the B-52 bombing escalation, and only that escalation. It would not prevent us from stepping up other phases of the war. In fact, this supplemental—as I shall point out—would do precisely this.

What Congress has done to date is to write a blank check to the President on bombing in Vietnam. The administration has chosen to curtail the bombing of part of North Vietnam, but it has immensely increased the bombing in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, we have dropped more bomb tonnage on Vietnam than we did in all of World War II. An actual breakdown of bomb tonnage dropped during World War II and in Vietnam through April of this year is very enlightening; as a matter of fact it is stupefying.

During World War II, we dropped in the Pacific theater 502,781 tons, and I emphasize the word "tons" of bombs. That comes to 1,005,562,000 pounds. In the North African and European theater, we dropped 1,554,463 tons or 2,108,926,000 pounds. The total of all bombs dropped during all of World War II, in both theaters, comes to 2,057,244 tons or 4,114,480 pounds. Using the rule of thumb of about \$1 per pound, we expended in World War II a total of \$4,114,480,000 just for the air-dropped munitions.

Now a look at the figures for Vietnam shows that, during the 3½ years that the Department of Defense has figures on, we have dropped a total of 2,220,000 tons, more not only than all the tonnage of bombs dropped over Europe and North Africa during World War II but more than dropped during all of World War II around the entire globe. Our present bombing totals in Vietnam thus exceed the entire total for World War II, not just Europe and North Africa.

Also, Mr. President, a look at the Vietnam bombing figures for each succeeding year demonstrates clearly the point that I am making here today—that the Congress is giving the bombing escalation policy another resounding endorsement.

In 1965 we dropped a total of 315,000 tons in Vietnam.

In 1966 we dropped a total of 512,000 tons in Vietnam.

In 1967 we dropped a total of 932,000 tons in Vietnam.

In 1968, through April, in the first 4 months of this year, we dropped a total of 441,368 tons in Vietnam.

If we sustain this rate through 1968, we will drop the stupendous tonnage of 1.3 million tons largely in South Vietnam this year or close to the amount we dropped in all the years of World War II in all of Europe and Africa.

I emphasize, Mr. President, these figures come directly from the Office of the Secretary of Defense and represent the very latest figures available.

We have dropped 130 pounds of bombs for every man, woman, and child living in North and South Vietnam.

In other words, if one were to put all the people in Vietnam on one side of the scale and then put all of the bombs on the other side of the scale, the bombs would weigh more than all the people living in South Vietnam and North Vietnam together.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr.

SPONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator has made a lot of comparisons about bombs dropped in previous wars. When we were dropping those bombs in World War II we were dropping them on cities and factories and they were hitting where they hurt.

Up to this point, in Vietnam we have been dropping them on jungles, or on top of an old and beat up flivver, or something of that sort. If those bombs had been dropped on the cities of North Vietnam, those people would know they had been bombed. However, unfortunately, this President and this administration have gone to great extremes to assure that those bombs are dropped on insignificant targets; and aircraft worth hundreds of millions of dollars are used to bomb some little peanut bridge that does not mean anything and that can be rebuilt the next day.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the Senator that what I am talking about is prospective bombing, which this amendment would limit, and prospectively, at least in the near future, the number of bombs dropped on North Vietnam would be relatively modest because we are not now bombing above the 20th parallel. My point is that we are bombing bigger than ever in South Vietnam.

While it is true that many of those bombs are wasted and dropped in the jungle, many destroy rice paddies, homes, and people. There is no question that many innocent South Vietnamese people have been killed. Certainly, the military regrets it as much as I regret it.

The point I am making and the point I shall make is that there should be a limit to this bombing. We ought to set the limit and recognize that if we do not set a limit there will be nothing left in South Vietnam. I am not talking about North Vietnam, the enemy country.

I have been a supporter of the administration on the war and I am not suggesting a deletion of any of the rest of the escalation for Vietnam provided in the supplemental. However, here we are following a policy that makes it increasingly difficult for us to hold the support of the people of South Vietnam, whose support is quite essential if we are to win a stable peace.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator that I am not sure whether we are in disagreement. However, I do wish to express my view. It is an absolute disgrace to send American fighting men to fight a war, to fight and die, with limitations imposed upon them which prevent them from winning, and cause them to lose the war without having a chance to win it or to fight in a manner to see if they can win it.

Unfortunately, up to now, the way the matter has been pursued, our men fight with shackles on. It is perfectly all right for the enemy to send men down and blast away at Saigon with anything they can blast away with and hit anything they can hit, with an aim to hurt civilians as well as the troops, and yet our people have imposed upon them such

a limitation that even if we warned all of the people to get out of Hanoi we could not blast them.

As long as we have those conditions and must fight with one leg and one hand tied behind us, I do not see how this Nation can prevail. If we do not lose under those conditions it will be by accident.

I have very little confidence that the enemy is going to agree to any honorable settlement shortly. In my opinion, sometime between now and the time this matter is over with, somebody should turn our military loose and let them fight the war and see if they can win it. Up until now they have not had that chance.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think I do disagree with the Senator. I favored limitations on bombing 2 years ago and I said so. I thought the bombing moratorium should have been continued longer. I favored the restraint of trying to avoid killing civilians in North Vietnam. We should not try to blast Vietnam completely off the face of the earth and this escalation is putting us in the position of doing that.

As far as the position of the Senator from Louisiana on the bombing of North Vietnam is concerned, much of that is irrelevant for the time being. This provision in the supplemental bill would not go to the bombing of North Vietnam, first, because we have not used our B-52's in the Hanoi area for various technical reasons and, second, we have de-escalated until only 10 percent of the people live in the North Vietnam areas where we are bombing.

I am talking about bombing South Vietnam. If we are going to create the conditions which Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY discussed in the New York Times on Sunday, in which he said the whole purpose of our military action is to create political conditions in which we can negotiate a constructive peace, I submit we are not creating that condition by unlimited bombing, increasing it steadily, month after month and year after year, in South Vietnam in the area where people live, where their homes and lives are being destroyed, and these are the people whose attitude toward their government in postwar Vietnam will determine whether or not the Vietnam war will turn out to have achieved any purpose or not.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would hope that those homes they are bombing are homes in which the Vietcong happen to be.

Now that is what it is. I would favor that and ask, why not? Would it not be better to bomb that house where the Vietcong is, rather than sending in one of our men with a bayonet to root the man out?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will go into that in a few moments, but Art Buchwald, in a column written last February, made a pretty good analogy that drives home to Americans what it means to a Vietnamese to come along and say to that Vietnamese, "Charlie is against you. The Vietcong are Communists. We must destroy your home, your farm to get him."

I think that we fail to understand how blasting that Vietnam house, dive bombing it, hitting it with artillery, and taking it off the face of the earth, af-

fect the Vietnamese whose property is being destroyed to save him. It is hard for us to understand because it is not our house. We do not live in it.

If the chief of police in the town where the Senator from Louisiana lives was shooting out all the windows of the Senator's house and brought up artillery to drive a criminal out of his house, he might have mixed feelings about it. The chief of police is after that criminal, but the Senator might not like the notion that his housing is being destroyed. That is what we are doing in Vietnam.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say that Art Buchwald, in my judgment, has the best credentials as a humorist, but I am not familiar with his qualifications as a military expert.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course not. That is not my point, whether he is or is not a military expert. He is not. He would be the first to say that he is not. But he does drive home the point which I believe makes sense. It is hard for us in this country, in our safe comfort, in Louisiana, Wisconsin, or Washington, to understand what is in the minds of people who are having everything they own completely destroyed.

Art Buchwald, it seems to me, has brought that home pretty well. You do not have to be an expert to know that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator wishes to use the same analogy: If the Communists were holed up in my home and they were trying to take this country over, even if they were holding me as a hostage inside that same house, I personally think that the forces operating against communism should blast the thing down even if it took my own life to do so. If I were a free person, I would come out with a white flag and say, "I am not a Communist." But if the Communists are holed up inside and I was not free to come outside and say that there were a number of Communists inside, I think the forces arrayed against communism should blast that house down. Why not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure that the Senator from Louisiana would feel that way, and perhaps I would, too. But, I am not sure. It is so hard for us to put ourselves in the same position as the South Vietnamese. The South Vietnamese peasant may feel strongly opposed to the Vietcong. But, he may not. He certainly feels strongly about what is happening to his own home. Perhaps a South Vietnamese has in his home where the Vietcong is suspected to be his wife and his children. Perhaps they will all be killed. That has happened over and over again, as the Senator knows.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not know how the South Vietnamese feel about communism. I do know how I feel about it. I have visited the Soviet Union and many other places and my reaction is that this is a struggle between the Communist and the anti-Communist forces. The Communist crowd is not going to give up unless they have been soundly defeated. So far as my side is concerned, I would not be in favor of giving up until we have whipped their shirttails from them. So I would not be in favor of surrender. I would be willing to fight, and

fight every bit as brutally as they are fighting, up until we have defeated them.

I do not understand why the Senator would not be willing to fight in the very same way.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I, too, approve enthusiastically the intent of the bill, that we must provide for a beefing up of the South Vietnamese Army so that they can fight more widely and more effectively. That makes sense. At the same time, I do feel very strongly that for us to increase above the level that is already high now the blasting of their country and the destruction of their homes, it is very, very hard for me to understand.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But that is where the Vietcong are. I am sure the Senator is familiar with the fact that the Vietcong are in there and so are a lot of North Vietnamese regiments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana draws no line at all? Would he, in effect, if necessary, kill every single South Vietnamese? Would he destroy every home in South Vietnam, and destroy everything else that is standing if necessary until we have killed the last Vietcong? Is there no limit?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would not destroy any significant—

Mr. PROXMIRE. Not willfully, of course, but if that is the only way to do it, would he do it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would not destroy where the Vietcong are not. But I would blast the ground everywhere where the Vietcong are, if I had my way.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We have dropped 15 tons of bombs for every square mile of territory in both Vietnams. We have dropped over four times the tonnage dropped in the Pacific theater during World War II.

Slightly more than half of the Vietnam war total landed in North Vietnam and the rest landed in South Vietnam from April, beginning with great intensification on the South Vietnamese capital, and within a few weeks will be increasingly more in South Vietnam. The bombing provided in this supplemental is going to be largely in South Vietnam. However, as I mention later in more detail, since we have restricted ourselves to bombing below the 20th parallel and yet are planning a sustained bombing escalation, it is apparent that South Vietnam and the South Vietnamese will bear the giant share of this bombing.

Mr. President, the field commanders of our forces in Vietnam directing this unprecedented rain of death and destruction are not insane. They are more than brilliant commanders. They are the best trained and the most skilled military commanders this Nation has ever had. But they are more than that. I would willingly concede that they know the excruciatingly cruel tragedy this cataclysmic bombing has on the plain people of South Vietnam. And yet they ask for more.

They ask for more bombing because there undoubtedly is a clear military advantage that does come from—as the Senator from Louisiana recognizes—blasting to kingdom come fields and villages and houses that are likely to include Vietcong sympathizers. They have a

clear-cut military mission. And they want to achieve it in the swiftest and most effective way.

But theirs is a military mission. I repeat a military mission. And Vietnam is only in part—in limited part—a military problem. What is the purpose of our military action?

Certainly it is not to destroy South Vietnam. Certainly it is not to obliterate houses and farms and the South Vietnamese who live in them. Certainly the purpose of this military action we are engaged in at such cost and such agony is not to alienate the South Vietnamese people for whom we are fighting.

And yet—if we are honest with ourselves—an all-out, no-ceiling, sky's-the-limit B-52 bombing escalation can do exactly this.

Can anyone consider these fantastic bombing figures and not see what we are doing to a land we would save?

Does it not mean something to U.S. Senators that we are appropriating money in this supplemental to step up, to increase the crushing devastation we are visiting on South Vietnam far, far above what we dropped on the European, the African, and the Pacific theaters in all of World War II?

No one else is going to put a ceiling on this bombing in South Vietnam. We cannot escape the responsibility.

We are voting the money, and if Senators vote against this amendment, they are voting for a step-up in conventional bombing that will have the same impact on this country we are trying so hard to save as dropping dozens of nuclear bombs.

This is not—or it should not be—a hawk-dove issue. This is not a matter of wanting to pull out or give in. This is not a throw-in-the-sponge amendment. This is a matter of using our God-given sense to limit a policy—which is sure to destroy everything for which we fight if we do not limit it.

And this is just what unlimited, all-out B-52 bombing can do. Ironically, it can defeat us. I repeat, it can defeat us, because it is alienating the people whose support in this kind of war we just have to have.

First, consider the attitude of the people whose support is essential if an honorable peace is to be achieved, the South Vietnamese themselves.

What does it do when they see literally hundreds of thousands—yes, hundreds of thousands—of these 500- and 750-pound bombs rip into their homes, their villages, their rice paddies—which are essential to their livelihood. Day after day, week after week, for endless months and years, their beautiful country is smashed over and over and over again by one wave of devastation after another.

Sure our intention is right, sure we are fighting the Vietcong, the North Vietnamese, the enemy of a free and independent South Vietnam. Many South Vietnamese respect and thank us for this. Some do not. But certainly, Mr. President, a vastly growing number of South Vietnamese must suffer the gravest doubts when they see the incredible destruction our bombing is necessarily visiting upon their country.

More and more must be crying out that

if we must destroy their country to save it, if we must blast their homes to smithereens, if we must ruin their rice paddies, and inevitably kill hundreds—perhaps thousands—of innocent and loyal South Vietnamese in the process—then they must wonder—and wonder increasingly—is it all worth it? Is it worth it?

Mr. President, this Senator has been an administration supporter on the war. I have never favored a pullout, or a give-in, I have never favored the Gavin enclave theory. I have been persuaded that as long as we are in Vietnam we cannot sit hunkered over like a jackass in a hailstorm. We cannot, and should not, give up the initiative.

The name of the game in Vietnam as in any war is power. We have it. We have to use it.

If we are to negotiate an effective settlement of this war, we must do it from demonstrated military strength.

But, Mr. President, that power is not now and never has been unrestrained. We have wisely refused to use our nuclear Sunday punch. We have wisely suspended our bombing from time to time to try to create conditions which might lead to peaceful negotiations. We are wisely right now limiting the area of North Vietnam which we have chosen to bomb.

Now, Mr. President, I am proposing that for once the Senate take the initiative and put a limit—a high limit, admittedly, but a limit—on our use of B-52 bombing.

As I say, the most important person to us in this Vietnam war is the South Vietnamese peasant. We are losing him. And a major reason why we are losing him is that we are devastating his country. He can see it, he is human, and he must resent it.

This amendment would tell the military that there is a ceiling to the devastation of our bombing of South Vietnam. It would let the people of South Vietnam know that the Congress of the United States is very much concerned with what our fantastically heavy bombing is doing to their nation.

It would tell the military that the blank-check days are over. It would say that we will not utterly destroy this nation to save it. Indeed, if we are to save it, this morale-destroying bombing at this crushingly high level must level off.

Mr. President, for any Member of the Senate who finds it difficult to visualize what it means to the South Vietnamese to have their homes destroyed in order to save them, the syndicated columnist Art Buchwald a few months ago spelled it out.

I am going to read that column here with. Here is the Buchwald column of February 20 of this year.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he reads the column?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I happened to come in at the tail end of the dialog between the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Wisconsin. I think the record ought to be set straight. The request for this money is not predicated upon the overall policy in Vietnam. As has been explained to our committee, this came about because of the situation in Khe-

sanh and the Tet offensive, which made it necessary to increase the B-52 sorties from 1,200 a month to 1,800 a month. If the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin prevails, the Senate will be saying to our commanders, go back to 1,200 sorties a month, thereby endangering our ground troops, because these sorties are in support of our ground troops in Vietnam.

The point I am making is that this is not an escalation on our part. The Senator is asking us to decrease our military capability, which will endanger the lives of American troops who are already committed in that area. This has been brought about by the situation in Khesanh and the Tet offensive. I think the record ought to be set straight on that point.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that I did point that out in the course of my remarks earlier. I emphasized that the Secretary does say what we did was in response to what happened at Khesanh.

I would like to read what Secretary Nitze said:

In addition, the higher sortie rates now in effect and planned for the future involve higher operating costs . . . more B-52's will be modified to give them a conventional bombing capacity.

The Senator from Rhode Island referred to the 1,800 sorties a month, which is a high rate, higher than had been proposed. We dropped far, far more bombs in 1967 than we did in 1966, and far more in 1966 than we did in 1965. That would have been somewhat increased if we followed the January program.

Secretary Nitze came forward and said we had that trouble in Khesanh. That is behind us, to a considerable extent. He wanted us in a position to continue indefinitely at a higher rate than we had planned in January, a much higher rate. I say that is an escalation over what was planned. I call that escalation. It is that escalation that I oppose.

It seems to me very clear that it is possible—and easy, as a matter of fact—for the military to use those 1,800 sorties a month to which the Senator from Rhode Island has referred whenever they have the kind of situation that confronted them in Khesanh.

The Senator from Louisiana pointed out that we are dropping bombs in all kinds of places where there do not seem to be many people, over bridges, and jungle trails and so forth. If my amendment passes it may be necessary for our military commanders to use more discrimination than they have in the past in that connection. It may be that they will have to use something other than B-52's to knock out a small bridge, for example. My argument is that we can respond to a situation like Khesanh with a sharp increase in B-52 sorties after my amendment passes. After all, that was the programmed sorties rate when Khesanh caused a step-up? It was 1,200. They were able to step it up to 1,800 than they could if necessary do it sooner.

To go ahead with the Buchwald column, I read as follows from that column:

My friend Kober doesn't seem to identify too much with what is going on in the

cities of South Vietnam these days; so my friend Schultz had to explain it to him. "Suppose," said Schultz, "you came home one night and found the police surrounding your house, and suppose you said to the chief:

"Hey, what are you shooting in my house for?"

"Don't worry, sir, Charlie's in there, but we'll get him out."

"That's fine but do you have to shoot at every window to do it?"

"It's the only way. If we don't rout out Charlie, there will never be any peace in this neighborhood."

"That's just great, but in the meantime, would you stop using that flame thrower on my house?"

"Charlie's dug in and we have to use everything we've got. It's for your benefit, sir. The sooner we get him out of there, the better it will be for everybody."

"I'm sympathetic with your problem, and I'd like to get Charlie out, too, but where am I going to live if you keep firing mortars into the roof?"

"Good heavens, man, don't be unreasonable. There's more at stake than your house. If we don't get Charlie out of there, we'll lose the respect of everybody in this city."

"Why did you just blow off my chimney?"

"We thought he might be up there. Look, you can always get a new chimney."

"Sure, but what am I going to do for a new garage, since you just blasted mine away?"

"You can't fight crime and lawlessness without doing *some* damage. Now be a good guy, and just stand back so we can move this artillery piece up here."

"Now wait a minute, you're going too far. I forbid you to use artillery against my house."

"You are in no position to forbid us to use anything. Charlie has to pay for his crimes."

"That's all right with me, but who's going to pay for my house?"

"I'm sure somebody will take care of it. Besides, that's not our department."

"I don't want to be a bore about this, and I know I can't see the big picture, but that happens to be my dwelling and I worked 25 years to pay for it. By the way, you know you just wrecked my kitchen, don't you?"

"Sorry about that. I guess he must be in the bedroom."

"What are you doing with that tank?"

"We can hit the second floor better with a tank."

"I'll bet you can. Let me ask you a question: Suppose he's not in the bedroom?"

"Then we'll have to knock out your living-room."

"It figures. I guess one last appeal to spare my house would fall on deaf ears, wouldn't it?"

"What did you say? I can't hear you because of the dive bombers."

"Are you going to dive bomb my house?"

"It seems to be the only way. Listen, this hurts us more than it hurts you."

"There they go. Holy smoke, the whole house is falling down! The whole house. My house is gone."

"There don't seem to be any bodies in the rubble. I wonder if Charlie's in the next house?"

Art Buchwald has a marvelous way of getting laughs, even from those who strongly disagree with the viewpoint he expresses. But in all seriousness, Mr. President, is not this precisely what our all-out, blank check, no ceiling, continually escalating B-52 bombings are accomplishing?

If we are to win a stable peace, we must above all have the support of the South Vietnamese for a stable, free government. Do we win that stability by blasting everything they own and indeed many of the South Vietnamese themselves into eternity with unlimited bombing?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I agree with much the Senator has said. He knows how I feel about this whole situation. I do not think we are debating the overall military policy with respect to Vietnam. I understand what he says, but I think we are getting off the track. I can appreciate the satire of Mr. Buchwald. It is very good. It makes some people laugh. Even in the satire, there may be a point. But with our troops trapped in Khesanh, what are we supposed to do? While they are shooting mortars at our marines, are we supposed to shoot at them with gumdrops or lollipops? Our men were trapped. That was the only way to get them out. If my son were there, I would not want to stand up on the floor of the Senate and vote to take away the bombers that are the umbrella our troops have to support them. That is the way it happened. That is how we got our boys out of Khesanh. Then we had the Tet offensive.

The point here is that these sorties were increased from the plan in January, only because of the situation as it developed. If the argument here is that we ought to get out of Vietnam and have it all over with, that is another point. But as long as we have our ground troops there who need this protection and this umbrella from our B-52 bombers, I think it does this country great harm if all of us on this floor begin to act like members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island in that I do not think we can withdraw unilaterally from Vietnam. It would be a serious mistake, as I see that struggle. I have said that over and over again. I do not oppose the various other escalations in this supplemental bill that I think are necessary.

I am opposed to the tremendous increases in B-52 bombing proposed for South Vietnam. Once again, it makes sense to me that with the tragic amount of bombing authorized at the beginning of this year, if the military will use just a little judgment, it will be possible for them to have available what they need for an operation like Khesanh: a strictly military operation by military forces.

But we know that B-52's are being used, as the Senator from Louisiana has so well stated, to take out bridges, to hit jungle trails, and in all kinds of ways, because there is no restriction and no limitation on their use; and the cost, of course, is tremendous.

I might point out incidentally, Mr. President, that in the course of the committee hearings, on page 239, in response to the same kind of argument that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has just given here, Secretary Nitze said:

With respect to the bombing, the large item here is the increase in B-52 sorties. That arose principally because of the North Vietnamese threat to Khesanh. I would hardly say that the successful defense of Khesanh could be called an escalation.

This Senator replied to Secretary Nitze:

That is absolutely right. But to follow through, you said that you expected to be able to maintain a substantially higher rate [deleted] as compared to [deleted] sorties

you had programmed, with a readiness to go to [deleted].

This indicates an escalation over what you planned.

Secretary NRRZE. It is true that this program is an increase over what we had planned in January, and a substantial increase, because one of the items that makes it higher is the B-52 sorties.

My point is that it is a sustained escalation over what they had planned in January. They were able to meet the Khesanh problem with what had been programmed, authorized, and appropriated before. Now they are asking for a much bigger appropriation—and I mean much bigger—to provide what seems to me to be a situation in which we are likely to have very serious destruction in South Vietnam, that could badly hurt us.

Mr. President, apropos of the Buchwald column, there comes a time when the city council must recognize that there are other ways of getting "Charlie" out of the house than turning the house to rubble, even if the chief of police cannot understand that.

Our chief does not see it this way; so it is up to this city council, the Senate, to act.

Again, we are not stopping B-52 bombing in South Vietnam. Far from it. This amendment would simply draw the line at a very high level, a very high level indeed, of sorties and tonnage, a level far, far above the tonnage delivered on all of Europe at the peak of World War II.

This is an amendment to attempt to see that there is something left in South Vietnam after this war is over.

Some Senators may argue, Mr. President, that this is an exaggeration of the true situation in Vietnam—that we are not destroying the country by our bombing.

Well, Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention to a letter written last August by a North Vietnamese Catholic priest to a fellow priest in France that spells out what the bombing has done to the churches in just one part of North Vietnam.

This letter is not a report from South Vietnam. It is from North Vietnam, written before the President at the end of March of this year limited North Vietnamese bombing. Since that time the bombing has been concentrated on South Vietnam. And the kind of destruction that our bombing visited on North Vietnam—and then some—is being concentrated now in South Vietnam.

We should note especially what this means for South Vietnam, because it had already borne about half of the bombing. After all, in South Vietnam is where most of the military action has been. Now with the limitation on bombing the north, and especially with the bombing escalation for which this supplemental provides, the ruin and destruction in South Vietnam will far, far out-pace that of the north.

This letter spells out what our bombing has done in the north.

The letter appeared in a very small publication distributed to a select group of Catholics who migrated from the north in 1954. The letter in Tinh Me—

Motherland News—appeared in the November 28, 1967, issue. Sent through France to Saigon, it was distributed by Archbishop Binh to several Vietnamese priests, who later published it in the Tinh Me. The archbishop, according to the same source, sent the letter to Pope Paul VI.

It reads as follows:

DOAI HAMLET,  
NGHI DIEN VILLAGE,  
NGHI LOC DISTRICT,  
Nghe An Province, North Vietnam.

August 29, 1967.

DEAR FATHER: I am very sorry to inform you about the death of Father Lien several months ago. It has been some time already so I am no longer certain of the day. During these last years he carried painfully his crucifix. He had to move from Dan Sa to Minh Cam to live alone, far from the other Fathers. That area has been bombed and shelled continuously, especially during the month of May. The church and the meeting house were completely demolished and all the furniture was lost except for his own watch. At that time he escaped uninjured. But shortly thereafter he fell suddenly very ill. He was carried into the hospital where he died. I do not know if he met the other Fathers before his death; it was very painful.

That is not all. I have just received a telegram from Father Tam who informed me that Ouy's wife and one of his children died in a bombing raid. His three other sons were seriously wounded. It is so awful! Please send on this news and my respectful condolences.

But dear Father, at home in our province, these incidents are very, very numerous. I could never count them. In the whole diocese there is no place that has not been bombed and shelled. Including the non-Catholic population it is impossible to guess how widespread is the death and agony. Every day, even every hour, bombs are poured down on our country with full atrocity and a careless manner. Of course, there are military centers here, but the majority of the bombs fall on civilian centers, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. I am not sure about the non-Catholic areas, but let me speak about the places in our diocese. Since the day the Americans have escalated the war up into the North in our diocese there have been three priests killed under American bombs. The dead are Father Loc at Ky Anh, Father Ngoc at Nghia Yen and Father Diem at the Hoa Thang diocese. Father Diem died just on the evening of prayer week at the diocese house of Vinh Phuoc. The number of Catholics who have died as a result of the bombings are so numerous that I could not even begin to remember them all.

As for the Church and the diocese's house of the Quang Binh Province, they are in a very dreadful state. . . . Father Lieu at the Minh Cham parish just recently died. As for the Churches, the diocese houses, and the meeting houses, all are destroyed by the American bombs. I am sure those places are now un-useful ruins. I do not know exactly where those priests are or where they have organized their Masses. From Ha Tinh up to the North I am sure that the following churches are destroyed by American bombs: Ky Anh, Vinh Phuoc, Du Thanh, Trang Luu, Tan Ho, Gia Pho, Ke Mui. And at Nghe An, Cau Ram, Xuan Phong, Truong Tap, (churches) are totally demolished. In the center of my diocese all the houses have received bombs already. The Low Seminary, the High Seminary, the Diocese House, and the Central church have been bombed, but they have been repaired and are still useful.

We live in sorrow and fear. It is really true that we do not know if we will be alive from the morning into the evening and the

evening into the following day! Every hour we can hear the planes and the bombs both close by and in the distance. Really, we live without a future.

Nevertheless, we still believe in God and His Mother. We pray to God, offering our sacrifices, penances and prayers. The majority of the Catholics are still faithful to the Church and are still the Divine Mother's children. But due to the length of time and because of the sorrows many cannot prevent themselves from discouragement and corrosion of faith. Please, Dear Divine Mother, give consolation to your people and deliver us from the war.

If I am so clear about the details, it is because I would like to give you a small part of the actual situation of our country. Please pray with the other Fathers more for our lovely countryland.

The two old priests and the other Fathers who are still here are all right. Our High Seminary was just opened on the 29th July. This year there are only seven priests studying there.

Finally, I wish you the Grace of God and His Divine Mother. You are living in a calm seminary and in a peaceful country in the center of the Church's history. Please remember our diocese and our poor country, and please do your best to pray to our Divine Mother to give peace and unification to our country.

Goodbye, dear Father. Please pray for me so that I can live correctly in the heart of our Divine Mother and full of love.

Sincerely yours,

NGUYEN BA DUONG  
(Father Duong).

So ends the letter from a North Vietnamese Catholic priest to a fellow priest in France. And my point, Mr. President, is that this kind of devastating bombing—intensified many times in the south—unless we pass this amendment, will be massively stepped up and will surely wreak an equivalent destruction on South Vietnam or far worse.

In spite of this, Mr. President, some Members of the Senate may feel that the sky should be the limit as far as bombing in South Vietnam is concerned. I disagree.

This all-out, blank-check bombing is bad tactics. It does not help win the war. It will help lose the war. You simply do not win a war by destroying the nation for which you are fighting. This amendment would begin to arrest those erroneous tactics.

Mr. President, this all-out blank-check bombing is fatal strategy because it destroys the support that the South Vietnamese people may—we fervently hope—demonstrate after the war is over for the non-Communist movement we support. How can they support the nation that has blasted their own country into chaos?

Last Sunday the New York Times reported an in-depth interview with Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY. In the course of this interview the Vice President spelled out in detail his position on Vietnam. He described the purpose of our military power in Vietnam as only: "to help bring about conditions which would help make possible a political solution."

Now, this is precisely what all-out, no-ceiling, sky-is-the-limit B-52 bombing does not do. This wholesale destruction of South Vietnam homes and churches, of rice paddies and villages, is making America and all we struggle for anath-

ema in the minds and hearts of the South Vietnamese.

It is true that we have had the good sense and restraint not to use nuclear weapons, but, Mr. President, just this past Sunday the radio carried reports that on that 1 day we had dumped tens of thousands of tons—yes, tons—of conventional bombs largely on South Vietnam from B-52's, and of course this is the mathematical equivalent of nuclear weapons. It is the military equivalent of nuclear weapons, and to the South Vietnamese who see their homeland ripped to hell-and-gone it is the moral equivalent of nuclear war. Let us pass this amendment and draw the line.

Mr. President, this all-out blank-check bombing is wasteful. The cost is astronomical. This amendment would simply excise the increase, the escalation in the B-52 bombing over the high level programmed in January of this year. It would not eliminate a very high level of B-52 bombing. Yet it would save \$268,000,000. Consider what a \$268 million saving represents.

For this year the entire cost of Headstart for the whole Nation—682,000 youngsters—is only \$295 million, or only a little more than the cost of escalating the B-52 bombing in Vietnam.

The whole VISTA program would cost only \$29.5 million or only one-eighth of the cost of escalating the bombing in Vietnam.

Our entire academic facility grants, both undergraduate and graduate, involves a cost of \$227 million, which is substantially less than the cost of escalating our bombing in North Vietnam.

For air pollution in this country—and we all increasingly recognize what a problem that is—the budget amount is \$107 million, and \$87 million is provided in the House bill. That is one-third the cost of escalating the bombing in North Vietnam.

For vocational education, under the Office of Education, the entire budget is \$253 million. That is less than the amount we are spending for escalating the B-52 bombing of North Vietnam.

On education for the handicapped in our entire Nation, the Federal amount provided is \$85 million, or less than one-third of what we are paying to escalate the bombing in North Vietnam.

For libraries and community services, \$156.5 million is provided in the budget. That is far less than we are spending on escalating the bombing of North Vietnam.

We all know that the work incentive programs under welfare is one of the finest programs we have. One hundred and thirty-five million dollars is provided in the budget, or less than half of what we are spending to escalate the bombing in Vietnam.

Maternal and child health under welfare has \$265.4 million provided in the House bill. This is a program that is absolutely essential from the humanitarian standpoint. The amount provided in the House bill is less than the amount we are spending on escalating the bombing in North Vietnam.

Mr. President, the amendment would not touch any of the additional esca-

tion or higher spending levels in Vietnam. For example, a huge \$554 million is provided for additional deployments of helicopters in Vietnam. This amendment would permit that escalation.

The \$104 million for additional—that is, additional—aircraft and to augment—the word is augment—the Navy's riverine warfare operation in the delta region of South Vietnam would proceed ahead.

The supplemental provides for \$278 million for the procurement of munitions for land and naval forces as a result of the higher tempo—and I quote directly from Secretary Nitze—the higher tempo—of activity and the additional—I repeat the additional—deployments. The amendment would not touch that \$278 million additional munitions escalation.

The supplemental will still include \$209 million for higher rates—and I stress again—higher rates of equipment overhaul, greater aircraft and ordnance shipments, and so forth.

The amendment would not touch the supplemental's provision for \$174 million for higher activity rates on the part of air and naval forces other than increased—I stress increased—B-52 bombing. We would step up our other aircraft sorties and activities, and that stepup of activities would not be touched by this amendment.

Secretary Nitze asked \$71 million to step up our program of improving the combat capabilities of South Vietnam's armed forces. This includes more M-113 armored personnel carriers, 105-millimeter and 155-millimeter howitzers, machineguns, and M-16 rifles.

Mr. President, this will stay in the supplemental and although it constitutes a step up in military activity, I am all for it, and I mean enthusiastically for it. This is precisely what we should do. We should turn more of the war over to the South Vietnamese—much, much more.

But, Mr. President, if we are to do so, would not we expect that our own burden would be eased at least somewhat? We are pouring far, far more into the B-52 bombing escalation by itself than we are to increase our support for South Vietnamese forces and all the other allied forces combined.

The supplemental provides a \$118 million more for equipping certain other free world forces to be employed in South Vietnam, and for this I have only warm support. My amendment would, of course, not reduce this increased capacity for military activity.

To meet the higher—and I repeat higher—ammunition requirements, the supplemental provides \$148 million to increase—the word for this supplemental is increase—the overall production base. The largest item includes the opening of five additional TNT production lines. Three additional "single base propellant" lines would also be opened to help support higher 155-millimeter and 105-millimeter artillery ammunition production. The amendment does not touch this escalation of ammunition.

The supplemental also proposes to take a number of actions to increase readiness of our forces by expediting pro-

curement of certain equipment at an estimate fiscal year 1968 cost of \$113 million. This is untouched.

So the supplemental provides a vast amount—a large proportion of the \$6 billion we are voting on tomorrow—for beefing up the Vietnam ammunition, the weapons, the equipment of our own force in Vietnam and those of other free nations, and this amendment would touch none of that vast sum designed for escalation, except—except—the \$268 million expressly and exclusively for increasing, and I stress increasing, from the high rate programmed in January of this year, the amount available for additional, additional B-52 bombing.

#### SUMMARY

This amendment would cut \$268 million from the over \$6 billion contained in the pending supplemental for Vietnam—\$4 billion is additional new funding; \$2 billion is a release of funds provided but frozen in fiscal 1968.

Secretary Nitze made very clear in his testimony before the committee that at least \$268 million of these funds were for increased B-52 sorties and their required support.

This amendment deserves the support of the Senate for three reasons:

First. The taxpayer will save \$268 million during a period of fiscal difficulty.

Second. Congress will be able to exercise the only real policy control it has over the war in Vietnam.

Third. The continued escalation of B-52 sorties which has destroyed so much of South Vietnam will be arrested. Although B-52 bombing can continue at a high level, this amendment will prevent its endless increase.

Nothing in the supplemental is being touched that is earmarked for support of our men and allies in the field. The amendment does not touch any of a series of increases in funds for additional ground and naval action and additional support for South Vietnam, Thai, and South Korean forces contained in the supplemental.

This amendment is aimed only at those escalations of expenditures which are clearly identifiable in connection with increased B-52 bombing. B-52 bombing could continue at the high levels programmed in January of this year, but at no higher level.

I urge the support of Senators for this moderate 4.5-percent cut in the \$6 billion supplemental appropriation for Southeast Asia.

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

Mr. PROXIMIRE. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I commend the senior Senator from Wisconsin for what I regard as a brilliant and unanswerable indictment of the further escalation of the bombing in North Vietnam and in South Vietnam.

I should like to ask the Senator if he would permit me to join as a cosponsor of his amendment.

Mr. PROXIMIRE. I would be very happy and proud to have the Senator from South Dakota as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from

South Dakota may be added as a co-sponsor of the amendment.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. I believe that many people across the country are under the impression that since the President's withdrawal statement last March, we had reduced the number of bombs and the tonnage of bombs being dropped in Vietnam. The Senator from Wisconsin leaves no doubt, in the case he has built here today, that quite the contrary is happening. We have increased the number of bombing missions. We have increased the tonnage of bombs being dropped in Vietnam since last March, and there has been a steady rise. As the Senator has pointed out, if we do not exercise some congressional check through our control over the funds that are being used to fuel this war, we are headed for a very sharp further escalation.

It seems to me that from the very beginning, the bombing has been a colossal military, political, and moral mistake. I perhaps feel somewhat differently about this than does the Senator from Wisconsin. I have the most profound objections to our entire involvement in Vietnam. I believe the most objectionable part about it, the most indefensible part about it, is the bombing of civilian populations, the bombing of North Vietnam that has been going on now for some 3 years, and to no avail.

Those who argue that the escalation of the bombing would be accompanied by a reduction of the infiltration have been proved wrong in every instance. Senator MANSFIELD asked the Defense Department some time ago how many North Vietnamese soldiers were fighting in the south when the bombing began, and he was told that there were only 400 men from North Vietnam fighting south of the 17th parallel when we started bombing. We know that today 50,000 to 60,000 troops from the north are fighting in the south.

So, far from lessening the danger to American troops from the infiltration, we have added to it. We have triggered a response on the ground on a massive scale in North Vietnam. There is, of course, no way to prove that the bombing caused the infiltration, but it is clear that it has not stopped it.

I believe there is considerable evidence that the North Vietnamese have responded to the bombing in the only way they could, not by bombing the United States, which would be comparable to what we are doing—that is out of their reach—but by escalating the ground infiltration. So today we are faced with a major war in South Vietnam as well as in the north, to a greater extent, I believe, because of the bombing.

As the Senator from Wisconsin has said, we have increased the cost of this war enormously—the billions of dollars that have gone into the destruction from the air, the hundreds of American pilots who have been lost, the hundreds of expensive aircraft, to say nothing of the enormous cost in the destruction of property and lives in North and South Vietnam.

I have often wondered about the state-

ment by the Army Chief of Staff, General Johnson, just before we started the major bombing in North Vietnam, when he said that we would not undertake that kind of bombardment, because all it would accomplish would be to increase the postwar reconstruction cost; that someday we would have to rebuild all this area; that the war had to be won in the south, as basically a political problem; that there was no merit to heavy bombardment in North Vietnam. It seems that we have lost sight of that argument.

Anyone who thinks that the bombing of North Vietnam has weakened the resolve of that country that we have been trying to bring to its knees should read Harrison Salisbury's firsthand report of what he observed about the impact of the bombing. He reports a nation united, a nation galvanized, a nation determined not to yield and not even to negotiate so long as the aerial bombardment continues.

I do not believe there will be any meaningful negotiations until the bombing of North Vietnam stops. The difficulty of getting negotiations started, the difficulty of maintaining the moral position of the United States and the political leadership of the United States in the world—all these are additional fallout results from this mistake in bombardment policy.

I wish we could somehow stop the bombing entirely. I believe it would result in a reduction of the war. I believe it would save American lives rather than take American lives. It would reduce the cost of the war. It would meet the one condition that North Vietnam says is essential before they can begin talking about a meaningful cease-fire and an end to this war.

I do not understand the rationale for the bombing. We might have begun it on some kind of an act of faith or of desperation, that, everything else having failed, the government in the south not being able to establish any support from its people, perhaps we could somehow create a better government in the South by bombing the North, a thousand miles away. But now we have had 3½ years of this and have had an opportunity to test it and to find the policy dreadfully wanting from every standpoint.

So I hope the commonsense contained in the pending amendment will prevail when the Senate acts on the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin. I am proud to stand with him on this proposal.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has added greatly to the arguments I have advanced, and he has added some real dimensions to them.

He has pointed out the moral position, which is certainly very significant and important.

He has pointed to the negotiations and the fact that the bombing and the escalation in bombing have made negotiations more difficult.

He has pointed to the argument that militarily it is not working; it is not achieving its objective so far as infiltration is concerned. He has documented his argument by inviting attention to the

first-hand observation of a correspondent we all respect, that it simply has strengthened the resolve of the North Vietnamese.

The point this Senator and I have made with the greatest emphasis is that now, under present circumstances, most of this escalated bombing is going to take place in South Vietnam. South Vietnam is a country where we must have the support of the people. It is obvious that we are not going to win the support of the people. We are going to lose the support of the people. It seems to me that no other conclusion can be drawn if we continue this type of B-52 bombing, which is certain to continue to destroy houses and rice paddies and people, and will leave the people in South Vietnam with a certain feeling that it is not worth it.

We hope the day will come, somehow, some way, when there will be a cease-fire. What will be their attitude toward the country that destroyed their homes? What is going to be the attitude of the man whose child was killed? What is going to be the attitude of the man whose wife was killed? What is going to be the attitude of the man whose home was destroyed or whose rice paddy was destroyed? These are wonderful people in South Vietnam and they are not people with a sophisticated understanding of some of the intricacies of Marxism or other ideologies, and so forth. I fear they will feel that a nation which has destroyed their homes and the lives of their loved ones can hardly be their friend.

Since this is not accomplishing the military objective and since the whole point of our military effort and the only justification we could have is to achieve a stable political settlement, I do not see how Senators can vote against the amendment.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I believe the Senator's point is well taken. We supposedly became involved in Vietnam a good many years ago to reduce the loss of life, to reduce the terror and eliminate the terror, and to restore the security and well-being of those people.

How we can carry out an objective of that kind by dropping more bombs on that one little country than we dropped in all of World War II in the Pacific and on Continental Europe escapes me completely.

People talk about the blood bath that would follow in the event we decided to reduce our commitment in Vietnam and began to move out. I think that the blood bath is on with a vengeance today.

The Senator is trying to reduce some of the funds we have been pouring into that part of the globe. I commend him for his effort.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I shall speak on this subject at greater length tomorrow. However, I do wish to make a few observations in answer to the argument of the Senator from South Dakota.

I can understand less our involvement in the first place in Vietnam than I can understand some of the bombing we are talking about now. I hope this amendment will not resolve itself into a debate on the whole Vietnam policy.

However, I do want to say in regard to this amendment that the amendment

would cut back our capability for B-52 sorties from 1,800 a month to about 1,200 a month, which was planned in January.

I want to make these points about the decision to increase the B-52 capability, and we are talking about capability now, the ability to use it if it is needed, the ability to have the bombs if we need them, the ability to free our troops if they are entrapped, if we have to. That is the question—if.

All of this came about not because of what America desires. We have been sitting in Paris for 3 weeks, and we have made overture after overture. We have tried to get negotiations started during the last few years, and we have achieved nothing. The President of the United States made the supreme political sacrifice by withdrawing himself from candidacy for the Presidency of the United States to prove his sincerity. All this time we have accomplished nothing in Paris.

Perhaps we should never have gone into Vietnam in the first place. Then, we should have withdrawn with the assassination of Diem. Then, there was the opportunity before so many American troops became involved. We had many occasions to consider withdrawing and we did not. Senators know how I feel about our involvement in Vietnam. I cannot say the Senator is wholly wrong. However, the fact remains that all of this has come about not because of anything we did but by reason of something they did.

They attacked our troops in Khesanh. They were on the top of the hill and our troops were down below, entrapped in a hole. What is going to be done about it? Are we going to let them be shot at and entrapped and starved into surrender? We had to fly in food and supplies. We had to do sufficient bombing to relieve those men and to free those men. They are American boys. Nobody wants to bomb and kill anybody, but who started it?

Who is the fellow who drove his bi-cycle into the American Embassy and set off an explosion? Who bombed out the barracks at Pleiku? Who killed our boys? The Vietcong? Who is burning the villages? Is it not the Vietcong? Surely, if they would stop, we would stop. We have said a million times that we are ready for a cease-fire; stop it and we will stop it.

It is regrettable that we have to do this bombing. Yes; I feel badly about it. In some measure, I quite agree with the Senator from Wisconsin, but when one sits and listens to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and listens to General Wheeler as he pointed up the fact that the American boys are there, it is quite different.

The Senator says, "Let us stop the money." If the money is stopped, the bombs are stopped. Is the Senator not saying, if we do not have enough bombs to protect the American boys we have to retreat? We cannot have it both ways. The policy of America would then be to retreat to enclaves and let others take over, which has been talked about by various people, knowledgeable people, such as General Gavin, and at one time that made a lot of sense to me.

I asked General Wheeler what he thought about the suggestion of General

Gavin. He said that if we are willing to give up the advantage to them the first thing they would do would be to push our men into the sea. We would find ourselves in the Gulf of Tonkin.

We are there and we have 530,000 American souls there. They are fighting boys who had nothing to do with the decision. Here is the Under Secretary of Defense who said that the decision to increase our B-52 capability stems directly—not indirectly, but directly—from a defense of Khesanh and the Tet offensive. Secretary Nitze made this point. The Senator read a part of his statement and the remainder is as follows:

In the Ashau Valley campaign, again the B-52 sorties turned out to be of very great assistance. Those B-52 sorties are directed by and large to areas that are almost entirely unpopulated by civilians. (p. 239).

The increase in the B-52 capability is an increase over the January level—not the current level. On this point, Secretary Nitze said:

I am glad you asked this question because as I was reading this statement it seemed to me that I had not been precise enough in pointing out that these changes are changes from the program estimated in January, not changes from today. Do you see what I mean? (p. 239).

With very few exceptions, B-52 operations are limited to areas south of the demilitarized zone. During the period June 17, 1965 through June 22, 1968, there were 25,656 B-52 sorties, of which only 1,711 were north of the DMZ.

The B-52 operations in South Vietnam are tactical in nature—that is important—in that they are usually in direct support of our ground forces. These operations are directed at enemy troop concentrations, supply centers, and logistical supply routes. These operations are not directed at the industrial or population centers of North Vietnam. The Congress should not take an action that denies to the field commanders the required air support for ground operations.

This is not an easy matter to debate. I know that. I pray for the day we can get out of Vietnam with honor and have it done with.

I repeat that we should not have gone in, in the first place. We should have thought it over twice before we did, but we became involved in foreign aid; then we sent in 18,000 troops under President Kennedy to train them; then the situation started to look bad. It looked as though our boys were going to be pushed out, as the Vietcong increased. Then we sent in more troops.

Let us face it. It is our money. It is our supplies. It is our blood. I admit all that. But how can I say to General Wheeler, how can I say to General Abrams, that they cannot have bombs, they cannot have the materiel, they cannot have the planes to do what is needed to protect American soldiers? How are we going to face that? Shall we sit here, academically saying, "Well, if we deny them the money, they will not have to do it"?

My mother used to tell me little stories by way of parables and proverbs. I remember one she told me about the man who owned a donkey. He was a poor man, but he used to feed the donkey

three times a day. His wife said to him one day, "Why do you feed the donkey three times a day? Maybe he will work just as hard if you feed him twice a day."

So he fed the donkey twice a day for a few weeks, and the donkey lived.

Then the wife said, "Why feed him twice a day? Why not every other day?"

So the man fed his donkey every other day, and the donkey lived.

Then one day the man went out to the stable, and the poor old donkey was dead.

Now I hope that when we talk about acceleration, deescalation, escalation—all that sort of business—we are not going to do anything here that might endanger the life and safety of our boys.

My heart goes out to the Senator from Wisconsin. I know how he feels about this. He is absolutely sincere. My good friend from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], now listening to this colloquy, is a World War II hero. He was a bomber pilot. He knows the horrors of war. I think I know a little something about the horrors of atomic and hydrogen bombs. I feel that sort of thing very keenly. It weighs upon me very heavily. But, in good conscience, I cannot say that I could subscribe to this amendment. I do not believe this is the way to do it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Rhode Island and I agree, on almost everything the Senator from Rhode Island said—almost. I do not suggest that we stop the bombing. Not at all. I do not suggest that we adopt some kind of enclave theory.

I point out that when Secretary McNamara testified, before he stopped being Secretary of Defense, he said:

Larger quantities of air delivered munitions will continue to be made, and a total of about \$3½ billion is included in the fiscal year 1969 request for those items.

Think of it, for air-delivered munitions, for the year beginning next Monday, July 1, \$3½ billion. That is far more than we have had for years and years. That is a tremendous amount, much more than we had in World War II. I repeat \$3½ billion for air-delivered munitions.

I am not talking about cutting back on the war. I am saying that this "donkey"—unlike the donkey to which the Senator from Rhode Island just referred to—has been getting about five meals a day, and now they want to feed him eight meals a day. The donkey is getting too fat. He will die of overeating.

I am saying that we should not step up that rate of feeding from five to eight meals a day. It will be too much for him. Military leaders will do a much better job, so far as the fundamental point made by the Senator from Rhode Island is concerned, if they are not given a sky-is-the-limit blank check to blast South Vietnam to eternity. But when they step this up over the 1,200 sorties authorized in 1968 to a higher level, when the 1968 authorization enabled them to meet the Khesanh problem, they are asking for a no-limit policy.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is talking about military strategy and tactics now. He is charting military policy. The Senate Chamber is no war room. We cannot decide those questions here.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator must recognize that there have been few wars in history in which there has been more mistaken tactical strategy than in this one; but that is not our problem.

Our problem goes beyond the military. Our problem is that we may be destroying the political opportunity we will have after the war is over to have anything left in South Vietnam.

Mr. PASTORE. All right. Then why does not the Senator introduce an appropriate resolution and let us vote on that resolution?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Because this appropriation is before us right now and I do not want to vote for a huge B-52 escalation. Without this amendment I would have to vote for it.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator says he wants to do it by means of this amendment. Do not take the money out in this way. What we will actually be doing here will be to rebuff our military leaders and rebuff the men who are fighting on the ground.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator want to give a blank check to our military leaders for anything they want?

Mr. PASTORE. No. Why does not the Senator ask that we take it all out, then?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator knows I do not want to do that because I share many of his views. I do not say that we should get out of Vietnam. Many people say that we should. Perhaps most people feel that we should get out, judging from the latest election returns.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think that on the floor of the Senate we should dictate what our tactical military strategy should be.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then the military can write its own unlimited check and we will sign it? Is that the answer? We have already taken out a substantial amount for various parts of the—

Mr. PASTORE. We have taken out \$80.3 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We have taken it out.

Mr. PASTORE (continuing). For construction because they have not planned it. Where we could sharpen this thing, we did. We took \$35 million for supporting pay increases because we thought they could absorb it. We went over this thing with a fine-tooth comb. We did our job diligently. What I am saying is that when we begin to dictate on this floor the military strategy of our commanders out in the field, as to how many sorties they should make—let us assume that they get trapped again—

Mr. PROXMIRE. Suppose they ask for 50,000 sorties? Would the Senator say all right?

Mr. PASTORE. Let me finish my thought, please. Let us assume that the military get trapped again with only 1,200 sorties capability, but they really need 1,500 sorties? What is the Senator going to do about that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do exactly what they did this year.

Mr. PASTORE. Retreat?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No.

Mr. PASTORE. Stay there and die, then?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No.

Mr. PASTORE. But they would not have any supplies.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. They already have in the 1969 regular defense budget \$3.5 billion for air-delivered munitions. Second, in 1968 they were programmed for only 1,200 sorties, yet they met the Khesanh challenge in spades. They could do it again the same way.

Mr. PASTORE. I think my good friend—and he is my very good friend, for whom I have great admiration, affection, and respect—is comparing all this to the poverty programs and that sort of thing. I do not believe those are connected. Maybe that is dramatizing the Senator's case. But I do not see the connection.

I say this: If we have got to stay in Vietnam, let us do what we must do. If we have got to get out, then let us get out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Rhode Island gave a very good illustration which I know appealed to him. It also appealed to me.

I am reminded of another illustration. When I was visiting an ancient barroom, somewhere in the western part of Colorado, I remember there was a sign over the bar which read, "Please don't shoot the piano player. He is doing the best he can."

Now, Mr. President, our boys fighting the war over there, from the generals on down, are doing the best they can with a very difficult situation. Most of them did not ask to go. Most of them who volunteered, volunteered because they felt it was their patriotic duty to defend their country.

They have had all sorts of restraints imposed on them now. If the military advisers are asked if they favor not bombing a northern port of Vietnam, they will say "No. That makes it easier for the North Vietnamese to bring in more supplies with which to fight us and kill us." If they are asked if they favor leaving the port of Haiphong open, they will say, "No. It should have been closed 2 years ago, so that the North Vietnamese could not bring in all the missiles and other materiel that has cost us the lives of our men." They will say, "You should have taken a chance on a confrontation with the Soviet Union, in an attempt to prevent supplies from reaching North Vietnam."

All sorts of restraints have been imposed on our fighting men over there, as things now stand. It seems to me that they have had enough restraints imposed on them without our trying to decide for them how many bombs they will need. We should base our decision on the best advice we can get from our military leaders.

I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who is in charge of the bill, that the supplies are needed to support the men who have been sent there. When we send men there, especially when they are sent to fight and die for the position of this country, it seems to me the least we can do is to give them as much as we can to support and help them to carry out the job they have and to save their lives, if they can be saved.

The Senator spoke of the Marines who were surrounded at Khesanh. It is our duty and obligation to give our men all the help they need to prevent their positions from being overrun by the overwhelming numbers of the enemy. Our men might have been destroyed at Khesanh without the strong support they received. Those courageous boys had been sent there to hold that position. They were surrounded and could have been destroyed.

I hope that we will trust the judgment of the executive branch and of the military officers by at least providing the supplies that are being asked for to fight the war, and not require it to be fought with more restrictions than have already been imposed.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I want to make one brief observation. I do not think anyone would want the RECORD to imply in any way that those of us who are questioning further escalation of the war are any less concerned about the lives and well-being of our troops who are there than are those who advocate such escalation. I know the Senator from Rhode Island did not mean to imply that.

Mr. PASTORE. I did not even say that.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator was generous and thoughtful in his remarks, but the truth of the matter is that there are many Members of the Senate who have felt for years that we made a tragic error in becoming involved in Vietnam. Like the Senator from Rhode Island, they wish we were not there. They think it was a mistake that we became involved.

Somewhere we have gone from that recognition of error to the view that almost anything the military requests in the way of additional involvement in Vietnam, or more troops, or more bombardments, or more military escalation is justified in order to redeem the original mistake.

Yet, each time we have lifted the level of our involvement in the name of helping our troops, we have had more of our troops killed and more of our troops fall. Each time we have expanded the bombing, instead of less infiltration from the north, we have had more. This is the way a war always expands.

The Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out that when heavy bombs are dropped in an area like Vietnam, far from breaking the will of the enemy, we recruit additional opposition; we inflame the country against us. And, beyond that, the only way we are going to stop the killing of American troops and stop the killing of Vietnamese is by taking this war off the escalation ladder and getting it into the conference room.

I do not know of any time when the Government of North Vietnam has indicated any willingness even to talk about the possibility of ending the war until the bombing of North Vietnam stopped.

If it is clear that the bombing has not reduced the scope of the war, has not reduced infiltration from the north, why are we not willing to take that step to stop the bombing as a means of ending the killing of both sides of the 17th parallel? Why do we not test the willingness of North Vietnam when they say that is the only way to even begin discussions? The way to reduce the number of Amer-

icans killed is to get into a discussion that will end the war.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator makes a very good point. I have thought about that. Many times I think about that, many a night just before I go to sleep. I wonder whether it would not be a good idea to take the negotiators in Paris at their word and say we will stop all the bombing—

Mr. McGOVERN. North of the 17th parallel.

Mr. PASTORE. All the bombing. They say they want us to stop all the bombing.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think they are saying they want all bombing north of the 17th parallel stopped.

Mr. PASTORE. No, all bombing. We are not doing much bombing above the DMZ except what is tactically necessary to halt the funneling in of their supplies and troops. That is the only place we are bombing. We are not bombing any of North Vietnam's industries or congested areas or cities or Hanoi. We are doing only that bombing, even a little north of the DMZ, that has to do with supplies and troops coming in, which would fortify their positions and put them in a better position to kill our boys.

To come back to the statement of the Senator from South Dakota, I have often thought of that. On the other hand, would not the Senator admit that there is this risk involved? Unless they are sincere, they could actually overrun us and jeopardize the safety of our boys.

Mr. McGOVERN. There is risk in any course we take. There is risk in endless escalation that could take us into World War III. I know the Senator has thought of that.

Mr. PASTORE. I have thought of that, too. I would suffer the ignominy of pulling out completely before I would use an atomic bomb in Southeast Asia. I would rather suffer that shame, that disgrace, that loss of prestige rather than use an atomic weapon again. I have taken that position. But we are not talking about that just now. All I am saying is that, for some reason, every time we have stopped our bombing, they have increased their activity and infiltration. Time and again they have done it. I have seen classified, authentic, documented pictures of it.

At one time, 2 years ago, just about Christmas time, I suggested that we stop the bombing of the north, and every newspaper in this country picked up my statement and said I was turning my back on the administration. But I thought it was the right thing to suggest and I said it.

I came back to Congress. They invited me downstairs. Does the Senator know who invited me? STUART SYMINGTON invited me to go downstairs to see the classified picture. They showed me pictures of Vietcong aluminum boats coming down with supplies, taking advantage of our moratorium on bombing.

The point I am making with the Senator is this: If we do what they say, we are taking a chance. I think the only effective way is to withdraw our troops back to safe positions before we take that chance, because, God help them if these

people are not on the level. When we stop our bombing and we give them the ability to deliver a Sunday punch, I do not know who is going to answer the letters from mothers of those boys who would be killed.

Mr. McGOVERN. Who is going to answer the letters of the mothers of those boys who have been killed while the bombing has been progressing? The Senator makes the point that there has been an escalation of the war when we have had bombing halts. I say there has been an escalation of the war for 5 years, whether we have bombed or not bombed. But there have been indications that the North Vietnamese are willing to talk if we stop the bombing.

Mr. PASTORE. How do we know that?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator has said we have stopped all of the bombing north of the 17th parallel. We have been dropping more bombs up to the 20th parallel than we were when the President made his speech 3 months ago.

Mr. PASTORE. I know that, and the reason for that, as Secretary Nitze made it clear, is that they have increased their activity.

The Senator must admit that we did not start the Tet offensive. We did not surround anybody around Khesanh. We were surrounded.

Sometime somebody ought to carry the brief for America.

Mr. McGOVERN. That is what I am trying to do. My recommendations are what I think are in our national interest. The Senator from Rhode Island is relying, it seems to me, very heavily on military advisers who have been consistently wrong.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the Senator's point of view. They do not make the policy. They carry out the war according to the policy that is initiated.

I do not know how many Members of the Congress feel as my good friend from South Dakota does. I do not know how many feel as I do. I do not know how many feel as the Senator from Wisconsin does. I do not even know how the vote is going to be on this amendment tomorrow. All I say is, let us take the black hat off the Americans once in a while and put the white hat on them and put the black hat on the other guys.

I still think we are the good guys.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator surely does not wish to leave the implication here that those of us who are advocating this amendment are running down America. What we are trying to do is advocate a very modest proposal to save funds, the spending of which we think is not in the interests of this country, and does not contribute to the security of our forces, but could, in fact, be leading to a larger and more destructive war.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin. We should not at this time vote any appropriations that contemplate escalating the conflict in Vietnam. North Vietnam has been bombed with far more intensity than any other country in the history of warfare. Must we further escalate the conflict by expanding the bombing in the north and the south at a time when we should be bending every effort to de-

escalate the conflict and get down to meaningful negotiations in Paris?

Yesterday, we dramatically escalated the atomic missile race with Russia by endorsing an anti-ballistic-missile system. This was a tragic blow to any hopes we have had for cooling the arms race with Russia. Now, 24 hours later, we are acting on an appropriation to intensify the war in Vietnam.

We have escalated the bombing in the north, and they have escalated the fighting in the south; and both of us sit in Paris, trying to load the blame on the other. This is not the route to peace or meaningful negotiations.

We should stop the bombing of the north and offer a total ceasefire, so that negotiations can proceed without further killing. If we are not willing to take the initiative in a small step like this, it can be seriously questioned if we really mean business in Paris at all.

Our intensification of the bombing in the north in recent months, coupled with that contemplated in this appropriation, is a step in the wrong direction.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for his statement, and I appreciate his support.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 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. PROXMIRE. 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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 26, 1968, at 12 noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 25, 1968:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Samuel C. Adams, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Niger.

Carter L. Burgess, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

Thomas W. McElhiney, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana, vice Franklin H. Williams.

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Bertram C. Harrison, [REDACTED], Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code.

##### IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions to title 10, United States Code, sec-

tion 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

*To be general*

Lt. Gen. Ben Harrell, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

*POSTMASTERS*

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

*ARKANSAS*

William F. Woods, Hazen, Ark., in place of M. E. Ingram, resigned.

R. E. Johnson, State University, Ark., in place of A. P. Essary, retired.

*CALIFORNIA*

Jeanne W. McMahan, Sierra City, Calif., in place of R. D. Atkeson, retired.

Marie C. DeNadio, Woodbridge, Calif., in place of P. A. Wells, retired.

*GEORGIA*

John D. Lance, Bogart, Ga., in place of H. C. Geer, retired.

*ILLINOIS*

Ronald C. Henderickson, Garden Prairie, Ill., in place of H. H. Klester, deceased.

*IOWA*

Charles M. Olson, Nemaha, Iowa, in place of R. M. Peters, retired.

*KENTUCKY*

C. Bruce Current, Millersburg, Ky., in place of H. D. Wood, retired.

*NEBRASKA*

Orville D. Joynt, Holstein, Nebr., in place of E. N. Pitz, transferred.

*NEW YORK*

Robert W. Sewall, West Park, N.Y. in place of F. I. Straley, resigned.

*OHIO*

Mary M. Fox, Blue Rock, Ohio, in place of K. E. Powelson, retired.

*OKLAHOMA*

Dora E. Hilliard, Medicine Park, Okla., in place of L. M. Hilliard, retired.

*PENNSYLVANIA*

John S. Kahat, Ford Cliff, Pa., in place of R. R. Walker, retired.

Alfred G. Bush, Portland, Pa., in place of L. E. Randolph, retired.

Robert A. Mowrey, Sybertsville, Pa., in place of A. A. Mowrey, retired.

*SOUTH DAKOTA*

Hilding C. Nelson, Stockholm, S. Dak., in place of J. H. Hallberg, transferred.

*TENNESSEE*

Willard S. Vitatoe, Crab Orchard, Tenn., in place of M. A. Martin, retired.

Lawrence E. Shell, Watauga, Tenn., in place of L. M. Reel, retired.

*TEXAS*

Richard C. Brown, Jr., Cross Plains, Tex., in place of L. L. Bryan, deceased.

William E. Flaherty, Happy, Tex., in place of H. S. Wilkes, retired.

Fred A. Strange, Silverton, Tex., in place of G. E. Martin, transferred.

Daniel B. O'Connell, Van Vleck, Tex., in place of L. L. Bickham, retired.

*VIRGINIA*

Earl T. Patton, Jewell Ridge, Va., in place of E. B. Kennedy, retired.

*WISCONSIN*

Henry J. Jarosz, Armstrong Creek, Wis., in place of Helen Klus, deceased.

*CALIFORNIA*

Joseph E. Alecci, Grover City, Calif., in place of Harry Sorensen, retired.

*FLORIDA*

Charles Rockett, Flagler Beach, Fla., in place of R. M. Miller, retired.

May M. Roberts, Pomona Park, Fla., in place of W. S. Middleton, retired.

Joachim J. Svetlosky, St. Leo, Fla., in place of D. W. Gormican, resigned.

*IOWA*

Nick J. Quint, Aurora, Iowa, in place of R. E. Dursey, retired.

Wayne M. Barbite, Iowa Falls, Iowa, in place of L. L. Weldon, retired.

*KENTUCKY*

Ocia M. Sloane, Allen, Ky., in place of L. F. Burke, retired.

*LOUISIANA*

Lessie G. Stafford, Collinston, La., in place of A. M. Pyron, retired.

*MAINE*

John W. Perry, Addison, Maine, in place of R. S. Joy, retired.

Irving W. McAllister, North Waterford, Maine, in place of W. L. Button, retired.

*MARYLAND*

Russell W. Beall, Laurel, Md., in place of G. F. Murphy, retired.

*MASSACHUSETTS*

Rena F. Simmons, Dunstable, Mass., in place of D. L. Connolly, resigned.

Charles R. Santos, Lowell, Mass., in place of J. J. Gallagher, retired.

*MISSISSIPPI*

Henry G. Miley, Pulaski, Miss., in place of G. W. Miles, transferred.

*NEW JERSEY*

Roy J. Adams, Bridgeport, N.J., in place of E. S. Kletzing, Jr., retired.

John C. Fornataro, Oakhurst, N.J., in place of W. A. Harvey, retired.

*NEW YORK*

Lulu M. Jones, Krumville, N.Y., in place of A. C. Jones, deceased.

Glendon W. Hulbert, Oak **XXXX**, N.Y., in place of T. L. Ford, deceased.

Virginia A. Williams, Spencertown, N.Y., in place of E. I. Wooley, deceased.

George E. Ellison, Walker Valley, N.Y., in place of H. A. Caldwell, retired.

*NORTH DAKOTA*

Arthur O. Johnson, Lehr, N. Dak., in place of Leo Ketterling, deceased.

*OKLAHOMA*

Albert E. Swearingen, Arcadia, Okla., in place of I. W. Cleek, deceased.

*TENNESSEE*

Jim C. Tolley, Lynchburg, Tenn., in place of W. P. Stone, retired.

*TEXAS*

Roy H. Byars, Blanco, Tex., in place of G. E. Greebon, retired.

Bobbye J. Cave, Wall, Tex., in place of J. E. Howard, retired.

*VERMONT*

Armina M. Fletcher, Cambridge, Vt., in place of G. L. Cutler, retired.

Elspeth P. Eaton, North Thetford, Vt., in place of A. P. Waterman, deceased.

*WASHINGTON*

Frank M. Suhadolnik, Prosser, Wash., in place of H. E. Chapman, retired.

Robert L. Pallett, Tenino, Wash., in place of H. H. Russell, retired.

*WEST VIRGINIA*

Vernon A. Shahan, St. George, W. Va., in place of A. W. Loughry, retired.

*ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION*

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1970, vice Samuel M. Nabrit.

James T. Ramey, of Illinois, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1973, vice Glenn T. Seaborg.

**CONFIRMATIONS**

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 25, 1968:

*JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF*

Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for reappointment as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, for an additional term of 1 year.

*U.S. AIR FORCE*

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10 of the United States Code:

*To be major general*

Brig. Gen. Reginald M. Cram, **XXXXXX** (colonel, Regular Air Force, retired), Vermont Air National Guard.

*To be brigadier generals*

Col. Robert W. Akin, **XXXXXXX**, Tennessee Air National Guard.

Col. Robert F. King, **XXXXXXX**, Washington Air National Guard.

Col. Billy J. Shoulders, **XXXXXXX**, Tennessee Air National Guard.

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code:

*In the grade of lieutenant general*

Lt. Gen. William K. Martin, **XXXXXX** (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

*To the grade of lieutenant general*

Maj. Gen. Gordon M. Graham, **XXXXXX**, Regular Air Force.

*U.S. ARMY*

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

*To be lieutenant general*

Maj. Gen. William Raymond Peers, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

*U.S. NAVY*

The following-named captains of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Frank H. Price, Jr. Lawrence Heyworth, Raymond J. Schneider Jr.

Arthur G. Esch William T. Rapp

Robert L. Baughan, Jr. John M. Barrett

David H. Jackson Marmaduke G. Bayne

Burton H. Andrews Robert L. J. Long

James B. Hildreth Thomas J. Christman

Mayo A. Hadden, Jr. Clarence A. Hill, Jr.

Henry Suerstedt, Jr. William R. Flanagan

Edwin M. Rosenberg David H. Bagley

Philip P. Cole Kent L. Lee

Daniel E. Bergin, Jr. Frederick C. Turner

George L. Cassell Robert B. Baldwin

Howard S. Moore Julien J. LeBourgeois

Philip S. McManus George P. Steele II

*U.S. ARMY*

The nominations beginning Burton G. Hatch, to be major, and ending Alan J. Johnson, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 12, 1968.

*U.S. MARINE CORPS*

The nominations beginning William C. Alrheart, to be colonel, and ending Lawrence R. Zinser, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 10, 1968.