61. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, relative to Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

62. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, relative to revising certain provisions of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to lower the voting age; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

63. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to use of the waters of the Upper Missouri River Basin in the upper Great Plains States before diversion of such water to other States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

64. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, relative to repeal of the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

65. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, relative to naming the body of water created by the Corps of Engineers dam on the Kootenai River near Libby, Mont., "Koocanusa Lake"; to the Committee on Public Works.

66. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana, relative to naming the body of water created by the Corps of Engineers dam on the Kootenai River near Libby, Mont., "Koocanusa Lake"; to the Committee on Public Works.

67. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the rights of the State of South Dakota to Missouri River Basin water; to the Committee on Public Works.

68. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to review and authorization of a bank stabilization and navigation project on the Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and Gavins Point Dam in South Dakota and Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Works.

69. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana, relative to elimination of the freeze in aid to families with dependent children under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

70. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana, relative to imports of meat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

71. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma, relative to uniformity in unemployment compensation benefits and rates and workmen's compensation benefits and rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 9087. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain mineral interests of the United States in certain lands located in Wagoner County, Okla., to I. Earl Nutter; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 9088. A bill for the relief of Clifford L. Petty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9089. A bill for the relief of Maria Drag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9090. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Fragale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9091. A bill for the relief of Antonio Benanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 9092. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Condon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 9093. A bill for the relief of Milovan Radanovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 324. Resolution to provide for sending the bill, H.R. 8568, with accompanying papers, to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

80. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council, city and County of Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to the Sentinel antiballistic missile system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

81. Also, petition of Bennie Lee Scott, Jackson, Mich., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Monday, March 17, 1969*

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

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Mighty God, Lord of the nations, we thank Thee for this Nation which Thou hast given us, for it is Thine and not our own. Help us ever to cherish all that is holiest in tradition and to welcome all that is healthiest in innovation. Enable us to commit our times to Thy providence. Grant to us Thy wisdom and strength for daily duties in this place that we may serve Thee with clear minds and warm hearts and new insights for the world's needs. Amid the din of many voices grant us the grace to pause and to hear Thy still small voice. As we seek to do the right wilt Thou first make plain what is right.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 13, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 14, 1969, received a message in writing from the President of the United States submitting two nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received on March 14, 1969, see the end of proceedings of today, March 17, 1969.)

THE JOURNAL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 13, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider all the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The bill clerk read the nomination of James V. Smith, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

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

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

The bill clerk read the nomination of Carlos C. Villarreal, of California, to be Urban Mass Transportation Administrator.

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

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill clerk read the nomination of Henry Kearns, of California, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in connection with this nomination, I am very concerned about what to me is about as conspicuous a conflict of interest as I have seen since I came to the Senate, and for this reason I will vote against this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Henry Kearns, of California, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States? [Putting the question.]

The nomination was confirmed.

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today, the Senate confirmed the nomination of Henry Kearns, of California, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

I voted against Mr. Kearns when he came before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I voted against him on the floor of the Senate today. I was only able to make a brief statement with regard to Mr. Kearns, because, frankly, I was completely surprised that his nomination would be taken up today. I did not realize it was going to be moved as fast as it was.

Mr. Kearns is a very amiable man, a friendly, attractive man, and a man of ability; but I do think he demonstrates what is as conspicuous a conflict of interest as any I have seen. This is the reason: Mr. Kearns has more than half of his net worth tied up in an investment that he has in the Siam Kraft Paper Co. in Bangkok. This company has not yet begun operations, but it has received a $14 million loan from the Export-Import Bank. Mr. Kearns, incidentally, owns 8 percent of the company's stock, which is a substantial amount of stock in that company.

It is perfectly obvious that the health—in fact, the survival—of that company is going to depend to a great extent on whether or not the Export-Import Bank will continue that loan, on whether or not perhaps they can get the loan renewed, and on the relationship between this company, in which Mr. Kearns is a principal investor and one of the important founders, and the Export-Import Bank.

It is true Mr. Kearns made a real effort to sell his stock at the suggestion of Senators on the Banking Committee. He went to a number of investment banking houses, but due to the fact that this company has no real operating experience and no profit and loss statement, it is impossible to sell the stock without a loss which would be too large for him to accept.

He said that rather than take the loss he would not accept the appointment to the Export-Import Bank. It is also true that Mr. Kearns stipulated that any decision with respect to this loan will be made not by him but by subordinates in the Export-Import Bank, by the Vice President and other top officers of the Export-Import Bank. However, the fact is that they will know that a principal owner in that company is the boss, the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. President, I am deeply concerned with this matter in terms of precedent for any future Presidential appointee who comes before the Senate for confirmation. Wherever there is a conflict of interest brought about by an appointee to high office having this kind of governmental power over his own investments, the Kearns precedent will haunt us.

All of us I think recognize that Mr. Kearns is a man of integrity. There has been full disclosure. However, it seems to me that disclosure and reliance on expected and hoped-for integrity are not enough. There are hundreds of able people who would make fine administrators of the Export-Import Bank.

I regret very much, in view of the fact that he was unable to sell his stock, that Mr. Kearns did not withdraw and permit President Nixon to name another head of the Bank because this is a very unfortunate and dangerous precedent.

Mr. President, I take the time of the Senate to speak on this matter because it is important that the Senate be placed on notice of the relationship of the Export-Import Bank, headed by Mr. Kearns and the Siam Paper Co. of Bangkok in which the same Mr. Kearns has a very substantial investment.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the measures on the calendar.

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

PARAPLEGIC VETERANS HOUSING PROGRAM

The bill (S. 408) to modify eligibility requirements governing the grant of assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing to include loss or loss of use of a lower extremity and other service-connected neurological or orthopedic disability which impairs locomotion to the extent that a wheelchair is regularly required was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 408

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 801 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by substituting a comma and the word "or" for the semicolon at the end of clause numbered (2) and adding "(3) due to the loss of use of one lower extremity together with residuals of organic disease or injury which so affect the functions of balance or propulsion as to preclude locomotion without resort to a wheelchair,".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the distinguished acting majority leader will yield, I wonder whether a statement can be printed in the RECORD in connection with S. 408. I note that it was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and probably an excerpt from the report can be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–94), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to expand the paraplegic veterans housing program—the program which provides for a grant of up to $10,000 for severely disabled veterans in acquiring specially equipped homes made necessary because of their peculiar difficulties.

Existing law (38 U.S.C. 801–805) authorizes monetary assistance to severely disabled veterans in acquiring homes equipped with special facilities made necessary because of the nature of the disabilities. Veterans are eligible for the assistance if they have a compensable permanent and total service-connected disability (1) due to the loss or loss of use of both lower extremities such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheel chair; or (2) which involves blindness in both eyes having only light perception plus loss or loss of use of one lower extremity.

The assistance furnished consists of payment of 50 percent of the total cost to the eligible veteran of a home having special fixtures or movable facilities "made necessary by the nature of the veteran's disability." The grant may not exceed $10,000, however, and there is no distinction between disabilities incurred in wartime and peacetime service.

The Veterans' Administration has encountered cases in which the current criterion of the loss or loss of use of both lower extremities is not met but in which the veteran has permanent residuals of orthopedic or neurological disease or injury which so affect the functions of balance or propulsion as to confine him to, and preclude locomotion without resort to, a wheelchair. The bill, S. 408, would modify the governing eligibility criteria so as to extend this program to such veterans. It would not encompass veterans who are, as a precautionary measure, temporarily confined to a wheel chair.

The original law (Public Law 702, 80th Cong.) provided these grants for veterans entitled to compensation for permanent and total disability due to spinalcord disease or injury with paralysis of the legs and lower part of the body. These were veterans with the most readily apparent need for specially equipped homes, being paralyzed from the waist down and severely handicapped in their movements and the use of ordinary facilities. Their condition was generally such as to require the use of a wheelchair. Ramps, special bathroom equipment, extra large rooms, exercising facilities, and other devices are essential for many of them to live comfortably outside of a hospital.

Experience later showed that some other conditions presented a strong need for special housing, though not involving disablement of the lower part of the body to the extent required in the first law. This problem was carefully considered in the 81st Congress with the result that the law was amended to cover loss or loss of use of both lower extremities resulting from amputation, ankylosis, progressive muscular dystrophies, or paralysis of both lower extremities, precluding movement without the aid of appliances. This expanded coverage, with limitation to loss or loss of use of both lower extremities, was enacted as Public Law 286, 81st Congress, September 7, 1949.

In 1959, Public Law 86–239 departed from the requirement of loss or loss of use of both lower limbs. It brought into the program veterans who sustained a loss or loss of use of one lower extremity in addition to blindness in both eyes, having only light perception. In addition, it deleted the reference to "amputation, anklyosis, progressive muscular dystrophies, or paralysis of both lower extremities" and thereby brought within the program's purview a small group of veterans whose loss of use of both lower extremities was from other causes.

The amendment proposed by S. 408 would render eligible for the specially adapted housing assistance a small number of veterans who, while they have not suffered the

loss or loss of use of both lower extremities, are confined to a wheelchair and can therefore present a strong need for special housing. The following are examples of the cases that the proposal would render eligible:

(1) The loss or loss of use of one lower and two upper extremities with residuals of a neurological disease or cerebral accident resulting in loss of balance and confinement to a wheelchair on a regular basis.

(2) The loss or loss of use of one lower extremity and one upper extremity on the same side at a level or with other orthopedic or neurological disease precluding locomotion with prosthesis or crutches and resulting in confinement to a wheelchair.

While exact figures as to the cost of the amendment to the paraplegic program by S. 408 cannot be precisely stated, the Veterans' Administration estimates costs as follows:

Fiscal year	Cases affected	Annual cost
1970	75	$750,000
1971	5	50,000
1972	5	50,000
1973	5	50,000
1974	5	50,000

Source: Veterans' Administration.

The first year fiscal cost is, of course, high in relation to subsequent fiscal years because of the number of veterans who would be able to take advantage of the program immediately upon enactment.

The Veterans' Administration recommended amending the paraplegic program as is provided in S. 408.

The committee believes that the amendment to the paraplegic program provided by S. 408 is beneficial and recommends favorable action by the Senate.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF THE AMERICAN FISHERIES SOCIETY

The bill (S. 1130) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American Fisheries Society was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the American Fisheries Society on December 20, 1870, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the American Fisheries Society not more than one hundred thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Fisheries Society subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the American Fisheries Society in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1970. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 368).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such various metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the American Fisheries Society.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–96), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill provides for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American Fisheries Society on December 20, 1870.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the American Fisheries Society not more than 100,000 medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Fisheries Society subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals are to be produced and furnished at no cost to the United States. No medals shall be made after December 31, 1970.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, and other expenses. Security satisfactory to the Director of the mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such costs.

The medals authorized to be issued shall be of such size or sizes and of such various metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the American Fisheries Society.

A REVIEW OF THE AMERICAN FISHERIES SOCIETY—100 YEARS OF SERVICE: 1870–1970

From the day of founding, members of the American Fisheries Society have played key roles in the formulation of policy in the field of fisheries, Federal, State, provincial and even worldwide. Among the early leaders of the society were U.S. fish commissioners, biologists in the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, as well as technical employees of State and game fish commissions, and in our neighboring country of Canada in like manner. As early as 1872, the Congress of the United States recognized a petition by the society and appropriated $15,000 for assistance in stocking the greater rivers and lakes of the United States with useful food fishes, on the ground that whatever the several States might be willing to do for themselves respectively, they were not ready to enter upon any measures, the benefit of which would inure partially, or perhaps exclusively, to the citizens of other States.

Over the years influence of its members has been demonstrated in international fisheries decisions, both freshwater and marine. While negotiating treaties and agreements with foreign countries, prominent members of the society have served on international commissions and advisory bodies in discussions on fisheries problems relating to tuna, haddock, halibut, billfishes, and many other species in both the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean. By holding national and international scientific meetings annually to report on findings of research and management studies, and then publishing these results in the society publication, the Transactions, the field of fisheries has kept the public and scientists worldwide abreast of developments. The Transactions is in its 98th volume, and now appears as a quarterly journal.

Growth of the membership of the American Fisheries Society has doubled in recent years. There are now over 5,000 members, including fishery scientists and laymen interested in fisheries; representing United States, Canada and more than 60 countries throughout the world. The society holds four regional annual meetings, including the adjacent Canadian Provinces, where local fisheries research studies are reported. There are 20 chapters of the society across the United States which also meet annually. The society is a nonprofit scientific body financed mainly from membership dues.

The American Fisheries Society is an affiliate of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, is an adherrent member of the American Institute of Biological Sciences, and holds membership in the Natural Resources Council of America, the Watershed Congress, and assists the Boy Scouts of America and others in conservation of fisheries matters.

The society publishes a career guide for young people who may wish to study the prospects of entering the fish conservation field. This is "Fisheries as a Profession," of which approximately 40,000 copies are distributed annually to individuals, high school guidance counselors, and others in the United States and Canada and elsewhere. Other significant publications are: "A List of Common and Scientific Names of Fishes From the United States and Canada," a bimonthly newsletter, several symposia publications including those on "Estuaries," "Water Quality" and "Fish Diseases." The American Fisheries Society publishes an English edition of the Russian fisheries journal "Problems of Ichthyology" for use in libraries of governmental and scholastic institutions.

The society maintains a national office in Washington, D.C., administered by an executive secretary. This office acts as a clearinghouse for the field of fisheries and is helpful to the lay public, as well as scientists and the Congress.

The "North American Fish Policy" is a publication issued by the American Fisheries Society for the purpose of spelling out the best information possible on the management and conservation of fisheries, freshwater or marine. The society has been the leader in developing policy along such lines for over 75 years. Qualified fishery scientists are registered through the society by a certification procedure established in recent years. Over 200 fishery biologists of the society are fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The society supports the National Academy of Science-National Research Council by having a representative serve in this organization.

During the centennial celebration year (1970) the society will publish a 400-page book on the history of fisheries in North America. Also, the names of fishes book will be revised and updated. During 1969 the society will publish a symposium text on "Fish Diseases" which will contain approximately 600 pages and will be the first such publication produced in America. The society will return to New York City where it was formed in 1870 to celebrate its centennial meeting at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel on September 13–16, 1970. The meeting will be held in conjunction with the 60th annual conference of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners which is scheduled for September 16–18, 1970. At this meeting not only will a highly important scientific program be held, but leading fishery and aquatic scientists throughout the world will participate. Research vessels in fisheries will be brought to New York for the occasion.

The American Fisheries Society is the first organization serving the field of natural resources in North America to celebrate a centennial.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this period, March 13, 14, 15, 16—and it could have been March 17—50 years ago, a caucus met in Paris. Col. Theodore

Roosevelt, son of the distinguished former President of the United States, was one of those present, as was Bennett "Champ" Clark, of Missouri, who at a later date graced this body as a Senator from Missouri.

They met in Paris for the purpose of bringing together an organization that would sanctify the comradeship that had developed in the course of the First World War. A second meeting was held at St. Louis, 60 days later. At that time they adopted a constitution, elected officers, and then proceeded to energize this organization to where it is today.

Tragically, Colonel Roosevelt died of a heart attack a year later in the Normandy sector.

But a U.S. charter was granted to the American Legion, and in the first year they achieved a membership of 648,000 persons. Today it is a diffused organization. It has posts in every section of the world.

I have attended Legion meetings in Mexico City; in Athens, Greece; in Paris, France; and in places all over this country. So there are 16,200 posts, having a membership of 2,600,000.

The members come from all walks of life—business, labor, agriculture, professional—you name it, and they are members of the Legion. The Legion embraces, also, the President, Cabinet members, I think 30 of the Governors of the 50 States, well over 200 or 250 Members of the House of Representatives, and I fancy nearly one-half of the Senate.

It operates through its posts, through the county organizations, through the district organizations, which are coextensive with our congressional districts, through the departments of each State, and then through the national headquarters at Indianapolis, where there is a staff of 300. The Legion's budget is approximately $7 million a year.

Throughout the country, they have allied themselves with sound causes, and they have made a tremendous contribution to the well-being of the country. Their first objective, of course, always has been to serve the members of the American Legion who may have been disabled or wounded, and of course there are many. The same care and the same solicitude are now bestowed upon those who are fighting the Nation's battles in Vietnam.

The American Legion always has been identified with the matter of national security and national defense and has been stout and vigorous in asserting itself to make sure that the country is adequately defended.

One other activity that has been diffused over the entire country and that has served a half million youngsters is American Legion junior baseball. I believe the Legion also serves some 4,000 Boy Scout troops. Then, of course, community activity in the community where the post is located is a large part of the American Legion's service.

So I think it appropriate at this time that we commemorate the American Legion for its deeds good and well done on its 50th anniversary. It is a farflung organization, with more than 2½ million active members who are prepared at any time to come to the call of the country, whatever the need may be.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished minority leader in the remarks which he has just made. I also wish to express the personal satisfaction the joint leadership, the Senator from Illinois and I, experienced last Wednesday when we had the opportunity to submit a resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the American Legion. That resolution, of course, was agreed to unanimously by the Senate.

As one who has been a member of the American Legion since shortly after its founding in Paris—I belong to posts in Butte and Missoula—I can attest to the work done by the American Legion. I join the Senator from Illinois in expressing to the organization best wishes on a job well done and good luck in the years ahead.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader for his kind remarks.

Mr. President, in connection with this matter I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which contains in greater detail activities of the American Legion.

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

From the moment of that now-historic gathering of men of the AEF in Paris in March of 1919, from which The American Legion was founded, there began an almost over-night change in the course of American History.

Born of the chance remark of a convalescing soldier to his commanding officer, the idea to form an organization for mutual assistance of veteran to veteran later instilled in millions of Americans a sense of obligation to community, state and nation.

Never before in the history of man had war veterans banded together for such a noble purpose: "Service to God and Country." Only once before in the history of our nation, at the time of the drafting of the Declaration of Independence, had men of such keen insight into human nature, such a grasp of the future course of history, and with such a feeling for their fellowmen, come together for a common purpose.

The First World War brought them together: Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Thomas Miller, Eric Fisher Wood, Bennett Champ Clark, Hamilton Fish and the other great men who were truly among the first in modern American history to "sacrifice their all" to preserve the peace and freedom of the Western World.

Seldom, in the court of history, has one organization so influenced the shape of human events—and the world may never again be the heir to deeds such as those of the Legion during the past half-century.

The American Legion was conceived at a caucus March 15–17, 1919, in Paris, France, by members of the AEF. Two months later, at St. Louis, Missouri, another caucus adopted a tentative constitution.

Lt. Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., son of President Theodore Roosevelt, is credited with being the "Father of The American Legion." A World War II Brigadier General, Roosevelt died of a heart attack at the front in Normandy.

The American Legion was chartered by an Act of Congress on September 16, 1919, and before the year ended, membership reached 648,000, heralding 50 years of steady growth and public service.

Members come from all walks of life. They include industrialists, publishers, movie stars, leading sports personalities, political leaders, attorneys, doctors, farmers, mechanics and clerks.

"In the Legion we bridge all racial and religious differences and cross all economic and social barriers," William C. Doyle of Vineland, New Jersey, National Commander said. "Our men and women members simply want to make our war service and sacrifices count for something positive for America."

This year The American Legion celebrates the 50th year of its founding. It is a milestone which recalls vivid memories of service and self-sacrifice to the 1,700,000 remaining World War I veterans, and is an observance of some magnitude for all American Legionnaires, most of whom will never again be privileged to take part in so historic an event.

Spanning the period of September 1968, to November 1969, the Legion's 50th Birthday observance brings to mind the robust days of the organization's infancy, when the passing of the word, "The Legion's in town" brought a new sense of patriotic pride and comradeship to young and old alike.

From its inception, The American Legion has been known for its spirit; for its sense of fairness to all men; for its ability to accomplish whatever job that needs done—and do it properly and efficiently.

There is perhaps no other institution in America that is so well known locally by name by so many as The American Legion. This public awareness of The American Legion rests largely on its local reputation.

But, when it comes to knowing about the sum total of the doings and acomplishments of more than 16,250 such hometown posts, it is an altogether different story. It then becomes a case of an organization about which so little is known by so many as to its nationwide character and accomplishments.

As a nationwide organization, The American Legion is truly a giant group. It is the largest veteran organization in the world. Its membership today is more than the enrollment of all other veteran groups combined. It is in truth, a king-sized organization, with a king-sized strength, king-sized program activities, king-sized resources and king-sized accomplishments.

With some 16,250 community posts, The American Legion can truly say today that there is scarcely a whistle-stop in the United States in which it isn't represented. Go where you will—East, West, North or South—and you will find that the typical American community has its functioning American Legion Posts.

You will find too, especially in the smaller cities and towns, that the local American Legion Post is the community center of patriotic, civic and in most cases, its social activities.

It is from these deep grass roots in the community life of the nation, that The American Legion draws its immeasurable strength, vigor and public support. The people of these communities know of The American Legion's good local works and they stand behind it. Nobody knows this better than the members of the Congress!

The membership of The American Legion is drawn from all walks of American life with such effectiveness that when it comes to getting a job done in any field of its endeavors, it can command the services, the talents and the energies of the recognized top leaders in that field.

The American Legion is well represented in high places in federal and state government with an impressive list of Legionnaire office holders headed by President Richard M. Nixon.

Thirty of the fifty governors are veterans of wartime service with the U.S. Armed Forces and all 30 of those who are eligible for American Legion membership are members.

Vice President Spiro Agnew and at least three members of the Nixon administration cabinet are members of the Legion, while information on three other members of the new cabinet still is incomplete.

Heavy majorities of both houses of the U.S. Congress are also members of the Legion. Nearly completed survey of members of the first session of the 91st Congress (five members had not responded at this writing) showed that 66 of the 100 Senators and 252 of the 435 members of the House are Legionnaires.

The American Legion has a women's Auxiliary of nearly 1 million members in more than 13,000 community units.

The National Organization of The American Legion is a big business operation. It has a current annual budget of over $7 million dollars. It employs a full-time staff of more than 300 persons at its three principal national offices in Indianapolis, Washington, D.C., and New York City. On this staff are alert specialists in law, medicine, rehabilitation claims, housing, employment, government insurance, hospitalization, Americanism, youth-training, national security, child welfare, community services and public relations.

The combined financial assets of The American Legion including the national, state and post levels are today estimated at well over $300,000,000. Legionnaires since 1919 have paid in more than $230,000,000 in national dues alone. These have established the financial stability of the National Organization.

The American Legion Magazine with an average monthly circulation of approximately 2,600,000 is today among the nation's top publications. It is first in size in the men's field. There are more than 2,000 department, district, country and post publications within The American Legion. Their editors have their own national organization known as The American Legion Press Association or ALPA for short. All this American Legion Press is served from National Headquarters in Indianapolis with a free weekly syndicated news service. A picture mat service is also provided.

In its committee structure that blankets the United States, The American Legion has 12 basic national commissions. Operating under these commissions are 29 national boards and committees. This structure is paralleled on every state front and carried down through district and county echelons to the community post levels. This provides a chain of command through which The American Legion can—and does—muster all its huge task forces to any given objective.

The American Legion places a high premium on patriotic service in the military forces in time of war. This is a special obligation of American citizenship imposed on the nation's youth—an obligation that demands special and hazardous service, that calls upon the individual to accept the sacrifices of health, career, education, financial loss, and life itself, if necessary, to protect and preserve our way of life. Nowhere else on the American scene is the individual called upon to make such a sacrifice.

Playing a significant role in the American Legion's planning for the future is the Vietnam War Vet and the number of Viet Vets who have joined the ranks of the Legion total more than 150,000.

He's "Our Kind of Guy," the Legion says and recently launched an intensive service program to increase the effectiveness of Legion service contacts to assist this new generation of war veterans to readjust to civilian life.

Working with the guideline, "Service first, membership second," is a "flying task force" of 25 field representatives and membership consultants who represent 15 geographical areas throughout the United States.

This task force is supplied by the Veterans Administration with the names and addresses of an estimated 70,000 men and women discharged each month from the armed forces. In turn, the special group trains Department (state Service Officers and local Post Adjutants in the methods of contacting and aiding recently-discharged veterans.

Field representatives supply whatever assistance is needed by Departments, Districts and posts of The American Legion in assisting Viet Vets to make an orderly and productive transition into the mainstream of American life.

Legion National Commander Doyle said, "The American Legion has an obligation to the returning Vietnam War veteran.

"The future of our nation rests, in great part, with this new generation of war veteran," who, Doyle cited as "belonging to a 'new breed.'"

"He (the Viet Vet) is better educated than were his predecessors in World War II and Korea and he takes a greater interest in national and international affairs," Doyle added.

That the Legion has been and remains both vibrant and stable is attested to by its many accomplishments down through the years: Establishment of a Veterans Administration; aid to the sick and handicapped (whether veteran-connected or not); programs for the protection and well-being of the nation's children; advanced education and training for America's war veterans, under the Legion-sponsored and supported GI Bill of Rights.

After twenty-five years, the GI Bill has gained rightful recognition as one of the most forward-looking pieces of educational legislation ever enacted.

These are but a few of the services rendered the American public by The American Legion in its 50 proud years of history.

Add to these the Legion's role as "watchdog" of our nation's security; its many programs which seek to instill in all Americans a spirit of 100 percent Americanism, through a love and respect for country, and its many character-building services for our youth, and you begin to get a feeling of the strength from which flows The American Legion force for good.

The youth-training programs of The American Legion under the direction of its National Americanism Commission cannot be matched by any other organization in their dimensions. They are a direct American Legion contribution to the building of future good citizenship.

More than 15,000,000 boys under 17 years of age have now graduated from American Legion Junior Baseball, the greatest organized teen-age boys' sports program in the nation. It is designed to indoctrinate the junior players with the qualities of good sportsmanship, respect for rules and appreciation of the value of teamwork.

More than 1,600,000 youths have graduated into good citizenship from the 4,000 Boy Scout Troops sponsored by American Legion Posts. The American Legion is today one of the leading sponsors of the Boy Scout movement.

More than 500,000 high school juniors have learned about the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship and the functions of self-government through the annual American Legion Boys State and Boys Nation programs. In this activity the youths organize and operate a mythical state and a mythical national government to learn by doing what the functions of government are and what the roles of good citizens are in maintaining good government.

The American Legion has made a massive contribution in developing champions and defenders of the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights. More than 5,500,000 boys and girls have participated in the annual national high school oratorical contests of the American Legion. Some 355,000 students participate annually in this nationwide competition in which they are required to prepare original orations on some phases of the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

For the past 50 years, the American Legion *has* made its influence felt on the American scene as a force for good; a force for the betterment of not only the veteran population but for every man, woman and child.

The Legion has a proud heritage and one which is being preserved by continuing and expanding upon the good works on which the reputation of the organization is based.

American Legion Posts throughout the nation are preeminent in the field of community services. There are thousands of hometowns which are better places in which to live today because American Legion Posts undertook the leadership in needed community improvements.

The men who compose. the American Legion today have dedicated themselves to a far-reaching program of assistance in the search for real solutions to the problems of our nation's society.

These men are helping to draw the initial blueprint which future generations of American Legionnaires can follow in striving to attain a better society for posterity.

This is a real challenge, and one which is being met by Legionnaires at all levels, who are rolling up their sleeves and getting down to work at the community level by helping initiate projects which are constructive and which will bear fruit.

During its first half-century of existence, The American Legion has maintained a young, vibrant outlook on the major problems with which our nation has been confronted. The Legion has played a major role in helping solve many of these problems.

Of its past accomplishments, the Legion is justifiably proud. This pride is not of a boastful nature; rather, it is born of a record of offering a helping hand to those in need of assistance.

With the belief that The American Legion can make its presence felt across this nation by tackling the problems facing Americans at the local level (education; civil disobedience and the attendant breakdown of law and order; the "permissive" atmosphere which is threatening to destroy our nation's youth), a "task force for the future" was formed early in 1968.

The Legion's awareness of the need to continue to provide effective service to God and country is evident in the move which led to the naming of the task force—a seven-member group charged with the responsibility of studying the existing programs of the Legion and establishing guidelines for the years ahead.

A review of American Legion programs in the light of modern day social, economic and political problems, with projections into the future based on past experience and present knowledge, should provide the Legion with a blueprint for tomorrow, a star by which to chart our course to new heights of service.

The American Legion prides itself in never having failed America when the chips were down and is taking the occasion of its golden anniversary observance to pledge anew that as long as the need for the Legion's services exists, The American Legion stands ready to serve.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to join in the statements made by the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished majority leader.

As a member of the Henry H. Houston Post of American Legion in Philadelphia, I share the pride in the 50th anniversary of this great organization. I was a very pleased recipient of one of the 50th anniversary plaques.

I wish for them continued success in their many and varied civic endeavors.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the annual general inspection of the U.S. Soldiers' Home for fiscal year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED ADDITIONAL FACILITIES PROJECTS, AIR FORCE RESERVE

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) transmitting, pursuant to law, the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air Force Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of the United States, reporting, pursuant to law, the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in January 1969 in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NOMINATION OF JOHN A. NEVIUS

A letter from the Commissioner, Executive Office, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting the nomination of John A. Nevius for appointment as a member of the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (with an accompanying paper; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on comparison of taxes in the District of Columbia with those of its environs and other metropolitan areas, dated March 14, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, on modification of contracts to facilitate the national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THIRD-PREFERENCE AND SIXTH-PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

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

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REFORM OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS

A letter from the chairman, the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission on proposed immunity provisions, dated November 18, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting for the information of the Senate, the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Regents held on January 15, 1969; (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on management of equipment by the Atomic Energy Commission, dated March 14, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. MCGEE and Mr. FONG members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the city council, city and county of Honolulu, Hawaii, remonstrating against the Sentinel Antiballistic-missile system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"H. RES. H1569

"Resolved that this house of Representatives memoralizes Congress to instruct the United States Ambassador to the United Nations of the urgency in using the influence of his office in any capacity that it is possible in order to avoid a useless and bloody revolution in Northern Ireland. Since the Constitution of Northern Ireland gives the British Government in London the right to intervene directly if it becomes necessary to do so, Congress should advise our Ambassador to make it clearly known to the British Ambassador that the United States Government favors immediate British intervention in this crisis before the hate mongers and the bigots are allowed to create a situation where prejudice rules and blood flows. Let this resolution sound forth loudly and clearly so that all concerned parties will know that the Government of the United States has not and will not ignore the seriousness of this situation but will work with every means allowed in international law to forestall a bloody confrontation between the forces of hate and prejudice as exemplified by the extremists who shout 'No Popery,' and the moderate civil rights reformists as exemplified by Terence O'Neill the present Prime Minister.

"Further let it be resolved that this house of Representatives unequivocally voices contempt for the bigotry and prejudice that at the present time makes 30% of the population of Northern Ireland suffer outlandish and outrageous economic and social discrimination.

"And finally let it be resolved that this house of representatives not only supports but emphatically encourages Mr. O'Neill to pursue his moderate course in attempting to achieve basic human rights and dignity for all the peoples of Northern Ireland. This House of Representatives will not be a silent partner to the bigotted Hitlerite tactics of the Paisleyites, but in the tradition that has made this an Honorable House will speak out bravely by this resolution so that all the world will know that the Elected Representatives of the State of Rhode Island are truly concerned as regards the cause of Justice and Righteousness in Northern Ireland.

"Upon passage of this resolution the Secretary of State is authorized to forward immediately exact copies of said resolution to both Branches of Congress and to the United States Ambassador to the United Nations.

"PRIMO IACOBUCCI,
"First Deputy Secretary of State."

A resolution of the senate of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"S. RES. 23

"A resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana requesting Congress to name the body of water created by the Corps of Engineers dam on the Kootenai River near Libby, Mont., 'Koocanusa Lake'

"Whereas, the Corps of Engineers is nearing completion of the Libby Dam on the Kootenai River; and

"Whereas, Libby Dam is the result of extensive negotiations with Canada and the United States of America; and

"Whereas, when Libby Dam is completed, the lake created will extend into Canada more than forty (40) miles; and

"Whereas, the lake created by Libby Dam will benefit greatly both the United States and Canada.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana:

"That the United States Congress is urged to name the lake created by the construction of Libby Dam, 'Koocanusa,' which is a combination of the words, Canada, Kootenai, and United States of America, which will represent the spirit of cooperation in the development of our natural resources between two great nations of Canada and the United States of America.

"Be it further resolved, That that Secretary of the Senate of the state of Montana send a copy of this resolution to each member of Montana' Congressional Delegation, to the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

"I hereby certify that the within Resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Forty-first Legislative Assembly of the state of Montana on the 5th day of March, 1969.

"WALTER H. MARSHALL,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"THOMAS JUDGE,
"President of the Senate."

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

Thomas O. Paine, of California, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1564. A bill to amend the Internal Revnue Code of 1954 to restore to individuals

who have attained the age of 65 the right to deduct all expenses for their medical care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1565. A bill to amend the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to administrative procedure and judicial review;

S. 1566. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 11, 1903, relating to appeals in certain antitrust actions, and for other purposes;

S. 1567. A bill to amend section 9 of the Administrative Procedure Act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to fair and impartial agency practices, and for other purposes;

S. 1568. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes"; approved July 5, 1946, as amended; and

S. 1569. A bill for the promotion of the progress of the useful arts by the general revision of the patent laws, title 35 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1570. A bill for the relief of Antonetta Cella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 1571. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. MONTOYA):

S. 1572. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to make the provisions of such act applicable to Indian tribes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1573. A bill for the relief of Karl Dobrowsky and his wife, Brigitte Dobrowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1574. A bill to authorize a program of demonstration projects in preschool education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. Moss):

S. 1575. A bill to regulate trade in drugs and devices by prohibiting the dispensing of drugs or devices by medical practitioners and their participation in profits from the dispensing of such products, except under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1576. A bill for the relief of Kwan Wo; and

S. 1577. A bill for the relief of Kwan Pakhunt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

S. 1578. A bill for the relief of Henry B. Rodrigues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN:

S.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to power reserved to the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. THURMOND):

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution in honor of Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. GOLDWATER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1571—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO INCORPORATE THE GOLD STAR WIVES OF AMERICA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America. This organization, which now holds a charter issued by the State of New York, is a national organization established by the widows of members of the Armed Forces who died while in the active service of their country. The Gold Star Wives of America, which has been in existence for a number of years, is a growing, active group which in February 1969, had members in every State except one and had active chapters in 17 States. Its total membership is comprised of 1,500 women, a number which its officers expect to increase at a steady pace in the future.

The objects and purposes of the Gold Star Wives of America are most commendable. In addition to honoring the memory of loved ones who paid the supreme sacrifice while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, it is committed to assisting their widows and children, both materially and spiritually. One of its stated goals, for example, is to "provide the benefits of a happy, healthful, and wholesome life to minor children of persons who died in the service of our country." Another aim is to "promote activities and interests designed to foster among its members the proper mental attitude to face the future with courage." Direct aid to widows and children of former servicemen is likewise an obligation which this organization has assumed. I am pleased to note also that the Gold Star Wives of America have dedicated themselves to the noble cause of safeguarding and transmitting to posterity "the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy for which members of our armed services fought and died," and that they have pledged themselves to "assist in upholding the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, and to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation."

Mr. President, I know of no other group more deserving of national incorporation than the Gold Star Wives of America. Its membership is composed of women who have experienced the great anguish of losing their husbands because of active duty with the military forces of the United States. They have a common bond of grief that few of us can fully comprehend, and which none of us can forget. Their objectives are both praiseworthy and significant; what more valuable contribution to society can be made than to bolster the fortitude and uplift the spirits, as well as to aid materially, the widows and children of those who paid the supreme sacrifice in the interest of their fellow citizens? Similar to the noteworthy accomplishments made by our various veterans' and adjunct organizations which have been granted national charters, the Gold Star Wives of America has a role to play that is nationwide in scope and is worthy of national recognition.

I have been informed by Mrs. Geraldine B. Chittick, who is the national president of Gold Star Wives of America and who is one of my constituents from Frankfort, Ind., that the goals of this organization could be better and more easily attained if it were incorporated at the national level. The scope of its membership and business now transcends any one State or group of States. Its stated purposes and activities extend to the widows and children of servicemen killed in action who live in every section of the country. Its officers and board members reside in such scattered States, among others, as Massachusetts, Colorado, Minnesota, Georgia, Louisiana, New Jersey, Arkansas, and Indiana. In every sense of the term and in all aspects of its operations this is truly a national organization dedicated to significant national purposes. Therefore, Mr. President, I strongly urge that prompt consideration be given to the adoption of this bill for incorporation of the Gold Star Wives of America in order that it could have the national stature and corporate structure so essential to implement achievement of its very desirable purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1571) to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America, introduced by Mr. BAYH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1574—INTRODUCTION OF PRESCHOOL EDUCATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on May 27, 1968, I introduced a bill (S. 3546) to authorize a program of demonstration projects in preschool education. This bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and no action was taken on it.

I now reintroduce this same legislation, more convinced even than before that the idea has merit.

In the intervening months, testimony presented to the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs—as well as other material that has come my way—indicates that a child's years prior to the age of 5 may well be decisive in the physical and intellectual formation of the individual. Therefore, I believe we should move at once to determine whether public education should be expanded to include 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds.

There is increasing evidence that we are ignoring the critical years of child development, the years when children are most receptive to learning and most responsive to intellectual growth.

Modern research indicates that as much intellectual growth takes place in the first 4 years of life as in the next 13—yet less than half of America's children go to kindergarten.

If the educators are right—and I do not doubt them—we are seriously handicapping our children by not offering good preschool training.

Under the legislation I am offering, pilot programs in preschool education would be conducted in representative urban and rural areas of the Nation.

Borrowing the concept of the educational park—already in use at the high school level, half day programs could be offered on a voluntary basis to all preschool-age children within a reasonable distance from the project site.

An educational park is actually a consolidated educational center which is both pleasing to the eye and efficient. Within a few acres it could offer the student all the resources that education can muster—libraries, auditorium, well-equipped laboratories and the latest audio-visual equipment.

We already know that beginning training earlier adds to the likelihood of success. But there is another benefit that deserves some attention.

It seems to me that the preschool educational park would be the best and most natural place to start developing a society where each man can be judged "on the content of his character and not the color of his skin."

Because a 3-year-old has not had time to become prejudiced, he would be free to cultivate respect from others, and at the same time, develop respect for those with whom he comes in contact.

My bill specifies no program of instruction nor does it name a price tag.

The Nation's bookkeepers would be so preoccupied with the figure that they would fail to take a look at the product being offered.

At this point, it is the idea that is important and I would prefer to let the committee decide its worth at the time the bill comes up.

This is not the sort of proposal that can be expected to win congressional approval in the next few months, but I am convinced that it is an idea whose time will come in a nation where education is of swiftly increasing importance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point, together with an editorial from the Asheville, N.C. Times of May 29, 1968, which discusses this proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1574) to authorize a program of demonstration projects in preschool education, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1574

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Preschool Education Act of 1969".

AUTHORIZATION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of determining the advisability of promoting preschool education as part of the public school education program throughout the Nation the Commissioner of Education is authorized to arrange, through grants or contracts, with State or local educational agencies for not to exceed demonstrated projects in preschool education. Such projects—

(1) shall be carried out both in representative urban and rural areas of the Nation;

(2) shall be of such size, and carried out in such location and manner, as to provide an opportunity for enrollment in one center to all or substantially all preschool age children in the area of the local educational agency where the project is being carried out;

(3) shall be carried out in such manner as to determine—

(A) the age when such education should begin;

(B) the scope of such education; and

(C) such other matters as the Commissioner deems appropriate;

(4) may include contracts or other arrangements with institutions of higher education or other nonprofit organizations to participate in such project; and

(5) shall provide for the payment by the Commissioner of not to exceed per centum of the cost thereof.

REPORT

SEC. 3. The Commissioner shall make an annual report to the President and the Congress of the results of the program authorized in this Act. The Commissioner shall also include in such report his recommendations for amendments to this Act and for additional Federal programs to encourage and improve preschool education in the United States.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of this Act not to exceed $ for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $ for each fiscal year thereafter.

The editorial, presented by Mr. HART, is as follows:

PRESCHOOL FOR ALL CHILDREN

Senator Philip A. Hart, Michigan Democrat, knows this isn't the year but he still plans to introduce his bill giving pre-school education to youngsters three to five years old. He points out that for more than half of the children in the United States, there is no form of kindergarten. North Carolina is one of the states that has no pre-school training except for the comparatively small number of children who benefit from Head Start.

Hart puts no price tag on his scheme, but the cost is bound to be big. The rewards would be big too, though. As Hart says, psychologists hold that as much intellectual growth takes place in a child before the age of four as in the next 13 years of his life. Also, racial antagonisms aren't formed yet, giving a chance to inculcate tolerance while the job is still easy.

The success of Head Start in boosting learning readiness in pre-school children has been well demonstrated by now. Making these advantages available to all youngsters is the logical next step. The sooner a child is involved in the learning process, the more likely he is to acquire good school attitudes and the less likely he is to become a dropout.

Senator Hart is right in seeing little hope for the adoption of his program at this session of Congress. Some day, though, the war in Vietnam will be over and it will be possible to take care of necessary domestic needs. Preschool education for all children should rank high in the priorities.

S. 1575—INTRODUCTION OF THE REGULATION OF TRADE IN DRUGS ACT OF 1969

Mr. HART. Mr. President, 5 years ago the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee took its first step down the long road of trying to protect patients from doctor-merchants.

These are doctors who do not restrict their income to charges for professional services but abuse the power of the prescription to significantly increase their income.

In other words, as a doctor they decide what products a patient should buy. Then, as a merchant they turn around and tell the patient where he will buy them and how much he will pay.

Too often, as four volumes of hearings affirm, this not only leads to the patient paying more, but sometimes it results in more prescriptions than medically required.

As the hearings have spelled out, doctor-merchants have several possibilities when they seek mercantile profits.

Some buy into relatively small drug manufacturing or repackaging companies—with the intent of prescribing those certain brands. Others own pharmacies, hire a pharmacist, and steer their patients to the store. Others establish pharmacies and rent them out to pharmacists on percentage leases, far out of line with normal business practices.

Others simply hire a girl in a white dress to dispense the medication in the doctor's office.

As I said, 5 years of work and two other proposed bills have gone into this effort. But, the situation is worse today than when we started.

Despite the publicity of our hearings—and the ethical ban of the American Medical Association—the number of doctor-owned drug companies and the number of percentage-lease drug stores has increased.

And, with the blessing of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, apparently, the number of doctors who are in the drug business on the side in their offices has also increased.

Under the first regulations issued by HEW for Federal payments for drugs dispensed under medicaid, doctors would have been paid only if there was no community pharmacy available to supply the drugs.

However, last year, HEW reversed itself and now pays doctors for any medication or devices they supply medicaid patients. The magnitude of the impact of that decision can be estimated through some figures developed by the State of Maryland. In one case, in particular, a doctor was paid almost $20,000 for drugs last year—more than for professional services to medicaid patients.

In light of evidence in our record of unnecessary prescriptions written when the doctor stood to profit and of evidence of higher prices charged by doctors, I think the taxpayers justifiably could feel cheated by HEW's new method of doing business.

The subcommittee's work in this area has not been a total loss.

Many more Americans should live this year because we uncovered the dangers of unlicensed medical laboratory technicians and diet pills.

Those revelations resulted in legislation requiring medical technicians be licensed and in the Food and Drug Administration moving to get at least some dangerous combinations of drugs off the market.

Basically these combinations were of thyroid and digitalis. The FDA also has prohibited manufacturers from labeling thyroid or digitalis for weight control. These actions were prompted after the subcommittee—with no in-depth investi-

gation—uncovered more than 60 deaths allegedly caused by diet pills sold by doctors.

Unfortunately, the fact that manufacturers no longer may publicize these two drugs as effective for weight control will not stop doctors from selling them to their patients. Nor will this limited action prevent thousands of overweight patients annually being sold medication which experts testified are dangerous. In fact, the testimony was that insofar as such "rainbow pills" are weight-reducers it is because they make the patient ill. Being ill is one way to lose pounds—but even doctor-induced sickness is not a safe way to reduce.

It is fitting that the first steps taken as a result of our investigation were to protect the health of Americans. But doctor-merchants are in some cases still jeopardizing patients' health and far more frequently they are jeopardizing the economic health of both patients and independent businessmen.

Therefore, I see a great need for the bill I introduce today which would prohibit a doctor from merchandising products he prescribes—except under some circumstances.

This is the third version I have proposed. Its title is the Regulation of Trade in Drugs Act of 1969. And I am delighted that the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee (Mr. MAGNUSON of Washington), and the able Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), have joined in sponsoring the bill. Like all others it strives to allow doctor-dispensing of drugs and devices when actually in the best interests of the patients. But, it seeks to forbid doctor-profiteering.

Basically a doctor would dispense drugs and devices only—

First. In emergencies.

Second. In one-dose units.

Third. If there is no community pharmacy within 10 miles of the doctor's office.

Fourth. If it is occasional dispensing and not part of his usual course of doing business.

The last provision would allow a doctor to supply drugs to patients who otherwise could not afford them. It would cover the giving of samples to patients to test their reaction to various medications.

The bill would outlaw doctor ownership of pharmacies and drug companies. It would prohibit percentage leases for pharmacies.

Ownership of stock in a publicly traded drug company would not be in violation of the provisions of the bills.

This bill also would overturn the current HEW regulations which allow taxpayer funds to be paid to doctor-merchants who sell drugs.

Mr. President, I know full well the demands made upon the time of my colleagues in the Congress. Dozens of issues of overwhelming import are put before us almost daily.

Even knowing that, I plead for careful attention to this one. For I am convinced that once the full impact of the harm doctor-merchants do to their patients and to independent businessmen attempting to serve consumers in the drug field is understood, this bill will be passed.

Mr. President, for Senator MAGNUSON, Senator Moss, and myself, I send the bill to the desk for referral to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1575) to regulate trade in drugs and devices by prohibiting the dispensing of drugs or devices by medical practitioners and their participation in profits from the dispensing of such products, except under certain circumstances, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. Moss), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 81—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION IN HONOR OF AMELIA EARHART AND JOAN MERRIAM SMITH

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have the pleasure of introducing today for myself and several other Senators a joint resolution to provide official national recognition of the achievements of two of America's greatest women pilots, Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith.

I am sure we all remember the feats and records established by these courageous women. Miss Earhart, who was born of the same generation as Charles Lindbergh, became the first woman to match Lindy's classic feat of flying the Atlantic solo. In 1928, only a year after Lindbergh had achieved his record, Miss Earhart, flying with two others, became the first woman transatlantic flier. Then, in 1932, exactly 5 years after Lindbergh had pointed the way, Amelia Earhart established a world record by becoming the first woman to fly the Atlantic alone. Of course, Miss Earhart achieved many additional flying "firsts" and was the winner of aviation's highest award, the Harmon International Aviation Trophy, on three separate occasions.

The final adventure of this great heroine has become a legend. Flying the roughest route conceivable in the days of no aids or maps, Amelia Earhart and her navigator Fred Noonan disappeared outside New Guinea while attempting a round-the-world trip. The mystery concerning her last flight still persists. But we all know that the trip planned by her was charted as a complete world route, staying as close to the equator as airfields would permit, and intended to cross a distance of 27,000 miles.

This goal, the last dream of Amelia Earhart, was not to be fulfilled until this decade. On March 17, 1964, exactly 27 years to the day after Miss Earhart lifted off from Oakland on her world attempt, Joan Merriam Smith taxied her Piper Apache onto the same takeoff point and began a flight no other woman had attempted except one. Born within a year of the tragic disappearance of Amelia Earhart, Joan Merriam had dreamed from early childhood of flying alone around the world and following the same route planned by Miss Earhart. And so she began the flight, both to fulfill her own ambition and to complete the goal inspired by Amelia Earhart.

Her trip took 57 days from March 17 to May 12. Forty-five percent of her trip was over areas having no air traffic and few radio aids. Many times she had to forecast her own weather. At the end, Joan Merriam Smith succeeded in achieving one of the most remarkable records in aviation. She was not only the first solo pilot, man or woman, to circumnavigate the globe, but she had made the longest solo flight in history. In all, her trip established six world records.

Mr. President, the basis for this joint resolution is clear. These distinguished American women have earned the fullest recognition that Congress can offer. The American people, and particularly the youth of today, need the inspiration which the spirit and bravery of these great ladies can give. The deeds and courage of these two women stand out as shining examples of the kind of service and dedication which individuals can render in the cause of their country. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will take early and favorable action on this resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution which I am introducing be printed in the RECORD to be followed with certain recent memorials made by State and local governments in honor of Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and memorials will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) in honor of Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 81

Whereas the Congress of the United States wishes to officially recognize the historic aviation achievements of two late patriotic American aviatrixes, Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith; and

Whereas Amelia Earhart (1897–1937) was America's first and greatest aviatrix, who holds record flights as the first person to fly from Hawaii to the United States mainland, to fly the Atlantic Ocean twice, and to fly nonstop from Mexico City to Newark, New Jersey, and as the first woman to fly the Atlantic Ocean solo, to fly both ways across the United States, and to be awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross by the Congress; and

Whereas, in 1932, 1933, and 1934, Amelia Earhart was the winner of the Harmon International Aviation Trophy, which is aviation's highest award; and

Whereas during the period March 17 to May 12, 1964, Joan Merriam Smith (1936–1965) flew the 1937 Earhart Equator route and thereby became the first woman to fly solo around the world; and

Whereas Joan Merriam Smith was awarded the 1965 Harmon International Aviation Trophy posthumously for this historic first flight: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and directed to issue annually a proclamation designating the 12th day of May in each year as "Amelia Earhart-Joan Merriam Smith Aviation Day", in honor of these two American aviatrixes.

SEC. 2. In recognition of the aviation achievements for the United States by Amelia Earhart who blazed the frontier of aviation for all women and all Americans and by Joan Merriam Smith who dreamed of, lived for, and fulfilled the achievement of flying solo the uncompleted 1937 Earhart Equator route, the Congress recommends the names of both aviatrixes to the President for consideration of the awarding of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, posthumously, as provided under Executive Order 9586 of July 6, 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 4504 nt.) or of such other appropriate award as the President may authorize.

SEC. 3. The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to give consideration to the issuance of a special series of airmail stamps commemorating Joan Merriam Smith's world flight and honoring the Civil Air Patrol, of which she was a cadet member. Such stamp shall be first issued on May 12 in as early a year as practicable in such denomination and design, and for such period, as the Postmaster General may prescribe.

The memorials, presented by Mr. GOLDWATER, are as follows:

THE STATE OF MARYLAND, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT: GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION

AMELIA EARHART-JOAN MERRIAM AVIATION DAY MAY 12, 1968

Whereas Amelia Earhart was America's first and greatest aviatrix whose record flights include the first flight from Hawaii to the United States Mainland; a nonstop flight from Mexico City to Newark, New Jersey; and the first woman to fly both ways across the United States; and

Whereas Joan Merriam, who flew the 1937 Earhart Equator route to become the first person to fly solo around the world at the Equator, also holds the distinction as the first woman to fly a twin engine plane around the world which awarded her the 1965 Harmon International Aviation Trophy;

Now, therefore, I, SPIRO T. AGNEW, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim May 12, 1968, as Amelia Earhart-Joan Merriam Aviation Day in Maryland, in recognition of the aviation achievements for the United States by these two great American women who blazed the frontier of aviation for all women.

Given Under My Hand and the Great Seal of the State of Maryland, in the City of Annapolis, this 7th Day of May, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred Sixty-Eight.

By the Governor:

SPIRO T. AGNEW,
C. STANLEY BLAIR,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

PROCLAMATION: AMELIA EARHART-JOAN MERRIAM AVIATION DAY

(By John H. Chafee, Governor)

Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam are two of the most distinguished aviatrixes in American Aviation history.

These two women were recipients of numerous awards for their courageous solo flights around the world, their varied aviation achievements and their invaluable contribution not only to aviation but to the United States. They stand symbolic of the great but unheralded accomplishments of the many women in American aviation.

In honor of these two patriotic American Aero Pioneers and the accomplishments of all women in Aviation, past and present, now, therefore, do I, John H. Chafee, Governor of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, proclaim Sunday, May 12, 1968, as Amelia Earhart-Joan Merriam Aviation Day.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State to be affixed this twenty-third day of April, in the year of Our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-eight and of Independence the one hundred and ninety-third.

JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Governor.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Oakland, Calif., Apr. 29, 1968.

TO: THE CITIZENS OF OAKLAND.

Greetings: Because of Oakland's historic affiliation with early flights and developments of the aviation industry, our City is proud to acclaim persons who establish flying records.

Amelia Earhart was America's first and greatest aviatrix, and Joan Merriam was the first person to fly solo around the world at the Equator. Miss Merriam completed the 1937 Earhart route for an historic aviation first, and was awarded the 1965 Harmon Aviation Trophy.

Therefore, as Mayor of the City of Oakland and in behalf of its administration, I hereby proclaim May 12, 1968, as "Amelia Earhart-Joan Merriam Aviation Day" in Oakland, in honor and memory of these two courageous American aero pioneers, and urge all our citizens to recognize their fine contribution to aviation progress.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. READING,
Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR, CITY HALL, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Amelia Earhart (1897–1937) was America's first and greatest aviatrix, whose record flights include: The first person to fly from Hawaii to the United States Mainland; to fly the Atlantic Ocean twice; to fly nonstop from Mexico City to Newark, New Jersey; the first woman to fly the Atlantic Ocean solo; to fly both ways across the United States; to be awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross by the Congress in 1932, and the winner of the Harmon International Aviation Trophy in 1932, 1933, 1934, which is aviation's highest award; and

Whereas Joan Merriam Smith (1937–1965) who, during the period of March 17–May 12, 1964, flew the 1937 Earhart Equator Route and became the first person to fly solo around the world at the Equator; the first woman to fly a twin-engine plane around the world, and for this historic first flight was awarded the 1965 Harmon International Aviation Trophy posthumously; and

Whereas in recognition of the aviation achievements for the United States by Amelia Earhart, who blazed the frontier of aviation for all women and all Americans, and Joan Merriam Smith, who dreamed of, lived for, and fulfilled the achievement of flying solo the uncompleted 1937 Earhart Equator route in 1964, it has been proposed that the names of both aviatrixes be recommended by the Congress to the President of the United States for consideration of the awarding of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, posthumously, or other appropriate award as the President may authorize; and

Whereas it has further been proposed that the Postmaster General be authorized to give consideration to the issuance of a commemorative airmail stamp in honor of Joan Merriam's world flight, with the suggested stamp theme of "World Friendship, via Aviation";

Now, therefore, I, Edwin W. Wade, Mayor of the City of Long Beach, with the unanimous consent of the City Council, do hereby proclaim Sunday, May 12, 1968, as Amelia Earhart-Joan Merriam Aviation Day in honor of these two late patriotic American aviatrixes.

EDWIN W. WADE,
Mayor.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, at its next printing, the name of the senior Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1538) to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the senior Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the junior Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), be added at cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of my resolution (S.J. Res. 18) on a constitutional amendment to the Constitution, relating to choosing a President when the choice devolves upon the House of Representatives, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN) be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from West Virginia, (Mr. RANDOLPH), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 74) providing for the designation of the first full calendar week in May of each year as "National Employ the Older Worker Week."

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

ARCHES AND CAPITOL REEF NATIONAL PARKS—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NOS. 6 AND 7)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on January 17, 1969, I once again introduced my bills establishing national parks out of three present Utah National Monuments—Cedar Breaks, Capitol Reef, and Arches.

At that time I stated:

Under my bills as currently written, I do not propose any acreage increase for any of the three areas. However, after proper hearings both in Washington and in Utah, it could be determined that some increases are justified.

It is my hope that under the new Nixon Administration and new Interior Department, we will be able to gain favorable reports on these proposals which I first introduced July 11, 1961.

However, just 90 minutes before he left office, former President Johnson signed the orders authorizing the expansion of Arches and Capitol Reef Monuments. By the sweep of a pen the President withdrew some 264,000 acres of land in Utah and put them under jurisdiction of the National Park Service. This means that no further use of the lands can be made by farmers, ranchers, or anyone wanting to merely use the water facilities on the land. In effect, it cut off mining rights, grazing lands, or the use of communication systems. This was done without prior consultation with Congress, without consultation or discussion with the State officials, without hearing any interested groups.

Since this land grab by the Johnson administration, my colleague, Representative LAURENCE BURTON, and I have made an extensive tour of the areas that would be affected in Utah and have met with the interested citizens. The reaction of these citizens was overwhelmingly against any extension of the boundaries.

Since my return from Utah I have talked to the Senate Interior Committee staff and the Legislative Counsel about my bills to make Arches and Capitol Reef national parks. In order to remove any doubt about the boundaries, they felt it would be advisable to amend the bills to indicate that the monuments would be established as parks to the extent of their acreage and boundaries as of January 1, 1969.

I therefore submit an amendment (No. 6), intended to be proposed by me to my bill (S. 399) to establish Capitol Reef National Monument as Capitol Reef National Park; and amendment (No. 7), intended to be proposed by me to S. 400, to establish Arches National Monument as Arches National Park.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as one who has advocated national park status for these magnificent areas for a number of years, I would like to stress that under my bills there would be no expansion of boundaries, taking in vast new areas of land. The great majority of Utahans objected strenously to this arbitrary and unilateral action by the former President. Congress has the right to reset these boundaries, and I urge the Senate Interior Committee to exercise this right and to conduct field hearings on my bills at the earliest opportunity.

UNITED STATES AND HAWAII'S ROLE IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a few weeks ago my good friend and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), delivered a very timely, thought-provoking address on the United States and Hawaii's role in the Pacific, with particular emphasis on the post-Vietnam war era.

Because he himself is a man of the Pacific, born and raised in the mid-Pacific State of Hawaii, Senator FONG's comments are particularly noteworthy.

Senator FONG knows this vast region well. He properly reminds us that the United States is a two-ocean Nation. His thesis is that, if after Vietnam, Americans desire peace in the Asia-Pacific area, we are going to have to work hard for peace, not isolate ourselves from half of the world.

So that other Senators and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have the benefit of his views, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

UNITED STATES AND HAWAII'S ROLE IN THE PACIFIC

(By U.S. Senator HIRAM L. FONG, Hawaii Manufacturers Association, Vth Industrial Week Conference, Honolulu International Center, Honolulu, Hawaii, February 20, 1969)

It is a pleasure to be here today to participate in your Vth Industrial Week Conference, which has the very timely topic "Hawaii's Role in the Pacific?"

Before offering some comments on your central theme, may I first take this opportunity to congratulate the Hawaii Manufacturers Association for your efforts to develop and expand manufacturing in Hawaii. The growth of manufacturing in Hawaii since statehood has been particularly impressive and has contributed substantially to Hawaii's economic health and prosperity. It is difficult to overemphasize the importance and impact of diversifying Hawaii's economy as you have done.

Last year, according to preliminary figures, manufacturing totaled $684 million in value, including processing of sugar and pineapple. The agriculture industry might dispute counting sugar and pineapple because this relegates agriculture to fourth-place income-producer for Hawaii. The tourist industry might also object, for this puts them in third position with $500 million—behind defense spending of almost $610 million.

But no matter how we figure, it is plain that manufacturing in Hawaii is on the rise—and I am convinced it will keep on rising in the foreseeable future.

The Good Book counsels that all things come to those who wait. As practical businessmen, we know we cannot just sit and wait for markets and opportunities to come to us. We must follow another Biblical maxim: The Lord helps those who help themselves.

So it is commendable that your Association had the foresight to assign members to explore the essential factors affecting Hawaii's future economic role in the Asia-Pacific Hemisphere.

Hawaii businessmen are going to have to be energetic and aggressive if they are to expand their markets in Asia and the Pacific. We are up against some high-grade competition from Europe, Japan, and elsewhere, whose businessmen and traders are already established in Asian and Pacific markets.

We dare not delude ourselves that, just because *we* regard Hawaii as the hub of the Pacific, others will think so, too, and act accordingly.

It is not my purpose to analyze how Hawaii can "sell" itself or to delve into such things as potential markets, demand and supply, manufacturing techniques, sales management, trade and business restrictions and all the other factors that enter the picture. Your own experts can counsel you on these things.

My remarks will deal with the broad framework of my topic, "The U.S. and Hawaii's Role in the Pacific."

This assumes our Nation and our State *will* have a role.

I am in full accord with that assumption.

Unlike the neo-isolationists, I believe U.S. involvement in the Asia-Pacific Hemisphere is inescapable.

By involvement, I do not mean war.

I pray Vietnam will be the last war!

Three major wars involving U.S. forces in 25 years are three too many wars!

The question after Vietnam is: Will America have a better chance for peace if we work for it in the vast Asia-Pacific area or if we withdraw all U.S. presence or interest there?

More and more today we hear cries that, once the Vietnam war is over, America should pull out and stay out of that area. We are told America has few ties that bind us with the peoples of Asia, that we have no business exercising leadership there, that we are already overburdened with worldwide responsibilities, and anyway Asia is a remote and alien world apart from ours.

My friends, there is a law of science known to every school child: Nature abhors a vacuum.

There is a similar law in government: Politics abhors a vacuum. When one power departs, another moves in to fill the vacancy.

In Asia and the Pacific, France has almost entirely closed out her sphere of influence. Britain has been steadily withdrawing from east of the Suez and is scheduled to leave Singapore and Malaysia by 1971, just two years from now.

If America abandons her Far East security bases after Vietnam, pulls the fleet back to Hawaii or the West Coast, abandons efforts for peaceful trade, commerce and cooperation, leaving a vacuum in Asia and the Pacific, the next question is: Who will fill that vacuum?

Who will give the emerging nations of Asia and the Pacific a helping hand to bring them into the mainstream of the Twentieth Century?

There is a tendency among many Americans to think of U.S. involvement in Asia and the Pacific as only our armed forces in Vietnam. Actually, our Nation has been deeply involved in Asia and the Pacific from the early days of our Republic. Our involvement has taken many forms.

As long ago as 1784, soon after the American colonies won independence from Britain, Yankee clipper ships visited the port of Canton, China, for the first time. In 1820, New England missionaries settled here in our mid-Pacific Hawaiian Islands. A decade later, the U.S. concluded a trade treaty with Siam, and eleven years later gained trade rights with China.

Our Nation became a Pacific power just before the Civil War, when Commodore Perry opened Japan to the outside world. At the turn of the century, America acquired the Philippines from Spain, Hawaii by annexation, and Alaska by purchase from Russia.

Years of trade and commerce with Asian lands, our governance of the Philippines, World War II in the Pacific, the U.S. occupation of Japan, and the war in Korea further enmeshed America's destiny with Asia. Vietnam is the latest chapter in a U.S. saga that dates back two centuries.

Today, U.S. ties in Asia are not just war-related. America has many other ties in Asia and the Pacific. We carry on extensive trade and commerce with a number of countries in that region. Americans visit many of these countries, and we try to attract their citizens to visit our shores. We are engaged in projects to improve the health of Asian and Pacific peoples, to improve their agriculture so they can better feed their people, and to provide education for the young people. We assist in economic development projects. We have cultural, technical, and educational exchanges.

We have defense outposts scattered in the Pacific and our military shield protects millions upon millions of people. Our Seventh

Fleet patrols international waters and keeps the high seas open to shipping.

Our very presence has a salutary effect. Proximity of U.S. naval units encouraged Indonesia to overthrow the Communist attempt to take over that vast land and her 113 million people. Thailand has been strengthened in its effort to combat guerrilla warfare. Malaysia, too, has been encouraged by America's determination to keep trade and communications lanes open.

Our presence and our stand against armed aggression are giving Asian nations the time they so desperately need to strengthen their economies, modernize their systems of government, effect badly needed reforms, and build their national identity and independence.

There is so much to do in Asia and the Pacific of mutual benefit that I envision our ties will be *strengthened,* not weakened, in the years to come!

America is anchored in the Pacific, close to Asia, and our future policy cannot overlook this!

Just think! The U.S. border is within two miles of Asia, now that Alaska is a State. Our boundaries in the mid-Pacific are 2500 miles closer to the Far East than the mainland West Coast, because of Hawaii's statehood.

To abandon Asia and the Pacific would be to abandon our westernmost States—and this is unthinkable!

So as we look at the U.S. and Hawaii's role in Asia and the Pacific, we do it against a background of geographical facts and long U.S. history in the area.

In the future, our priority effort, of course, is peace in Vietnam. What the final terms will be and when peace will come no one knows. Until these become clear, it is difficult to make accurate assessment of the full impact of the war's end. But through the cloudy crystal ball, some things appear fairly clear.

With the advent of peace in Asia, nations will devote attention to building their economies and improving the lot of their millions of citizens. More than one and one-half billion people—more than half of the entire world population—live in Asia. Across the broad sweep of this fantastic area, they are demanding a better life, from the ultra primitive regions to the highly modern urban areas.

For centuries most Asians have endured a lifetime of abject poverty and misery. But a new day is dawning for them. They know it, and their leaders know it—and they are trying to do something about it. They see the modern success stories of Japan, Taiwan, South Korea, the Philippines, Malaysia, Hong Kong, and Singapore—and they know it can be done—in Asia by Asians, with some outside help.

Many of the least-developed countries face a lack of capital and know-how to develop their resources and diversify their economy, over and above the ever-present problem of increasing food supplies. They face enormous tasks of promoting economic growth in basic industries, while at the same time trying to satisfy pent-up consumer demands. Many nations will need a mix of industry that will earn foreign exchange and industry that will supply domestic needs.

More highly developed countries face different economic problems, such as finding new markets for their projects and providing employment for their people.

Everywhere there is a weariness and impatience with the waste and tragedy of war. People long for an end to the shooting and for the opportunity to engage in peaceful pursuits. In countries that have experienced war and civil strife, the people yearn for peace and for the return home of their menfolk.

With peace, most manpower tied to war will be released. American GIs will be heading home—and what a joyful day that will be! Hawaii's 25th Division and Marine Brigade at Kaneohe are likely to resume their stations in Hawaii. Still a question mark is whether peacetime U.S. forces will be assigned to Vietnam for a transition period. We just don't know.

The peace agreement may prohibit this. And South Vietnamese forces may be strong enough by the time peace comes that no outside troops will be needed, although an international force may be needed to enforce the peace terms along South Vietnam's borders and the DMZ.

Undoubtedly, the entire question of America's military presence in Asia and the Pacific will be reviewed in the context of the peace agreement. Vital policy questions will face us. Where and how will our peacetime military forces be deployed? What about our overseas bases? If we turn Okinawa over to Japan and our bases there and in Japan close down, what steps do we take to fill the security gap? Suppose the Philippines decide not to extend leases on our Subic Bay base and Clark Field? Will replacements be found for bases on our Pacific defense perimeter? Or, will the U.S. shield be drawn back to Guam, Midway, Hawaii, and the West Coast?

Technological developments—like the Poseidon missile and the C–5A troop transport aircraft—may eventually lessen reliance on far-out bases. Again, because Hawaii is U.S. soil and in the mid-Pacific, we may play a vital role in the improved airlift-sealift now being worked on and perhaps be involved in converting Polaris submarines to use the Poseidon. Military space weaponry may also in time reduce reliance on overseas bases in Asia and the Pacific. Hawaii's space tracking operations might then be assigned a new mission, related to defense.

If our defense perimeter *is* pulled back from the Far East, it is possible that Hawaii will become even more important as a defense center than it is now. So while Vietnam-generated defense spending in Hawaii is expected to decline with peace, a pullback from the Far East could beef up Hawaii's role and result in compensating defense expenditures in the Islands.

For the foreseeable future, Hawaii can expect to continue as the hub of America's defense structure in the Pacific. Our role may change, but Hawaii will continue to be a key to defense strategy in this Hemisphere.

With peace in Vietnam, it is reasonable to foresee the United States will take part in rebuilding the war-shattered South and putting her on her feet economically as she was a few years ago. You will recall that, following World War II, we helped to rebuild Japan and to guide her people in establishing a thriving democratic government. We did the same for South Korea, and these two nations are now shining examples not only of the energy and resourcefulness of the Japanese and Korean people, but also of the effectiveness of U.S. postwar policy in Japan and South Korea.

Last year, Japan became the third major industrial power in the world, surpassed by only the United States and the Soviet Union. South Korea is a sturdy country, making substantial economic strides, far beyond what the pessimists in America predicted. With help, South Vietnam can recover, too.

It is also anticipated the United States will extend a helping hand, bilaterally or multilaterally, to other developing countries in Asia willing to help themselves. In the future, however, whatever U.S. aid is extended is likely to be far more selective than in the past, far more practical, far more constructive.

With all of the urgent domestic needs we have in America, public sentiment will not tolerate the lavish foreign aid give-aways of the 1950's and early 1960's, where at one time more than 100 countries—almost all nations of the world—were receiving U.S. military or economic aid, or both.

Former President Johnson's committee to study the impact of peace estimated a cessation of war in Vietnam would release $22 billion. The mood of the American people today is that these funds should be applied to remedying the urgent domestic needs of our cities and poor rural areas, to improving education, to cleaning up our dirty air and dirty water, to solving our transportation mess, and to giving a tax break to the American taxpayers. Outright grants to foreign countries will decline sharply in favor of loans, and even loans will be lean.

The aftermath of war has always caused economic dislocation. So we can anticipate postwar adjustments here in the U.S. and in Asia. Aside from this transition period, most observers look to increased economic activity in Asia and the Pacific after the Vietnam war ends. In fact, following President Johnson's announcement of the bombing halt, prices on all major stock exchanges in Asia rose sharply. Businessmen and stockholders there apparently believe peace will bring stability and better business to the region.

In the rehabilitation and rebuilding process, managerial and consultant services are bound to be in demand in the Far East. This can be the forerunner to intensified business, commercial, and construction activities in Asia and the Pacific. U.S. firms should be alert to opportunities that open.

We can also look forward to an increase in trade and commerce with our Asian and Pacific neighbors, provided these countries, and ours, do not erect a host of protective trade barriers and restrictions.

Another proviso, crucial to economic development and expanded commerce, is that the Asian nations must not discourage foreign investment. Without foreign capital and investment, many Asian countries simply will not be able to develop their economies. They are too poor and their needs are too great. Encouragement of foreign capital investment under fair terms and with guarantees against expropriation is a "must" for many Asian countries. Let us hope their leaders have the wisdom to perceive this. Otherwise, the lagging countries of Asia will not reap the benefits that loom so promising on their horizon after centuries of economic stagnation and deprivation.

Peace will undoubtedly generate a surge in tourism and travel, which should help to offset the expected decline in military R & R as our defense forces phase out of Vietnam.

The current scramble for Pacific air routes and the flurry of hotel and resort investment in Asia and the Pacific attest to a widespread conviction that this Hemisphere is on the verge of an international travel boom.

In today's race between food supply and the population explosion in much of Asia, America is already beginning to play a two-fold role. One, we are supporting those seeking to control the birth rate. Two, we are helping Asian lands increase their food supplies.

With the advent of miracle rice, many nations of Asia now see for the first time a ray of hope that some day they will obtain enough food for their people. This will require major investments in irrigation works, fertilizer and pesticide plants, and storage and distribution facilities. But the hope is there, where before there was no hope. In this headlong race between food and people, America will do its part to solve the scourge of hunger.

Despite our best efforts and despite our best intentions, however, there will persist problems in Asia and the Pacific that defy ready solution. We do not have absolute control, nor even in many cases nominal control over events in Asia and the Pacific. Everything will not go according to our plans and our wishes. The best we can hope for is to be able to influence or bend the course of events away from war toward peace and progress.

A big enigma in the future is Mainland China. How long will her leaders take to perceive the folly of their self-imposed isolation? When will her government permit resumption of normal relations in trade, commerce, communications, and travel with the rest of the world? When will Mainland China's leaders permit their 750 million people to enter into the family of nations, to become a peaceful member of the Pacific community? Only Peking knows the answers, and Peking is not talking at the moment.

Obviously, what Mainland China does in the future will impact upon Asia and the Pacific. In the absence of any signs that her leaders are charting a course away from isolationism, we can only assume China will continue in the foreseeable future as a closed society.

And now, where will Hawaii fit into the future picture of Asia and the Pacific?

I have already stated Hawaii will undoubtedly continue as the hub of America's defense structure in the Pacific possibly with an even larger peacetime role than before Vietnam.

In the field of subtropical agriculture, Hawaii has a reservoir of experienced, talented specialists whose expertise would be most valuable to Asian countries with similar climate.

Our growing oceonography program could also serve to help others learn to develop the resources of the seas.

In education, also, we have many excellent educators and administrators who can render fine service in helping establish and modernize school systems at elementary, high school, and college level.

In the health field, Hawaii has outstanding doctors, nurses, and other private and public health personnel. Their skills and knowledge could help wipe out diseases that plague the people. In India, the once-dreaded malaria has been almost completely wiped out.

In finance and insurance, Hawaii has a great number of talented and successful people who can share their experience and know-how with other Asian peoples.

In business and manufacturing, Hawaii has many top-notch entrepreneurs and innovators. Although our Islands are poor in mineral resources and raw material for heavy industry and although Hawaii for years appears destined to remain a rural, agricultural economy, manufacturing has steadily increased in importance because of the ingenuity, imagination, courage, and farsightedness of go-getters like all of you in this audience. You have assessed Hawaii's needs and figured out how to satisfy those needs, and even many times created goods for export.

Those of you who have seen opportunity for industry in Hawaii could well serve, not just as suppliers for Asia and Pacific nations but as consultants in lands where opportunities remain undiscovered. In turn, Hawaii could be a test market for Asian goods destined for U.S. markets and U.S. goods aimed at Asian markets.

More and more Hawaii enterprises such as banks, business, manufacturing, transportation, may find it profitable to them and useful to Asians to establish branches in some of these nations.

Hawaii has institutions as well as people who play a vital role in Asia and the Pacific. The East-West Center, the University of Hawaii, our Foreign Trade Zone, the Hawaii International Services Agency, your own Hawaii Manufacturers Association are examples.

Hawaii will be further equipped for a greater role in development of Asia and the Pacific as we vigorously pursue research and development in the growing and vital communications, space, biomedicine, oceanographic, and other fields.

To play the greatest possible role in Asia and the Pacific, for which Hawaii is uniquely qualified and to become in reality the "crossroads of the Pacific," Hawaii must broaden its horizons far beyond the borders of our State. Concerned up to now with our internal affairs and having attained solid success as a State, we of Hawaii must now look outward from our shores to find new opportunities for our people and to foster new friendly links with our neighbors in Asia and the Pacific.

Hawaii must assert far more leadership in matters Asian and Pacific!

We must become the spokesman for rational, far-seeing, peace-promoting policies in this crucial area of the world. We must exert far greater efforts to make sure Hawaii's counsel on Asian affairs is heard—and heeded—in the rest of our Nation.

We cannot sit quietly by while highly vocal, influential Americans preach the gospel of isolationism from Asia and the Pacific. We dare not permit the "Eastern establishment", so heavily oriented toward Europe, to dominate or neglect U.S. policy toward Asia and the Pacific.

Hawaii is a "natural" for leadership in the Pacific. After 10 years of statehood, Hawaii unquestionably has acquired new stature and now has pipelines into the real power structures of American government—Congress and the White House.

We of Hawaii, who patiently lobbied long and hard—and successfully—for statehood should assume responsibility now for lobbying for a positive policy for peace and progress in Asia.

With Richard Nixon in the White House, I believe we in Hawaii can make our voices heard as never before.

There are those—including a well-known officeholder in Hawaii—who predict President Nixon will disengage the United States from Asia and the Pacific, turn his back on this vast and vital area, and concentrate on Europe.

And when these political prognosticators allege President Nixon will turn his eyes away from Asia, they would have you believe he will turn his eyes away from Hawaii!

Nonsense!

No President, Republican or Democrat, could ignore the Asia-Pacific arena, even if he wanted to!

America is bounded by two oceans—the Pacific as well as the Atlantic—and this reality of geography can no more be ignored than the reality that the earth orbits the sun.

President Nixon will give intense attention to the Asia-Pacific arena, not only because the facts of life force any President to do so, but also because he has long known that, if there is to be peace in this half of the world, America as a Pacific nation is going to have to do her part to work for peace, just as America had to work for a peaceful Atlantic community after World War II.

Without question, President Nixon's overriding priority is to end the Vietnam war so that American boys will no longer be engaged in a shooting war and so the immense drain on our resources will stop.

But this does not mean President Nixon will thereafter ignore our Asian and Pacific neighbors—nor that he will ignore Hawaii.

As a matter of fact, at a recent news conference President Nixon was asked whether his re-emphasis on Europe would mean a lessening of interest in Asia. The President replied: "I think you could best describe me as not being a 'half-worlder,' with my eyes looking only to Europe or only to Asia, but one who sees the whole world. We live in one world and we must go forward together in this whole world."

Richard Nixon is a longtime student of history. He knows our country has been drawn into three major wars in Asia in less than 25 years. He knows that America cannot insure future peace by retreating to Fortress America, saying "A pox on all of Asia and the Pacific," as the new isolationists would have us do.

A little more than a year ago, Mr. Nixon published an article entitled "Asia After Vietnam." Let me quote a few statements.

"The United States is a Pacific power. Europe has been withdrawing the remnants of empire, but the United States, with its coast reaching in an arc from Mexico to the Bering Straits, is one anchor of a vast Pacific community. Both our interests and our ideas propel us westward across the Pacific, not as conquerors but as partners, linked by the sea not only with those oriental nations on Asia's Pacific Littoral but at the same time with occidental Australia and New Zealand, and with the island nations between."

Mr. Nixon also said, and I quote:

"Weary with war, disheartened with allies, disillusioned with aid, dismayed at domestic crises, many Americans are heeding the call of the new isolationism. And they are not alone; there is a tendency in the whole Western world to turn inward, to become parochial and isolationist—dangerously so.

"But there can be neither peace nor security a generation hence unless we recognize now the massiveness of the forces at work in Asia, where more than half the world's people live and where the greatest explosive potential is lodged. * * *

"Without turning our backs on Europe, we have now to reach out westward to the East, and to fashion the sinews of a Pacific community."

My friends, a man with such deep understanding will not turn his eyes from Asia and the Pacific. Make no mistake about that!

I believe we can rely on President Nixon to forge a new role for America in Asia and the Pacific—a role keyed to realities . . . a role not of paternalism or Big Brotherism, but a role of helpful neighbor . . . a role of peaceful Pacific partnership so as to spare America further agony of war and bloodshed—and hopefully in the process to spare the nations of that area also from the tragedy and waste of war.

I believe Hawaii will play an increasingly larger role in building a thriving, peaceful Pacific community. I am very hopeful the Nixon Administration will call upon Hawaii's people to use their special talents, their special skills, and their warm aloha to assist in this challenging task.

In his Inaugural Address, President Nixon asked the American people to "join in a high adventure—one as rich as humanity itself and exciting as the times we live in."

Building a Pacific community, wherein each man retains his identity, maintains his dignity, nurtures hope for a better life and helps bring it about is a "high adventure" indeed—and one we in Hawaii willingly join.

For our Nation's goals in Asia are our goals worldwide: self-determination and territorial integrity for nations large and small; opportunity for economic advancement, a better life, hope for the future for mankind; peace and justice for all, Asian as well as non-Asian.

As businessmen and as citizens, you have a deep and personal concern with Asia and the Pacific, for what happens here can mean peace or war, progress or stagnation. You, the American businessmen are among the most effective ambassadors of good will and international concord. You are the architects of a higher standard of living. You are craftsmen who can teach nations how to care for their people.

Particularly because you are citizens of Hawaii, your role takes on new meaning and special emphasis. Working through your business, with your government, and as individuals, you can help not only in the growth of Hawaii and our Nation but also in the advancement—even the survival—of millions of Asian and Pacific peoples who look desperately to us for help and guidance down

the road to dignity, freedom, and a better life.

Thank you and aloha.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 6 minutes.

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

OPPOSITION TO ENACTMENT OF 10-PERCENT FEDERAL SURTAX

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise to announce that I flatly oppose the reenactment of the 10-percent Federal surtax scheduled to expire June 30. Instead of relying on the surtax, the Congress can and should cut Federal spending by at least $15 billion with the military taking $10 billion or more of the reduction and the balance from space and public works.

The 10-percent surtax has been a complete failure. It was passed to slow inflation, to reduce interest rates and to improve our international trade balance.

It has not only failed to achieve any of these objectives; but the inflationary outlook is actually worse now than it was last July 1 when the surtax went into effect.

The result: The consumer is now required to endure a sharper rise in the cost of living together with higher taxes.

Wholesale prices and manufacturing prices have risen more sharply in recent weeks than they have in years—and these are the retail prices of the future.

Since July 1, interest rates have not only risen more rapidly than prior to the passage of the surtax, their rates of increase has accelerated and gained special momentum in recent months.

The period since the surtax went into effect on July 1 has seen the first actual deficit in years in our merchandise trade balance, the cornerstone of our balance of payments.

And latest indications are that the economy is likely to go on its inflationary binge indefinitely with unemployment continuing at its 15-year low and business plans for investing in plant and equipment at a highly inflationary 14-percent increase for the rest of 1969.

Certainly this is going to be a tough economic policy to reverse. Virtually the entire economic fraternity, as well as most of business, joined the Johnson administration last year in calling for a surtax.

The support for the surtax as the cornerstone of antiinflation economic policy was as impressive as it was wrong.

But the President and the Congress can act to correct this massive error. It is likely that the surtax, if continued, might eventually slow inflation and reduce interest rates. But the name of the inflation game is time.

And there is a swifter and surer way for Government to act. Here is why Congress should rely on spending cuts as our antiinflation medicine:

First. Testimony before our Joint Economic Committee indicated that the tax increase—dollar for dollar—has only 75 percent of the inflation-slowing effect of expenditure reduction. And the expenditure reduction route is far prompter.

Second. Recent years have seen enormous increases in spending, much of it unjustified and with no priorities established by the Congress.

Military spending can be reduced $10 billion without endangering our combat effectiveness.

Space spending should be reduced by $1 to $2 billion now that we will have achieved in 1969 our established objective in space.

We should cut or postpone public works spending of $3 to $4 billion of the $10 billion proposed.

Third. The American taxpayer has been surfeited with tax increases in the past year or so. Local property taxes have been climaxing sharply. In at least 38 of the 50 States, sales or incomes taxes will increase this year to the highest levels on record. The social security tax has just been increased and is now becoming seriously burdensome.

Perhaps most important of all—

Fourth. The achievement of a $15-billion Federal spending cut this year would be the clearest kind of notice that this Government is determined to pay the price required to stop inflation.

It is the psychological expectation by consumers and especially business that prices are sure to be higher—and much higher 2 or 3 years from now—which is causing unjustified and unparalleled investment in plant and equipment which, in turn, is a prime inflationary problem right now.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the role.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 20 minutes.

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

VIETNAM: 1969

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, although I sympathize with President Nixon as he grapples with the complexities of Vietnam and the defense of our country, I was deeply disappointed by the course charted at his historic press conference last Friday. His statements advocating the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system and his flat rejection of American troop reductions in Vietnam indicate that military considerations are dominating this administration as they came to dominate the previous one after 1964.

During the 8 years since former President Eisenhower warned of the mounting influence of the "military-industrial complex," military spending has doubled from approximately $40 billion annually to approximately $80 billion. Now we are told that we need a new anti-ballistic-missile system costing untold billions of dollars.

During the 5 years since former President Kennedy warned that in the last analysis the Vietnamese war was "their war," that "they are the ones who must win or lose it," American troops in Vietnam have mushroomed from 20,000 to 550,000. Now we are told that the enemy is still so strong that there must be no reductions of American forces and that we must keep up our offensive military efforts.

Just as military demands have claimed a steadily increasing share of our resources here at home, so have military considerations largely guided our policy in Southeast Asia. It is an open question whether we have paid a greater price for the militarization of our domestic economy and society, or the militarization of our foreign policy as applied to the complex struggle of the Vietnamese people.

I am increasingly concerned over our continuing failure to reverse the policy of military attrition and moral disaster in Vietnam.

For 4 long years, this policy has been the transcendent issue of our national politics. It has been a relentless challenge to the collective conscience of our people; and it has tested our vision and wisdom as well as our capacity to admit error and to build from disaster the foundations for more enlightened judgments in the future.

For 4 years I have viewed our deepening involvement in the bloody jungles of Southeast Asia with a troubled mind and a heavy heart. Now after all the political upheaval of 1968, after repeated indications that most of our citizens regret and deplore our involvement in this cruel and futile venture, I find it intolerable that we should still be pursuing the same tragic course with the same tragic results.

It is nearly a year since President Johnson announced the first steps to negotiate an end to the war. It was a year ago almost to the day that the voters of New Hampshire gave us the first clear manifestation that the American conscience and will were shocked and disgusted by the war. In the following months, millions of Americans committed their greatest efforts to bringing about an end to that conflict and a change in the policy which had conceived and nourished such a terrible venture.

Today, the killing continues. American battle casualties have exceeded 200,000.

The toll of American lives lost will shortly pass 33,000. Since March 1968—since the dramatic speech by President Johnson urging a prompt settlement of the war—11,600 American lives have been lost on the battlefield. Another 1,800 of our men have been killed in battle-zone accidents and support operations. In the last 11 months, 37,000 American soldiers have been seriously wounded in combat; an almost equal number have sustained injuries which did not demand hospital confinement.

Mr. President, I believe that the American people had every hope and expectation that the Paris talks would bring a military disengagement; that we would minimize clashes with the enemy and seek to hold down the loss of life on both sides while the Paris discussions were pending.

And yet, in defiance of all the dictates of commonsense and respect for human life, we have pursued the opposite course. We invoked the old, disingenuous slogan, claiming the need to "negotiate from strength," and launched a so-called accelerated pacification campaign designed to keep constant, intensive military pressure on the enemy.

While the North Vietnamese responded to our bombing halt by withdrawing 22 full regiments from South Vietnam, we were preparing a great extension of our own offensive operations in the south. Air, marine, and ground engagements increased in number and intensity. In a 3-month period this winter, after the bombing halt in early November, the total number of battalion-size operations undertaken by South Vietnamese and American troops has climbed from 820 to 1,077. For the first time, American ground troops were admittedly extending combat operations over the border into Laos. Marine units have engaged in what their commanders publicly describe as the largest amphibious operation since the end of World War II. For several months our military commanders have been boasting publicly that they had the enemy on the run and near collapse.

Let us be honest about the present military activities in South Vietnam. Are the current attacks by the Vietcong in the south a calculated offensive ordered by Hanoi, and designed to trigger a general escalation of hostilities by all combatants? Or is this Vietcong drive a response to our own offensives over the last 5 months—a response determined more by our own aggressive combat operations than by any design of Hanoi's?

Now, Mr. President, with the new "Tet Offensive" underway, the Joint Chiefs, the Secretary of Defense, the Commander in Chief himself are talking once again of the need to devise an "appriate military response" to the enemy drive. But who is responding to whom?

At his news conference last week, the President claimed that any current escalation in Vietnam was the responsibility of our adversaries. I deplore the bloody attacks of the enemy on our installations and on the cities of South Vietnam. No American can view those attacks with anything but deep regret. But the President's assignment of blame for the escalation of the war is too one sided.

Is the Vietcong responsible for stepped-up American pacification operations over the last 6 months?

For the great increase in battalion operations?

For the intensive bombing sorties in the South?

Is the Vietcong responsible for all the delays in Paris?

Are the Vietcong responsible for our failure to admit to ourselves and to impress on our allies what we all know in our hearts—that there must be a share of power and responsibility for the National Liberation Front in any postwar government?

Are the Vietcong truly responsible for the massive American involvement in an historic civil war, 10,000 miles from our shores?

Are the Vietcong responsible for our blind determination to follow failure down the road to disaster—until today, when we talk once again of enemy offensives, appropriate responses, new escalations—as though the terrible losses of 4 years had taught us nothing; as if the proven way of failure was the only course open to us?

These threats of a new escalation are accompanied by the familiar claims of impending military success. We hear that the war is going well; the enemy is tiring; if only we persist in the present course there will be victory.

But if the administration is truly flirting with plans to pursue the military effort toward some undefinable and, I think, unachievable victory, then it is setting a disaster course for our country and for the cause of peace. The new Commander in Chief must grasp what his predecessor learned to his sorrow—that in any continuance of the war in Vietnam lies the seed of national tragedy and the certainty of personal political disaster.

It has been the terrible, relentless logic of Vietnam that new talk of victory brings new escalation of military commitments and new casualties. What seems attainable in the private councils of the Pentagon has proven always more costly, in the swamps and jungles of Southeast Asia.

There is one consistent characteristic about our military strategists on Vietnam during recent years—they have always been wrong. The time is long overdue for us to cease listening to their narrow and badly conceived counsel that has cost us so heavily in blood and treasure.

The war in Vietnam must be ended. In lives lost and self-esteem forfeited, in investments diverted and opportunities missed, it has been the most costly national experience in modern times. Tragically, it has been also the most unnecessary, and the most unwarranted.

Mr. President, in August 1968 before the national platform committee of my party, and again on December 17, 1968, I publicly proposed that we begin negotiations by bringing half of our troops home, while consolidating the others around our most easily defended installations at a time when we had 200,000 troops in Vietnam. This was the strategy which General Gavin told us would have enabled us to defend ourselves and provide areas of safety for those Vietnamese concerned about their safety without any additional increase in manpower. But it is the attempt to carry on offensive purposes in all parts of South Vietnam which has resulted in the building up of troops and the consequent stepping up of casualties.

That is a strategy designed to reduce clashes with the enemy and thus to reduce the loss of life on both sides. It is the strategy we ought to be pursuing today—accompanied by an all-out effort to get the negotiations moving in Paris—both privately and at the conference room. I was encouraged by the President's indication on Friday that, at long last, private discussions are getting underway. Early in February of this year, I spoke to the clergy and laymen concerned about Vietnam. As I had on so many occasions before, I talked of the need to end the war and end it quickly—if we were to reverse the tide of neglect and decay at home. I expressed my belief then and I repeat it today—our present military strategy is killing young Americans and wasting billions of dollars in efforts that have no real relevance either to the diplomacy of Paris or the politics of Saigon.

Two weeks ago I appeared before the Action Conference on National Priorities and urged that we quit worrying so much about saving face and begin instead to save lives. I noted on that occasion that "while we gather in this comfortable room, young Americans are still dying half a world away, undernourished guerrilla fighters still huddle in their caves—and they are human beings, too—and tunnels and spill their blood in countless rice paddies; 3 million Vietnamese refugees still languish in miserable camps—homeless, neglected, and despondent."

Now, Mr. President, the accelerating casualty rate, the increase in battalion-size operations—which has been dramatic and unprecedented—the sustained pace of U.S. air sorties over South Vietnam, all belie the evident fact that the war has been escalating, on the ground and in the air, throughout South Vietnam.

And what these actions say, more loudly than any words or proposals, is that our policy has not yet changed: that we are still committed to the preservation of the current regime in Saigon by means of American blood and military power. We are trying to win, on the battlefield and in Paris, what the Saigon government long ago lost beyond all recall: the allegiance of its own people and the control of its own land.

The Saigon regime we are still fighting to preserve is the same government whose corruption and ineptitude and intolerance of dissent have always in the past thrown away the gains bought so dearly by American lives. If we have learned anything from all the sacrifice and suffering, all the trial and effort, it is that such a government is beyond our ca-

pacity to save because it does not have the capacity or the desire to save itself.

The Saigon regime was not worth the first 20,000 American lives spent in the desperate pursuit of victory. It was not worth the 10,000 who have died since the Paris conference began. It is not worth the 360 who died last week, or the 453 who died the week before, or the hundreds who will die this week, or the hundreds who will lose their lives in the next week's futile engagements. It is not worth one more American soldier or pilot dying next week or next month or any month in the future.

There is no more time for "considering military options," no more time for "improving the bargaining position." In the name of decency and commonsense, there must be no further continuation of the present war policy, however, disguised in rhetoric or more hollow predictions of victory yet to come.

Two weeks ago, President Nixon spoke on his belief that "the American people will support a President if they are told by the President why we are there, what our objectives are, what the cost will be, and what the alternatives would be if we took another course of action."

I believe that we are in Vietnam because, having intervened in a tragic error, we followed failure inexorably down the road to catastrophe—and because our Government has not yet marshaled the moral courage to genuinely reverse our course.

I believe the only acceptable objective now is an immediate end to the killing.

I believe that the terrible costs of pursuing this war long ago surpassed any benefit that can be obtained from continuing our present course.

The only alternative to an immediate change in policy is more war, more senseless bloodshed, and a revival of the divisions and disorders that went so far toward tearing our country apart over these last recent years.

At this important crossroads for our Nation, I would hope that America could reap the bright promise of the President's inaugural address; and that in the spirit of that excellent speech, Mr. Nixon will reject the counsels of war and move to end the killing, and turn American energies back to the solution of our own problems and the search for a more decent world.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 20 minutes.

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

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 80—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO POWER RESERVED TO THE SEVERAL STATES

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which proposes an amendment to the Constitution to clarify rights and powers reserved in the States and in the people under the ninth and 10th amendments to the Federal Constitution.

The amendment to be submitted to the States for ratification is quite simple:

SECTION 1. Each state shall have the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the organization and administration of all public schools and public school systems within the state. The courts of each state shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine all rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the state with respect to public schools and public school systems within the state. No officer or court of the United States shall have the power to impair or infringe any rights herein specifically reserved to the states.

This amendment would do nothing more or less than to make it explicit in the fundamental law that the power to operate, manage and control local public schools is one appropriate for exercise only under powers reserved to the States and to the people under the provision of article IX and X of the amendments.

The proposed amendment does not challenge the right of Congress to appropriate funds for public education. It merely prevents the use of that power in derogation of reserved powers in the States. Consequently, it would prevent the delegation by Congress of power to the executive to accomplish by indirection that which Congress cannot accomplish directly. More specifically, the executive could no longer act as judge of its own powers in the area of public education as it does now.

The proposed amendment would not deprive any person of any right, privilege, or immunity under the law of the Constitution or any valid law or regulation promulgated by State or Federal authority. Instead, all questions of right would finally be determined in the courts of the separate States where "rights" to public education are created.

The amendment would give meaning and vitality in the field of public education to the provision which the Founding Fathers were careful to include in the Bill of Rights that the "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, or to the people."

The Constitution does not delegate to the U.S. Government nor prohibit to the States the power to administer and control education in local public schools. It has been almost universally held that the people retained the right to exercise control over their public school systems through the instrumentalities of their State and local governments.

The principle has been enunciated time and again on no less than 12 occasions since 1889 in the admission of new States to the Union. The admission acts of the following States grant exclusive control and authority over the public school systems to these States: North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, Alaska, and Hawaii.

As recently as 1958 the 85th Congress provided in the Alaska Statehood Act that—

The schools and colleges provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the State or its governmental subdivisions.

As recently as the 86th Congress it was provided in the Hawaii Statehood Act that Hawaii schools "shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the said State."

In addition, Congress has time and again affirmed the principle of the local nature of public schools and provided for their control on the local level. For example, the National Defense Education Act contains the following specific language and declaration—

The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. . . .

Similar expressions may be found in numerous Federal aid to education statutes.

The local nature of school financing and management is exemplified in the fact that a vast majority of all public school revenue and practically all capital outlay funds for public school facilities are raised on the State and local levels. It is only reasonable and fair and right that State and local officials continue to exercise authority commensurate with their responsibilities in the area of public education.

In this resolution we ask only for an affirmation of the principle of local control of public education as provided in the basic document of our Government, the Constitution of the United States.

Let us settle once and for all that neither the Supreme Court nor any other branch of Federal Government has constitutional authority to take control from State and local communities.

Let us reaffirm as a part of the Constitution itself the inalienable right of our citizens through their State and local governments to control their own schools.

By thus preserving this principle we shall greatly strengthen our America and we shall help build an impregnable bastion of human liberty for an enlightened and free people.

If we were to judge from past statements of individual Members of Congress and by the language of various statutes authorizing Federal aid to education, we could reasonably conclude that the proposed amendment would be welcomed. For example:

As late as 1963 Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling McMurrin said:

I do not believe that giving more Federal funds to public schools will lead to Federal control of public education, for the simple reason that no one wants it. The educators don't want it, the taxpayers don't want it, and quite certainly the people in government don't want it. . . .

The above statement was quoted, with approval, by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the Honorable EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, in his book, "A Liberal Answer to the Conservative Challenge."

Naturally, if it is true, as contended, that the executive is not interested in controlling public education—to say nothing of interferring in the administration of local public schools, then we can conceive of no reasonable objection to this amendment which would merely

preclude the possibility of future interference by the executive.

From the standpoint of the Federal judiciary, we do not believe that a majority of Federal judges are so distrustful of their colleagues on State benches as to oppose the traditional exercise of power in State courts to determine constitutional and statutory rights of citizens as they relate to public school education. If the Federal judiciary does object to the amendment on the ground of mistrust, then the issue is political. As a political issue it is beyond the competence of the Federal judiciary and one which properly can be determined only by Congress or the people.

Despite frequent disclaimers by Congress; despite denials by the Federal executive that they do not want to or intend to regulate and control local public schools; and despite similar disclaimers by the Federal judiciary—the facts speak otherwise. Federal Government, through the instrumentalities of the executive and judicial branches, has assumed plenary powers over public schools and are regulating and supervising the administration of local public schools throughout this Nation. That is a fact.

It is a devastating commentary on our times, and an indictment of trends in our Nation, that this fact is disputed in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary. The Federal Government is not only interferring in the administration of public schools but is actually dictating policy and actually supervising the administration of local public schools in infinite detail, and it is doing so pursuant to Federal policy and intent.

The executive has promulgated 30-, 40-, and 50-page guidelines. These so-called guidelines regulate every aspect of public school administration. They lay down absolute conditions with respect to recruitment, employment, training, compensation, assignment, promotion, demotion of schoolteachers. They prescribe absolute conditions relating to pupil assignment, pupil transfers, busing, and school attendance boundary lines. They assert power to regulate the location of new schools. They assert a power to overrule the will of the people, elected public officials, and even prevent the expenditure of proceeds from publicly approved bond issues for new construction and renovation of existing schools. They regulate extracurricular activities of pupils and parents, they assert a supervisory power over curriculums, textbooks, courses of study, and methods of instruction and a virtual veto power over expenditures of all school funds.

Federal district courts have gone to even greater extremes. Federal courts have compelled closing of neighborhood schools throughout this Nation—some $15,000,000 worth in Alabama alone; they have enjoined the expenditure of publicly approved bond issues for improvement and renovation of schools. They have asserted a power to override the judgment of parents and elected public officials. They set aside solemn acts of State legislatures addressed to matters of health, safety, morals, and welfare of schoolchildren. They have enjoined the highest constitutional officers of State government and other elected public officials each of whom is charged by the obligation of a solumn oath to exerise their judgment free of coercion in matters involving the best interest of children, parents, and communities.

In addition, Federal district courts have perverted the judicial process of injunction. It is used today as mandamus to compel public officials to act contrary to State and local laws and contrary to their conscience, and contrary to their best judgment respecting the best interest, safety, and welfare of children under their care.

Nor is that all. Federal district courts have legitimized actions which offend all rational concepts of due process of law. They have sanctioned the use of pencil and paper regulations having force and effect of law, as well as law by memorandum, law by telephone, and oral law handed down by Federal agents. Federal courts authorize swarms of Federal agents to go about States threatening, bullying, and intimidating local public officials as a means of implementing executive edicts.

Furthermore, Federal district courts incorporate voluminous administrative rules and regulations in injunctions and decrees and compel obedience by threats of fine and imprisonment for civil contempt without benefit of trial by jury. Mind you, this is the constant threat and coercive power used to control decisions of elected public officials on questions relating to safety and welfare of schoolchildren.

Federal district courts have sanctioned the basic premise of the inquisition. They authorize deprivation of innocent schoolchildren, the aged, the sick, the blind, the handicapped, of funds and services to which they are otherwise entitled. Such deprivations are authorized without benefit of a hearing or even an opportunity of those deprived to object or protest on grounds of human compassion or law or reason.

Both the executive and Federal judiciary contend that a hearing provided for boards and commissions and those who administer Federal education programs and not the individual victims who suffer the loss is right, and just, and all that is required by law.

This is a monstrous departure from due process. Compare this barbaric treatment with that accorded common criminals. Criminals are entitled to counsel, at public expense if necessary, to protect their rights. Rightfully so. But not innocent schoolchildren, parents, or local school boards. No funds are budgeted for school boards or parents of children to enable them to protest abuses of power by the Federal executive. These must accept without recourse any rule or regulation handed down to them by strangers to the community. The only alternative is to file an action in a Federal district court, to amend, modify, or repeal an offensive regulation. But, in the absence of funds this recourse is meaningless. They are at the mercy of Federal officials.

And what of the rights of children who suffer the loss of lunches? What of the rights of parents who object to unreasonable regulations relating to busing of their children? What can be done to alleviate the dangers to which these children are unnecessarily exposed? Under the present system there is no recourse. This we are told is "due process."

There is no point in belaboring the obvious. It is a fact that both the Federal executive and the Federal judiciary are regulating the administration of public schools throughout this Nation. We reject the contention that these regulations are justified on grounds related to equal protection. The issue is not regional or sectional. It is a national issue with dangerous consequences. For, the power to control public schools has been centralized in Federal Government pursuant to deliberate design to nationalize public education. Do you doubt it?

Daniel P. Moynihan has spoken with approval of the achievement on the Federal level of "nationalization of public policy that has accompanied the achievement of a generally national society." With respect to nationalization of education he has said that the process is not yet complete but seems well underway. He observes further, "in this sense we have centralized decisionmaking within a Federal structure" and thereby reduced pressures to change the Federal structure itself.

Dr. Ronald Campbell, a noted educator, has been more explicit in identifying aspects of nationalization. He sees national policies established, "at the Federal level with important roles played by the courts, the Congress, and the Executive offices of the President. All policy questions regarding education seem to be shaped within the context of general government."

The degree of arrogance bred by nationalization of education is illustrated by Dr. Harold Howe who has angrily condemned local control in these words:

> Local school districts must not sit on their hands and then bellow about having the reins of educational policy yanked from their fingers.

A reasonable estimate of executive intentions, as they relate to nationalization of education, may be fairly summarized as follows: It is an intent to establish Federal education policies at the national level; to initiate and implement revolutionary national school programs; to effect drastic changes of public education policies throughout the Nation; to secure discretionary powers on the Federal level to enable planners to control curricula, teaching methods, teacher training, teacher tenure, and qualifications and certification of teachers; to draw school district boundaries, consign children to federally controlled schools and otherwise establish local policies with respect to programs and priorities in all public schools in the United States.

In addition, it is an intention to establish vast regional school districts, characterized by school parks of 40- to 50-acres, and most significantly to establish "special education governments." This last movement is well underway.

This brief summary of Federal intent is a matter of record. Agents and agencies of Federal Government now assert the power to implement these goals. But even these goals are merely the part of

the nationalization iceberg presented to public view.

In this connection we submit that the power delegated by Congress to the executive to accomplish these intentions poses a many-sided threat to our federal system of government.

One aspect of that threat is in its contribution to an ever-expanding Federal bureaucracy, about which Peter F. Drucker has warned:

> Modern government has become ungovernable. There is no government today that can still claim control of its bureaucracy and of its various agencies. Government agencies are all becoming autonomous, ends in themselves, and directed by their own desire for power, their own narrow vision rather than by national policy.
>
> This is a threat to the basic capacity of government to give direction and leadership. Increasingly, policy is pragmatic and execution is governed by the inertia of the large bureaucratic empires rather than policy.

The above point can be illustrated by what has happened to "policy" announced by Congress in relation to Federal aid to education. The Senate will recall that it was the expressed intention of Congress that the executive should not be empowered to compel busing of schoolchildren. This surely was a limitation on power delegated. How faithfully has this limitation been observed? Local public schools are now ordered closed by the executive under alleged authority of Congress and children are bused all over counties and cities. Thus the intention of Congress not to require "busing" is circumvented by the exercise of a more drastic power in the executive to close schools. Did Congress intend to give power to the executive to compel closing schools?

Furthermore, it was the intention of Congress that innocent children and others entitled by law to benefits provided by Congress should not be deprived without due process of law. Yet, hearings are provided only for administrators of programs—not those who actually suffer the loss of funds and services. Public school districts and administrators do not eat school lunches. They are not the beneficiaries of innumerable Federal-aid programs. The actions of the executive in this regard is obviously a devious and dangerous departure from due process of law and a gross abuse of delegated powers.

But aside from ethical and humanitarian considerations, Federal intervention in the administration of local public schools points up the disparity between the apparent power of Congress to establish policy and the actual lack of control over policy when unlimited discretionary powers are delegated to the executive. It has been said that the trend in this direction may represent the greatest crisis of Federal Government today.

Proliferation of Federal administrative agencies involved in local education is bound to undermine congressional policy: In the words of Peter Drucker:

> No sooner are they called into being that they become ends in themselves, acquire their own constituency as well as a vested right to grants from the Treasury, continuing support by the taxpayer, and immunity to political direction. No sooner, in other words, are they born then they defy public will and public policy.

The abortive experiment in nationalization of education is a classic example. It has yielded nothing but bungling, waste, and hardships, loss of public confidence, good will, and public support.

A few of hundreds of examples could be cited in support of this last conclusion. A few will suffice. A judgment on bureaucratic ineptitude in one area of nationalization of education has been expressed by Prof. Edmund Gordon. Writing in the winter 1966–67, issue of College Board Review, he observed:

> For all their variety the programs have generally suffered from one fundamental difficulty: They are based on sentiment rather than on facts.

In addition it is openly admitted that programs were designed in the face of overwhelming evidence that they could not produce what their sponsors promised, and such evidence continues to pour in.

Roger A. Freeman writing in the National Review cites these facts for consideration:

> The Associated Press conducted a nationwide survey of the program results in May and found that both critics and supporters now agree that it is not working. "It is a monumental flop," and the outbreak of recent riots speak louder than anything I can say about the total collapse of the program.

The Assistant U.S. Commissioner of Education, Joseph Fronkin, has stated:

> We still have little evidence that the problem is being licked; in fact, we may be even falling behind.

And Alice M. Rivlin, Assistant Secretary for Program Analysis at HEW, has said:

> I think we have found the task is much tougher than we thought at the start. When we began, we really didn't know how to go about it. We still don't. . . .

And what can Congress do about it? What will Congress do about it? One answer, and the wrong one, is shown by a survey which reveals the continuing proliferation of bureaucratic agencies and programs which continue to be added by Congress. Let us take a look.

James Reston in the New York Times, November 23, 1966, cited the fact that there were then 170 different Federal-aid programs on the books, financed by over 400 separate appropriations and administered by 21 Federal departments and agencies, aided by 150 Washington bureaus and over 400 regional offices. One congressional session alone passed on three health programs, 17 new educational programs, 15 new economic development programs, 12 new programs for the cities, 17 new resources development programs, and four new manpower training programs, each with its own administrative machinery.

Under these circumstances we cannot but concur in the observation of Peter Drucker that the best we can get from government in the welfare state is competent mediocrity but more often—not even that. We get incompetence such as would not be tolerated in private industry. The more we expand, the less capable routine mediocrity becomes. What does this hard judgment mean for the future of public education? We had better not try to duck this question, because chaos in education is inevitable unless changes are made. Let me show why this is so.

The powers of State and Federal Governments are distributed, allocated, and balanced on the basis of a logical proposition that there are separate and distinct functions of government.

It is axiomatic that powers of government follow responsibilities of government which identify function. No power is delegated under the Constitution independently of the logical function of the agency to which the power is delegated. If the agency has no responsibility in a particular area of public concern, it has no power in that area.

This is a fundamental limitation upon the powers of governments. It stands to reason that Congress, the Federal executive, and the Federal judiciary have no competence, no rightful responsibility, and therefore no power to regulate and supervise administration of local public schools. On the contrary, it is the responsibility of State and local governments. Power follows that responsibility, and logically that power was reserved in the States.

We have departed from this rational principle of limitation. In this connection the well-known student of government, Montesquieu said:

> When once the principles of government have been corrupted, the very best laws become bad and turn against the state; but when the principles are sound, even bad laws have the same effect as good; the force of principle draws everything to it.

The essence of Republican government is in limitations placed upon powers of government. Its integrity is measured by faithful adherence to such limitations by agents and agencies of government. Federal intervention in the operation of public schools is a gross usurpation of powers and violates the integrity of Republican government.

And what is to be done? Again let us return to Montesquieu who suggested:

> When once a Republic is corrupted, there is no possibility of remedying any of the growing evils but by removing the corruption and restoring its lost principles: Every other correction is either useless, or a new evil.

The proposed amendment will restore control of public schools to the States and local communities. It will remove a corruption and restore our Nation to its lost principles.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 80) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to power reserved to the several States, introduced by Mr. ALLEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WE AMERICANS MUST WITHDRAW OUR ARMED FORCES FROM VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the most recent outrage perpetrated by the Saigon militarist regime of Thieu and

Ky was the trial and sentencing by a Ky judge of the venerable Thich Thien Minh, one of the topmost Buddhist monks. His alleged offense: "harboring rebels opposing the Saigon government and concealing illegal documents." His sentence: 10 years at hard labor. This on top of imprisonment for some months before any charges were filed against him. This, despite the plea of our Ambassador "to exercise prudence and leniency."

The persecution of a venerated Buddhist leader further inflames the civil war in South Vietnam. Thieu and Ky are Catholics. Twenty percent of the population of South Vietnam is Roman Catholic. Buddhists claim at least 70 percent of the population. The Saigon government police raided the Buddhist youth center, a college dormitory, last February. The president of the college is the venerable Thien Minh. Police claim to have found a revolver, explosives, and Communist books or documents in the school.

His trial took but a few hours. All other Buddhists arrested at the same time, including two students who were sentenced to 15 years at hard labor, were summarily tried before the same judges and sentenced after a few hours trial. The chief offense of the Buddhist monk, Thien Minh, was that he stated Ky did not want peace in Vietnam, but wanted the fighting to continue to enable him to stay in power.

It is evident that the major stumbling block against achieving an armistice and a ceasefire in Paris is the Saigon government itself. It is a militarist regime. Its leaders were generals who fought with the French against the forces of national liberation during the fighting that continued from 1946 to May 1954. They were born in North Vietnam. Both Ky and Thieu were born in Hanoi. This regime lacks the support of more than two-thirds of the civilians in South Vietnam. It has no political base, nor strength whatever. At most but 20 to 30 percent of the citizens of South Vietnam have supported this regime from the start. Most of those who favor the Thieu-Ky dictatorship are officers and soldiers of the South Vietnam Army.

If the truth were known, or admitted, the facts are that President Johnson at a conference with Ky and Thieu at Guam in 1967 insisted that Generals Thieu and Ky run for President and Vice President of South Vietnam. They are our puppets. They were scheming to run against each other for President. It is said that President Johnson, in rough, blunt Texas language to both, said "Your only chance to win is to have one military ticket with both of you as candidates, one for President and one for Vice President. Opposing each other, a civilian would win." They barely won at that, obtaining only 34 percent of the total vote. Our President meddled into the internal affairs of South Vietnam and had the effrontery to term it a nation of the free world. So, Americans created an unpopular militarist Saigon regime whose leaders know they will be out of office within hours following a ceasefire and an armistice.

Therefore, they are now complaining about a VC offensive against Saigon, when for many months we Americans have been maintaining without cessation a search and destroy offensive in South Vietnam. In fact, Gen. Creighton Abrams at the time President Johnson ordered a bombing halt of North Vietnam was directly ordered to continue "all-out pressure on the enemy." General Abrams has meticulously followed these instructions. For 4 months U.S. forces in South Vietnam have conducted a major offensive against the VC. During that time the VC and particularly the regiments from North Vietnam have been on the defensive. For the most part, the North Vietnamese forces in fact have been and are in their rear bases in Cambodia and Laos. General Abrams and his forces have been successful to some extent in broadening the areas of South Vietnam under allied control.

From November 1968 to January 1969 the number of allied battalion-sized operations in South Vietnam increased more than one-third from 800 to 1,077. Of these, 919 were South Vietnamese, 84 American and 74 combined. During this period the North Vietnamese pulled all but three of their 25 regiments in the northern sections of South Vietnam back north across the demilitarized zone. This made it possible for more than a full division of American troops to join in maximum military pressure in the more southerly areas of South Vietnam as a means of maintaining morale there and hoping to encourage the Saigon regime to participate more earnestly in the Paris peace talks.

Former Ambassador Averell Harriman has stated that the present Vietcong offensive is "essentially a response to our actions rather than a deliberate, reckless attempt to dictate the peace terms or torpedo the talks."

Mr. President, our administration cannot continue to press the fighting with increased vigor and at the same time charge that the Vietcong and North Vietnamese are acting in bad faith and breaking their word when they are firing rockets at targets in areas occupied by American forces and soldiers of the Saigon regime.

That the Vietcong would fire mortar shells in Saigon, Hue, and other cities was a logical response to the attacks made upon them. This problem is now in the hands of President Nixon as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. Does he propose to continue to seek military victory in Vietnam? If so, with more than half a million American fighting men in that little country, the price would probably be a continuation of losing 400 American lives in combat each week. Unfortunately, the end might not be this or even next year. Ky desires us to fight to the last American.

The challenge confronting President Nixon in the current Vietcong offensive is to resist the tendency of the Johnson administration and the generals of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to escalate the war with each new challenge from the Vietcong. The sudden doubling of our casualties in South Vietnam is a bitter indication of the high price of this ugly war. We have been caught in a civil war raging for years between the forces of the National Liberation Front, or Vietcong, and the militarists of the Saigon regime headed by Ky and Thieu. It makes clearer than ever the need for ending it as soon as possible. That goal will not be reached by further self-defeating responses caused by frustration and anger.

The Nixon administration will need to keep its head. Any reckless threat to resume bombing of the north would easily precipitate an escalation more frightening than any in the past—and harder to stop. Let us hope that President Nixon and his advisers will have the resolution and patience to see the present crisis through without any rash response.

It is definite and clear that a military victory is an impossibility for both sides. The only hope is for all parties involved in this miserable civil war to make a greater effort to move the peace talks in Paris off dead center and to negotiate an armistice and ceasefire and to continue diplomatic talks now going on. Anything either side does to retard the progress of those negotiations simply condemns more American lives and more treasure to destruction in the bottomless pit that is the Vietnam war.

We should withdraw without further delay 50,000 to 100,000 American soldiers from South Vietnam in the same manner we sent them there—by ships and airplanes. The huge number of our men remaining should then be placed on the defensive in areas such as Saigon, Hue, Da Nang, Cam Ranh Bay and some other coastal bases. They would have ample protection with their own fire power and with the umbrella of our Air Force and the tremendous fire power of the 7th Fleet and its planes. Then, in effect, there would be a de facto withdrawal of American forces, and results from Paris should be accelerated. Also, secret diplomatic negotiations that we feel certain have been proceeding for some months are much more likely to bear fruit and bring about a ceasefire and an armistice very soon thereafter.

Mr. President, the Saigon militarist regime is incapable of making peace. The reason: Thieu and Ky have a vital interest in continuing the war and the bloodletting. Their political and probably even their physical lives depend upon it.

When the civil war in South Vietnam is brought to an end Thieu and Ky will rendezvous with their unlisted, but well larded by corruption, bank accounts in Hong Kong and Switzerland. They will get our fast when American GI's no longer sustain them in power in Saigon, and then no doubt leisurely join the colony of other ex-dictators on the French Riviera and Swiss Alps.

HUMAN RIGHTS CANNOT BE TAKEN FOR GRANTED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, upon his return from Europe President Nixon expressed the view that the prosperity he saw there made it very, very clear that we had been justified in providing aid to European nations directly after the Second World War. For it was through our aid, together with a mas-

sive effort by the people of Europe, that this very prosperity came about.

However, we should be as generous with our spiritual support for Europe and other people as we have been with our material support. Because of the atrocities committed by the Third Reich against the Jewish people before and during the Second World War, the United Nations has since acknowledged the sanctity of the international commitment for the safety of ethnic, racial, and religious groups by adopting a convention outlawing genocide. That was largely because of the effort of former President Harry Truman and the United States.

Yet in the 20 years since this treaty was submitted to the Senate we have failed to join the overwhelming majority of nations in ratifying this treaty. Thus, although we have been most generous with our dollars in this case we have been miserly indeed with our spiritual capital—with the leadership that our Nation had displayed so prominently since our forefathers first declared that "all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

It is past time for the Senate to reassert the leadership of the United States in the realm of human rights and freedoms by ratifying not only the genocide convention but the other human rights conventions that have been pending before the Senate for far too long.

CLEM ZABLOCKI RECEIVES WELL-DESERVED PRAISE FROM MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Milwaukee's own CLEM ZABLOCKI, who has represented his district in the House of Representatives for over 20 years, recently was the subject of a fine editorial in the Milwaukee Journal. As the Journal article points out, CLEM has done a superlative job for his constituents, but he has also earned the respect of Presidents, top diplomats, and high officials in this country and abroad. He is the ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and has been notable for his shrewd, tough-minded judgments on international matters.

We all know how difficult it is to combine the scope of an expert in foreign affairs with sensitivity and concern over a constituent's social security payments or veteran's pension. Yet this is exactly what CLEM ZABLOCKI has done and continues to do. I ask unanimous consent that the Journal editorial, which points this out so well, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ABOUT CLEM ZABLOCKI

What makes a good congressman? In today's Picture Journal Don Oleson writes about Clement J. Zablocki, Democrat from Milwaukee's 4th congressional district. It is good reading and accompanying pictures reinforce the story.

Clem Zablocki has served almost three decades as a legislator, state and national. For 20 years his south side constituents have been sending him to Washington—with such strong support that when he doesn't get over 70% of the vote he worries.

It is a matter of pride to longtime friends that "this church organist" has done so well. But that misses the point. Zablocki has gone far because he is intelligent, works hard, usually rejects "exercises in futility," knows the ropes.

Zablocki knows his constituents and their needs and works constantly for them. He is a wise politician. He is something of an expert in foreign affairs, too. He knows and has known presidents, top diplomats, high officials in this country and abroad. They respect him and his position and abilities. He is a kielbasa man, but a caviar man, too. He is worth reading about.

MILWAUKEE SCHOOL SYSTEM—JOB CORPS COOPERATIVE PROGRAM MAY SET FUTURE PATTERNS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Forest Service and the Office of Economic Opportunity recently joined with the Milwaukee public schools to initiate a unique pilot program to salvage young lives. Under the terms of an agreement signed on January 30 of this year the Forest Service has agreed to provide up to 50 spaces at its Blackwell and Clam Lake conservation centers for youth recruited from the Milwaukee school system. These young men will be identified through a counseling program as not fully benefiting from their enrollment in the system. They will then be referred by the system to a youth opportunity center in Milwaukee for screening and recruitment by the Office of Economic Opportunity in conjunction with the youth opportunity center.

This program exemplifies the type of cooperation between national and local government that is simply essential if this Nation is to combat effectively the many problems spawned by poverty, ignorance, and disease. It uses skills that the local schools are best equipped to provide—the identification and counseling of young people in the community who need to escape from an environment of broken homes and grinding poverty to a milieu where they can be trained to become wage earners rather than tax eaters. It also combines the talents of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Forest Service in making sure that those chosen are equipped to benefit from their chance and that they are given the best possible education and work experience.

I know that many other communities will follow closely the Milwaukee experiment to see if it can be applied to their problems. I believe that it has tremendous potential. So that Senators can be better informed on the basis of the program I ask unanimous consent that a press release and information sheet on the program as well as an article that recently appeared in the Milwaukee Journal be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

INFORMATION ON COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT: FOREST SERVICE-OEO-MILWAUKEE SCHOOLS

Who.—Dr. Richard Gousha, Milwaukee, Superintendent of Schools, Mr. Alan Beale, Chicago, Regional Administrator OEO; Mr. George S. James, Milwaukee, Regional Forester, Eastern Region FS.

What.—This is an agreement entered into by the Milwaukee School System, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Eastern Region of the Forest Service/U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Forest Service operates the Blackwell and Clam Lake Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers in Wisconsin, which provide intensive programs of education, vocational training, and work experience in a residential situation for disadvantaged male youth. The OEO is responsible for the recruitment, screening and assignment of enrollees to these Centers in conjunction with the Youth Opportunity Center in Milwaukee. The Milwaukee Public Schools are in a position to identify numerous youth who are not fully benefiting from their enrollment in the Milwaukee Public School System, but who would benefit from participation in the Civilian Conservation Center program. The Forest Service agrees to allot up to fifty (50) spaces at both Blackwell and Clam Lake Centers for youths (enrollees) from the Milwaukee area. These young men will enter the Job Corps training program in conformance with Wisconsin employment and school enrollment laws, and coordination with Malwaukee Public School's procedures. The OEO agrees to reimburse the Milwaukee Public Schools for the expenses incurred by their coordinator to be hired specifically for this job of counseling and recommending youths for the program. These youths will be referred to the Youth Opportunity Center, 710 North Sixth Street, Milwaukee, for interview and possible recruitment.

When.—The formal agreement will be signed at 3:00 PM Thursday, January 30, 1969. The program will take effect immediately upon signing the agreement.

Where.—The agreement will be signed by the above principles in the Office of the Regional Forester, eighth floor of the Clark Building, 633 W. Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee.

Why.—There are many school dropouts or near dropouts who can be given a second chance to acquire the education and training they need to become productive citizens in today's complex world. The Civilian Conservation Centers being run by the Forest Service has now had nearly four years of experience in salvaging such youths. The combination of work-study experience in the Center programs, in combination with residence with good counseling, proper medical care and adequate food and living facilities, and also vocational training by skilled instructors, is now a proven way of helping these young men who are not able to make out as well as society demands in the public school system. Many of the youths come from broken homes, or poverty backgrounds, and badly need the help this program can offer them. Too many of them have not known about the program. The coordinator in the Milwaukee schools will give them the counseling about the program they have not had, this is a pilot program, and if successful could become national in scope, with other school systems doing as Milwaukee has determined to do.

REGIONAL OFFICE FOREST SERVICE-U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

An agreement was signed in the office of Regional Forester George S. James today between the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Milwaukee Public Schools, and the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is a compact to salvage school dropouts or those about to drop out. It is designed to give these youths a good second chance to acquire the basic knowledge and skills they need to better survive in today's complex world.

Dr. Richard Gousha, Superintendent of

Milwaukee Public Schools, Emery Biro, Regional Job Corps Administrator, OEO, Great Lakes Regional Office and Regional Forester James were the principals signing the formal agreement. The signing took place at 3:00 PM at the Milwaukee headquarters of the Forest Service.

Under the terms of the agreement, the Forest Service agrees to allot up to fifty spaces at both Blackwell and Clam Lake Civilian Conservation Centers, located on the Chequamegon and Nicolet National Forests in northern Wisconsin. At these two Centers the youths recruited for the program will go through the Job Corps training, which consists of intensive programs of education, vocational training, and work experience in a residential situation. At the Centers they will also be provided adequate medical attention, wholesome food, and good living quarters with other youths of similar background and age (from 16 to 21). The Forest Service has had nearly four years of experience in operating these Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers, and have suceeded in salvaging many young men, who might otherwise have failed to meet society's demands as productive citizens.

The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) agrees as its part of the compact to reimburse the Milwaukee Public Schools for the expenses incurred by their supervisor, who will be hired specifically to counsel youths in the school system about the opportunities in the Job Corps program. Those young men eligible will be referred to the Youth Opportunity Center in Milwaukee for possible recruitment.

The Milwaukee Public Schools agree to identify youth in the 16–18 age group under their jurisdiction, for subsequent screening and enrollment in Blackwell or Clam Lake Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers. The schools agree to provide approximately 50 male youths for Blackwell by April 1, 1969, with a lesser number for Clam Lake. Referrals should begin immediately upon signing of the agreement.

Speaking for himself, as well as Regional Administrator of OEO, Alan Beals, Regional Forester James said: "We are particularly pleased to have a man of Dr. Richard Gousha's stature to enter into this agreement with us. In the several years he has been Superintendent of Milwaukee Public Schools, he has shown compassion for the type of young men we want to recruit into this vital program. He is an educator well respected by his peers around the country. We are sure that other school administrators will want to do as he has done, seeing in the Job Corps program an opportunity to salvage those young men in the school systems, who might otherwise be lost. Nothing could be more vital than this."

MILWAUKEE JOB CORPS PROGRAM NOW LINKED WITH CITY SCHOOLS

Educators and conservationists will be watching a new phase of the job corps program, made official the other day by the signing of an agreement by the federal forest service, the Milwaukee public school system and the office of economic opportunity.

The forest service agreed to allot up to 50 spaces at its Blackwell and Clam Lake conservation centers in northern Wisconsin to accommodate youths "not now fully benefiting from their enrollment in the Milwaukee public school system."

The youths will be recruited through their schools and referred to the Youth Opportunity Center. They will be removed from the temptations of truancy and street problems, and the influence of a bad home life. Attendance, of course, will be 100% in their new surroundings.

The youths will go through academic and vocational training and work experience, along the lines of work-study programs with Milwaukee industry. They will be put into small classes and will study at their own rates, repeating where necessary. Main emphasis will be on reading and mathematics. They will receive school credit for work completed, making this a sort of extension of the Milwaukee school system. The program is aimed at dropouts and near dropouts. They will get adequate medical attention, wholesome food and good living quarters.

The two conservation centers already have racked up admirable records in salvaging young men. In about four years of operation, they have trained some 3,000, of whom 90% were high school dropouts with third grade reading levels, and 60% were from broken homes.

If the pilot program lives up to hopes for it, it could become national in scope.

THE TAXPAYERS REVOLT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, from time to time we receive in our mail an especially poignant or refreshing letter. At times, even when critical, they may yet express the essential mood of the country.

Last week I received such a letter from the editor of the Cambridge News, a weekly newspaper in Cambridge, Wis. The editor, Mr. G. W. Crump also sent one of his recent editorials.

From what I see and hear from my weekly trips in Wisconsin, the letter and editorial represent the fundamental sentiment of the people in my State. The ordinary citizen is being hit very, very hard by increases in local property taxes to pay for schools, and teachers' salaries, and public facilities. He is being asked to sacrifice a great deal for his community and his country.

At the same time he sees big increases in industrial wages and corporate prices and profits. If he lives in the rural area or in the smaller towns serving them, he knows that farm prices and farm income have fallen very far behind.

On top of this he knows of a dozen examples of obvious Government waste or misplaced spending priorities. Chief among these are the pay increases only recently voted for the President, the Cabinet, Congress, and the senior civil servants, which I opposed and fought against.

Our forgotten average citizen is willing to make sacrifices if he feels others are also making them. But when millionaires pay no taxes on huge income; when Congress votes itself a 40-percent pay raise; when the Pentagon and defense industries show little or no concern for wasteful practices and generate huge surpluses and cost overruns; he finds it most difficult to make what to him are huge sacrifices when others not only fail to make them but give every appearance of benefiting from what he has done.

When, in addition to all of this, the Federal surtax is extended and price rises continue, he developes a smarting sense of injustice.

Frankly, Mr. President, I agree with him.

I ask unanimous consent that both the editorial from the Cambridge News and the letter to me from the editor, Mr. Crump, be printed in the RECORD in order that we may all get some better sense of the essential feeling in the country.

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

THE CAMBRIDGE NEWS,
Cambridge, Wis., March 8, 1969.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: On March 6th, the editor received an important letter from you which, because of its contents created considerable interest in this community. According to the information contained in this release, your office sent a questionnaire to 100,000 people in this state. More than 11,000 people responded. The replies revealed the following facts:

These people voted 24 to 1 in favor of cutting or holding the line on governmental spending.

They opposed the proposed renewal of the surtax 2 to 1. (The editor believes it would have been 25 to 1 in this community.)

And then, in the all important statement made in your speech on the senate floor you said: "The message I read in the results of the latest constituents poll is that the long talked about tax payers revolt is upon us. It is here! The Congress and the administration can ignore it only at their own peril."

In the light of these sensational findings and your speech and the directive you have received from the tax payers in your state how can you and the other governmental workers justify a 41% increase in salary without putting up a powerful attempt to defeat this legislation?

The writer is informed you voted against this increase; but haven't your constituents a right to expect more than just a negative vote—and is it not fair that you should fight to repeal this vote?

On February 13th, this paper ran a message on this increase and a protest on this increase. About 70 people responded by filling out the protest petition. Why weren't there more? And this you people in Washington should worry about!

Because they believe that nothing short of an open tax revolt will get results. Person after person told the editor: "If I thought it would have done any good I would have signed. But nothing will change these spenders down there." You were right in your statement Senator, people are fed up with the waste, stupidity and manner that our tax dollars are being wasted.

In the face of the terrific cost of the war in Vietnam, the poverty program, the rebuilding of our cities, foreign aid and the stupid blundering and waste in government of all kinds—in face of all that how can you and your associates possibly justify this increase?

You are one of the Senators who put up a good fight for the repeal of the 10% surtax and Wisconsin people applauded your attempt. But you know and we know that this increase took just about one-half of the money raised by this increase. Don't you see, our people are disgusted, discouraged and disappointed in our representatives because there is not more serious attempts to remove this tax.

The editor wonders how familiar you are with the financial and tax problems of rural and small village Wisconsin? Do you know for instance what education is doing to our taxes. We invite you to consider a few of the details.

During the past decade, the instructional cost of our community school (950 children) went up from $104,000 to $414,000 in 1968. And today we are told by the educational leaders of our state that our teachers are underpaid and immediate raises are due if we are to compete for the better teachers now moving on to the larger communities.

Every department of our school—Administration, Transportation, Maintenance, etc.—

is asking for more money and the costs are up from about 300% to 375% in this period.

In order to meet the educational needs of our children, this school district is building a million dollar school this year and the taxpayers shudder to think of the cost of this additional facility. Add to this a new program in our state of vocational education—and financed again by the assessment on property owners.

And then consider the increased cost of village, county, township, state, and federal governments and you will understand why our people are about to refuse to accept a greater tax burden.

You as our senator have delivered some fine talks about inflation—and you should.

But we know and you know that the union workers and the big business interests in this country can and will meet these inflatinonary costs by increased wages and added prices on goods manufactured and sold.

But not so communities like ours.

There are too many people living in small villages and rural areas who are retired and depend on small pensions and social security for their living. Another serious matter bothers. We are a rural community and depend on the prosperity and farm prices for our income.

And no one need to tell this to a Wisconsin senator so familiar with farm income, rising costs and lowering net profit on our farms. The small farmer so important to our continued prosperity is disappearing as is the small farm dairy industry. The writer worked for 12 years as publicity director of the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture, the State Fair and the Dairy promotion program of the state. The decline in farm profits is frightening when it means so much to our small communities.

Now getting back to this salary increase. Did you not sign an implied contract on the amount of money you were to be paid during your term in office? We know you put up a fine struggle to be elected at the salary you knew you were to get.

Senator, no one knows better than you do the effect this salary hike has on inflation. The working man in the powerful unions, the big businessmen are saying: "Those birds got theirs—why shouldn't I get mine?"

You have called this the most dangerous trend in modern history. And you must know what it is doing to small town America.

The Milwaukee Sentinel published an editorial in which they said that there was a possibility that this raise was illegal. Couldn't you try to prove this? The attitude of some of your fellow Senators is known: Senator Dirksen is quoted as saying—"Let 'em holler—we're men enough to take it."

This is too long a letter and probably a busy senator will never see it. But honestly, you and your fellow legislators better listen. In the Good Book Solomon sang: "For the needy shall not always be forgotten. The expectations of the poor shall not perish forever."

We will be delighted to publish your reply—and please senator give us some hope that something is being done to check this salary hike and the impossible tax burden these small town and rural folks are being asked to carry.

You must know that this letter is being written by the editor and contains some poor typing. We are sorry that there are no secretaries in the small newspapers of Wisconsin.

Yours very truly,

G. W. CRUMP.

DISGUSTED WITH TAXES?—THEN SIGN AND RETURN PETITION PRINTED BELOW

We honestly believe that 95% of the American tax payers are bitterly opposed to the whooping and sickening pay raises the selfish politicians in Washington voted themselves last week.

We further believe that these Washington money hungry lawmakers know that the American people are against this and they are deliberately and selfishly disregarding their wishes when they make this steal.

Certainly these political connivers must know that these outrageous pay hikes are going to cost the tax payers directly and indirectly billions of dollars in additional taxes and could well deal a fatal blow to their feeble attempt to check and control inflation.

What a sad and miserable example they have set for big union labor seeking inflationary wage demands. What an argument they have presented to big business to up prices and profits. This program of "I'm going to get mine and to hell with the tax payer" was never more perfectly demonstrated.

What can a small weekly paper and an unimportant editor do about this? Maybe nothing but burn inside and find new names to call these political hypocrites.

It has ever been thus. The people who pay the tax burdens have never been able to do anything about these injustices. Helplessly, they watch these wastes and stupidities. Yet according to the constitution and the preachments made by these same politicians during election time, all power comes from common man.

Now if the majority of the readers of the News who in their financial agony of trying to keep their heads above the threatening waters of mounting inflation and high taxes would sign these petitions, we not only could encourage other papers to secure signatures but could send these petitions to the men in Washintgoin who engineered this steal.

Maybe the forgotten man of the rural area the small town—the so called "little fellow"—the gent who makes the terrific sacrifices to meet this impossible tax bill could tell their servants in Washington "where the bear went through the buckwheat" and this clever steal could still be stopped.

What is the financial situation in our state and nation? These politicians are in a horrible mess. They have a costly war to fight, countless numbers of poverty and crime committees to finance, they have inflation making the service of state and federal governments more costly, and finally the costs of education have soared to almost impossible heights.

Honestly, if you will sign the below petition in sufficient numbers; if this fight could be taken up in other communities by other papers, maybe something could be done. So please do your duty as an overtaxed citizen and express your concern at such an unfair and dangerous raise in salaries.

PETITION

As an overburdened tax payer, worried about mounting taxes and dangerous inflation—

As an American citizen disgusted, disappointed and disillusioned at this unwarranted and selfish pay raise recently voted by the Washington politicians, we demand that this deliberate steal of tax dollars be stopped.

You must know how utterly opposed to this action the majority of the voters in your district are and hence we have a right to expect you to start at once to secure its repeal.

Both of us also know that this big wage increase will encourage inflation and result in higher union wages and bigger business profits.

We will appreciate knowing what action you are taking to carry out the wishes of the voters of your district.

Name _____

City _____ State _____

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in these days when many of our institutions and traditions are being questioned, it gives me great pleasure and reassurance to note the 50th anniversary of a great organization that has served our Nation with dedication and devotion. I refer to the golden anniversary of the American Legion. It was 50 years ago, on March 15, 1919, that Americans serving in France met in Paris to found the American Legion.

On November 11, 1919, the first anniversary of the armistice that ended World War I, the Legion stepped off in parade down a snowy street in Minneapolis. At the same time, Legion groups were holding Armistice Day parades in cities and towns all over America. In Centralia, Wash., as Legionnaires marched down Main Street, shots rang out. Four Legionnaires fell mortally wounded, ambushed by members of the IWW. In the history of the American Legion this tragic event has since been referred to as the Centralia massacre.

Perhaps it can be fairly said that the American Legion's unalterable opposition to communism, socialism, and all forms of radicalism stems partly from the time of the Centralia massacre. Through the years since 1919, the Legion has been the implacable foe of the international Communist conspiracy. During the 1930's and the 1940's, when it became fashionable in some quarters to look upon communism as just another form of political ideology, the Legion consistently warned the American people that Communists had only one ultimate goal, and that was the overthrow of our American form of Government, preferably by force and violence. The American Legion has never been deluded by the shifting policies of the Kremlin, designed to lull Americans into a sense of security. And as events have unfolded through the years, the Legion has been shown to be correct. Communism, either the foreign or domestic brand, cannot be trusted.

Whether in the rice paddies of Vietnam or in public places and on the campuses here in our country, the Communists are conspirators whose goal is revolution leading to the downfall of the capitalist free enterprise system upon which the American Nation has been built.

I am glad that there is an American Legion which will continue to remind Americans of their priceless heritage and to oppose those foreign and domestic enemies who threaten the future security of our Nation. As long as there are organizations like the American Legion, we

can be confident that freedom will be preserved.

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 assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S. 4 AND S. 335 OFFER PROTECTION TO ENDANGERED SPECIES OF NATIVE FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Interior, Walter J. Hickel, has recently published a list of endangered species of native fish and wildlife. I should like to point out that the Texas Red Wolf and the American Ivory-billed Woodpecker, both found to exist in the Big Thicket area of southeast Texas, are on this list. There are some who believe they might already be extinct.

My bill, S. 4, to establish a Big Thicket National Park of not less than 100,000 acres, would provide protection for these and other species native to that area of Texas.

The American alligator is also on this list. Widespread illegal poaching and continued destruction of habitat areas have placed this once common creature in danger of extinction. My bill, S. 335, to prevent the importation of endangered species or parts thereof into the United States; and, to prohibit the interstate shipment of any domestic species taken contrary to State law, will offer protection to the American alligator, as well as numerous other species threatened with extinction.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the Senate will soon take action on these bills as part of an overall effort to preserve our environment and protect the rapidly vanishing species of fish and wildlife from eventual extinction.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of endangered species of native fish and wildlife, issued by the Secretary of the Interior, be printed in the RECORD. Tragically, it is three pages long. There are so many species which are on the verge of becoming extinct in this country, including mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, and fish.

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

ENDANGERED SPECIES OF NATIVE FISH AND WILDLIFE

In accordance with Section 1(c) of the Endangered Species Preservation Act of October 15, 1966 [80 Stat. 926; 16 U.S.C. 668 aa(c)], I find, after consulting with the States, interested organizations, and individual scientists, that the following listed native fish and wildlife are threatened with extinction:

MAMMALS

Indiana Bat (*Myotis sodalis*).
Delmarva Peninsula Fox Squirrel (*Sciurus niger cinereus*).
Utah Prairie Dog (*Cynomys parvidens*).
Eastern Timber Wolf (*Canis lupus lycaon*).
Texas Red Wolf (*Canis rufus rufus*).
San Joaquin Kit Fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*).
Black-footed Ferret (*Mustela nigripes*).
Florida Panther (*Felis concolor coryi*).
Caribbean Monk Seal (*Monachus tropicalis*).
Guadalupe Fur Seal (*Arctocephalus philippi townsendi*).
Florida Manatee or Florida Sea Cow (*Trichesus manatus latirostris*).
Key Deer (*Odocoileus virginianus clavium*).
Columbia White-tailed Deer (*Odocoileus virginianus leucurus*).
Sonoran Pronghorn (*Antilocapra americana sonoriensis*).

BIRDS

Hawaiian Dark-rumped Petrel (*Pterodroma phaeopygia sandwichensis*).
California Least Tern (*Sterna albifrons browni*).
Hawaiian Goose (Nene) (*Branta sandvicensis*).
Aleutian Canada Goose (*Branta canadensis leucopareia*).
Tule White-fronted Goose (*Anser albifrons gambelli*).
Laysan Duck (*Anas laysanensis*).
Hawaiian Duck (or Koloa) (*Anas wyvilliana*).
Mexican Duck (*Anas diazi*).
California Condor (*Gymnogyps californianus*).
Florida Everglade Kite (Florida Snail Kite) (*Rostrhamus sociabilis plumbeus*).
Hawaiian Hawk (or Io) (*Buteo solitarius*).
Southern Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus l. leucocephalus*).
American Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*)
Attwater's Greater Prairie Chicken (*Tympanuchus cupido attwateri*).
Masked Bobwhite (*Colinus virginianus ridgwayi*).
Whooping Crane (*Grus Americana*).
Yuma Clapper Rail (*Rallus longirostris yumanensis*).
Light-footed Clapper Rail (*Rallus longirostris levipes*).
Hawaiian Gallinule (*Gallinula chloropus sandvicensis*).
Hawaiian Coot (*Fulica americana alai*).
Eskimo Curlew (*Numenius borealis*).
Hawaiian Stilt (*Himantopus himantopus knudseni*).
Puerto Rican Plain Pigeon (*Columba inornata wetmorei*).
Puerto Rican Parrot (*Amazona vittata*).
American Ivory-billed Woodpecker (*Campephilus p. principalis*).
Northern Red-cockaded Woodpecker (*Dendrocopus b. borealis*).
Southern Red-cockaded Woodpecker (*Dendrocopus borealis hylonomus*).
Hawaiian Crow (or Alala) (*Corvus tropicus*).
Small Kauai Thrush (Puaiohi) (*Phaeornia palmeri*).
Nihoa Millerbird (*Acrocephalus kingi*).
Kauai Oo (or Oo Aa) (*Moho braccatus*).
Crested Honeycreeper (or Akohekohe) *Palmeria dolei*).
Molokai Creeper (or Kakawahie) (*Loxops maculata flammea*).
Akiapolaau (*Hemignathus wilsoni*).
Kauai Akialoa (*Hemignathus procerus*).
Kauai Nukupuu (*Hemignathus lucidus hanapepe*).
Maui Nukupuu (*Hemignathus lucidus affinis*).
Laysan Finch (*Psittirostra c. cantans*).
Nihoa Finch (*Psittirostra cantans ultima*).
Ou (*Psittirostra psittacea*).
Palila (*Psittirostra bailleui*).
Maui Parrotbill (*Pseudonestor xanthophrys*).
Bachman's Warbler (*Vermivora bachmanii*).
Kirtland's Warbler (*Dendroica kirtlandii*).
Dusky Seaside Sparrow (*Ammospiza nigrescens*).
Cape Sable Sparrow (*Ammospiza mirabilis*).

REPTILES AND AMPHIBIANS

American Alligator (*Alligator mississippiensis*).
Blunt-nosed Leopard Lizard (*Crotaphytus wislizenii silus*).
San Francisco Garter Snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*).
Puerto Rican Boa (*Epicrates inornatus*).
Santa Cruz Long-toed Salamander (*Ambystoma macrodactylum croceum*).
Texas Blind Salamander (*Typhlomolge rathbuni*).
Black Toad, Inyo County Toad (*Bufa exsul*).
Houston Toad (*Bufo houstonensis*).

FISHES

Shortnose Sturgeon (*Acipenser brevirostrum*).
Longjaw Cisco (*Coregonus alpenae*).
Piute Cutthroat Trout (*Salmo clarki seleniris*).
Greenback Cutthroat Trout (*Salmo clarki stomias*).
Montana Westslope Cutthroat Trout (*Salmo clarki*).
Gila Trout (*Salmo gilae*).
Arizona (Apache) Trout (*Salmo* sp.)
Desert Dace (*Eremichthys acros*).
Humpback Chub (*Gila cypha*).
Moapa Dace (*Moapa coriacea*).
Colorado River Squawfish (*Ptychocheilus lucius*).
Cui-ui (*Chasmistes cujus*).
Devils Hole Pupfish (*Cyprinodon diabolis*).
Comanche Springs Pupfish (*Cyprinodon elegans*).
Owens River Pupfish (*Cyprinodon radiosus*).
Pahrump Killifish (*Empetrichythys latos*).
Big Bend Gambusia (*Gambusia gaigei*).
Clear Creek Gambusia (*Gambusia heterochir*).
Gila Topminnow (*Posciliopsis occidentalis*).
Maryland Darter (*Etheostoma sellare*).
Blue Pike (*Stizostedion vitreum glaucum*).

WALTER J. HICKEL,
Secretary of the Interior.

SECRETARY HICKEL'S "WAR ON ALLIGATOR POACHERS" EMPHASIZES NEED FOR PASSAGE OF S. 335, ENDANGERED SPECIES BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel has declared war on the poachers who slaughter alligators in the Everglades National Park and reap fancy prices for these illegally taken hides by selling them to northern markets. For several days last week, Secretary Hickel visited the Everglades to learn of the extent of gator poaching first hand. He has pledged to enforce the Florida law against gator killing and to stop the illegal traffic in hides that is threatening the American alligator with extinction.

Mr. President, I commend Secretary Hickel on his firm stand in this conservation area. I am also pleased to note that the Department of the Interior is supporting the passage of endangered species legislation, such as my bill, S. 335, now pending before the Senate.

In recent days, both Secretary Hickel and Gov. Claude Kirk, of Florida, have emphasized the plight of the American alligator, and have publicly declared their intentions to preserve this unique

species. My bill, S. 335, to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish and wildlife, and to prohibit the interstate shipment of our domestic species—including the American alligator—taken contrary to State law, will be an effective way to stop this widespread illegal poaching. I hope that the Senate soon will take action on my bill, and that this valuable protective legislation will be written into law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Sunday, March 9, 1969, edition of the New York Times entitled, "Hickel Will Oppose Alligator Killings," and an editorial from the Tuesday, March 11, 1969, edition of the Washington Post entitled "Saving the Everglade Gators," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 9, 1969]

HICKEL WILL OPPOSE ALLIGATOR KILLINGS

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—An Alaskan set out today to save alligators.

Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel, in a surprise action, announced that "we are declaring war" on poachers who slaughter alligators in the Everglades National Park and reap fancy prices for illicit hides that go into womens handbags, shoes and other ornaments.

The former Governor of Alaska, who has been criticized by conservationists as more attuned to business interests than to the preservation of natural values, backed up his words with Federal funds.

He said that the drive against poaching would cost about $100,000 this year. This money will have to "come out of other essential services throughout the national park system," he said.

WILL FOLLOW UP ORDER

"Lack of funds already is causing a deep cut in park services throughout the country and this additional drain will hurt badly," he said. "But our nation will be hurt even more if we do not act now to save irreplaceable wildlife."

Mr. Hickel said that to assure that his orders were carried out he would fly to Florida next week for an on-the-spot investigation. A transfer of National Park Service personnel to create a ranger force to stamp out poaching has already begun.

State and Federal efforts have long been under way, with little effect, to save the alligator, a 200-million-year-old survivor of the age of reptiles. The alligator once numbered in the millions in this country, but the estimated population now is 20,000.

Poachers, working in the trackless Glades by day and night, sell the hides for as much as $6 to $7 a foot to illicit buyers who smuggle them to New York.

The buyers command factory prices of $20 to $30 a foot. A finished pair of women's or men's shoes brings $70 or more. A suitcase may cost as high as $1,000.

Florida law for poaching and other violations related to the killing of alligators could bring fines of up to $10,000 and imprisonment up to 10 years or both.

The Administration is backing a bill aimed at protecting endangered wildlife. A similar bill failed last year after last-minute opposition from the fur and leather industries.

FOREIGN BACKING SOUGHT

The bill would assist states in fighting illegal traffic in protected animals put into interstate or foreign commerce, prohibit the importation of wild animals threatened with extinction and authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire private lands within any boundaries of a national preserve for the purpose of protecting endangered species.

Representatives of furriers, tanners and unions associated with the industries generally endorsed the new bill but some sought assurances that the United States would lead in getting major countries to adopt a uniform approach to endangered species.

The Secretary, it was learned, may follow up his drive on the slaughter of the vanishing gators with another effort to save the musk oxen in his own state.

It was understood he was considering issuing orders against the hunting of the musk ox on Nunivak Island National Wildlife Range, 18 miles off the Alaska coast in the Bering Sea.

As Governor of Alaska last year, he vetoed a bill by the Legislature that would have permitted hunting of the docile animal. The State House of Representatives recently approved a second bill for hunting of the musk ox.

Mr. Hickel has said that the rare animal could mean a new industry in the Arctic country. Its fine wool fleece sells for about $50 a pound.

Mr. Hickel also said that he had instructed the Park Service to begin "recruiting longtime residents" of the Everglades area to be trained as a "conservation posse" to reinforce the park rangers.

"We are looking for men who know the 'glades' like they know themselves," he said. "We want men who have lived in the swamps, who love wildlife and who will dedicate themselves to preserving the alligator."

Four rangers in the Everglades National Park are being relieved of all other duties and assigned to alligator protection, he said. Their former duties will be taken over by rangers transferred from other parks, including Great Smoky Mountains and Shenandoah National Parks and the Blue Ridge Parkway.

Three former Everglades rangers are being returned from Cape Hatteras National Park, Vicksburg National Military Park and Natchez Trace Parkway.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1969]

SAVING THE EVERGLADES GATORS

Secretary Hickel's "declaration of war" against the poachers who are slaughtering alligators in the Everglades National Park is a salutary straw in the wind. When the former Governor of Alaska was under fire in connection with his confirmation hearing, he promised the Senate Interior Committee that he would give vigorous attention to the conservation problems of the entire country. His interest in gators at the southern tip of mainland U.S.A. does suggest a Nation-wide concept of his job.

The Secretary has acted none too soon. For some years the snatching of alligators right out of a national park has amounted to a scandal against conservation. The Everglades is an enormous wilderness which is extremely difficult to police. It will not be easy for even specially trained park rangers to drive out the thieves who are killing alligators and smuggling their hides to shoe and bag industries in New York. But this despicable traffic will have to be halted if a disappearing species so characteristic of the southern Florida swamps is to survive.

The fight should not be left solely to the rangers. An Administration bill before Congress would help the states protect their wildlife against illicit interstate traffic and enable the Secretary of the Interior to set up additional safeguards for species in danger of extinction. The protection of wildlife is a vital part of the broader movement to retain an environment conducive to human survival. It merits thoughtful consideration on Capitol Hill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, let me point out that if my bill S. 335—which is basically the same as my bill introduced at the last session of Congress which came out of the Commerce Committee onto the floor of the Senate during the closing days of the session, too late to be passed—can be passed this session, it will furnish the needed protection.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE GOVERNMENT STORY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to note the national premiere on Tuesday March 18 at 5 p.m. of the "Government Story," a series of 40 half-hour television programs on the operation of three branches of the Federal Government. I have watched this series during its production over the past 3 years. I was pleased to have been interviewed on my view of nature of the work of the U.S. Senate. This has been a magnificent undertaking that has needed to be done for a long period of time.

It is my sincere hope that everyone in the country will have an opportunity to view these programs. Anyone who does see this series will better understand the ways in which the three branches of our Government work to do the business of the country. The uniqueness of this series is that Members of this body and the other body were willing and happy to tell the story of legislative process firsthand. The Library of Congress, the Smithsonian, and the Archives as well as the National Geographic cooperated fully to provide the graphic material and research facilities to make this series accurate and interesting to the eye.

I wish to extend my congratulations and thanks to group W, Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. and the members of the Operation Government Committee for their splendid work. It is fine that Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.'s chairman, Donald McGannon, and his fine staff have done a great public service in sponsoring this extensive series. The ladies of the Operation Government Committee have spent their time well, over the past 3 years in seeing this project to fruition.

THE PLIGHT OF THE MEXICAN TOMATO INDUSTRY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for the past 6 weeks I have sounded, I am sure, like the proverbial "voice crying in the wilderness" in my attempts to bring some official attention to the plight of the American housewife and the Mexican tomato industry.

I have repeatedly complained about, first, the Johnson administration's ill-advised, 11th-hour order placing an embargo on the importation of medium-sized tomatoes from Mexico, and, second, the Nixon administration's acceptance of that damaging order.

Mr. President, this ridiculous restric-

tion has been in effect long enough to place a genuine hardship on the American consumer in a way that is now drawing editorial attention from eastern newspapers.

On Thursday of last week, for example, the Washington Evening Star attacked the Agriculture Department order as "rank discrimination" and concluded:

Something has to be done and the best thing to do is for the Agriculture Department to rescind its new regulation so that the housewives can once again pay less for tastier tomatoes.

In another editorial last week, the Wall Street Journal—which has investigated the entire Mexican tomato problem with great thoroughness—said this about the Agriculture Department's embargo:

So the restrictions peril moves toward freer trade, irritate friendly neighboring nations, penalize U.S. consumers and may even be self defeating for U.S. growers. We'd say that makes them look about as appealing as, say a rotten tomato.

Mr. President, I believe the conclusions reached by these newspapers are entirely correct. It is long past time for the Department of Agriculture to end this discrimination. I again call upon the Republican administration to right a grievous wrong and end this restriction to the freer trade concept advocated by President Nixon.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Star and Wall Street Journal editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 13, 1969]

MEXICAN TOMATOES

What is good for the Florida tomato grower is not necessarily good for the American consumer and the Mexican tomato industry. That is the moral to be drawn from the current flap over the new Department of Agriculture regulations setting minimum sizes for all tomatoes sold in the United States.

The department adopted these regulations in January at the urging of the Florida Tomato Committee, a grower group. The regulations provide that vine-ripened tomatoes must be more than two and 17/32 inches in diameter as compared to two and 9/32 inches required for the so-called mature green tomatoes that ripen after they are picked. This is clearly rank discrimination, for about 90 percent of Mexican tomatoes ripen on the vine while only 15 percent of our home-grown tomatoes have that same flavor-building experience. As the vine-ripened tomato is much tastier, the American consumer is hurt in two ways. He has to pay more for less tasty tomatoes.

The Mexicans, according to the Wall Street Journal, are incensed about these new regulations. Ambassador Hugo Margain has filed a formal protest at the State Department. And the Mexican press has savagely attacked this protectionist policy. For instance, one cartoon depicts a large Uncle Sam stabbing a small Mexican farmer in the back.

For their part, many tomato connoisseurs in this country are passing up the mature green tomatoes available at their supermarkets and are instead opting for tomato-less salads.

Something has to be done, and the best thing to do is for the Agriculture Department to rescind its new regulations so that housewives can once again pay less for tastier tomatoes.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar 14, 1969]

TOMATOES AND TRADE

American businessmen complain, quite justifiably, of the nontariff trade barriers that other nations erect against U.S. goods. The U.S. will have a better chance to reduce such obstacles, however, if it stops putting up its own.

In January, for example, the Agriculture Department imposed minimum-size restrictions on all tomatoes sold in the U.S. Mature green tomatoes, those that ripen after picking, have to be at least two and 9/32 inches in diameter, while vine-ripened tomatoes must measure at least two and 17/32 inches in diameter.

The average consumer is likely to consider such rules pretty silly; because tomatoes are sold by the pound, not the dozen, a difference of 1/32 inch or so is of little concern. But he may figure the restrictions are fair enough since they apply across the board to all tomatoes.

Actually, though, the rules discriminate against tomatoes grown in Mexico and in favor of those produced in Florida, the other major source of winter tomatoes for the U.S. market. For one thing, they are more lenient on green tomatoes, which make up most of Florida's crop and very little of Mexico's output. Mexican growers say the restrictions may bar as much as half of their crop from the American market.

One result is soaring prices for consumers. Winter tomatoes, already viewed as a luxury by many housewives, are rapidy becoming even more so—a trend that could mean smaller sales for growers in Florida as well as Mexico. The tomato rules, moreover, are another step toward worsening already shaky relations between the U.S. and Latin America.

So the restrictions peril moves toward freer trade, irritate friendly neighboring nations, penalize U.S. consumers and may even be self-defeating for U.S. growers. We'd say that makes them look about as appealing as, say, a rotten tomato.

DISCRIMINATORY EMPLOYMENT POLICIES OF SOUTHERN TEXTILE MILLS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I hope all Members of Congress have had an opportunity to read the lead editorial in last Thursday's Washington Post, under the headline "The Pentagon Dispenses Southern Comfort." The editorial analyzes what it calls "one of the more mystifying episodes of the past several weeks"—the circumstances surrounding the recent award of contracts to three southern textile firms whose employment policies had been found to be discriminatory.

No one is challenging the commitment to equal opportunity of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, who has received assurances that the three companies will take steps to bring themselves into compliance with the requirements of the Executive order on contract compliance. The assurances received by Secretary Packard were not in writing, however, and only he and the contractors apparently are aware of the steps which will be taken.

This procedure is not only inconsistent with the requirements of the Executive order but it also puts all parties in an awkward position. The sooner the details of the agreements are reduced to writing, the better. I join the Washington Post in urging that the details of the agreements be made public without further undue delay so that those of us with an interest in the Federal Government's contract compliance program will have an opportunity to make our own judgments about the adequacy of the assurances provided by the three textile contractors.

Mr. President, I think it appropriate at this time to give credit to the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) for the excellent work he has done in calling to public attention a number of important questions about the procedures followed in awarding the contracts to the three textile firms. Without his persistence in this matter, the public would know considerably less than it does about the circumstances of the contract awards.

Mr. President, for the benefit of Members of Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who may have missed the Post editorial, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PENTAGON DISPENSES SOUTHERN COMFORT

One of the more mystifying episodes of the past several weeks has concerned a verbal agreement reached between the Deputy Secretary of Defense, David Packard, and the representatives of three Southern textile firms—J. P. Stevens, Burlington Mills and Dan River Mills. The employment policies of all three firms had been under investigation and review by the Pentagon and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance for over a year owing to well substantiated charges that they were racially discriminatory; and all three firms had been so unyielding to Government efforts to bring them anywhere near compliance with the guidelines for Federal contractors that neither the Pentagon's own investigators nor the OFCC would recommend that contracts with them be approved.

Early in February, however, Mr. Packard awarded the three offending firms $9.4 million in Federal contracts, asserting that he had received assurances that they would put "affirmative action plans" into practice. Ordinarily, and by provision of an Executive Order, such assurances would have been put in writing. However, no one but Mr. Packard and the textile firms' representatives seems to know of what these assurances or "plans" consist. They were not committed to paper or shared with officials at the OFCC or elsewhere in the Department of Labor who were involved in the cases and who have a clear responsibility for the outcome. Indeed, more than a month after the contracts have been awarded and despite the OFCC's effort to find out more about them, the most that could be learned was that the firms had assured Mr. Packard that they would try to meet the Government's standards.

There are a couple of things that ought to be said by way of providing some background and perspective on all this. One is that Mr. Packard's own reputation in this field appears to be good, as is that of the firms for which he was responsible in private life. The other is that contract cut-off or denial has been anything but standard operating procedure in these tangled matters—the custom has been to threaten it or to delay the award until the Government's racial requirements were met. But when you have said this, you have pretty well exhausted what assurance or extenuation is to be found in Mr. Packard's odd act.

The dangers inherent in what he has done are more readily apparent. The Southern textile cases had been building for a long time. They were ripening for a big decision and had acquired the status of test cases, being widely watched in the South and elsewhere for evidence of Washington's seriousness on the question of contract compliance. Now whatever meaning they had in that regard has been spent. Moreover, weak as the Government apparatus for assuring compliance had been, there is little question that it has been drastically further weakened by the exclusion of the OFCC—presumably the maker and judge of compliance policy—from the deliberations between Mr. Packard and the spokesmen for the mills.

Finally, there is the matter of example and direction. In the South, and especially in the areas of greatest recalcitrance, Federal guidelines and official statements about them are read with excruciating, comma-picking care, there is a kind of stock market effect at work, whereby the most minute evidence of loss of resolve in Washington is registered at once in declining cooperation on the part of those companies or school districts or local governments still holding out. Reportedly, right on the heels of Mr. Packard's decision, inquiries did start coming in—from other Government agencies as well as from private concerns—as to whether this did not mean new and relaxed procedures were now in effect.

By May 1, the Southern textile firms in question will be obliged to issue a quarterly report on their progress in meeting Government requirements. Customarily, the Pentagon would issue instructions as to what it wished answered in that report. This routine procedure offers an opportunity to retrieve the situation somewhat: a public and specific list of what the Federal Government expects to hear about in that report would have the effect, retroactively to be sure, of establishing the compliance terms the mills are expected to meet. Nor would it be a bad idea to issue such a public declaration before the end of March, since additional contracts are scheduled for award by then and some are expected to go to the same three firms. The Administration, via the Pentagon and the Labor Department, should be trying to strengthen the compliance program, not weaken it. They will have the most cause for regret if they open a Pandora's box of resistance and regression.

ESTONIA MARKS 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, Americans of Estonian descent recently celebrated the 51st Anniversary of independence of the Republic of Estonia.

Following the outbreak of World War II Estonia and the other Baltic States, Latvia and Lithuania, were victimized by the totalitarianism of Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. These countries were forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Union's assault against its Baltic neighbors was the inception of the Communist thrust into free Europe. This aggression marked the beginning of today's international tension and the Russian threat to the free world.

Estonia, and other nations behind the Iron Curtain, continue to wage a valiant struggle for liberty against the Communist oppressor. This fight for freedom must not go without notice.

Estonians who fled this tyranny, their descendants, and all freedom-loving Americans must join together to lend support to the rightful aspirations of captive Estonians. With this support and the continuing efforts of all the members of the free world we hope Estonia will soon be free of the bonds of her conquerors and return to her people the basic freedoms of all independent free nations.

Mr. President, we must not rest until Estonia and all other people under Communist domination are again free to exercise their right of self-determination.

TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN LEGION ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it was most fitting that the Senate last week adopted Senate Resolution 163 marking the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion.

I wish to add my personal tribute on this occasion to the great national organization the American Legion has become since its inception. From a few hundred members at its first meeting on March 15, 1919, in Paris, the American Legion has grown to a membership of more than 2,600,000. The members come from the ranks of veterans of four great conflicts—World War I, World War II, the Korean war and now the Vietnam war—veterans who have served their country loyally and courageously in war and peace.

We who serve in Congress know of the notable legislative activities of the American Legion in support of veterans' benefits of many kinds. We also recognize the direct service the American Legion provides veterans and their families who have sacrificed so much for their country. In close partnership, the American Legion Auxiliary has rendered excellent cooperation and service through the years.

As a Legionnaire, like so many others of my colleagues in Congress, I salute and congratulate the American Legion on this memorable golden anniversary.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE AND THANKS TO ROBERT RAND OF THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, Robert L. Rand has resigned as a member and Acting Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, effective March 15. Mr. Rand is a Californian and a Republican who was appointed to the Board on September 9, 1966, by President Johnson, whose nomination was unanimously confirmed by the Senate on September 14 of that year, and took his oath of office on October 10, 1966, for the remainder of a 4-year term ending June 30, 1970.

Mr. Rand's resignation is a loss to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the executive branch of the Federal Government, and, more particularly, to the savings and loan business.

I came to know and respect him during his service in Washington. His appearances before the Committee on Banking and Currency and other committees of the Senate and House of Representatives were marked by candor, helpfulness, and demonstrations of his wide knowledge of the savings and loan business.

Mr. Rand was the first representative of the savings and loan industry to serve on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in many years. He was an admirable choice. At the time of his appointment to the Board, he was a senior vice president of the Fidelity Federal Savings and Loan Association of Glendale, Calif. During his 20 years with that institution, he was responsible for developing and administering its loan program aggregating about a billion dollars.

He was a member of the Legislative Committee of the California Savings and Loan League and chairman of its Lending Procedures Committee. He served his home city of Glendale as a member of the planning commission and is a former president of the Glendale Chamber of Commerce.

Before joining the savings and loan industry, Mr. Rand was in the banking business, interrupted by service in the U.S. Army during World War II. Mr. Rand entered the Army as a private and left it as a major in the Infantry, having served in the Philippines, Okinawa, and Korea.

On numerous occasions since Mr. Rand became a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, members of the savings and loan industry have informed me of their high regard for him, both as a leader in their business and personally. On many occasions, similar sentiments have been expressed to me by my banking committee colleagues on both sides of the aisle and by other Members of this and the other body who have come to know him.

I regret to see him leave the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and I can only hope that his successor can in some measure, bring to the Board the qualities, the high purpose, and the spirit of public service that Mr. Rand did.

I wish to convey to Mr. Rand my sincere best wishes.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last month the American Society of Insurance Management held its annual conference. One of the matters discussed was the access of corporate insurance buyers to the unlicensed insurance markets.

I ask unanimous consent that an account of the statement on this subject made by ASIM's legislative counsel, Mr. James E. Bailey, as printed in the February 19, 1969, Journal of Commerce, be printed in the RECORD.

The article will be of interest to those involved with this area, and I offer it with that in mind.

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

RISK MANAGERS PUSH FOR INDUSTRIAL EXEMPTION IN ALIEN INSURERS BILL

The American Society of Insurance Management is waging an all-out fight to preserve the corporate insurance buyers' right of access to the unlicensed (unauthorized, unadmitted) insurance markets.

This right, according to the ASIM, is under the most severe threat in the form of the introduction of bills in various states which are patterned after the Wisconsin law on the subject of unauthorized insurance.

The battle, according to James E. Bailey,

legislative counsel of the ASIM, stems from the interested parties' several positions that often are in conflict.

In a statement released here during the ASIM's annual conference, Mr. Bailey added:

"Very generally stated these are:

"(1) The very real need on the part of business and industry for those historically reliable insurance markets, Lloyd's and English companies, which, as you know are unlicensed (unauthorized, nonadmitted) in most of the U.S.;

"(2) The desire of the states to protect the public from unscrupulous and incompetent insurance companies, associations and agents;

"(3) The desire of the American insurance agents and companies to protect their competitive insurance sales positions from encroachment by unlicensed insurers (including Lloyd's)."

Historically, U.S. business and industry has always needed Lloyd's and other reliable unlicensed insurers. Most of us have been able to deal fairly well through the surplus lines channels in the past. However, of late, the problem has intensified because of the untimely combination of a severely tightened world insurance market and a rush by many of the states to protect their citizens from insurance racketeers and incompetents.

"WISCONSIN IN STYLE

"Wisconsin style unauthorized insurance laws (styled after a 1961 Wisconsin statute) seems originally to have been designed to protect the public primarily against unlicensed mail-order insurance companies and other types of insurance organizations not conducting their insurance business in a manner that safely and fairly serves the citizens of the state. Unfortunately, most of the Wisconsin type unauthorized insurance bills (unauthorized insurance) which have been introduced in 1967, 1968 and 1969 have included a definition of transacting or doing an insurance business that has the net effect of severely hindering our access to any authorized or unlicensed insurance market, be it a reliable or unreliable one.

"It should be stated here that the position of corporate insurance men has been to support legislation that strives to eliminate or control the unreliable elements. On the other hand, when the house must be burned down to get at a few rats in the basement (the house being an access channel to a great business and industrial insurance market), or when our only key to that house can be had only from a surplus line or reinsurance arrangement which adds greatly to our cost, then we must either oppose the legislation or seek an extension that will allow us to deal freely with those unauthorized insurers we need so much. (The same ones, by the way, that most of these laws, while making it illegal for the giant insured corporation to do so, allow a licensed insurance company to negotiate its reinsurance with.)

"Further, we believe that such legislation, enacted in addition to existing statutes, makes it impossible for underwriters such as Lloyd's to act lawfully within those states. The problem is that insurer reserves and other solvency requirements are set up for corporations; Lloyd's is not a corporation and cannot comply with most statutory requirements in this regard. Lloyd's has other and more elaborate safeguards to assure payment of claims including more than a half-billion dollars in funds in the United States.

POTENTIAL SEEN

"The Wisconsin type insurance legislation has a potential, which we heartily support, of accomplishing much good in behalf of the unsophisticated insurance buyer: but also an equal potential for creating extraordinary hardship for many of the states' business and industrial insureds by unnecessarily, and perhaps unintentionally, interfering with or even prohibiting the placement of needed insurance.

"It would seem that many state insurance commissioners think of the citizenry their office was created to protect solely in terms of the general public whose ignorance of insurance matters is admittedly vast and needs constant attention. We business and industrial citizens think the commissioner has an equal duty to be certain that regulatory power sought to protect one class of insureds does nothing to handicap another class of insureds. In supporting this kind of legislation we think that many of the state insurance departments just haven't done their homework on these corporate insurance matters. They differ greatly from the personal and commercial lines of insurance used by the general public. The business and industrial insureds need access to insurance markets responsive to the extraordinary requirements of American industry.

"The current severe insurance capacity limitations naturally result in underwriters being more selective, declining the less desirable risks for the more attractive lower hazard risks, and raising prices generally. Under these conditions this is certainly not a time for sponsoring statutory impediments to free access to all insurance markets. What may be protection for the uninformed public is actually an intolerable burden for the experienced insurance manager.

"Because the Wisconsin type legislation deals with regulation of insurers on so broad a basis as to include all, and exclude none, as it should, the exemption asked for a class of insureds may at first seem to be unfair discrimination. In actuality, however, no particular class or type of insurer is segregated for special treatment, but that merely one class of beneficiary of the legislation are exempted from what becomes a very dubious benefit when examined in the light of their special problems. We seek no favor; only the avoidance of a benefit we can ill afford."

THOMAS MASARYK: FATHER OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, March 7 was a date that held deep meaning not only for people of Czech and Slovak ancestry, but for all people dedicated to freedom and democracy. That day was the 119th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Masaryk, the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918, and an outstanding European statesman. He guided his country through its first 17 years of democracy, until he resigned in 1935.

Czechoslovakia suffered two tragic blows when Thomas Masaryk died in 1937, and shortly thereafter when Hitler's troops occupied their land.

Communist occupation of Czechoslovakia after World War II dealt a blow to Czech aspirations of a return to democracy.

A new spirit emanated in Czechoslovakia in 1968, however, and most of 1968 witnessed preparations for celebration of the 50th anniversary of their independence as a republic.

It was a matter of pride that the people of Czechoslovakia were allowed to honor once again the two Masaryks: "Taticek" Thomas Masaryk, father of his country, and his talented son, Jan, Foreign Minister after his father's death and during the time of the Communist takeover. Both were great men in the annals of freedom and humanity; both were truly "champions of liberty." In the past summer, shrubs outlined with flowers were planted about their graves to spell out the presidential motto "Pravda Vitezi"—"Truth Prevails."

For a long time such extension of recognition had been denied. The Novotny regime had long sought to erase from the nation's history and memory the lives and the doings of these and other true patriots.

In the midst of the preparations for the anniversary celebration, came, on August 20, 1968, the heavy military seizure and occupation of the country by the Soviet bloc forces.

Despite the cruel and oppressive occupation of Czechoslovakia, contrary to all standards of international law, and shocking to our sense of justice and national self-determination, we know that the spirit of liberty so well taught by Thomas and Jan Masaryk still lives in that country.

The calm courage of the Czechs and Slovaks in the face of occupation, and their unity of opposition, has confounded their occupiers, caused repercussions throughout the world, and brought denunciation of Soviet tyranny from many nations, including such Communist countries as Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Albania.

Let us note and remember the birthday of Thomas Masaryk and in his honor help keep alive the spirit of freedom and the desire for liberty and democracy of Czechoslovaks which, though restrained by tyranny, so eloquently flowered last year in Czechoslovakia.

SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, JR., ASSIGNED TO COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD recent editorial notices from the Nation's press that reflect favorably on the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

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

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Jan. 18, 1969]

ON FINANCE COMMITTEE: BYRD APPOINTMENT WILL AID NEEDED FISCAL REFORM

To cost-conscious, tax-conscious citizens the nation over—irrespective of political preference—it is good news that Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., Virginia Democrat, has won assignment to the Senate Finance Committee. That is like firming up the lock on the Treasury door— against debilitating leakage.

[From the Troy (N.Y.) Record, Feb. 6, 1969]

WE MUDDLE THROUGH

The *Pueblo* probe grows "curioser and curioser."

Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr. of Virginia has told the Senate that information concerning the *Pueblo* has disappeared from the permanent files of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

A year ago the Senate committee was questioning Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, on the capture of the *Pueblo*. Senator Byrd asked the secretary to comment on the statement of a high Japanese official that U.S. aircraft based in Japan could not have been sent to the aid of the *Pueblo* without the consent of the Japanese government. The Secretary of Defense replied.

Senator Byrd says that he put ten questions to Mr. McNamara "and that one of the ten including the reply has been entirely scissored out of the report by the Department of Defense."

The senator also said that the clerk of the Senate Armed Services Committee told him that this was the first time in 22 years that material has been deleted by scissors from a permanent committee report. If portions of testimony are to be kept secret they are marked in red but the report remains, always, as a permanent record.

"The Secretary's reply to an apparently significant and vital question is written on air," Senator Byrd remarked.

There are wheels within wheels in the *Pueblo* investigation. There are mysteries within mysteries.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. MURPHY. Today, Mr. President, we in this Nation are all Irish, regardless of whether we trace our ancestry to the banks of the Rhine or the Arno or the Jordan or the Shannon.

The reason for this remarkable solidarity among so many citizens of diverse backgrounds is not hard to find, for it is based on the recognition of the fact that it is the spirit of the Irish, more than that of any other country, which we find reflected in the principles on which our Nation has grown.

This is not to detract in any way whatsoever from the many other great lands whose men and women have brought us those ancient traditions and skills without which we could never have attained our present standard of civilization.

But when the mixture of vital ingredients which make up America is examined, the soul, we find, is unmistakably Irish.

Let us analyze this for a moment by considering just a few of those characteristics of spirit which are shared by the Emerald Isle and our own Land of the Free.

First, of course, there is that inborn sense of personal integrity which is the legacy of every Irishman and American alike—the God-given instinct which tells us that there is something more important than fame, and it is honor; and that there is something more important than wealth, and it is honesty; and that there is even something more important than good health, itself, and it is self-esteem.

Then, too, there is within that spirit which is common to our lands a deep patriotism, but more than this, it is a patriotism which is to be proclaimed proudly, accompanied by blares of trumpets and ruffles of drums, to all lands.

It is a patriotism which is neither too sophisticated to shed tears nor too faint-hearted to shed blood.

It is a flag-waving, parading, Saint Patrick's Day kind of patriotism, which combines unrestrained emotion and deep dedication.

It is the kind of patriotism which the purveyors of alien philosophies among us try by ridicule and innuendo to stifle and to kill.

It is, if you will, the Irish-American brand of patriotism exemplified in such an inspiring manner by the five Sullivan brothers who enlisted in the Navy on the same date during World War II with the stipulation that they remain together—and who were killed as they had fought—together—when the cruiser *Juneau*, on which they were serving, was sunk.

Combined with this patriotism, of course, is a deep faith in God.

I use the word "combined" advisedly, for the patriotism of which I speak and the religious convictions of which I speak are inseparable, regardless of court decisions or the efforts of those misguided individuals who fail to see that our traditional severance of church and state is strictly a legal distinction, not a philosophical one.

In fact, I sometimes wonder what our Founding Fathers, who placed religious principles above all else, would think if they read some of the forced explanations we hear from certain groups as to why we must not acknowledge our Almighty Father in our classrooms, mention His name on our coins, or affirm in our pledge to the flag that our country is, indeed, a Nation "under God."

In my mind, there is no doubt about what they would think, and therefore I offer today the example of their combined patriotism and religious fervor as being worthy of the emulation of every one of us.

This is our generation, our year, and our day, and the challenges we face in applying our legacy of love of God and love of country to the problems of the 20th century demand men as stalwart, men as dedicated, and men as destined for immortality as those who shed their blood at Bunker Hill, Meuse-Argonne, or Iwo Jima.

Having presented these observations, I can only add the wish that you, my colleagues, renew with me today our pledge that the Irish-American traditions so important to the younger days of our Nation shall remain our guidelines and inspiration through these years of increasing maturity.

Perhaps, then, we Irishmen, who traditionally have been accused of starting fights, can lead the way to the just, lasting peace which we and all mankind so fervently seek.

OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), on his most recent analysis of the proposed Machiasport project. He has so carefully detailed for us the adverse, if not disastrous implications of a foreign trade zone at Machiasport, that it would be almost impossible to amplify or supplement the irrefutable case he has made.

To give to Occidental Petroleum Co. the kind of windfall it seeks at the expense of the rest of the oil industry, the national security, and the oil import program would be in my judgment a tragic error. I have a great deal of sympathy for the plight of the New England consumer, but Senator LONG's analysis has demonstrated that far from lowering fuel prices for New England, the free trade zone may have precisely the opposite effect.

At any rate it should be borne in mind that even if the result would be beneficial to the New England consumer we simply cannot afford as a matter of policy to confer special benefits on one section of the country at the expense of the Nation as a whole.

Senator LONG has quite correctly pointed his finger at one of the most unfortunate effects of such a foreign trade zone with its enormous quota for finished products; namely, that it will sharply inhibit the future exploitation of oil resources in certain parts of the United States, notably the Southwest and the Far West.

As an Alaskan I feel this concern acutely; there must continue to be incentives for the exploitation of new oil resources and this can only be the case if we preserve a competitive and viable domestic oil market.

The New England footwear, shipbuilding, and textile industries cannot successfully withstand foreign competition from countries whose labor and production costs are a mere fraction of ours. The case for the oil industry, in withstanding the proposed free trade zone at Machiasport, is parallel, and in fact, because of the implications for our foreign policy and national security, all the more compelling.

I sincerely hope that the foreign trade zone will not be granted, or, if it is, that the allotted quota for the domestic sale of finished products will be substantially lower than the proposed 100,000 barrels a day. In any event, the burden of proof in changing the status quo, which is the mandatory oil import program, must rest squarely on the shoulders of the Occidental Petroleum Co. when it makes its case before the Board.

Mr. President, in these modern times, we cannot tolerate the balkanization of our domestic economy nor a wholesale surrender of our national security to the political whims of oil potentates in Africa or the Middle East. On that account I expect that the Foreign Trade Zone Board will see the unassailable wisdom of Senator LONG's argument.

THE HAZARDOUS OCCUPATION OF COAL MINING

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, I am convinced by testimony recently heard by the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Welfare, of which I am a member, that the mining of coal as is now being conducted in this country is an extremely hazardous occupation. I am further of the opinion that were all the safety and health provisions of the pending bills enacted, a great deal of risk would remain for the men who go into mines.

Coal is a vital element of our national industrial complex. I need not enumerate the ways that coal contributes to our economy. Suffice it to say that it is our most important and valuable mineral. We must have coal. How then can we utilize this product without endangering the lives of men? I suggest that we should look outside the conventional methods and strike out in a new, untried, even revolutionary direction.

What are the principal dangers to men when working underground? They are cave-in, water, dust pollution, and explosion. The first two are mechanical

and physical and can be best controlled by adequate safety laws and frequent inspections to insure compliance. The last two I believe can be best controlled by having the miner work in a completely controlled environment.

How do we handle man's survival in a completely hostile environment? We put our astronauts and aquanauts in space suits and diving gear. They breathe pure air, their bodily responses are closely monitored. Are not our miners entitled to an equal amount of concern? Their environment at work will not kill them instantly as in outer space or underwater work; but their environment can kill them just as surely.

I know there are those who will dismiss out of hand the proposal that a miner work in a space suit. This Buck Rogers idea will no doubt provide considerable amusement around the mine and in the board rooms of coal corporations. But I believe that some day coal will be safely mined in this manner.

There are other advantages. A mine could be completely sealed, filled with an inert gas such as helium, and a few pounds of pressure maintained. This would retard the invasion of water. Without oxygen, there could be no oxidation, which causes water pollution. The valuable methane gas, now lost, could be recovered.

Of course, the obvious and immediate benefit would be complete relief from air pollution and resulting "black lung" and complete removal of explosion danger, since the inert, pressurized gas would not support even the weakest explosion.

Eliminating temperature changes and maintaining a constant temperature inside the mine would prevent cracking and other physical damage that changing temperatures would cause.

Mechanical problems of maintaining a sealed mine would be substantial. It would indeed be awkward for a machine operator to spend his day in something resembling a space suit. But I submit that this might be the most workable solution if we are earnest in our desire to prevent prolonged misery and death of the men who work underground in search of our most precious mineral. I understand that at least one coal company has discussed what I am proposing today, and contemplates further research.

But I know of no present experiments in this type of mining. I firmly believe that the miners, the companies, and the Government should work together for such a model unit. To proceed with dispatch is not only desirable. It is a necessity.

THE GOVERNMENT STORY

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, after 3 years of very hard work, group W, Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. in cooperation with the Operation Government Committee, of which Mrs. McIntyre is a member, will premiere their 40 one-half hour television programs tomorrow evening. This monumental series was said to be impossible to complete when it was first proposed over 4 years ago.

Many other companies turned this project down. But the ladies of the Operation Government Committee continued to seek sponsorship, and Westinghouse Broadcasting, and their chairman, Donald McGannon took the challenge which was offered and now the series is complete.

The program will be shown on commercial television channels around the country, without cost, and with no commercial sponsorship. The whole family will be able to view the programs at convenient evening hours. Educational channels and classroom film versions will also be offered. A classroom manual for teachers will be available so that teachers can make the greatest use of this important and highly educational series.

My congratulations to the ladies of the Operation Government Committee and to the staff and executives of group W, Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. for their steadfastness in pursuing this great project to this day of national premiere.

THE ARMY ABM CONSPIRACY

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, one of North Dakota's leading dailies, the Bismarck Tribune, recently editorialized on "The Army ABM Conspiracy." The editorial was especially shocked with the Army's involvement "in an apparent conspirary with defense contractors to propagandize in behalf of the Sentinel anti-ballistic-missile program." The article concluded:

> The biggest mistake we could make now would be to spend billions for a system that won't be effective when needed, if needed, while at the same time lulling the citizenry into a confidence that they have a protection against nuclear bombs which they don't really have.

Mr. President, so the Sentinel publicists may know better the nature of the probable opposition, I ask unanimous consent that the March 12 editorial from the Bismarck Tribune be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ARMY ABM CONSPIRACY

That President Eisenhower knew whereof he spoke when he warned Americans to keep an eye on the industrial-military complex is becoming more apparent all the time.

One of the latest pieces of evidence came in the revelation that the Department of the Army involved itself in an apparent conspiracy with defense contractors to propagandize in behalf of the Sentinel anti-ballistic-missile program.

Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor's cute hand was caught in this operation, in which the Army planned to conspire with defense contractors to "plant" articles favorable to the Sentinel system in the nation's press.

Builders of the AMB system are interested in the billions of dollars in contracts it represents. To get these billions, they can spend vast sums to convince the taxpaying public that the Sentinel system will be worthwhile. Generals interested in bigger and more expensive weapons systems cooperate by conducting "information programs" which really are propaganda campaigns.

This newspaper long ago suggested that the limited ABM system the Defense Department wants would be of doubtful value, a judgment based upon that of recognized experts in the field. The contention is that it would represent a back-breaking cost to the taxpayer and still provide little or no protection against missile attack.

This viewpoint has been gathering supporters recently, and now a substantial number of United States senators have indicated they are opposed to funding the Sentinel program. President Nixon has been listening and is expected now to plump for a considerably smaller deployment of anti-ballistic missiles than originally planned.

Certainly we'll be billions ahead if we build a smaller system than the one President Johnson and Secretary McNamara had in mind, but whatever billions we do spend are still apt to be money thrown to the winds.

What this country ought to do is continue to carry on the development work and research which might some day produce a dependable defense against enemy missiles. The biggest mistake we could make now would be to spend billions for a system that won't be effective when needed, if needed, while at the same time lulling the citizenry into a confidence that they have a protection against nuclear bombs which they don't really have.

RECOMPUTATION BILL, S. 364

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to again coauthor with Senator TOWER legislation to equalize the retirement pay of retired military men of equal rank or grade and years of service. This bill is designed to assure that this Nation will honor its commitments to retired military personnel.

The legislation would correct an inequity which has existed since 1958. Prior to that year, the computation of the retired pay of retired military personnel was based on the pay schedules of the Active Forces. This means that whenever the pay of active duty servicemen is increased, the pay of retired personnel, with few exceptions, would be recomputed on the basis of the new active duty salary schedule for the grade in which the retiree was serving at the time of his retirement.

Mr. President, in 1958, the law was changed, overturning the long-standing policy of our Federal Government, to provide for increases in retired pay only when the cost of living increases by 3 percent. This 1958 action not only overturned traditional policy, but also represented a breach of duty by our Government to the many military people who served so long and so faithfully to our country.

Mr. President, the retired pay of our older retirees, we are told, has dropped more than 30 percent behind younger men. Rising prices have further aggravated an already bad situation. I certainly was pleased that President Nixon during the last campaign indicated support for this effort to end this inequity.

There has been a great deal of interest recently throughout the Nation in an all-vounteer army. President Nixon has urged the Defense Department to make an in-depth study of its feasibility. Bills have been introduced in the Congress. Certainly our chances of providing for a professional army will not be helped if the word goes out that the Government will not honor its commitments to its career military men upon their retirement. Yet, that is precisely what we have done here. This inequity has now been frozen into law for over a decade.

The enactment, Mr. President, of the

Tower-Murphy recomputation measure will repeal this law and thus do away with this inequity. I strongly urge congressional action on this important bill this year.

THE IMPACT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, the reinstatement of several hundred million dollars to the impact educational program of the Nation is a question which may soon face this Congress, when we receive the new administration's budget.

My particular concern for these funds revolves around the fact that several schools in federally impacted areas in Alaska will have funds cut in half under the proposed reductions. As a result, worthy educational programs established under this program will be eliminated.

This is true of every State in the Nation. The cuts average 40 percent or more in most of the States.

Each year since this program was begun, there has been a severe administration cutback in the funds, and each year, thanks to the tenacity and zeal of many Senators present, the funds have been restored, and the programs were not threatened. I want to add my voice and vote to theirs this year.

I protest the annual threat, or veiled threat, under which the Federal-impact educational appropriation has suffered. This has created severe budgetary problems in itself, since administrators in schools all over the Nation plan their budgets at the very moment Congress is faced with this threat. This is a situation which will in the long run affect nothing but the quality of education. And we cannot afford a deterioration of our efforts there.

Mr. President, to illustrate the threat posed to school administrations by these proposed cuts, I offer for the RECORD under unanimous consent, the following letter from the Fairbanks North Star Borough School District, which touches upon the very point I am making here today.

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

FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR
BOROUGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Fairbanks, Alaska, March 14, 1969.

Hon. MIKE GRAVEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRAVEL: Information received by this School District indicates that the new Administration will support the stand of the past Administration, urging a $332 million cutback in funds for the Public Law 874 program for the fiscal year 1970. It is evident that the survival of the program is at stake. The continuation of this program is vital to the basic educational program in Alaska as well as many other states which are dependent upon this revenue in order to continue an educational program which meets the needs of a progressive society. Continuation of the Section (b) support as it presently is contained in the law is especially vital to the independent school districts of Alaska, as their entitlements are almost fully dependent upon children in this classification. Any change in the law therefore, which affects this Section will have a drastic effect upon the finances of the Fairbanks North Star Borough School District.

The effects of the proposed amendments on our School District, based on the current year's P.L. 874 count are as follows:

1. Require school districts to absorb the cost of education equal to 6 percent of enrollment for sec. 3(b) children	$\frac{148}{2} \times \$390 = \$28,860$
2. Reduce the rate of payment to 25 percent for sec. 3(b) children where the related Federal property is in another school district (present rate of payment 50 percent)	$\frac{1,662}{4} \times \$390 = \$162,045$
3. Eliminate one-half State and National average per pupil payment rates for both sec. 3(a) and 3(b)	(1)
4. Eliminate from the definition of Federal property those properties which are outleased by the Federal Government and on which taxes are paid (Alaska Railroad leases)	$\frac{178}{2} \times \$390 = \$34,710$
Total loss in Public Law 874 income to the district	$225,615
Reduced by	−39,000
Total loss in Public Law 874 revenue	186,615

[1] No effect on our district.

This would reduce our P.L. 874 income from our estimate of $478,126 to $291,511. Regardless of the fact that one-half of this loss in income is off-set by an increase in the state Foundation Program income under the present formula, this is still Federal income lost to the State of Alaska.

There is contained in the proposed amendment a provision that no school district shall suffer more than a 25% reduction in the first year, which would reduce our reduction in 1970 to $119,532. However, in future years we would suffer a loss of $186,615 on the basis of our current year's count in all future years.

There seems to be an ever increasing effort by the Department of Health, Education & Welfare to eliminate 3(b) provisions from Public Law 874. This provision is a temporary law and is renewed every other year or every three years and each time that it comes up for renewal it has received increased opposition, both from the Department and the Administration. It is urged that you make every effort to support Public Law 874 in its present form and obtain sufficient funding to pay full entitlements to all districts and obtain passage of legislation to make the 3(b) Section of the law a permanent provision.

If this School District can be of any service to you in providing information or testifying in support of this legislation, we would be happy to assist you. I would appreciate information on progress of this legislation.

Respectfully,

W. W. VANCE,
Business Manager.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

INTERPRETATION OF NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION TREATY—REFERRAL OF RESOLUTION TO COMMITTEE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution (S. Res. 164), which comes over under the rule.

The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 164) relating to interpretation of Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do so with the approval of the joint leadership, the author of the resolution, and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, March 20, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 14, 1969, under authority of the order of March 13, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Arthur Fletcher, of Washington, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Marshall Green, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 17, 1969:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

John A. Nevius, for appointment as a member of the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 592, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 17, 1969:

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

James V. Smith, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

Carlos C. Villarreal, of California, to be Urban Mass Transportation Administrator.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Henry Kearns, of California, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.