

public service component in the curricula of professional schools. New and relevant courses will serve the twin purposes of attracting more professional school graduates into government and fitting them to operate more effectively in the unique environment of the public sector.

NEEDED: MORE RELEVANT AND BETTER QUALITY COURSES

But more fellowships and more courses are only half the answer to the problems of education for public affairs. The other half has to do with the quality of the courses we teach and their relevance to the challenges confronting public executives at all levels of government. The role of computer technology, the problems of the inner city, social accounting systems, planning for the future, the internationalization of public policy, the changing patterns of creative federalism, new management techniques, the control of environmental pollution, the interrelationship among social, economic, and political developments—these are random but staggering examples of subject areas where educators and curricula need extensive updating.

Clearly one of the most important impacts of the Education for the Public Service Act will be its provisions for grants to universities to permit them to take a good hard look at their own offerings and to come up with better programs of public affairs education—and better ways of teaching. For we have barely begun to tap the exciting possibilities for the utilization of techniques and technology for communicating more effectively and efficiently with our students. TV, programmed learning, audio-visual techniques are all underutilized; team teaching, syndicate and T-group techniques, self-instruction all offer valuable improvements over traditional methods when properly em-

ployed. Innovative internships and exchange programs can be richly rewarding. But up until now we have had neither the time nor the resources to do the experimentation to determine what are the most productive teaching methods for different kinds of subject matter with different types of students. In this area I see the provisions of Section 1204 as a challenge to the universities and to private associations like the American Society for Public Administration, the International City Managers Association and the Public Personnel Association to develop new knowledge and new ways of disseminating it, and to utilize existing capabilities in the stronger institutions to foster new capabilities through regional cooperative arrangements with institutions that are currently weak. None of these are easy tasks, but they must be faced and mastered if we are to upgrade the nation's ability to develop and implement public policies to master our public problems.

For this is really the purpose of Title XII, to improve the capacity of the American people to govern themselves. The vast new responsibilities entrusted to the public service of state, local, and national governments can be met only by a vastly improved public service backstopped by universities with heightened capabilities for public purposes. Public Service Fellowships; newly devised internship and exchange programs; updated faculty, curricula, and teaching materials; and new kinds of institutional arrangements are all made possible by the Education for the Public Service Act. All will contribute to attracting and educating more and better qualified college and professional school students for careers in government. Together with the equally important provisions of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, Title XII of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 constitutes a strategic program for

raising the quality of government in the United States. And the two bills are interrelated, for in-service and mid-career training of existing Federal, state, and local officials must depend in no small measure upon university-based research, teaching materials, and talent.

THE TIME IS NOW

Madam Chairman, the President and the Congress have taken giant steps in recent years to develop appropriate legislative responses to some of this nation's most serious and intractable problems. This has been true in education, in health, in housing, in urban renewal, in civil rights, in transportation, in consumer protection, in social security, and so on. Billions of dollars have been appropriated. New and exciting intergovernmental partnerships have been established. These responses have been heartening. But without trained men and women to carry out these complex functions with imagination and skill, the laws themselves can be thwarted by administrative incompetence and can themselves create a bureaucratic quicksand perilous to freedom itself.

Unless Congress helps our educational institutions to attract and to prepare outstanding young people for modern public service careers, the great hopes and purposes of our government cannot possibly be achieved. We cannot, in Lord Balfour's great phrase continue to be "so fundamentally at one that we can safely afford to bicker." We cannot harness our collective and diverse energies for the accomplishment of common and humane goals.

In the long run, the legislation before you may spell the difference between success and failure for what is surely "the last best hope on earth."

Thank you, Madam Chairman. I shall be happy to discuss, to the best of my abilities, any questions the Committee may have.

SENATE—Saturday, March 2, 1968

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

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

Eternal Spirit, amid the tensions of these days we seek in Thy presence a saving experience of inner quiet and certainty.

We thank Thee that this is our America, and that amid all the contentions and convulsions of these days, still we can say with utter confidence, "God lives and the Government at Washington still stands," and with Thy help will continue to stand as the beacon light of truth in these days so fraught with destiny.

The Lord bless thee and keep thee.

The Lord make His face shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up His countenance upon thee and give thee peace.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 1, 1968, be dispensed with.

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

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.

THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my great pleasure and gratitude that President Johnson announced on yesterday that he was summoning all parties in the 231-day copper strike to an emergency conference at the White House on Monday.

I am also glad that the President made it quite plain in his request to the parties that he expected them not only to come—and I am sure they will accept his invitation—but also to work on an around-the-clock basis, to the end that a settlement of this most serious economic disruption in the five Western States primarily affected will be brought to a successful conclusion.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to concur with the distinguished majority leader that this is a breakthrough with respect to this strike. The President,

with all good will, has indicated that he wants these people to come in and bargain collectively on words that Senator MANSFIELD and I used in our telegrams, that those words are "without preconditions," without any of the other concessions, to come in and lay all these negotiable things on the table.

If the companies will come in and declare that they will give economic benefits and a substantial wage increase and the unions will come in and withdraw some of the bargaining provisions they have laid down, I believe that, with the prestige of the President on the line, we will settle this unfortunate long drawn out strike. We will settle it for the benefit of the people involved, we will settle for industry, and we will settle it for the benefit of America.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROVISION FOR DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF CREEK NATION OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in

favor of the Creek Nation of Indians of Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 276, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON DESALTING AND ELECTRICAL POWER GENERATION PROJECT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report regarding the progress and results obtained by the United States from participation in the desalting and electrical power generation project (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LOWER BRULE AND CROW CREEK INDIAN RESERVATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to supplement Public Law 87-734 and Public Law 87-735 which took title to certain lands in the Lower Brule and Crow Creek Indian Reservations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THIRD-PREFERENCE AND SIXTH-PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third-preference and sixth-preference classifications for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE FOR CERTAIN ALIEN

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order granting the application for permanent residence filed by Yeu-Long Wang, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to this alien, and the reasons for granting such application (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Cavalier County Water Management District, of Langdon, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to flood control on the Pembina River, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3075. A bill for the relief of Dr. Richard Francis Power; and

S. 3076. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miguel A. Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 3077. A bill for the relief of Olusegun Adewale Oduko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3078. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make the exemption from the

prohibition against participation in political activities applicable to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia and the members of the District of Columbia Council; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

S. 3078—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO MAKE THE EXEMPTION FROM THE PROHIBITION AGAINST PARTICIPATION IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES APPLICABLE TO THE COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND MEMBERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I have today introduced a bill which would allow the Commissioner of the District of Columbia and the members of the District of Columbia Council to take an active part in political activity and campaigns. The Hatch Act, of course, generally prohibits an individual employed by the Federal Government from taking an active part in political management or in political campaigns. The act, however, expressly exempted the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia from this prohibition. It is appropriate that the freedom to take part in political activities which was accorded to the former Commissioners should be shared by their successors.

The heads of the District of Columbia government should take an active part in the political life of their community. The legislation I am introducing would give them this opportunity. The assistant to the Commissioner is not covered by any proposal, and he would continue to be subject to the Hatch Act. The assistant to the Commissioner is not a successor to the powers of the former Board of Commissioners, who were exempted from the Hatch Act. Moreover, his function is not that of a political leader of the community; rather he is a manager charged with carrying out the policy directives of the Commissioner and the Council. It is thus appropriate that he be barred from partisan political activities.

This is not a partisan proposal. It is interesting to note that among the present nine members of the District of Columbia Council, at least two Democrats and two Republicans have been active in party affairs. Thus, this is not a measure designed to help any particular political party or individual. Rather, it will benefit the entire community by allowing the heads of the District of Columbia government to assume their rightful role as active and representative political leaders.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3078) to amend title 5, United States Code, to make the exemption from the prohibition against participation in political activities applicable to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia and the members of the District of Columbia Council, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (by request) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN ACTS OF VIOLENCE OR INTIMIDATION—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 591 AND 592

Mr. COOPER submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 554) proposed by Mr. DIRKSEN to the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendments when submitted by Mr. COOPER, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENTS NOS. 593 AND 594

Mr. MILLER submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 554) proposed by Mr. DIRKSEN to House bill 2516, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendments when submitted by Mr. MILLER, which appears under a separate heading.)

HEARINGS ON MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate under the chairmanship of Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, will begin hearings on March 26 on the effect of railway mergers on mass transportation. The hearings, expected to last 3 days, will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, and will commence at 10 a.m. each day.

Persons wishing to testify on this subject should contact Miss Doris I. Thomas, Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee, room 5226, New Senate Office Building, telephone 225-6348.

I ask unanimous consent that a news release that was issued by the office of Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, February 26.—The Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will conduct hearings into the effect of railroad mergers on commuter service.

Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (D-NJ) who announced the hearings, said Senator John Sparkman, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee has agreed to set aside three days in late March for the hearings. Senator Williams will conduct the hearings. He is author of the existing Federal Mass Transportation Program.

Invited to testify at the hearings will be railroad executives, representatives of municipal and regional transit agencies, federal officials, members of Congress, state transportation officials and representatives of the riding public.

The witnesses will not be asked to address themselves to any specific legislation presently before the committee. They will be asked to give their views on how the present rash of railroad mergers will affect com-

muter service, together with any recommendations they may have for legislative or administrative action designed to improve the service.

Specific questions on which the subcommittee will seek testimony are:

(1) Will the increased economic strength of the newly merged railroads lead to improved commuter service?

(2) Will the absorption of the weaker railroad systems into larger systems enable commuter services to be put on a financially sound basis.

(3) If not, what forms of cooperation between private enterprise and government are necessary to maintain good commuter service?

(4) Observations or suggestions concerning the existing Federal Mass Transportation program.

In announcing the hearings today, Senator Williams said: "An increasing number of mergers is creating transportation giants and giving new economic strength to once ailing railroads. In my view, the Interstate Commerce Commission has acted wisely in approving these mergers. A strong and financially sound railway network is still a vital part of our transportation system.

"There is one aspect of these mergers that is of particular interest to the Subcommittee: the impact they will have on weak, near bankrupt commuter lines.

"One of the new economic giants, the Penn Central Transportation System, will take over the New York, New Haven and Hartford, the Norfolk & Western, which seeks merger with the Chesapeake & Ohio, is under court order to absorb the Erie Lackawanna, the Boston and Maine and the Delaware and Hudson.

"The railroads, the so-called 'weak sisters of the East', are in serious economic condition. The New Haven, for instance, is in bankruptcy and the Erie Lackawanna depends for its existence on subsidies from the State of New Jersey.

"But one fact is paramount: these commuter services are vital to those citizens who depend on them. 25,000 New Jerseyans a day travel on the Erie Lackawanna alone; the New York Central and the New Haven moves thousands daily to and from New York.

"The question of the impact of these mergers on the commuter has not been discussed or even raised. And there are big questions involved.

"Will a portion of the savings resulting from these mergers be used for the benefit of good commuter service?

"Will a change in the Urban Mass Transportation Program or other federal, state or local assistance programs be required?

"Is some new form of federal cooperation with the railroad industry indicated?

"Will these mergers slow or, perhaps, even reverse, the trend of railroads to cut passenger service?

"These hearings also will provide a forum for the voice of the commuter. And it's important that the commuter's voice be heard before it is drowned out by the rumble of freight cars."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I certainly appreciate the chairman of the full committee making this announcement and giving all the details of how people can reach Miss Thomas. We are always willing to give everybody who wants to be heard an opportunity to be heard.

This program is working and will work and we want to continue it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

I wish to remind the Senate—I am sure it needs only a reminder—that the

distinguished Senator from New Jersey was the initiator of mass transit legislation in the Senate. I remember that he introduced a bill. It was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. We were having hearings on housing when the Senator from New Jersey asked me if he might include the urban transit bill. I demurred at first, because I said it was not connected with housing; but he convinced me that it was a very vital part of maintaining the downtown areas in our cities throughout the land.

We had those hearings, and we put it through as a part of the housing bill on the Senate floor, on a trial basis, until we could see how it has worked out.

The Senator from New Jersey probably knows more about the problem than any other Member of Congress, and when he says that it has been successful, I am sure he knows what he is talking about. I am very glad to follow his lead in the matter of mass transit, particularly urban transit. We have not gone into interurban or transcontinental transit, but only mass transit as it pertains to the urban areas.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I hope the Senator's words were taken down. I cannot express to the chairman of the full committee how grateful I am for his statements. I am grateful, indeed. I hope his words were taken down. I will remember them forever.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

THE "FAT" DOCTORS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, some days ago the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee concluded its hearings on the "fat" doctors—or obesity specialists. Because of the magnitude of the facts revealed, I reserved the right to file conclusions after I had read the record.

These conclusions were filed today, and I would like to share them with my colleagues.

Mr. President, based on these hearings and three other sets the past 4 years, I see a compelling necessity for enactment of S. 260, the Medical Restraint of Trade Act. By prohibiting doctors generally from selling what they prescribe, in my opinion, this bill would protect patients from doctors whose medical judgment becomes confused with economic goals. It also would protect independent competitors.

Doctor-merchants are in the minority of the profession. However, their number is sufficient to cause deep concern—especially when evidence is before us of the physical harm and apparent deaths they have caused.

May I appeal to my colleagues to study my conclusions and then join with me in enacting corrective legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks be printed in full at this point of the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR PHILIP A. HART AT CLOSING OF DIET PILL HEARINGS

Death, dressed in statistics, has no face. But this committee has listened sadly to a

recital of at least 35 deaths suspected to be caused by diet pills which had more than faces. They had names, personalities and families.

A nurse and mother died suddenly in the night in Illinois—a 25-year old girl died suddenly in Texas—a 20-year old in Iowa.

You don't have to be a parent or spouse to know the suffering. Each of us has the potential to put ourselves in the place of those families.

Any of the deaths—most in youth or middle age—would have been tragic. But these were worse. Apparently, they were needless.

For these families we can do nothing. Condolences don't wipe out heartache.

But we can vow not to sit quietly any longer—long enough for more needless losses.

This subcommittee in 1964 began the investigation of doctor-merchants because of the anticompetitive practices alleged. As we have gone along, human drama has seeped through the economics. First, it was financial harm to independent competitors resulting in loss of employees' jobs. Then it was bankruptcy.

Slowly, we became aware that doctor-merchants may be endangering the health of their patients in the search for fatter annual incomes. But, this was supposition—based on statistics. There were not death certificates offered for the record.

At this set of hearings the death certificates—in full and grim detail—were entered into the record. In just two states—Oregon and Illinois—20 persons apparently lost their lives when they sought only to lose pounds. Most of these deaths occurred in the past four years.

Other suspected deaths make the total 35 now. State medical officers and others still are reporting more.

Medical opinion is that it is almost impossible to prove the cause in these cases because of chemical changes death brings. But, competent pathologists have assured us that it is their considered opinion diet pills can be blamed.

Also, we have heard detailed case histories of other patients who got to non-obesity doctors in time to avoid death—or for correction of medical conditions—caused by the pills. Some of these were pilots—grounded because of adverse side-effects.

How many Americans make up the total of the diet pill victims we will never know. Nor will we know if a doctor-merchant killed—or made ill—any patient by overprescribing for other ailments.

But, you do not need a degree in psychology to understand the great temptation to write an extra prescription—or six—per patient when this will add thousands of dollars to the doctor's annual income. The hearing record over the past four years contains cases where doctors did succumb to that temptation.

And the record of these hearings is replete with examples of questionable medical attention to patients—of doctors handing out dangerous combinations of pills with no physical examination—of doctors who never see the patients who stop by to pick up resupplies of pills.

The Drug Abuse Control Bureau reports that of 28 obesity doctors inspected in the Kansas City region, 25 were breaking the law covering handling of dangerous drugs. These 25 represent 20 percent of the 123 doctors known to specialize in obesity in the region.

It seems we have dallied long enough with the question—doctor-merchants: good or bad?

Until 1955 the American Medical Association had no problem with their reply. It was "bad." They had an ethical rule cautioning doctors to limit professional income to fees and to avoid selling products. But, the rule has been modified. And, frankly, following almost four years of work in this area, I don't believe it makes much difference what the professional ethic is. For it is apparently unenforceable.

Doctors who value the dollar most highly—and these are the minority of the profession—would rather give up membership in professional groups and even lose hospital privileges than give up lucrative merchandising.

If the professional groups can't do the job, what of the states—through licensing boards? As I said, the subcommittee began uncovering these questionable practices four years ago. Diet pill deaths have been suspected for over 20 years.

To this day, I have not learned of one doctor whose license has been revoked or who has been censured because of these practices. It seems a little late in the game to suggest we can wait the several years necessary for all 50 states to investigate each dispensing doctor and decide if he is helping or hurting the patients.

What then can the Food and Drug Administration do under present law? Frankly, I'm convinced they could do a lot more than they have been.

The FDA Commissioner, Dr. James L. Goddard, told the subcommittee the agency medical adviser had been recommending for some 23 years that one of the combination drugs—Thyroid and digitalis—used by obesity doctors be taken of the market because it was so dangerous.

The first seizures of this pill came in January, a few days before this subcommittee opened its hearings. Dr. Goddard said agency lawyers thought the difficulty of the burden of proof made earlier suits inadvisable.

Difficulty of a case—especially when people are dying—seems a poor excuse for not trying it. And Dr. Goddard was kind enough to agree.

However, it is my opinion that FDA has had the authority—under the New Drug Applications section of the law—to rid the market of these drugs or to forbid labeling them for weight control, for years. If that is wrong, then FDA should have asked Congress for new law.

But no law would prevent a doctor from dispensing any drug for a patient—whether recommended for that usage or not. Nor would it be advisable for government to get into the practice of medicine.

Yet, I am convinced that as long as a doctor can make \$100,000 to \$300,000 yearly selling pills, patient interest isn't always going to be the first consideration. Certainly it hasn't been with some of the diet doctors. Legislation seems the only answer.

Pending before the subcommittee is S. 260—the Medical Restraint of Trade Act—which would prohibit a doctor from selling anything he prescribes. The bill has been troublesome in the drafting because consideration has been given to doctors who are dispensing to aid patients financially or to offer convenience.

But in the age of welfare and medical insurance it would seem doctors are treating fewer indigent patients. Also, with 70 percent of our population already living in urban areas it would seem that generally pharmacies are equally or more convenient than an individual doctor's office.

In 1962, malformed babies born in Europe alerted us to update our own drug laws.

In 1967, just one day of testimony before this subcommittee of the deaths caused by inaccurate medical laboratory work led to almost immediate enactment of corrective legislation.

Surely in 1968, reports of deaths from diet pills should move us to act again.

I, for one, don't ever again want to be confronted with a death certificate bearing the statement: "Apparent cause of death—diet pills."

HELICOPTER AMBULANCES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, everyone shudders at the soaring auto fatality rate in the United States.

We have tried to tackle the problem by building better roads, offering driver education and putting seatbelts, headrests and other safety devices in our cars.

This is well and good, but we are still going to have accidents. But accidents do not have to be fatalities.

Many victims who die enroute to a hospital 30 miles away would have a better chance to live if they could receive hospital treatment shortly after the accident.

And they could, if the ambulance was a helicopter.

Superior Ambulance Service of Wyandotte, Mich., is presently providing helicopter ambulance service for two Michigan counties—and University of Michigan physicians report that the quick transportation can make a difference.

In the interest of public safety, I should like to bring this new service, as described in a Bell Helicopter news release, to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the release be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HELICOPTER AMBULANCES

The first private helicopter ambulance service in the United States—only a few weeks old—already has dramatically proved its life-saving capabilities.

The helicopter, a Bell 47J Ranger, is owned by Superior Ambulance Service of Wyandotte, Mich., a Detroit suburb. Superior has a large fleet of surface ambulances which operate from 11 different locations in Wayne and Washtenaw Counties.

On Dec. 6, a demonstration flight from Garden City, Mich., to the University of Michigan Medical Center clearly showed the time-saving advantage of the helicopter over ground transportation. Since the University Center is a referral hospital, it receives many difficult cases from other institutions.

University officials and the Highway Safety Institute are particularly interested in how the helicopter service would work out as part of their study for improving patient care from the moment a person is injured until he is in the hands of a doctor.

A mock patient was used in the demonstration, but since then the Superior patients have been for real.

First mission of the helicopter ambulance involved the transfer of a critically burned patient from Wayne County General Hospital in Detroit to the U-M Burn Center.

Superior President Walt Gutowski anticipated that most trips would be 20 to 25 miles, but planned to offer the service within a 100-mile radius of Ann Arbor.

However, on Jan. 11, another emergency sent the Bell helicopter some 200 miles away to Dayton, Ohio. The night flight involved transportation of a brain tumor patient. The Superior ambulance landed on the rooftop heliport of an industrial building in Dayton after a non-stop flight from Detroit. The helicopter, running into strong headwinds on the return flight, made a refueling stop but still delivered the patient to Ann Arbor in little more than three hours.

"The doctor told me the patient could not have survived a move of this distance if it had not been for the helicopter," Gutowski said. "In addition to the smooth trip, we saved an hour to an hour and a half over surface transportation."

The U-M Medical Center presently has a 70-foot bare ground landing pad, but this will be black-topped, lighted and fenced by spring.

Five other hospitals in the area are preparing helicopter landing areas. Included are

Mt. Carmel in Detroit, Bayer in Ypsilanti, Seaway in Trenton, Garden City Osteopathic and Wyandotte General.

Superior officials have contacted additional hospitals within 100 miles of Ann Arbor, explaining their service and offering help in arranging for heliports. Several of these have landing pads under consideration, Gutowski said.

The company purchased the Bell 47J last June, then spent several months laying the groundwork for its addition to the ambulance fleet. The helicopter, normally a four-seater, has pilot in front and three seats across the back of the cabin. It cruises at about 90 miles per hour. The helicopter was equipped for night flying and two-way aircraft and ambulance radios were installed.

It also was equipped with special doors that permitted installation of a Ferno-Washington dual litter in place of the fold-up back seats.

As a standby helicopter, Superior has a Bell 47J-2A, owned by Hi-Lift Helicopters and outfitted in the same fashion. Barney Stutesman, operator of Hi-Lift, and well-known for his traffic patrols over the Detroit area, is one of four pilots on call by Superior. Stutesman has logged more than 8,000 hours of helicopter flying time.

Maintenance of both helicopters is performed by Hi-Lift.

Also on call is Attendant James Boucher, a former Navy chief hospital corpsman trained in helicopter rescue. The helicopter can accommodate two litter patients in addition to the pilot and attendant or doctor.

University of Michigan physicians, after studying the effectiveness of helicopters for transport of wounded in military combat zones, concluded that civilian accident victims would benefit greatly from similar prompt handling, especially in cases of extensive burns, head injuries and spinal injuries.

The helicopter has great potential for rescue-ambulance service in cities by permitting vertical access to an injured person when highways are clogged—possibly by the very accident that caused the injury. It also is valuable in rural areas where roads may be non-existent or blocked by snow or mud.

Dr. Roger B. Nelson, senior associate director at the U-M Center, said that while it might be hard to define the number of lives that might be saved by cutting a few minutes off the transportation, a half hour would make a lot of difference.

Dr. Charles F. Frey, assistant professor of oral surgery at the University and one of the leaders in the study of helicopter ambulance service said, "Most of our traffic deaths occur in rural areas where there are inadequate hospitals." He believes that in the long run it would be best to transport emergency cases directly to the Center.

One large utility company with many employees on jobs in remote areas already has called on Superior to demonstrate its helicopter ambulance techniques. Inquiries have been received from industrial, medical and safety groups, Gutowski said.

Cost of the helicopter service is \$30 plus \$1.50 per mile, exceptionally reasonable in light of equipment and personnel requirements. For its "land ambulances," Superior charges \$25 plus \$1 per mile.

NUCLEAR POWER FOR SMALL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on February 27 of this year, Charles R. Ross, Commissioner of the Federal Power Commission, addressed the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association annual meeting at Dallas, Tex. The address relates to a bill I introduced on behalf of myself and several other Senators re-

lating to the development of nuclear power.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ACCESS TO NUCLEAR POWER FOR SMALL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS: THE AIKEN-KENNEDY BILL

(An address by Charles R. Ross, Commissioner, Federal Power Commission, at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association annual meeting, Dallas, Tex., February 27, 1968)

The Aiken-Kennedy Bill, upon which I have been asked to comment, represents a thoughtful approach to provide for the most economical development of nuclear power. It was inevitable that scientists would eventually unlock the secrets of the atom. It is not inevitable that civilization will profit. It is up to us to see to it that the dreams for the peaceful use of the atom come true. If we do not destroy ourselves in the meantime, atomic power may, if properly controlled and developed, dwarf the visions of the conservationists like Theodore Roosevelt, who recognized the tremendous potential of our streams—an inexhaustible but limited source of energy. As the Federal Power Commission under Chairman Kykendall pointed out in the summer of 1953 during the hearings on the amendments to the present Atomic Energy Act:

"It becomes pertinent to test any legislative proposals with respect to non-federal development of atomic energy to see whether the public interest in atomic energy is protected and benefited as adequately as the Congress of an earlier generation sought to do for the Nation's interest in water power (p. 1128)."

In my opinion the Atomic Energy Act as amended has failed miserably in this respect during the last fourteen years of trial.

Before I discuss in detail some of the provisions of the Aiken-Kennedy Bill and why NRECA should support it, let me discuss for a moment why this bill is needed by the consumers of electric systems throughout the nation, whether public, private, coop or federal. This is not a public versus private power fight. It is an attempt to take a public resource, in this case the "know-how" which was developed at a tremendous expense to the public at large, and turn it into the most efficient source of low-cost power. It is up to the public's representatives, whether in Congress or in the Administrative agencies, to settle for nothing less. We must not hesitate to vigorously push for its adoption even though the opponents will seek to brand the supporters as public power advocates. This is not a new role for me since I have been a hero and a traitor at various times to the various segments of the industry.

By defending the Aiken-Kennedy Bill, someone is sure to accuse me of sacrificing our glorious free enterprise systems, and of being ready, willing and eager to force the I.O.U.'s to capitulate to the hungry, grasping public power advocates. I don't think so. I believe that the average man in the street who is my client, the one I represent to the best of my ability, wants large-scale projects; he wants low-cost power. He doesn't want to generate power in small local stations which clutter up his landscape, pollute his air and defile his lakes and streams. He senses that there are only so many sites for these large stations. Were he to think further about it, he probably would conclude that these sites should be preserved for future use in the most economical fashion. He is hopeful that his Federal Power Commission will set some guidelines as to the location of these sites after due consid-

eration to the many factors involved in selecting such sites. He knows full well that a site suitable for atomic generating plants is fully as unique and valuable a resource as were the many natural water power sites which are reserved under the law. Of course, if a study were to be made as to feasibility of various sites, he probably would assume it would be done by those who work for him and are paid by him. Should advisory committees be used, he undoubtedly would expect all segments to be fairly represented on it.

The average man in the street, grown accustomed, though reluctantly so, to regional schools, regional transportation systems, and regional governments, would naturally assume that the same rules must apply generally to power systems. He just might even wonder for a moment why electric rates keep coming down instead of going up like everything else. If he had a child in the Montgomery County schools in Maryland, the child might even explain to him something called economies of scale.

Because the average man in the street is gregarious and has a tendency to join every possible organization, he wants to get in. Of course, he says to himself, if they don't want me, I'll form my own club; I don't have to accept crumbs from them just because they say so. He is reluctant in this case to do so, however, because it will mean using some of his own valuable land and in order to gain economies of scale, he may have to build duplicate transmission systems which again would incur the wrath of those other citizens who are getting fed up with all the utility leaders who throw their weight around when selecting rights of way.

This unknown but real life citizen wants to do right; he wants his leaders to do right. He knows he has invested a lot of dough in solving the mystery of the atom and he wants a return, not only on what has already been invested but what has to be invested in the future to develop the breeder reactor, without which all these glorious hopes may become a figment of our imagination.

Above everything else, this citizen, in my opinion, is going to insist that some governmental and orderly means for the development of atomic power. The Aiken-Kennedy bill seeks to do this. For the first time in history, a nuclear generating proposal would be analyzed to determine whether this particular plant was best adapted to provide the most economical source of power. Government would not be able to order construction of any particular size plant but it could sure say "no" if the cost to man's environment had not been adequately recognized or if there were a better alternative, such as the development of a feasible hydro-electric project. It might be quite interesting to determine whether a project were being built in a certain company's area to satisfy some local or state government official, whether the site selected was chosen because it would be the least resisted, whether competitive bids were sought and competitive fuels costed, whether the size of the plant was dictated by the size of the market or by politics, whether a plant was being built by a particular company in order to avoid a declining rate base, or whether the plant was the result of some promoter's or financier's dream. These are interesting questions for both public and private applications. They will be answered if the Aiken-Kennedy bill is passed. In view of the fact that I don't expect to be around to see such a bill administered even if it were to pass this year, and thus cannot be charged with seeking to become more power-oriented than I already am, I must confess that I believe that the Federal Power Commission is the logical government agency to administer such a bill and I doubt that the sponsors would quarrel too much about it.

As the bill now stands, it provides that the A.E.C. shall administer it.

It would do essentially four things for small systems. It would

(1) Give them a chance to own a fair and reasonable portion of a proposed nuclear plant

(2) Make output from nuclear plant available for sale on fair and nondiscriminatory terms

(3) Require transmission from the nuclear plant to provide reasonable service to its owners and purchasers

(4) Coordinate the size and operation of the plant with the best development of the region's natural resources and power needs and consistent with the antitrust laws.

Much of what has been presented by Senators Aiken and Kennedy in this bill is not new. At the time the Atomic Energy Act was amended in 1954, Representatives Hollifield and Price presented their separate views in a Minority Report regarding the deficiencies of the legislation.

Had Congress passed legislation along the lines recommended by the minority report, it is quite possible that much of the aggravation that has accompanied recent hearings for licenses before the Atomic Energy Commission would have been avoided.

Nuclear energy would not be a source of further aggravation between public and private power. Conceivably, some delays could have been avoided in the licensing procedure as well.

In order to correct the omission of Congress in 1954, Senators Aiken and Kennedy have co-sponsored a bill to assure that the mix of large and small power systems will both share in the benefits of nuclear energy and that such energy shall be used to the greatest advantage. Clearly, the bill does not provide a preference for any segment of the electric industry nor does it give anybody a free ride.

In my opinion, as I have already said, the Aiken-Kennedy Bill is a timely and necessary piece of legislation. It's timely because the small systems must participate now in the development of nuclear power in order not to fall behind in what will probably comprise 50% of electrical energy by the year 2000, slightly more than 30 years away. It's necessary because the small systems apparently have not yet been offered a share in the participation of nuclear plants nor rates reflecting the cost of power from such plants. In fact, several municipalities so attempting have actually been turned down by the private utilities. Whether or not the courts will uphold the legality of the actions is still an open question.

As individuals responsible for managing systems, you're only too aware that time's a-wasting. Either you must install your own generation or power contracts must be arranged that will provide your customers with power for the next month, the next year—and for the next 20 years, if possible in some cases. You must know now whether you are going to be blackballed from the pools that are constructing the large nuclear and fossil-fuel plants and the transmission grids which will keep down future energy costs.

I think entry into the pools by the smaller systems will become more and more common but I am worried about the terms that will be imposed on the smaller systems as a condition of doing business. A review of recent filings as the Commission indicates that very favorable economic terms are being worked out between large systems in a manner which essentially seeks to enlarge the generation capacity beyond the needs of any one company by selling on an incremental basis. For example, I have seen a steady progression during the last two years towards more sophisticated arrangements for firm power. There are companies now that state in their contracts that firm power shall be billed at the cost of the lowest-cost unit after all other firm commitments have been met—and not on an overall system basis. Likewise,

energy is often billed at the average fuel cost of the latest unit, with energy taken beyond the capacity of the unit billed at incremental costs plus a percentage. Where one company returned firm energy to another company during its off-peak season, it informed the FPC staff that it was using incremental costs as a basis, costs which were lower than its average costs. (Iowa-Illinois). Another category that is utilized is "short term firm power" which in one contract runs for periods of "not less than seven consecutive days nor more than twelve consecutive months" with a weekly rate plus 110% of the supplier's energy costs. In one contract, allowances were made for days in which power was not needed. (Union Electric-Kansas City Power & Light). In addition, there are firm power and associated energy terms available for delaying installation of a new generating unit or to cover a lengthy contingency.

The variety of terms are the normal outcome of an industry that is becoming interconnected to a greater degree—and the terms I've noted above indicate that, done in the spirit of comity, there are real economies in interconnection.

Although some small systems and public systems have been able to benefit from the kind of terms I've described, they represent more the exceptions than the rule. You are all familiar with the Buckeye proposal and perhaps some of you know of arrangements like that recently taken among Minnesota Power & Light, Otter Tail Power, Northern States Power and the Cooperative Power Association to build an integrated transmission grid that would provide for more efficient utilization of each party's facilities and eliminate future duplication. But, what is critical is whether you, as individual systems, have been offered such terms or been able to receive them when you have sought them on your own initiative. It does make one wonder how valid is the argument that it would be discriminatory if the public power systems were to be able to purchase power incrementally from these pools.

Make no mistake, I am not saying that the terms between parties of different sizes should be identical. Probably the small system would not want to be subject to some conditions that a large system should gladly undertake or vice-versa. What I am advocating, however, is that the same attitude about bringing about the lowest costs for both the supplier and the purchaser should prevail, regardless of the size of each party.

The Aiken-Kennedy bill proposes to do just that—that is, make nuclear power available to all systems, large and small—public and private—on fair terms.

In addition, the bill is proposing to take the fullest advantage of the economies of size available in nuclear reactors in order to obtain the maximum benefits. It simply doesn't make sense to allow political boundaries to cut off the dollars and cents that technology would otherwise make available. For example, I understand that legislation may be proposed to allow the Power Authority of New York permission to construct nuclear plants. Under the Aiken-Kennedy bill PANSY would be required to satisfy the regulatory authorities that the size of the plant was not determined by political geography. For example, it would be senseless for PANSY to build a 500 megawatt unit rather than a 1,000 megawatt unit—despite the availability of cooling water and a market for the additional 500 megawatts in systems adjoining New York State. The savings from the additional 500 megawatts thus would be irrevocably lost for the consumers of not only New York State but also the adjoining systems.

One justifiable criticism of the bill may be that it focuses on nuclear power. Why not coal-fired or gas-fired units, too, which are also bringing down the price of energy because of their increasing size? The answer is that these units should be subject to the

same nondiscriminatory terms as the Aiken-Kennedy bill, and legislation should be forthcoming unless the private sector that owns the bulk of these facilities recognizes the problem and acts on it. However, because nuclear power is becoming such a large percentage of the sources of electric energy and because of its attractive economic potential, it is the logical starting point for assuring the smaller systems an opportunity to share in the technology of the industry.

All the criticisms of the Aiken-Kennedy bill are not justified however. One criticism by an I.O.U. particularly comes to mind, in which the company resurrected all the old arguments used in the public-private power controversy . . . only updated to use the word "nuclear."

While I am tempted to answer such criticisms with a single phrase—'t'ain't necessarily so!—I will forego such simple answers before this knowledgeable audience. The facts of life are simply this: 1) public power—whether federal, state or municipal is here to stay; 2) the development of present nuclear technology is largely the result of federal expenditures; 3) the development of future nuclear technology, in particular the breeder reactor, depends upon federal expenditures; 4) the federal government is subsidizing every nuclear plant being built today through its insurance of each nuclear plant; 5) private development alone will not assure the most efficient use of nuclear energy for electric generation.

Let me elaborate just a bit. Public power systems have played a unique role in the development of power in this country—they've prodded, competed and fought with the private power companies—and yet both have managed to come up with viable systems and generally speaking, low-cost power. Essential to the health of the public systems has been their power to exercise their option of self-generation if terms weren't favorable enough. As a regulator, I must confess that the value of this option at times far exceeds what any law or regulatory body could contribute to low-cost power. But—the times are changing—and I don't think you appreciate a proliferation of small steam plants across this country any more than I do. It's an inefficient way of doing business and this country simply isn't so wealthy that it can afford to waste its land, water, and natural resources in the inefficient generation of electricity.

Passage of the Aiken-Kennedy bill is essential and the small systems and public power must be willing to pave the way for it. They must be willing to share the research and development expenses incurred by private industry and to give up some of their autonomy in order to participate fully in pool operations. On their own part, they must review their charters or seek empowering legislation to make sure that they can participate in out-of-state facilities. State regulation of rates for the first time may have to be considered in some cases as well as accepting the concept of territorial integrity. The latter two items in particular have been points of aggravation between public and private power—and public power can do much to relieve the tension in these areas.

I would urge your support of the Aiken-Kennedy bill either as a separate piece of legislation or an adjunct to the Electric Reliability Bill and further urge you to seek support from both political parties. Without these two or some modification thereto, the smaller systems will continue to survive, but in a haphazard manner that will not bode well for their future well-being.

TRIBUTES TO SECRETARY OF COMMERCE ALEXANDER B. TROWBRIDGE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on yesterday, another great public servant,

Alexander B. Trowbridge, left the Cabinet along with Secretaries McNamara and Gardner. While it is with regret that I noted the resignation of Mr. Trowbridge, it is with understanding, also, as well as an appreciation of the many contributions he has made to bettering our Government.

I worked very closely with Mr. Trowbridge in endeavoring to find a solution to the copper strike, and I know that in this field, as in so many others, he devoted his full energies to attempt to bring about a settlement.

I wish Mr. Trowbridge every success in whatever endeavor he pursues in the future, and I wish to note that, like John Gardner and Robert McNamara, he carries with him the best wishes of the Senate and our recognition of a job well done.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL—AMENDMENTS NOS. 591 AND 592

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to H.R. 2516, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered as read and qualified for all purposes under rule XXII.

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

MAN IN THE NEWS: SENATOR FRED R. HARRIS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in this morning's New York Times, in its "Man in the News" column, appears a story on our remarkable colleague, Senator FRED HARRIS. He is, indeed, the "man in the news" today, but he will be the "man in the news" for many years to come. His remarkable ability, his sense of devotion toward the best interests of the country, and his remarkable sensitivity to the needs of our people mark him as one of the truly great Members of this body, and I am glad that the New York Times has recognized him to be such.

The article also points out that his wife, LaDonna, is an equally effective partner in this team for national advancement. Marrying LaDonna was the smartest thing this smart man ever did; and in the two of them we have a team—2 for 1—serving the citizens of Oklahoma and this country.

I am proud that I am seated next to him. Even more than that, I am grateful that FRED HARRIS is a Member of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEGROES' ADVOCATE: FRED ROY HARRIS

WASHINGTON, March 1.—A few days ago a staff member of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders pointed to a stocky, brown-eyed man rushing down a Capitol corridor with his hands stuffed in his coat pockets and said: "There goes my favorite commission member. He really cares about people." Senator Fred Roy Harris, the object of the remarks, seems at first glance unlikely as an expert in urban affairs or a champion of black masses confined to the urban slums of Northern communities.

The 32-year-old Oklahoma Democrat rep-

resents a constituency that is largely white protestant fundamentalist. He holds the Senate seat occupied for many years by the late Robert S. Kerr, who is remembered as a wheeler-dealer from the oil country and whose record fell somewhat short of being altruistic.

Fred Harris can wheel and deal in his own way, and he did this on the commission to get a stronger report on the riots in the cities last year—one that would shock white America into action and commit the nation to new programs that would help the victims of the inner city. The commission issued a summary of its report yesterday and will issue the full report tomorrow.

SHAKESPEARE FROM MEMORY

But Mr. Harris departs from the Oklahoma stereotype in several respects. An able and suave politician, he is also an intellectual who consumes books. He quotes Shakespeare, Shaw and Bacon from memory, and he is a lawyer with a Phi Beta Kappa key.

While the commission was holding marathon work sessions during the last seven months, the Senator turned out a book for Harper & Row, scheduled for summer publication, giving his own account of the commission's findings.

Unlike most members of Congress who write books, Mr. Harris did the writing himself. He typed the rough drafts at his home in McLean, Va., and dictated it by telephone to a secretary in his office.

In an institution composed largely of old men, Senator Harris is known as a promising newcomer—he had been a Senator since November of 1964. He gets along well in the Senate establishment, which commands conformity and respect for seniority.

The Senator manages somehow to please diverse interests and individuals. He is close to both Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Democrat of New York, and President Johnson.

He had not joined Senator Kennedy and other liberals in publicly attacking President Johnson's policies in Vietnam. He tells his constituents that any criticism he has of that policy he conveys to the President in private.

Senator Harris was born on a farm in southwestern Oklahoma on Nov. 13, 1930, the son of a sharecropper. Before he was 12 years old he went to work as a printer for a newspaper. He later worked in the wheat harvest sessions in the public schools.

At the University of Oklahoma he earned bachelor and law degrees and later set up a law firm at Lawton, Okla.

He served eight years in the Oklahoma Senate before he ran for the United States Senate in 1964. He defeated the incumbent, former Gov. J. Howard Edmondson, in the primary and Charles B. (Bud) Wilkinson, former University of Oklahoma football coach, in the general election.

Since coming to Washington Mr. Harris has made himself an expert in education, science and urban affairs. He is a member of the Senate's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which also has been studying the causes of the riots, and is chairman of a government research subcommittee that has been delving into the problems of cities.

When he is not attending to Senate business, reading or traveling around Oklahoma, he likes to fish and go to the beach.

His wife, LaDonna, is a Comanche Indian. They have three children, Kathryn, 18, a student at the University of Oklahoma; Byron, 10, and Laura, 7, all enrolled members of the Comanche tribe.

Much of Senator Harris' concern for the poor is said to stem from his wife, who has been active in helping underprivileged members of her race.

They were married when the Senator was a freshman in college. When he is campaigning, she goes along to help.

"She is a fierce and warlike Comanche," the Senator says jokingly in introducing her to audiences. "But I domesticated her."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE LONDON GOLD MARKET IS A THREAT TO THE DOLLAR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on Wednesday, February 28, 1968, the very distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] made a speech in connection with our gold reserves and suggested that the threat of the dollar was a result of the activity of the London gold market. He made a speech with which I wholeheartedly concur.

The biggest drain on the U.S. gold reserves is not from dollar conversion by official holders or from the deficit in the balance of payments, or from tourists or from troop maintenance—but from the U.S. support of the so-called free market for gold in London. The United States supplies 59 percent of all the gold purchased there out of its official reserves. During the past few months the losses to our reserves to the London gold market amounted to more than \$1.5 billion. This is the greatest loss of U.S. gold in a comparable period on record. This gold goes into private hoards and is a complete loss to the free world's reserves. It is the operation of the London market and the gratuitous agreement of the United States to supply it with 59 percent of its sales that constitutes a continuing and unlimited drain on the U.S. gold reserves and no one is benefited thereby except hoarders, speculators against the dollar, and a few British gold bullion dealers. This London gold market should be closed at once.

During the war there were no dealings in gold except on black markets and for years after the war the market in London was closed. Then, in 1953 the five or six bullion dealers asked the Bank of England for permission to open, citing trades in gold on black markets in Lebanon and Zurich; the Bank of England in turn asked the U.S. Treasury's approval, which was given in the cause of "free markets" anywhere and for everything. The only thing free about the London gold market is that anyone with any kind of money can have recourse to it to buy gold which is supplied at a fixed price by the participants in the "gold pool" with a guarantee that it can be sold back to Uncle Sam without loss. If that is a free market it certainly does not look like one.

What would happen if the London gold market were closed? Probably there would be black markets in such places as Lebanon and maybe the price of gold there would rise to as much as \$40 per ounce. Who would care what the price was in a black market? And if further, the United States would terminate its gratuitous commitment to buy all the gold offered at a fixed price of \$35 maybe there would be some selling and dishoarding. At any rate the United States

would be free of its commitments to supply gold to speculators out of its reserves and to repurchase from them without loss; that is, assuring them against loss, a condition that no other commodity enjoys.

Officially the United States will sell its gold only to central bank holders of dollars, and if this were the true state there would be no threat to the dollar because these holdings are known, limited and subject to bilateral agreements. But actually, through its support of the London gold market, the United States has made an open end commitment to supply gold out of its official reserves and this has been and continues to be the most serious threat to our ability to continue the gold-dollar relation without depleting our gold holdings to a point at which our own defense needs must be considered. When this point is reached we shall perforce stop selling gold altogether. Where this point is should be a matter of determination now. It is important to note that the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit has little to do with the dollar threat here described. As long as holders of zlotys, pesos, and so forth can exchange them for British pounds they can purchase U.S. gold—59 cents for each dollar of purchase—right out of Fort Knox. In this context the foreign holdings of dollars, whether official or unofficial, represent only a marginal factor.

Until there is a reversal of present arrangements which favor the speculators against the dollar and the gold hoarders, these will continue to operate regardless of the pious declarations of the U.S. Treasury that all dollar commitments will be met at the fixed price of \$35 per ounce of gold, which is an impossibility and actually a fraud. And regardless of official denials, the inevitability of one of the following alternatives is accepted by all knowledgeable financiers with an eye to international forces:

First. The official price of gold will be raised materially in order to satisfy the expectation of speculators and to cause dishoarding on a measurable scale; that is, the return of the \$15 to \$20 billion of privately held gold;

Second. The United States will cease to supply the private gold demands either on the London market or on any other with the result that the London market would close and gold would be dealt in on the black markets at prices unrelated to the official price;

Third. The U.S. gold reserves will be depleted to a point considered essential for national defense—because gold may be justly maligned as a medium for settling trade balances, but it is still a valid call on strategic supplies in case of war—and at that point the United States will stop selling altogether. This would mean an end to the gold exchange standard which has prevailed since the war and probably result in a series of competitive devaluations with resultant deflation on the pattern of the 1930's.

For years the U.S. Treasury has insisted that radical remedies must be deferred until the United States has balanced its international payments, that is, we must only act from "a position of strength" as they say. Meanwhile they have been resorting to patchwork reme-

dies and the position has cumulatively weakened. This writer has since 1961 urged the Government to take certain specific steps, including withdrawal from the London gold market and discontinuance of gold purchases at a fixed price, as measures to discourage hoarding, but he has always encountered the response: "not now, we must wait for better conditions, for the elimination of our payments deficit." Now we know that we do not have much more time to wait, that we had better take action before it is forced upon us as it was upon the British in 1967 with disastrous consequences which have not yet been fully realized.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN W. GARDNER

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a moment ago I commented on the remarkable contribution of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] in this body.

On a less happy note we should observe that one of the greatest men ever to serve in the executive branch of our Government, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, yesterday retired from that position.

I am greatly heartened by the fact that he is assuming leadership of the Urban Coalition because in that position he will be able to translate the prestige of the business community into power in the halls of Congress, State legislatures, and local government.

Upon the Urban Coalition may depend the success that we will have in meeting the problems of the Nation's cities, and the many compelling humane problems with which the Secretary dealt so effectively and efficiently.

Mr. President, I know that I speak for many Members of the Senate, if not all, when I commend John W. Gardner for his magnificent and moving service as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

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

Mr. MONDALE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks just made by the Senator from Minnesota in regard to the retirement of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. John W. Gardner.

Mr. Gardner was truly a dedicated, able, and outstanding public servant. He took charge of one of the greatest agencies in our Federal Government which has many problems and he carried on through a very difficult period when we entered into the medicare and medicaid fields.

The Nation owes him a great debt. I deeply appreciate his service. I regret that he is leaving this position in the Government, but I wish to say that I think under the leadership of Acting Secretary Wilbur Cohen the Department will be in good hands.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to meet Mr. Cohen in 1935 when I first served in the House of Representatives. I worked with him as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I am fully aware of his ability and his in-

terest in the programs of that Department.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his most useful observations. As he rightly said, the Department remains in good hands under the leadership of the present Acting Secretary, Wilbur Cohen, who is, I am sure, one of the truly remarkable men to serve in the executive branch, and in whose able hands the Department will continue to deal efficiently with the human problems of our country.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BIRTH RATE PUZZLE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appears in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "The Birth Rate Puzzle."

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

THE BIRTH RATE PUZZLE

Scientific interest in population growth traces back to the great Arab historian and philosopher of the 14th century, Ibn Khaldun. Since his insightful speculations, successive generations of investigators have sought to explain or rationalize variations in the rate at which human populations grow. And while there has been progress, some of the principal mysteries remain.

Recently the Population Reference Bureau, an organization whose publications are always worth reading, called attention to the fact that the United States birth rate in 1967 fell to 17.9 live births per 1000 of population, a level lower than that reached during the depressed 1930s. The low birth rate for 1967 will be reflected in a diminished demand for elementary school facilities in 1972-73. And should that depressed rate prevail for any extended period of time, the impact on the growth of the total population would be quite significant. If the birth rate remains constant at 17.9 per 1000 and the death rate constant at 9.6 per 1000, the population in 1990 would be about 249 million. But if with the same death rate the birth rate were set at 19.7 per 1000, the 1990 population would be about 270 million. Over time, seemingly small changes in birth rates can result not only in large differences in total population, but in significant differences in the age composition of those populations.

But birth rates rarely if ever remain constant, a fact of life that makes population projecting hazardous and causes the Census Bureau to prepare four sets of estimates which range from a low of 256 million for 1990 to a high of 300 million. And no one, to our knowledge, has provided a satisfactory explanation of the short-term swings. Mr. Robert C. Cook, president of the Population Reference Bureau, believes that the rising costs of rearing and educating children is one of the principal factors that are depressing the birth rate. If that is the case, however, why did the birth rate rise so sharply in the early postwar years, a

period of far more severe inflation? Perhaps the answer lies in a rising level of aspiration, that the proportion of parents who regard expensive higher education to be essential has risen very sharply in the past two decades.

Perhaps the rising cost of bringing up children explains the recent decline in the U.S. birth rate. But will it suffice for the future. Those who recall the population projections of the late 1930s, when it was confidently expected that the population would begin to decline by the 1960s, will remain stubbornly skeptical.

TRIBUTES TO SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE JOHN W. GARDNER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with regret and sorrow that I note the resignation and the passing from the secretaryship of Health, Education, and Welfare of John W. Gardner. He has served the Nation with dignity and understanding, and I would hope that, being the unobtrusive man that he is, we would give full consideration to his many contributions in a most difficult assignment and that he would understand that he has our deep appreciation for the many contributions he has made.

In his leaving Government, I want to extend to Mr. Gardner my congratulations for his dedication to duty and for a job well done. I know that his immediate successor, the Acting Secretary of HEW, Mr. Wilbur Cohen, will carry on in the same dedicated manner. They formed a good team. It is with a sense of sadness at this particular time that I note John Gardner leaving the Government, but with a sense of anticipation and confidence that Wilbur Cohen remains.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL AMENDMENTS NOS. 593 AND 594

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to amendment No. 554, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], known as the star print, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD, and that they be printed and considered as read for purposes of the pending cloture motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER's amendments are as follows:

On page 2, strike all after the period in line 6 and all of lines 7 through 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "No prosecution of any offense described in this section shall be undertaken by the United States except upon the formal authorization

in writing of the Attorney General or Deputy Attorney General of the United States, which authorization shall not be given unless the appropriate State or local law enforcement official has failed to promptly, after the alleged offense has been brought to his attention, commenced proper proceedings in the matter, or, having done so, failed to carry forward such proceedings in good faith and with dire diligence and reasonable promptness. In no event shall such authorization be given except upon the certification in writing of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General that in his judgment a prosecution by the United States is in the public interest and necessary to secure substantial justice, which function of certification may not be delegated.

Strike all after "(a)" in line 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "; or".

Strike lines 8 through 10.

On line 11 change "(3)" to "(2)".

On line 12, strike "participate—" and insert in lieu thereof "participate; or".

Between lines 12 and 13 on page 27, add the following:

"(c) any citizen because he is or has been, or in order to discourage such citizen from lawfully aiding or encouraging others to participate, without discrimination on account of race, color, religion or national origin, in any of the activities, services, organizations or facilities described in subsection 301(a), or participating lawfully in speech or peaceful assembly opposing and denial of the opportunity to so participate—".

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT BY SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for filing the report of the Senate Special Committee on Aging be extended from March 15, 1968, as granted by unanimous consent January 18, to April 1, 1968.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEDICATION AT SIOUX EMPIRE COLLEGE

Mr. MUNDT. On February 17, in Hawarden, Iowa, a significant program was held dedicating the campus of a new educational activity of great promise in the upper Midwestern section of these United States. While I was invited to participate in the dedicatory ceremonies,

other public duties prevented my attendance. As Senator from a State closely neighboring Hawarden, Iowa, however, I wish to join in the many congratulations being extended this community and its new educational achievements.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the dedicatory program. President George S. Reuter, Jr., of Sioux Empire College, his excellent staff, and the trustees of this new and growing college are bringing a great new educational opportunity to the people of western Iowa and the entire Nation.

In this era of crowded college classrooms and exploding student body population, it is good to know that our Nation has the services of this enterprising new college which expects to carve out for itself a special niche in our educational world by developing instructional programs designed to graduate young citizens with special devotion to the good life and to the concepts which have made America great and kept it strong. I wish for it a total and highly constructive success in these endeavors.

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

DEDICATION, SIOUX EMPIRE COLLEGE, HAWARDEN, IOWA, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1968

Invocation, Rev. John Vos, Pastor, Community Reformed Church.

"In the Time of Roses," by Reichhardt; Professor B. N. Brown, Sioux Empire College, Mrs. Don Hummel at the piano.

Remarks from Board Chairman, Mr. Roger O. Blake, Editor, The Independent.

Messages from Board Secretary, Mr. Don Hummel, Booth Pharmacy.

"How Beautiful Upon the Mountains," Dr. H. Johann Eschbach, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Remarks from Prominent Americans (introduced by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., President of the College).

Mr. Gay Orr, Superintendent of Schools. Dr. Robert Hayes, Nebraska-South Dakota Regional Medical Program, University of South Dakota.

Hon. Jack Miller, U.S. Senator from Iowa. Dr. Lars I. Granberg, President, Northwestern College, Orange City, Iowa.

Hon. Wiley Mayne, U.S. Representative from Iowa.

Dr. John R. Spaulding, Omaha, Nebraska.

Hon. Stanley L. Greigg, U.S. Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

Charles H. Sedgwick, Jr., Mayor of Hawarden.

Hon. John Ligtenberg, Ligtenberg, Goebel & DeJong, Chicago, Illinois.

Elmer Den Herder, State Representative, Sioux Center, Iowa.

Mr. Marvin Rist, Director of Admissions, University of South Dakota.

Dr. C. Howard Hursey, East St. Louis, Illinois.

Lucas D. Koster, State Senator, Hull, Iowa. Michael L. Blake, For Student Council.

"Though With the Tongues of Men & Holy Angels," Dr. H. Johann Eschbach.

Dedicatory Address, Dr. Harry H. Kalas, President, Westmar College, LeMars, Iowa.

Special Recognition of: Dean Charles S. Wehrer, Dr. W. L. Roy Wellborne.

Benediction, Dr. G. S. Bruland, Pastor, First Methodist Church.

Tour of the Campus, under direction of Student Council, Faculty & Staff.

Special hour in commons area of classroom building, 3:00 to 4:30; under direction of Dames' Society of Seco.

Basketball game; Seco vs. Freeman Jr. College, 8:00 P.M. High School Gym.

LISTER HILL: "STATESMAN FOR HEALTH"

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently the chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the Honorable LISTER HILL, announced that he would retire at the end of his present term of office. As my chairman, he almost literally—from my first day in Congress—took me by the hand and led me down the path toward that ultimate goal of being a good legislator.

The Bulletin of the Association of American Medical Colleges recently referred to him as "Undoubtedly one of the greatest, most influential, and most effective Members of the Senate." I agree completely. But even more than that, the article referred to him as the "Statesman for Health." In this capacity, the chairman is known far and wide throughout the country. He well deserves the tribute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

A TRIBUTE TO LISTER HILL OF ALABAMA

Undoubtedly one of the greatest, most influential, and most effective members of the Senate of the United States in its entire history, Lister Hill of Montgomery, Alabama, has announced that he will not seek re-election and will retire from the Senate January 3, 1969.

Known as the "Statesman for Health," Hill, the son of a doctor whom he proudly remembers as one of the very first to successfully operate on the human heart, has done more to advance the health of our people and to promote the art and science of medicine in the United States and for all mankind than any other individual.

A Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the University of Alabama, Lister Hill studied law at Alabama, Michigan, and Columbia. What was to be a life-long interest in the educational process and the needs of our schools became early apparent when, at the age of 23, he became president of the Montgomery, Alabama Board of Education. Elected to the House of Representatives in 1923 and re-elected through 1938, he soon became recognized as an authority on education.

However, named after the great Lord Rister, raised in the atmosphere of clinical medicine, intimate friend of scores of physicians throughout his lifetime, Senator Hill's overriding interest has been in the field of health and, with his election to the Senate in 1938, he found opportunity to demonstrate it.

The drafting and passage of the Hill-Burton Act, his first monumental achievement in the health field, well illustrates the approach and technique which has ever since been the Lister Hill trademark and the basis of his amazing success as a legislator. Before the measure was even drafted, Hill and his staff spent well over a year in repeated consultations with every group which might be concerned. Hospital administrators, hospital organizations, representatives of physicians and of nurses, and experts from federal and state health departments, of course. But with consumer groups, as well, and—then most unusual in the federal legislative process—with state and municipal officials who would have to live with the results. The first draft of the legislation was then submitted to these same groupings for continued consultation and step two of the unvarying Hill formula undertaken: the resolving of differences. In that instance and repeatedly

since, Senator Hill, by gently but insistently forcing contending bodies to focus on a shared objective and to talk out their differences in private but before a group of their peers, has devised measures which won the wholehearted support of what had been and what in other areas often continued to be bitterly antagonistic groups. "A great compromiser," some have said of Senator Hill. But it never was compromise of principle or of objective. A resolution of differences, yes; compromise, no!

Step three in the Hill progression, which was carried on concurrently with step two, was to win bipartisan support for his objectives and his measures by the very simple tactic of proving to his colleagues that he really knew what he was talking about, that he had pre-resolved possible political differences, and by the not too common tactic of giving his colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, full and public credit for their co-sponsorship or other help in passing his bills. Almost without exception, Hill-sponsored bills on health have been reported to the Senate with the overwhelming or unanimous support of Republican as well as Democratic members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

This was the pattern followed religiously during the next 20 odd years during which Lister Hill sponsored and saw the Congress enact several scores of measures each of which meant a betterment in the health of America. In that pattern one element was of utmost importance: Lister Hill's knowledge of his subject. In the Congress of the United States, if a man is to really have influence with his colleagues in any area, he must display, in tandem, personal integrity and a real knowledge of his field. The maintenance of integrity was never a problem with Lister Hill. The acquisition of knowledge in the field of health and medical care he made his personal and ceaseless quest.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate's all-important Committee on Appropriations, Lister Hill devoted an unbelievable number of days over more than 10 years to the non-publicized drudgery of listening hour after hour as witness followed witness to testify at length and in pitiless detail as to why this, that, or the other item in the federal government's health budget should be maintained, increased, or stricken. And when witnesses differed, Lister Hill and his staff spent still more hours ascertaining the facts. By a most strange quirk of history, Senator Hill's counterpart in the House, the chairman of that body's Subcommittee on Health Appropriations, the late John Fogarty, was engaged in the same avid search for the fiscal facts of America's health system. Concurrently they became not only the most knowledgeable men in the Congress in that area but almost certainly the most knowledgeable in the country. The result, as we all know, was the unprecedented, really revolutionary, federal funding of health measures by the Congress which has occurred over the last two decades. And Lister Hill and John Fogarty not only persuaded the Congress to appropriate but their knowledge of the facts and of the why's and of the consequences were such that, until this time of wartime stringency, they were able to persuade Presidents to spend more on health than they had asked for and more than their budgeteers thought desirable.

Appropriations are essential to the carrying out of programs. But Congress cannot appropriate save to carry out measures that have been enacted into law. Here Lister Hill has stood alone in his preeminence. As both chair of its Subcommittee on Health and of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senator Hill helped draft, introduced, held hearings on, wrote reports for, and guided through the Senate every major piece of health legislation enacted by the Congress over the last

two decades.¹ In this process, too, he was constantly adding to his store of knowledge and his reputation with his colleagues.

Apparently even this double immersion in the pool of learning—through the appropriations and the substantive legislation routes—was not enough for Lister Hill. His social evenings, more often than not, were spent with a group of carefully selected, key members of House and Senate, at a well appointed soiree or dinner hosted by Mary Lasker, his socially and financially prestigious ally in all his health promotions. And at these affairs, too, the main topic would invariably be the need for more research, for more health facilities, for more education in the health professions as presented by one or another of the Hill-Lasker assemblage of friends and outstanding men of medicine such as Drs. Connie Traeger, Sidney Farber, Mike DeBaKey, Isidore Ravdin, Dusty Rhoades, Alan Gregg, Paul White, C. J. Van Slyke, Jim Shannon, or others.

Let us inadvertently create the picture of a narrow minded, single track, pedantic bore, we open a parenthesis to point out that the Lister Hill of whom we speak is a cultured, urbane, witty and gallant gentleman with a host of other interests and conversant in many other fields. Nonetheless, it has been the awesome breadth and depth of his knowledge in the field of health and their complete awareness of it that has been responsible for the unparalleled willingness of the members of the Senate to follow without debate where Lister Hill leads in health legislation. Only once in more than 20 years, so far as the *Bulletin* knows, was the Senator wrong in his facts while presenting and explaining a measure to the Senate. In that instance, someone he had reason to trust as knowledgeable and accurate had given him misleading information. Learning this, just moments before the Senate was about to pass the bill unanimously, Lister Hill took the floor, explained the situation, and moved to defeat the measure he himself had sponsored.

Such is the man to whom the world of medicine and medical education owes so very much today. And that debt will no doubt be compounded before the year is out. For in this year of 1968, when so much legislation of such vital import to us all will be up for reconsideration, Lister Hill will still be serving in his dual role as chairman of the Committee which will enact our bills and of the subcommittee which will fund them. Historically, a lame duck Congressman, one who has been defeated or announced retirement, is a man bereft of influence. In this instance, the very opposite will be true. The Senate will more than ever be eager to take advantage of this man's wisdom while it can. The Administration will have its bills to propose. A host of claimants will appear with counter-proposals. Lister Hill will listen to all, study all, reason with all, and, finally, it will be he, more than any other man, who will dispose. Once again the cause of medicine and of health manpower will have been well served.

The *Bulletin* knows it speaks for all our teaching hospitals and schools of medicine and their staffs and faculties when it pays tribute to this great man. It is especially glad to do so at this time because it is so obvious that we are not writing an epitaph. For Lister Hill, hale, hearty, and keen of mind at 72, has too much to offer to be permitted to retire. A 45 year career in House and Senate will come to a close. We are certain that the President and our people will call on him to start another. And knowing Lister Hill, we know he will respond.

THE RIOT COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the President's Commission on Civil Disor-

¹ Save Medicare and Medicaid which were not within the jurisdiction of his Committee.

ders warns, "Our Nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal." Pervasive discrimination and segregation in housing has kept the millions of Negroes from sharing the opportunity and economic progress that most whites know and enjoy. The one major sector of American life in which overt racial discrimination remains is housing.

The Riot Commission specifically recommends that the Federal Government enact a comprehensive and enforceable Federal open housing law to cover the sale or rental of all housing, including single family homes. Rarely is a report as timely as this one. Rarely has a study in such depth been done at a time when we could respond immediately. And our failure to respond to such a clear and explicit statement—prepared not by a pressure group or a group with a vested interest, but by a commission appointed by the President—will only be a signal to those trapped in the ghettos that our Government is paralyzed, that it cannot respond to a need that affects every single American. In the words of the Commission, unless drastic remedies are begun at once, there will be "continuing polarization of the American community and, ultimately, the destruction of basic, democratic values."

On Monday we face the fourth cloture vote on fair housing. A majority of the Senate is on record in favor of what the Riot Commission recommends—a law covering the sale or rental of all housing. We have compromised this stand in order that the Senate not remain paralyzed behind the cloture requirement. Monday's vote may be the final attempt—the choice remains with less than a majority of the Senate. Their choice is whether to send America further along the road of polarization and the ultimate destruction of a democracy based upon equality—or to indicate to Americans and to the world that we are not a racist society. A vote for cloture on Monday will reinforce our determination to end the unconscionable insult of racial discrimination in housing.

The Commission report contained two other housing recommendations: to assist nonprofit groups with preconstruction costs for their housing programs and to provide supplements which would make homeownership possible for low-income families. During the last session I introduced legislation for both of these programs, and the proposal currently before the Banking and Currency Committee includes these provisions.

In addition, there are many other fine recommendations in this report. It focuses on the tremendous task that faces us if we are to have a society in which peace is our way of life and the call for violence falls on deaf ears. It seems to me that every thoughtful American will support the recommendations of the President's Commission.

But these recommendations are not the only striking part of the Commission report. During these several months of tremendous effort, the President's Commission on Civil Disorders has taken on the task of finding out what is wrong with America at home. Their answer is a grim one. But I believe it is a true one.

Mr. President, last summer the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] and I, along with several other Senators, introduced a joint resolution to establish a Special Commission on Civil Strife. At Senator HARRIS' suggestion, the President acted the next day to create a commission by Executive order.

In my remarks at the introduction of this resolution last July, I said that one of our problems in dealing with civil disorders is "that we have not, surprisingly, explored the fundamentals resulting in these examples of civil strife, and have not come to a national understanding of what they involve."

I said I hope that this study would "help disclose to the American people the enormous character of the social problem we are facing. I believe that this Nation is as sick as it has ever been. I believe that one of the first and necessary steps to its cure is an understanding of the vast character of the problem that lies ahead of us. It literally involves the remaking of the Nation."

The President's Commission on Civil Disorders has diagnosed that sickness for us. It describes an America that is becoming a divided society, with black and white separate but not equal. It defines an explosive mixture of discrimination, poverty, and ghetto frustration. It bluntly tells the patient the source of his symptoms—white racism.

That is as hard to take as a diagnosis of cancer. And it is just as threatening. For white racism is by nature a fatal illness in a free society, and our pride in the skill and forthrightness of the diagnosis should be matched by our horror at what we find within us, at the final verdict which we have suspected and feared, but hoped to avoid.

This is a society of opportunity. White racism will kill it if we do not act to protect ourselves from it. This is a society of freedom. White racism will kill it if we do not act. The prognosis is just as clear as the diagnosis.

The illness of this society has reached the point where its symptoms are specific and dramatic—violence, despair, rage. Our system is crying out to us for treatment. I cannot believe that we will ignore the best advice we have. I cannot believe that we will refuse to face up to the critical state of our national social health. I cannot believe that we will fail to accept treatment that can sustain the life of the society we cherish.

We must have fair housing. We must have greater opportunity. We must destroy the cancer of white racism. If we do not, history may have an interesting autopsy to perform. But autopsies are always performed on corpses—and this one will be the corpse of the free society to which we are dedicated and which we are elected to protect and serve in this Congress.

If we do act, there will be no miraculous 24-hour cure, for this is no 24-hour illness. But every day that we delay makes recovery more difficult. We must begin now.

SERVICE TO OLDER AMERICANS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, President Johnson recently

announced the award of contracts totaling more than \$2 million to establish service centers for older Americans. At the same time, President Johnson pointed out that while we have not done all that is needed, we have made great strides during the past 7 years in helping older Americans attain a secure and decent life. At this point, I should like to insert President Johnson's remarks on that occasion into the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE SIGNING OF CONTRACTS FOR OLDER AMERICANS, THE CABINET ROOM, FEBRUARY 15, 1968

Secretary Wirtz, my distinguished friends: One of our great poets had this to say about getting older: "The years between 50 and 70 are the hardest. You are always being asked to do things, and yet you aren't ancient enough to turn them down."

Well, today we are giving a great many older citizens a chance to do a great many things. And I'm willing to bet that we won't get turned down.

Today we are launching a program to provide work in community service projects for retired or unemployed citizens who are 55 and over.

The three contracts that were referred to by Secretary Wirtz that we will sign will create more than 3,000 job opportunities in the coming year. These jobs will be in schools, hospitals, in beautification projects and other efforts that will improve life for all of us.

There are a good many of us in this room today who can remember seeing people grow old 20 or 30 years ago: seeing what old age did to them.

Too often, it meant being alone. Too often, it meant being dependent on someone else—their children or their sons-in-law. It meant that as the years mounted up, their savings dwindled down. And worst of all, it meant being sick and afraid because they just didn't seem to be able to afford to be sick.

Things have changed some since then, largely because of a leadership that people like you have provided.

In March, more than 17 million older citizens will receive a Social Security increase of some 13 percent. When the benefit checks go out, another one million Americans will be lifted above the poverty line—a goal that we are working toward.

Medicare—that for many, many years was not seriously considered and after it was considered and passed, many said would not work at all—is now flourishing. More than 20 million senior citizens have its protection. Last year, 7½ million of these senior citizens received help in paying their medical bills. That is a fact—not a fantasy.

But beyond all of this, we all have another goal. That goal is to guarantee—to every older American—not only security, but the pride of being able to be active and being able to be productive.

Last year we took a major step toward that goal.

We passed a law forbidding age discrimination in employment.

We renewed and strengthened the Older Americans Act. It promised a new sense of involvement and usefulness to hundreds of thousands of our citizens.

And that is only a small part of the story. More than 4,000 Foster Grandparents in 38 states; nearly 300 older VISTA volunteers; 500 older Peace Corps volunteers; more than 3,000 members of SCORE—the Service Corps of Retired Executives—have already learned what it is to have a feeling of pride in serving others, regardless of one's age.

Now we meet here again this morning in another good cause. Soon, after the signing

of these three contracts, thousands of older citizens will know what it is to have a long life. They will know what it is to have a full life; to know what the wise Frenchman meant when he said: "Growing old is nothing more than a habit which a busy man has no time to form."

In this day of trouble and trial for our people, I want to salute those representatives, who are here in the Cabinet Room this morning, of the older Americans in our country, for your objectives, for your goals, for your persistence and for the manner in which you have represented those for whom you speak.

You have spoken where it counts; you have been represented in the rooms where there is a pay-off.

In December we signed a Social Security Bill. It affected the lives of millions of people directly; it affected the lives of all of us—all 200 million—indirectly.

President Truman proposed Medicare. But you testified for it—and you presented your opinion—your concern—and your dissent—and your voice—and your logic—and your argument before the committees.

Those committees listened and they learned. As a subsequence, 7½ million of your fellow citizens have benefited.

There will be hearings in the days to come—hearings on poverty, hearings on education, hearings on health, hearings on security for older Americans.

While we have made great progress, we have just gone a few steps up a long road. I had three figures in my mind that were brought to me by the Budget Director this year when we signed the budget.

The first one was on manpower training that is very important to you. In 1960, our budget was \$3 billion—\$3 billion for manpower training.

By fiscal year 1964—just before I took office—that had increased to \$4 billion plus.

From 1964 to 1968, largely through help that you and other concerned citizens have rendered in the Congress, in the precincts and in the election, the Congress—by an overwhelming vote—increased that \$3 billion in 1960 and that \$4 billion in 1964 to \$12 billion in this year's budget.

In poverty, which affects us all, but affects no one more than the older American—one million were removed from the poverty level by the last Social Security Bill alone—that poverty group was receiving a little over \$9 billion in the year 1960.

We had moved that \$9 billion up to \$12 billion by the fiscal year 1964. In 1964, we renewed our pledges that were made and our promises of 1960 when President Kennedy went from one end of this Nation to the other. We pledged with the members of the appropriate committees to try to move forward with the New Frontier and the Great Society.

From 1964, when we had \$12 billion to '68, this year, we have \$28 billion—more than double the amount of federal funds spent for those below the level of \$3,000.

Now, finally, if there is anything that is vital to every citizen of this land, it is health. It doesn't make any difference how many PhD's he has if he is bedridden and can't get out of his room and requires the care of other people.

Education is one of the reasons, I think, that America leads the world. I was reading a book last night; Europe was very concerned about our industrial management. They felt that we were taking the place that some of their citizens should be taking. But they said we have this great ingenuity and this great industrial management system primarily because of the education of our people.

So health, education and Social Security: In 1960 we were spending \$19 billion in that field. Fiscal '64—a little over three years later—we were spending \$23 billion in that field.

We moved it up \$4 billion. Since 1964, to 1968, we moved it not one billion, not four billion—but we have more than doubled it from \$23 billion to \$47 billion in the budget this year.

The Social Security Bill, the Poverty Bill, the Training Bill—all of these items overlap. But the important thing is that we are moving along.

Now that is not nearly what we ought to do. That is not nearly as much as we want to do. But it is a sign when you can triple manpower and when you can more than double aid to poverty in one Administration. When you can go in health, education and Social Security from \$23 billion to \$47 billion, it is something that you are not justified in saying is being completely neglected.

So to those of you who man the ramparts—to those of you who have marched in the committee rooms—to those of you who have written the letters and talked to your Congressmen and your Senators of both Parties, and the leaders of both parties, I salute, congratulate, and thank you for what you have done for your fellow man.

Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO HARPER SIMMS, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, too often we fail to give deserved recognition to some of our faithful public servants who contribute much to the beauty and general welfare of our country.

On March 1, 1968, a native son of New Mexico, Harper Simms, retired from Federal service to return to our State where he will reside. I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Simms for the outstanding job he has done with the Soil Conservation Service and for his contribution to the conservation of our natural resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement concerning Harper Simms be printed in the RECORD.

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

D. Harper Simms retired as director of the Information Division of the Soil Conservation Service on March 1, 1968 after 17 years of imaginative and meritorious national leadership in conservation information and education.

He served with distinction for the only three heads the Soil Conservation Service has had—Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Dr. Robert N. Salter, and the present Administrator, Dr. Don Williams.

The quality and quantity of his contributions to the conservation of our national resources—soil, water, plants, wildlife, watersheds, outdoor recreation, and beautification—are recognized by leading national public and private organizations.

Mr. Simms joined the newly-organized Soil Conservation Service in 1935 as an assistant messenger at a salary of \$1,080 per year. Jobs were scarce then, even for a young man with two college degrees and a Phi Beta Kappa key.

He rose through the ranks, becoming regional information chief at Albuquerque, New Mexico in 1943, a job he held until 1951 with time out for service as a Navy Lieutenant in World War II. He became SCS information director in Washington in June 1951.

Since Harper Simms is a native of New Mexico, and worked in that State for many years before his national assignment, and since I had the honor to be the Secretary of Agriculture from 1945 to 1948 and have since closely followed the activities of the SCS and of Harper Simms, I believe I am qualified to

assess his contributions to the Nation—and I do not hesitate to classify them as first rate.

Mr. Simms has served in the No. 1 public information spot of the SCS during its most trying times. He weathered the transition from the SCS founder and original Chief—Hugh Bennett—through two successors, a major reorganization of the agency that eliminated its regional offices and established a State-Washington set-up, and an enlargement of the agency's responsibilities from one mainly concerned with erosion control to one directly involved in more than 15 major activities.

His work has not gone unnoticed. He holds the Department of Agriculture's Superior Service Award and the American Motors National Conservation Award. He was made a Fellow of the Soil Conservation Society of America—a rare honor for a non-scientist.

But in the main he is another in the long line of unsung public servants who dedicate their lives and subordinate their own ambitions for an ideal—to serve the public in a cause about which they have deep personal concern.

The words Harper Simms has written, and the informational materials created under his direction—while largely credited to others or to SCS or the Department of Agriculture—will, in the words of Shakespeare's Marc Anthony, "live long after him."

Perhaps our greatest public servants are those who have an honest passion for anonymity. Harper Simms is one of these. As he leaves, I wish the public record to show that many have long recognized his true worth and wish much happiness to him and his good wife, Effie, as they leave the scene of action in which Harper has performed so creditably for 31 years and return to their native land of sunshine—New Mexico.

MASS TRANSIT FORGES PARTNERSHIP

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, President Johnson has recommended the transfer of the urban mass transit program from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Department of Transportation. As you know, I have been a vigorous supporter of the mass transit program since its very conception. I consider myself among those responsible for congressional enactment of this essential program which holds forth such promise for solving one of the major problems facing our cities—that of traffic congestion.

I believe the program has measured up to what we had hoped would be its accomplishments in its early years and I pay tribute to Secretary Weaver, Assistant Secretary Haar, and others in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, for having done so much to nourish this effort in its formative stages.

The President has made his proposal and I support it because it will provide for a more effective utilization of all Federal resources in the transportation field to improve urban transportation.

Approximately 1½ years ago this Congress voted to establish the new Department of Transportation. We lodged within that new unit all of the nonregulatory and nonmilitary transportation functions of the Federal Government, excepting the maritime and urban mass transit programs. If we had one particular goal in mind, it was to insure a sound planning and development effort

necessary for a balanced transportation system in the United States.

Certainly an effective urban transportation system is a key ingredient in such a balanced transportation system. By proposing a transfer of the urban mass transportation program to the new Department, the President has taken one more step that will bring us closer to a sound, effective and efficient national transportation system.

I do not see how planning for urban transportation can take place outside the context of the national planning effort now underway within the new Department. At the same time, such planning must necessarily take place within the context of the comprehensive planning for our urban areas by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The proposal before us very effectively combines these concepts and for that reason it has my support.

As a member of the Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I know this committee can work effectively with the two Departments concerned on legislative proposals that will strengthen and expand this program. It is my intention, as a member of the committee, to work to insure that the committee reports a bill to extend the life of the program and to provide authority to encourage private transit companies to take advantage of the opportunity to provide more adequate transportation for their customers. The future of our great cities depends in large measure on the future effectiveness of this partnership. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I will certainly look forward to working with such a partnership in attempting to solve at least this portion of the problem of our urban areas within this decade.

Let me conclude by commending both Secretary Weaver and Secretary Boyd for the cooperative effort that has resulted in this constructive suggestion by the President. It is my understanding that the total planning effort for urban areas will be strengthened in this transfer process. The Department of Housing and Urban Development will continue to oversee the comprehensive planning effort for our cities. It will be a partner in the decision as to whether a proposed urban transportation system is consistent with the plan for the overall development of a community. This represents a very happy accommodation, and I believe it deserves the full support of Congress.

STUDY BY MR. DOUGLAS PIKE ON THE 1968 VIETCONG LUNAR NEW YEAR OFFENSIVE IN SOUTH VIET- NAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, North Vietnam's defense minister and chief military strategist, Vo Nguyen Giap, has been quoted as having once said:

I am not a western general. You must not judge me by those standards. I am a Marxist. All my military operations have a purpose.

We are indeed fortunate that in our Government we do have men who have the training, motivation, and insight to

take Giap at his word and to study the problems which face us in Vietnam from the viewpoint of the enemy, the Communist leaders in Hanoi. One such expert, Mr. Douglas Pike, a U.S. Information Agency officer has recently written a study analyzing the Communist strategy underlying the recent Communist offensive against the cities of South Vietnam. I would like to place in the RECORD the text of this study entitled "The 1968 Vietcong Lunar New Year Offensive in South Vietnam."

Mr. Pike brings considerable expertise to the task of writing about the Vietnamese Communists and their strategy. He has many years of professional experience in Asia and has served a total of 6 years attached to the U.S. Embassy in Saigon. Following his service in Vietnam Mr. Pike spent a year in 1963-64 at the Center for International Studies at MIT writing a book entitled "Vietcong, the Organization and Techniques of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam." This book is considered by many to be the most objective and careful study on the Communists in South Vietnam. Mr. Pike has recently been in South Vietnam studying the Communist campaign.

In his study Mr. Pike outlines General Giap's timetable for a determined and general winter-spring offensive during which the Communist leaders hope to achieve: the destruction of the American military capability and the Vietnamese armed forces; the seizure of the governmental centers and the establishment of a coalition government excluding the present leaders in Saigon; and the unification of North and South Vietnam. I commend this study to anyone who wishes to get a clearer insight into the recent events and be better prepared to interpret future Communist moves.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the study in the RECORD.

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

THE 1968 VIETCONG LUNAR NEW YEAR
OFFENSIVE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Douglas Pike)

The lunar new year offensive launched by the communists against 36 major South Vietnamese population centers in the early hours of January 31 bears the unmistakable stamp of North Vietnamese Defense Minister, General Vo Nguyen Giap. Any assessment of the objectives, magnitude and subsequent developments of the campaign must attend closely to the mind and personality of this master tactician, victor of the Viet Minh war and supreme strategist of the present one.

General Giap is one of the best tactical commanders of the 20th century, expert at seizing the local initiative and master of the surprise diversion. He is meticulous in his planning, imaginative and bold in executing his military strikes. Only Giap, among all North of South Vietnamese communists, could have supervised the elaborate synchronization not only of the Tet offensive but of the broader Winter-Spring campaign of which it is part. For this audacious strike—and audacity is what carried it as far as it did go—must not be viewed as something isolated nor unique, but rather as the intensified continuation of something under way at least since August 1967.

The backdrop, against which General Giap planned and acted, was both temporal

and internally political. He was working against time, trying to cope with what he knows is in the long run a strategically hopeless situation in which American firepower eats deeper and deeper into his reserves of men and arms. And he faced, in the world of Politburo politics in Hanoi, increased pressure from younger members who see his preoccupation with military victory as a forlorn attempt to restage the Viet Minh war under vastly changed conditions because a generation of military technology has outdated many of the military techniques that were successful against the French.

The broad view of the war, as Giap sees it, and as he outlined it in an important series of articles published in Hanoi last September¹ goes something like this:

The American military build-up in South Viet Nam, beginning in mid-1965, resulted in two American military offensives, the 1965 dry season offensive and the 1966 dry season offensive. Both offensives failed, Giap believes, and resulted in a condition of stalemate which offered him unprecedented opportunities if only they could be properly seized. Dissension was rising in the United States, he held, and pessimism was spreading in the American ranks in Viet Nam. Foreign support for the communist cause was growing abroad, in terms of increased hostility to American military activities in Viet Nam.

But, at the same time, a sort of mirror-image condition was developing in Hanoi. The stalemate which General Giap thought he saw was, of course, a stalemate in both directions. Dissension in the Politburo developed over the lack of progress and particularly over the "no-win" policy for which General Giap held the chief responsibility. A sense of impotency developed as American planes continued to pound away at the North Vietnamese transportation and communication centers, curtailing the flow of food, consumer goods and people throughout the country as well as military material in from China and out to South Viet Nam. From the communist capitals, especially from Peking² but also from the USSR came muted but stronger criticism of the manner and means by which General Giap was conducting the war. In Hanoi, especially among younger Politburo members, General Giap was in trouble, although not serious trouble, for there is nothing definite to suggest that the dissension or dissatisfaction was at the level of a schism. But the stalemate condition which General Giap had proclaimed did have the effect of putting him—as well as Ho Chi Minh and Pham Van Dong, the other two of the big three in Hanoi—on the defensive, and forced General Giap to act more precipitously in commitment that he prefers, being by nature a cautious man reluctant to act while loose ends remain.

Throughout the Viet Minh war and during the present war General Giap has pursued what he calls his Three Phase Strategy, namely: resistance, general offensive and general uprising. The Viet Minh war is today divided by Hanoi historians into these stages, and the three also have been used in explaining the course of events of the present war.

In the summer of 1967, General Giap decided that for political and personal reasons, if not for military ones, the moment had arrived when he must order the start of the general offensive and subsequently, the general uprising phases in the south. He and his staff began work on what internally was called the Winter-Spring campaign. The

¹ *Great Victory, Big Tasks*, by Vo Nguyen Giap. New York: Praeger, 1967.

² The Chinese Communist response to the Tet offensive was formal to the point of coldness. In keeping with past Chinese attitudes and position on Viet Cong tactics and strategy, the Chinese Communists appear to consider that the Viet Cong are doing virtually everything wrong.

broad characteristics of the campaign have been an intensification of what General Giap calls Co-ordinated Fighting Methods, manifested at Dak To in Kontum Province, Con Tien in Quang Ngai Province and Loc Ninh in Binh Long Province, all three in the mountainous interior of South Viet Nam along the Cambodian and Laotian borders; an intensification of what he calls Independent Fighting Methods, that is, revolutionary guerrilla war, aimed at the cities, airfields, military headquarters, and Allied military logistic, transportation and communication networks. These were the military aspects. Also as part of the Winter-Spring campaign was a stepped-up program of terrorism, especially against the Government of Viet Nam's pacification program, which largely had been ignored before this. And, by increased organizational and motivational work by political cadres, employing the three, long-standing communist programs or techniques known as *dan van* (motivating and harnessing the energies of those South Vietnamese people controlled by the communists), *dich van* (non-military activities by the communists in GVN-controlled areas, specifically in this case, social organization work by covert cadres, to form the people of the towns and cities into mass movements that would engage in public disorders and, eventually, the general uprising, thus supporting the military assault) and *binh van* (proselyting efforts among members of the Vietnamese Armed Forces and civil service).

General Giap's campaign had three phases following the initial planning, training and indoctrinational work which preceded it and which began in July of last year. The first phase came in October, November and December, the second is taking place in the first three months of 1968 and phase three is scheduled for April, May and June. The scenario therefore calls for an end to the war by mid-1968. This is not to say Giap anticipated peace arriving by mid-year, rather that a decisive point of no return would be passed in which inexorably and irreversibly, the war would begin to work itself out to final victory, much like the situation in Europe in late 1944, when the fate of Germany was sealed and the final victory, no longer in doubt, became simply a matter of time, although months of hard fighting lay ahead. Seen lying along the route to this goal are the destruction of at least a portion of American military capability in South Viet Nam, disintegration of the Vietnamese Armed Forces as a military organization, seizure of the governmental centers in South Viet Nam down to and including the district or county level, establishment of a broad-based coalition government, although not one which would include present power holders in Saigon, and unification of North and South Viet Nam, the final objective being the goal which General Giap and fellow members of his Politburo have been pursuing ceaselessly and relentlessly since 1954.

The Co-ordinated Fighting Methods attacks at Dak To, Loc Ninh and Con Tien, in the early winter, resulted in heavy DRV casualties and were, for General Giap's purposes, inconclusive. They served to increase the grumbings by the younger elements in the Politburo, joined perhaps by certain of the "professional" generals in Hanoi, the line commanders, who argued that they had lost a sizeable number of good men in these mountain battles to no very good purpose in a campaign large enough to extract a real price but too small to be decisive. However, the campaign ground on and the plans went forward for the general offensive which was to deal a major, or hopefully catastrophic, blow at the enemy, in actuality, the South Vietnamese rather than the Americans.

Meanwhile, the diplomats and propagandists in Hanoi were busy developing a peace overture campaign which was a fabric woven of many threads. Peace or "talks" overtures—the difference between the two being lost as

the word "peace" spread around the world—served propaganda ends, possibly could achieve a cessation of air strikes into North Viet Nam, helped reduce the grumbling in the Politburo and, above all, formed the right hook which together with the left jab was to assure victory.

Thus, in the broadest terms, the grand strategy of Hanoi, which goes beyond General Giap's military contributions, is a two-salient thrust, one salient being military and the other being diplomatic-negotiational.

The military salient has two prongs. Employing independent fighting methods, a maximum strike is being mounted in South Viet Nam and focused on the cities. It is billed as the general uprising and portrayed to the rank and file as Armageddon. General Giap used at least fifty percent of his main strike forces, estimated at 118,000 total,³ although he employed southern Viet Cong soldiers rather than Northern (PAVN) troops wherever possible. The Tet offensive, heert of the general offensive, concentrated on airfields and air support activities, military headquarters, civilian governmental complexes, material and logistic centers, as well, of course, as the 36 largest towns and cities of the country. Hopefully, to General Giap, the general offensive will have these results: the Americans will crack, militarily and psychologically; a significant portion of what he regards as the real American strength—aircraft, communication and transportation techniques and well-coordinated command centers—will be destroyed; the Vietnamese Armed Forces will disintegrate, and the population will rise up in massive support of the communists, if not enthusiastically at least because it appears to be the wise individual thing to do. Employing concentrated fighting methods, the other prong of the salient, comes the Dien Bien Phu gambit, probably at Khe Sanh. The essence of the military salient is a play for time—take and hold the order, so that time will run out especially for the Americans.

The diplomatic-negotiational salient is the political attack. Its first prong is the negotiational ploy, offering a political "settlement" of the war. Beginning in December of last year Hanoi began its overtures directed at talking the Americans out of South Viet Nam under the world worst possible circumstances to them. The second prong is aimed at the establishment of a coalition government in South Viet Nam, a coalition government as that term is used peculiarly by the communists. The vehicle for this is a series of specially designed interim communist front organizations in South Viet Nam, most important of which is the *Alliance of National Peace Forces in Saigon*, (described in Appendix A). These sprang up in South Viet Nam beginning in early February of this year. They are supposed to help establish a new ruling group in South Viet Nam that excludes the present members of the Government of Viet Nam.

Implicit in this double-pronged salient strategy is a difference of opinion among members of the DRV politburo. Giap continues to see the route to victory as military—the way to win, he argues, is militarily, on the ground, in South Viet Nam, not at the con-

ference table and not as the result of the American presidential elections. This view, from all evidence, is shared by Ho Chi Minh and Pham Van Dong, who is Ho's most likely successor. Le Duan, the fourth leading figure in the Politburo probably supports, the big three but with some reservations, while Truong Chinh, the fifth man plays a role which, if it is important, is unclear. The younger members of the Politburo while subscribing to the two-salient approach, argue for greater emphasis on the diplomatic-negotiational salient, regarding the military salient as valuable chiefly as a means of closing the ring. Essentially this fighting-negotiating method was the pattern during the 1954 Indochina Conference in Geneva and, in Korea, during the period prior to and during the armistice talks that ended Korean hostilities.

The Tet offensive, within this context, quickly became many things to many men. Assessment of the degree of failure must be built on an assessment of the enemy's intentions. If intentions in the offensive were limited, then the failure was a limited one; if more ambitious, then the failure was a major one. And if the enemy intention was a knock-out punch then, quite obviously, the failure was monumental. In short, intentions are a continuum. The Tet offensive was wrapped in the great Vietnamese communist social myth of the General Uprising,⁴ which like all social myths essentially is something existing in men's minds, not in the finite world. What counts is not truth but what is believed to be true. In communist public statements the events of early February generally were termed "the offensive campaign and uprising campaign"; internal documents called it a "general offensive to culminate in the general uprising"; during indoctrination sessions for the rank and file, in previous months, it was most frequently billed as a general uprising; and the political cadres mingling with the population during the offensive almost universally said or implied it was the general uprising.

An indication of what the offensive meant to the rank and file communists can be found in a tabulation of prisoner interrogation reports.⁵

With respect to the basic purpose of the assignment given individuals, a sample shows 40 percent were told this was to be the General Uprising; 32 percent were told simply they were to take part in an attack of unspecified dimensions (overwhelmingly, this is what those who attacked Saigon in individual actions, such as the attack on the U.S. Embassy, were told); 26 percent were told they were to seize and hold the cities; (chiefly the explanation in Central Viet Nam area); about 20 percent were told the purpose of the attack was "to drive out the Americans"; and about 15 percent were given to understand that the military attack would culminate in establishment of a coalition government.⁶

An oblique indication of the direction the leadership believed the offensive would move

⁴ General Uprising, or *Khoi Nghia*, is a social myth, a term employed here in the sense used by Georges Sorel, the French sociologist. As such it has precise and concrete meaning, but still is something that exists chiefly in the mind. Sorel is most directly associated with the myth of the General Strike, the idea that some day the workers of the world simultaneously will strike, bringing all industry, transportation, government, society itself, to a standstill, after which the workers will simply take over the controls of power. The General Uprising is the same myth in an agrarian setting.

⁵ A sample of about 200, covering persons who were captured or surrendered in the period January 31-February 9.

⁶ Some prisoners gave more than one explanation.

lies in the fact that a large number of the rank and file, especially in Central Viet Nam did not have any specific withdrawal plans. Some 47 percent of the prisoners said they did not receive withdrawal plans as part of their individual assignment; 21 percent did have some such plan; and 22 percent either were given no instructions (although their officers may have received them) or were told that subsequent actions would depend on developments. These troops may have been regarded by the leadership as expendable, but the pattern is quite unlike previous communist military behavior in the war and most certainly will hurt future communist leadership credibility.

One of the best indications of the leadership's calculation can be found in the battle order of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the National Liberation Front (see Appendix B). The heart of this order was these specific instructions to the troops:

"1. Wipe out a good deal of the enemy's potential, defeat the U.S. and satellite troops; cause disintegration of the puppet army.

"2. Overthrow the lackey government at all echelons, drastically punish all high-level traitors and all tyrants.

"3. Establish a People's Revolutionary Government at all levels, strive to defend this government and resolutely smash all enemy counter-offensive attempts.

"Implement all policies set down by the National Liberation Front."

The major anticipated results of the Tet offensive and the Winter-Spring campaign appear to be three-fold. First, that the Vietnamese Armed Forces would disintegrate as a coherent military organization, that is reach a condition in which individual military units might remain intact but in which the system would be in disarray, fragmented and chaotic, its officers receiving no orders since higher headquarters would have been overrun, its troops disoriented and demoralized. The pattern of the attacks, it is clear from documents, consisted of strikes at the ARVN chain of command rather than at the decimation of large numbers of troops. The documents and prisoner reports also indicate the leadership counted heavily on the soldiers of the Vietnamese Armed Forces, not only not fighting, but joining the communists en masse. The creation of the paper organization, the Patriotic Armed Forces, (see Appendix B) was for the purpose of quickly employing the services of vast numbers of defecting ARVN soldiers.

Second, the calculation of General Giap was that a great deal of public support would be forthcoming. This is the political dimension of the Tet offensive. It is a safe estimate that for every five communist soldiers in the offensive there was one political cadre in action. During individual city operations political cadres moved from house to house or among the early morning crowds, mingling with the people, explaining the general uprising and soliciting support. Many carried with them lists of names of persons ostensibly willing to take part in public demonstrations. A common theme used by these cadres was that the NLF stood for democracy, social welfare, neutralism. Peace was a recurrent theme, directed especially toward Buddhist women. Commando units striking at specific targets in the cities had satellite political cadres circling, four or five blocks away, the installation under attack, keeping people out of the fire fight and soliciting support. A special "coalition" flag was flown. Typical of this political activity was a "people's court" held at the intersection of Minh Mang and Su Van Manh streets in Cholon. A cadre on a soap box told an assembled crowd that standing next to him was a woman whose son was a GVN security agent. He asked the crowd what "justice" should be meted out. The crowd shouted: "Don't execute her." So the cadre replied that she would be let off with a warning to call her

³ Estimates of the enemy strength at the start of the Winter-Spring campaign were these: National Liberation Front full-military, 64,000; North Vietnamese units in the South, 54,000; National Liberation Front para-military (the regional or territorial troops and the local guerrillas) 70,000-90,000; National Liberation Front membership: 300,000 (including 40,000 civilian cadres). One captured document said that one-third of all forces and units employed must be members of the People's Revolutionary Party, the communist party of South Viet Nam, which may have been a limiting factor on the number of forces employed in the Tet offensive.

son back from the GVN ranks. Then the cadre went on to explain the general uprising. A clique of other political cadres in the crowd applauded throughout the speech, urging those next to them to do likewise. No one of these incidents in itself may be significant. What is important is that the communists expended a great deal of effort and allocated considerable resources, especially manpower, in creating them.

Although almost all of the rank and file communists were told to expect support from the population, either specific assistance or the General Uprising, 90 percent of the prisoners said they received no aid from the general population; only two percent said they received unsolicited assistance; six percent of the reports did not touch on this matter.

The third expectation by General Giap was that a strong punitive blow could be delivered against the Americans. Again, the pattern of the offensive suggests that he sought not to decimate large numbers of Americans—this being futile in a manpower sense, like trying to bail the ocean dry—but to cripple the American air strike ability, and to disrupt the American military and civilian network that ties central command centers with field headquarters through an elaborate communication network. In short, the target was the American ability to assess and respond quickly to attack.

Beyond this lies the domain of the unknowable: how much General Giap was the victim of overly optimistic reports from his commanders in the south, and, to what degree Politburo politics caused him to override his better judgement. Only historians, far into the future, will be able to answer these questions with certainty.

At this writing the prospects for the remainder of the Winter-Spring offensive, in a very tentative way, appear to be these:

1. Communist assertion of victory and the semblance of continuity, the "all is going according to plan" approach. Doctrinally, increased emphasis on the protracted conflict theme.

2. Continued public reference to a negotiated settlement but, for the short run, actually, a tapering off of negotiational overtures.

3. An effort to maintain the appearance of high tempo military activity—especially political work and military pressure on the urban centers—while the obviously necessary regrouping, resupplying and retraining missions are pursued. Military activity by PAVN troops especially at Khe Sanh although this need not involve a full closing of the battle of Khe Sanh.

4. Possibly the introduction of new, more sophisticated weapons by the communists. Possibly Hanoi requests for more foreign assistance from communist nations.

APPENDIX A

INTERIM COMMUNIST POLITICAL GROUPS FORMED AS PART OF 1968 TET OFFENSIVE

The chief communist front organizations formed during the 1968 Tet offensive consists of three types, negotiational front organizations, military proselyting (*dinh van*) organizations, and administrative organs:

Alliance of National Peace Forces in Saigon (Lien Minh Cac Luc Dan Toc va Hoa Binh a Saigon). First reference to this came in a *Nhan Dan* (Hanoi) article dated January 31. It is aimed at "intellectuals, industrialists, political party representatives, religious organization representatives, etc." which is to

say, urban middle-class Vietnamese. The platform of the group consists of four planks: "a) Overthrow the Thieu government and establish power representing all strata of the South Vietnamese people; b) Fight to regain national sovereignty and press for an end of the U.S. unjust war and withdrawal of all U.S. and satellite troops; c) Restore peace and build an independent, democratic and peaceful South Viet Nam. (Note: in the South Viet Nam version, this read "... independent, democratic, peaceful and mental South Viet Nam"); d) Negotiate with the National Liberation Front, political organ of the Viet Cong, in order to enforce above aspirations..." This group is apparently intended to present the appearance of being a third force in South Viet Nam, standing between the communists and the Americans, by-passing the GVN.

National, Democratic, Peace Alliance Front of Central Part of Central Viet Nam. This is the so-called Hue-group. First known public reference to it came on February 1, in a broadcast over the captured Hue radio station. It said the group stood for: "1) independence, sovereignty; 2) freedom, democracy; 3) peace, neutrality; and 4) food, clothes and land". Subsequent broadcasts lumped the above four planks into one, adding then two others: "2) withdrawal of U.S. and foreign troops and 3) establishment of a coalition administration in South Viet Nam, normalization of north-south relations and preparation for unification." This platform puts the Hue group closer to the North Vietnamese objectives than is the Saigon group. Head of the Hue group is listed as Dr. Le Van Hao, a Hue University ethnologist, who had been active in the 1966 Buddhist Struggle Movement as editor of that movement's publication, *Vietnam Vietnam*. He is generally regarded in Hue as a Trotskyite. The appeals of this group indicate that it is aimed chiefly at students in Central Viet Nam.

The second type of interim organizations formed during the Tet offensive are *ad hoc* military groups to incorporate Vietnamese armed forces' defectors, hopefully as complete military units. These include such groups as

1. *Association of Patriotic Soldiers and Officers in Quang Nam-Da Nang*.

2. *Federation of Peace-Loving Buddhist Armymen in Central Viet Nam*.

3. *Association of Soldiers and Officers of the First (ARVN) Division Who Have Broken with the Saigon Army*.

4. *Quang Ngai Insurrectionary Army Corps*. Apparently these groups collective are to be known as the *Patriotic Armed Forces*, although possibly the PAF is conceived as still another collection of ARVN defectors fighting with the Communists.

The third group of organizations is made up of revolutionary administration councils, which apparently were designed to administer towns and cities once they had been taken by the Viet Cong. The concept of these appears to be of a commune nature, similar to the original Paris commune or the Shanghai commune of the 1920's. There were a number of public references to these councils in the first days of the General Offensive, but none after February 4, as far as can be determined.

APPENDIX B

ATTACK ORDER FROM THE PRESIDUM OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, NATIONAL FRONT FOR THE LIBERATION OF SOUTH VIETNAM (NFLSVN), TO ALL CADRE AND MEN OF THE LIBERATION ARMY

COMPATRIOTS: In the wake of the successive victories achieved during the past few years, the situation at home and throughout the world is favorable to the revolutionary task being undertaken by our people. The confused Americans are bogged down

and are hurting badly. The puppet army, a mercenary instrument at the Americans' disposal, is well on its way to complete disruption. The corrupt and ineffective stogie is increasingly exhibiting its traitorous nature. Our revolutionary forces have attained full-fledged maturity and have become unprecedently powerful. North Viet Nam, the major rear base of the South, is unceasingly consolidated; is dealing the most stunning blows to the American aggressors in their war of destruction; and, together with the South, is doing its utmost to fight the Americans for the country's salvation. Our friends all over the world, including the progressive American people, sympathize with and support us wholeheartedly.

We are confronted with an extremely profitable situation. The Presidium of the Central Committee, NFLSVN, has decided to launch a full-scale attack to defeat the enemy and to return the government to the people.

All military forces of the Liberation Army and militant political forces are ordered to collaborate closely with different patriotic forces and the entire population to simultaneously dash forward to:

Wipe out a good deal of enemy potential, defeat the American and satellite troops, and disrupt the puppet army;

Overthrow all levels of the stogie government and drastically punish all high echelon traitors and all "tyrants";

Establish the people's revolutionary government at all levels, strive to defend the [revolutionary] government, resolutely smash all enemy attempts at counter-offensive under all circumstances;

And implement all policies that have been laid down by the Front.

Compatriots, cadre and men:
Courageously march forward.

We are bound to score full victory.

APPENDIX C

[Inclosure B]

HEADQUARTERS, SOUTH VIETNAM, LIBERATION ARMY.

ORDER OF THE DAY OF THE HEADQUARTERS, ALL SOUTH VIETNAM LIBERATION ARMED FORCES

To all cadre and combatants:

Move forward to achieve final victory!

The [1968] Tet greeting of Chairman Ho [Chi Minh] is actually a combat order for our entire Army and population [to carry out the all-out attack].

And in compliance with the attack order of the Presidium, Central Committee SVN Liberation Front, all cadre and combatants of all South Viet Nam Liberation Armed Forces should move forward to:

Carry out direct [overt] attacks on all the headquarters of the enemy [FWMAF/RVNAF], to disrupt the U.S. Imperialists' will for aggression and to smash the Puppet Government and Puppet Army, the lackeys of the U.S. [We will] restore power to the people, completely liberate 14,000,000 people of South Viet Nam, fulfill our revolutionary task of establishing democracy throughout the country.

This will be the greatest battle ever fought throughout the history of our country. It will bring forth world-wide change but will also require many sacrifices. It will decide the fate and the survival of our Fatherland and will shake the world and cause the most bitter failure to the imperialist ring-leaders.

Our country has a history of four thousand years of fighting and defeating foreign aggression, particularly glorious battles such as Bach Dang, Chi Lang, Dong Da and Dien Bien Phu. We defeated the special war and are defeating the limited war of the Americans. We resolutely move forward to completely defeat the American aggressors in order to restore independence and liberty in our country.

Dear comrades, our liberation armed units have had many achievements in the past. This will be a good opportunity for you to score more brilliant and heroic victories. Through this opportunity, you will be able to make maximum use of your abilities, demonstrate your devotion to the revolution and your unsubdued will to get even for what has been done to our country and brighten our beloved country.

In the name of our Fatherland's independence and liberty, headquarters of all South Viet Nam Liberation Armed Forces orders every cadre and combatant to—

1. Move forward aggressively to carry out decisive and repeated attacks in order to annihilate as many American, satellite and puppet troops as possible in conjunction with political struggles and military proselyting activities. Each cadre and combatant must be doggedly determined to accomplish their combat mission. Each local area must also accomplish its assigned mission.

2. Display to the utmost your revolutionary heroism by surmounting all hardships and difficulties and making sacrifices so as to be able to fight continually and aggressively. Be prepared to smash all enemy counterattacks and maintain your revolutionary standpoint under all circumstances. Be resolute in achieving continuous victories and secure the final victory at all costs.

3. Correctly comply with all combat discipline and the Front policies. Strive to assist and protect the people and motivate them to comply with the Front policies.

Dear comrades, it is evident that the American aggressors are losing.

The call for assault to achieve independence and liberty has sounded.

The Truong Son [Annamese Cordilliers] and the Mekong River are moving.

You, comrades should act as heroes of Viet Nam and with the spirit and pride of combatants of the Liberation Army.

The final victory will be with us.

Day Month 1968.

(Instruction: This Inclosure B will be read to every cadre and combatant prior to departure for attack.)

INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE AND THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, individual initiative and the small businessman are sinew and bone of the American way of life. It has always been the American dream, from the very beginnings of our country, to be one's own boss. That this is true today becomes obvious when we read what President Johnson said last October:

Today, 95% of the businesses in the United States are small. They employ 4 out of every 10 of our wage earners. They provide a family income for more than 75 million Americans.

The 95 percent of our businesses represents more than 5 million small businessmen who are most certainly a vital force in our economy.

I commend the Small Business Administration for its active role in promoting the growth of the economy through assistance to the small businessmen of the United States.

Through the capable direction of Administrator Robert C. Moot, and with the support and interest of the President, the Small Business Administration continues to effectively provide financial assistance and administrative guidance to the Nation's small businessmen so that they may take full advantage of opportunities available to them.

Mr. President, in my home State of Alabama the Small Business Administration during fiscal year 1967 made 220 long-term loans totaling \$14,203,000.

Included in this total are 183 loans made to help small businessmen, adding up to \$11,554,000.

Twenty-one disadvantaged persons received \$254,000 to help establish a business or improve an existing one.

Three displaced businesses, forced to relocate due to highway or urban renewal programs, received \$313,000 in long-term loans.

Four disaster loans—\$17,000—were made, and nine local development companies received \$2,065,000.

I am gratified that the Small Business Administration devotes itself to helping small businesses all over the United States.

A notable example of SBA's assistance to a small business in one of our urban centers is the help given Aladdin Cleaners & Dyers, Inc., of Birmingham, Ala.

In April of 1946 Aladdin Cleaners & Dyers was purchased by Mrs. Gladys D. McNeal, her husband, and another man. They had had previous experience in operating a small drycleaning plant at Dora, Ala.

When her husband died in 1950, Mrs. McNeal assumed full management of the Aladdin Cleaners & Dyers, and proved to be a very efficient and progressive businesswoman.

In 1957, the company opened a plant in Mountain Brook, Ala., and established three branch offices in 1959. The following year Mrs. McNeal opened a completely new drycleaning plant at the Eastwood Mall Shopping Center in the Birmingham suburbs. In 1962 they added to it a coin-operated drycleaning center. A small laundromat in another Birmingham suburb, Crestline Village, was added to the company in 1963.

During May of 1963, Mrs. McNeal made the decision to replace the original Aladdin plant located in the Woodlawn section of Birmingham. The firm applied for an SBA loan to construct and equip the new location.

At the time they obtained the loan the firm had assets of \$84,296 and a net worth of \$66,825. Sales for the fiscal year 1962 were \$260,649.

Today, less than 5 years later, Aladdin Cleaners & Dyers has shown great success and rapid growth. Sales for the fiscal year 1966 were \$425,000. The firm reports total assets of \$250,000 and a net worth of \$183,566.

When the 1963 loan was granted, the firm had three drycleaning plants with three branches manned by 34 employees. Now there are three plants, eight business offices, and a staff of 60.

Mrs. McNeal credits a great deal of her success to the long-term financing provided by the Small Business Administration. She acknowledges that the firm would not be at the point it is today without such assistance.

Mrs. McNeal's foresight, capability, and ambition helped her utilize the opportunities made available to her through the Small Business Administration. Her ability has been recognized in trade journals of the drycleaning in-

dustry—a 1960 article in the Guide, and a Dry Cleaning World story in 1966.

The help that the Small Business Administration provides small businesses such as Aladdin Cleaners & Dyers is of great importance to the continued expansion and good climate of our American economy.

Mr. President, I am grateful to Administrator Robert C. Moot and the staff of the Small Business Administration for their awareness of the needs of the small businessman and for their aggressive and progressive actions in assisting them.

Mr. President, I have taken the time of the Senate to narrate the experience of one firm, but I believe it illustrates the many thousands of firms throughout the United States that have been helped. Many of them have been enabled to stay alive, to grow, and to prosper not only through loans and credit from SBA but also through advice and help that SBA is constantly giving to the small businesses throughout America. I believe it is worthy of note.

CHARTER DAY CONVOCATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on February 24, 1968, at a charter day convocation, Dr. Hurst R. Anderson, president of the American University, made a report to Congress through Vice President HUMPHREY. Let me say that the speaker at the charter day convocation was the distinguished Vice President of the United States.

The Congress passed the charter legislation 75 years earlier, and President Benjamin Harrison signed the act into law on February 24, 1893. I ask unanimous consent that the report by Dr. Anderson on the 75th anniversary of the chartering of American University, in Washington, D.C., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

IN RETROSPECT

(By Hurst R. Anderson)

Mr. Vice President, members of the board of trustees of the university, members of the faculty, student body, staff, and other distinguished guests and institutional representatives: We are met today in a simple ceremony to express our gratitude for the federal charter under which this university has operated for seventy-five years. The Congress passed the Charter legislation, and President Benjamin Harrison signed the bill on February 24, 1893. The act, a very remarkable one indeed, created for us the opportunities and charged us with the responsibilities which have become The American University heritage cherished through the years.

We thought it only fitting that on this date we report to you, Mr. Vice President, on our seventy-five years of stewardship—what we believe we have accomplished on this hill overlooking the nation's capital.

The beginnings were in the dreams and hopes of a few men, led by a distinguished scholar, Dr. John Fletcher Hurst, the Bishop of The Methodist Church in residence in Washington. He chose the site, and he himself made the down payment on this property, undergirded only by a faith that here would be built a great university dedicated to the welfare of men of all faiths and creeds and, indeed, to the nation and community of nations. He gave his life in the struggle to

pay in full the purchase price of \$100,000 (and now worth several million), which cleared the title on the property on which we even now continue to build for the future.

The University was opened in 1914 with twenty-eight graduate students enrolled. President Woodrow Wilson delivered the address from a platform erected in front of the steps of Hurst Hall. He was the first of a number of Presidents and other distinguished government officials who have participated in major events on this campus; of this fact we are justly proud.

The life and growth of The American University have been interwoven with the economic and political life of the nation. The postponing of its opening was made necessary because of the difficulty of securing funds in a period when gifts were not readily available.

During two world wars, all of the facilities on this hilltop were offered to the Government for whatever uses were deemed desirable. In the uncompleted McKinley Hall was born the Chemical Warfare Division of the United States Army. In other buildings were housed the Red Cross and the United States Naval Bomb Disposal School. During the New Deal days of rapid government expansion, our downtown property was used to further the advanced education of hundreds of young government workers. This was the origin of our School of Government and Public Administration.

The College of Arts and Sciences was opened in 1925 to undergird the already established graduate program, to insure the broadest general education needed as a prerequisite for intensive and fruitful graduate study. The Washington College of Law became the law school of the University to further the development of this program in a city with unusual demands for those trained for the legal profession. The School of Business Administration was organized as the first such school in the city, established to serve the expanded business community and to emphasize the analysis and understanding of the relationship between business and government. The School of International Service was founded in a period when the needs of a nation for trained manpower in this area had become critical. The Theological Seminary was invited to join the cluster of schools and, though independent, now graces the northwest corner of our campus with a name appropriate to its theological tradition, Wesley Theological Seminary. In an attempt to help supply the needs for trained nursing personnel, the Lucy Webb Hayes School of Nursing was established, carrying the name of the wife of former President Rutherford B. Hayes. The College of Continuing Education was formally organized to bring dignity and stature to the growing demand for adult education courses.

Thus it can be fairly said that the University, opened for a few graduate students in a semi-rural section of the District of Columbia, has grown with, and because of, the spectacular expansion of this national, and now international, city and has, in each four or five-year period, so adapted itself to meet the needs of one of the world's great urban areas that its growth has been, in fact, inevitable.

A few relevant facts concerning this growth speak for themselves:

In 1893 the University consisted of ninety-two acres of undeveloped land, with a newly acquired federal charter and broad powers to develop any kind of higher education which the Board of Trustees deemed wise. It had no faculty; it had no students.

In 1914 the University consisted of one building, Hurst Hall, twenty-eight recently admitted graduate students, a Chancellor, and seven "faculty members."

In 1968 one has but to look about to see the changes wrought between 1914 and 1968.

Total resources of the institution are now approximately \$50,000,000. We have about 14,000 students from all states of the Union and from eighty-five foreign countries, and 610 faculty members actively participating in the life of the University, individually and through the University Senate with its numerous effective committees. There are now eight Schools and Colleges with a substantial enrollment in each. Undergirding all of this we have a fundamental belief in the future mission and position of this University in the total program of higher education in America.

Needless to say, Mr. Vice President, we are proud of this record. With all of the normal struggles of a new, expanding institution, we have achieved reasonable maturity, with a restlessness characteristic of one with significant dreams and hopes for the future.

I would be remiss if I did not mention what seems to many of us here in Washington to be the future grand design for higher education in this city. We have in the District of Columbia five great universities. We are now organized in the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area. We feel that our growth in the future should be closely related to the growth of each and every member of the Consortium and that together we can bring to this great city the most profound distinction as a major center of research, of teaching, and of public service. The American University has pledged itself, and renews its pledge today, to work with devotion and with an unconditional commitment to this significant Consortium objective.

Seventy-five years of growth and development are therefore but a prologue to the future. We are humbly grateful for the authority and trust which the federal government extended to us in 1893. We have tried to measure up to this faith and pledge to you today, Mr. Vice President, and to the Congress of the United States that our efforts will continue and be intensified with the realization that our greatest challenges lie ahead.

THE REAL ISSUES CONCERNING VIETNAM NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. President, the Economist of London is one of the most respected publications in the world. In recent years its coverage of the war in Vietnam has been particularly astute, lucid, and responsible. Time and again, the Economist's writers have blown away the rhetorical smokescreen that has so frequently obscured the real issues in the Vietnamese conflict.

Perhaps a part of their success in dealing with the war has been due to the fact that they are able to take the perspective of noncombatants. This the English are—and yet they are noncombatants who wish America well, and who understand that the conflict has ramifications that deeply affect noncombatants as well as combatants all over the world.

The current issue of the Economist is especially enlightening. It makes a major point that is frequently overlooked in America—where hope and prayer for speedy negotiations leading to a settlement sometimes obscures the central point of the struggle. That point is this: Who will control the Government of South Vietnam?

Americans forget this sometimes; and when we do, it is easy to become impatient—and angry—at the apparent snail's pace toward the negotiating table. What we neglect to note in our anger is that there is little to negotiate about concern-

ing the basic issue of the war—that is, who will dominate the Government of South Vietnam, the Communists or the non-Communists; the majority of the people of South Vietnam, or a nonmajority directed by the North?

And that is the point that the Economist makes. Negotiations may be very useful to paper over a defeat for one side or the other, and both President Johnson and President Ho Chi Minh are aware of this. But the central issue remains—who wins?

President Johnson has stated again and again that he will abide by any system of South Vietnamese Government that derives from a one-man, one-vote system—even should a free election favor the Vietcong. President Ho Chi Minh has been equally insistent that a South Vietnamese Government be established on a nonrepresentative basis, where Vietcong and North Vietnamese influence would prevail.

That is why negotiations have been so slow in coming and, indeed, why a war is going on.

Neither a cessation of bombing, nor the unwillingness for a "political settlement," nor the lack of U.N. participation, nor lack of site, are the factors that postpone negotiations. What postpones negotiations is the very basic substantive nature of what those negotiations would yield. And, at least for now, neither the Americans and the South Vietnamese on one side, nor the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese on the other, are willing to give up control of South Vietnam to the other.

That is the sad but accurate state of affairs as of this moment. If we wish to understand the situation, if we wish to contribute our efforts toward a resolution of the conflict, we had better understand that this is the situation as it exists and not fool ourselves with an easier, but false, appraisal.

I ask unanimous consent that the lead article of the Economist of February 17, 1968 be printed in the RECORD.

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

IF HE GETS TO SAIGON

The trouble with Vietnam is that there can be no such thing as a neutral solution to this war. One side must win, and the other lose, and the result will have an ideological impact far beyond Vietnam. That is what plagues the peacemakers: U Thant, hustling from Moscow to London and from London to the North Vietnamese mission in Paris; Mr. Wilson, telling the House of Commons on Tuesday that the gap between the two sides is "very narrow indeed"; and everybody else who just wants the war to stop. They would all like to find a way of ending the fighting that did not require either side to accept defeat. The men who are conducting the war, President Ho Chi Minh and President Johnson, know that this is impossible. On everything except the central issue of the war they can and should offer each other liberal terms. The ultimate acceptance of defeat, by one side or the other, will come sooner if the winner is magnanimous about non-essentials. But both President Ho and President Johnson know that the central issue is who will dominate the government in Saigon after the war: the communists, or the noncommunists. And there is no way of fudging the answer to this question. It has got to be one or the other.

It is necessary to say this, because the beastliness of the past two weeks has driven many people to hope for the impossible. The war cannot just be switched off, by the flick of a master-finger, before the question it is being fought to answer has been answered. On Wednesday night Mr. Dean Rusk gave a chilling reminder of how little real progress there has been towards negotiations while the peacemakers have been making the headlines. The North Vietnamese still seem to see negotiations primarily as a device that will stop them being bombed. The Americans see no advantage in talking for talking's sake. So the war goes on.

This does not mean that two sides will not meet to negotiate some time this year. It could even happen quite soon. The great battle that opened on January 30th with the Vietcong's attacks on the towns looks more and more like the knife-edge of the war. If General Giap beats General Westmoreland at Khe Sanh, and if the Vietcong show that they can continue to dispute the allies' control over the towns, it is unlikely that the Americans will have the heart for the total military campaign that would then be needed to regain the upper hand. If the communists achieve neither of these things, the casualties they have suffered in this offensive—the loss of key men like General Tran Do as well as many of their best troops—will make it harder for them to fall back on the strategy of a "protracted war." When this battle has been fought to a finish both sides may at last be ready to negotiate. But that moment will not come—they will not meet to talk, or the talks would be no more than a verbal tennis match if they did—until one of them is ready to give the other best on the heart of the matter. There is no reason to think that the battle has yet produced the evidence that will bring that about.

There is one way, and one way only, in which the war could be ended in anything like a draw. That is by a physical division of the country, as Ireland was divided in 1921 and Korea in 1945 and Laos in 1962. But it is very difficult to believe that Ho Chi Minh will agree to that. The Irish formula might give him the northern provinces around the old imperial capital of Hué. The Laos formula, which began as an attempt to share the country's government among the contending parties but almost immediately broke down into a partition based on the areas each army occupied, has even less to offer him. It would leave the communists running part of the Mekong delta and very little else except large stretches of almost uninhabited back-country. Ho is an old man and, according to some communists who have recently been in Hanoi, a sick one. His aim is to bring the whole of Vietnam, and probably the whole of Indochina, under a communist government. That means establishing the communists in Saigon; and, if he wants to live to see it, doing it soon. It is desperately hard to see him settling for a few fragments of his life's dream.

The real issue is who controls Saigon, and here the result cannot be a draw. The South Vietnam that emerges from the war may be neutral in a military sense, as Austria and Finland are. It cannot be politically neuter. It will either be a society organised on a marxist basis, or it will not. There is no third option. The peace settlement may give certain secured positions to the people on the losing side. They may be allowed the right to operate as a tolerated opposition; they may even be given a few junior jobs in what will politely be called a coalition government. But the commanding heights—which means the ministries that regulate the armed forces and the economy—will be controlled by men who speak for one system or the other. Until there is at least a tacit agreement about which way the commanding heights will go a negotiation will be a dialogue between peo-

ple speaking different languages. Can anyone imagine the two sides seriously sitting down to persuade each other of the relative merits of communism and capitalist pluralism for the South Vietnam of the future? It is the balance of military advantage, and nothing else, which will decide that argument. The job of negotiations is to work out the lesser concessions that will make the pill palatable to whoever has to swallow it.

This is why the Russians (see page 27) say that negotiations ought to begin at once. They know that, with the Vietcong still fighting in parts of Hué and Saigon and the North Vietnamese regulars still sitting around Khe Sanh, General Giap's offensive may have reached its high-water mark. The next round of the campaign, if Giap insists on it, could be much dicier for him. The Russians are saying that if Mr. Johnson will admit defeat now they will arrange for the concessions of detail that would ease his withdrawal. That is the kind of situation to which professional intermediaries like U Thant (and Mr. Wilson) feel they must respond, time and again, in the belief that they are on the brink of making history. For a day or two it even looks interesting.

But Mr. Johnson knows that the concessions the Russians are still talking about would not, and could not, disguise the extent of the United States' defeat. It is not just a matter of Vietnam. The Americans cannot give up Saigon to Ho Chi Minh without enormously weakening their position in the five other countries of south-east Asia that already have communist insurrections on their hands. And it would go beyond that. The Americans would be admitting that they had been beaten by the technique of guerilla war as applied by a minority of the population of one small Asian country. That would affect the way that men in Moscow, and in many other places, make their plans for the future. There are a lot of people in Britain who, from what they have said and written in the past two weeks, look forward to an American defeat of that magnitude. They do not see it exactly that way, of course. They are bemused by the false excitement of diplomatic matchmakers, by good intentions outrunning all recognition of what, in reality, they do intend. President Ho does not live in this particularly illusory world; nor does President Johnson which is why, through the years, the matchmakers have invariably failed: the North Vietnamese, like the Americans, insist on fighting.

H.R. 2516—EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE BILL (AMENDMENT NO. 554)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Department of Justice has prepared an explanation of amendment No. 554, offered to the bill H.R. 2516. The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] is the author of amendment No. 554.

On his behalf I ask unanimous consent that the explanation offered by the Department of Justice be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question. Did the Department of Justice prepare that statement in its capacity as legal adviser or as chief lobbyist for the administration?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that the Department of Justice was requested to prepare an explanation of the substitute which the minority leader has authored. I have read the explanation. I believe it is accurate. I believe its inclusion in the RECORD would be helpful to our colleagues.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator possess

sufficient information as to the motive which inspired preparation of the paper by the Department of Justice? The Department of Justice acts, in respect to this bill, certainly in the capacity of chief lobbyist for the administration, and I want to know if this is the argument of a lobbyist or a legal opinion; and I would like to know how it is that the Department of Justice furnishes legal opinions to the distinguished minority leader when it has always informed me, when I asked for a legal opinion, that it did not furnish legal opinions to anybody except the President.

Mr. KUCHEL. I believe I have adequately explained the reasons for introducing this explanation into the RECORD. It is to the credit of the Department of Justice that it indicated its belief in the validity of certain legislation now pending. I believe it is also to the credit of the Department of Justice to have prepared such a clear English explanation of some of the problems which are before us and which are a part of the Dirksen substitute. This is why I have requested that it be set out in the RECORD.

Does the Senator from North Carolina object?

Mr. ERVIN. I do not object to it being placed in the RECORD. I was trying to find out which of its capacities the Department of Justice was exercising in preparing this paper.

I have, on prior occasions, asked the Department of Justice to interpret for me certain existing laws, and they have always informed me that they do not give legal opinions to anybody except the President or executive officers.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I cannot understand why the Department of Justice will give opinions to an individual Senator upon proposed legislation which has not become law, and refuse to give opinions upon legislation to another Senator upon matters which have already become law.

But the Department of Justice is perhaps like the Lord in one respect. It moves in mysterious ways its wonders to perform.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The explanation, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

H.R. 2516—EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE BILL (AMENDMENT NO. 554)

Title I of the substitute bill would accord federal protection against violent interference with the exercise of a variety of benefits and activities, some public in nature and others the subject of previous legislation. The bill is intended to assure persons who are exercising rights or privileges secured by the Constitution or federal law that they may do so without fear of unredressed violent intimidation. The bill is drawn with considerable specificity to overcome many problems encountered in the

present law, 18 U.S.C. § 241. Under present law the United States must prove the existence of a conspiracy; the proposed bill would operate against persons acting singly. The present law has been construed to require proof of a specific intent to deprive the victim of a known right; the proposed bill identifies those rights. Present law includes a maximum penalty of 10 years imprisonment, regardless of the circumstances of the crime; the proposed bill would provide graded penalties varying with the seriousness of the offense, and providing up to life imprisonment where the crime results in the death of the victim.

Section (a) of the bill expresses the intent of Congress not to supersede state and local law enforcement except when required by the public interest in order to obtain substantial justice. In all cases state and local law would continue to apply, and would not be preempted by federal law. However, in those situations when state and local law enforcement is unable or unwilling to prosecute effectively, federal prosecution may be undertaken. To assure that decisions relating to exercise of this dual jurisdiction are carefully made, the bill requires advance certification of prosecutorial authority by the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General. To assure effective federal enforcement, however, federal officers or grand juries may undertake investigations of possible violations of the section at any time.

Subsection (b) contains the substantive provisions of the bill. The initial paragraph makes clear that the bill applies to private persons as well as to persons acting under color of law. The bill prohibits injury, intimidation or interference with the subsequently defined activities, but only where that injury, intimidation, or interference is made by means of force or the threat of force. Thus, personal injury, bombings of buildings and the like would be within the act, but economic sanctions would not be included.

Persons protected from violence are of three classes described in subparagraphs (b) (1), (b) (2), and (b) (3). Subparagraph (b) (1) includes all persons who are injured, intimidated or interfered with because of their participation in certain activities. The participation may have been in the past, in the present, or may be intended for the future. The intimidation may be intended to preclude the victim's participation in the protected activities, or it may be intended to intimidate others from participating. The activities protected in this subparagraph include a variety of direct federal facilities and programs, including voting or campaigning, participating in federal programs or programs receiving federal financial assistance, applying for or enjoying employment by any agency of the United States, or serving as a federal juror. The section on voting has been drawn so as to include all elections—federal, state or local—because of the particular importance of elections.

Subparagraph (b) (2) defines a number of additional activities, all of which are either state operated or supported activities or are private relationships affected by the 1964 Civil Rights Act or other federal law. These activities include attendance at public schools, participation in state programs or utilization of state facilities, employment by a state or subdivision, service as a state juror, private employment, participation in labor unions, travelling in interstate commerce, or use of public accommodations. In the activities described in subparagraph (b) (2), however, it will be necessary to show that the assault was not only because the victim had been or was participating in the activities, but also that the violent interference was because of the victim's race, color, religion or national origin. The

federal interest in these cases is to insure against interference with the Fourteenth Amendment-guaranteed right to equal participation in state activities. Some of the activities protected are based on rights created by federal law with respect to certain private relationships—for example, employment and public accommodations.

Subparagraph (3) defines three additional kinds of acts relating to the protected activities which will also be covered by the bill. In (b) (3) (A) it is made clear that acts intended to discourage persons or classes of persons from participating without racial or religious discrimination in the previously described activities will be covered. This completes the coverage of (b) (2) which applies to racially or religiously motivated assaults against persons who have been or are participating in the activities described in (b) (2); these persons are now also covered in situations where they are attacked in order to discourage them from participating nondiscriminatorily in the protected activities. In addition, persons who lawfully aid or encourage others so to participate, or lawfully speak or assemble to protest denial of the opportunity so to participate, or who afford opportunity or protection to others so to participate, will be covered by the bill.

Finally, the bill also includes a revision of the penalty sections of present law to make them conform substantially with the penalty structure of the new law. The penalty section of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is modified to avoid duplication.

TITLE II—FAIR HOUSING

The purpose of Title II of the substitute bill is to assure the availability of most housing in the United States to all persons, without discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion or national origin.

Immediately upon passage of the bill, subject to certain exemptions outlined below, housing provided with the aid of Federal funds, including loans, grants, loan insurance or guarantees of the Federal Government, and urban renewal redevelopment housing obtained from State or local agencies receiving Federal financial assistance, would be subject to the prohibitions against discrimination, if such housing was provided under agreements or contracts entered into after November 20, 1962. Dwellings owned or operated by the Federal Government would be similarly covered. Thus, the effect of the bill would be to cover by statute the kinds of housing now subject to prohibitions on discrimination under the Executive Order on Equal Opportunity in Housing, No. 11063, signed on November 20, 1962 by President Kennedy.

After December 31, 1968, the bill would extend coverage to all housing, except any single-family house sold or rented by an owner who was the most recent resident of such house prior to the sale or rental, and rooms or units in dwellings occupied by no more than four families, if the owner of such dwelling resides therein. This is the so-called "Mrs. Murphy" exemption. Also included in the bill are limited exemptions permitting religious organizations and private clubs to prefer members of their own group when making available housing owned or operated by such organizations for other than a commercial purpose.

All the exemptions contained in the bill are permanent, but the single-family home exemption becomes a limited one on December 31, 1969. After that date, sales or rentals of owner-occupied single-family homes would continue to be exempted from coverage only if a sale or rental transaction was completed without the use of the sales or rental facilities of a real estate broker or other person in the business of selling or renting dwellings, and also without the publication

or posting of any notice or advertisement indicating an intention to discriminate in the selection of a purchaser or tenant. The bill will permit the use of the professional services of attorneys, escrow agents, abstractors, title companies, and other such persons as necessary to perfect or transfer title, even when the sale has been made on a discriminatory basis. What is prohibited is the use of sales and rental services and facilities, i.e., the use of a professional real estate dealer or other person in the business of selling or renting dwellings to help in accomplishing the individual's discriminatory purpose.

Individuals who wish to sell or rent their own dwelling would be permitted to advertise such intention, but if discriminatory advertising were used, such a dwelling would thereby be brought within the coverage of the bill.

PROHIBITED ACTS

The following acts would be prohibited by the bill if such acts were based on discrimination because of race, color, religion or national origin:

1. Refusal to sell or rent, negotiate for the sale or rental of, or otherwise make unavailable a dwelling to any person;

2. Discrimination against any person in the terms, conditions or privileges of sale or rental of a dwelling, or in the provision of services or facilities in connection therewith;

3. Making, printing, or publishing any notice, statement or advertisement indicating a preference, limitation or discrimination, or an intention to make any such preference, limitation or discrimination.

4. Representing to any person that a dwelling is not available for inspection, sale, or rental when such dwelling is in fact so available.

5. Inducing or attempting to induce anyone to sell or rent any dwelling by representations regarding the entry or prospective entry into the neighborhood of a person or persons of a particular race, color, religion or national origin. This is the "anti-block-busting" provision.

6. Denying a loan or other financial assistance to any person applying therefor for the purpose of purchasing, constructing, improving, repairing, or maintaining a dwelling, or otherwise discriminating against such person in the terms, amount, interest rate, or other conditions of such a loan. This prohibition is applicable to banks, building and loan associations, insurance companies, or any other enterprise whose business consists in whole or in part in the making of commercial real estate loans.

7. Denying access to or membership or participation in any multiple-listing service, real estate brokers' organization or other service relating to the business of selling or renting dwellings, or discriminating in the terms or conditions of such access, membership, or participation. This provision simply guarantees free access to the listed facilities to otherwise qualified persons barred by discrimination.

ADMINISTRATIVE ENFORCEMENT

Under the provisions of the bill, the Department of Housing and Urban Development would have the power to accept and act upon complaints alleging discriminatory housing practices which have occurred or are about to occur. Whenever a person aggrieved filed such a complaint with the Secretary of that Department, the Secretary would have thirty days to investigate the complaint and give notice to the person aggrieved whether he intended to resolve it. If the Secretary decided to resolve a complaint, he would engage in informal conference and conciliation with the person alleged to have committed the discriminatory housing practice, and attempt to bring an

end to such practice by that means. If conciliation failed, or if the Secretary declined to resolve the charge or otherwise did not act within the thirty day period, the aggrieved person would thereafter have an additional thirty days in which he could file a civil action in either a State or Federal court. The aggrieved person must file his complaint with the Secretary within 180 days after the alleged discriminatory housing practice.

The Secretary, after receiving a complaint, ordinarily would be required to refer the complaint to a State or Local agency where such an agency exists, if the complaint appears to allege a violation of State or Local law, and that law provides rights and remedies substantially equivalent to the rights and remedies provided in the bill. However, where the Secretary certified that in his judgment the protection of the rights of the parties or the interests of justice preclude such referral, he may immediately begin his own investigation of the complaint. In the case of a complaint referred to a State or local agency, an additional thirty days is allotted for resolution of such complaint before the time period begins within which the complainant's civil action must be brought.

In any case brought to the Secretary, or in any judicial proceeding commenced thereafter, the bill specifically provides that the burden of proof shall be on the complainant. Where an individual who has complained to the Secretary has thereafter brought a civil action and that action comes to trial, the Secretary would be required immediately to terminate all efforts at conciliation.

The Secretary would be given the power to subpoena records, documents, individuals and other evidence or possible sources of evidence for the purpose of carrying out his investigative function. Persons accused of discriminatory acts would have comparable power to subpoena witnesses and materials in connection with such investigations.

In addition to his conciliation function, the Secretary would be required to make studies and to publish and disseminate reports with respect to the nature and extent of discriminatory housing practices in the United States. He would also be directed to cooperate with and to render technical assistance to Federal, State, local and private agencies which were carrying on programs to prevent or eliminate discriminatory housing practices, and to administer Department of Housing and Urban Development programs and activities in a matter affirmatively to further the policies of the bill.

PRIVATE CIVIL ACTIONS

In addition to the administrative remedy provided through the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the bill provides for an immediate right to proceed by civil action in an appropriate Federal or State court.

Such an action would have to be commenced within 180 days after the alleged discriminatory housing practice occurred, although in cases where a complaint had been made to the Secretary prior to filing suit, it is possible in some circumstances that a civil action could be brought at a time beyond 180 days after the alleged practice, since the time limitation in such cases is expressed in terms of a period of days after the complaint is made to the Secretary.

In any civil action brought under Title II, where previous agency proceedings have been involved, the court could continue the case from time to time before bringing it to trial if the court believed that conciliation efforts by the Secretary or by a State or local agency were likely to be successful.

The bill would authorize, in appropriate cases, the appointment of an attorney for the plaintiff and the commencement of a civil action upon proper showing without the payment of fees, costs or security. Relief

could include permanent or temporary injunctions, temporary restraining orders, or other appropriate orders, as well as the awarding of actual damages and not more than \$1,000 punitive damages.

The bill would also make it unlawful to coerce, intimidate threaten or interfere with persons seeking to exercise or enjoy the rights granted or protected by title II. Civil actions would be authorized to enforce the right to be free from such interference.

ENFORCEMENT BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The Attorney General would be empowered to bring civil actions in Federal courts whenever he had reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons was engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the enjoyment of rights granted by Title II, or whenever he had such cause to believe that any group of persons had been denied such rights in a case of general public importance.

In any case brought by the Attorney General, or by a private plaintiff under Section 212 of the bill, the court would be directed to expedite the proceedings.

RELATION TO STATE LAWS

The bill provides that nothing within Title II shall be construed to invalidate or limit any State or local law that grants or protects the same rights. The Secretary of HUD would be authorized to cooperate with State and local fair housing agencies and, with their consent, could utilize the services of such agencies.

TITLE III

Using language similar to that in Title I, this Title would protect persons from forcible interference or injury because of race, color, religion or national origin and because they were seeking to sell or acquire housing, or to exercise ancillary rights connected with housing.

Finally, after Senator Dirksen offered his substitute, Amendment No. 554, it became apparent that there were still two points that had not been adequately clarified by the compromise agreement.

The first is whether the exemption for single-family, owner-occupied housing is to be applicable to housing that is financed by the Federal Government, or through loans insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government.

The second is whether the Attorney General should be able to bring suits on behalf of individuals to remedy violations of the act where, in the Attorney General's opinion, the case involves issues of general public importance. The alternative would be to restrict the Attorney General to bring such suits only where a pattern or practice of discrimination is alleged, or on behalf of groups of individuals who have been discriminated against.

In the case of both of these issues, those who were parties to the compromise agreement have determined that the Senate should, by majority vote, decide which position should be adopted. To this end, amendments to the Dirksen substitute have been filed by Senator Hart that will allow the Senate to make these choices after cloture is voted.

RUSH UPON GOLD IN THE EUROPEAN MARKET

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on a question which is of great importance to our country right now, the matter of gold.

The Washington Post this morning in a Reuters news dispatch reports—

Heavy demand for gold hit European markets yesterday, leading to sudden pressure on the dollar and British pound.

The wave of speculative buying stemmed

from rumors of an imminent U.S. embargo on the sale of gold abroad or a change in U.S. gold policy.

Demand for gold on the London bullion market was believed to be the highest this year and in Paris 17.5 million francs (\$3.5 million) worth of the metal was traded, more than three times the normal daily average.

Pressure on gold inevitably brings pressure on the dollar and its stability in the world markets. Reuters reported that—

Within minutes of reports of sharply increased gold turnover in London, (the dollar) had shed 80 points against the Swiss franc. Dealings were suspended shortly after midday. The dollar also dropped in Frankfurt.

Mr. President, unfortunately, a rumor without any substance at all has resulted in a rush upon gold in the European market, threatening the stability of our own currency, all as an outgrowth of unfounded reports that the United States plans to forsake its firm commitment to redeem dollars held by foreign central banks at \$35 an ounce.

I have the honor to serve as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I think I know something about the feelings of the members of that committee. We have had continuing consultation with Treasury Secretary Fowler and Federal Reserve Chairman Martin. They have testified before our committee. Their views should be well known to all. In addition, I have had occasion to discuss the matter at length with each of them on different occasions. I know of their determination to stand behind our present policy.

Mr. President, there is just no plan either in the Government or our committee to recommend any change in the price of gold or our commitment to buy and sell it at that price.

Our committee has just approved overwhelmingly the Treasury Department's proposal to remove gold reserve requirements. While I know it is the Treasury Department's proposal, I call attention to the fact that it was strongly supported by the Federal Reserve Board. It is true that some amendments have been suggested. I have urged that they be rejected. I believe that they will be and that the proposal will be enacted promptly so that our gold supply will be free to discourage the speculator and to emphasize our resolve to stand behind the dollar.

Speculators had best be on notice that the United States is going to stand by its pledge and that those who trifle with the American dollar do so at their peril. They are going to end up with some gold to look at and a loss of profit to show for it.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order of yesterday, March 1, 1968, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock on Monday morning next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 4, 1968, at 11 a.m.