

August 23, 1966

ording to the formula which distributes these Federal funds, the higher the per capita income of a State, the lower the Federal allotment percentage.

The District of Columbia since 1954 for the purposes of the act has been treated as a State. During this time the District has been among the top three States as to its per capita income and at the present time ranks at the top. The District, an entirely urban area, has a level of per capita income which, while comparable to the level of other central cities of standard statistical metropolitan areas, is considerably above the level of per capita income of States where generally, the per capita income of rural areas and small cities tends to pull the level down. This results in the District, being highest in per capita income, receiving the smallest allotment percentage—33½ percent—and, therefore, a comparatively small allotment of Federal funds.

The District's rehabilitation program, although operating in only one large city, has to cover both the functions and responsibilities for overall program direction ordinarily assumed by an agency of State government, and those ordinarily exercised by the State through its district offices in cities, counties, and other political subdivisions. This dual responsibility, together with the needed expansion of the vocational rehabilitation program in the District, suggests that the most equitable treatment would be that used by the Congress in providing for unique situations in other jurisdictions which are not one of the 50 States.

The District of Columbia presently is not able to expand its program to greater capacity, due mainly to its being considered under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as a State. The bill which I am introducing would increase the District of Columbia's allotment percentage to 75 percent, the same as other jurisdictions requiring special consideration, such as Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. This change would be made at the beginning of a new fiscal year, July 1, 1966.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3754) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide a fixed allotment percentage for the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3754

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11(h)(1)(B) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act is amended by inserting "the District of Columbia," after "the allotment percentage for".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section shall take effect July 1, 1966.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 759 AND 760

Mr. JAVITS submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 13712) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendments when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appear under separate headings.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. BENNETT] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3207) to prohibit desecration of the flag.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator PASTORE be added to the list of cosponsors of the joint resolution I introduced (S.J. Res. 85), proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to equal rights for men and women, and that his name be listed among the sponsors at the next printing of the joint resolution.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH OF THE ELDERLY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I would like to announce to the Senate that the Health of the Elderly Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Aging will hold hearings on September 20, 21, and 22. The subject of the hearings will be "Detection and Control of Chronic Disease Utilizing Multiphasic Health Screening Techniques."

Early returns from a number of health screening projects that have been in operation in recent years indicate that the techniques developed thus far offer great promise for their utilization in the detection of certain chronic diseases in their early stages, in some instances before they become symptomatic.

The 89th Congress has done much to better the health lives of the elderly, but our efforts have been directed, primarily, to the treatment of the diseased elderly, rather than to preserving their health in the first instance.

Certainly the adage, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" has no greater application than in the field of health. It may well be that the "ounce of prevention" for many diseases is available to us now in the appropriate use of space age technology adapted to health problems. It is hoped that the hearings will develop a compendium of information for the use of the Senate in for-

mulating programs to assure that every "ounce of prevention" is made available so that the lives of our elderly may be even more enriched.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 23, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 602. An act to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; and
S. 2663. An act for the relief of Dinesh Poddar and Girish Kumar Poddar.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UN STOP THE INVASION TALK

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the flamboyant young Prime Minister, Ky, of the Saigon government recently urged that instead of waging a long war to win a victory in South Vietnam, North Vietnam should be invaded by land forces pouring over the 17th parallel from South Vietnam and invading from the sea. This was an irresponsible statement typical of the reckless and brash young puppet that we have installed as head of the Saigon government.

What is frightening is the fact that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, when asked to comment on this statement at a press conference, said:

There is no policy desire to move into North Vietnam or the demilitarized zone.

It will depend, Mr. Rusk said, "on the turn of events; the commander will have to do those things to protect the security of his troops."

Mr. President, of course a field commander has the obligation to do those things necessary to protect the security of his troops. However, the Founding Fathers, the architects of our Constitution, provided that civilian authority should always be supreme over the military. If it is not our policy to move into North Vietnam and the demilitarized zone, then the civilian leaders of this Nation have the obligation to instruct our field commanders to keep their forces out of areas where such a course of conduct might appear necessary to those field commanders, and Secretary of State Rusk should have indicated in his press conference that this has been done.

This is outrageous, frightening talk on the part of Secretary of State Rusk.

19418

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 23, 1966

Mr. President, at one time it was considered unthinkable that we would get involved in a war in southeast Asia. It seemed unthinkable that we would bomb Hanoi and Haiphong and other densely populated areas and kill many, many civilians. It was unthinkable, so it seemed, that we would one day have more than the 300,000 men of our Armed Forces in southeast Asia, whereas, in truth and in fact, we now have approximately 500,000 men there, including our forces in Thailand and the officers and men of our 7th Fleet in the Tonkin Gulf, and in the South China Sea. Within a short time, within a very short space of time, all of those "unthinkables" have come to pass.

It should be unthinkable that we would escalate this miserable civil war in which we are involved in South Vietnam to the extent of crossing the 17th parallel and invading North Vietnam with all the risks that such a move implies. However, Secretary of State Rusk's refusal to repudiate Ky's statement indicates that, in his mind at least, that possibility exists. Should that happen, any chance of negotiating a cease-fire or armistice in Vietnam would be seriously jeopardized, if not completely destroyed. We might very well find ourselves on a collision course toward war with Red China, if not worse.

Mr. President, administration officials should at once put a stop to any idea that we would seriously consider invading North Vietnam by land. Such talk has a way of creating a climate of acceptance; before long the unthinkable becomes thinkable. Such talk should be terminated by firm assurances by State Secretary Rusk or other top administration officials, that this Nation will not escalate the war to that extent.

Mr. President, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, there appeared a very perceptive editorial entitled "Stop the Invasion Talk." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, August 1966]

STOP THE INVASION TALK

Secretary of State Rusk's discussion of the possibility that American troops might invade North Viet Nam is frightening. It is difficult to believe that the United States would commit such a tragic blunder, and it is true that Mr. Rusk said, "There is no policy desire to move into North Viet Nam or the demilitarized zone" between North and South at the Seventeenth parallel.

But Mr. Rusk's discussion of the matter at a press conference indicated that an invasion, urged a few days ago by Premier Ky of South Viet Nam, was not out of the question. It will depend, Mr. Rusk said, "on the turn of events; the commander will have to do those things necessary to protect the security of his troops."

We concede that a field commander has this obligation. But his superiors have the obligation of instructing him to keep his men out of areas where such a court might appear necessary to him. A movement of infantry across the parallel would involve another, drastic change in the nature of the war. It would be similar to the movement that brought the Chinese into the Korean

war. It would alienate international opinion still further from United States policies. Ultimately, it might mean disaster.

The United States has recently been bombing not only North Viet Nam but the buffer zone in the vicinity of the Cambodian border, across which North Viet Nam troops are said to flee to sanctuaries. These raids, different in kind from an invasion, are taking place as Ambassador Harriman prepares to go to Cambodia to seek ways of keeping that peaceful little country out of the Indochina conflict. We certainly hope he succeeds.

Standing alone, Mr. Rusk's remarks are not so disquieting as when placed in conjunction with what Premier Ky said on two occasions within the last two weeks. In effect Ky posed the alternative of a war of five to 10 years duration or an invasion of the North, which he said he did not think would mean Chinese intervention. The State Department refused to repudiate Ky's statements; instead, it tried to dissociate itself from Ky's proposals without appearing to offend Ky.

Unfortunately, the history of United States involvement in Viet Nam is one of escalation, and so there are additional reasons for viewing the Rusk and Ky remarks with trepidation. Perhaps this is mitigated to some extent by Mr. Rusk's repeated assertion of his desire for peace in Southeast Asia, and his willingness to negotiate for it.

Any chance of negotiation would be further jeopardized, however, if not destroyed, by an invasion, and the Administration ought at once to put a stop to any idea that it could take place. Talk has a way of creating a climate of acceptance; it should be terminated by firm assurance that invasion is unthinkable.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield, if I have time remaining.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 3 minutes on my time.

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

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] for his continuing and forthright turning of the spotlight on our folly in southeast Asia. I think it is about time that the American people learned the truth about the situation.

We allegedly are there to fight aggression. The fact is that we are the aggressors. When we went into Vietnam in 1954, we were not invited in by a friendly government as has been alleged repeatedly by official pronouncements. We invited ourselves in. As we escalated, and a year and a half ago started sending our troops into combat and began bombing day after day, we became the aggressors.

When we went into Vietnam the only nationals involved were Vietnamese fighting each other. We barged in, violating every pertinent treaty in the process. It was a civil war. The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], after his trip to Vietnam, came to the conclusion that it was a civil war and so stated on the floor of the Senate. He quoted statements by General Westmoreland and General Stilwell to that effect; namely, that it was a civil war. We have the earlier statement of President Kennedy that it was a civil war. More recently we have had the testimony of four knowledgeable and experienced newspapermen who have reported from

the front, who appeared on television and declared that it was a civil war.

Until the American people realize that we are the aggressors they will continue to be deluded into thinking that we are pursuing a patriotic course of action. This delusion should be continually exposed. I think it is important that the American people learn that they have been deceived and misled from the very beginning.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, once again I am honored and privileged to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], in respect to the unjustifiable course of action that the United States is following and has followed since the beginning in conducting our unjustifiable, immoral, and illegal war in Vietnam.

I particularly wish to associate myself with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] in his appraisal of the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk. In my opinion, in his press conference Dean Rusk doubletalked again. He follows the course of propagandists who seek to mislead and confuse American public opinion.

That is why I repeat again what I have said for the past several years: The greatest need in American foreign policy is a new Secretary of State. The President sorely needs a Secretary of State who will advise him on the basis of the facts and stop duping him.

I particularly regret the attempt on the part of Dean Rusk, in his latest press conference, to tell the American people that if John Fitzgerald Kennedy were alive he would be supporting our present American war policy in South Vietnam. I do not believe there is a scintilla of fact that supports this misrepresentation and distortion by the Secretary of State.

I am satisfied, as I have said on the floor of the Senate before, that from my last conference with the late President, quite the opposite would be the case had he lived. I speak on the basis of what came from the late President's lips in my last conference with him. I am satisfied as he told me that he was engaging in a complete reappraisal of our foreign policy in South Vietnam. I subsequently learned that he had been greatly influenced by the Galbraith report which had been made to the late President by his request. President Kennedy had that report under study at the time of his death. I am reliably advised that the Galbraith report did not support American war policy in South Vietnam, but it was quite to the contrary.

INTEREST RATES AND THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Government has now released official statistics which confirm that the cost of living rose sharply last month. This is a continuation of a trend that has been underway throughout the year. I find it disturbing that the trend shows signs of rapid acceleration. For instance, the cost of living has advanced 3.1 points on the Consumer Index during the past 12 months. The greatest part of that in-

August 23, 1966

extent that any system, involving so many individuals, could approach perfection.

However, as we have noted, the track system appears to be doomed, to be replaced by a system of "team teaching" and ungraded elementary classes for the more backward pupils. At this writing, the anti-trackers on the School Board appear to be rather nebulous in their thinking. They speak of "innovations" and that's about it.

We believe innovations are fine, but let's make certain where they lead before we put them into effect.

The lessons of the Head Start program should not be overlooked. The Head Start idea was, and is, splendid, but it began, and, to an extent, has continued, with little planning and scant teacher training. Better that we should have studied what has been learned elsewhere about pre-school teaching—especially in Scandinavia—before we plunged into something we knew practically nothing about.

We hope, then, that the newly constituted School Board will make haste slowly in eliminating the track system. We hope that the members will bear in mind the ancient aphorism: "Don't trade something for nothing."

Incidentally, and quite by the by, in this city where citizens are rightfully concerned about the educational facilities available to the current generation, we call attention to a graphic exposition of just what's on tap here. We refer to the window displays at Woodward & Lothrop's downtown store. We urge Washingtonians to take a tour around them. We believe they'll be surprised—and proud—of what has been accomplished up to now.

THE DONABLE SURPLUS PROPERTY PROGRAM—HEARINGS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to extremely important hearings which are being held in the House this week. I refer to the hearings of the Donable Surplus Property Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee. The subcommittee, whose chairman is Representative MONAGAN, of Connecticut, is seeking to evaluate the donable surplus property program which I discussed briefly yesterday. May I repeat that I consider this program to be a very valuable one, in giving much needed property to deserving schools and hospitals.

Mr. President, Chairman MONAGAN said at his hearing this morning that he wanted to demonstrate the dedication of the Congress of the United States to the donable surplus property program. The Senate has demonstrated its dedication to that program by passing S. 2610. I was happy to participate in the hearings which led to the writing of the bill and also to join as cosponsor with Senator GRUENING who introduced the legislation. The bill was assured passage by the expeditious work of the chairman of the Government Operations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Under S. 2610, the first priority for Government surplus property goes to possible utilization in some agency of the Federal Government—"further Federal utilization." So we first make sure that no property that could profitably be used in Government is given up. After this,

however, the top priority goes to donation under the donable surplus property program for use in schools and hospitals. It is right that in a humane society, education and health should have high priority. Finally, if the property cannot be used by either the Federal Government or by schools and hospitals, it may be sold. This is the outline of S. 2610 which I hope will be passed soon by the House.

One subject being examined by the Monagan subcommittee is a recent General Services Administration directive which redefines the categories of property which can be sold or exchanged for new property. The Defense Department on August 10 announced its compliance with this directive, although many people—including Chairman MONAGAN—have voiced their concern that the donable program may be harmed by the new policy. In view of this concern, the Senate action on S. 2610, and the present House hearings, I ask that the Defense Department stop sales of surplus property until Congress has expressed its intent on this matter.

The Congress of the United States has many times reaffirmed its dedication to the donable program, and will constantly be alert to any administrative regulations which would weaken the program. I know that many of my colleagues in both houses of Congress will join me in my determination to see that this fine program is maintained and strengthened.

ALL-ASIAN PEACE CONFERENCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, more and more American boys are daily risking their lives in their effort to protect the Republic of South Vietnam from Communist slavery.

This is the unavoidable price a nation of freemen must pay to preserve freedom.

We are in Vietnam with a purpose and we are there with a right. Our purpose is to preserve the freedom of 14 million human beings in that land and our right is the right of all freemen to protect that which they cherish and hold dear.

But let us never lose sight of the reason for our fight in Vietnam. Let us never become so concerned with the waging of war that we forget that its object is peace; a just and honorable peace.

Mr. President, I hope we will carefully examine every avenue leading toward such a peace in Vietnam. I do not speak here of a peace which appeases the enemy and only whets his appetite for more and larger conquests. I trust that we have learned the lesson of that folly.

I speak instead of a peace that guarantees the freedom of the 14 million people of South Vietnam; a peace which guarantees the protection of the concept of individual freedom for which Americans have fought and died all over this globe.

A constructive suggestion has been brought forth on this floor by my distinguished colleague from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. He has focused the attention of this body on a proposal to examine the feasibility of an all-Asian conference to try to find an equitable solution to the

conflict in Vietnam. The idea is that the Asian nations are directly concerned with the war and know best the problems of southeast Asia and their possible solutions.

Such a conference just might open the door to a cessation of the fighting in Vietnam.

We must back our men in Vietnam because their lives and our security depend upon it. We must stand firm there because the freedom of the people of southeast Asia depends upon it. But if there is another way to protect the freedom of the people of southeast Asia, a way less costly in terms of American lives, Mr. President, we must seize upon it.

We can leave no stone unturned in our search for an honorable solution to the Vietnamese problem and we can leave no stone unturned in our search to find a way to lessen the toll of American lives lost in solving that problem.

Therefore, I hope the United States can give the closest attention and consideration to the proposal for an all-Asian conference. Let us apply new and imaginative thinking to this situation.

The freedom of the people of South Vietnam and the American lives buying that freedom demand that we do so.

SCHOOL MILK AS IMPORTANT AS OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the budget for fiscal 1967 proposes to spend \$219.9 million on oceanography. These funds will be spent, if appropriated, on oceanographic research and survey programs. Yet last year the administration spent only \$100 million to provide milk for the Nation's young under the special milk program for schoolchildren.

Now I do not intend to criticize the various oceanography programs of the Federal Government. However, I do feel that the health of the young people of our Nation is at least as important. If we can afford to spend almost \$220 million for oceanography, we can afford to spend at least half that amount to see that our children receive milk.

The Senate has appropriated \$105 million for the school milk program. Past statistics would indicate that even this amount, if it is accepted by the House, would be inadequate to provide full Federal reimbursement for half-pints of milk at the prior maximum level. Consequently I intend to fight for adequate funds in a supplemental appropriation bill before Congress adjourns this year.

PRAYERS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of our country, termed with affection "the Bill of Rights," were adopted on the demand of men who had won the Revolutionary War.

The first amendment guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of religious beliefs. It is the cornerstone of every American's freedom of conscience.

The amendment proposed by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] to permit voluntary prayers in schools, if adopted, would severely infringe upon freedom of religious belief. While I share with the junior Senator from Illinois and with most Americans our common American heritage of religious traditions and a personal religious faith, I also believe in the wisdom of those who framed our Bill of Rights and in the correctness of the interpretation by the Supreme Court of the first amendment with regard to prayers in public schools.

The place for prayers is in the home and in the church. Every American has the constitutionally guaranteed right to worship as he pleases, and not to worship if he pleases. He can pray at home, at church, on the job—in short anywhere. However, to authorize prayers as part of the public school routine is to inject the state into this private matter of conscience and belief.

Public school prayers could never be truly voluntary. There would always be pressure on school pupils to conform. The first amendment to the Constitution should not be amended or tampered with. I will never vote to weaken our inherited doctrine of absolute separation of church and state. When we weaken the Bill of Rights in one respect, then other precious rights such as the right of fair trial, freedom from compulsory self-incrimination and from unreasonable search and seizure might be next in order to be destroyed.

Mr. President there appeared an excellent editorial in the Cincinnati Enquirer on August 4, 1966, entitled "Prayers in the Public Schools." I commend this to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

PRAYERS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments this week began formal hearings on Sen. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN's amendment to undo the U.S. Supreme Court's work in connection with prayers in the nation's public schools.

Like Senator DIRKSEN's other amendment on the subject of apportionment of the state legislatures, the so-called prayer amendment is designed to redefine what most Americans regarded as the unquestioned status quo before the Supreme Court acted.

The specific court decisions that would be undone by the amendment are two:

In the case of Engel vs. Vitale in 1962, the Supreme Court held in a 6-1 decision that the use of a prayer composed by New York State officials and required to be recited aloud by students at the beginning of the school day constituted a violation of the First Amendment. Even the fact that the prayer was designed to be "neutral" as far as the various religious denominations were concerned did not affect its unconstitutionality.

In the twin cases of Abington Township vs. Schempp and Murray vs. Curlett a year later, the court held in an 8-1 decision that a Pennsylvania law requiring the reading of at least 10 verses from the Bible at the beginning of the school day and a similar law in Maryland were also a violation of the

First Amendment. The fact that objecting students could be excused from participation made no difference to the court.

In both cases, the sole dissenter was Justice Potter Stewart, formerly of Cincinnati.

Most Americans will recall the nationwide debate that accompanied both decisions. The anger that generated the debate stemmed not so much from the importance of public school prayers in themselves as from the conviction among many Americans that they were somehow being pushed around. They felt, in most cases, that the two decisions pleased only a tiny segment of the nation—in some respects the least "religious" segment. And they pointed to the nation's rich religious heritage as evidence that the Supreme Court was indeed misinterpreting the intent of the Constitution's framers.

As emotions have cooled, more and more Americans have become less indignant. Religious leaders in particular have tended to uphold the court—a circumstance that bodes ill for what Senator DIRKSEN's amendment seeks to accomplish.

The National Council of Churches maintains that the leadership of 93% of the nation's 56 million Protestants are firmly opposed to the Dirksen amendment. Jewish groups are also opposed. And among the nation's Catholic bishops, opinion is so divided that the Catholic church will probably take no stand at all.

What support the Dirksen amendment enjoys—and it is considerable nonetheless—comes from rank-and-file church-goers who feel that the Supreme Court decisions of 1962 and 1963 amount to a denial of God.

Even though we did not welcome those decisions, we are inclined to feel that the Dirksen amendment should not be passed. We have frequently spoken in this space of the vital importance of religion in American life. But we question whether the public school system is the proper apparatus for nurturing the religious spirit in America. In too many instances—and religion is only one—American parents have tended to foist off on the schools more and more of the responsibilities that are properly theirs. The effect of the Supreme Court rulings was to put the religious responsibility back where it belongs—in the laps of the parents. Should the Dirksen amendment find its way into the Constitution, many parents would feel once more that they had disposed of that responsibility.

Conscientious parents, we think, have nothing to fear from the status quo.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN THE COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, a number of students of the collective-bargaining process—men who are committed to that process and want to see it work with maximum effectiveness—have quite correctly been concerned by the occasional breakdown of that process, or the development of tendencies which seem to prevent its functioning the way we had hoped it might.

It seems to me, therefore, quite heartening to observe sincere effort to make collective bargaining work in the Nation's tremendously important and sensitive communications system. I believe that both the union involved, the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, and the management of the Western Electric Co., a division of the Bell System, deserve commendation for their efforts to date to reach a mutually satisfactory agreement.

Perhaps they will not do so. I hope they will. But I think that, whatever transpires in the next few days, we can appreciate the affirmative and untiring effort that has gone into this particular set of collective-bargaining negotiations.

First of all, there has been real bargaining. There have been union proposals and company counterproposals. Neither side, apparently, has felt it necessary to crystallize its position into hard-and-fast attitudes that are not susceptible of easy solution.

Second, the Communications Workers did not come into the Western Electric negotiations with a take-it-or-leave-it attitude. It had no pat formula; it sought improvements on a number of issues, but on each of these issues it proposed discussion and examination—in other words, collective bargaining.

Third, the union did not feel that it was necessary to involve the Government in the collective bargaining process. CWA has given us, I believe, a highly commendable example of the method by which a free and democratic union seeks to achieve its objectives at a national company without reliance on governmental power.

Fourth, I believe that CWA deserves praise for going to the public with its story. It has not sought to bargain with Western Electric through the press; that would be unwise and hurtful to the chance of getting agreement. But CWA has not hesitated to take its philosophy—about collective bargaining, about guidelines, about its general objectives—to the general public.

All of this I find a most commendable posture by CWA. It is a union whose national and local leaders have done much to earn a reputation for responsibility and for a sense of obligation not just to their own members but to the entire community, local and national.

I have no facts upon which to make any judgments about the actual content of the collective bargaining discussions between CWA and Western Electric. Without specific facts, I do not know what is a fair wage increase figure, or what should be done specifically about vacations or holidays or pensions or health plans for Western Electric employees.

But it seems to me signally encouraging that a major trade union and a major communications company have been trying to make collective bargaining work, with a minimum of histrionics, or name calling, or public airing of the details of their negotiation efforts. For this effort, CWA and Western Electric management deserve congratulations from the public, from the labor movement, from forward-looking management.

Let us hope that this collective bargaining process, undertaken here with mutual respect and a sense of the economic realities, will eventually come to a sensible, practical conclusion and agreement between American labor and management. The public deserves this reminder that collective bargaining can work, and work well, on a national scale.

August 23, 1966

stop until plant capacity utilization had dropped to 79 percent. And by present standards that would mean heavy unemployment and a real recession.

I ask unanimous consent that this very interesting column be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Government reports leave little doubt that U.S. living costs have been climbing more rapidly in recent months. The consumer price index, a widely used gauge of living-cost trends, recently has been rising at an annual rate of more than 3%, nearly three times the yearly gain that prevailed in 1960-65. In the view of many economists, the current rate of increase constitutes worrisome inflation.

Whether living costs continue to move up so rapidly, of course, depends in part on a variety of imponderables, ranging from the course of events in Vietnam to President Johnson's willingness to pursue more restrictive economic policies in an election year. A somewhat encouraging suggestion of what may lie ahead, however, may be glimpsed from some of the yardsticks that indicate what is happening to the amount of growing room, or slack, in the economy.

For many months before living costs began to rise more rapidly, these yardsticks showed the slack was fast disappearing in the economy—a development not unrelated to the recent price trend. Now, however, this seems no longer to be the case. The current picture indicates that the amount of slack still remaining in the economy, while small, at least no longer is shrinking.

The change can be detected, for instance, in statistics that record the portion of unused capacity in U.S. factories. The percentage had been shriveling. But recently it has remained approximately constant. Since the first of the year, according to Government estimates, manufacturers have been using roughly 92% of their total plant capacity.

Admittedly, this factory operating rate continues at what many analysts feel is an uncomfortably high level, and there is little indication of a significant reduction any time soon. Still, the rate at least appears to have stopped climbing—and is leveling off, it is noteworthy, at a percentage appreciably below the post-World War II high of 96%, reached in early 1953.

This leveling off is in marked contrast to the trend in recent years. As recently as 1961, at the start of the current economic expansion, the operating rate stood at only 78% of capacity, a full 14 percentage points below this year's level.

A similar development has taken place on the labor front. In July, after seasonal adjustment, the labor-force unemployment rate stood at 3.9%. This is down very slightly from the 4% levels of May and June, but actually is higher than the jobless rates in February, March and April. As recently as April, the unemployment rate was only 3.7%. For the first seven months of 1966, the jobless rate averaged 3.9%, precisely equal to the latest figure.

The 1966 record is very different from the pattern earlier. In 1961, the unemployment rate was 6.7%. As the expansion has progressed, the rate has declined, sporadically at first, then steadily. Between January 1964 and December 1965, the rate declined with almost monthly regularity; it fell from 5.6% at the beginning of 1964 to 4.1% at the end of last year.

Within the overall labor picture, it should be added, the job category that includes only married men with families actually has shown

less sign of strain recently. This key category contains most of the nation's breadwinners and skilled workers who form the backbone of the labor force. The overall jobless rate, of course, also includes many part-time workers, such as many teen-agers and housewives.

This rate for married men, seasonally adjusted, rose in July to 2% from 1.9% in June and 1.8% in May. July marked the first time since last November that the rate has been as high as 2%.

Again, the recent record differs markedly from the past trend. In the course of last year, for instance, unemployment among married men fell from 2.7% to 1.8%. As recently as early 1963, the rate was near the 4% mark.

The unemployment levels in recent months, to be sure, do not suggest any considerable slack in the nation's reserve of manpower. However, it should be noted, the overall July unemployment rate of 3.9% by no means approaches any sort of record low. In the postwar era, unemployment has been as low as 2.9%, the 1953 average. In fact, in six of the years since World War II, the average unemployment rate has been as low as or lower than the recent 3.9% level.

There are, of course, many considerations that will determine the trend of prices in coming months, besides the purely physical limits of the nation's men and machines. Evidence that the strain on factory and human resources is no longer increasing, however, suggests that the living-cost outlook may not be quite so worrisome as it may seem at first glance.

Certainly, there is little in the recent record to indicate that the current price climb will slow significantly. Business history suggests that any actual slowdown in the rise of prices very likely must await more slack in the economy.

For instance, the rise of the consumer price index in the last economic expansion, in 1960-61, did not begin to slow appreciably until the final quarter of 1960. By then, the factory operating rate had dropped to 79% from 1960's first-quarter level of 87%. The price index, by no coincidence, did not begin to rise appreciably again until the latter part of 1961, when the rebounding operating rate was approaching 85%.

However, the record of recent months also provides an indication, albeit tenuous, that a further acceleration in the rise of living costs is perhaps unlikely in coming months. And such a prospect is certainly welcome at a time where there is widespread and increasing concern about the possibility of spiraling inflation.

—ALFRED L. MALABRE, Jr.

PRESENT VIETNAM POLICY NOT THAT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. CLARK. The morning papers refer to a statement made by Secretary of State Dean Rusk yesterday in a way which very much surprises me.

The headline in the Washington Post reads, "Viet Policy Also J.F.K.'s, Rusk Says." In an article under the byline of Homer Bigart in the New York Times this morning, the statement is made:

He—

Meaning Dean Rusk—

implied that had President Kennedy lived, American combat troops would be as heavily committed in Vietnam as they are under President Johnson.

An AP dispatch is also published this morning under the headline, "Salinger Says J.F.K. Viet Policy Probably Would Match L.B.J." This sudden effort to

join the late President Kennedy in the responsibility for the American involvement in Vietnam today I find most unfortunate. It is quite out of line with what was stated by Mr. Arthur Schlesinger in his authoritative book on President Kennedy's administration, entitled "A Thousand Days." In addition, it is entirely out of line with what President Kennedy said 2 months before his death. I quote his comments which he made in September 1963:

In the final analysis it's their war—they're the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it.

It has now become our war.

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

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

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, speaking only for myself, and without having any way of knowing what our late and much beloved President Kennedy would have done under these circumstances, I believe he would have stuck to what he said in September 1963.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am familiar with the quotation to which the Senator referred. It is taken from one of President Kennedy's news conferences in the closing days of his administration.

I think we may add to that a presumption, because no one can say exactly what President Kennedy would have done. But I think it is fair to assume he would have carried out the implications of the quotation which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] cited. But also I believe his experience in the Bay of Pigs fiasco would have greatly disillusioned him with the military advice he had been getting in that unfortunate situation, and would have been reluctant again to follow such misguided advice as has been given by Secretary McNamara, who at various times has made forecasts about Vietnam which have proved totally erroneous.

President Kennedy had that bitter experience in the Bay of Pigs, with military advisers, the CIA, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff all giving him the very mistaken advice which resulted in the Bay of Pigs incident.

I am certain that President Kennedy would have learned by that experience and would not have followed their advice in South Vietnam.

THE McCLOSKEY CONTRACTS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, yesterday on the Senate floor the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] made some remarks about the General Services Administration's handling of the contract awards for the Philadelphia Mint. It was particularly interesting to learn how the General Services Administration handled the bid of McCloskey

19430

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 23, 1966

& Co. It was indeed alarming to me to note that McCloskey & Co. would receive what, on the surface, appears to be favored treatment. Yesterday I made some remarks concerning Senator WILLIAMS' statement and my thoughts suggesting that this was a scandalous way in which to handle our Government contracts. I suggest that perhaps the Senate should consider looking into the procedures involved.

Yesterday I referred to the fact that, on one hand, our Government is suing the McCloskey Co. for \$5 million because of the Government's contention that the McCloskey Co. was negligent in the performance of its contract to build the Boston Veterans' Administration Hospital and thus poor construction resulted in the loss of the exterior wall which had to be rebuilt. Our Government, on the other hand, improperly, in my opinion, is entering into new contracts with the same company for the construction of the \$12 million mint at Philadelphia. This does not make sense.

We could not expect any reasonable man to deal with a company that had treated him as the McCloskey firm has treated the U.S. Government.

On July 19, I entered in the RECORD a letter I wrote to Mr. Lawson B. Knotts, Jr., Administrator of the General Services Administration, questioning the award to the McCloskey firm. That letter appears on page 15392 of the July 19 RECORD. In fairness to Mr. Knott, and to inform all Senators, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD Mr. Knott's response, dated August 2.

Mr. President, I also asked to have printed in the RECORD a letter I received from Ramsey Clark, Deputy Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice. Mr. Clark is responding to my letter of July 26, wherein I asked to be brought up to date on the status of the McCloskey suit and to know what the allegations were. I think Senators will find it interesting to see how the Department of Justice looks upon the McCloskey firm and how the General Services Administration looks upon it. I think this situation deserves immediate Senate attention.

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

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1966.

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: Reference is made to your letter of July 19, 1966, concerning award of the contract for construction of the new U.S. Mint in Philadelphia to the firm of McCloskey & Co., Inc., and suggesting that McCloskey & Co., Inc., be precluded from further Government contracts and denied the Mint contract.

As you know, debarment is a severe penalty which can easily destroy a going business, inasmuch as debarment by one Government agency is grounds for similar action by others. Consequently, the requirements of Constitutional "due process" have necessitated the erection of procedural safeguards against abuse and limitations upon the power of contracting agencies to impose such a sanction. The Federal Procurement Regulations reflect these considerations and are specific as to matters that constitute grounds for debarment.

In this instance, we have no evidence, with respect to any of the matters to which you allude in your letter, to support a debarment. The mere fact that a civil action has been instituted against the McCloskey firm in connection with the Veterans Administration hospital in Boston is not sufficient evidence, in and of itself, upon which to base so drastic an action as debarment.

Quite apart from the foregoing, we must also mention that the McCloskey firm's record of performance under contracts with the General Services Administration has been satisfactory. Among the more recent contracts performed for GSA by McCloskey & Co., Inc., was the construction of Federal Office building No. 6, a \$10,000,000 project. McCloskey has also satisfactorily completed the contract for construction of the substructure of the new Mint. Against this factually documented record of satisfactory contract performance, we would be acting prematurely if we were to base a debarment or finding of nonresponsibility on a matter that is being litigated.

Please be assured that we share your concern in safeguarding the national interest in the selection of Government contractors.

Sincerely yours,

LAWSON B. KNOTT, JR.
Administrator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., August 9, 1966.

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: Your letter to the Attorney General bearing the date of July 26, 1966 and relating to McCloskey & Company has been referred to me for reply. Suit against McCloskey & Company is being tried in Boston before the Federal District Court. A Special Master was appointed by the Court and hearings were held from March 30, 1966 until June 10, 1966. They will resume on August 16, 1966, and based on present progress it is not anticipated that they will conclude for several months, or that a decision of the District Court will be issued before the summer or fall of 1967.

The Government's complaint alleges that on February 15, 1950 the Government entered into a contract with McCloskey & Company for the construction of a hospital at a contract price of \$10,563,000, the hospital to be constructed in accordance with drawings, plans and specifications prepared by a joint venture composed of Coolidge, Shepley, Bulfinch and Abbott, a partnership and Charles T. Main, Inc., a corporation; that the Government entered into a contract with the Architect-Engineer whereby said Architect-Engineer agreed to furnish a resident engineer and other inspection personnel to supervise construction for the purpose of assuring compliance by McCloskey with the approved drawings and specifications; that construction of the hospital began on or about May 27, 1950 and was completed on or about June, 1952; that about June of 1953 the outer brick wall began to spall, bulge, crack and loosen and that this condition continued; that in 1961 an exploratory contract was entered into with a firm of consulting engineers, Weiskopf and Pickworth, and that based in part on their recommendations the Government determined in 1962 that there were so many unauthorized departures from the contract plans and specifications by McCloskey & Company and failures by the Architect-Engineer properly to inspect and supervise McCloskey's contract performance that local repairs were not sufficient and that it was necessary to remove and replace the brick outer wall and windows and to construct a new frame to support the new outer wall; that the defects and deficiencies consisted in part of the misalignment of concrete columns, of the failure to install some

relieving angles used to support the brick work, of the failure to install in many places metal ties and anchors which tie the outer brick wall to the inner concrete frame; that the cause of the failure described was the negligence of McCloskey & Company in the performance of the construction contract and the negligent performance by the Architect-Engineer of the inspection contract; that the Government has been damaged in the approximate sum of \$5 million.

The files of the Department reflect but one other action against McCloskey & Company. In this action it appears that the Government was assigned an account receivable in the approximate amount of \$21,000, owed by McCloskey & Company. However, McCloskey & Company paid a materialman creditor of the assignor a sum in excess of \$21,000, and under the Miller Act was discharged of its debt to the assignor. In short, the assignee (the United States) was subordinated to the materialman. Hence, it is expected that this action will be dismissed in the near future.

The pending criminal indictment against Mr. Baker does not involve allegations concerning Mr. McCloskey or McCloskey & Company.

Sincerely,

RAMSEY CLARK,
Deputy Attorney General.

THE BACKTRACKERS

MR. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial, entitled "The Backtrackers," which appeared in the Washington Daily News of August 11, 1966.

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

THE BACKTRACKERS

And so it seems that the "track" system in the D.C. public schools is on the way out.

The new members of the School Board, having voted down a proposal to add a fifth track for pupils who have fallen far behind their contemporaries, may now be expected to succeed in eliminating the track system altogether.

Well, so be it.

Our own position has been made clear many times. We have felt that the institution of the track system by Superintendent Carl Hansen—after he had presided over the peaceful integration process here—was a wise move. We felt that this system provided for at least a partial solution to two major problems, namely, making it possible for relatively deprived pupils to trade up scholastically, while, at the same time, giving more gifted pupils the opportunity to proceed at a rate equal to their abilities.

We still feel that way. We still feel that any society has this dual obligation. It cannot overlook the needs of the previously deprived. Equally, it must not inhibit those who are born equipped to become intellectual leaders.

Let's not delude ourselves about this. All men are not created intellectually equal. We shall be doing a major disservice to the future if we believe otherwise.

Such men as Albert Einstein and Ralph Bunche seldom appear among us. To presume that all of us can, with equal opportunity, equal them is to subscribe to the veriest nonsense.

We believe that the track system, for all its manifest insufficiencies, is aimed at making it possible for each pupil to proceed toward his maximum intellectual potential at his own best pace. We have always agreed that the track system was less than adequate, but also that, by trial and error, it could and would be improved to the

August 23, 1966

19467

The Indians of Arizona know very well what happens to a society when its water supply is diminished or disappears. Around them are the crumbling ruins of their ancestors—including the outline of primitive irrigation structures that can still be seen. They stand as powerful reminders of vanished people—civilizations that withered and died or moved on when the water was gone.

The sad part of Mr. Brower's extreme arguments against this project is the fact that he makes them in the name of conservation.

But let me remind my colleagues that true conservation in the American tradition does not mean the preservation of exclusive privilege for one small group of citizens.

On the contrary, opportunities for the enjoyment of nature and its wonders have been extended to virtually all Americans through the multiple-purpose concept of resource utilization.

All of us know these opportunities must be expanded in light of current and projected population pressures on our available facilities. Hualapai Lake would be a major step in this direction.

Given our experience with Lake Mead and Lake Powell, we know that Hualapai Lake would soon develop into one of the most popular attractions in the Nation.

Lake Mead is a priceless recreational asset because of its proximity to urban centers of the most populous State in the union and adjacent States. With metropolitan concentrations growing rapidly in the Southwest, Hualapai Lake—like Lake Powell and Lake Mead today—would be another welcome bonanza for boating, fishing and camping enjoyment.

Public response to Lake Powell, for example, has been amazing, when you consider that it began filling only 3 years ago and visitor facilities are still limited.

Some 196,400 persons visited Lake Powell the first year. Attendance climbed to 303,500 the next year, and as additional accommodations and marina facilities are completed, the figures will climb steadily higher. Already, in the first 7 months of 1966, attendance is reported over the 1965 pace.

There is a curious anomaly in Mr. Brower's propaganda which deserves comment. On behalf of the Sierra Club, he professes to support Arizona's quest for supplemental water. I might say that with friends like this, we do not need enemies.

His ads tell us to forget the dams. They say: "Go ahead and build the central Arizona project and use conventional steam generating plants to provide the necessary pumping energy. Besides, cheap nuclear power is just around the corner."

To the naive and uninformed, this sounds fine. But it just is not true—and wishful thinking cannot change fiction into fact.

I can assure the Senate that the positive economic case for the dams will be documented, and the fallacious arguments against them exposed, as we proceed with the consideration of this project.

For now, I would remind Mr. Brower that steam generating plants require fuel—coal, oil, natural gas—or some form of fissionable material, in the case of nuclear reactors.

All of these, uranium included, are depletable and nonrenewable resources. Their unnecessary use to perform a function that can more efficiently and economically be performed by inexhaustible falling water surely cannot be justified in the name of conservation.

So far, Mr. President, I have not mentioned the unique provision of this legislation which sets it apart from previous reclamation bills. I refer to the long-range need for increased supplies of water in the Colorado River.

Let me assure my friends in the Pacific Northwest that the question of augmenting the water available in the Colorado River at some future date merits objective study by the most competent authorities in our land.

You are perfectly within your rights to demand that this proposal be subjected to the most searching examination—and I have no doubt that it will be.

At this point, let me plead with you not to prejudice the case before the facts are in.

We in Arizona do not covet one drop of somebody else's water which they can put to beneficial consumptive use, either now or in the foreseeable future.

At the same time, we know that the disparity between total supply and predicted demand in the Colorado Basin is only a reflection of a national, not a local, problem.

The extra water that Phoenix, Tucson, Flagstaff, Williams, Ash Fork, and Casa Grande need today, New York and Washington will need tomorrow.

Experience has taught us that the longer we delay in mounting a coordinated national attack on our water supply and distribution problems, the more difficult and expensive they will be to solve.

Action now to meet our water needs in the year 2000 and beyond is not a visionary step. It is a practical necessity.

Finally, Mr. President, on behalf of Arizona, let me repeat that the river runs on but our time is running out.

It is my earnest hope that the House of Representatives will soon act on the bill reported by its Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and thereby provide the Senate with an opportunity for adequate consideration of this legislation at this session.

Congressional approval of this vitally needed project will usher in a bright new era of progress and prosperity for the entire Colorado River Basin.

For myself and my senior colleague, the beloved President pro tempore of the Senate, we ask only that you make your judgment on this legislation squarely on the basis of the facts that will be presented.

We are perfectly willing to match the combined legal, engineering, and economic recommendations of a quarter-century of study against the desperate distortions of those who represent less than one-hundredth of 1 percent of the American people.

And we have confidence that the Senate, as it has twice before, will make the proper determination.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

WORLD OPINION ON U.S. POSITION IN VIETNAM

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I know that all of us have been very interested in listening to the many statements indicating that, so far as world opinion is concerned, our policy in Vietnam is looked at with extreme skepticism, if not with open hostility and criticism.

I was therefore quite interested to read the lead editorial in the current issue, August 20, 1966, of the London Economist entitled "This Is the Third World War."

This is a very excellent editorial. It is one which I think should commend itself to those of us who are concerned with the events in Vietnam. I think it is also a very strong endorsement in large part of the American position in connection with Vietnam.

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

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

THIS IS THE THIRD WORLD WAR

There is no Mao but Mao, and Lin Piao is his prophet. That is what the past week's events in Peking (see page 719) boil down to. The communiqué from the Chinese communists' central committee at the weekend, followed by the ominously martial rally in Peking on Thursday, with a uniformed Mao Tse-tung presenting his "close friend in combat" Lin Piao to the people, mark out unmistakably the path Mao means China to follow. It was predictable that the central committee, in the sort of words Stalin once made Russians use about him, would duly declare Mao Tse-tung a genius, "the greatest marxist-leninist of our era." After the Mao-organised purges of the last four months, and his baptism in the Yangtse last month, this was inevitable. Like all monopolists of temporal power, from the Roman emperors to Stalin, Mao is spending his last years in arranging to become a god.

What was not inevitable is the emergence of Marshal Lin Piao as China's number two, and the meaning this has for China's foreign policy. The only other Chinese mentioned by name among the ecomiums to Mao in the central committee's communiqué—and twice at that—is Lin Piao. At Thursday's rally in Peking it was Lin Piao who took precedence immediately after Mao himself, before the country's president and prime minister and the communist party's secretary-general. It was Lin Piao who made the main speech under the approving gaze of Chairman Mao. Sick man or not, palely self-effacing or not, the defence minister has risen to the rank of Mao's chief assistant and his successor-ap-

19478

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 23, 1966

plied during the course of the flight. This has required a 24-hour-a-day effort, and many of the principal individuals have had to spend most of the 24 hours a day making important decisions.

The first already provided by this mission are numerous: It is the first U.S. spacecraft to successfully establish an orbit about the moon; it has provided the first high resolution photographs of the backside and the eastern face of the moon; it has performed the first controlled orbit changes around the moon; it has provided the first conclusive information on the mass distribution and shape of the moon; and in doing these things, it has been remarkably responsive to over a thousand commands while being actively "flown" by engineers and scientists here on earth.

The performance of the spacecraft and the project team on this activity thus far have surely proved the greatness of our Nation's research efforts. The Langley Research Center of NASA deserves the highest praise of the people of the United States for this remarkable project.

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON DE FACTO SEGREGATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the ad hoc Subcommittee on De Facto Segregation of the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman repeat his request?

Mr. ALBERT. The request is made on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] and has been cleared, I understand, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], the ranking minority member. It is that the ad hoc Subcommittee on De Facto Segregation of the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED IN FULFILLING MILITARY OBLIGATIONS

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the extensive hearings held by the House Armed Services Committee on the draft reveal a number of needed changes to permit a fairer, a sounder, and a more useful system than we have at present. Former President Eisenhower has recently pointed out that at two opposite ends of the manpower spectrum there exist two large privileged classes, the col-

lege students with their access to exemptions from military service and those considered unfit for service by the military authorities under their present attainments but capable of being brought up to usable standards.

President Eisenhower further stressed the need for passing universal military training legislation in order to eliminate these deficiencies in the present system.

Today, Secretary of Defense McNamara has announced a plan to bring up to standards thousands of young men who presently do not meet standards previously set but who can, by training, be brought up to proper standards; and this will to a degree limit the imperfections of the present draft system insofar as those in marginal attainment groups are concerned. Secretary McNamara and President Johnson have both addressed themselves at various times to the possibility of some nonmilitary utilization of young manpower as a possible means of bringing about universality of service to our country when so many young men are actually on the frontlines in combat as a result of being drafted into the military service. They have not stated, however, that they have come to the conclusion that people should be drafted for civilian service as a quid pro quo for being drafted into the military, and, of course, there would be no equality of service between a frontline infantry soldier and a person who is performing some nonbelligerent activity even if a longer period of service were required in the latter group.

It seems to me that the time is here for us to enact a universal military training proposal that would be truly universal among the young men of our country, and that this provides a better answer to the inequities of the present system than any drafting for civilian service could possible offer. There is considerable doubt in my mind that it would be constitutional to draft people for other than military service; but, whether or not that is so, universal military training would provide a fairer distribution of the obligations and it would have the additional benefit of providing trained manpower and classification of all young men in our country as a tremendous defense backlog if the military requirements of our country should substantially escalate at some time in the future.

So, I find it very encouraging that President Johnson and former President Eisenhower and Secretary McNamara are all constructively thinking in this field; and I urge Congress to undertake legislation in this field at the earliest possible time. Frankly, I believe that the answer lies in the line of thinking which would establish universal military training, which I have always supported and which I have backed by introduced legislation from time to time in Congress.

DEDICATION OF BIG BEND DAM IN SOUTH DAKOTA

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in his col-

umn carried in the Washington Post, today, Drew Pearson cries copious tears because Secretary of State Dean Rusk will dedicate the Big Bend Dam in South Dakota on September 15.

The principal pain Mr. Pearson suffers comes from the fact that the Governor of the State of South Dakota, who is thank-goodness, a Republican, will be the master of ceremonies.

Another stab in his side comes from the fact that Senator KARL MUNDT will be on the platform and that neither the Democrat candidate running against Governor Boe or the candidate running against Senator MUNDT will be in TV camera focus. As Mr. Pearson puts it, those who would like to defeat these officeholders will not be in the limelight.

Is this anything new? What is the function of officeholders if it is not to develop and then through appropriations finance, construct, and then handle the dedication of projects such as this?

Mr. Pearson says:

The Big Bend Dam was conceived under the Flood Control Act passed by Franklin Roosevelt and the money for it was appropriated under Truman.

First it should be pointed out that Franklin Roosevelt never passed a law—the laws were passed by Congress, of which Senator MUNDT was a very active Member at the time of the passage of this act, and much of the credit for the passage of the Flood Control Act must go to Senator MUNDT, as his efforts were as much responsible for its passage as anyone.

Another little item of interest is that Senator MUNDT has served on the Appropriations Committee in the Senate for the past 13 years and has been primarily responsible for getting funds for construction of all of these dams in the main stem of the Missouri River including the Big Bend Dam—just why should he not have an important part in its dedication? Who, pray tell, would have a better right?

In further talking about the dam, Mr. Pearson says:

Its origins are entirely Democratic.

Two minutes of research by this famous columnist would have proven to even him the fallacy of that statement. He would have discovered that I along with 12 other Republicans, organized in 1938 the South Dakota Reclamation Association, and that I served on its board of directors for the succeeding 6 years. He would have discovered that the purpose of organizing the association was to promote irrigation in South Dakota and to get Missouri River water on South Dakota soil.

Two minutes of research would have demonstrated that in 1940, under the leadership of the then Gov. Harlon J. Bushfield, a Republican, the Missouri River States Committee was organized with two members from each of the Missouri River States serving on that committee, the purpose of which was to promote Missouri River development for irrigation, navigation, flood control, and power development. He would have learned that I was named by Governor Bushfield as the second member of the delegation from South Dakota.

August 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19487

ically prohibits the granting of Federal funds for the purpose of promoting the assignment of students to overcome racial imbalance.

In view of the clear intent of Congress in enacting Title IV, and specifically in light of its definition of "desegregation", I am herewith requesting to know under what authority your Office is acting in making these grants to northern school boards, where there has been no deliberate segregation, for the purpose of overcoming defacto segregation or racial imbalance.

I am specifically requesting information on the proposal made by the Hartford, Connecticut School Board where there has been no deliberate segregation and which I understand has requested \$130,840 to attack defacto segregation and which is making its request for this sum as part of a program which involves the bussing of 300 students to suburban areas.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

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

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

GETTING THE JOB DONE

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have called to public attention, by means of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the shipping bottleneck in Saigon which was affecting the flow of supplies into Vietnam. Mention was made of the efforts of Thomas Gleason, the president of the International Longshoremen's Association and of his trips to Vietnam to effect needed changes. It was encouraging to read in the New York Times of August 5 of the vast improvement in the situation. While certain factions militantly oppose our efforts in Vietnam—the set of directions on how to beat the draft which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday is one distressing example—the efforts of other Americans like President Gleason are indeed refreshing. Especially praiseworthy is the comment of Mr. Gleason concerning the possibility of his speedup methods possibly being used to haunt him in future contract negotiations: "But the country comes first."

I insert the news item entitled "Saigon Port Snag Is Said To Be Over," in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 5, 1966]
SAIGON PORT SNAG IS SAID TO BE OVER—GLEASON SAYS BOTTLENECK IS "COMPLETELY CLEARED UP"

The shipping bottleneck in Saigon harbor that had threatened the flow of supplies to troops in Vietnam has been "completely cleared up," Thomas W. Gleason, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, said yesterday.

Mr. Gleason, who made several trips to Saigon with some of his union colleagues to determine ways of getting traffic through that port faster, said some of the methods intro-

duced might "embarrass" him in future negotiations with United States shipping companies.

The I.L.A. officials persuaded South Vietnamese dockmen to forgo their midday siesta and to accept an incentive system for speedier cargo unloading. Such "speed-up" methods "are going to haunt me when we sit down for the next contract," Mr. Gleason said at a news conference. "But the country comes first," he added.

The news conference was held jointly with John Condon, United States labor attaché in Saigon, who is completing a two-year tour of duty.

While Mr. Condon praised the "unprecedented type of union service" given by the union, he qualified the success reported by Mr. Gleason.

He described the shipping bottleneck as "substantially" cleared up as a result of the "know-how" supplied by the union, and said the flow of cargo had been speeded up to "three or four times the previous rate."

At the suggestion of the I.L.A. advisers, the United States furnished modern hoisting machinery for palletized cargo and shipped a fleet of flatbed trucks to speed cargo from cluttered piers to inland prefabricated warehouses for sorting and inland distribution.

THE INCREASING COST OF LIVING

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Labor Department reported today the national cost of living increased another four-tenths of 1 percent in July to a record level, although goods prices did not climb as much as usual during July. Just when and where this inflationary spiral will level off no one seems to know. The following article by Ted Lewis in today's New York Daily News entitled "Question Is: What's Ahead With HCL?" details the uncertainty which prevails in official circles concerning the months ahead.

I insert the above-mentioned column in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Daily News, Aug. 23, 1966]

QUESTION IS: WHAT'S AHEAD WITH HCL?

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, August 22.—The most elusive cost-of-living information in the nation's capital concerns what is going to happen to the purchasing power of the consumer dollar in the months ahead.

We went down to the Labor Department today to try to get statistical lowdown on this because it seemed more important than what happened to prices in July, now three weeks past.

All we can report is that if any expert on the consumers price index has a firm opinion on price trends for the next few months, he prefers to keep the significant political and economic information to himself.

There were a few, cagily-phrased nuggets of knowledge forthcoming that could suggest that the outlook isn't too good. For example, Arnold Chase, assistant commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, expects that the price of eggs will be lower later in the year.

On the other hand, Chase believes that dairy products such as milk and butter are going to remain high for awhile. As for meat, poultry, fish, fruits and vegetables, it is hard to say. A continued shortage of

pork is probably keeping that kind of meat high, but beef prices could well be stabilized at their present high level.

As for the accelerated rate of medical care costs, there is some hope that this will level off when more beds are available in hospitals now under construction.

Now, it would appear that marvelous computers should be available to supply some hard information as to what is going to happen next about the high cost of living.

Isn't this the kind of guideline that housewives want, not the meticulous data showing how living costs went up again in July—which surprised no one?

What everyone wants to know is where do we go from here. The only clue that was supplied today was the trend of the past—which, if continued, means more gradual melting away of the purchasing power of the dollar.

Buried way down in the data on the consumers price index was the revealing information about what has happened to the dollar.

In July, it was worth in terms of the dollar's 1957-59 purchasing power just a little over 88 cents. In July, 1965, its value on the same basis was 90.7 cents.

In terms of the 1947-49 purchasing power of the dollar, it was worth in July 71.9 cents. In terms of the 1939 dollar, exactly 42.7 cents.

GROCERY BILL GOES UP AND UP

We prefer the statistic about this offered by Commissioner Chase. A typical grocery bill of \$25 a week in June increased 10 cents in July. And the July cost was 68 cents more than the same amount of groceries cost in July a year ago.

What is this consumer price index anyway? Well, it covers pretty much every item of consequence in a family's living costs.

It covers food bought for the home, food away from home (restaurants). It covers rent, fuel and utilities, household furnishings, wearing apparel, transportation, health and recreation costs, new cars and used cars.

The statisticians do a good job. They even come up with comparable cost of living data for key cities in the nation. Their basic finding, however, is in the national average category.

These government experts do a tremendous job of finding out what happened to consumer prices in the past, even if they hate to talk about the future, except to remind that there are usually seasonal trends.

For example, past experience has shown that food prices usually decline in September. Does that mean they will decline this September? No one knows positively, is the response.

COST OF SERVICES OUTSTRIP FOOD PRICE RISE

There is a positive effort, as displayed by the spokesman for the cost of living statistics today, to show that the average consumer does not have the right perspective in facing up to his spending programs.

According to Commissioner Chase, the consumer gets upset about the high price of bread but ignores the significance of other price rises.

It was pointed out that a so-called "\$100 basket of consumer goods and services" rose \$2.80 from July, 1965 to July, 1966. This may be hard to believe, but the biggest increase came in services, not in food prices. Food rose 71 cents, which services rose \$1.35. Other items accounted for 74 cents.

What are these services that cost so much more and outstripped food price rises? In this category are medical care, barber and beauty shops, domestic service, baby-sitters, utilities, public transportation, laundry and dry cleaning, movies, mortgage interest, etc.

This is a category worth considering in trying to figure out how much more the cost

19488

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 23, 1966

of living is likely to rise during the rest of the year. They are definitely services that always keep on rising during an inflationary period. While the consumer price index experts clearly want no part of forecasting what the August or September index is likely to show, no one else in the Administration wants to either.

Garner Ackley, chairman of the President's Economic Advisory Council, won't guess what is going to happen. President Johnson isn't sure which way prices are going, except up. He as much as said so in one of his speeches on his New England swing, when he admitted "we are faced today with a real danger to the prosperity we have enjoyed for almost six consecutive years."

FORTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. MACKAY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to have reprinted all of the speeches on the 48th anniversary of Lithuania contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, or any previous or latter RECORDS, and if any Member objects to reprinting of his remarks, it is requested that he contact Mr. Raymond P. Noyes, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk, room H-112 in the Capitol, or myself, within the next week. This announcement is being made in order to comply with the rules of the joint committee on reprinting remarks from the RECORD.

LET US INCREASE INSURANCE ON SAVINGS DEPOSITS

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 17168, a bill to increase the amount by which individual savings deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The present limit stands at \$10,000. My bill would raise the amount to \$20,000, an amount more suited to the needs and demands of today.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting this legislation simply because the dictates of commonsense demand it. We remain in the midst of a period of continuing, unparalleled economic growth. Our financial institutions have become stronger than ever through skillful guidance by able managers. They have earned our confidence. We need now to make an apt and timely expression of that confidence. Let our constituents know that the soundness of our Nation's financial institutions and the integrity and character of their management is not questioned by the Congress of the United States.

This legislation makes especially good sense in the context of the current crisis in homebuilding. By increasing the amount of protection afforded the individual saver, by bolstering public confidence in our long-term savings institu-

tions, people will be encouraged to save more, thus increasing the supply of money available to homeowners and homebuilders.

When the insurance ceiling was last raised in 1950 from \$5,000 to \$10,000, there was a measureable total increase in savings. An analysis of the distribution of savings accounts, particularly in savings and loan associations, shows that there is an artificial "bulge" at the \$10,000 level indicating that a great many savers deliberately limit their savings accounts to the insured amount. Leaders of the savings and loan industry estimate that if the ceiling were raised there would be \$1 billion to \$2 billion overall increase in savings and loan association accounts within a year aside from normal increases.

Moreover, this bill makes sense simply in terms of keeping up with our normal economic growth. The last time Congress raised the insurance ceiling was 1950. Since then the amount of real disposable income per person in terms of the value of the dollar in 1958 has increased from \$1,520 to \$2,277 in the second quarter of this year or an increase of 49.8 percent. The total amount of personal savings has gone from \$176.3 billion to \$402.3 billion in 1963 an increase of 128.2 percent. Since 1963 that amount has increased even further, but exact figures are not available. And our gross national product has increased in real terms by 81.3 percent from \$355.3 billion to \$644.2 billion in the second quarter of this year.

It is in our tradition to allow our institutions to grow with the times. It makes sense that if our people are going to grow economically and at the same time increase their potential to save more, we ought to allow for it.

The soundness of this legislation is beyond dispute. It represents a logical extension of one of the most successful programs the Congress has ever enacted. In 30 years of operation virtually the entire adult population as individuals and millions of businesses and farmers have enjoyed absolute protection of their deposits and savings to the extent of the insurance ceiling. As a result high confidence in our financial institutions has prevailed and financial transactions of all types have been conducted with greater safety, convenience, and speed.

What will this legislation cost? It will cost the individual saver nothing. It will cost the Government nothing. Premiums for the insurance are paid by the insured institutions themselves. Over the years that premium has been steadily reduced first from the original rate of one-fourth of 1 percent of the total accounts of the insured institution plus any creditor obligations it might have to one-eighth of 1 percent in 1935 and from there to one-twelfth of 1 percent in 1950. Additionally, because of almost negligible losses during the last 20 years of the program, the act establishing the FDIC was amended in 1960 to increase the rate of rebate of premiums to insured banks. Thus although insured banks pay a premium of one-twelfth of 1 percent of deposits, 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ of the Corporation's net assessment income is refunded back to them.

Moreover, the FDIC and the FSLIC both assure me that they are both well-equipped and financially able to handle this \$20,000 insurance ceiling.

Two years ago both corporations testified that a ceiling of \$25,000—\$5,000 higher than my bill proposes—was actually justified by projections of reserves in the foreseeable future. Studies by the FDIC indicate that by 1971 a projected ratio of the insurance fund to total deposits will be .96196 percent if the present \$10,000 limit is retained and would be .96185 at a \$25,000 limitation. This almost infinitesimal difference would be further decreased, of course, with only a \$20,000 limitation.

In short, Mr. Speaker, everything calls for passage of this bill and nothing that I can see argues seriously against it. When similar legislation was up for consideration a couple of years ago, it was contended that the ceiling should not be increased without also increasing regulatory controls over savings institutions. This year, the administration has come forward with proposals for increased controls which are being considered, as they should be, on their own merits in a separate bill, the Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966. That bill passed the Senate yesterday.

It was also suggested 2 years ago that the need to increase the ceiling had not been demonstrated and that the increase in the number of insured accounts would be so small as to hardly justify passing a bill.

Today, the need is clear. Our housing industry which relies so heavily upon the saving institutions which finance homebuilding and home buying is in a state of crisis. It is cut off from its normal sources of finance by a dam of tight money as the members of this body well know.

We should not quibble over how many more accounts the program would cover if the ceiling were raised today. The point is that we should do everything possible to encourage savings. We can do this best by increasing protection for the individual saver. We can do it cheaply at no cost to either the individual saver or to the Government. This is clearly the time to act, Mr. Speaker. I note in passing that the last time we increased the ceiling was in 1950, 15 years after the last increase. At that rate, we are now 1 year overdue. My hope is that this oversight will be remedied by speedy action first by the House Banking and Currency Committee and then by this body. This legislation will benefit everyone—the individual saver, the savings institutions themselves, the homebuyer, the homebuilder—and hurt no one. We have nothing to lose by this legislation and a great deal to gain by its speedy enactment into law.

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

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

employers, Union and New York State Employment Service in order to:

1. Develop an action program for local labor organizations in voluntary compliance with the State Law Against Discrimination and other labor laws designed to protect the rights of workers.

2. Develop a community project through which Chemung County's labor organizations can demonstrate labor's collective concern and cooperation in dealing constructively in a specific area with regard to non-discriminatory employment, training and union membership programs.

3. Suggest those programs, techniques and procedures in keeping with labor's own self-interest that will eliminate the aspect of apparent discrimination.

Finally, there is the Government Relations Committee. This committee will develop far reaching programs dealing with the City and County Governments, the Police Departments and the various Public School Systems. It will be suggested that this committee study Civil Service policies, to work toward the elimination of discrimination in these practices; to study City and County contracts to make certain contractors are fulfilling a non-discrimination policy and to recommend actions to implement a non-discriminatory policy. While law enforcement is properly the role of a police department, the responsibility of a County intergroup agency in cooperating with and aiding a police department in this task is of particular significance. Consequently, this Committee will make every effort to achieve close contact with the police departments. And finally, this committee will acquaint the Boards of Education and elementary and high school principals with the resources of the Commission itself, and will cooperate with public school officials on school-community relationships.

So much for the Commission and Committees.

We, here in attendance should realize that while the government agency on the local level must recognize that it has a distinctive role to play, you should be aware that it does not have the only role—each citizen has a role to play also. More than a law is needed to bring about the equality of treatment, the expansion of individual opportunity and the human dignity we seek for every citizen. Our Commission cannot over-emphasize the need for the continuing aid and cooperation of all citizens in going beyond the law to establish warm personal relationships based on mutual respect and dignity.

You have undoubtedly read in your local newspaper, that the Commission assisted the first person who filed a housing complaint at the Chemung County office to obtain an apartment which he desired.

I am sure that as their new neighbors become acquainted with this family they will learn to appreciate that differences of color are very extraneous to any judgment they might make as to their character and worth as individuals. The Commission has become aware that the complainant, at first, was subjected to vilification. This, in itself, was extremely regrettable, as I am sure that it did not reflect the true feelings of the community, but it was rather the expression of the warped viewpoint of a sick, lunatic fringe.

It is because there does exist in any community this fringe of fanaticism that the progressive people in the community must take steps to nullify and eliminate such expressions of hate before they contaminate the thinking of other people.

So what is our present need? The present need, therefore, is to rouse from the lethargic concept that time will take care of everything and that nothing needs to be done to assure that the voices of well-motivated people will be heard throughout the County.

We cannot afford the easy assumption that an integrated community will develop naturally as a matter of simple, evolutionary progress in the cultural history of Chemung County. It is highly necessary that those who have committed themselves to the advancement of equal opportunity and who have the social awareness of the need to provide human rights to all people be heard throughout Chemung County.

I deliberately avoided describing such persons as articulate because it is my conviction that all of us are fully articulate and all of us, if we take the time and effort, can get the message across. It is a sad commentary on the life of any community when the most vociferous are those who work toward anti-social and degrading goals, while persons who should know better are too often silent.

Therefore, it is necessary that we plan together—government, community leaders, religious leaders, labor, industry and all elements of the community in Chemung County so that there be no discrimination, no ghettos, no racial or religious enclaves, but that Chemung County become a model of vibrantly alive, progressive, socially-balanced and peaceful people in the years ahead.

To achieve this requires community planning at all levels. There must be in the minds and hearts of all people a realization that the equalities are truly inseparable. It is not enough for Chemung County to assure to its residents that they will have equal opportunity in the purchase or rental of a housing accommodation. There must be a similar assurance that all persons will have equal opportunity for employment and equal opportunity to enjoy the facilities of its places of public accommodation—restaurants, parks, barbershops and all places of amusement, recreation and cultural development.

For it is not enough to recognize the rights of a person to buy a home or rent an apartment unless there is equal recognition of his right to be gainfully employed. Having a home and employment, a person does not enjoy full equality unless his rights to the use of public accommodation is firmly established.

Human Rights are interrelated and interdependent. For freedom itself is indivisible. A person may not be one-quarter, one-half or three-quarters free. He is altogether free or he is not free at all.

You of Chemung County have an unusual—a golden—opportunity to project for the future as few communities have had in their growth period. With intelligent planning for the social, as well as the physical advancement of this community, Chemung County may well become a model of American life for many parts of the Nation. It needs only the vigilance of the people and the exercise of their morality and intelligence.

The Chemung County Commission on Human Relations is the command post for equal opportunity for all. Through the recently opened office at the Federation Building the people of this County will have full access to the utilization of the services and the experiences of the Commission.

Our County has traveled part of the way but still has a long way to go, but the revolution is underway and it is part of a revolution that has scored gain after gain in the past.

[From the Elmira (N.Y.) Star-Gazette, Aug. 16, 1966]

CHICAGO AND ELMIRA: A STUDY IN CONTRASTS

Two reports in yesterday's newspaper accented poles-apart approaches to a problem that's big today and likely to be bigger tomorrow.

Chicago provided another installment in the continuing story of Negro rights marchers being assaulted and insulted by white mobsters, some of whom were arrested in battles with police.

Elmira reported forthcoming appointment

of four major committees to work with the Chemung County Human Relations Commission in the important areas of housing, employment, public information and government relations.

The importance of these areas is indicated by the complaints of the Chicago marchers and the hostility with which the peaceful airing of their grievances is greeted by an admittedly small but intensely biased segment of Chicago's white population.

Searching studies of the Watts and other violent manifestations of Negro frustration have shown that no inconsiderable part has been played by communities' failure to strive for solutions to such problems as housing, employment, communication and government relations before the stage is set for violence.

In announcing plans to amplify the human relations commission's work through the four committees, Philip J. Davis, the commission's executive director, told the Elmira Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People that "with intelligent planning for the social as well as the physical advancement of this community, Chemung County may well become a model of American life for many parts of the nation."

Davis' statement can be made to come true if the people of the community not only recognize the problem that exists but move, through understanding and awareness of human rights, to achieve a solution.

As it takes two sides to make an argument, it takes two sides to avoid one—two sides willing to talk frankly and to act realistically.

This, and every other enlightened community, has a chance to avoid the costly and hurtful situation that has put Chicago into the headlines.

The way is not simple and certainly it is not easy.

But it is the honest way to recognize that all men have rights and to win respect for these rights.

UN Vietnam Pilfering, Graft Muzzled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the following report on the Vietnam AID program, by William C. Selover, writing in the Christian Science Monitor of August 8, 1966, is a sequel to his report which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 15, 1966:

VIETNAM PILFERING, GRAFT MUZZLED

(By William C. Selover)

WASHINGTON.—The black-market business in Vietnam is in serious trouble.

Pilfering of American aid shipments in Vietnamese ports is on the wane.

Undetected diversion of United States goods to the Viet Cong is no longer a simple matter.

And United States and Vietnamese businessmen in Saigon no longer are hauling in vast profits from a grossly artificial dollar-plaster exchange rate.

All this resulted because the State Department and the Department of Defense finally decided to tighten controls over the use of United States commercial and defense spending. And for the first time, the General Accounting Office is maintaining auditors on the scene to investigate persistent rumors of graft, collusion, and mismanagement.

The sincerity of these new controls shows up in sharply increasing action taken by the

August 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4455

Human Relations Progress in Chemung County, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, during this summer which has seen so much racial violence in northern communities, it is a pleasure to be able to report on advances which are being made in the field of equal opportunity and living conditions.

From March 1958 to June of this year I employed on my congressional staff Philip J. Davis of Elmira, N.Y. He began while an undergraduate at Howard University and served as a part-time file clerk. In the next year he also did part-time work for then-Representatives William H. Avery, of Kansas, and Jack Westland, of Washington. On his graduation from Howard and his entry into law studies at that university, he assumed a full-time position on my staff as a staff assistant, and held this post until his resignation in June to accept the post of executive director of the Council of Human Relations of Chemung County, N.Y., one of the four counties in my congressional district.

Earlier this month Mr. Davis made his first speech in his new position, addressing the Elmira, N.Y., branch of the NAACP. I include the text of his speech, and an editorial from the Elmira Star Gazette, commenting on it:

I feel deeply honored at being permitted to participate in your program today. I would hope that I am here representing the Chemung County Commission on Human Relations, charged with the responsibility for advancing human rights and human dignity. I speak to you, therefore, as one connected with a county agency which is beginning to learn its way in the difficult and complex area of human relations. I am representative also of a county government agency which does not possess enforcement powers but must rely on the processes of mediation and conciliation, reinforced by the power of whatever status and prestige the Commission and its members and staff are able to achieve in the community. Some of you may wonder just what is human relations—it's the art and science of human beings relating to each other. It allies one person with other people—in short, it's every day living with respect for your fellow man.

We are blessed today that laws have been enacted by the federal government, many states and municipalities, guaranteeing civil rights to all citizens. Laws are important! They place a fashionable cloak on efforts to eliminate discrimination.

The passage of civil rights laws, however, as Winston Churchill once said in another context, marks only "the end of the beginning." Unfortunately, stratification and discrimination based on color, creed and ethnic grouping have been embedded in our society, and for so long, that it vitally affects every area of the American way of life. The bars can be lowered completely at the hiring gate, but an employee's progress in the plant or factory can be seriously affected by his social club, his social status and his social acceptance.

When we are dealing with civil rights and human rights, it is entirely possible to obey the letter of the law and to violate its spirit

at every turn. The stirring challenge of our times, my friends, is how we transcend the latter and evoke the *spirit*.

We, of the Human Relations Commission have no simple answer. We have no easy answer.

Basically, we do believe that we can only move beyond the letter of the law if neighbors will help neighbors do so on the local level. The battle for civil rights in the future assuredly will be fought and won or lost in each individual community—in the city hall—in the county boards—in the courts—in the police department—in the schools—in the churches—in the factories—in the stores—in the homes—and yes, in the streets. If this be so, then the role of a human relations agency must become increasingly important as the struggle for human dignity is channeled more and more within the local areas. This is why we believe the momentum for the formation of these agencies will continue until virtually every community of any appreciable size will have its Human Rights Committee or its Human Relations Commission.

According to the U.S. Conference of Mayors a total of 264 of the 589 U.S. cities with populations of 30,000 or more have official community relations study organizations.

But establishing a human rights agency, just like enacting a civil rights law, is at best only a beginning step. Translating that agency into a viable instrument for change is the important task. The task of a human relations agency and its opportunities have never been greater.

In referring to the post civil war period, historian C. Van Woodward has written, "Just as the Negro gained his emancipation through a falling out between White men so did he lose his rights through a reconciliation with White men". Thus, indeed was the emancipation of the Negro aborted.

Now today, on behalf of the Human Relations Commission, I would like to call upon you to join with us in helping complete that emancipation and bring about another reconciliation. This time, a real reconciliation—that of Negroes and Whites and people of all nationalities who live within our land. But let me warn you that this task will not be easy.

Let us take a look at our local commission, thereby allowing you to gain a broader understanding of what we are and what we are attempting to do and how each one of you can better aid the cause.

The Chemung County Commission on Human Relations was created by the Chemung County Board of Supervisors and its very able Chairman, John C. Gridley, on October 14, 1963, and the members and the Chairman were appointed by the Board on January 13, 1964. The Commission was established in accordance with general enabling legislation enacted by New York State in 1963 with an overall purpose of fostering mutual respect and understanding among all racial, religious and nationality groups in the county.

The statutory duties and obligations of the Commission are:

1. Inquire into incidents of tension and conflict between racial groups and take action to alleviate the same.
2. Receive complaints of alleged discrimination, seek the assistance of the State Commission for Human Rights in cases within the State Commission's jurisdiction and to solve others through conference, conciliation and persuasion.
3. Conduct and recommend educational programs to open opportunities in all areas of community life and enlist all groups to help in such programs.
4. Hold conferences and other public meetings in the interest of constructive resolution of racial tensions and resulting prejudice and discrimination.

There are several different ways to interpret these obligations. Obviously, if a commission is charged with alleviating tension

and group conflict as well as preserving domestic peace and tranquility, it can do so by attempting to strengthen the status quo; by discouraging members of minority groups from moving into houses in areas where there is resistance to them; by keeping large employers satisfied by not challenging their right to employ Negroes only as maintenance workers or elevator operators; by trying to prevent street demonstrations through bringing pressure on the minority group rather than through attempting to remedy the unfair situation which has incited the demonstration. This, however, is not what we are in business to do.

Our purpose is promote amicable relations between racial and cultural groups, coordinate activities of private groups in this field and aid in enforcement of anti-discrimination laws.

At present there are 9 Commissioners and 2 paid staff persons, an Executive Director and Secretary.

The members are chosen usually because they are persons of status or because they have been in the forefront in the human rights struggle as protagonists or private organizations having a unique constituency and a special point of view. Suddenly the Commission members find themselves sitting around a table considering problems jointly instead of being placed at opposite ends as adversaries.

Instead of representing a particular group or cause, they must now represent all the people. This is not an easy or simple transition. It takes time and patience and wisdom to effect rapprochement—and understanding to overcome suspicion and antagonism.

The Commission is broken down into 4 standing committees. Briefly I shall try to give you some of the activities that each committee will be concerned with.

First, the Public Information Committee. This committee could be considered one of our "bread and butter" agency programs. The broad function of this committee is that of informing the larger community about problems and prospects in the area of human relations. This committee will take the form of speakers bureaus, forums, basic study courses in human relations and ongoing consultant services.

Next there is the Housing Committee. The Human Relations Commission believes that there must be full access to adequate housing for all residents of Chemung County regardless of race, creed or color, and that non-whites must have the opportunity to compete for adequate housing with full assurance that the deciding factors, rather than racial identity, will be those criteria that are uniformly applied to any white person who is desirous of renting or buying. To this end this committee will be concerned especially with relocation and Urban Renewal, code enforcement, real estate, rentals and implementation—which will be designed to further obtain compliance with housing regulations as defined by New York State Law and other law.

Next the Employment Committee. The Human Relations Commission believes that there must be full equality for opportunity for all persons in every aspect of employment in all of Chemung County. To this end this committee will be concerned with cultivating wider employment opportunities for both male and female; developing resources for training and employment opportunities; providing regular consultation services to employment personnel departments both public and private; identifying the under-employed and up-grading in present jobs; developing a more effective working relationship with organized labor; holding regular meeting with guidance counselors in public schools and initiating new training programs through existing institutions. In addition, consideration will be given to sponsoring a Human Relations Workshop involving local

August 23, 1966

provost marshal against United States military and civilian nationals involved in black marketing and currency violations.

Almost without publicity, case after case has been heard and disciplinary action taken to thwart illegal activity.

In a closed hearing before a congressional committee on Aug. 1, Thomas D. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense, revealed the extent of the action taken to date.

As of the end of June, cases against 92 persons in the military and 7 civilians had either been completed or were in process.

All cases against military personnel which had been completed resulted in some type of disciplinary action, he reported. And convictions against civilians resulted in the ejection of each individual from Vietnam and referral of his case to the Internal Revenue Service.

Little of the present diligence would have occurred—certainly, not so quickly—except for the persistent efforts of a congressional fact-finding committee which conducted an on-the-spot probe of United States operations in Vietnam this past May.

This is one congressional trip which may already be paying off in multimillion dollar savings to the American taxpayers.

STARTED IN JANUARY

The House subcommittee on government operations, under the careful chairmanship of Rep. JOHN E. MOSS (D) of California, began last January to investigate reports that the escalation of the war had not been followed by a corresponding increase in control procedures over government spending.

In closed hearings at that time, spokesmen for the Defense and State Departments argued that very little could be done under wartime circumstances. "Don't rock the boat," they said, in effect.

Finally, feeling that those responsible for the programs in Washington were unable to provide them with enough useful information, the committee decided hearings on the spot would be necessary.

What they turned up in May was shocking to most committee members.

Blackmarketing was rampant; profiteering rife; controls and audits nil. But already the story is changing.

Members of the subcommittee came back from Vietnam with some very specific proposals. And responsible officials apparently got the message.

The problem was summed up recently by Rep. DONALD RUMSFELD (R) of Illinois, a member of the subcommittee.

CONTROLS EFFECTIVE

He told his congressional colleagues: "There is no question that the relationship which existed when the United States had but a handful of advisers in South Vietnam is out of date at a time when there are 300,000 Americans in that country."

Members of the Moss subcommittee are reasonably satisfied with recent steps being taken to correct audit and control gaps in Vietnam. Still, they feel, there is much more that could be done, especially in the defense construction spending.

Independent reports received by the subcommittee from Vietnam indicate that already controls have produced a "definite effect" on the black market, that it is "really hurting."

Substitutes for American goods commonly found in the black market are beginning to appear. This is considered a sure sign that controls are working.

One example of a simple device for controlling products sold at post exchanges is the introduction of "women only" counters. Here only the authorized American service women and female civilian government personnel are allowed to purchase goods. No men can buy goods here.

This apparently has markedly cut down the injection of American cosmetics, per-

fumes, lingerie, etc., into the black market. These formerly filtered down through generous gifts from American servicemen to their Vietnamese girl friends.

This new procedure went into effect following the subcommittee inspection in May.

On June 1, new PX cards were issued, printed on watermarked paper and serially numbered to avoid counterfeiting.

On July 1, a new directive was issued which, in effect, reduced the civilian PX clientele by about 6,000.

A program of merchandise control was begun, designed to keep tabs on individuals who purchased 3 or more of an item at the PX.

Greater diligence is being exercised to protect movements of PX merchandise from port areas to the depots.

Mr. Moss testified that this has "practically eliminated the diversion of post exchange merchandise on a bulk basis into the black market."

He also reported that "pilferage from the depots has practically disappeared." Overall loss has been reduced, reportedly, to an acceptable 4 percent.

ECONOMY ASSISTED

These are examples of relatively simple control measures which have been put to work. Congressmen think these measures should have been in effect much earlier.

"This proves that you can have adequate controls over these matters in wartime," explained an informed congressional source. "Rather than hurting the war effort, it helps the economy."

The Agency for International Development (AID) program has also, since the May visit of the subcommittee delegation, initiated several other useful reforms.

The dollar-plaster rate on import transactions was reduced from an effective rate of 60 to the dollar to 118 to the dollar.

Rutherford M. Poats, AID director for the Far East, testified in closed hearings before the Moss subcommittee on July 18, that "the devaluation by doubling the plaster cost of foreign exchange also will result in an appreciable curtailment of opportunities for illegal reexportation of Commercial Import Program (CIP) commodities and reduce or eliminate the profit possibilities in such practices as over-invoicing."

Until this exchange reform, these practices apparently were common.

The devaluation resulted from extended negotiations with the Vietnamese Government.

IMPORTERS EXPANDED

Another result of these negotiations was the permission by the Vietnamese Government to allow new importers to enter the previously closed import community. Formerly, this privilege was limited to a few influential businessmen, who pulled in juicy profits.

Also, the Vietnamese Government has agreed to allow General Services Administration (GSA), the government housekeeper, to directly import seven bulk commodities. This, according to Mr. Poats "will preclude collusion between suppliers and importers." Formerly, the GSA was forced to purchase these needed materials from the Vietnamese importers. Mr. Poats hopes that AID can convince the Vietnamese Government that other bulk commodities should be allowed to be imported directly by GSA.

RUSE UNCOVERED

One of the most important innovations by AID was the recent establishment of an office of special assistant for commodity analysis, with a staff of four, in the Far East bureau of AID. Their function, according to Mr. Poats, is to identify "commodities which are particularly susceptible to diversion to the Viet Cong and to alert the mission of their expected arrival or to the need for special measures."

This could mean end-use auditing of the particular sensitive product.

The whole aim is to avoid a repeat of the earlier discovery that ten times the amount of silver nitrate that could possibly be used by that country went to Vietnam last year. Nobody noticed until too late. Presumably much of it was diverted to the Viet Cong, and broken down into silver and explosives.

FEW DEFENSE AUDITS

Still, end-use auditing of imported goods is done now only in these spectacularly sensitive cases. But, of course, even this was not done before the Moss committee began probing.

The General Accounting Office, an arm of Congress to help keep tabs on administration spending, completed a report on the Vietnam program and commended AID for its efforts. The report issued July 29, pointed out that "AID has taken aggressive action in recent months toward applying greater audit and review effort in significant program areas. For example, a special group has been established in Vietnam to give particular attention to strategic commodities; and action has been started to increase and upgrade the mission audit staff in Vietnam."

But the story is still far from glowing. Nobody is happy with the military construction picture.

To date there have been virtually no audits in a program which has spent half a billion dollars, and is expected to reach one billion soon.

The accounting-office report bore down most heavily on this.

Explaining the report in closed hearings of the Moss subcommittee on July 29, Elmer B. Staats, United States Comptroller General, told the congressmen: "Although there seems to be great potential for waste and extravagance in connection with military construction activities in Vietnam, including the diversion of supplies and material, agency review and audit of these activities has been minimal."

The picture so far is mixed, but the direction is, according to the congressmen who watch this closely, good.

"What we want now is to get the military audit activity in Vietnam going," explained an informed congressional source. "The Defense Department has done practically nothing in this field."

The visit to Vietnam by the Moss subcommittee represents a real turning point in this whole business.

This watchdog committee doesn't claim full credit for the action taken, just for speeding it along. Nevertheless, ever since his return from Vietnam, Chairman Moss has been banging away at the administration. His efforts are paying off. "He forced the administration to 'can' their arguments that nothing could be done," said a source close to the chairman.

The only question being asked is: Why did it take so long for the State Department and the Department of Defense to take the first few simple steps toward adequate controls?

A Mother's Poem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a touching poem entitled "My Son, A

August 23, 1966

Marine" which was sent to me by Mrs. Joyce Jimenez Essex, of Davenport, Iowa, in loving memory of her beloved son, Norbert, who was killed in action on June 15 while on a patrol with the 9th Marine G Company in Vietnam.

The author, the mother of Norbert, would like to share with each of you her poem:

MY SON, A MARINE

(Written by Mrs. Joyce Jimenez, the mother of Sgt. Norbert G. Simmons, Co. G 9th Marines)

Viet Nam is where my son died
When I heard the news
I cried and cried
My son was a Marine
outstanding and brave
Fought and died
for our country to save.
Not wanting to see
communist at our back door
So he kept re-enlistin'
more and more
His letters I received
showed him a human being
But at the end of each one
"Mom I'm a tough Marine.
Mom I'm also a man
so don't worry about me
I'm doing my job
to help keep you all free"

Now he is gone
from this world of sin
To make a new life
where in dreams I have been
Jesus was waiting
with an outstretched hand
Looked at my son and said
"You have obeyed my command"
He fell on his knees
before our Most High
with a backward look
and a last good-bye
And Jesus said
"My boy you are one,
who has come to me
with a job well done."

A Reminder of Our Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, in the August 21 issue of the New York Times, there appeared a very interesting article concerning Fort Griswold, located at Groton, Conn., in my congressional district. The fort is a stirring reminder of the brave role played by the militiamen of Connecticut during the American Revolution.

I am pleased to call this article to the attention of the House, because it illustrates the point that in our daily bustle we tend to overlook the fact that our cities and countryside contain numerous and fascinating historic sites telling of a proud past. Too often we put the family in the car and set off for a destination little more enlightening than the next hotdog stand.

I feel that it is not only a rewarding experience for citizens of all ages to visit our historic shrines, but by so doing parents may also fulfill the duty to instill in their children a knowledge and respect

for the history of their Nation. If this had been done more thoroughly in the recent past, we would today have a much better understanding and appreciation of our history by our younger generation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the article referred to above into the RECORD.

A TINY GARRISON THAT DEFIED BENEDICT ARNOLD

(By Bernard J. Malahan)

GROTON, CONN.—Every summer, thousands of visitors climb the steep hill to Fort Griswold State Park for a look at the historic stone and earth defense works. This fortification was the setting of a Revolutionary War battle in which the British commander was Benedict Arnold.

A year before, Arnold had been a commanding officer in General Washington's Colonial forces. But he fled to the British lines after being exposed as a traitor, and it was as a brigadier general in the British Army that he led the assault on Fort Griswold in 1781.

STRATEGIC LOCATION

The fort had been completed by Colonial militiamen in 1778 to help defend the strategic coastal area on the Thames River. Groton is situated directly across the river from New London, which during the Revolution served as a home port for the privateers that constantly harassed the British.

Benedict Arnold's raid on Fort Griswold took place in the closing months of the war. Its primary, although unrealized, objective was to divert General Washington, who was massing his forces at Chesapeake Bay for a siege of Yorktown.

With a fleet of more than 30 ships and a force of about 1,700 men, Arnold entered New London Harbor on the morning of Sept. 6, 1781. He formed his troops into two divisions. One of them, under his direct command, overcame the New London defenses and burned some 130 buildings before nightfall, destroying the town.

The other division, with approximately 900 men, fought its way up the heights in Groton to attack Fort Griswold. Defending this stronghold were about 160 men, including hastily summoned militiamen and a small garrison force.

Twice the British were repulsed. They had lost two of their ranking officers and 191 men, when, according to an eye-witness who recorded the details in his diary, "a luckless shot cut the halcyards" of the Fort Griswold flag. The British, believing the flag to have been struck by the defenders, rallied, charged again and gained entry to the fort.

Col. William Ledyard, commander of the Colonial troops, ordered his men to lay down their arms. A British officer approached Colonel Ledyard and asked, "Who commands this fort?" Ledyard replied, "I did, sir, but you do now," and, in the traditional ceremony of surrender, he handed over his sword. The British leader then thrust the blade through Ledyard's heart.

This touched off an unbelievably brutal massacre of the defenseless and exhausted Colonial troops. Eighty-four were killed, 40 suffered serious wounds and the rest were taken prisoner and horribly mistreated. The attack lasted only an hour.

In 1830, the State of Connecticut erected Groton Monument "in memory of the brave patriots who fell in the Battle of Fort Griswold near this spot." The monument is a stone obelisk that stands 135 feet high; it is 22 feet square at the base.

Inside this is an excellent place from which to view the expansive fort and the adjoining battery area, which was built in 1812.

HISTORIC REMINDERS

Gun emplacements looking down on the harbor, a powder house and a sturdy brick furnace used for heating cannon balls are all reminders of Fort Griswold's historic role.

At the foot of the monument is a small museum operated by the Daughters of the American Revolution. Here, Colonel Ledyard's sword is displayed, as are other items associated with Groton's and New London's eventful history.

The museum and monument are open from 2:30 to 5 P.M., Tuesdays through Saturdays. The fort itself is open daily.

Groton is in the eastern corner of the state, on Interstate Route 95. It is approximately 130 miles from New York City.

Political Realities and Educational Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 18, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, for many years now, the Federal Government has provided funds to support much basic and applied research at this Nation's educational institutions. We have reason to be proud of the achievements which the science community has made but we cannot afford to rest on our laurels. Science is a dynamic and constantly changing field of intellectual pursuit requiring our continuing confidence and support.

In the August 19 issue of Science magazine we are reminded of our duty to oversee the equitable and efficient distribution of research and development funds to our many advanced educational centers. We must be responsive to the existing political realities of the present and future and to the vast and complex educational needs which confront us. In doing so, it is important to note that the same Russian scientists who shocked us into a massive buildup of our scientific forces in the 1950's are still deeply involved in the development of their country's resources. There is no doubt that they will be followed by men of superior knowledge and training. This is not the time to relax our vigilance.

I would like to bring to the attention of Congress the following editorial:

POLITICAL REALITIES AND EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

In September 1965 President Johnson issued an executive order aimed at achieving more even distribution of research funds. Change, however, has been slow. There has been little alteration in the situation outlined by Representative GREEN of Oregon in 1962: a few states and a few institutions get most of the money. Congressional impatience is increasing. This was evident in recent hearings on geographical distribution, before a subcommittee on Government Operations headed by Senator HARRIS of Oklahoma (Science, 5 August 1966). In his examination of the President's Science Adviser, Senator HARRIS accused both Dr. Hornig and Dr. Haworth, of NSF, of being patronizing and condescending in their treatment of his committee and of giving Congress the runaround. The bitterness of Senator HARRIS's attack seems excessive, but a look at the background makes his attitude more understandable.

Leaders of the Establishment have been slow to respond to important shifts in political attitudes arising from changing circumstances. Perhaps the most important is a revised evaluation of the Russians. During the 1950's Ivan was portrayed as a superhuman 12 feet tall. Following the 1962 Cu-