

July 25, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3903

The presence of American flyers held captive in North Vietnam and now threatened with inhuman treatment, illegal prosecution and perhaps even public execution, gives you and me a most singular opportunity to bring peace to our time. It gives me the chance, once and for all, to answer the question: Is peace worth risking freedom? It gives you the chance to answer the question: In a representative republic do those who represent still function as the voice of the people or has this land become the bureaucratic republic in which those who represent function only as the whipping boy of the people and the liaison of a dictatorial executive branch?

The American flyers in Vietnam, like Francis Scott Key, are looking across a great body of water and wondering, "Oh say, does that star-spangled banner yet wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?" Our only answer to them and to the world must be this ultimatum by Congress to North Vietnam:

The sovereignty of American human rights and dignity has been desecrated by the parading of American flyers as a public spectacle on the streets of Hanoi. We would not treat our basest criminals in this manner. To have another country do so to our heroes cannot be tolerated.

The time for consideration has ended. If withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops and a firm appointment to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the disagreement over the Vietnams is not effected by October 1, 1966; or should American prisoners now held by the Government of North Vietnam be handled in any manner other than that prescribed for prisoners of war by the Geneva Convention; that is to say, should they be further displayed publicly as criminals of war, should they be tried as criminals of war, or should they be executed as war criminals, the Government of the United States shall, through its Armed Forces, neutralize North Vietnam by destruction of its war making industries, acquisition of its natural resources and annihilation of any of its people who resist. This will be done without reservation and by invasion and blockade.

Furthermore, interference by any nation in the world in these actions will be considered as a hostile act against the United States and dealt with accordingly.

Every man must make his own choice when the whole world hangs in the balance. I am too proud to sacrifice freedom, dignity and individuality at any cost, peace notwithstanding! I am as the Bald Eagle. This letter expresses my choice. I have the strength of conviction that faced with such an ultimatum not only North Vietnam but any country in the world would meet the demands. And ultimately prove that the powers of the Bald Eagle, not the virtues of the dove will bring peace to our time.

Best personal regards,

DONALD R. COLLINS, D.V.M.

A Difficult Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a young man in my hometown of Martinsville, Ind., was recently faced with a difficult decision: Should he accept a deferment from the Army, because of the death of his father or should he go ahead and be inducted.

He made his choice, and his letter in the July 21, 1966, Martinsville Reporter is one of the very finest statements of personal conviction, integrity, and dedication I have ever read. We should all be grateful to boys like Craig; upon them rests the hope of our survival as a free nation:

To the Editor:

Recently I received my papers to report for induction into the United States Army. I was quite surprised after failing my physical for enlistment last summer.

Last week I was offered a chance for a deferment because of the death of my father which left me as the eldest son capable of helping with the family in case of emergency.

The decision was left up to me to choose between staying home or going to serve my country.

The way I came to my decision is why I am writing to you.

Friday night, as usual, I came into town to get one of my buddies. He had a new album that he wanted me to hear so I went in to listen. I never caught the name of the album, but the words stuck in my mind. It was a protest song against draft dodgers and the description went something like this, "They are the ones who would never be caught dead with their eyes closed at public prayer. They wouldn't put their hands anywhere but behind their backs during the Pledge of Allegiance, or would they let the little ones hear them sing 'America' at the ballgame."

The communist cause does not have to fight us to win, they just have to wait until we rot in our own cowardice.

I might not get back, and if I do I might not find a fine job, another car to compare with the one I have now, or the girl I want, but I will be able to hold my head up and walk down the street.

I personally would be grateful if you would do an article to get my point across. Every boy has a responsibility to God, his country, and to his loved ones to do his part to make his country and their country a free one.

Thanks a lot,

CRAIG SAVAGE.

Atrocious Crimes in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, F. F. McNaughton of the Pekin Daily Times, dated July 23, comments on a speech by British Foreign Secretary, Michael Stewart.

Secretary Stewart points out clearly the terror that the Vietcong have wrought in South Vietnam. He leaves no doubt that there is no balance of terror in that war-torn country, only the heavy weight in the deaths of key South Vietnamese. For those who believe that our bombing of oil facilities is inhumane, Secretary Stewart's presentation is must reading.

Under unanimous consent I include Mr. McNaughton's column in the RECORD at this point:

THE EDITOR'S LETTER
(By F. F. McNaughton)

The U. S. bombs key things.
Viet Cong kill key men.
Like Stalin killed key farmers.
Like Mao killed key Chinese.

To us has just come a speech made in Parliament by the British Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart.

American fliers had just bombed oil tanks. They had done it so skillfully that hardly a civilian was killed—as expertly as a surgeon's knife takes out a tumor.

But it caused angry cries from the Labor benches and from Yank haters in the House of Commons.

So Michael Stewart told them: "You are screaming about some careful bombing; but what about the cruelty that the Viet Cong has carried on for years?"

He went on to say: "There is a long story of the most merciless cruelty carried out by the Viet Cong over a long period of years. As far back as 1960, the number of persons, quite apart from operations of battle, being murdered or abducted by the Viet Cong was running at 6,000 a year."

By 1965 it was 9,000 a year.

In the first half of 1966, 5,000.

Secretary Stewart say it is important to note who these victims are. Not only are they civilians and unarmed, but they are particularly people who held any kind of governmental position, or positions of authority in their villages.

Stewart said their aim is: "To fill everyone with so much dread that he dares not take on a responsible position."

These continuing, cold blooded murders in South Vietnam all but prevent competent government. This, says the British Foreign Secretary, is one reason why the Geneva Agreement can not be fulfilled.

Whereas U.S. bombing of oil tanks may have killed watchmen, the Viet Cong are murdering mayors and other officials and civilian leaders of their communities at the rate of 10,000 in this year 1966.

**Retardation Legislation: What It Means
To Massachusetts**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RETARDATION LEGISLATION: WHAT IT MEANS
TO MASSACHUSETTS

(Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, remarks to the Massachusetts Association for Retarded Children, annual convention banquet, White Cliffs, Manomet, Mass., May 22, 1966)

President Frankel, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am always pleased to visit my neighboring State of Massachusetts, and even happier to address the Massachusetts Association for Retarded Children at this convention banquet.

Actually, I feel somewhat humble to speak to citizens of this great State who have contributed such a great deal in the continuing battle against mental retardation.

It is rather an odd feeling to be standing here where the Kennedy family virtually started the great movements against mental retardation we are involved in today.

You can all be very proud of this State's Kennedy family, for it was from this State that John F. Kennedy traveled to Washington

A3904

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 25, 1966

as a young Senator and later won the Presidency. As President, he fought, successfully, to create a bold, new approach to mental retardation problems. He, and the panel of experts he called together, formulated the national plan to combat mental retardation that has meant so much to this State and to the country.

From this place, also, you have sent another young Senator, EDWARD M. KENNEDY, who is no less interested in furthering plans to conquer mental retardation.

As a Senator and as President of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation, "TED" KENNEDY has the same spirit of action that his older brother John possessed. Upon his return to Massachusetts at the end of the last Congressional session, he quietly toured State schools and residential institutions for the retarded to gain first-hand knowledge of the problems they face.

As President of the Kennedy Foundation, "TED" KENNEDY, and other members of the family, have diligently worked to get retarded persons accepted as part of the national work force.

Their efforts have begun to pay off in recent years. For example, the Kennedy Foundation was instrumental in opening up an important area of employment for the mentally retarded—the Federal government. Prior to 1964, there were only a handful of retarded citizens working in Federal jobs. Then, in 1964, through the efforts of the Kennedy Foundation, the Federal Civil Service was persuaded to waive its usual written examination in cases involving the mentally retarded. Now the Civil Service Commission will accept mentally retarded workers if State vocational rehabilitation officials will certify that a retarded man or woman can perform certain jobs.

By the end of last year, this procedure had already resulted in more than 500 retardates being placed in Federal jobs as copy machine operators, messengers, clerical workers, and as custodial personnel in Federal buildings.

The Kennedy's were also instrumental in developing a model project to train retarded workers. Just last month, they saw their idea become a reality when the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration granted \$149,000 to run the John F. Kennedy Flame of Hope Candle Project. Through this project, more than 1,200 mentally retarded workers will be employed to make hand-molded candles. It is hoped that this project will serve as a model for training the retarded for simple hand craft jobs in private industry.

Federal support for mental retardation programs, like the one under which the candlemaking grant was made, has been possible as the result of some major legislative developments over the past three years.

Mental retardation programs began to be truly effective in 1963, even though many of us in Congress had been calling for more Federal support since shortly after World War II. At any rate, the big push for action against mental retardation was started by President John F. Kennedy. In 1963, his administration put forward two bills which became milestones in the fight against retardation. These two bills, signed into law by President Kennedy, were "The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963," and "The Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963."

Under the program authorized by the maternal and child health and mental retardation planning law, over 50 States and Territories have completed initial planning for comprehensive programs against mental retardation. In addition, the same law has given assistance to insure better prenatal care for mothers in low-income areas, thus further combating a cause of possible re-

tardation resulting from inadequate care during pregnancy.

Construction aid, authorized in 1963, has been initially successful. Advances made under three basic programs of this law include the following:

Community mental retardation centers—As of last December, two such centers had been approved for funding, and 175 other applicants were interested in receiving such aid. This program will gain momentum as State planning programs are more fully developed.

University-affiliated facilities—This program, to aid in the construction of buildings in which professional and technical training for mental retardation can be given, has so far received over 55 applications for grants. Nine of these have been funded with a total money value of nearly 17 million dollars.

Mental retardation research centers—Since the inception of this aid program, 8 awards, totaling nearly 20 million dollars, have been made to aid in constructing large, multidisciplinary centers to be used for research and research training in retardation.

Your State is participating wholeheartedly in the programs authorized by 1963 legislation. In fact, this year the State will receive 57,200 dollars for planning money, and a like amount next year.

Also, Massachusetts' institutions have received large awards for both university-affiliated centers and for research centers.

The Walter E. Fernald School in Waltham has received some 1.5 million dollars to help construct a retardation research center, and a community evaluation and rehabilitation center on the school grounds.

Working closely with the Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, and the Harvard Medical School, the research center at Fernald School will focus on basic research in retardation with scientists working in such areas as neurology, psychiatry, pediatrics, epidemiology, and the like.

The school's Community Evaluation and Rehabilitation Center will concentrate on diagnostic and evaluation procedures and will provide training for special education, psychology, social work, nursing, and other allied disciplines.

In Boston, the Children's Hospital Medical Center was recently awarded over 3.3 million dollars in Federal matching funds to help construct facilities for research and for a child development research and evaluation center.

Nearly 2.5 million dollars of the Children's Hospital money will go toward the construction of a large research center with research areas including experimental neurological sciences, behavioral sciences, genetics, and metabolism and clinical research. As at Fernald School, this medical center is closely-linked to the Harvard Medical School.

The Child Development Research and Evaluation Center at Children's Hospital will be constructed as a two-and-a-half floor addition to Children's new outpatient building. This extra space will allow the hospital to increase its services to the mentally retarded in Massachusetts and from surrounding New England States.

Besides the activities generated by the planning and construction acts of 1963, four other major pieces of legislation related to mental retardation were recently signed into law.

"The Social Security Amendments of 1965" authorize 2.75 million dollars, for each of the years 1966 and 1967, to assist the States in implementing retardation plans started with earlier Federal aid. This law authorizes further funds to help train professional personnel to care for the mentally retarded and other handicapped children. In addition, financial aid is authorized for the needy

aged in mental or tuberculosis institutions, including the mentally retarded.

A second law passed in 1965 is "The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act Amendments of 1965." These amendments extend and expand programs for the training of teachers of handicapped children, and for research and demonstration programs related to training and teaching mentally retarded and handicapped children.

A third law—"The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965"—authorizes a three-year program of Federal grants to the States to improve the education of some 5 million children in low-income families. This will benefit those children who are considered retarded because of cultural deprivation.

Finally, fourth law—"The Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1965"—provides further aid to help rehabilitate retarded persons through vocational rehabilitation programs. Under these new amendments, programs for service and for rehabilitation facilities will be expanded and improved.

All of the legislation mentioned here will benefit the retarded and their families in Massachusetts and throughout the country.

In addition to these programs, however, the Federal government is supporting millions of dollars worth of research in various private institutions. The Federal government, through its own agencies such as the National Institutes of Health and the Children's Bureau, is also conducting far-reaching research and research training programs aimed at solving the problem of mental retardation.

We in the Congress will continue fighting for new and better legislation to combat mental retardation, as will President Lyndon B. Johnson. President Johnson's own commitment to this fight was made very plain this year in his Health and Education Message to Congress. In that message he said, "We have begun to ease the tragic burden of the mentally retarded and their families . . . (and) . . . We shall continue our increasing attack on this problem. It deserves the concern and attention of our most able specialists . . ."

President Johnson then said he would appoint a new committee in 1966 to study new and better ways to attack mental retardation. In saying this, President Johnson followed the lead set by your own State son, John F. Kennedy, who created the first President's Panel on Mental Retardation several years ago.

Since the establishment of the original President's Panel, the Nation had made great advances in its attack on mental retardation. I think that now we would all agree even more with the words of President Kennedy delivered to the 1963 White House Conference on Mental Retardation: "We have left behind prejudice, superstition and ignorance which since the dawn of time distorted our thinking about the mentally retarded. We have entered a new era of understanding, hope and enlightenment."

Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the Sacramento Bee, Sacramento, Calif., expresses its pleasure with the recently en-

UN

Appendix

The Factor of Morale in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the report made Tuesday, July 12, with my colleagues on our recent trip to Vietnam, I am pleased to add to my report of that date the following items dealing with the morale of our troops—and the morale of the other side.

As Tolstoy pointed out in "War and Peace," morale is the x factor in a fighting force which can compensate for many other deficiencies and which is so often decisive.

I have never known the morale of fighting men, based upon my experience in the two wars since my youth, to be any higher than I found in Vietnam. On the one particular day I spent with the troops of the 18th Infantry Division, I was pleased to notice that nearly all rifle company combat infantrymen seemed to have had a calm approach and professional, businesslike demeanor in their combat duties.

I was particularly struck with the fact that a large percentage of the troops were colored and I made a point of visiting for a few minutes with several squads at a time to discuss the tremendous opportunities open to these men, all of them, following their service in Vietnam. I believe every veteran there will wear his Vietnam service as a badge of honor for the rest of his life and I have no question but what those who probably will come to the front of leadership in America—in our rights movement and in the progress for all people—will come from the ranks of those now serving in Vietnam. It disturbs one very much to read, in the current issue of Life magazine, the constant repetition of the fact that the masses in the Watts area and other ghettos of the colored sections of the large towns of America simply do not have leadership. We lack leaders, we have no leaders, is the saying.

BLACK POWER MILITANTS

It is my true belief that what a few rights activists in the States now ought to do is to get to Vietnam without further ado and to fulfill the proof of loyalty to the Nation and to its institutions with a tour of duty in the infantry ranks there and then return to speak of equal opportunity, once proof is available of the equal responsibility and the equal accomplishments of defending America and protecting it from foreign aggression.

With these particular troops it was my pleasure to be accompanied by my col-

league, ROMAN PUCINSKI, and we made it a point to stress that the two of us stemmed from immigrant parents and the lowest economic levels possible in the United States of America and we stressed that in one short generation each of us was able to practice his profession, serve honorable duty for our country in a war, establish his education and profession—with the benefit of the GI bill—and proceed to a career as a Congressman. We impressed on each and every one of these soldiers that this role is open for them and that the sky is their limit, too—and that the greatest achievement they have made is to begin their careers as infantrymen in time of war. We believe this is the strongest and best thing we could do for the morale of these gentlemen.

ROTATION OF TROOPS

There is no question but what the 1-year rotation policy is one reason that morale is as good as it is.

Following my speech to request rotation in Vietnam, I was particularly grateful to staff officials at the White House, to the Secretary of Defense, and members of his staff, and particularly to Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for their help and assistance to me in the discussion of the complicated factors involved in rotation. Further, Mr. Speaker, had it not been for the great loyalty and help of the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, my distinguished and widely respected friend OLIE TEAGUE, of Texas, I doubt very much if the success now enjoyed in these policies could have been accomplished.

In March, Chairman TEAGUE gave me his assurance of cooperation and his efforts to establish a tour of duty and rotation from combat assignment is perhaps another of the many accomplishments of this remarkable man in his service to the people of America—from his vantage point of power as chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

I also feel I should pay great tribute to the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and to three members of his organization, who were kind and patient enough with me to sit down and go through the difficult work in distinguishing the factors of rotation as they would effect combat efficiency, personnel changes, morale, and numerous other items, which had a bearing upon this complicated subject matter. Without the personal help of the Vice President, I doubt very much if these changes could have been effected.

It has now been established by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Speaker, that, first: rotation and replacement will be accomplished on an individual basis; not on a unit basis; and second, the personnel rotation is a con-

tinuing process; and third, and sure the most important matter, that current and planned replacements as of this time contemplate an average monthly rotation for in excess of the 2 percent of unit personnel—or four riflemen per company, per month, that had been my suggestion in my speech on the floor of the House on February 24, 1966.

I wish to quote from a communication sent to me by General Berg, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, regarding the effect of this type of rotation policy. His letter of April 23, contains the following:

I realize it might appear that under a prescribed 12 months tour of duty for Vietnam, unit composition will change only upon the anniversary dates of unit arrivals in Vietnam. In this regard, it is true that some members who initially arrived in Vietnam with their units will remain for a full 12 months' tour of duty. Hopefully, there will be many in this category for their Vietnam experience is most essential, not only for unit combat effectiveness, but also for orienting and giving guidance to new replacements as they are integrated into operating units. But the fact is that not all unit members had 12 months remaining to serve on active duty or on their units' arrival in Vietnam. Some had as little as four months remaining. Obviously, these personnel have to be replaced and sent home for discharge in accordance with their terms of service. In other cases, units ordered into Vietnam from other Pacific bases contained members who had already served portions of their overseas tour. These members also were rotated home early. Inevitably, too, there is personnel attrition resulting from battle casualties.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, the process of change in unit personnel composition tends to be a continuing one, wherein replacements are being effected on a weekly and monthly basis. Obviously, there will be peaks and valleys in the rotational flow. But, as a minimum, rotation should average about 8 percent of unit personnel per month. For a rifle company, this should amount to an average of about 14 to 16 men per month depending on the size of the company—180 officers and men for an Army rifle company; 203 for a Marine rifle company.

Thus, while the morale of American troops improves, that of the Communist forces seems to be declining. Recent Rand Corp., studies of captured Vietnam show that, in contrast to their attitude a few months ago, our opponents no longer seem to feel that they have a chance of success. Their desertion rate has been steadily increasing.

More insight into the trends of morale on both sides is provided by a perceptive editorial by Bernie Horton, in a recent edition of the Wyoming Eagle, published in Cheyenne. He points to major developments which confirm that the tide is now running in our favor and will continue to do so as long as those of us here

A3893

A3894

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 25, 1966

at home provide the necessary moral support to our fighting men in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, so that I may share these worthy ideas with my colleagues:

NOTES OF OPTIMISM

Slight as they may be, there have been notes of optimism in connection with the war in Viet Nam this week.

Tuesday, President Johnson said there were indications that the Communists no longer really expected to achieve a military victory in Viet Nam.

The President told a news conference at his LBJ ranch that these indications had come to him through diplomatic channels but he did not pinpoint any specific source.

It was the first time a top U.S. official had reported evidence that the Communists had come to a conclusion that they could not win on the battlefield.

The President's remark attracted particular attention because it came after a French magazine report that North Vietnamese leader Ho Chi Minh had advised Peking and Moscow that unless he received greatly increased help, he would have no choice but to undertake negotiations with the United States and South Viet Nam.

Meanwhile, Premier Nguyen Cao Ky installed a new 80-man military and civilian council to "help unify the nation," and he predicted a victory over communism within a year.

Ky said allied forces are within sight of final victory over the Viet Cong.

"According to intelligence reports, the Communists have strengthened their forces," Ky said. "But with the greater firepower of the United States, Allied and Vietnamese troops—with ability and flexibility—we may have victory by the end of the year."

Yesterday, Undersecretary of State George Ball said the leaders of North Viet Nam apparently had given up hope of a military victory in the war. At a Washington news conference, Ball said this was the tone of reports from other governments with contacts in Hanoi.

Ball also said there is no evidence that the Red Chinese are likely to intervene directly in the war. The undersecretary, who is running the state department while Secretary Rusk tours Asia, said he did not want to draw "an overly optimistic picture" of the Viet Nam situation. But he said the reports the department has been receiving bear out the war-weariness of the North Vietnamese people.

All of this points up the importance of our presenting a unified front to the world.

It has long been apparent the Communists had no intention of moving from the battlefield to the conference table so long as there was any hope they might win.

Only last week, Secretary Rusk said the Communists apparently were pinning their hopes on criticism of the Viet Nam war from within the United States.

"America has reason to think Hanoi has been banking heavily on criticism from within the United States and elsewhere in the free world as well as on political dissent within South Viet Nam," he said.

The time is now for the arch-critics of American policy in Viet Nam to put away their megaphones.

We must make it clear to the Communists that the United States is united in its effort and determination in Southeast Asia.

Once the Communists realize their final hope for success is gone—that they are not going to be allowed to take over South Viet Nam—perhaps they may be willing to end the fighting and move to the conference table.

Remarks of U.S. Representative John E. Fogarty at New England School Library Association Spring Conference, Newport, R.I., Saturday, May 21, 1966, at 1 p.m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REMARKS OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN E. FOGARTY AT NEW ENGLAND SCHOOL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION SPRING CONFERENCE, NEWPORT, R.I., SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1966, AT 1 P.M.

I am happy to be here today to address the New England School Library Association on new legislation and its impact on school libraries.

In the past 3 years, it would seem that the Congress has been extremely busy increasing the demands to be placed on school librarians. The Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are six pieces of major legislation that will either directly or indirectly affect school libraries. The poverty programs of the Economic Opportunity Act, as we all know, are creating a market expansion of library books and textbooks geared to the culturally and educationally deprived. School librarians are meeting demands for afterschool programs and paperback lending libraries for the underprivileged with every ounce of their energies. They are being called upon to survey existing resources and to absorb great quantities of new resources. And with their help these programs for tutoring, independent study, and general strengthening of community education are working.

Programs under the Library Services and Construction Act are calling upon cooperation between public librarians and school librarians in assessing the overall needs of the community for expanded library services. Interlibrary agreements will be formed to extend the flow of books in areas which must be upgraded educationally.

Vocational education programs will place greater listings of technical and vocational education reference books in school libraries. Programs of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities will bring greater quantities of instructional materials in these two categories to be placed in school libraries.

The Higher Education Act of 1965, which includes a title for community service and continuing education programs, will create an increased request for books on social problems to be made available in both school and public libraries. School librarians will be called upon to assist public and school administrators in pulling together informational materials for the study and solution of community problems.

These are just a few of the acts which will place indirect demands on school librarians as the administrators of school library programs. The act most responsible for direct involvement of school librarians in new programs is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Because of these new responsibilities, I would like to turn our at-

tention to this act for the next few minutes.

Last year, when considering the proposals for strengthening elementary and secondary education in the United States, my colleagues and I were alarmed by the status of school libraries. We felt that quality in textbooks and school library programs was directly related to a student's academic achievement and future educational goals. Yet, almost 70 percent of the public and more than 50 percent of the private elementary schools had no libraries. Nearly one-half of our elementary school children were attending schools that did not have libraries. Public schools were spending from \$2 to \$4 less per pupil than was recommended to maintain even minimum school library standards.

As a result of reports relating to us the extreme needs of schools for assistance to build up their libraries, we drafted Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Later, when the bill was passed by the Congress, the U.S. Office of Education and the State Library Agencies joined together to administer the program for strengthening school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials.

The State plans that have emerged from State Library Agencies show great promise for the future of school libraries. State plans had to illustrate specific needs by category within the three main headings of library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials.

In order to pinpoint such needs, many States had to take inventories of library books within each major classification of the Dewey decimal system for the first time. This meant that school library problems would no longer be clouded by simply vague statistics on the need for a number of estimated volumes. Each State Library Agency would have a quick catalog of all school library resources and could draw up specific title listings of standard volumes to be purchased. Each State Library Agency would also know whether grant funds should be concentrated on library books or on items such as filmstrips, globes, encyclopedia sets and classroom reading books.

Title II State plans reflect the reports of these surveys. Acquisition of library resources has been given priority by the States. Every State plan calls for spending at least half its money from school library resources. Twenty of the 34 State plans require at least two-thirds of their allotments to be used for this category.

The progress in the New England area under the Title II program has been extremely encouraging. In our State of Rhode Island, a special Title II coordinator has been appointed to the Office of the Commissioner of Education to assure effective administration of the program. The State plan for Vermont calls for 100 percent of Title II funds to be used for school library resources. It calls for the Director of the Division of School Libraries to administer Title II. His position is financed by by another section of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The State plan for Maine similarly emphasizes library resources by calling for 100 percent of the allotment to be spent on this item. One good feature of the Maine plan is the stipulation requiring that each project application contain an assurance that all teachers were given an opportunity to submit lists of materials needed by them and their pupils. This kind of stipulation brings the teacher and the librarian into even closer coordination as they work to achieve the best possible educational atmosphere for their students.

Connecticut's Title II plan, in addition to concentrating on school library resources, establishes an index of need to determine grants to local school districts. The four criteria for grants include: the quantity of

July 25, 1966

year ago, and unable to prevent more of his bills from being turned over to collection agencies, he is at least both able and willing to make bigger payments to the collection agencies. The American Collectors Association says the average initial payment to an agency on a bill turned over for collection rose to \$17.18 in the first quarter, from \$15.97 a year earlier.

PROPOSED WAR CRIME TRIALS FOR U.S. FLIERS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, although today's press suggests there might be some second thoughts in North Vietnamese policy circles over the advisability of submitting American fliers to war crime trials, I think some rather interesting observations were made on this subject last Saturday by the senior Senator from Connecticut, Senator THOMAS DODD.

As one who served as executive trial counsel at the Nuremberg trials at the close of World War II, Senator DODD convincingly outlines the inapplicability of the propaganda which has suggested that the Nuremberg trials established legal precedent which could now be invoked to prosecute the captured American fliers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a press statement issued by Senator DODD on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[A news release from Senator THOMAS J. DODD, July 23, 1966]

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator THOMAS J. DODD (D.-Conn.) today released the following statement on the Nuremberg war crime trials and the proposed prosecution of American airmen in North Vietnam as war criminals:

"President Johnson spoke for the entire American people, including those who have been critical of the war in Vietnam, when he warned the North Vietnamese communist leaders that if they bring the captured American fliers to trial as war criminals, they will harden the resolve of our people, not weaken it, and they will earn themselves the contempt of civilized opinion throughout the world.

"The communist propagandists in Hanoi have been putting out the claim that the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials established a legal precedent which they can now invoke to prosecute the captured American fliers as war criminals.

"As Executive Trial Counsel at the major Nuremberg trial, I want to state categorically that there is not an iota of truth or an iota of logic to this claim.

"I believe it is important to make this point, because there are apparently some people in our own country who mistakenly believe that the Nuremberg trials set a precedent which the communists can now use to their own advantage.

"The Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal listed three types of crimes as coming within its jurisdiction:

"(1) 'Crimes against peace,' which involved waging or conspiring to wage a war of aggression, in violation of international treaties and agreements;

"(2) 'War Crimes,' which involved the murder, ill-treatment, or deportation of civilian population in occupied territory, the murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war . . . and the killing of hostages;

"(3) 'Crimes against humanity,' which included 'the extermination, enslavement, de-

portation and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, before or during the war.'

"The Charter made it clear in its opening paragraph that the trials would be limited to major war criminals.

"The Charter also made it clear that simple obedience to orders could not be used to justify participation in a major capacity in any war crimes.

"However, no member of the German armed forces, of any rank, was prosecuted because he had served as a member of those forces or because he had obeyed orders of a clearly military nature that involved none of the crimes against humanity specified by the Nuremberg Charter.

"No Luftwaffe pilot, or Luftwaffe commander, for example was brought to trial because of his participation in the bombing of London, despite the fact that the Luftwaffe bombings were directed primarily at the civilian population and not confined—as we have been seeking to do in Vietnam—to oil storage tanks and bridges and other clearly military targets.

"The war crimes and crimes against humanity specified by the Nuremberg Charter were criminal by standards generally accepted in all civilized countries. They were clear and grave offenses against the spirit of International Law, which was described in the Fourth Hague Convention of 1907 as including the 'laws of humanity and the dictates of public conscience.'

"The Nuremberg trial did set a precedent—but it was a necessary precedent. As Secretary of War H. L. Stimson eloquently put the matter:

" . . . Now this is a new judicial process, but it is not *ex post facto* law. It is the enforcement of a moral judgement which dates back a generation. It is a growth in the application of law that any student of our common law should recognize as natural and proper, for it is just this manner that the common law grew up.

"There was somewhere in our distant past, a first case of murder, a first case where the tribe replaced the victim's family as judge of the offender. The tribe had learned that the deliberate and malicious killing of any human being was, and must be treated as, an offense against the whole community. The analogy is exact.

"All case law grows by new decision, and, where those new decisions match the conscience of the community, they are law as truly as the law of murder . . ."

"This was the meaning and intent of Nuremberg.

"The American airmen in Vietnam are soldiers performing military duties in the strictest sense of the definition. They have been guilty of none of the crimes against humanity condemned by the Nuremberg Charter. Indeed, since the development of military aircraft, I do not think there has been a war in which any Air Force has exercised so much care and placed such rigid restrictions on itself, to avoid bombing civilian targets.

"No amount of twisting or legal skulduggery will enable the communists to use the Nuremberg trials as a precedent justifying the show trials they now propose to stage with the captive American airmen in their hands.

"If the Nuremberg trials have any application at all to what is going on in Vietnam, it is my conviction that they established a precedent which would brand as criminal both the treatment to which the captured American fliers have already been subjected, and the trial and sentencing of these airmen by communist kangaroo courts pretending to operate with the power and authority of an internationally sanctioned tribunal.

"I join the President of the United States and my colleagues who have already spoken on this matter, in warning the leaders of

the Hanoi regime of the possible consequences of their projected action."

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar in sequence, beginning with Calendar No. 1344, H.R. 10104, to and including Calendar No. 1362.

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

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10104) to enact title 5, United States Code, "Government Organization and Employees," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the organization of the Government of the United States and to its civilian officers and employees which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after item 7, "Judicial Review", insert:

9. Executive Reorganization----- 901

Page 6, at the beginning of line 21, strike out down to and including "1902" and insert in lieu thereof "1884, 1891-1902, and former section 1641(b)(2)".

Page 10, line 32, strike out "hearing examiner" and insert in lieu thereof "employee".

In line 36 after the comma, strike out "a hearing examiner" and insert in lieu thereof "such an employee".

Page 18, line 3, insert a comma after "States".

Page 21, line 9, strike out from "1641" down to and including "1902" in line 27, and insert in lieu thereof "1884, 1891-1902, and former section 1641(b)(2)".

At the top of page 23, insert the following:

CHAPTER 9—EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

- Sec.
901. Purpose.
902. Definitions.
903. Reorganization plans.
904. Additional contents of reorganization plans.
905. Limitations on powers.
906. Effective date and publication of reorganization plans.
907. Effect on other laws, pending legal proceedings, and unexpended appropriations.
908. Rules of Senate and House of Representatives on reorganization plans.
909. Terms of resolution.
910. Reference of resolution to committee.
911. Discharge of committee considering resolution.
912. Procedure after report or discharge of committee; debate.
913. Decisions without debate on motion to postpone or proceed.

§ 901. Purpose

(a) The President shall from time to time examine the organization of all agencies and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

- (1) to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;

calls the Hartford National Charge Card in operation by August.

Major banks also appear, surprisingly, to be cutting back only slightly on loans to securities dealers, who relend the money to traders buying stock on margin. The banks consider loans to brokers an excellent temporary use for the funds they keep around to meet unexpected loan or deposit-withdrawal demand. Such loans are usually made on a one-day basis (though they are made every day) and they can be called immediately, if stock prices plunge sharply or if the bank needs its money.

With their bank borrowings, plus funds of their own that have been generated by this year's immense stock-trading volume, brokerage-firm members of the New York Stock Exchange between Jan. 1 and April 1, the latest period for which figures are available, expanded their loans to stock buyers nearly 6%, to a total of over \$5.8 billion outstanding. In the like period of 1965, broker loans to customers declined, though only a fraction of 1%.

True, some stock buyers are paying fancy interest to make margin transactions (on such a transaction the buyer puts up in cash 70% of the value of the stock he purchases, and borrows the rest). A stock-market tyro borrowing money to buy his first few shares on margin will pay interest at an annual rate of 7% at some brokerage houses. But a veteran speculator borrowing to finance a huge margin trade will pay only 6% interest to some brokers.

If stock-market speculators have been relatively unaffected by tight money, home buyers have been hit harder than anyone else. The main reason: Individuals—including would-be home buyers—are saving much less money than a year ago, putting a pinch on the supply of money available for mortgages. This trend generally has been blamed on increased payroll withholding for Social Security and Federal income taxes, which has bit into workers' take-home pay.

In the first four months of 1966 net savings (new savings minus withdrawals) received by U.S. savings and loan associations plummeted to \$740 million, from nearly \$1.8 billion in the 1965 period. April saw a large outflow of savings, as withdrawals exceeded new savings.

S&L officials are certain savings they normally would get have been flowing into bank CDs, which are available to individuals as well as corporations, at rates up to 5½% (savings and loan associations aren't permitted to offer such high savings rates without losing their borrowing power at the Federal Home Loan Banks). But in total the drop in savings at banks has been more dramatic even than the drop at S&Ls.

Big commercial banks that report weekly to the Federal Reserve System by May 25 had increased their CDs outstanding by \$1.7 billion, or about 10%, from the start of the year. But in the same period they suffered a \$2.2 billion drop in their outstanding totals of passbook savings, on which they are permitted to pay only 4% interest tops. So their totals of CDs and passbook savings went down a net \$500 million.

The drop in savings has accentuated the squeeze on banks, and with corporate loan demand booming they have cut back on mortgage loans. The reaction at S&Ls, which make many more mortgage loans, has been more drastic. With money flowing out in April, some have stopped making mortgage loans entirely for the time being.

Nor will the home buyer find any relief at life insurance companies, which normally make many mortgage loans. The insurers' sales of policies have been expanding at a rapid clip. But the lendable funds that the policy sales supply have been snapped up by corporations that have been unable to borrow as much money as they would like at their banks. The corporations are lining up to

arrange private sales of bonds to the insurance companies.

An official at Prudential's main office in Newark, N.J., says the company is short of funds for mortgage lending throughout its Eastern region, and that the cash is being conserved mainly to satisfy the demands of builders and developers who regularly do business with Prudential.

Frustrated home buyers might console themselves by buying something else—plush furniture for the old quarters, perhaps. If the increased withholding tax rates leave too little cash in their paychecks for the purchase, personal finance companies will lend them the money gladly.

Personal-loan companies, like some other non-bank lenders and some corporations, raise money by selling "commercial paper" (essentially a form of IOU) to investors. The rates they have had to pay on the paper to attract funds have risen sharply; they now range from 5½% to 5¾% on 90-day to six months notes. But the small-loan companies have no qualms about paying such rates, since they can lend the money to consumers at interest rates ranging as high as 20% annually.

"NO SLOWDOWN HERE"

Buoyed by high interest rates, the market for commercial paper has been strong. The total outstanding rose 4% just in April, to a record \$11.6 billion outstanding; that was 20% greater than a year earlier. So the finance companies have plenty of money to lend.

"There's no tendency for a slowdown in lending by personal loan companies," says DeWitt Paul, chairman of Beneficial Finance Co., one of the largest of these concerns. "We want to get good customers while the stream is flowing, and have been continuing to do all the things we always do to promote our business."

Some non-bank lenders that concentrate on loans to businesses, and also raise their funds by selling commercial paper, take the same line. Example: Factoring concerns, which lend money to companies in return for the right to collect the bills that customers owe to those companies.

The basic factoring loan rate now ranges from 7.2% to 8.4%, up from 6% to 7.2% in late 1965. But the rise has not hurt volume. The factors are getting a heavy demand from businessmen who have been turned away from banks where they had sought loans.

Mill Factors Corp. in New York expects to expand its new-loan volume to \$400 million this year, from \$390 million in 1965. "We don't have to compete for new accounts today; they come to us," says Walter D. Yankauer, president. Mill Factors, he says, long has concentrated on loans to textile and soft goods manufacturers, but now is making loans to such new customers as steel distributors.

CORPORATION CASH SQUEEZE

An expansion of lending on the modest scale Mill Factors talks of, however, hardly will meet the credit demands of business. As a group, U.S. corporations, like the banks from which they are trying to get loans, are in a tight cash squeeze.

To finance day-to-day operations and expansion plans, corporations ordinarily rely largely on internally generated funds—chiefly retained profits and sums charged off by the company as depreciation but kept in the treasury. During 1965, however, corporations as a group turned nearly none of these funds into cash or Government securities. At the end of the year holdings of cash and Governments by U.S. non-financial corporations totaled \$64.1 billion—exactly the same as at the end of 1964.

Some apparent reasons: Corporations chose to put much of their internally generated funds to use financing higher inventories.

Inventories held by non-financial corporations expanded to \$126.6 billion at the end of 1965, from \$114.3 billion at the end of 1964, a rise of nearly 11%.

Companies also apparently made many more of their sales on credit. While the cash and Government-security holdings of non-financial corporations didn't rise at all during 1965, the National Association of Credit Management figures that by March 31 this year U.S. manufacturers' holdings of accounts receivable—bills owed to them by customers—jumped to a record \$54.7 billion, up almost 12% from \$49 billion a year earlier.

Whatever the reason, since U.S. corporations' debts grew while their cash holdings didn't, non-financial companies finished 1965 with cash and Government securities equal to only 27% of their current liabilities—a record low ratio. At the end of 1964 the ratio was 30%; as recently as the end of 1962 it was 34%. This ratio is an important measure of corporate "liquidity"—the ability of businesses to meet unforeseen expenses.

With less cash on hand, in relation to their debts, corporations also are less able to meet those well-foreseen expenditures, spending for new plant and equipment. Their need to do so is much greater, though; according to the most recent Government survey, corporations plan capital spending of \$60.3 billion this year, up 17% from 1965.

PAY UP QUICK

In 1965, for the first time in the current boom, corporations' capital spending exceeded the funds they got from "cash flow" (profits plus depreciation), notes Eli Shapiro, Harvard University finance professor. The same thing is expected to happen in 1966.

What to do? Besides besieging banks for loans, and trying to sell bonds privately to insurance companies, cash-pinched corporations have been selling many stock and bond issues to the public. Also, while extending credit liberally to customers, they have been demanding that the customers pay up faster.

At the end of March, according to the National Association of Credit Management 85.7% of the bills owed to manufacturers were being paid on time and only 2.5% were over 90 days past due. A year earlier, only 84.3% of manufacturers' accounts receivable were classed as "current" and 2.8 were 90 days or more delinquent.

"We can invest our idle money and get a return of better than 5% nowadays, but when the money is tied up in old unpaid accounts it's dead," says Peter McLaughlin, comptroller of Union Camp Corp., a leading maker of paper products. So, he says, his company has begun a stricter collection program, with some success. The average period of Union Camp's unpaid bill has been cut to 29 days, from 31 days a year earlier, he says.

Some companies have gone even further. In the aluminum industry, which is swamped with defense orders, one major fabricator is simply refusing to sell any more goods to some of its slower-paying customers. Union Camp, too, is becoming more selective about whom it sells to, says Mr. McLaughlin.

DUNNING CONSUMERS

As big companies dun smaller ones to pay their bills faster, smaller companies are similarly dunning consumers. The American Collectors Association says both the number of bills referred to collection agencies and the size of the original bill that becomes delinquent, have risen in the past year.

In the first quarter of 1966, a spokesman says, the number of accounts held by the average collection agency increased to 1,333, up 4% from 1,278 in the 1965 period. The average size of the individual account referred for collection rose to \$62.14 from \$51.31.

A bright note: If the American consumer is unable or unwilling to save as much as a

Apropos of this subject, a timely and pertinent editorial appeared in the *Beckley, W. Va., Post Herald* on July 23, titled "The Inevitable Course Taken in Chicago."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *Beckley Post-Herald* July 23, 1966]

THE INEVITABLE COURSE TAKEN IN CHICAGO!

"Shoot to kill if you are attacked," were the orders issued National Guardsmen brought in to help keep peace in Chicago. When word of the order swept through areas of the city where the riots were occurring, the streets became virtually deserted.

When the arm of the law is strong and purposeful, lawbreakers usually become peaceful and law-abiding immediately. When the arm is weak and vacillating, however, rioters and other lawbreakers run roughshod.

Even in nations where the freedom of the individual is a truly cherished right, the arm of the law can and should become mighty and awe-inspiring if one of the greatest freedoms of all, freedom from fear, is endangered.

In New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and many other American cities, fear roams the streets of down trodden and affluent neighborhoods alike. It is the fear of brutality, of fire by night, of looting, of rape, of a knife in the back, of sinister strangers, that makes decent people tremble for their lives and those of their loved ones.

Only a strong and vigilant arm of the law can drive that fear away and make the streets safe again. Only a gutless administration allows lawbreakers to gain the upper hand.

A courageous administration in Chicago risked the revenge of a growing political bloc when it called in the armed forces to restore law and order, but it showed the way for all other American cities threatened this summer by anarchy and worse.

MANDATORY SUICIDE IN SAIGON

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, an article published in the July 24 *Washington Post* has shed an interesting light on a matter that has had the emotional wallop to produce at least one change in government in Vietnam.

Compiled from news dispatches, the article told of the death of a young Buddhist monk who was apparently to have been the latest in Vietnam's so-called suicides by fire or immolation. The monk gave police a death-bed statement:

I don't know who wanted to assassinate me but I really had no intention of committing self-immolation.

It is to be remembered that many months ago when Buddhists were incinerating themselves, ostensibly in protest of the various regimes in Saigon, a few journalists had the courage to speculate that perhaps all of these immolations were not suicides. In my judgment, this story from Saigon would support that premise.

It has been reported that Buddhist leaders have systematically doped and coerced their monks and nuns and burned them in a manner which would hardly be called suicide in order to have a political impact in Saigon. If this is true, it is among the most reprehensible, disgusting, and tragic acts that have oc-

curred in the tragedy-filled saga of Vietnam.

It is understandable, and admirable as a point of courage and conviction, that a member of a religious organization would knowingly, willingly, and without coercion, make the supreme sacrifice for a cause in which he believes. It is quite another thing when a band of self-serving monks throw one of their drunk or drugged confederates into a village square, douse him in gasoline, set him afire, and then hurl invectives against a government that had nothing to do with the whole thing. The news dispatch from Saigon would seem to suggest that such "involuntary suicides" have been practiced in South Vietnam.

PROBLEMS OF THE U.S. FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week an eight-member delegation from the National Fishermen and Wives, Inc., arrived in the Capital to discuss a number of our fishery problems, particularly those associated with the present Soviet fishery off our coasts. They are all ladies, all wives of fishermen in the Oregon and Washington area.

Those arriving were, Mrs. Peter Mosen and Mrs. John Lervold, Seattle; Mrs. John Malchow and Mrs. Lawrence Prest, Chinook, Wash.; Mrs. Rea Green, Mrs. Iola Kelly, Mrs. Delores Hart, and Mrs. Sally Smotherman, all of Warrenton, Ore.

I would extend a rather belated welcome today to these dedicated ladies and also my congratulations, not only for the good impression they have made with Government people concerned with fisheries, and Members of the Congress, but for their courage in attempting travel during these times of great difficulty.

A telegram which they sent to me and which I received upon my arrival in the Capital on Friday said in part:

Our fishery is in peril. Fish in the seas adjacent to the coast of North America has been conserved by commercial and sports fishermen for over 50 years. Now huge Russian and Japanese fleets are fishing continuously off our coast with gear designed to take even the smallest fish. When they deplete an area, their hundreds of vessels move on to more lucrative grounds. . . . The seas are eventually to be the main source of protein when population growth renders our land inadequate to meet our needs. . . .

The women further called attention to our failure to heed the warnings of the needs of the ocean, even as President Johnson, in dedicating the *Oceanographer* the other day, referred to the great hope we hold for fish protein concentrate to feed the hungry of the world. I have long urged our Government to increase its efforts both in the area of general oceanography and in the harvest of the resources of the sea, and I share the concern of these women for the future.

For a long time my office and the Commerce Committee has been literally deluged with protests and communications of concern from citizens, particularly in the coastal areas of Washington

and Oregon over the increasing threat of the Soviet Union fishing fleets. As you know, I have continuously urged that our Government sit down with the Soviets and discuss the problems of conservation, for it is my judgment that our responsibility to maintain the harvests of the adjacent sea for future generations is even more important than the questions of jurisdiction. I was pleased when I was advised of the talks in Moscow which are getting underway this week to discuss some data exchange and a basis for conservation of the coastal fishery resources.

The timing of the arrival of the delegation from the National Fishermen and Wives, Inc., was excellent, for they were able to meet with the leaders of the U.S. fishery mission to Moscow, just prior to their departure.

In addition to urging a strong U.S. position in these meetings with the Russians, the ladies brought with them a resolution on the offshore fishery problems which now enjoys widespread support, not only in Washington and Oregon, but in other States as well. It calls for the proclamation of extended conservation zones predicated on the principles set forth in the 1958 Geneva Fishing and Conservation Convention. There is nothing unreasonable about this approach, and I would urge that it receive broad support by Government.

I have recently had a communication from the Governor of the State of Washington supporting the 12-mile fishery zone legislation introduced by the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and myself, and I am told that the women will be meeting with members of the other House to urge adoption of this measure.

Whenever we speak of jurisdiction of the fisheries, we find that the U.S. fishing industry tends to divide itself due to the variation of interests. This is regrettable, and I am always hopeful that we can achieve some understanding whereby we may be united in the protection of our resources, and still preserve the historic fisheries which some of our fleets enjoy off other shores. This is not necessarily a question of having our cake and eating it too, for our distant fishing fleets have asked only for fair treatment and a reasonable opportunity to continue in their historic and traditional areas, but as we well know the conditions off South America in the case of the American tuna fleet have been intolerable.

One of the misunderstandings in the question of jurisdiction results from the loose application of the principle of freedom of the seas. One of the longtime leaders in America's international fishery relationships, Edward W. Allen, Seattle attorney, and honored member of many of the treaty commissions, recently made some remarks at the Law of the Sea Conference at the University of Rhode Island.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Allen's remarks be included in the RECORD at this point in their entirety.

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

July 25, 1966

16218

INTRODUCTORY COMMENT OF EDWARD W. ALLEN
AT PANEL OF UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
CONFERENCE ON THE "LAW OF THE SEA,"
JUNE 26, 1966

Various elements of the United States fishing industry are united as to certain practical aspects which affect their approach to government and law, and are divergent as to other aspects.

All unite in desiring competency in the fishery divisions of Federal and State governmental agencies. This was demonstrated recently in the unanimous support for upgrading the fishery division of the Department of State. Also, they all avidly support oceanographic research. But they are divergent as to ocean fishery protection.

Although no fishery people openly disclaim their attachment to the cause of conservation, some emphasize the necessity for its being applied right now to coastal fisheries, whereas others contend that the potential of ocean fisheries is so great as to negate necessity for high seas limitations. Those who oppose restrictions on ocean fishery exploitation point out that almost any kind of fish can be made into flour to meet the protein needs of billions of people; hence, that the beautiful phrase "freedom of the seas" must be kept pure, sacred and absolute, whereas the first group, while not disparaging the value of fish flour, suggest that, in this country at least, people prefer to know that they are eating salmon, tuna, shrimp, pampano or cod, rather than risk a diet of spoon-fed conger eel and rat fish powder; hence that practical protection of coastal fisheries is more important than some theory.

These two divergent approaches to the law of the sea met at Geneva with the result that the fishery convention adopted there in 1958 was a compromise; hence its complexity. Although the fisheries convention purported to endorse freedom of the seas, both it and the Continental Shelf Convention in fact contain provisions demonstrating that such freedom is neither absolute nor sacrosanct, thereby leaving the principle open for rational application. This fisheries convention was the last of the four Geneva Conventions to secure enough ratifications to bring it into operation. The United States attached a reservation to its ratification, and the convention need not be considered to be the last word on the subject.

Hugo Grotius, champion of freedom of the seas, was no theoretical dreamer, but a great advocate. The English translation of the title to his thesis is "The Freedom of the Seas or the Right which Belongs to the Dutch to Take Part in the East Indian Trade," that is, freedom of the Dutch to course the India Ocean and to break into the Portuguese monopoly of the highly profitable East Indies spice trade. Though not in the same publication, he also extended the application of his thesis to cover freedom of the Dutch to continue their own near monopoly of the herring fishery off the British Coast.

Factually there is as much reason in the 20th century as in the 17th to avoid curtailing trade and communication between nations, and a territorial sea width of not more than three miles is highly desirable as to navigation. But with mechanical power, refrigeration, floating canneries, radar, sonar, power blocks, nylon nets, today's ocean fishing has an efficiency beyond imagination in the Hugo Grotius days when fishing was done from row or sail boats and it was believed that ocean fisheries were inexhaustible.

The American Bar Association in 1964 passed a resolution urging our Government to seek international agreement giving wholly separate consideration to freedom of the seas for navigation, and to the distinct problem of conservation of ocean fisheries.

International law should be kept abreast of the times. If protection of coastal fish-

eries is essential to their preservation, this should not be hampered by the popularity of an attractive phrase.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, though we might find some disagreement with Mr. Allen's views as to the future of fish flour, or fish protein concentrate, I see no conflict as to the interests of the United States, for the protection of the Pacific hake off my State's coast may well provide some protection for the salmon.

The National Fishermen and Wives delegation has made a strong case for damage to the salmon resource by the Soviet Union, and I am told that the representatives from the Department of the Interior and the State Department were much impressed by the depth of their evidence. That the Soviet Union is inflicting damage to our coastal salmon resource seems beyond doubt, regardless of whether their fishery is a specific one or if the salmon are taken incidentally to their fishery for hake.

I am regularly receiving affidavits from fishermen attesting to fresh net marks on the troll and sportsmen's salmon taken offshore, and there are no American seines or gillnets out there, for we are banned from such net fishing for salmon on the high seas by conservation law. The ladies brought with them depositions from fishery biologists who believe the marks were not made by Soviet trawls, but by gillnets.

I have just received another of these affidavits on net-marked fish, this one from Otto Fitterer, a 21-year veteran in the coastal fisheries, and a resident of Westport, Wash.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fitterer's notarized statement to appear in the RECORD in full at this point.

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

I, Otto Fitterer, being duly sworn, depose and say that I am owner of the boat "Hardly Able" and that on July 13, 1966 a gill net marked fish was caught on my boat by Mr. Morgan of Yakima in 22 fathoms of water off the North Whistler of Grays Harbor.

The fish weighed between 9 and 10 pounds, and was caught about 12:30 p.m.

The marks on the fish are definitely net burns, and are so deep the flesh was cut. The gill net marks are definitely fresh and recently incurred.

I was born in Hoquiam in 1918 and have been engaged in fishing for 21 years, and have raised two boys in the fishing business. I feel qualified to identify the gill net marks on this fish.

[SIGNED] OTTO FITTERER.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 13th day of July, 1966. In testimony whereof I have set my hand and seal the day and year aforesaid.

MARTIN R. THURMAN,
Notary Public for Washington.

My Commission Expires: January 2, 1970.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the delegation of National Fishermen and Wives have asked what progress we are making in this problem of foreign fishing. I believe that we are making some headway, but I would hasten to add that it is not enough, not nearly enough, and we are still some distance from solutions to the basic problems.

We have made some progress in some areas:

First. Certainly one of our major marks of recent progress has been the upgrading of the fisheries office in the U.S. Department of State. For too long we have been handicapped by the position of our negotiator in our dealings on international fisheries where across the table we have been faced by men of much higher status. The new ambassador title for this office will be very helpful in our future dealings.

Second. The general surveillance of the Soviet fishing fleet—a matter of great concern and criticism from citizens—has been strengthened and I have been able to announce the appointment of an industry-government committee to study the results and advise improvement.

Third. The long-sought meeting with the Soviet Union is now underway, and our technical team is now in Moscow for the first meeting today. This is an informal meeting—it is only a beginning—but it is progress.

Fourth. I am hopeful for favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 29 which will assist us in getting some needed data on the offshore resources so that we will not again have to make statements that we do not know the conservation requirements of adjacent resources while foreign fleets are in heavy harvest.

Fifth. I am hopeful for favorable consideration by the other House of the fish protein concentrate bill—S. 2720—which will authorize the construction of up to five developmental and demonstration plants, a huge step forward toward establishing some of the necessary markets for substantial production of such species as Pacific hake.

Sixth. I hold equal hope for the passage of S. 2218, to establish a 12-mile fishery zone, which is a useful step toward proper protection of the resources and a move toward establishing the concept for the separation of the fishery zone and the territorial sea.

Seventh. The opening of the fishmeal plant of Pacific Protein, Inc., at Aberdeen, Wash., and the resultant beginning of harvest by American fishermen of the Pacific hake is noteworthy. The effort is a small one alongside the huge Soviet effort concentrated there, but it is a demonstration of our interest, and will be helpful in our talks with the Soviets.

Eighth. The increasing national fishermen's representation as demonstrated in this present visit of delegates of the National Fishermen & Wives, Inc., and the recent delegation from the Congress of American Fishermen who appeared in support of S. 2720 and S. 2218 at the Senate Commerce Committee hearings. It would be extremely helpful if the fishermen of the Nation could speak with a unified national voice, and I would encourage such organizations.

Ninth. The progress toward a World Fisheries Conference is a prime example of recent progress. Though I would have wished it much sooner, the interest of the State Department at present is heartening. We must provide for the conservation of the world ocean resources or we will have violated one of our prime responsibilities to those who are hungry today and those who will be in hunger tomorrow.

vides an analysis of issues, ghostwrites speeches and briefs the incumbent on subjects that are important to him—all of which can add to his advantage over the challenger. At election time, the members may ask the Service to coddle more of the voters who write in. The people at LRS were delighted when Lindley Beckworth was beaten in the recent Democratic primary in Texas. They weren't interested one way or the other in his politics. But Beckworth had sent over quantities of constituent mail to be answered.

GHOSTWRITING SCHOOL PAPERS

While the LRS is meant to be used judiciously by members to help them with their work, in practice, requests are usually accepted from anyone calling in from a member's office. This presents interesting opportunities for people on the make. Assistants to members have got the LRS to do research for books they were writing. In one case, the staff was asked to prepare an outline for a lazy political science professor who was a friend of a Congressman. Secretaries have called in with requests for reports, which, as it turns out, are papers for boy friends at college. Students who work as interns in Congress during the summer sometimes send over queries that will be of use to them in college.

Lester Jayson, director of the LRS, says his people catch most of the phony requests. As for constituent mail, while it is increasing, he feels these requests take relatively little time to process, and are not a major obstacle to the researcher in getting work done. But some of the staff people I talked to said the queries meant the interesting substantive work they were assigned had to be rushed and was sloppy as a result. In some quarters in the Congress the service has got itself the reputation of turning out poor, dull stuff. In 1962, for instance, Senator NEUBERGER asked for a rundown of the previous legislative history on smoking and health preparatory to the debates on cigarette labeling. Her office got back a list of previous bills and a brief description of what each one said. The LRS report said the Congress had held no hearings on the subject. As it turned out, the Congress had held an important set of hearings in 1957.

The Service is at its best analyzing matters of public policy when there is a mass of published information and the arguments are clearly drawn. Two of the staff members, Fred Arner and Helen Livingston were useful to members during the Medicare debates last year. They were loaned first to the House Ways and Means Committee and then to the Senate Finance Committee, where they helped prepare questions for expert witnesses, worked on drafting legislation, and in the final stages were on the floor to advise members.

In an effort to avoid partisan politics, the LRS staff is not permitted to offer opinions in their research papers, which makes the reports dull, and over the long run, very probably discourages spirited people from working there. The researchers also are expected to stick closely to published material, a rule which sometimes prevents a research analyst from giving a member the nuances of what he has discovered. The Service hasn't the money to put together the sort of investigatory research which played an important part in helping Congress make up its mind about auto and tire safety, pesticides, water and air pollution, and poverty. The Congress ought to have imaginative and expert information in such areas before the executive departments and lobbyists descend on it. As it is now, because the LRS is so ineffective, members will ask the executive departments to prepare expert testimony, and write questions for witnesses which, in effect, means that the Administration not only writes the legislation it wants, but exercises oversight as well.

There are signs that the LRS may be slowly changing. A new division of science policy research is beginning to put out the wide ranging reports on science and technology which should go some way towards helping members stand up to the executive departments. Jayson is asking the House Appropriations Committee to give him more staff, and he wants to get the constituent mail and other spot requests out of the researchers' hair. The Joint Committee on Organization has been preparing a report which would strengthen the LRS by creating a separate division to handle routine inquiries, and thus freeing researchers for more substantive work. It also would encourage the Congress to hire expert consultants when needed on a temporary basis. All this will help. But the Congress would find things considerably more lively if it staffed the Legislative Reference Service with people whose opinions the members found stimulating.

NEED FOR NEW TRADE POLICY TO OVERCOME RESTRICTIONS AGAINST AMERICAN FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in commenting on our present international economic position, I have attempted to identify some critical areas where policy or natural changes may affect our overall balance of payments. Today I draw the attention of the Senate to the vital contribution of agricultural exports.

It is easy to overlook their importance. The growth of world trade has been largely in exchanges between industrial countries. The recovery of the war-torn countries of Europe has brought a new competitive challenge to our manufacturing industry. There, as here, the share of agriculture in total output and in the employment of labor has been declining. But, the United States has continued as the world's largest exporter of farm products. It has supplied about one-fifth of the world's total of these exports. And the market is a growing one. The total value of farm product exports is expected this year to be almost double that of only 7 years ago—\$6.7 billion compared with \$3.7 billion in 1959. Cash receipts will approach \$5 billion. Agricultural exports represent almost one-quarter of the value of our merchandise exports, excluding military aid items. A prosperous and increasingly populous world creates growing demand for our produce. The less prosperous, but also increasingly populous, countries need our supply of food. It is in a real sense food for peace.

But the critical role of our agricultural exports is based on our trade with the industrialized countries. They account for about one-third of our total exports to Western Europe, whereas our agricultural imports from these countries are one-tenth or less of our total imports. It is very easy for us to strike a balance and say we have an annual surplus of over \$1 billion on our agricultural product trade with the countries of the Common Market. It is just as easy for these same countries to look at the same trade and see a large deficit. And when some of these countries are in overall deficit, there is a ready political appeal, even if no economic case, for a policy of restricting their imports from us.

Now the Congress has made very clear its expectations that trade negotiations under the Trade Expansion Act must assure improved access to world markets for U.S. agricultural exports. Yet we have, since November 1964, been negotiating on industrial products only, and the EEC, while it has recently reached internal agreement on agriculture, has yet to present its agricultural proposals to our negotiators in Geneva.

The evidence is accumulating that we shall be facing a common agricultural policy of the EEC that is protectionist and restrictive in its international aspects. Let it be made clear that we in the United States understand by the term "reciprocity" an agreement on trade that includes agricultural trade liberalization. We need that, and we shall not quietly grant concessions on industrial products without it.

Let me make a serious proposal. If the negotiators of the EEC go on their August vacations without submitting their agricultural proposals, a failure which would cast doubts on their serious intention to bargain, the United States should begin to give thought to a change in its trading policy. This would have two aspects: First, an abandonment of our unconditional most-favored-nation approach, so as to exclude named customs unions that have demonstrated unwillingness to move toward trade liberalization. Second, an offer to negotiate with any and all other nations with a view to the elimination of trade barriers. If the Common Market of Europe will not play, let us show that we can make a common market of the rest of the free world. If we are unable to reduce restrictionism by the EEC, the United States has no prospect of gain from a general retaliatory policy or a broad retreat from all of its postwar trade aims. The United States has a clear interest in liberalizing trade with those who are likewise willing to liberalize it.

PUBLIC OPINION POLLS AND VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, at a time when major foreign policy and military decisions relating to the war in Vietnam seem to be made more and more on the basis of public opinion polls, Mr. Art Buchwald's column on this subject in the Sunday, July 24, Washington Post is of special interest. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BOMBING OUT—AH RIS POLL SHOWS ONLY 13 PERCENT OF NORTH VIETNAMESE LIKE BOMBS
(By Art Buchwald)

LONDON.—There has been a lot of emphasis on polls of late, particularly on the Vietnam war. After the United States bombed the outskirts of Hanoi and Haiphong, President Johnson announced that 75 percent of the American people approved.

Unbeknownst to most people, a recent poll was taken in Hanoi by the North Vietnamese political pollster, Lu Ah Ris, and someone slipped it to me. The results were very interesting.

July 25, 1966

16206

AGREEMENTS SIGNED

Ah RIs revealed that 75 per cent of all the North Vietnamese said they did not like being bombed by American planes, 13 per cent said they didn't mind being bombed and 12 per cent said they didn't know.

Sixty per cent of the people asked said they would rather be bombed than strafed, 23 per cent said they would rather be strafed than bombed and 17 per cent said they had no preference.

A large segment of those questioned said that, while they didn't agree with President Ho Chi Minh's domestic policies, they felt he was doing a good job in foreign affairs. At least 98 per cent replied yes when asked if they were happy with President Ho's handling of the war. The other 4 per cent turned up as refugees in South Vietnam.

President Ho still has a good following in North Vietnam. In answer to the question, "If elections were held tomorrow in Vietnam, would you vote for Ho Chi Minh, Gen. Ky, President Johnson, Gov. Romney or BOBBY KENNEDY?" President Ho got 63 per cent of the vote.

But in the follow-up question, "If elections were held in 1972 . . .?" KENNEDY came out 2 percentage points over President Ho and 34 percentage points over HUBERT HUMPHREY.

When asked if they thought President Johnson was doing a good job in Vietnam, 98 per cent of the North Vietnamese felt he wasn't doing enough bombing of South Vietnam. Two per cent said they "didn't know."

President Johnson's popularity in Hanoi hit a new low after the bombing near Hanoi and Haiphong.

Seventy-three per cent of those questioned said they would have thought twice about supporting President Johnson if they knew he was going to bomb North Vietnamese cities. Twenty-three per cent of those interviewed said they saw no reason to go to the conference table now that all their oil supplies were burned up and 7 per cent said Barry Goldwater's approach toward North Vietnam was much more honest and straightforward.

When asked what they thought of the escalation of the bombing, only 6 per cent of the North Vietnamese thought it was a "good thing."

Good thing—6 per cent.
Bad thing—32 per cent.
Not sure, but probably bad—59 per cent.
Too early to tell—3 per cent.
The final question of the poll was about what the average North Vietnamese felt was the most pressing problem facing Hanoi at this time.
Urban renewal—2 per cent.
Air and water pollution—5 per cent.
The move of large masses to the suburbs—6 per cent.
The draft—3 per cent.
The Seventh Fleet—84 per cent.

STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM MOVING FORWARD

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, one of the milestone legislative accomplishments of this Congress, which has been dubbed by some the education Congress, was the passage of Public Law 89-329, the Higher Education Act which was signed into law last November 8.

As one who has long sought to improve the opportunities for financing a college education by all those who are qualified to make profitable use of such training, I was particularly pleased that title IV incorporated the proposals I offered in the 88th Congress for student loans guaranteed by the Federal Government, for a program of work-study assistance, and for grants in aid to the neediest stu-

dents. At the same time, as I have frequently noted, the new program cannot be expected to carry the full load of need without the continuance at its present level of the National Defense Education Act loan fund program.

But it is significant that the bankers of the Nation are girding for participation in the new federally guaranteed private loan program. According to Dr. Benjamin Fine in his syndicated column appearing in the Washington Star recently, the Association of Reserve City Bankers has pledged full support to the program. Charles E. Walker, vice president of the American Bankers Association, is quoted as saying that eventually all banks will participate in the loan process established by the act.

In this time of rapidly rising interest rates and tight money, it is encouraging that the Nation's banks are willing to make such a universal commitment to loans which will bring the banks a lower return than they might receive from other types of lending.

Dr. Fine's article also contains information about available materials for students who wish to become familiar not only with the Federal program but with others as well. The suggestions made there may be useful to Members of the Senate in responding to student inquiries. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Fine article may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, June 26, 1966]

COLLEGE FOR THE ASKING: BANKERS BACK STUDENT AID

(By Benjamin Fine, Ph. D.)

The top management of the nation's largest banks, members of the Association of Reserve City Bankers, have pledged their full support to finance student loans under state and private guarantee plans.

The bankers plan to develop methods and procedures to provide adequate amounts of funds in all sections of the country. An estimated 775,000 college students will be eligible to borrow \$620 million during the next school year to finance their education.

According to Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, all banks will eventually participate in the program. He predicted that students will borrow primarily in their home towns rather than in their college towns.

The federal government is the principle source of college loans. More than \$190 million a year is loaned to some 250,000 students. But the federal government wants private and state agencies to take over this job, though the government will continue to underwrite the loans and subsidize the interest rate. Thus, if the banks charge the students 6 percent interest, the federal government will pay 3 percent and the student will pay the other 3 percent.

As the importance of education continues to mount, so does the cost of obtaining a higher education. The cost of financing a higher education at either a public or private school has increased by 50 percent in the last 10 years and will jump another 25 percent by 1970. Enrollments are climbing along with costs. The number of students in college doubled between 1955 and 1965, going to 5.5 million. By 1970 enrollments will reach 8 million.

Interim agreements to initiate the insured student loan program during the 1966-67 academic year have been signed by the U.S. Office of Education with agencies in 13 states and the United Student Aid Funds which operates a nationwide student loan program. The United Student Aid Funds, 5259 N. Tacoma Ave., Indianapolis, Ind., is a nonprofit student guaranteed loan agency with programs in all 50 states.

The USFA guarantees the loans, reimburses the banks and continues the collection procedure if the loans become delinquent. The loans, of course, are supplemented with scholarships, fellowships and outright grants from private, federal and state sources.

Under the government-guaranteed loan program the government assists state and private student loan insurance plans in underwriting loans up to \$1,000 a year for undergraduate students and \$1,500 for graduate students.

I have prepared a series of bulletins that spell out the sources available for scholarships, fellowships and loans and the steps to follow in getting college funds. Write to Dr. Benjamin Fine, in care of The Star, and ask for these bulletins: Bulletin No. 1, "College Help for Children of Veterans"; Bulletin No. 2, "Where to Get Federal, State and Private Loans"; Bulletin No. 3, "Major Scholarship Sources"; Bulletin No. 5, "Scholarships Available Through Business and Industry" and Bulletin No. 10, "Federal Scholarships, Fellowships and Loans." Please send a long, stamped, self-addressed envelop and 25 cents in coin for each bulletin desired to cover handling charges. (All five for \$1.)

One of the major sources of scholarship aid are the colleges themselves. During the coming year the colleges are scheduled to offer \$100 million in scholarship aid to 300,000 students. Not everyone who applies gets help, of course. But two important considerations are involved: academic record and need.

YALE EXAMPLE

Yale University is a good example. At present the total financial assistance received by the four Yale classes amounts to \$3 million each year. A request for financial aid will in no way handicap an application. This is generally true among all colleges.

Financial aid, in accordance with need, will be continued all four years, provided only that the student remains in good academic and personal standing. Jobs will normally be offered but are not mandatory. Yale loans may always be substituted for the job. Every effort is being made by Yale to find on-campus jobs when requested. More than 40 percent of each recent class of Yale has received financial aid.

You can get a listing of the scholarships, loans and jobs available at each college and university in the United States from the 360-page U.S. Office of Education book "Financial Assistance for College Students: Undergraduate." (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, \$1.25.)

For those interested in graphic arts, the Educational Council of the Graphic Arts Industry, 1411 K St. NW, Washington, has set up a national scholarship trust fund for 12 fourth-year scholarships to be used at institutions offering degree programs or majors in printing design, printing teaching, printing management and technology. The values of the scholarships range from \$100 to \$1,000 a year. Additional scholarships are offered by several companies, foundations and other donors in the industry.

ALL IS LOST IN DISORDER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Dominion-News of Morgantown, W. Va., carried an editorial on

call it, of a work of art. And although George Stewart's East Front now appears as an exact replica, future generations will, no doubt, instantly recognize it for what it is—a mid-20th century imitation.

Even Latrobe, aside from his jealous ambition, rebelled against Jefferson's and Thornton's pure classicism, though in the end he, like Bulfinch, faithfully executed Thornton's design. Besides he created the marvelous interiors of the original building.

Another difficulty was lack of skilled craftsmen. It proved hard to recruit carpenters and stone cutters who could build anything higher than thresholds.

Money, furthermore, was short. Washington's public buildings were to be financed from the sale of lots. But in the trackless wasteland where few streets were even marked, the real estate business was slow. The Government had to borrow money.

Under the circumstances, President Washington would not hear doing the building in marble as Thornton urged. There was none about at the time and it would have had to be imported at tremendous expense. Instead the original Capitol was built of sandstone from the nearby Acquia quarry and painted white.

CORRODED AND PAINT-CAKED

Sandstone is porous and has, as the incumbent Architect of the Capitol keeps pointing out with much alarm, corroded in spots and is caked with the innumerable coats of paint. But Washington's sandstone is part of our history, too. And although it must, of course, be repaired, and although marble is unquestionably the most suitable building material, it should no more be changed for the sake of prettiness than we should put up plastic cherry trees around the Tidal Basin.

On Nov. 22, 1800, President John Adams welcomed Congress in the completed north wing of the building, congratulating the gentlemen "on the prospect of a residence not to be changed." Seven years later, built under the direction of Latrobe, the identical south wing was completed. The two were joined by a wooden arcade where the Rotunda now stands.

Latrobe was appointed by Jefferson in 1803. He was a most accomplished architect and engineer but just as arrogant and troublesome as Hallet had been—at least for poor Thornton. The two kept harpooning each other with bitter accusations and acid sarcasm.

Latrobe was born in England and trained partly in Germany. On a visit to Philadelphia, in 1798, he met the president of the Bank of Pennsylvania and in the course of a casual conversation made a sketch of what a bank ought to look like. Nine months later, to his great surprise, he had the commission.

Latrobe was almost unique among the architects of his time in believing in function as well as form. This led him to his many quibbles, not only with Thornton but with Jefferson as well, who would not have his conceptions of classic design altered for the sake of a more workable building.

Latrobe and Jefferson, for instance, disagreed violently over roofing the House of Representatives. Latrobe, for functional reasons, wanted a hemispheric dome lighted by a lantern with vertical glass panes that could be easily waterproofed. Jefferson wanted something like the dome over the new Halle aux Bles he had seen in Paris with long ribs springing from a drum and horizontal glass strips between them. It seemed to him more like the Pantheon in Rome.

The President had his way. Latrobe was sarcastic. "Presidents and Vice Presidents are the only architects and poets," he wrote his assistant. "... Therefore let us fall down and worship them..." The leaks Latrobe had predicted were fixed with some extra putty.

But Jefferson, like everyone else to this day, much admired Latrobe's handsome "cornucop" capitals on the ornamental columns in the original Senate wing. It was a patriotic deed of much daring to replace the 2000-year-old acanthus leaf of antiquity with a motive as lowly—and American!—as carved ears of Indian corn.

BRITISH SET FIRES

"The Cossacks spared Paris," as one English newspaper remarked, but the British did not spare Washington and the fire damage they did to the Capitol in 1814 was extensive. The District Commissioners promised Congress, which had retreated to Sam Blodgett's nearby hotel, to have the building restored by 1816. It took 14 years longer.

Latrobe now did over much of the formerly wooden interiors in marble and metal, but was out of town a lot on other business and an increasing irritant to the growing bureaucracy. In 1817 he stiffly informed President James Monroe that he had "no choice between resignation and the sacrifice of all self-respect." He was spared the sacrifice. Bulfinch took over and to him goes the credit for completing the Capitol much as Thornton had envisioned it.

That job completed in 1830, there seemed no more need for an architect of the Capitol and the position was abolished for many years.

In 1850 the country's population exceeded 23 million and even distant California had become a state. The 62 Senators and 232 Representatives who assembled that year felt crowded.

Again, following precedent, a competition was called. Again the munificent sum of \$500 was offered as first prize. And again the entries proved most unsatisfactory.

Robert Mills, the official government architect and engineer at the time, was asked to combine the various ideas the competition had brought out into a new scheme. Mills had designed the Washington Monument, the Treasury and the Patent Office (now the National Portrait Gallery), among other handsome buildings, but failed to please Congress on this job. After much hassle, President Fillmore appointed Thomas U. Walter to build the Capitol as we know it today.

Walter's design reflects a different America than Thornton's. The age of elegance and almost aristocratic refinement had yielded to a new sense of power—in fact, to a certain arrogance, and to the esthetic confusion of the beginning industrial revolution. Walter's idea of "classic" architecture was different from that of Thornton and Jefferson. He would, he once lectured, have architects think as the Greeks thought, not do as they did. And what he thought the Greeks thought was really what most Americans thought of—the manifest destiny of a new industrial empire.

Walter's nine million pound, cast-iron dome reflects this spirit. Besides, it was a great engineering feat. People often wonder how Walter got the 16-foot figure of Freedom way up there. It's quite simple. He merely built scaffolding straight up the middle of the rotunda, through the eye of the dome. From there he swung a derrick by means of which the ironwork could be hoisted up on the outside.

He left the interior of the original rotunda unchanged up to the top of the cornice. From there a new and higher inner dome was constructed.

The last constructive and truly handsome work on Capitol Hill was performed by Frederick Law Olmsted, America's greatest landscape architect, who, beginning with Central Park in New York, gave us fine city parks all over the country. Olmsted, in 1874, spruced up the Capitol grounds. He created the handsome plaza on the east of the building which has now been turned into a dismal parking lot. And he designed the marble

terraces and grand stairs on the west which Stewart's extension scheme would also destroy, along with the architecture. They were, according to Olmsted, "to support, sustain and augment."

By the time all this was finished, Ulysses S. Grant was President, the flag had 38 stars and Congress again felt crowded.

Though long retired as Architect of the Capitol, Walter offered two remedies. His plans showed the Capitol enlarged like a blown-up balloon. Then the busy architectural firm of Smythmeyer & Pelz came along with a real lulu. Extending the Capitol east and west, they wanted to adorn it with towers and turrets in all directions. It was filed away.

In 1903, however, these ideas were again resurrected and a Joint Commission of Congress appointed architects Carrere & Hastings to study the possibility of extending the east front.

They recommended an extension of no more than 12½ feet to give Walter's dome better visual support. They called this Scheme A. In addition, they complied with the request of the Commission for more space but recommended against it. This plan, called Scheme B, was to extend the east front by 32½ feet. With some slight amendments, the Commission approved Scheme B, despite the architects' recommendation to the contrary. But the Congress as a whole voted it down in 1905 and built the first House and Senate Office Buildings instead.

Nothing was ever said about the west front.

Scheme B was brought up and voted down three times more—in 1935, 1937 and 1949. In 1955, a year after J. George Stewart was appointed Architect of the Capitol, legislation to extend the east front in substantial accordance with Scheme B was passed as a rider to the Legislative Appropriations Act. There were no public hearings or public debate. But the measure had the emphatic backing of Speaker Sam Rayburn. Many Congressmen apparently took any criticism of the scheme as a criticism of this popular leader. The deed was done.

A PROMISE BY RAYBURN

Again, nothing was ever said about the west front. On the contrary, Rayburn assured the Congress in 1958 that "we are not going to do anything with the west end."

Yet the present Commission for the Extension of the Capitol says that it derives its authority from the 1955 Scheme B legislation.

It proposes to bring out Thornton's portico by 44 feet and change its design by adding a pediment, widening it and adding more columns. Thornton's wings are to be brought out 88 feet. And Walter's corridors that connect the original building with his wings is to be extended by 65 feet. Olmsted's terrace and stairs to be redesigned.

The yield: 4½ acres of space—a 25 percent increase in the size of the present Capitol—to be used for two visitors' auditoriums, two cafeterias, four dining rooms, several conference rooms and 109 "hideaway" offices for Members of Congress.

The cost: an estimated \$34 million and the certain loss of a building that for a century-and-a-half has had Thomas Jefferson's words "captivated the eyes and judgment of all."

DECISIONMAKING IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, Mr. Philip Geyelin, of the Wall Street Journal, who has written perceptively on this and related issues in the past, contributed two articles appearing in that newspaper July 21 and 22, examining the interrelationships of

July 25, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16195

Somehow, I fail to see that the yield of 2 visitors' auditoriums, 2 cafeterias, 4 dining rooms, conference rooms, and 109 new places in which Congressmen can hide from their constituents could be adequate justification for the monumental changes which are envisioned by Stewart and company.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Mr. Eckhardt be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A FURTHER OUTLOOK: LESSER MINDS FIDDLE WITH WHAT FATHERS FUSSED OVER

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

Although busy enough making independence and self-government work, George Washington and Thomas Jefferson worried and fussed a great deal about the National Capitol.

The original building—the last remaining portions of which lesser minds would now entomb in a new, vastly extended marble front—is as much their work as that of architects William Thornton, Benjamin Latrobe and Charles Bulfinch.

As Washington and Jefferson saw it, the Nation's first building was to be the symbol for generations of the dignity and permanence of the new republic.

Two generations later, President Millard Fillmore decided against tampering with the original building when Congress demanded more space. Instead, in 1851, he appointed architect Thomas U. Walter to add new wings to either side of the old building. They are connected with it by narrow corridors. To give harmony to this ensemble, Walter capped it with his magnificent dome.

To Abraham Lincoln, too, the Capitol was a symbol of the permanency of the Union. Despite the demands which the Civil War made on manpower and finance, he ordered the work rushed to completion. His judgment of the country's sentiment was soon proven correct:

"How is the Capitol? Is it finished?" were among the first questions the representative of the Confederacy asked the representative of the Union when South and North first met to negotiate the end of hostilities on Feb. 3, 1865, aboard a ship in Hampton Roads.

It was essentially finished. Two years earlier—not long after Gettysburg—the bronze statue of Freedom was, precisely at noon on Dec. 2, 1863, slowly hoisted atop the great cast iron dome. A flag was unfurled and a salute of 35 guns was fired from Capitol Hill.

All that remained to be done now was Frederick Law Olmsted's magnificent west terrace and landscaping and, obviously, continuing interior improvements of plumbing, lighting, heating and cooling. But for this the building and the symbol were complete, or should be considered so. Who would dream of extending St. Peter's in Rome, Monticello, Mount Vernon or even the Houses of Parliament in London?

BICKERING GOES ON

But the unending bickering—a curious mixture of political and architectural ambition, of genius and pettiness, parsimony and extravagance, respect for history and disrespectful vainglory—that had accompanied the work from the very beginning has persisted to this day. In a way this bickering helped create our Capitol. Now it threatens it.

President Fillmore had ended the long debate in Congress about enlarging and changing the original Capitol because he would

not "mar the harmony and beauty of the present building which, as a specimen of architecture, is so universally admired." Yet only ten years later scheme after hideous extension scheme was proposed.

For nearly a hundred years, Congress, supported by the vast majority of the country's architects, has resisted all of them. Rather than change and disfigure its glorious home, Congress decided to accommodate the ever-growing need for additional space and facilities by constructing new buildings on Capitol Hill. The results are the Library of Congress, the Supreme Court Building, the old and new Senate Office Buildings, three huge House Office Buildings and now the proposed Madison Memorial Library which will serve as a third building for the Library of Congress.

The old, vainglorious and long rejected enlargement proposals of the 1870s and '80s have, however, intrigued the present Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart, who is not an architect but a builder and former Republican Congressman from Delaware.

With the emphatic backing of the late House Speaker Sam Rayburn (D-Tex.), he puffed out the east facade of the original, central portion of the building by 32½ feet with a new, slick marble replica. The work was completed in 1961.

ON THE WESTERN FRONT

Last month Stewart and his powerful Commission for the Extension of the Capitol suddenly announced that they had decided to similarly extend the west front, but this time by up to 88 feet and not with a replica but a somewhat changed design. The members of this Commission, in addition to Stewart, are Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK Democrat, of Massachusetts, Senate Minority Leader EYEBETT M. DIRKSEN Republican, of Illinois and House Minority Leader GERALD F. FORD Republican, of Michigan.

This second extension would, of course, spell the final obliteration of the splendid building that Fillmore saved and Washington and Jefferson worried so much about.

Of all the politicians who fussed with the work of the Capitol's architects, Washington and Jefferson were surely the most qualified. An informed appreciation of architecture was, in their day, considered an essential part of the education of a Virginia gentleman.

True, Washington thought it best to let the design of buildings "be governed by the rules which are laid down by the professors of the art." But his active part in the enlargement of his home at Mount Vernon belies this modesty.

And for Jefferson, of course, architecture was a passionate avocation. He had, he confessed, in uncharacteristic ecstasy, "stood for whole hours gazing at the Maison Carré like a lover at his mistress." It was not that this exceptionally well preserved Roman temple at Nîmes, in southern France, seemed more perfect to him than other buildings he had seen.

It was because, in the words of one scholar, this temple's almost austere simplicity—in contrast to the still predominant Georgian style which accompanied British colonization—"was the speaking symbol of all that America could and should stand for, proclaiming the strength of republican virtue, the beauty of discipline, the wisdom of rule by laws rather than men, in a language he wanted all the United States to learn."

In quest of such architecture, Washington and Jefferson called a competition for the design of the Capitol. Its disappointing results may justify the slight hanky-panky which helped Thornton to win it. The fact that he had been introduced to President

Washington by the famous painter John Trumbull may also have helped.

At any rate, Thornton was given permission to enter three months after the competition was officially closed and after the French architect Stephen Hallet had been given reason to believe that he had won. But surely Hallet's drawing of what looked like the fairy tale palace of a minor Renaissance prince was hardly the simple, classic building both Washington and Jefferson had in mind.

William Thornton was born in 1759 at Tortola in the Virgin Islands. He studied medicine in Edinburgh, traveled extensively in Europe and in Parisian society, settled for a while in Philadelphia where he knew Benjamin Franklin, gave up the practice of medicine and married a 15-year-old girl. He eventually became a Commissioner for the District of Columbia and later head of the United States Patent Office which he saved from destruction by the British in 1814 by stepping in front of their cannon and cussing them out.

At Philadelphia he had learned of a competition for the design of a public library. "When I traveled," he wrote, "I never thought of architecture, but I got some books and worked a few days, then gave a plan in the ancient Ionic order, which carried the day.

He carried the day again in the Capitol competition, his second architectural effort.

"Grandeur, simplicity and convenience appear so well combined in this plan of Dr. Thornton's," wrote George Washington on Jan. 31, 1793, to the District Commissioners who were officially in charge, that he was certain of their instant approval.

And Jefferson let it be known that Thornton's design "had captivated the eyes and judgment of all. It is simple, noble, beautiful, excellently arranged and moderate in size. * * * Among its admirers none is more decided than he whose decision is most important."

But Hallet's eyes and judgment, understandably perhaps, were captivated not at all. He, after all, was a professional architect and Thornton was not. And the District Commissioners, it turned out, made a bad mistake when, to appease the cantankerous Frenchman, they awarded him the same prize as Thornton (\$500 and a building lot in Washington), invited him to examine Thornton's plans (which he promptly ripped to pieces in a lengthy report), and gave him the \$400-a-year job of supervising the construction of the building (which he proceeded to change in accordance with his own ideas).

When it was discovered that Hallet had laid foundations for a square court instead of the Rotunda Thornton had planned, President Washington, according to the long harassed Thornton, "expressed his disapproval in a style of such warmth as his dignity seldom permitted."

Hallet was fired. But since he refused to surrender the original plans, it is difficult to judge precisely how much influence he had on the design. Some historians have accepted Hallet's assertion that Thornton stole it from him in the first place. Glenn Brown, in his two heavy volumes on the history of the Capitol, defends Thornton's originality and competence with passionate eloquence.

The truth is probably, as Latrobe has written, that Thornton's design was one of the most brilliant and modern of his time, but that the amateur lacked the practical skill to properly execute and articulate it. His, regardless of details, is no doubt the chaste, classic simplicity of the building that pleased Jefferson so well and that Walter's House and Senate wings lack. As any discerning art historian knows, it is impossible to recreate this spirit, the "Zeitgeist," as the Germans

July 25, 1966

political, psychological, and military considerations in decisionmaking in south-east Asia. I believe these articles are important contributions to the study of policy formation and of interest to all concerned in that area.

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

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 21, 1966]

THE ESCALATION MACHINE: POLICYMAKING SYSTEM ITSELF MAKES ANOTHER STEPUP LIKELY

(By Philip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—The smoke had barely blown away from the Hanoi-Haiphong oil depots and the latest expansion of the U.S. effort in Vietnam when the wheels that could carry the U.S. toward yet another "escalation" began, barely perceptibly but almost inexorably, to turn again.

Not conclusively, necessarily, perhaps not even consciously. No Presidential "decisions" were taken. No military orders were handed down. Quite the contrary; when pressed in public, such leading Administration figures as Presidential assistant Walt W. Rostow stoutly insisted that military considerations—meaning the response of the enemy—would dictate the next U.S. moves, and that nobody could predict the enemy's response.

After all, argued Mr. Rostow, the North Vietnamese had really started it in 1964, by infiltrating new and heavier arms and whole divisions of their troops; the U.S. was merely responding when it landed its own troops and launched air attacks on the enemy's "logistical and military bases" in the North. Similarly, it was only after the invaders continued to pour in that the U.S. did the same, while progressively intensifying the air assault. As for where it would end, Mr. Rostow begged off by declaring that "there is only one target officer in this Government—that is the President of the United States." Besides, he added, the answer rests with "the other side."

There is simple logic in this portrayal of military responses to military moves, with all of it apparently under careful control. But if that was all there is to the machinery of escalation, as it has functioned so far, it would also be a lot easier to accept the prospect put forth of late by at least some influential Administration officials of a protracted conflict, at something close to the present scale, with the Communists ultimately wearying of it all and either quietly scaling down their effort, or openly seeking peace.

It may turn out that way, of course. Or it might turn out just the other way. Either by a massive increase in infiltration, or a big monsoon offensive, or a war crimes trial and execution of captured U.S. airmen, or the entry into the war of the Red Chinese, the Communists might make further U.S. escalation clearly inescapable. But if past performance is any test, it is even more likely that nothing so dramatic or decisive will happen, but that the U.S. war effort will escalate anyway, for reasons only marginally related to strict military need.

A COMBINATION OF INGREDIENTS

For the fact is that the wheels propelling the U.S. toward wider war in Vietnam are not just military wheels. Some are political or diplomatic or psychological, both within and outside the U.S. Government, and all are tightly intermeshed under the complex process of step-by-step consensus-building, of balancing contradictory pressures, which is resident Johnson's preferred technique for making Vietnam policy.

The momentum, in short, is in the decision-making system, and nowhere has that been more graphically demonstrated than in the case of the Hanoi-Haiphong raids, and some little-noted developments that were all but lost in the excitement afterwards.

The bombing of the Hanoi-Haiphong oil depots was an entirely "logical," high-priority Pentagon project from the moment the U.S. set out to interdict Communist supply lines by bombing North Vietnam. Why bomb roads, bridges or convoys and leave untouched the oil that fuels the trucks that make up the convoys? But the President at first held off, adhering to the doctrine of "graduated response." Going for the fuel supplies too fast, it was argued, would pose an intolerable provocation to the Communist Chinese.

By early this year, as the U.S. air strikes resumed after a 37-day "pause" for a peace offensive, the oil depots had moved to the top of the list of prime targets. But again the President held back; this time not out of military considerations at all, but because political unrest in South Vietnam raised the question of whether the Saigon government could stand the strain of a new expansion of the war. But the political unrest, in turn, was also helping sap public support in the U.S. for the war. Public dissent was growing loud, and with it official U.S. anxiety that Hanoi would misread U.S. resolve.

Meantime, public speculation and debate was widening over the possibility that the oil depots would be attacked. The longer the U.S. held off the more Hanoi might misunderstand. Hitting those oil depots thus became more than ever a test of U.S. will.

So it should have surprised nobody that, when Premier Ky finally got the upper hand over his opposition, Mr. Johnson began preparing U.S. and world opinion for this next step in intensification of the U.S. air war against North Vietnam. On June 18, the President warned publicly that the cost of aggression would be "raised at its source." Privately, he began the business of building Congressional backing for the Haiphong-Hanoi raids.

The reasoning put forth was that destruction of the oil depots would curtail, if not cripple, North Vietnam's infiltration capability, that it was a justifiable retaliation for Communist "escalation," that it would ease some of the enemy pressure on U.S. troops in the South. But this military argument was only part of the rationale, perhaps the smallest part. In February, when the Administration didn't want to expand the bombing, Secretary McNamara was one of those arguing privately that even a four-fold step-up of the bombing of North Vietnam's "logistical bases" would have only slight effect on the Communist war effort.

Suddenly, in June, it had become an urgent, crucial element. The real rationale, officials have since explained, was that a dramatic blow at "the source"—the Hanoi-Haiphong oil depots—would serve multiple purposes. It would put some limitations on infiltration. But it would also reaffirm American mettle for Hanoi's benefit, while damping down U.S. dissent by removing the point of further debate over this particular step. It would probably also prove popular with a U.S. public grown frustrated by lack of solid achievement in the war—and thus, too, would reduce dissent.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S FOLLOW-UP

That a showy display of public approval was a good part of the purpose is suggested by the follow-up effort of the President and his top men to picture the enemy as "war weary" and defeatist in spirit and by the flourishing of the resulting, favorable, opinion polls.

With consensus-building so much a part of the whole episode, it is hardly surprising

that the news leaked out prematurely; it is hard to enlist a Congressman's backing for a military measure without telling him a little about it. Still, Government officials loudly lamented the "leaks," however unlikely it seems that Hanoi was either surprised or effectively forewarned. After all, the pros and cons of just such action had been a public topic for many months longer than it would have taken to beef up defenses at the target sites.

Indeed, the North Vietnamese were hard at work dispersing the oil supplies when the air raids took place. Even so, officials expressed outrage at the advance news report and the President ordered the FBI to search out the source.

So what happened within hours after the Hanoi-Haiphong raids? First, from the Pentagon came published reports that "top military men" had a list of new objectives, including the closing (presumably by mines) of the Haiphong harbor, destruction of the three biggest airfields in the Hanoi-Haiphong area, and the bombing of power plants and industrial facilities, including quite specifically the Thanguyen steel plant 35 miles north of Hanoi.

This was all anonymously attributed. But before long, according to a dispatch from United Press International, Rear Adm. James R. Reedy, commander of the 7th Fleet Task Force off Vietnam, made it more official. He had picked out new targets in the industrial corridor between Hanoi and Haiphong, he told a press conference aboard his flagship the USS Constellation, according to the UPI account, which added: "The Admiral said one target would be a large steel plant if his five-carrier force receives orders to widen its air assault on North Vietnamese targets," (The Admiral later told superiors he was misquoted, but as a practical matter, the impact of the original UPI report is likely to be the same.)

A few days later, in Canberra, the U.S. Ambassador to Australia was still more expansive, according to the Washington Post. Arguing for a stepped-up bombing offensive, he declared "We will knock out oil, electrical grids, power lines, dams and canals."

A GRIM PROSPECT

So Hanoi is on notice, and so are the war critics in the U.S. as well as the press. The notice won't matter, of course, if the latest turn of the screw against the Communists should prove to be the telling one. But history argues for contemplation, at least, of quite a different prospect:

Assuming the war drags on without dramatic change, public patience at home is likely once again to wear thin. There will be a revival of open and acrimonious debate and fresh fears among the policymakers that Hanoi will see such dissent as a U.S. disinclination to stay the course. Finally, perhaps some months from now, there will be urgent consideration of the need, politically, and psychologically, as well as militarily, for further measures to reaffirm U.S. resolve.

At that point, it should surprise nobody if public speculation about next moves should center on the Thanguyen steel mill, on Haiphong harbor, on those three airfields, on electricity grids, dams and canals. As the critics oppose and the proponents propound and the press probes, the President and his advisers may come to see yet another urgent test of will. As Decision Day approaches, they will doubtless also deplore the inevitable security transgressions, perhaps without recalling their original source, and even though a span of months ought logically to allow a lot more time than a span of hours or days for the Communists to beef up defenses or make alternate arrangements to keep supply routes open.

For now, the President can hope that his refurbished consensus, coupled with a real increase in military effort, will actually give

the Communists serious second thoughts. At the best, he can hope that it will carry him safely past the Congressional elections, when heavy Democratic losses, growing out of disillusionment with Vietnam policy, might serve to hearten Hanoi. But unless there is positive, demonstrable headway to show for the U.S. effort in Vietnam, serious public disillusionment and dissent is almost certain to recur in time. So will serious consideration of further escalation as a logical, military necessity.

But the "logic" of this military argument may well be less important than the political and psychological pressures inherent in the free play of business-as-usual consensus politics—pressures which give an added measure of inevitability to the escalation machine.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 22, 1966]

VIETNAM AND VOX POPULI: SOME MERIT SEEN IN CONGRESSIONAL ENDORSEMENT OF OUR AIMS

(By Philip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—Air raids aimed in large part at muffling war critics at home by way of reaffirming U.S. resolve abroad. U.S. public opinion polls employed as a psychological warfare weapon against a foreign foe. Step by step endorsement of military measures, sought privately and out loud from Congress and the public in ways that can only give weeks of warning to the enemy.

Is this any way to run a war?

A short answer is that the conflict in Vietnam is no ordinary war. It is undeclared and without any readily understandable, clearly definable goal; here is a U.S. armed force, committed to a struggle rapidly reaching Korean War-size, whose purpose seems to be as much political and psychological as military. By inflicting military punishment, it seeks to break the enemy's will. The professed aim is not surrender, but something much more like stalemate out of which a political settlement might ultimately be forged.

For this unprecedented purpose, the prevailing Administration view remains that the war is being run in the only way it can be, given its nature and the particular talents and preferred techniques of the man who is running it, his high premium on what the diplomats call "wriggle room," his abhorrence of final commitment, his passion for patient building and rebuilding of "consensus" under each successive step.

AUTHORITY FROM CONGRESS?

But there is another view, encountered increasingly among those policy makers and war-planners once or twice removed from the peak of power where domestic and foreign politics must be figured into final decisions (and are figured in with a vengeance by President Johnson). This view has it that the time is fast approaching—if not already passed—when the widening Vietnam effort requires something more in the way of Congressional authority and public endorsement than a controversial treaty commitment, or a two-year-old resolution growing out of a one-shot raid against North Vietnamese torpedo boat pens, or the samplings of Gallup, Roper, Harris or Quayle.

Events, of course could quite quickly make this the prevailing view. A major enlargement of the Communist effort might confront the President with the need for the sort of Congressional action—a declaration of emergency, a Reserve call-up, or whatever—which would constitute unmistakable endorsement of the Administration's Vietnam policy. But even in the absence of a dramatic expansion of the war, a case can be made that if the machinery of steady escalation is ever to be halted or reversed, some better means must be found to convince the "other side" of this country's determination to see the struggle through.

The question, of course, is how to make U.S. staying-power as convincing as its fire-power—how to put to rest, insofar as it is possible, any doubts the Communists have about the American public's willingness to carry on the war. Almost everybody agrees that the obvious alternative to consensus politics—a formal mobilization under a declaration of war—would harden demands for unconditional surrender as the goal. It would stir war fever to perhaps irreversible heights, and lock the U.S. even more tightly into the struggle when its best chance of extrication lies in maintaining maximum flexibility.

But there is a middle course open, and it is worth examining, both because it might be adopted at some point, and, even if it isn't because of the insight it offers into one of the most troublesome aspects of the Vietnam conflict. As outlined by some of its advocates, the idea goes something like this:

Congress would be formally requested to approve the basic U.S. approach to Vietnam by accepting the concept of "limited war for limited objectives," to be fought, not all-out, but with a "graduated response" to the escalations of the enemy. In the process, Congress would redefine and reaffirm the U.S. commitment to South Vietnam. The U.S. public, in short, would get an opportunity, in the only way available, to state its acceptance of the war for what it has become and for the long, costly struggle it may well turn out to be.

QUIETING THE CRITICS

In theory, then, either the war's critics, having been offered a meaningful outlet, would pipe down, or if they continued their dissent it would be less likely to mislead Hanoi or Peking or Moscow about U.S. intents. A vote of confidence in current strategy would reduce the need for Mr. Johnson to drum up fresh evidence of backing for each new move, and thus reduce the need for him to tip his hand. Policy—or strategy—debates within his Administration could be more readily stifled; there would be less incentive for the debaters, and in particular the military, to carry their arguments into public print or to push their points of view with sympathetic lawmakers.

This, when coupled with official acknowledgement of a state of emergency by a solid majority vote, might even tend to discourage confusing and often misleading public speculation about next steps.

That's the theory—and even its proponents concede it has some flaws. Few seriously doubt that Congressional endorsement of the war effort would be overwhelming; with several hundred thousand U.S. troops already engaged in battle, and U.S. prestige squarely committed, Congress would have little choice. But the language of any very precise Congressional resolution of support would be difficult to draw. There would be a bruising debate, confusing to the enemy, perhaps prolonged. Senator Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, for one, could be counted on for a filibuster.

Moreover, a request for a fresh Congressional authorization would carry with it the implication that Mr. Johnson felt he perhaps did not have authority to commit the U.S. so deeply to an Asian land war and was seeking authority retroactively. To the extent that Congress tempered its approval, it might seem to be putting limits on Presidential prerogatives—limits which might restrain the President's freedom of action in Vietnam or some future crisis. Finally, a formal resolution of Congressional support might tend to make Vietnam officially "Johnson's war."

Plainly, Mr. Johnson would prefer to draw on the inherent powers of the Presidency; on the original Eisenhower letter of commitment to former South Vietnamese President Ngo Dinh Diem; on U.S. obligations under the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization; on occasional appropriation requests which have

been pointedly tied to Vietnam spending and presented as a test of Congressional support for the war; and on the virtual blank check contained in a joint resolution growing out of North Vietnamese torpedo boat raids on a pair of U.S. destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin in August 1964, and the U.S. air raids in reprisal.

Technically, all this is probably authority enough. But the ten-year-old Eisenhower letter to Diem was in the context of economic aid. The SEATO argument was an afterthought, all but unmentioned at the moment of massive U.S. escalation over a year ago, and tossed belatedly into the argument. The appropriation votes were hardly a fair test of sentiment. As for the Tonkin resolution, when the entire House and all but two Senators voted for it, there were no U.S. troops organized as combat units in South Vietnam, and no systematic air raids against the North, and election candidate Johnson, in vivid contrast with his opponent, was repeatedly promising that he would not "go North."

Indeed, when an attempt was made to restrict the language of the resolution in the Senate, so as to limit authority for any open-ended escalation, assurance was offered by the Administration's floor manager of the measure, Senate Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, that nothing so sweeping was either contemplated or implied.

The real weakness of the Tonkin resolution, however, is not so much in its "legislative history" as in the fact that it is out of date, unrelated to the current U.S. involvement, and almost certainly unpersuasive to the enemy. Whether a new declaration of Congressional sentiment would be any more convincing to Hanoi is perhaps less important than the indirect impact it might have on a decision-making process which currently requires the careful building and re-building of popular—and impermanent—majorities behind each new venture in the war.

The polls show powerful support for the oil depot raids. What they don't show is what portion of that approval rests on the belief that the raids will measurably shorten the war, or how quickly this might turn to disillusionment and disapproval if the war drags on inconclusively. It's in this fashion that escalation feeds upon itself, for public disapproval would then argue for some new military blow to demonstrate U.S. will.

It is perhaps unreasonable, in this election year, to expect Mr. Johnson to provoke a showdown with Congress over his conduct of war, especially when his principal advisers are telling him that the war is going relatively well. But if this advice proves premature, criticism of the war is almost bound to swell. At some point, it may not be unreasonable to ask whether the President can continue to demand suspension of debate-as-usual and dissent-as-usual for the duration, while at the White House "consensus" politics-as-usual remains the rule.

IRS RULING IS A STEP IN WRONG DIRECTION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on July 7, the Internal Revenue Service announced a proposed change in its regulations administering the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which, if allowed to stand, would discourage every teacher, skilled professional person, salesclerk and even doctors from furthering their knowledge of their profession or skill by pursuing formal education. The Internal Revenue Service proposed "clarify" paragraph 1.162-5 of section 162 of the code which relates to the expenses for education. These proposed changes are, in my estimation, a step

July 25, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16113

ment of the Federal Government, the states, and the cities. It takes the effort of the poor themselves—and of men and women like you.

For what we must do is no less than to correct the injustice of two centuries which give men a reason to protest.

But there are ways of protesting that any civilized society can tolerate. There are also ways that are unacceptable. The ballot box, the neighborhood communities, the political and civil rights organizations—are the means by which Americans express their resentment against intolerable conditions. They are designed to reform society, not to rip it apart.

Riots in the streets do not bring about lasting reforms. They tear at the very fabric of the community. They set neighbor against neighbor and create walls of mistrust and fear between them. They make reform more difficult by turning away the very people who can and must support reform. They start a chain reaction the consequences of which always fall most heavily on those who begin them.

So it is not only to protect the society at large that we refuse to condone riots and disorder. It is to serve the real interests of those for whose cause we struggle.

Our country can abide civil protest. It can improve the lives of those who mount that protest. But it cannot abide civil violence.

III

The next pillar of our task is a spacious vision of what America can be.

For prosperity is not enough and duty alone cannot transform our country. "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

But vision does not belong to a President alone. It must be the sum of all our dreams.

For my part, I believe America can be a place where the last man among us—the last man—has an equal chance to become the best that is in him.

For my part, I believe America can be a place where the impossible is unheard of and the unlikely happens today.

When it comes to America, I am an optimist. I am an optimist because I have lived through 57 years of the best and worst years we have ever known. And I have seen what Americans can do.

Think of all that has happened in the last five decades; space crafts and penicillin, computers and electric dishwashers, air conditioners and atomic power, five-day work week and movies in the skies.

But those are only a small part of it. They are the "things" that make life easier. But think of all that has happened to make life better.

Think of the children who don't die—and of those who no longer labor at grueling tasks.

Think of the millions of women and Negroes who vote—and of all the workers who retire in good health.

Think of the millions who can now read and write—and the heart attacks that do not kill.

We forget these victories very quickly. This may be well, for it means we always go on to the next job at hand. And our work is cut out for us.

But 1976 there will be 220 million of us. We will have to create jobs for 12½ million more people, including four million for teenagers.

We will have to provide for three million more elementary students—four million more high school students, and four million more college and university students.

We will need two million more elementary and secondary school teachers.

And we will have to build 200,000 additional elementary and high school classrooms and replace almost half a million more.

We will need 40,000 more doctors just to keep up.

And we will have to provide roads, streets, and parking places for up to 40 million more cars.

We must bring to the millions of Americans who still live in misery a better standard of living—a fuller share of justice—and a deeper faith in our nation.

And there are cities to rebuild—traffic jams to resolve—rivers to reclaim.

NO STANDING STILL

All these things and more we will do. There is only one thing that I am sure we won't do. We will not stand still.

We know our problems and our faults. We know the dark shadows that fall across our doubts that disturb us and the frailties that undo us.

But we also know—as one observer has written—that "here is a nation that in 50 years has endured two world wars, beat off a savage depression, played a major role in rebuilding a shattered world, and created the most wealthy, healthy, and educated nation the world has even seen at any time or at any place."

So on this 150th anniversary of Indiana's statehood, it is good to take stock of what we have done and of how much is still ahead. Of this I am certain: The best is yet to come.

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BRADEMAS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

POSSIBLE TRIAL OF AMERICAN AIRMEN IN NORTH VIETNAM SHOULD BE RENOUNCED BY CONGRESS

(Mr. HANLEY (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a House concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam. I think it is of the utmost importance that the Congress express firmly and swiftly the outrage of the United States at the thought that American airmen will be tried by the Government of North Vietnam as war criminals.

Such an inhuman and cruel act would only serve to destroy all of our efforts at restraint in the conduct of this war. Such an act would considerably lessen the chance of a just and secure settlement of the war. Our feelings on this matter ought to be made unmistakably clear to the leadership of North Vietnam and to the governments which support North Vietnam in its efforts to destroy the independence of South Vietnam.

UNITED STATES AHEAD IN SPACE PROGRAM IN NINE CATEGORIES

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the success in space exploration by America's space team has become so consist-

ent that it is difficult for us at times to realize the extent to which our fantastic progress has been made.

I want to call to the attention of the House the phenomenal progress being made in our space program.

Following the success of our latest astronaut team of Capt. John W. Young and Maj. Michael J. Collins, in their Gemini 10 flight, newspapers across the Nation last Friday carried a box score report of the nine categories in which the United States is ahead of the Russians in space exploration.

The United States has successfully completed 14 manned space flights as against 8 manned flights by the Soviets.

In multimanned flights we have successfully completed eight as against two multimanned flights by the Soviets.

We have had 22 men in space as against 11 for the Soviets.

We have had three successful space walks as against one for the Soviets, and

The United States has completed 1,661 man-hours in flight as against 507 for the Soviets.

In the nine categories shown in the accompanying table, the United States is ahead in space flights in every instance.

The following table reported by the Associated Press, which has been confirmed in its accuracy by NASA, indicates the extent of our success and superiority.

UNITED STATES AHEAD IN 9 CATEGORIES

CAPE KENNEDY, FLA.—The manned space flight box score:

Manned flights:	United States, 14.	Russia, 8.
Multi-manned flights:	United States, 8.	Russia, 2.
Manned hours in flight:	United States, 1,661 hrs., 52 min.	Russia, 507 hrs., 16 min.
Men in space:	United States, 22.	Russia, 11.
Time outside capsule:	United States, 2 hrs., 56 min.	Russia, 10 min.
Space walks:	United States, 3.	Russia, 1.
Maneuverable spacecraft:	United States, 8.	Russia, 0.
Rendezvous in space:	United States, 7.	Russia, 0.
Space link-ups:	United States, 2.	Russia, 0.

In addition, the NASA space team has successfully launched more than 1,000 flights in other space probes and our sounding rocket program, which has contributed greatly to weather reporting and communications, as well as our manned flights into space.

Administrator James E. Webb, of NASA, and every man and woman who has played a part on the U.S. space team in these remarkable achievements, deserve our highest commendation. They have contributed to writing a great and new and exciting chapter in space development.

I congratulate all of America's space team that has made this Nation first in space.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON COMMENDED FOR DEPLORING CIVIL STRIFE

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in a major speech last Saturday made some very basic and bedrock statements concerning the epidemic of riots occurring in cities throughout the Nation. The President declared that "Our country cannot abide civil violence." He emphasized that the riots react against those who begin them.

The President pointed out that civil strife tears at the very fabric of our democratic society. He deplored the recent violence, looting, theft, and murder. He urged all of our citizens to have respect for law and order and orderly processes.

I commend the President for his forthright statements. I support his position wholeheartedly.

This Nation cannot tolerate street violence, theft, and plundering destruction of property—in short, anarchy.

As a nation, we have developed democratic procedures for correction of abuses and righting of wrongs.

The courts are available for relief of injustice. The legislative process is available. Street riots and anarchy are not the way to correct civil wrongs.

In city after city we have seen this pattern of riots rear its ugly head in Chicago, Cleveland, Brooklyn, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and other cities.

The pattern of this wave of riots has all the earmarks of being Communist-inspired, Communist-directed insurrection. It is a technique and pattern all too familiar as a Communist trademark.

Recently I requested Attorney General Katzenbach to investigate this situation and to determine whether and to what extent, these repeated riots are Communist-inspired and directed. I have been assured that the Attorney General is investigating the matter.

Mr. Speaker, where anarchy reigns, democracy dies. This swelling wave of riots and rebellion must be stopped.

Again, I commend the President for his action and leadership. We should heed his words and act upon them.

ON THE LOSING SIDE FOR 26 YEARS

(Mr. JONES of Missouri (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is no dearth of reading material in the office of any Member of Congress. Most of us have the problem of trying to allocate our time in such a way that we can keep informed on what is going on, here in this House, in our districts, and throughout the Nation, as well as to know something about world problems that affect us both directly and indirectly.

During the past few days, I believe all of us received through the mail, from the American Tract Society, a nonpolitical,

interdenominational religious organization, a paperback book, entitled "26 Years on the Losing Side," written by a retired officer of the New York City Police Department, Deputy Inspector Conrad Jensen, who spent 26 years of his life on the department, attaining the rank of deputy inspector. He is now associate director of Youth Development, Inc., an evangelical organization working with youth gangs in East Harlem.

I do not know what caused me to start reading this book, but I do know that after I had read a few pages, I could not put it down without reading the entire book, consisting of only 83 pages, requiring less than 2 hours. Those 2 hours was one of the most rewarding experiences I have had in some time, and for this reason, I am recommending to my colleagues who are seeking some solution to many of the problems which are facing this country, in this era of deteriorating morals, increasing disrespect for our moral and legal laws, increasing instances of mob violence, marches, sit-ins, lie-ins, and so forth, and an apparent disregard of the laws of God, that they take the time to read this book. It may have the same effect on others that it had on me, to rekindle the feeling of responsibility, which we are prone to forget.

As Officer Jensen points out, "Lawful living does not necessarily imply righteous living. Most people only keep the law because of their fear of the consequences," and "it is a comfort to know that the Lord deals righteously and many a person who having escaped punishment here, will one day be tried by a different kind of judge."

I agree, and I believe many of you will agree with Officer Jensen when he says:

I am convinced that law enforcement is engaged in a losing fight against crime and criminals.

And he backs up this statement with statistics and statements from no less an authority than J. Edgar Hoover. And I am among those who believe as Mr. Jensen believes, "that the general unrest and tension in our land will continue to increase until enough of us are honest enough to face the facts and return to the discipline of the word of God." He said:

Crime has increased five times faster than the population growth, and with the roadblocks which are constantly and continually being thrown into the path of the law enforcement officer, I am convinced that "the only thing that can stop this tide of lawlessness is for the people of America to return to the simple faith of those who first settled here. Theirs was a faith based on an open Bible. Today we boast of the Bible being the "best seller" yet how little we turn to its pages and live by its precepts.

I could mention the apparent disdain that the majority of the members of our Supreme Court have for the Bible, but I have long since given up hope that the rights of the innocent, the law-abiding and God-fearing citizen, will be protected by this present Court.

Mr. Speaker, I could quote many other succinct passages from this little book, "26 Years on the Losing Side," but I know the Members would receive greater inspiration if they would take the time to

enjoy reading and absorbing the suggestions made by Officer Jensen.

(Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. ASHLEY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CURBSIDE MAILBOXES AT ALL FUTURE COMMUNITY HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

(Mr. EDWARDS of California (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1963 the Post Office Department issued an order requiring all future community housing developments to be equipped with curbside mailboxes. Since that time, the residents of my district, and indeed residents from all over the country, have vigorously protested this order. I have received resolutions in opposition from the city councils of San Jose, Livermore, Milpitas, Fremont, Newark, Hayward, Union City, and Pleasanton. In fact, the city of Pleasanton is investigating the possibility of engaging the Federal Government in a lawsuit to get the Post Office Department to rescind its mailbox order. California newspapers have carried daily stories on the battle between the residents of California and the Post Office Department. On their editorial pages they have sympathized with the protesting citizens.

The objection is one of esthetics—it does not make sense to me or to my constituents to construct new community developments which from their inception plan for a recreational and pleasing atmosphere and then require each home to put up a curbside mailbox which, regardless of the design of the individual box, is an eyesore for the total area.

The Post Office Department has labeled this order an economy measure, and I am in sympathy with the administration's efforts to economize. But in this case, I do not think the economic advantages outweigh marring the landscape of our new residential areas. I feel quite sure that in a few years we will either spend more money tearing down these boxes or else live with another blight on our landscape which, with a little forethought, could have been avoided.

I had hoped that public opposition would convince the Post Office Department that this is indeed an unpopular and unwanted measure and that the Department would ultimately change its position. But, unfortunately, this has not been the case—the Post Office Department remains adamant.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide city delivery mail service on a door delivery service basis for postal patrons receiving curbside delivery service who qualify for door delivery service.

16088

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 25, 1966

pect the congressional members of a political party—again, regardless of the party—to subject executive branch officials of the same party to the kind of complete and searching scrutiny required for the proper exercise of congressional oversight authority.

While it is understandable in human terms that majority party Members of Congress—whatever the party—should be reluctant to expose their opposite numbers in the executive branch to serious political embarrassment, the integrity and constitutional authority of Congress cannot be allowed to be compromised by inaction, however understandable, when abuse of authority, incompetence, inefficiency, or wrongdoing may be involved.

This is a problem, Mr. Speaker, of such great significance for the proper exercise of congressional authority that a systematic alternative should be provided whereby Congress can assure itself of meaningful oversight of the executive even when the same party controls both branches.

This need to strengthen the check-and-balance role of Congress has been recognized by students and Members of Congress alike, even though there has been disagreement with respect to the best way of achieving the objective. I am hopeful that my proposal may provide a realistic basis for agreement whereby effective oversight could be assured without interfering with the prerogatives of established committees or the responsibilities of the majority party.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the select committee I propose would function only when the executive and legislative branches of the Government were controlled by members of the same political party. Its 15 members would be appointed by the Speaker, 8, including the chairman, from among minority Members of the House, and 7 from the majority. The minority party appointments would be made from a panel of at least 24 Members nominated by the minority leader. The committee's jurisdiction would be Government-wide but it would be specifically precluded from investigating any subject which was under active investigation by a standing committee or subcommittee.

I emphasize this last point, Mr. Speaker. The select committee could investigate only when a standing committee or subcommittee—under majority control—failed to conduct an active study. A major part of the select committee's significance, therefore, could well reside in its function as goad or stimulant, with standing committees always aware that the select committee could investigate if they themselves failed to exercise their prior jurisdiction. The very existence of such a select committee, under such conditions, could serve to encourage a substantially better performance of oversight by the Congress using those means which already exist.

There are other features of my proposal, Mr. Speaker, which will also help assure restraint and responsibility on the part of the select committee, but without inhibiting its ability to do a good job. These include the temporary and renewable nature of the select committee's au-

thority, the appointment of its chairman and members by the Speaker, and the slim, one-vote margin by which the minority will control the committee.

In previous discussions of alternative ways of providing for improved oversight by Congress, proposals have tended to center on the idea of utilizing an existing committee, generally the Government Operations Committee, or one of its subcommittees, to be controlled by the minority for this purpose. After considerable reflection, it seems to me that the use of standing committees or subcommittees would be inappropriate for several reasons including the following:

Standing committees must, under our system, be controlled by the majority; minority control, however, would be essential to assure the kind of sustained interest and determination effective congressional investigations require, and there would be no impediment to minority control of a single select committee.

Standing committees have permanence; the oversight group would need only temporary authority, for those periods in which Congress and the Presidency are politically united.

Standing committees have legislative responsibilities which cannot realistically be delegated to the minority; an oversight group would require only investigative authority.

A standing committee, under majority control, would be unlikely to guarantee a minority-controlled subcommittee the necessary independence concerning staff, funds, the issuing of reports, and so forth; an oversight committee would by its nature possess the required independence.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, a select committee such as I have proposed would seem to be the most desirable vehicle with which to accomplish our purpose, maximizing the potential for effective oversight while minimizing the possibilities of irresponsibility or interference with established procedures.

In the final analysis, we come back to this central consideration—if there is any sense to or valid purpose to be served by Congress oversight or watchdog or investigative authority, then that purpose is surely heightened when the executive and legislative branches are both controlled by members of the same party. For it is then that the human and political pressures are at their strongest to limit, in the interests of party harmony and political success, the checks and balances applied by Congress.

But the country needs the checks and balances just as it may require a reasonable degree of legislative cooperation between the two branches. In fact, to the extent that Congress provides more or less ready approval of an administration's legislative program, it should simultaneously be exercising an enhanced degree of oversight. Or, to put it another way, the need for checks and balances increases in direct proportion to the practical difficulty of achieving it.

The only dependable way of accomplishing both objectives—the checks as well as the cooperation—under conditions of single-party control of both

branches is by entrusting a minimum share of Congress' investigative responsibility, subject to prudent limitations, to the minority party.

This is what my resolution would do, Mr. Speaker, and I urge our colleagues to reconsider this age-old problem of governmental control in the light of this new and I believe especially realistic proposal.

(Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. DWYER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

RED BLOC DOUBLES AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, new guidelines prepared by the State Department reportedly will allow travel to Communist China, and Albania, Cuba, North Vietnam, and North Korea. This condescending gesture by the State Department which further relaxes the restriction on travel to Communist countries was announced little more than a week ago. The guidelines propose that visitors to these countries be important and that their visit benefit the United States. Without delving into the vague delineation which the State Department is evidently prepared to make between "important" and "ordinary" tourists, I wonder what effect the easing of travel restrictions will have.

It would appear that the agency is attempting to, at the least, develop a closer relationship between the United States and these countries. This, presumably, would lead to concessions by the Communists.

What is really evident is that the Communists will concede, but only when they are, in fact, gaining. Certainly, they will be happy to permit Americans to visit their countries, but only when they have something to gain. That is, when the Communists benefit.

Keeping in mind that the State Department's guidelines were issued recently, an article in the New York Daily News written under the byline of Joseph Fried indicates how interested the Communists are in concessions.

The article states:

Communist countries have begun a fresh flow of aid to North Vietnam, including military hardware, with a sharp increase in the number of cargo-laden vessels putting into the port of Haiphong.

The only encouraging note is the statement that most of the foreign ships entering Haiphong Harbor with supplies and munitions for the Vietcong are Soviet and not those of our allies.

The new travel guidelines appear to be the latest in the State Department's attempts to give a little bit more and ask for a little less in return. The only clear

July 25, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16087

connection with pork purchases, "I might very well do again what I did before."

It is obvious from such statements that this administration has no intention of letting supply and demand work for U.S. agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, in my speech before Minnesota farmers I emphasized price as the key both to farm income and to an adequate food supply. Fair prices are the most important ingredient in our efforts to assure farmers a satisfactory return for their production, and to assure consumers a plentiful supply of food. Price is the incentive for the production we need to meet our domestic food requirements and to fulfill our foreign commitments as well.

And yet, our Secretary of Agriculture told me and members of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee that parity prices are too high, and that the whole concept of parity prices is really meaningless today.

I am sure that some of the nearly 3 million farm people who have been forced to migrate from the land during the last 5 years believe that parity prices have a very real meaning.

The American farmer deserves far more consideration than he has been getting, but the administration's attitude seems to be hardening instead. The State Department just gave its "very warm blessing" to an arrangement which will bring at least \$100 million worth of Rumanian canned pork and ham into this country over the next 10 years, and in the last 2 weeks the Department of Agriculture has expanded sugar imports by a quarter of a million tons.

As if the uncertainty of weather were not enough, the American farmer is also faced with the uncertainty of Government actions in agriculture. This presents him with a formidable challenge, but the days ahead are going to present even greater challenges and will require a further concentration of cooperative effort among farmers all over this Nation.

THE AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT SHOWS DISREGARD FOR U.S. SUGAR PRODUCERS

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, recent developments in the sugar industry, involving changes in the Aroostook County, Maine, processing plant and fluctuations in the foreign import quotas prompt me to express concern over the administration's lack of sound reasoning in sugar-related decisions.

The Department of Agriculture is showing its disregard for the interests of America's domestic sugar producers and consumers by its inconsistent approach to the sugar import situation and its allotment of domestic acreage to questionable areas of production.

Back in 1964, the area of Aroostook County, Maine, received a 33,000-acre sugarbeet allotment before it was even definitely established the area could support the growing of high quality sugarbeets. Proven beet areas, including the

Red River Valley area of Minnesota and North Dakota, were not given the opportunity to realize their full potential in the raising of top-quality beets.

Aroostook County is the site of a sugar processing plant, built in 1964, that was financed by Area Redevelopment Administration—ARA—funds. The plant was originally intended for the processing of sugarbeets and was backed up by the 33,000-acre allotment granted to the area.

It is now been found the Maine plant is being forced to add additional equipment, again government financed, for the refining of sugarcane. Figures show they have not even come close to planting their allotted acreage of beets.

The new equipment, costing over \$2 million, is being financed by the Economic Development Administration, the 1965 successor to ARA.

We questioned the original decision on the loan and acreage allotment and our argument seems to be bearing out. The desperate move to keep the factory running by adding facilities for the refining of sugarcane is not the answer either.

This addition of cane refining facilities will produce a "double-pronged effect." The increased facilities will either force further increases in the importation of sugarcane or will take away from the cane available for refining by existing, established plants in other areas.

The latter effect would only result in the transfer of jobs and materials from one place to another and would reflect no overall gain.

If imports should be increased, it would only be another confusing move in the Department of Agriculture's inconsistent approach to import quota decisions. Since the first of the year, the sugar import quota has been raised three times but, last month, the Department sought to lower imports by reducing the percentage of sugar allowable in quota-free, sugar-butterfat mixtures.

A late July increase of 125,000 tons in the import quota for sugar was preceded by one earlier in the month of 100,000 tons and another in April of 200,000 tons. However, in June the Department of Agriculture, "to limit the importation of products or mixtures containing sugar and butterfat," placed import restrictions on any sugar-butterfat mixtures containing over 25 percent sugar.

Original approval by domestic sugar and butterfat producers on hearing of Department intentions to limit the import of this mixture turned to criticism when details of the order, labeled inadequate by producers, were revealed by Department officials.

Contradictory moves such as these by the Department of Agriculture and the administration make their position on the sugar situation seem very unclear. It's plain to see, however, their actions in these and other areas are not geared toward the best interests of the domestic producer and consumer.

THE NEED FOR A HOUSE SELECT INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE UNDER MINORITY CONTROL

(Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, I introduced House Resolution 915, to create a select committee of 15 members, to be controlled by the minority, which would have general authority to conduct studies and investigations of the administration and enforcement of Federal laws, subject to certain reasonable limitations.

At this time, I should like to set forth for our colleagues some of the reasons that have impelled me to introduce such a resolution and to explain how and under what conditions the committee would function.

The constitutional principles of the separation and balance of powers, Mr. Speaker, impose upon the Congress the obligation to exercise careful oversight of the administration and enforcement of the laws by the executive branch. This oversight function has increased notably in scope and importance within recent years as the size and complexity of our society have grown and as the activities of the Federal Government have kept pace.

The Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946 issued a clear and compelling mandate that Congress "exercise continuous watchfulness" over the administration of laws. Students of government are in general agreement that the oversight function has become equal in importance to Congress lawmaking authority. And, certainly, from our own experience in the House, we are daily aware of the great significance of providing adequate means to control, check, stimulate, supplement, and ameliorate the Federal bureaucracy.

Congress today has a number of means available which it can exercise its oversight responsibilities vis-a-vis the executive branch. Among them are: the Government Operations Committee with respect to the economy and efficiency of Government activities; the Appropriations Committee through its annual review of the administration's budget requests; the standing committees of the House with reference to the administration of the laws within their respective legislative jurisdictions; the Senate's power to advise and consent to Presidential appointments; and the power of impeachment, among others.

Under certain circumstances, I believe that these means are adequate to permit Congress to do an effective oversight job. This is especially true when Congress and the executive branch are controlled by members of different parties, a circumstance which encourages closer supervision by congressional committees of executive branch activities.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, although the authority of Congress to investigate the operations of the executive branch is clear and undisputed, existing methods and procedures are, I believe, demonstrably inadequate when the same party controls both branches of the Government. I need mention only the well-known case of the Bobby Baker investigation as evidence of such inadequacy, though other examples readily come to mind.

The problem exists regardless of the party in power. It is unrealistic to ex-

16106

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 25, 1966

unless there is an agency responsible for developing programs and fighting for the attention of the Executive Branch and the Congress. This would be the role of a Bureau of Older Workers.

It should be emphasized that the Bureau of Older Workers provided for in my bill would not duplicate, or conflict with, the excellent Holland-O'Hara-Bennett proposal for a National Commission on Older Workers; in fact, the two would complement each other. The National Commission would be temporary, for the purpose of getting the attack on the older worker problem started. The Bureau of Older Workers would be permanent, for the purpose of carrying it on. The National Commission would plan the strategy and coordinate the efforts of the many agencies in our national government concerned with older workers' problems. The Older Workers Bureau would do the actual research and administration work for the National Commission, as well as carry out its own continuing missions of persuading employers, through facts and figures, that older workers are worth hiring.

If the Congress in 1966 decides to build on the basis of the blueprint set forth in the legislation proposed last year, millions of despairing men and women would have new assurance that life—not old age—can begin at 40.

REVISE STANDARDS REGULATING HOURS OF SERVICE OF EMPLOYEES ON RAILROADS

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on July 22, 1966, to present the following testimony to the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in support of my bill, H.R. 11263:

STATEMENT OF HONORABLE ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND AERONAUTICS OF THE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 11263 ON JULY 22, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of my bill, H.R. 11263, which would bring up to date the antiquated standards regulating the hours of service of employees on railroads. H.R. 11263 amends a law enacted, and last substantively amended, in 1907.

The standards which the original law established in 1907 were probably not even adequate for that horse and buggy era. They were standards for employment on steam locomotives, pulling wooden coaches with much smaller boxcars. Trains also ran much more slowly then.

This was before the day of the diesel, even before we had electrified railroads. It was back when only 140,000 automobiles were registered in the United States. We had practically no paved roads.

Today we have millions of miles of surfaced roads and upward of 90 million registered motor vehicles and so the chances for accidents occurring between the general motoring public and the trains have also become substantially greater, despite the decline in railroad traffic in recent years. The standards Congress set forth in 1907 are simply not adequate for 1966.

Much has been made of the point that travel on trains is much safer today than previously, that the number of accidents and injuries is substantially less. This only becomes true, if one compares the bare statistics of 1907 with today's. For example, in

1907, which was the worst year on record, 11,839 employees, passengers and others were killed in railroad accidents. Over 111,000 people were injured. In 1964 only 2,423 were killed and 27,614 were injured. Even allowing for a considerable decline in passengers carried and a reduced exposure to accidents this looks like a good record. Let us remember, that these are American lives we are talking about and not merely statistics. 2,500 is just as appalling to me as is 11,000.

This reflects all the more clearly the need for taking further action such as this subcommittee is considering here today. Over the years the many other safety measures which have been taken on railroads have had their effect. But, we have reached today no better than a plateau in accidents on railroads. We need new safety measures.

Indeed, there is evidence that in recent years we have been losing rather than gaining in our railroad safety record. If we take the ten years from 1954 to 1963, to minimize the impact of the recent reductions in the number of firemen employed, we find that the number of fatal accidents on railroads dropped from 2,475 to 2,141. But during this period the number of train-miles fell from 764 million to 590 million. Thus the number of people killed per million train-miles went up from 3.2 to 3.6. As far as accidents are concerned, they went up even more, from 3.54 per million train-miles in 1954, to 5.10 in 1963.

Thus, even before the recent reduction in the number of operating employees, the likelihood of an accident was increasing with each mile a train moved. It is still increasing, even more rapidly as the years pass. In fact the figure I cited earlier for 1964—2,423 dead—was a shocking increase from 2,145 in 1963, to the highest figure since 1956. We are losing, not gaining, ground in railroad safety.

No man, especially one over 50 years of age as most engineers are, should work 16 hours operating a train without any rest. Personally, I believe the figure in the bill of 12 hours is too long. I certainly favor the provision of the bill that no engineer may be alone in a cab without relief for longer than 9 hours.

The requirement of the bill that an operating employee must have at least eight consecutive hours off duty before returning to work seems to me a minimum amount of rest if we are to protect the safety of the public and the railroad employees themselves.

I do not see how we in the Congress can overlook our responsibility to bring this apparently obsolete law up to date. I am well aware that the motives of many who support this bill extend beyond an interest in safety. It is my personal feeling that, in this respect, the firemen have merit in their contentions that their job rights have been taken away without just compensation. But this is not the prime reason for my support of this bill. In bringing to the attention of our colleagues the failure of Congress to bring up to date this important piece of legislation, the firemen, whatever their motives, have put us all in their debt. The law must be altered.

I cannot too strongly urge this subcommittee to act without delay to favorably report this piece of legislation as an urgently needed safety measure. Any further delay will place on us the responsibility for any further increase in the already shocking number of deaths and injuries on our railroads. Until recent years we could look at the safety record of the railroads and say it was getting better, year by year. As I have pointed out this is no longer true. It is getting worse. It is time to act. H.R. 11263 will help reduce the hazards to everyone, including the operating personnel on railroads, who must be exhausted with insufficient rest after 16 hours of work.

WHEN WILL THE UNITED STATES SIGN THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION?

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in 1948 the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Genocide Convention. Since that time 69 countries of the world have signed the convention including most recently the Netherlands.

As pointed out in the following article from the July 21, 1966, edition of the American Examiner, the United States is one of the few remaining great powers which has not signed the convention.

I believe that we should do so immediately. There is no doubt as to our position on genocide and we should affirm it now.

The article follows:

NETHERLANDS 69TH STATE TO SIGN GENOCIDE PACT; UNITED STATES STILL BALKS

(By Ruth Gershon)

UNITED NATIONS.—The Netherlands has just become the 69th country to ratify the renowned Genocide Convention which was adopted by the General Assembly on December 9, 1948—the year Israel gained her independence.

The United States remains the single big power which has not yet acceded to the Convention which had come into force on January 12, 1951. The Convention seeks to prevent and punish genocide, whether committed in time of war or in time of peace. It also requests States adhering to the Convention to take legislative steps to give effect to it and to grant extradition in cases of genocide.

The Convention was originally inspired by the late Dr. Raphael Lemkin, a Jew of Polish origin.

The 69 states which have thus far ratified the Convention include: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, West Germany, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Vietnam, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, USSR, U.A.R., Upper Volta, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. (WUP)

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING MIS-TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR BY NORTH VIETNAM

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent statements by the Government of North Vietnam concerning our captured American prisoners of war are cause for grave concern to this Congress and this Nation. It is for this reason that I am introducing a resolution condemning any mistreatment, trial, punishment or ex-

July 25, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16105

A direct attack is the bill of Rep. ROMAN PUCINSKI (D-Ill.) to make it an unfair labor practice to discharge, or to refuse to hire, or otherwise to discriminate because of age, "when the reasonable demands of the position do not require such age discrimination." The Pucinski bill would also make it unlawful to hire through any employment agency, placement service or labor organization which discriminates because of age.

Age is most discriminated against in firms where sheer size, complicated pension and insurance programs, bargaining relationships with many unions in different regions and trades, as well as unwillingness to rely on the judgment of personnel departments, lead to highly formalized procedures. One result: rules against hiring people over a certain age.

Laws forbidding this kind of discrimination could scarcely eliminate it completely; for firms determined to discriminate against older workers can find ways to do so, regardless of law. For one thing, age discrimination is enmeshed in certain hiring and retirement policies which provide powerful institutional reinforcement of this discrimination. Many firms hire only at the bottom and promote solely from within. As the director of personnel of a famous insurance company once pointed out, "We pay nothing for experience." Such practices, although designed to retain and reward long-service employees, nevertheless close the door against older workers who have lost their jobs. If hiring only at the bottom is widespread, the only openings will be at the "office boy" level.

Discrimination is also reinforced by the "nailed-to-the-floor" pension. The employee who leaves—because of slow business, a department closing or a new process—and thereby loses his pension, must find some way of providing for his retirement. A potential employer is torn between the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand, if he hires the man at, say, age 60 and must build up a full pension for him in the 15 years to retirement, the annual pension cost will, of course, be greater than that for a younger man. On the other hand, if he provides the older recruit with a smaller pension or no pension at all, he can be criticized for being inhumane. The humane thing is therefore not to hire the older worker at all! There is obviously a need for a portable pension system, as well as modification of such hiring and promotion policies. These are, of course, complicated matters and call for considerable study. The Holland-O'Hara-Bennett bill (H.R. 10634) would provide for an investigation into such hiring and pension policies, and for proposals to Congress for remedial legislation.

But getting rid of formal rules and procedures will not do the whole job. The main attack on the problem must proceed by convincing employers that older workers are as effective as younger ones and no more costly; by making sure that older workers have the training both to qualify for the new jobs that are opening up, and almost as important, to know how to sell themselves to employers; and by creating adequate organizations in our national government to carry out this attack.

Two broad types of organizations, one temporary, one permanent, would be created by bills introduced in 1965. The temporary organization would be created by the Holland-O'Hara-Bennett bill, already mentioned. This bill would set up a National Commission on Older Workers designed to be a kind of temporary general staff, to get the war on discrimination off to a start. The National Commission would attack the problem on a nationwide scale—plan the board strategy, initiate research and coordinate the many agencies concerned with the problem. The authors of the bill intend that the National Commission on Older Workers would go out of business at the end of two years.

The permanent organization would be provided by my bill (HR 2062) to set up a Bureau of Older Workers in the Department of Labor. The Older Workers Bureau would have for its prime mission a long-term campaign to persuade employers all over the country voluntarily to lower barriers against the older workers—as the Department of Agriculture did in selling new methods to farmers through local agents. Persuasion is far more effective than force or propaganda.

But if employers are to be persuaded, the arguments must rest on solid facts supporting the contention that older workers—at least some older workers—are worth hiring. The second mission of the Bureau of Older Workers would be to carry out the research and demonstration projects to establish these facts.

The most serious deterrent is the too general belief that older workers are less efficient. A corporation executive—himself in his sixties—states that "keeping older people with diminished capacity in the labor force appreciably reduces efficiency." Other employers believe that older persons have more accidents, do not get along well with others, are not receptive to new ideas.

Without question, some older workers are less effective than the average younger worker. But so are some younger workers! The central question is, does age affect efficiency so adversely as to justify rigid rules against hiring older workers, regardless of their individual capacities? What are the facts?

Certain capacities do diminish with age, beginning almost at adulthood. Studies at Stanford University revealed that manual mobility and reaction speeds reach an optimum in a person's twenties or thirties and speed of learning peaks shortly after the teens. As a man grows older, investigations of the Cambridge University Psychological Laboratories have concluded, he has increasing difficulty in comprehending verbal or visual data, particularly when new or unfamiliar, and as a result has to rely more and more on his past experience.

Nevertheless, the deterioration is usually slow. Some persons maintain mental abilities without loss until late maturity; others suffer from disuse or lack of training. "Although speed may decrease among older people," the Cambridge study concludes, "the deficiency is often more than offset by gains in quality and accuracy."

Scattered studies suggest that the average older worker may even excel in output, attendance, turnover, safety and attitude, in some cases, output is slightly lower, in other cases steadier—especially compared with the worker in his early twenties or late teens. Convincing employers is another matter, however, and requires thorough research—comparing older and younger workers in productivity, absenteeism, accidents, turnover, pension costs and other important dimensions.

Another mission of the proposed Older Workers Bureau would be to see that older workers get the job training they need for the jobs that are vacant.

Breaking down barriers against older workers will not get them the jobs if they are not able to do the work. As a result of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, training has been approved for 400,000 persons in 700 occupations. These training programs are being directed by the Manpower Administration of the Labor Department and the Division of Vocational and Technical Education in the United States Office of Education.

But these programs are not getting to the older workers. In 1964, only about one in nine trainees was over 45; in the case of Negroes, 1 in 17. Among men 45 to 54, one-third of whites and two-thirds of nonwhites have not gone beyond eighth grade. Yet the Wirtz report acknowledged that only limited

arrangements for this further education now exist. The report even proposes "education sabbaticals," financed from contributory insurance programs, to enable the older worker to make up for his failure to complete grade school or high school.

This proposal is intriguing. How well it would work would depend on how effectively it were implemented and sold to the older worker. Poorly educated people do not have an abundant faith in education and, since they spend little time reading or listening to the news, are scarcely aware of the existence of these training programs, let alone appreciate their value. Without a powerful and imaginative selling program—under the leadership I visualize for the Bureau of Older Workers—the education and training of older workers will continue to be a limited-success story.

Still another mission of the Bureau of Older Workers would be to conduct, or at least see that some other agency such as the U.S. Employment Service conducts, a nationwide program of showing workers how to look for a job.

Knowing how to do a job is one thing; knowing how to look for a job is another. Many excellent craftsmen come in unshaved, clothes soiled. They slouch, mumble, mess up simple forms. Asked what they can do, they say, "anything"—employer's translation: "nothing!" Asked where they have looked, they say, "everywhere"—translation: "a few well-known companies!" Asked how often, they say, "all the time"—translation: "a couple of times a week!"

Early last year, I initiated a do-it-yourself job-finding program in the Baltimore area. Six clinics—financed by the Labor Department as a pilot project—meet in fire houses, Knights of Columbus halls, Y.M.C.A.'s, American Legion buildings. Classes meet in late afternoon or evening, giving the worker time to look during the day, and in the evening talk over his experiences and discover any mistakes he may have made. The worker is coached by experts drawn from the U.S. Employment Service, vocational and guidance counselors from public schools, the MDTA Center and personnel staffs of local firms. Rehearsals show him how to get leads on job openings; size up requirements and decide which jobs he has a chance for; fill out application forms; dress, sit and speak when interviewed; take tests.

A bonus of the do-it-yourself clinics has been a kind of group therapy. Talking things over with others in the same fix provides the bitter and frustrated with an outlet for hostilities, and the defeated a balm for bruised confidence.

The program has not been a precision operation; perhaps no job program can be. Some older workers turn out to be unemployable. Others become disillusioned and drop out. At the end of three months, however, about one in three of the participants who reported information on subsequent progress had found a job and nine per cent were in training.

These do-it-yourself clinics have attracted attention outside Baltimore; a report was recently requested by the International Labor Organization. A Bureau of Older Workers could extend the Baltimore-type do-it-yourself clinics throughout the nation.

These missions—convincing employers of the desirability of hiring older workers, carrying out research and demonstration programs, strengthening training and education programs, and extending the do-it-yourself job-finding experiment—would not exhaust the functions of the Bureau of Older Workers. Others can be visualized, including a proposal in the Wirtz report for a Neighborhood Older Workers Corp. to hire older people to improve and beautify communities.

But no program can hope for success unless effectively developed and sold. In our highly organized federal government, little gets done

July 25, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16107

execution of U.S. military personnel held captive by North Vietnam.

The terms of the Geneva Convention of 1949 were established to provide and assure humane treatment of war prisoners and any violation of these terms would be a reprehensible offense against the peoples of the world, and would certainly diminish the opportunity for the achievement of a just and secure peace in southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues will join me in realizing the gravity of this situation and will take prompt and favorable action on this resolution.

A RESOLUTION TO SETTLE THE AIRLINE STRIKE

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution to deal with the national emergency. The resolution would bring the present strike on the airlines to an end. It would further provide for a special arbitration board to settle the dispute. I think we all recognize that these two objects can only be attained by our intervention.

Continuation of the present rounds of negotiations is, as Assistant Secretary of Labor James J. Reynolds so aptly indicated, an exercise in futility. Action by the Congress is clearly needed to prevent drastic injury to public convenience and the welfare of the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the airline strike, now in its 18th day, has reached alarming proportions and we have not yet felt the full front of its impact. Thirty-five thousand union workers and their families are involved while costs to the five airlines amount to approximately \$7 million each day in lost revenues. The strike has caused 66,000 other airline employees to be furloughed while literally hundreds of thousands of workers whose jobs depend on airline service have been affected.

We in Florida have been particularly hard hit by this strike. In addition to the tens of thousands of airline workers who are on strike or furloughed, another 80,000 aviation-oriented employees who do not work for the struck carriers are affected. Their payroll alone amounts to \$10.8 million each week. It has been estimated that the total loss due to the strike, in Florida alone, exceeds \$2.5 million each day.

The five principal air carriers serving Miami and Dade County, an area which I have the honor to represent here, are all on strike. Dade County is losing between \$18 and \$20 million each week because of the strike. I am certain that every other tourist area in America is suffering a loss comparable to that of Miami Beach, where hotel occupancy is only 50 percent of capacity.

Mr. Speaker, an endless list of statistics could be cited to show the immense damage which this strike is causing across the Nation. Suffice it to say that this pattern is being repeated in every

major city served by the five airlines involved. New York alone has reported a three-quarters of a million dollars a day cost in lost tourist revenues. Chicago, Washington, Kansas City, and dozens of other cities report similar losses. I do not doubt that there will be many in both Houses of the Congress who will join in support of immediate action on this measure.

This resolution is patterned on the law enacted in 1963 to settle the railroad dispute. Like that law, Public Law 88-108, this measure would not create any permanent apparatus to settle labor disputes. Neither would it in any way interfere with the future rights of airline labor and management to engage in free collective bargaining. It is addressed to the present dispute and to that dispute only.

The Arbitration Board would be directed to end the present strike, settle the dispute by a binding award, and would then go out of existence. It would be set up, like the Arbitration Board established in 1963, as just another emergency board, operating under the usual procedures of sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act. The difference would be that it would have power to make a binding award to settle the dispute. This award would remain in effect for 2 years.

I am not unmindful of the feeling on the part of some Members of the Congress that action of a permanent nature is needed to prevent situations like the present strike arising. I am also aware that many other Members stand ready to oppose any interference in the collective bargaining process.

We face a specific and urgent problem. There is no time for long-range decisions. Our problem is to end the airline strike. This resolution would do it. It would do it without in any way committing the Congress either to favor or not to favor this or any other labor-management legislation in the future.

In 1963 we faced a similar problem, then a threatened strike on our railroads. We acted to settle this problem. We did settle it. I see no reason now why we should not adopt the same method to settle the present dispute.

A question has been raised that in 1963 a strike threatened, but had not taken place, whereas, today we have a strike in being, which must be ended. This measure would restore the conditions existing prior to the strike. It would continue them while the arbitration board is meeting and until it makes its award. This proviso would end the strike, or provide the legal basis for an injunction to end it. After that, the award is binding upon both parties for 2 years, during which time a strike over this issue will not be possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the greatest possible speed be made in acting on this resolution in this emergency.

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FASCELL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE SCHOOLBOY AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

(Mr. BARRETT (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this past May, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the Vice President of the United States, while on a visit to the great city of Philadelphia announced the first of the magnet schools, Bartram High School, which is located in my district. This will become one of the finest commercial education schools in the country. The "magnet" school is a new and imaginative concept and, as the term implies, is designed to draw an integrated student body from all parts of the city. The Bartram High School will have a dual role of both preparing students for college courses in such fields as accounting, bookkeeping and all other facets of higher commercial and financial education, while at the same time preparing other students for the business world directly after high school graduation.

This new program represents one of the most meaningful and most exciting adventures in education today. The increased cost of providing for such outstanding educational programs and facilities is being met by a productive partnership of government and private groups at all levels. This pilot effort will serve to benefit the education of our young people throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print at this point in the RECORD the article written by the Vice President of the United States, which appeared in yesterday's Sunday Bulletin magazine, on the challenge which faces Philadelphia's exciting new magnet school program so that all those concerned with the education of our young people can have the benefit of this great American's views on this fine program.

THE SCHOOLBOY AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

When I was in Philadelphia last May I visited several schools and met a lot of children. Your papers reported how, as I was leaving John Bartram High, I took the opportunity to kiss the cheeks of some kindergartners who had gathered there.

Not that there's anything so unusual about a politician kissing kids. But what moved me to this display of good will and affection?

I think you'll understand if I tell you about a little boy I remember very clearly. He was wearing a bright red sweatshirt. I asked him what his name was. His eyes grew very round. He was silent.

Just as I was thinking, "Poor kid, he's so scared he's forgotten his name," he came out with it.

"Larry," he whispered, barely audibly. Then, gaining some courage, he went on to say, "I want to be an ast'naut!"

Why not?

Well, the problem is, or perhaps I can say the problem used to be, that Larry happens to go to school right in the center of the city.

For years the central city schools of America have lacked proper books, materials and

16108

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 25, 1966

teachers—and even clean and safe facilities. But to be an astronaut, Larry is going to need a topflight education.

In the past, central city schools have dampened the high hopes of their students. They contributed to community hopelessness and despair. They have all too often produced delinquents and dropouts rather than high school, college and job-bound youth.

With little or no education past grade school "graduates" of these schools have swelled the ranks of the unemployed and joined the vicious cycle of poverty that condemns so many persons to lives of idleness, uselessness and despair.

In the usual course of things, a boy like Larry would have little chance indeed of becoming an astronaut.

But with proper education, the vicious cycle can and will be broken. This is why Philadelphia's new and imaginative magnet school program seems to me to be one of the foremost steps taken in urban education in recent years.

I had the privilege of announcing the first of the magnet schools, Bartram High School, which will become one of the finest commercial education schools in the country.

Here we will have the last word in commercial education.

A new dimension in staffing by using professional people from business and industry as part-time instructors to keep the students abreast of the latest advances in the business world.

The new equipment—business and book-keeping machines, calculators, comptometers, duplicators—which increasingly play such a critical role in industry today.

Imaginative new materials and methods of instruction to be used by specially trained teachers.

Additional teachers, non-teaching assistants, counselors.

And perhaps the best part of the magnet school will be its "magnet," its power of educational excellence to draw an integrated student body from all parts of the city to study together beneath its roof.

Another new and most welcome concept of Bartram's commercial magnet school will be its dual role of both preparing students for college courses in such fields as accounting, bookkeeping and all other facets of higher commercial and financial education, while at the same time preparing other students for the business world directly after high school graduation.

The increased cost of providing for such outstanding educational programs and facilities must be met by a productive partnership of government and private groups at all levels.

Happily, this has been done in Philadelphia in a manner which should serve as a prototype for the nation.

The federal government has provided great and necessary help through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania last year authorized the payment of an additional \$19 million in state educational subsidies to the Philadelphia Public Schools, beginning in late 1967.

The City of Philadelphia has played an integral role. Last year the City Council authorized a real estate tax increase to raise \$13 million to support the public schools.

The schools will receive additional support from the recently approved \$60 million school bond issue.

And private foundations—Carnegie, Ford and Field—have made large grants to the school district.

This new program represents one of the most meaningful and most exciting adventures in education today.

But the fight against complacency and mediocrity in education is a never-ending one. Momentum must not be lost. Initiative and endurance must be maintained and supported by all.

All these programs will be to no avail if young people are allowed to drop out of school.

As Chairman of the Youth Opportunity Campaign, designed to eliminate the dropout problem and provide for youth employment, I am greatly concerned over certain statistics:

A college graduate earns nearly two-thirds more than a high school graduate over the span of a lifetime.

A high school graduate earns three-quarters more than the worker who has only an elementary education.

The blunt fact is this: the unemployment rate for dropouts is four times that of workers with high school diplomas.

Young people should know that their own health, housing and opportunities—and the opportunities of their children in the years to come—are directly related to the education they now acquire.

An individual's capacity to chart his own destiny is directly related to the level of education which he has acquired. One trained to use only the muscles of his arms and back can only dream of the frontiers in physics, space exploration, medicine and human relations which are open to those with proper training.

The goal of the educator—and of every citizen—must be to provide and participate in an educational program which will widen the freedom of choice of each individual to that breadth which is limited only by his own ability and initiative.

Our job, so to speak, is to make it possible for Larry to be an "ast'naut" if he's got the makings of one.

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

STANDBY TAX INCREASE
AUTHORITY

(Mr. MOORHEAD (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would authorize the President, during the period in which the Congress is adjourned sine die, to increase on a temporary basis individual and corporate taxes up to 5 percentage points.

On July 18, according to a Washington Post article, the President told his Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy that:

The upward pressure on prices and costs is continuing and threatens to overheat the economy in the last half of the year.

In view of this threatening situation the Congress should not adjourn without providing a weapon to deal with an overheated economy.

During his press conference of July 19 the President urged the Congress to reduce nondefense expenditures to avoid the alternative of either inflationary deficit financing or a tax bill. I am sure that the Congress will respond to this request and cut expenditures, and I hope that such a reduction will be of sufficient magnitude that a tax increase will not be necessary. However, the future is difficult to predict and, after adjournment, it may develop that such reductions in expenditures were not sufficient to halt inflationary pressures and that a tax increase is necessary. The bill which I have introduced is designed to protect against such a situation.

In the past, proposals to give the President power to increase and decrease tax rates or merely the power to decrease tax rates have not been looked upon favorably by the Congress because they would grant to the executive branch, which has gained power over the year, the opportunity to gain additional power by granting a politically popular tax decrease.

The bill which I have introduced does just the opposite. It imposes on the executive, the onus for imposing a politically unpopular tax increase. Under the bill, at any time during the period after the sine die adjournment of the second session of the 89th Congress and before the convening of the 90th Congress in January 1967, the President would be authorized to act to increase corporate and individual income tax rates and withholding rates.

Such an increase would be effective only for 6 months except that the bill would also permit the President to make two 6-month extensions of the new rates. However, such extensions would not take effect if Congress approved a concurrent resolution expressing opposition to the extension.

These provisions insure the temporary nature of this standby authority. They would safeguard the authority and responsibility of the legislative branch in the field of tax policy. However, the bill would provide the President, during the adjournment of the Congress, with a weapon to deal with an overheated economy.

You and I hope that inflation can be halted and that the President will not have to use the authority which would be authorized by the bill which I have introduced, but we recognize that the anti-inflationary tight money policy has been used to such an extent that it is seriously threatening the home building industry and that there is not much room for further tightening if inflationary pressures should increase after the Congress has adjourned.

For this reason, standby tax increase authority should be granted.

For this reason, I ask your support for this legislation.

The bill follows:

H.R. 16486

A bill to authorize the President during the period which the Eighty-ninth Congress is adjourned sine die, to increase certain income tax and withholding rates temporarily

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

July 25, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16089

result is cited in the last sentence of Mr. Fried's article:

An unofficial toll of Americans killed in 5 years of war rose to 4,304.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

[From the New York Daily News, July 22, 1966]

RED BLOC DOUBLES AID TO NORTH VIET
(By Joseph Fried)

SAIGON, July 21.—Communist countries have begun a fresh flow of aid to North Viet Nam, including military hardware, with a sharp increase in the number of cargo-laden vessels putting into the port of Halphong.

Intelligence sources said the traffic was about double the usual number of foreign ships calling at Halphong, and most of the vessels are Soviet.

PLEGDED MORE AID

The Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact members promised to step up their military and economic assistance to North Viet Nam after the United States began bombing oil storage areas on the fringes of Hanoi and Halphong last month.

Over North Viet Nam, American fliers yesterday encountered MIG jets, surface-to-air and air-to-air missiles. Six MIGs were spotted and one fired two air-to-air missiles which missed. Air Force and Navy planes encountered nine surface-to-air missiles.

TEN FLIERS MISSING

Three more American planes were brought down yesterday, bringing the number lost over North Viet Nam in a 48-hour period to five. Ten American fliers are missing.

In South Viet Nam, the Communist death toll in Operation Hastings rose to 425. Contact was light in the jungle-covered mountains of Quang Tri province where the U.S. Marines have been conducting their biggest sweep of the war, close to the North Viet Nam border.

A series of clashes yesterday, one of which cost the enemy 30 dead, helped to increase the enemy casualties. Overall Marine losses were described as light.

The U.S. command disclosed a decline last week in total American casualties.

A spokesman announced 65 Americans were killed, 368 wounded and none missing in combat July 10-16, compared with 110 killed, 620 wounded and seven missing in the previous week. In all the allied combat dead totaled 279; Communist dead were listed at 1,200. An unofficial toll of Americans killed in five years of war rose to 4,304.

HORTON URGES CONGRESS TO INFORM HANOI OF THE PERIL THREATENED IN TRIAL OF U.S. SERVICEMEN

(Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been much concern in our Nation over the question of whether North Vietnam will try as war criminals our military personnel held captive in Vietnam. It is therefore imperative that we in Congress act to inform the North Vietnamese regime that they will be embarking on a perilous adventure should they follow such a course.

I think it is clear by now that the United States is anxious to find a solution to the Vietnamese situation. Our sole aim in Vietnam is to insure that a climate exists in which free institutions

can grow and prosper. As soon as the infiltration from the north ceases and the Vietcong abandon their bellicose posture, the United States will gladly end its military operations in that corner of the world.

However, should the North Vietnamese proceed with the trial, punishment or execution of any of our servicemen, the chances for achieving a just and secure peace will be greatly diminished. The American people will not stand for such a flagrant breach of the Geneva Conventions and of the accepted standards of international behavior. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, any trials of captured U.S. military personnel would seriously endanger this country's ability to work for peace in Vietnam.

Because of this fact, I have today introduced a resolution calling upon the President to inform the Hanoi government that it is the sense of Congress that any such proceedings will imperil chances for a just and stable peace in southeast Asia. Passage of this resolution will put Congress on record as recognizing the peril in Hanoi's threatened course of action and will serve to demonstrate that we are attempting to divert North Vietnam from this adventure in folly.

A SLAP AT THE HOMEMAKER

(Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee presently studying the so-called truth-in-packaging proposal, I was especially interested in the editorial observations of the Mankato Free Press, Mankato, Minn., concerning parts of the bill. I place the editorial at this point in my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues.

A SLAP AT THE HOMEMAKER

It takes a brave man to resist voting for a bill whose tag is "Truth in Packaging." The label may have helped push the bill, co-sponsored by Senator MONDALE, through the Senate by an overwhelming 79 to 9 vote. We believe, however, that the bill, which is in two parts, is half bad and we hope that a more careful House will take a close look at the Senate measure before it votes.

The good half of the bill demands that manufacturers clearly label their packages in even pounds, pints or quarts, etc., and do away with such "gimmicks" as a "Giant Pint" or "Big Pound," which may confuse a consumer. Most manufacturers have been putting net weight on packages for years. To require all to follow the same standard will give the careful buyer a chance to compare values. We doubt if it will change many buying habits. Too many surveys have shown too many reasons why people buy certain products, and price very often is not the compelling reason. However, the labeling provisions may be of help to some.

It is the second half of the bill to which we object. This section gives the Secretary of Commerce the right to dictate the weights or quantities in which a product could be marketed if he decided there were so many different sized packages that comparative shopping was impossible.

True there are situations where comparison of contents to price is difficult. The cos-

metic counter—for men as well as women—is one place. Potato chips have been used to illustrate another. There are, Senator PHIL HART of Michigan, another cosponsor, tells us 50 variations in packaging chips. But so long as the buyer can find out what weight she is getting for what price, what difference does it make as to how the package looks? If some buyers didn't want to buy in cans, others in sacks and still others in boxes, there would not be 50 different packages of potato chips.

The government has a duty to protect the health, safety and welfare of the consumer. We question whether it has the duty to limit her choice of packaging. A counter full of drab square containers is going to take a lot of fun out of the housewife's buying trip. It is going to kill packaging incentive—and a lot of packaging has been developed for convenience as well as sales stimulation. It puts the long, unimaginative arm of the do-good government in another new field.

Passage of this portion of the bill by the House would be, in effect a slap in the face of the American homemaker who does most of the buying. It says to her that confronted with modern packaging she is gullible, confused and apt to throw her money away. We don't think it takes the Great White Father to tell her what to buy and we hope House members do away with this second section of the bill. If they don't we will soon have another grand bureaucracy immersed in grave decisions on the correct angle of bend in the macaroni or the size of the letters in alphabet soup.

EDITOR SUGGESTS A FIRMER LINE

(Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Al McIntosh, editor of the Rock County Star-Herald in Luverne, Minn., suggests a firmer line in dealing with allies who will not support the American position in Vietnam. I place his editorial on the subject in the RECORD at this point:

HERE COMES MR. WILSON RATTILING HIS TIN CUP AGAIN

There is a polite little fiction that always jars as when President Johnson or Vice President HUMPHREY refer to the Viet Nam war and they use the term "the Allies."

When you look at the casualty lists the South Viet Namese are doing precious little fighting. Outside of some gallant Australians we "just ain't got no allies."

We are financing and fighting that war—alone—and that is the way it is going to be.

We will say this for President Johnson . . . he has reversed the "gutless" policies of some State Department officials of the past who not only turned both cheeks to be slapped—but also said "thank you."

When some of these nations now threaten us with blackmail if we don't "kick thru" the president has been known to say "go ahead." Which is about time.

It is about time too he uses some plain, raw four letter Texas words on Prime Minister Wilson during his conference here at the White House.

We have plucked Britain's chestnuts out of the fire time and time again. Again just lately when we joined in Britain's blockade of the tiny nation she was trying to crush. You may not admire that country's racial policies but you have to respect her gallantry in defying the Motner County and the world.

So—what did we get in return? Nothing! Britain still keeps on selling and shipping to the Communists regime in Viet Nam.

16090

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 25, 1966

Things are easier now for Britain now that Sukarno is "out," except in name only, in Indonesia.

Now that Britain no longer has to protect Malaysia we asked her to help us in Viet Nam.

Would she? Not one tiny bit. Heck no.

Not one soldier would she send.

In fact—she won't even sell arms to the U.S. to be used in Viet Nam. Prime Minister Wilson even "disassociated" himself from our bombing of Hanoi and Halphong.

Prime Minister Wilson's White House conference is on military and financial matters. He's rattling the tin cup again.

When we talk about "allies" let's not kid ourselves. It is American blood that is drenching the ground . . . and other than that of some gallant Australians and some South Viet Namese blood . . . that's it.

And it's about time that we talked brutally frank to Mr. Wilson and tell him that this allies bit is not a one way street.

POOR PERFORMANCE REWARDED

(Mr. GROSS (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to believe that the No. 2 official in the Department of Defense, Deputy Secretary Cyrus Vance, would help clear the way for the appointment of J. Robert Loftis to a \$25,000 a year job with the Communications Satellite Corp.

Loftis was one of three high Defense Department officials who were indicted on charges of embezzlement and false statements. Two were convicted and sentenced to prison terms. Loftis, acquitted in a jury trial, resigned his \$20,000 a year job in the Defense Department in the heat of the controversy.

Vance is reported to have said that he would not rehire Loftis at the Pentagon because—

I don't think he (Loftis) was a very good manager.

Yet Vance was perfectly willing to help send Loftis to his reward of a substantially higher paid job in the Government subsidized Communications Satellite Corp. If he was not a good manager in the Pentagon at \$20,000 a year what reason would there be to think he would be a good manager on the payroll of Comsat at \$25,000, plus a Government pension of \$8,820 a year, compliments of Defense Secretary McNamara?

Unanswered, too, is the question of why Loftis resigned his position at the Pentagon pending the outcome of his trial. This situation further indicates the need for congressional scrutiny of the handling of civilian personnel in the Defense Department.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the RECORD at this point the following article on this subject as published by the Des Moines Register of the date of July 21, 1966:

CONTROVERSIAL EMPLOYEE GOT VANCE AID ON JOB

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Deputy Defense Secretary Cyrus Vance said Wednesday that he cleared the way for J. Robert Loftis to be hired in a \$25,000-a-year job with the Communications Satellite Corp.

The deputy defense secretary told The Register he put his okay on the hiring by the government-subsidized corporation because Loftis, a former administrative assistant to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, was acquitted on charges of embezzlement of government funds and false statements.

WILLIAMS CRITICAL

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, has been critical of the fact that Defense Secretary McNamara had arranged for special circumstances under which Loftis was permitted to resign a \$20,000-a-year Pentagon job in the midst of the controversy with a pension of \$8,820 a year.

Vance told the Register that we would not hire Loftis at the Pentagon today because "I don't think he was a very good manager."

He said that he had a role in the decision to abolish the job Loftis held in 1964, and that this gave Loftis a choice of whether he would "bump" some person with less seniority from some other post or leave with a pension that was higher than normal.

Vance said that Loftis could have stayed with the Defense Department at that time because it was before the facts came out that resulted in the indictment. The deputy defense secretary denied telling Loftis that he would hire him back at the Defense Department if he wanted a job.

Loftis was one of three high Defense Department officials indicted on charges of embezzlement and false statements. The other two—John A. Wylie and William H. Godel—were convicted and sentenced to five-year federal prison terms.

PENSION AT 52

Loftis, who was acquitted in a jury trial, resigned from a \$20,000-a-year job in the Defense Department in the midst of the controversy, but under special circumstances that permitted him to take a pension at age 52.

Vance stated that there were indictments and a trial and an acquittal of Loftis, and as far as he is concerned this ended the government's interest.

Although Loftis told The Register he was "recommended" for the Communications Satellite Corp. job by Vance, the deputy defense secretary drew a distinction between a "recommendation" and the action he took to clear the way for Loftis being hired.

"I was not asked to recommend," Vance said. "I was called by (Chairman and Chief Executive Officer James) Jim McCormack of Comsat. I was asked if he (Loftis) were taken on, would this have any adverse impact on relations (between Communications Satellite) with the Department of Defense. I said 'certainly not.'"

Vance said he did not write to Communications Satellite, as Loftis has indicated, but that he had written "a personal letter" to Loftis and had given Loftis permission to use the letter in seeking the job.

**WATERSHED PROJECT RELEASED—
SENT TO CONGRESS BY BUREAU
OF THE BUDGET**

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Bureau of the Budget finally threw in the towel in its bid for more power and bowed to the public interest by sending to the Congress and for House Committee consideration 56 Soil Conservation Service watershed projects.

As is known, the Bureau has not sent up a single watershed project for con-

gressional consideration since last September because of an attempt to wrest from the Congress the right to determine on an individual basis which of such projects should be authorized.

Included among the 56 projects is one from my own district in West Virginia. It is the upper Buffalo Creek watershed project in Marion County, W. Va. This was cleared by the Soil Conservation Service more than 6 weeks ago and sent to the Bureau of the Budget.

I pointed out in a public protest last week the Budget Bureau's highhanded action and sought to encourage the Bureau to release these projects. For nearly 12 years, the Congress has been giving careful consideration to watershed proposals, and as a matter of fact, has approved 446 such projects. I expressed the hope that the President and the Director of the Budget would break loose this logjam and permit the Congress to continue to give its careful consideration to each of these projects as it has done over the past dozen years. This logjam also threatened a delay in the construction of another important project in my district. This is the Wheeling Creek watershed project which is expected to be approved by the Soil Conservation Service in about 2 months.

This action by the Budget Bureau in releasing these 56 pending projects is, in my estimation, a victory for the public.

**STUDY OF EFFECTS OF ALCOHOLISM
ON TRAFFIC SAFETY PRO-
VIDED IN HIGHWAY SAFETY BILL,
H.R. 13290**

(Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, during the past year, the Congress and its committees have directed a considerable amount of time and attention to the varied and intricate problems of highway, traffic, and automotive safety. During the past year, no less than five congressional committees have held extensive public hearings on bills to provide for greater motoring safety.

The recognition by the Congress that the senseless slaughter of over 49,000 Americans on our Nation's highways each and every year had to stop was made last year.

THE 1965 BALDWIN AMENDMENT

With the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 81 last year, Congress recognized that the problems of highway safety could no longer be ignored by either the Federal or State Governments. As enacted on August 28, 1965, the Baldwin amendment, section 4 of Senate Joint Resolution 81, which I supported with enthusiasm, provided that after December 31, 1967, each State should have a highway safety program, approved by the Secretary of Commerce, designed to reduce traffic accidents and deaths, injuries, and property damage resulting therefrom on the 382,600 miles of highways on the Federal-aid highway systems. The Baldwin amendment further