IOWA

Evelyn P. Lupkes, Kesley, Iowa, in place of F. D. Lursen, resigned.

Wallace L. Sheehy, Lawler, Iowa, in place of Florence Goss, retired.

Lawrence G. Phillips, Stratford, Iowa, in place of Hannah Nelson, retired.

KANSAS

Willena J. Martin, Chase, Kans., in place of D. L. Kirsch, removed.

Joseph F. Pendergast, Frankford, Kans., in place of R. C. Barrett, retired.

J. Ernestine Cannon, Latham, Kans., in place of M. D. Haring, retired.

Loyd L. Baughman, Longton, Kans., in place of F. G. Burford, retired.

Paul W. Wade, Mayfield, Kans., in place of J. I. Goodrum, retired.

Earl D. Medlen, Rantoul, Kans., in place of F. E. Betz, retired.

Robert A. Franken, Troy, Kans., in place of A. W. VanBebber, retired.

KENTUCKY

Bobbie T. Hunter, Providence, Ky., in place of T. C. Thomson, retired.

James P. Edwards, Russellville, Ky., in place of G. M. Beasley, deceased.

Doris K. Burns, Sanders, Ky., in place of M. V. Garvey, retired.

LOUISIANA

Roger Frere, Madisonville, La., in place of L. S. Behrens, resigned.

Henry L. Parham, Mangham, La., in place of A. C. Brunson, retired.

MARYLAND

Albert A. Phillips, Hampstead, Md., in place of E. M. Belt, retired.

Margaret A. Stotler, Hancock, Md., in place of M. L. Shives, retired.

Nicholas S. Price, Sparks, Md., in place of W. E. Ensor, deceased.

Thomas H. Wallace, Street, Md., in place of C. W. Glasgow, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Frank Zalot, Jr., Hadley, Mass., in place of R. H. Horton, deceased.

James I. Keyes, Sharon, Mass., in place of A. F. King, retired.

Lawrence B. Connelly, Sherborn, Mass., in place of J. C. Jackson, retired.

John J. Kelley, Jr., Truro, Mass., in place of M. E. Joseph, retired.

MICHIGAN

Kenneth G. Kienitz, Ithaca, Mich., in place of H. H. Alverson, retired.

Robert C. Clark, Lupton, Mich., in place of M. G. Cox, removed.

James M. Stubbert, Mason, Mich., in place of L. B. Palmer, deceased.

Theodore Russ, New Buffalo, Mich., in place of J. M. Littlejohn, resigned.

John L. May, Paris, Mich., in place of F. B. Munn, retired.

Donald F. Gillard, Spruce, Mich., in place of Velma Gillard, retired.

MINNESOTA

Michael C. Rooney, Benson, Minn., in place of W. G. Swanson, retired.

Marcellus J. Simonson, Wood Lake, Minn., in place of Joseph Trojohn, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

William E. Peets, Brookhaven, Miss., in place of A. M. Coker, retired.

M. Deaton McAuley, Byhalia, Miss., in place of E. E. Perry, retired.

Julian W. McLeod, Pascagoula, Miss., in place of A. V. Smith, retired.

Mattie C. Kyzar, Ruth, Miss., in place of C. C. Clark, retired.

MISSOURI

Emmet R. Carey, Brookfield, Mo., in place of G. F. Breen, retired.

Wilson S. Tally, Clinton, Mo., in place of W. B. Menefee, retired.

Robert F. Reddick, Crystal City, Mo., in place of A. A. Fults, deceased.

Janet K. Lewis, Des Arc, Mo., in place of N. A. King, retired.

Martha F. Mead, Harrisburg, Mo., in place of T. R. Long, retired.

Thomas G. Williams, Lathrop, Mo., in place of M. C. David, deceased.

Don O. Baker, Newburg, Mo., in place of Roy Southern, retired.

MONTANA

Nels O. Peterson, Nashua, Mont., in place of M. M. Baker, retired.

NEBRASKA

Roy E. Boham, Bassett, Nebr., in place of F. C. Diehl, deceased.

Ella E. Jackson, Crookston, Nebr., in place of G. J. Brown, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Raymond A. Saulnier, Whitefield, N.H., in place of M. A. Laughery, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Virginia A. Korbobo, Bloomsbury, N.J., in place of C. K. Sheets, resigned.

James Luciano, Florham Park, N.J., office established January 5, 1963.

Rudolph J. Kuchta, Linden, N.J., in place of C. F. Vanderwall, retired.

Clair J. Nenno, Riverside, N.J., in place of Herbert Schneider, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Howard Young, Bakersville, N.C., in place of J. F. Greene, resigned.

Paul E. Buck, Burnsville, N.C., in place of G. L. Hensley, retired.

Ann F. Watts, Germanton, N.C., in place of R. T. Beck, retired.

Annie B. Collins, Laurel Springs, N.C., in place of A. O. Clark, retired.

Elma P. Drew, Magnolia, N.C., in place of J. C. Chesnutt, transferred.

Mildred A. Crowder, Peachland, N.C., in place of J. R. Crowder, deceased.

James W. Jenkins, Pendleton, N.C., in place of R. W. Davis, retired.

Sybil M. Biconish, White Oak, N.C., in place of R. C. Johnson, retired.

OHIO

Miles S. Snyder, Jr., Brookfield, Ohio, in place of R. W. Steuart, retired.

Thomas R. Armstrong, Mendon, Ohio, in place of E. D. Severn, retired.

Thelma M. Schneider, Middle Bass, Ohio, in place of H. A. Heise, retired.

C. Thomas Sharp, Pleasant Plain, Ohio, in place of A. O. Sharp, retired.

OREGON

Mabel E. Pounds, Adrian, Oreg., in place of Glenwood Pounds, retired.

Max E. Gardner, Springfield, Oreg., in place of S. V. Ward, retired.

Lavonne H. Moe, Sweet Home, Oreg., in place of N. G. Haven, retired.

Elizabeth A. Barber, Ukiah, Oreg., in place of M. V. Arbuckle, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Walter G. Carney, Armagh, Pa., in place of R. O. Trexler, retired.

David E. Best, Callensburg, Pa., in place of E. P. Heeter, deceased.

John S. L. Halenar, Coatesville, Pa., in place of C. H. Conner, retired.

Paul B. Robinson, Concordville, Pa., in place of B. S. Robinson, retired.

Edwin V. Strohl, Hellertown, Pa., in place of T. K. Hagey, retired.

Herbert A. Hall, Lakewood, Pa., in place of C. G. Reynolds, retired.

Ernestine C. Buttorff, Millmont, Pa., in place of H. R. Sampsell, transferred.

Ralph S. Meyer, Pocopson, Pa., in place of D. L. Meyer, deceased.

George Novak, Sayre, Pa., in place of A. F. Vosburgh, retired.

Lloyd S. French, Starrucca, Pa., in place of H. S. Glover, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Douglas E. McTeer, Early Branch, S.C., in place of A. F. Foy, retired.

Farrell E. Rodgers, New Ellenton, S.C., office established November 1, 1963.

Milledge D. Penn, Ward, S.C., in place of M. S. Hallman, retired.

TENNESSEE

Joe F. Corlew, Bruceton, Tenn., in place of W. I. Easley, retired.

Mary B. Marlin, Christiana, Tenn., in place of M. I. O'Brien, retired.

TEXAS

Sam A. Kelley, Alvarado, Tex., in place of E. P. Robinson, retired.

Edwin Zajicek, Buckholts, Tex., in place of E. B. Hyer, retired.

Walter Kutzer, Comfort, Tex., in place of Arthur Bergmann, deceased.

Otis S. Bowers, Corpus Christi, Tex., in place of A. C. McGloin, retired.

Evaline W. Bartlett, Glen Flora, Tex., in place of L. A. Williams, resigned.

Leonard W. Pierce, Gordon, Tex., in place of Sue DeFord, retired.

Katherine B. Carter, Hawley, Tex., in place of Tommie Wood, retired.

Loralee J. Simmons, Magnolia, Tex., in place of Wilora Damuth, retired.

Charles E. Lindsey, Memphis, Tex., in place of J. H. Vallance, retired.

Sammie O. Smith, Telephone, Tex., in place of W. H. Castleberry, deceased.

VERMONT

Francis H. Eddy, East Wallingford, Vt., in place of N. E. Graves, retired.

VIRGINIA

E. Trigg Harrison, Chesapeake, Va., office established January 1, 1963.

Agnes M. Allen, Goshen, Va., in place of G. D. Condon, retired.

Norman J. Hogge, Hayes, Va., in place of L. B. Williams, retired.

Charles R. Jordan, Haymarket, Va., in place of R. C. Smith, retired.

Louise H. Miller, Topping, Va., in place of C. M. Revere, deceased.

Stuart M. Petke, West Point, Va., in place of J. F. Walsh, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Lottie G. Moore, Durbin, W. Va., in place of J. C. Gum, retired.

Charles G. Robison, Fairview, W. Va., in place of M. L. Michael, retired.

Glenn W. Hammer, Weston, W. Va., in place of Ross White, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Lawrence J. Vandehey, Auburndale, Wis., in place of T. J. Weiler, retired.

Vernon A. Plamann, Greenville, Wis., in place of R. C. Trauba, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted these words of the Psalmist: *Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him; and He shall bring it to pass.*

Let us pray.

Almighty God, may the legislation which is proposed and enacted by the Congress during this session redound to Thy glory and bring blessedness to our Republic and humanity everywhere.

Grant that the Members of this legislative body may be endowed with clear judgment and wise decision and always find their minds and hearts sustained

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

by the assurance that righteousness shall prevail.

Inspire them with that moral and spiritual stamina and courage which will never permit them to take a neutral or negative attitude toward life's loftiest principles.

We humbly and penitently acknowledge that we cannot achieve the fulfillment of the high aspirations which we cherish, unless we commit ourselves to Thy grace and guidance.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 28, 1965, was read and approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes;

S. 408. An act to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future natural disasters; and

S. 576. An act to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians and dentists.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 65–7.

JUSTICE FOR ALL CITIZENS IN WAR CLAIMS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to eliminate a grave injustice. In 1962 Congress passed Public Law 87–846 amending the War Claims Act of 1948 to authorize settlement of several classes of World War II claims which were not covered by the original law or its subsequent amendments. But that law provided for compensation of war claims only if the claimant and all predecessors in interest were nationals of the United States on the date of the loss. Those who fled the horrors of Nazi Germany to seek a refuge of freedom in this country were not entitled to recover for property lost in their native land if, as happened so often, the Nazis confiscated and destroyed the property before they could become U.S. citizens.

Pointing out the inherent discrimination in not compensating all citizens for their war claims, I offered an amendment when the bill was on the floor in 1962 to include those citizens who suffered losses and later became American citizens. Later I introduced a bill to accomplish this result.

Again today I am introducing a bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to allow the filing of claims by citizens of the United States who would be eligible to file for compensation under the present law except for the fact that they were not citizens at the time of their loss.

The present law creates in effect two classes of citizenship and constitutes an affront to our democratic principles. It says in effect that the United States owes a greater obligation to those who became citizens earlier than their fellow citizens.

This is a question of the obligation of the U.S. Government to its people and not a matter of international law. The assets from which war claims are paid are U.S. assets.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot tolerate two classes of citizens. Citizens by choice are entitled to equal treatment with citizens by birth.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to make an announcement.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, has advised that he will bring up, under unanimous consent, three bills reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on tomorrow, as follows:

H.R. 203, funds for research on diseases;

H.R. 214, repeal of mustering-out payments; and

H.R. 228, increased compensation for service-connected disabilities.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am advised that identical or very similar bills were reported in the 88th Congress and passed the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it my understanding that these bills have been reported out unanimously by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs?

Mr. ALBERT. That is the report that I have. They were reported out unanimously last year and passed the House unanimously last year.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so I may answer the question of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. These bills were passed out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs unanimously.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the majority leader.

BEN COLE

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in commendation of a fellow Hoosier who has just been elected to the congressional standing committee of correspondents.

Mr. Ben Cole is chief of the Washington bureau of the Indianapolis Star, the Muncie Star, and the Arizona Republic. He has been associated with the Indianapolis Star since 1944, serving as State house reporter and city editor. He has been chief of the Washington bureau since 1949.

Ben Cole is typical of those in the Capitol who help so much in keeping the public informed about Washington happenings. The standing committee of correspondents does an excellent job in facilitating the operation of reporters in the Capitol and it also polices their activities to see that everything is carried on with fairness and appropriate decorum. I know that Ben Cole will be a valuable addition to this group. I commend the correspondents on their wise selection.

I have known Ben Cole for many years. He represents the very finest in our great fourth estate. This honor could not have happened to a "finer feller."

It is also of note that the chairman of the committee is Mr. Robert N. Branson, a great reporter, who represents, among others, the Lafayette Journal and Courier and the Marion Chronicle, and Leader Tribune, other fine Hoosier newspapers.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to the fact that it was 30 years Friday that the gentleman from Indiana, CHARLES HALLECK, was sworn in as a Member of this body. Few men have contributed more to our country than has CHARLIE HALLECK. I hope he will be around for 30

years more to give new Members the benefit of his very fine advice.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, for yielding to me.

As I look back over these last 30 years, they have been quite something. As a matter of fact, after the 1936 elections I think we only had 88 Republicans in the House of Representatives. We are not quite that bad off now, but I well remember that for 4 years I was the lone Republican from Indiana. You people over there ought to cheer that. But it was kind of a desperate situation with us back there.

In any event, I want to add my word of commendation to these people from our area, particularly Bob Branson, who is chairman of the joint committee. He is a Michigander by birth, and represents newspapers up there. He also represents the Lafayette Journal and Courier in my district in Indiana, as well as the Idaho Statesman out in Boise.

He is one of the young, up-and-coming hardworking journalists. He works at his profession, he is proud of his profession, and he does a great job.

With reference to Ben Cole, who came from the Indianapolis Star, and who heads their bureau here, as the gentleman from Indiana has said for these many years, I welcomed him to Washington when he came here. He has been everything I had hoped he would be here. He is a topnotch reporter, and being a topnotch reporter, he is imaginative and witty and a great writer of features.

Bob and Ben have been fine in every respect. They have been fair in their objectiveness. These gentlemen, in my opinion, are a great credit to their profession.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 30, many of us sat before our television sets paying final tribute to Sir Winston Churchill, one of the greatest men in the world's history.

As we watched a barge carrying Sir Winston's casket depart from London Tower and make its way along the Thames to Waterloo Station, a familiar voice came through for the world to hear. It was the voice of our own beloved former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Although, as he said, he had no charter to speak for the American people, no person more deserved the honor; no person could have more truly represented the deep and personal feeling we, as Americans, have for Sir Winston Churchill.

Along with millions of other Americans I am proud that a man of Dwight D. Eisenhower's stature spoke for me, which indeed he did.

Former President Eisenhower's words of final tribute to Sir Winston Churchill well express the feelings of all Americans:

REMARKS BY GENERAL EISENHOWER

Upon the mighty Thames, a great avenue of history, move at this moment to their final resting place the mortal remains of Sir Winston Churchill. He was a great maker of history, but his work done, the record closed, we can almost hear him, with the poet, say:

"Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me.
Twilight and evening bell
And after that the dark.
And may there be no sadness of farewell
When I embark."

As I, like all other freemen, pause to pay a personal tribute to the giant who now passes from among us, I have no charter to speak for my countrymen—only for myself. But, if in memory, we journey back two decades to the time when American and Briton stood shoulder to shoulder in global conflict against tyranny, then I can presume—with propriety I think—to act as spokesman for the millions of Americans who served with me and with their British comrades during those 3 years of war on this sector of the earth.

CHURCHILL WAS BRITAIN

To those men, Winston Churchill was Britain—he was the embodiment of British defiance to threat, her courage in adversity, her calmness in danger, her moderation in success. Among the Allies his name was spoken with respect, admiration, and affection. Although they loved to chuckle at his foibles, they knew he was a stanch friend. They felt his inspirational leadership. They counted him a fighter in their ranks.

The loyalty that the fighting forces of many nations here serving gave to him during the war was no less strong, nor less freely given, than he had, in such full measure, from his own countrymen.

An American, I was one of those allies. During those dramatic months, I was privileged to meet, to talk, to plan and to work with him for common goals.

Out of that association an abiding—and to me precious—friendship was forged; it withstood the trials and frictions inescapable among men of strong convictions, living in the atmosphere of war.

VICTORIES AND DEFEATS

The war ended, our friendship flowered in the later and more subtle tests imposed by international politics. Then, each of us, holding high official post in his own nation, strove together so to concert the strength of our two peoples that liberty might be preserved among men and the security of the free world wholly sustained.

Through a career during which personal victories alternated with defeats, glittering praise with bitter criticism, intense public activity with periods of semiretirement, Winston Churchill lived out his 4 score and 10 years.

With no thought of the length of the time he might be permitted on earth, he was concerned only with the quality of the service he could render to his nation and to humanity. Though he had no fear of death, he coveted always the opportunity to continue that service.

At this moment, as our hearts stand at attention, we say our affectionate, though sad, goodby to the leader to whom the entire body of freemen owe so much.

CHAMPION OF FREEDOM

In the coming years, many in countless words will strive to interpret the motives, describe the accomplishments, and extol the virtues of Winston Churchill—soldier, statesman, and citizen that two great countries were proud to claim as their own. Among all the things so written or spoken, there will ring out through all the centuries one incontestable refrain:

He was a champion of freedom.

May God grant that we—and the generations who will remember him—heed the lessons he taught us; in his deed; in his words; in his life.

May we carry on his work until no nation lies in captivity; no man is denied opportunity for fulfillment.

And now to you, Sir Winston—my old friend—farewell.

HAS THE PRESIDENTIAL OATH BEEN CHANGED?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, when the oath of office was administered to the President on January 20, there was a departure from the form prescribed by the Constitution. Both the Chief Justice and the President referred to "the office of the Presidency of the United States" whereas the Constitution directs that the President-elect swear to faithfully execute "the office of the President of the United States."

This alteration I supposed to be an inadvertence. A respected columnist, David Lawrence, now suggests the change was deliberate. He writes:

After all, it seems unlikely that members of the Supreme Court would ever countenance for one moment the idea that anything a Chief Justice said in reading the Constitution could possibly be due to a misprint or be a misreading of the text.

The phrase "the office of the Presidency" connotes an establishment, broader, more encompassing than the original constitutional form. Mr. Lawrence hints the change in language was part of the "modernizing" which the present Court engages insofar as the Constitution is concerned—amendment by interpretation rather than by the people in the prescribed way.

If this was a deliberate and not an inadvertent change, and if it is acquiesced in as inconsequential, here is a precedent for further judicial change in the form of the oath. If the Court may control the form of the oath, may it not also dictate its substance? If so, might not the Court in the end prescribe the conditions under which the President assumes his office? It truly appears the Court is setting itself above the Constitution.

CLOSURE OF VETERANS HOSPITALS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of New Mexico, at the end of my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of this body once again the cruel and heartless act of closing veterans hospitals throughout this Nation.

Economy certainly cannot be used to justify these closings when you examine the new budget and find $260 million included for the implementation of the Hill-Burton Act to build new hospitals. Over $20 million has been asked to build new hospitals for the military—and the whereabouts of these new hospitals is still a secret. Funds have even been requested to build new veterans hospitals and an item of $61 million has been included for the operation of public health hospitals. Also, over $66 million is in the budget for hospital health service under the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

When we have such a shortage of hospitals and hospital beds, it seems ridiculous to me to even think of closing these vitally needed hospitals.

I might add that the Fort Bayard Veterans Hospital in New Mexico has been in use serving the people of that area for over 100 years and is still desperately needed.

I once again hope that the great and distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and the chairman of the Hospital Subcommittee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of this House, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], will give the Members of the Congress and the people a chance to be heard with regard to this cruel action.

Mr. Speaker, the letter to which I referred earlier is as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, DEPARTMENT OF NEW MEXICO,

Alburquerque, N. Mex., January 22, 1965.

Hon. THOMAS G. MORRIS,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRIS: I have delayed correspondence with you on two subjects.

1. A vital concern in this State is the Administrator's announcement of the closure of Fort Bayard Veterans' Administration Hospital.

TOM, according to statistics released by the Veterans' Administration, Fort Bayard hospital had 215 operating beds; and on November 30, 1964, had an ADPL of 156. It has been announced that the hospitals involved were considered marginal hospitals, and that transportation and staffing problems existed in this hospital. I know of no staffing problems in the Fort Bayard hospital; as I saw a recent publication from the hospital that they had hired just recently a Dr. Wilson, former professor of medicine at the University of Minnesota and Wisconsin. To hire a man of this caliber does not appear to me to be a basis for stating difficulty in finding doctors to go to Fort Bayard.

As you already know, Fort Bayard covers two-thirds of the southern part of New Mexico, the western part of Texas, and the eastern part of Arizona. The over 36,000 veterans in El Paso, Tex., and its surrounding area rely on the facilities at Fort Bayard for treatment. It has already been experienced that those servicemen retiring in El Paso area and Albuquerque-Roswell areas are having to seek hospitalization in VA facilities because of what we understand is insufficient facilities in service hospitals.

The closure of Fort Bayard Veterans' Administration Hospital is going to deny many many World War I veterans who have service connection for pulmonary diseases; and who moved to the area shortly after World War I; and who are requiring to have more and more treatment for residual pulmonary diseases. It would appear impossible to get a seriously disabled veteran into a VA facility, such as here in Albuquerque, from the Fort Bayard area if an emergency arises because of being over 250 miles away from the nearest Veterans' Administration facility.

The transportation costs and the cost of emergency hospitalization in a hospital in the Silver City area will have a great effect on the budget allocated for the Veterans' Administration in this State. I cannot understand how this can be termed any improvement toward service to service-connected disabled veterans; and those veterans eligible for treatment in a Veterans' Administration facility.

The department commanders of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and Disabled American Veterans have met in Albuquerque and they on behalf of the combined membership of these organizations also vigorously protest the closing of the Fort Bayard Veterans' Administration Hospital.

I have heard that since the announcement January 12, 1965, of the closing of Fort Bayard, that a veteran traveling through the southern part of the State required emergency hospitalization. Because the hospital had been told to close operations, they were unable to admit this veteran even on an emergency basis.

It has already been established that numerous veterans and families travel across the Southwest; and emergencies have arisen which require emergency hospitalization; as the veteran under the law is entitled to make application for hospitalization and our existing facilities are overtaxed. It is difficult to understand why such an action was taken.

I might further state that every existing non-VA hospital in the State of New Mexico are already overloaded with patients, and inadequate facilities to take care of those patients. Even beds in hallways has not kept up with the growing population of this State.

Many, many people cannot afford the high cost of hospitalization; and many do not have the income to purchase any type of hospital protection; therefore, the veteran population, we believe, should be given due consideration as a veteran toward adequate treatment in VA facilities in this State.

Tom, you already know that our hospital in Albuquerque is experiencing extreme difficulty in attempting to stay within an allocated budget. You already know the city of Albuquerque alone has been forecast to increase its population from approximately one-fourth million to 700,000 by 1970 or thereabouts. The facility that we have at this time will not in any way take care of the veteran population coming in by that time.

By the same token, the facility in the next 2 years, at the rate of the increase of seriously disabled veterans in this area must—and I emphasize this—result in more funds to adequately operate our hospital. I am sure that the Congress has attempted to appropriate adequate funds to the Departments of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration to adequately support the hospital program.

Nevertheless, I don't believe that those responsible for allocating funds understand the situation that this hospital in Albuquerque was facing prior to the notice of the reduction in force that was instigated at our hospital because of budget allocations. We have had as many as 404 to 405 patients needing treatment in the hospital. Prior to January 12, 1965, because of the budget problems, a ceiling of 470 average daily patients was set up for this hospital. Since this time, because of seriously disabled veterans applying for admittance, the admission has gone up as high as 495 patients. Surely these veterans who are in need of emergent treatment or are service connected must be taken care of. Therefore, it appears to me inconceivable that this hospital will be able to operate within its budget unless everything is cut to the bone.

I have been advised as of this date that this hospital is down to 458 patients with the anticipation of approximately 50 patients being transferred in from Fort Bayard Hospital. Adding this together leaves me with a figure of 510 patients. At the same time, the waiting list is approximately 200 already.

Since the cutback some time ago and with the reduction in personnel and staff at the hospital, I do not understand how adequate summaries and reports can be handled with the already short staffed personnel to properly adjudicate cases for benefits to which veterans in the State are entitled. I can only say we have a delay in summaries. This delay will be greater than ever before.

In conclusion, Tom, all I can say is that I strongly support the department commanders and the organizations in the protest in keeping Fort Bayard open to care for the sick and disabled veterans of the southern part of the State of New Mexico.

Yours very truly,

JOHN R. KLOTZBACH,
Department Service Officer.

DO WE REALLY WANT EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days I have heard many voices raised both here and in the other body in criticism of the Veterans' Administration and Mr. William J. Driver, its most able Administrator, as a result of the VA's plan to streamline its operations and to effect economies in its field structure.

Much of this criticism is unjust and is based on unsound or inaccurate information, and some of it must be placed in the category of "economy is fine but don't practice it in my State or district."

I wish to address myself to two basic points: First, my own experience with recent VA consolidations which I have closely observed and, secondly, to the matter of the qualifications of Mr. William J. Driver, whose confirmation as VA Administrator is now pending before the Senate.

The past decade has seen many changes in all programs of the Veterans' Administration. Many of the benefit programs established to assist veterans in readjusting to civilian life are phasing out and will terminate in the not too distant future. Indeed, some have already done so; and, as is to be expected, participation in many of these programs has dropped sharply. In the medical programs, there have been significant breakthroughs in medical science which have greatly altered the type and nature of medical care and the facilities necessary for providing such care.

In order to adjust to these changing conditions and in furtherance of the

administration's policy of reducing unnecessary Government spending, the Veterans' Administration plans to streamline its operations and make adjustments and consolidations in its field structure. These changes will provide for continued high quality service to veterans and savings to taxpayers in administrative and/or overhead cost amounting to some $23,500,000 in fiscal year 1966.

I have firsthand knowledge of the benefits realized by the consolidation of two VA regional offices, which are typical of the purposes of the present plans of the VA; namely, to streamline operations and reduce costs. In December 1963 the VA regional office in Waco, Tex., was the receiving station in a merger with the VA regional office of Dallas. I am reliably informed that this was one of the most successful consolidations of its kind ever undertaken by the VA and the experience gained in this consolidation has been invaluable in formulating VA's current plans. I have solicited all the information available on the achievements and savings realized in this highly successful consolidation of offices. They are of such magnitude that I feel they should be placed in the RECORD:

First, salary savings: This consolidation resulted in annual payroll savings exceeding $360,000, excluding savings in fringe benefits costs. This consolidation resulted in a savings of 45 positions. The combined average employment in the Dallas and Waco offices in July 1963, 6 months prior to consolidation, totaled 385. By June 1964, 6 months after consolidation, the average employment had been reduced to 340 employees.

Second, space savings: Prior to consolidation, the two offices occupied a total of 81,920 square feet costing $355,700. The present space occupied by the combined office is 71,657 square feet with an annual rental of $171,685. Net savings to the Government in rental cost is $184,000 annually and a reduction in space of 10,263 square feet. The General Accounting Office report to the Congress of the United States on this consolidation estimated annual savings in lease cost as about $69,000. The actual results are 2½ times as good as the estimate.

Third, performance: It was, of course, uppermost in the minds of the responsible officials of the Veterans' Administration that service to veterans and their beneficiaries not be diminished. My information leads me to the conclusion that in reality service rendered by the combined regional office at Waco has, in fact, improved over that previously rendered by the separate offices in that—

(a) Based on 100 percent as the highest attainable score, the Waco office is presently assigned a 95-percent ranking in the performance index system used in measuring the efficiency of all regional offices. This compares with a preconsolidation ranking of 90.11 in Waco and 90.34 in Dallas. The Waco office now ranks among the top 5 of 66 regional offices of this Nation;

(b) The Veterans' Administration uses productivity as an important measure in the proper utilization of its employees. The productivity of the two offices during the 12 months immediately preceding the consolidation was 77 percentile. In the 12 months immediately following consolidation the Waco office productivity had increased to 83 percentile, an increase of 6 points or a percentage increase of 9.3 percent;

(c) In December 1964, the manager of the Waco regional office was presented a Presidential citation "in special recognition of an outstanding contribution of greater economy in Government in the field of personnel management." Only two such awards were made to VA regional offices; and

(d) The timeliness of processing in the consolidated office at Waco has shown considerable improvement resulting in more expeditious service to veterans, an increase in productivity and an increase in the quality index measurement system used by the VA central office. Remember too that this was all done with 45 fewer people.

Fourth, employee morale: Several morale indicators are of particular significance in the Waco office and include the following:

(a) Every permanent employee of the Waco office participates in the U.S. Savings Bond payroll deduction program;

(b) Every employee participated in the Kennedy library fund;

(c) There was 100 percent participation in the Greater Waco United Fund Campaign, leading all Federal agencies in the area;

(d) Employee attitude surveys under conditions where employees' answers were anonymous and secret unto themselves reveal that 95 percent of all questions were favorably answered evoking the following evaluation: "Overall management-employee relations indicating high morale"; and

(e) There were no appeals from employees from personnel actions taken as a result of consolidation.

Fifth, management: The General Accounting Office report No. B-152355, dated November 29, 1963, which is a report on the proposed move of the VA regional office from Dallas, Tex., to Waco, Tex., contains a statement on page 21 as follows:

> Effective management will play a significant role in the overall effectiveness of the consolidated office.

As we look back from the time of consolidation of these offices to the present, this is a particularly meaningful observation since every measure of the effectiveness of management and efficiency applied by the VA central office to its 66 regional offices reflects that the management of the combined office at Waco, Tex., is operating in a highly efficient manner. The Waco office is providing the highest type service to veterans and their beneficiaries not only with significant savings each year but with many compliments on the part of those being served, giving thanks and words of appreciation for the manner in which they were treated and the attention their individual cases received. Some representative comments from Congressmen, businessmen, organizations, and individual beneficiaries are as follows:

> My husband and I sent a registered letter to Governor Connally commending your interest and special kindness.

> Thank you for your good service that always comes from your office.

> I thank the entire staff of the Veterans' Administration of Waco for courteous treatment.

> I appreciate your tireless efforts and enthusiasm during the United Fund Campaign.

> Sincerest gratitude for time and effort you spent in my behalf.

Mr. Speaker, the Waco office is alert to any complaint concerning its service and there is no record of receipt of a complaint attributable to the consolidation of the two offices. A contingent of those activities of the Waco regional office having direct contact with the veteran public is physically located in the VA office at Dallas to perform this direct service. As Congressman, I have not received one complaint alleging that this consolidation has made it any more difficult for any veteran to make a needed contact with the Veterans' Administration

Sixth. In summary I wish to point out that an annual savings exceeding $544,000 has been realized by this consolidation. The Waco office is performing at a high level of efficiency by every standard of measurement applied by the Veterans' Administration. The pending workloads in the Waco office were brought to a manageable level immediately after consolidation and have continued well within established tolerances. Employee morale is excellent. Service to veterans in the Waco regional office territory is rendered efficiently and expeditiously.

I would like for the record to show the names of the responsible officials of the VA regional office at Waco who along with their dedicated staff have played such an important role in the success of that office: Glyndon M. Hague, manager; G. J. Coker, assistant manager; Wooten D. Simpson, personnel officer; O. D. Goodwin, management analysis officer; Thomas E. Ball, chief attorney; Paul F. Barnett, finance officer; J. Paul Board, chief outpatient clinic; W. H. Moore, contact officer; Bryan W. Ready, loan guaranty officer; and L. A. Townsend, adjudication officer.

I submit that this consolidation has proven to be in the interest not only of economy but also of efficiency and service to the veterans. I see no reason to feel that the pending consolidations will not have a similar result.

And now to my second point, the qualifications of Mr. William J. Driver to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Driver is the first career Federal employee to be appointed to that position. He has been with the Veterans' Administration since February 1946, with the exception of 2 years during the Korean conflict when he returned to active military service.

He served in the Contact and Administrative Services, the Compensation and

Pension Service, and then later directed the entire benefits program as Chief Benefits Director before becoming Deputy Administrator. Mr. Driver brings to his new assignment a more thorough understanding of the VA program than any of his post-World War II predecessors.

He holds the Veterans' Administration's two highest awards, the Exceptional Service Medal and the Meritorious Service Medal. In 1964, he attained national prominence when he was awarded the Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League.

His wartime service brought him other awards. He served during World War II as a commissioned officer with Headquarters, Adjutant General, European Theater of Operations, from 1942 until his separation from active duty in 1946. His military decorations include recognition from Great Britain and France as well as the United States. He holds the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, the Order of the British Empire, and the Croix de Guerre.

During the Korean conflict he served with the office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, U.S. Army. He returned to the VA in August 1953.

Mr. Driver came with the VA in February 1946 as special assistant to the Assistant Administrator for Contact and Administrative Service. He later served as Director of the Records Management Service; Director of the Planning and Field Supervision Service, and special representative to the Assistant Administrator, all in the Contact and Administrative Services.

It was during this period that he attended law school at George Washington University at night and earned his LL. B. degree in 1952. He was admitted to the bar in the District of Columbia that same year.

Following his Korean conflict service, he became staff assistant to the Chief Benefits Director, and in February 1956 he was named Director, Compensation and Pension Service, an office responsible for the disbursement annually of approximately $3.5 billion in benefit payments to more than 3 million veterans or their dependents.

In January 1958 he became Acting Chief Benefits Director, and in February 1959, he was named to the post of Chief Benefits Director. He was named Deputy Administrator, second in command of the VA, in February 1961.

Mr. Driver was born May 9, 1918, in Rochester, N.Y., and received his high school education in that city. He underwrote his college education at Niagara University by employment with a Rochester insurance firm and received his degree in business administration, cum laude, from Niagara in 1941.

He married the former Marian McKay, the daughter of professor emeritus of economics, Marion K. McKay, of the University of Pittsburgh, where Professor McKay is also chairman of the civil service commission.

The Drivers have two sons, Joe, 13, and Kellie, 9, and make their home in Falls Church, Va.

Mr. Driver has been principally responsible for many of the important achievements that have occurred in the Veterans' Administration in recent years. These include:

The veterans pension law, Public Law 86–211, which is more equitable to veterans and taxpayers;

The work measurement and performance standards program which provides knowledge essential in improving operations and the quality of service;

Effective planning, not only to anticipate and meet organizational problems, such as declining workloads in certain areas, but also to improve organizational effectiveness as such; and

The large-scale application of automatic data processing and the establishment of a new department of data management to provide a completely coordinated agencywide approach which will enable VA to realize more fully the potentials of ADP personnel skills and equipment.

Mr. Speaker, seldom is the best qualified man in the Nation appointed to head a great agency of the Federal Government. The appointment of Mr. Driver to head the Veterans' Administration is one of those rare instances where, truly, the best qualified man in America has been appointed to that important position. I know that my colleagues who have been privileged to deal with Mr. Driver over the past years in veterans affairs join me in praising the remarkable abilities and outstanding leadership qualities of this man. I know that this view of Mr. Driver is shared by my esteemed colleague and friend, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE.

It is my earnest hope that the Senate will speedily confirm the President's nomination of Mr. Driver as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

PENNSBORO'S RINEHART

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the keys to the success of any Federal program is local initiative. The most enduring form of progress is achieved through citizens at the grassroots working together, sparked by local leadership. Such leadership has been effectively provided in the town of Pennsboro, W. Va., by Mayor J. Carl Rinehart.

Built on a hillside in rugged Ritchie County, Pennsboro has a population of about 2,000. In recent years, people were leaving Ritchie County because jobs just were not available. The young people were moving out just as soon as they had finished school—and many before they finished. That was before a remarkable bundle of energy, enthusiasm, and imagination, Mayor Rinehart, began to stir Pennsboro to cooperative action.

First, he started a community building program, and coaxed and prodded everybody to pitching in with their own hands and tools to build a firehouse, a community hall and gymnasium, and a medical building. Then he burned up the telephone wires and traveled to many different States at his own expense to stir the interest of small industries to move to Pennsboro. With the help of local capital, he induced the town fathers to build and remodel on industrial sites as a lure for small business to set up shop in Pennsboro. And it worked, too, as a new garment factory and several other new plants started operations in Pennsboro.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE HELPS

The remarkable story of achievement in the development of the Bond's Creek watershed project is another bright chapter in Pennsboro's progress. The U.S. Soil Conservation Service, working with the local and county people, developed a flood control and recreation project which annually attracts many visitors to Pennsboro to enjoy the fishing and hunting around the lake.

Mr. Speaker, the lessons to be learned from Pennsboro's experience can be applied anywhere in the United States. Mayor Rinehart has shown what local leadership and cooperation can do. His record was so remarkable that it has attracted attention in Canada, as indicated in the following editorial and article which appeared in the November 19, 1964, issue of Family Herald, Canada's national farm magazine:

DON'T LEAVE IT FOR GEORGE

Many of our communities are divided into many little cliques, each with its own goals and often cut off completely from other groups. In other communities several groups may lean heavily on the same people for support and direction. Either way, keeping an organization alive is often such a task that little energy is left for achievement. Often, loyalty may be the only reason for continuing membership. When this is so, loyalty might be more usefully employed in other ways, such as promoting the welfare of the whole community.

In few places do we need to look very far to see something that needs to be done. What amenities are there for old folks? What is there to channel young people's energies into creative lines instead of frustration and destruction? How could jobs be provided locally so that, when there are more people on a farm than it can rightly support, they can find suitable employment without leaving the home community? What can be done to wipe out eyesores and to make the most of beauty spots?

A single group may be able to do little to provide practical answers to these questions. But with the ideas and energies of several groups rolled together, some excellent solutions may be found, and it may be possible to accomplish far more than anyone has dreamed possible.

Of course, someone has to start the ball rolling, and as long as everybody is willing to leave that distinction to someone else, nothing will be done. Whose responsibility is it to get things moving? That question can be debated at great length, without settling anything.

What is the answer, then? It is so simple that it can easily be overlooked. The easiest answer is that nobody should wait for anyone else to start the ball rolling. In fact, we should not worry about what other people are doing or not doing; but when we see something that really needs doing, do what we can ourselves. Then, inspired by our example, other people are likely to pitch in.

That is the sort of thing that has happened in Pennsboro, W. Va., as described on page

19. Why? Because Pennsboro has a mayor who is not afraid of putting effort into things, and who does not wait for other people to start before he will do anything. Like people anywhere, those in Pennsboro had to learn how to do things; and they would never have been able to organize the Bond's Creek flood control project if they had not amassed a lot of experience at working together, and gained a great deal of confidence in their ability to tackle large projects.

Most communities in this country have people quite as capable of working together as those in Pennsboro. Some of them have already accomplished a great deal through their joint efforts. For others, it is time to stop dwelling on differences and to start concentrating on getting at jobs that need to be done for the common good.

THE TOWN THAT TAMED A CREEK

(By J. S. Cram)

A friend says Mark Twain's remark about the weather applies equally to the common good—everybody talks about it but nobody ever does anything. After meeting certain people on my Appalachian trip, I don't believe this cynical remark.

One of them was J. Carl Rinehart, the mayor of Pennsboro, W. Va. "We do things for ourselves in Pennsboro," says Mayor Rinehart. It's true, too.

When something needs doing Pennsboro people don't hire somebody else to do it with tax money while they swap stories about the good old days when people did things for themselves. And they're not above helping out the friends and neighbors through working with them on community projects. They roll up their sleeves and go to work side by side, townsman and farmer. As a result, the townspeople understand something of farm problems; and when active help is needed, they're eager to give it.

Pennsboro has changed a lot since 1955. The city was on the skids then. Industries had closed down, businesses were going bankrupt, people were leaving the district because there was nothing left to do but get into trouble. The three-cell jail was full almost every night, and the town council seemed able to do nothing to improve things. Then Carl Rinehart ran for mayor as a reform candidate and was elected. Immediately he started the task of cleaning up the city and putting it back on the map. Stimulated by his enthusiasm and inspired by his example, the citizens, rich and poor, laborer and professional, young and old, went to work to rebuild their city. Donating materials and doing the work with their own hands they built things the community needed, such as a firehall, a community hall and gymnasium, a medical building to house two doctors and a dentist. The jail fell into disuse; nobody had time to get drunk and disorderly. Encouraged by offers of factory space rebuilt to suit particular needs, industries began to come in, expanding employment and teaching new skills: a glass works, a garment factory, a plant turning out playing marbles, a metal stamping plant for aluminum awnings.

By last summer population had reached 2,000, double what it was 8 years ago.

Town-county cooperation flowered in the project to tame Bond's Creek. This little stream usually appeared quite tractable; but after a heavy rainstorm it would swell to a fury and play havoc with farms for miles along its course before spilling its silt-laden waters into the Ohio River about 20 miles northwest of Pennsboro. In a 12-month period in 1957–58 the waters went on the rampage 13 times, flooding bottom land, depleting soil fertility, washing away recent applications of lime and fertilizer, carrying off hay, destroying fences and damaging farms and out-buildings. Bursting out of the shallow channel of Bond's Creek the floodwaters crept up into meadows, fields, and gardens, carrying a load of silt and sand torn from fields higher up the watershed. And when they receded they deposited much of this material, smothering crops and lowering the future productivity of the land. Not all of the sediment was left on farms. Some of it plugged the creek channel, slowing down the runoff so still more sediment was deposited and more water overflowed, striking a random course across the flood plain and scouring the bottom land.

DOUBLE-BARRELED CHANCE

The local grange, led by Harold F. Vincent of Highland, had been trying for some time to arouse general interest in controlling Bond's Creek. He found an ally in Mayor Rinehart, who served with him on the Ritchie County Redevelopment Committee. Although Bond's Creek flooding did not affect Pennsboro directly, some of its headwaters were in a city-owned park, and Mayor Rinehart saw a chance of a double-barreled effort—not only helping farmers, but providing recreation facilities where there are no natural lakes.

A preliminary flood control survey of the Bond's Creek area had already been made by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service under its small watershed project. It recommended putting in a dam high up in the Bond's Creek watershed, to slow the passage of floodwaters, and channel improvement below the dam, to permit surplus water to get away faster and reduce the chance of overflow. These engineering studies showed that although an improved stream channel and a dam would not solve all the farmers' flooding problem, most damage could be averted if individual farmers used approved practice to protect woodlands, improve pastures and meadows, reforest steep areas and improve management of cropland.

With this information before it and spurred on by the 1957–58 spate of floods the Little Kanawha Soil Conservation District, which is the regional operating authority in that part of West Virginia, considered going ahead with the project, but it seemed a lot for a few farmers to undertake. Then Mayor Rinehart put in his oar. The city of Pennsboro would cosponsor the project if it could be assured of a fair-sized lake for recreation.

Plans were reworked and it was found that to make a 12-acre lake would cost $92,000—$23,000 more than for a straight flood control structure. The U.S. Soil Conservation Service would pay half of this for flood control, and share the next 25 percent equally with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. That left another quarter of the total to be divided equally between the Fish and Wildlife Service and the city of Pennsboro—$11,500 each.

That was a lot of money for a city of 2,000 people to raise. Mayor Rinehart was thinking of the enjoyment people could get almost right away from boating and fishing on the lake, and of how the reservoir might also be useful as a municipal water supply when the city had outgrown its present one. But he didn't want to borrow money for the job if he could help it. So he had an engineering firm make an estimate of clearing and stabilization work that could be done by hand or with small equipment, and suggested that Pennsboro people would perform the work instead of paying for it.

"It can't be done like that—it never has," was the reaction of the Soil Conservation Service. But Mayor Rinehart finally convinced them that it could be done like that—and it was. Week after week the citizens of Pennsboro felled trees, grubbed roots, burned brush, and seeded slopes to grass. Finally the job was finished and approved in December 1962 and the city took over the cost of maintaining the reservoir—about $4,000 a year. That meant a continuing effort at money raising.

WHAT THE FARMERS DID

The farmers still had plenty of responsibility left to them. In March 1960 they set up the Bond's Creek Watershed Improvement District, to sponsor their end of the project. Its object was "meeting the requirements outlined by the Soil Conservation Service for establishing, repairing, and maintaining dams, adequate creek channels, and anti-erosion program in order to provide uniform drainage of Bond's Creek watershed, and thereby minimize damage to lands in said territory from floods and erosion."

Each farmer was required to sign an agreement to undertake improvement measures on his land, as listed in the box. After the 1957–58 floods, it wasn't hard to get their cooperation, as they realized that without this project they would soon be broke and their farms ruined. They also had to sign a trust agreement putting a lien on each farm for 50 years, to insure maintenance of the project; and to put up an emergency fund of $2,000 so critical work could be done when required. A good start toward the $2,000 was made by a $50 donation from each of the 2 dozen farmers whose land adjoined the creek. The balance was raised by fish fries, auctioning high-powered rifles, and raffling a pony—events supported by the whole community.

The Soil Conservation Service picked up the biggest tab. It paid for the materials and use of heavy equipment in making the dam and for the improvements to the stream channel—improvements which included widening, deepening, and straightening the creekbed where necessary, to contain the runoff from all but unusually heavy storms.

Now the dam has been built, the channel cleared, and the high-priority land measures undertaken, and farmers along Bond's Creek are getting used to living without a crisis every time there's a storm. With flooding under control and land management improved meadows are producing 2 or 3 tons of hay where previously farmers were lucky if they got one off. And hillside pastures are supporting several times as many animals as they did before—and doing it without overgrazing.

Pennsboro, with water assured for recreation and future growth, is forging ahead on improvements to its 375-acre park complete with picnic tables, fireplaces, and shelters. It's trying to coax more industries in to join those it already has. It wants to keep on expanding so that local boys and girls, even if they can't all stay on the farm, can make a living and enjoy life without leaving the old hometown.

HOW BOND'S CREEK WAS TAMED

These were the control measures agreed on by the local land treatment committee, the West Virginia Conservation Commission and the U.S. Forest Service.

Forest land: Owners of forest land in the watershed were required to undertake the following measures, with technical assistance provided by the U.S. Forest Service.

1. Tree planting: Artificial reforestation of 80 acres of appropriate open land, needed to adjust land use to meet the needs and to reduce runoff and erosion by developing a protective cover and an absorbent forest floor sponge of humus and litter. Under such conditions the soil is protected, infiltration rates improved, soil moisture and storage capacity increased and the land put to its best use.

2. Hydrologic cultural operations: On 350 acres tree management would be aimed at improving absorption of water by the soil through thinning, weeding, improvement, and harvest cutting of existing stands, to encourage growth of trees most suitable for the purpose.

3. Woodland grazing control: Installing 5 miles of fencing to protect 500 acres of woodland from grazing of livestock, thus

preventing damage to the land's water-absorbing ability.

4. Skid trail and logging road erosion control for 2 miles: Simple ditches with pole or earth diversions, known as water bars, would be installed at regular intervals to slow down and divert water so it wouldn't gully the trails. Some eroding areas need replanting to hold the soil in place.

5. Other technical services: Individual management plans were prepared for at least 30 forest landowners, outlining practices and measures to be applied in the immediate future to maintain and improve forest hydrologic conditions.

Open land: The following land treatment measures were to be established with technical help from the U.S. Soil Conservation Service:

1. Contour farming on 150 acres: Laying out sloping fields in contour strips, with terraces and diversion ditches where required, would make it possible to plow, plant, and cultivate them on the level instead of up and down the slope, thus improving their water-retaining ability.

2. Hay land planting on 500 acres: Establishing long-term stands of grasses and legumes would anchor the soil, provide good moisture-absorbing capacity, and put the land to its best use.

3. Pasture treatment on 100 acres: Lime and fertilizer would be applied in accordance with approved recommendations on pasturelands, to increase the amount of vegetation for the control of soil erosion and runoff as well as to provide better grazing.

4. Farm ponds in 20 places: Impounding water by constructing a dam across a watercourse or a natural basin, or by excavating a pit or dugout, would lessen the floodwaters reaching the creek and make supplies available to farmers.

5. Streambank planting: Establishing 500 rods of perennial vegetation on streambanks to hold ground in place and shelter wildlife.

Wildlife: Measures undertaken with technical help from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:

1. Hedgerow planting: A 500-rod hedgerow of trees and shrubs within, across, or around fields to shelter wildlife.

2. Wildlife food planting: Establishing 4 acres of perennial, biennial, or annual plants in fields, odd areas, or strips.

3. Wildlife area improvement: Establishing 30 acres of wildlife habitat by providing protective cover, food plants, and protection from grazing.

SELECTION OF A NEW VICE PRESIDENT WHEN A VACANCY OCCURS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, events of the last few years, and specifically the assassination of President Kennedy, have caused Americans to take a long second look at our legal structure providing for Presidential succession and the selection of a Vice President, if a vacancy in that Office occurs. Many of us have given serious thought to the need to fill this gap.

I have today introduced a bill calling for the selection of a new Vice President whenever a vacancy occurs in that office more than 30 days before the expiration of the term for which the Vice President was elected. I suggest that procedure for such selection should be for the person discharging the powers and duties of President to convene the Senate and the House of Representatives in joint session to select a person to act as Vice President.

The Speaker of the House shall preside over the joint session and a quorum of both Houses of Congress shall be present. The selection should be made by majority vote of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives present and voting, each Member having one vote. The person discharging the powers and duties of the President shall have the right to veto any selection so made within 3 days.

Should the President veto any selection, the joint session shall make another selection under the same procedure. If the selection is vetoed, that person shall not again be eligible for selection so long as the President is the same person who vetoed such selection.

No person constitutionally ineligible to the Office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President. Such a new Vice President would act until the end of the term for which the Vice President or Vice-President-elect whom he succeeds was elected.

GEN. CURTIS E. LEMAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, one of the greatest living soldiers of this century, will retire this afternoon as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force. The distinguished general's retirement ceremony will take place at Andrews Air Force Base.

The people of the United States, and indeed the people of the free world, owe General LeMay a great debt of gratitude. No one has been more vigilant in the defense of freedom in his native land and abroad than General LeMay. His outstanding career of active military service witnessed the growth of the U.S. Air Force into the most powerful military deterrent in the world. We must give to General LeMay the credit for building our air arm into a global shield against world Communist domination.

General LeMay's entire career has been distinguished by a high sense of patriotism and an untiring zeal to strengthen the defenses of the United States. Nearly every important event which has taken place in the Air Force during the past 35 years has borne the imprint of General LeMay. In peace and in war he has been the outstanding exponent of airpower and a balanced Military Establishment.

The general was born in Columbus, Ohio, on November 15, 1906. He secured his education in the public schools of Columbus and at Ohio State University, where he was graduated with a degree in civil engineering. In 1928 he began his military career as a flying cadet at Kelly Field, Tex. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Air Corps Reserve in 1929 and received his Regular commission in January of 1930.

General LeMay's entry into the military service was no accident. He had an early desire to enter military aviation. The Air Force has been the general's life.

His first assignment in the Air Force was with pursuit squadrons. In 1937 the general was assigned to the 2d Bomb Group at Langley Field, Va., where he came in contact with the Air Corps' first four-engine bomber. Thereafter, the name of General LeMay and the manned heavy bomber were to be inseparably linked.

Prior to World War II General LeMay did everything possible to demonstrate the superiority of the manned bomber in warfare. In 1938 he participated in the first mass flight of B–17 Flying Fortresses to South America. This flight won for his 2d Bomb Group the Mackay Trophy for outstanding aerial achievement.

Prior to the outbreak of war in 1941 the general surveyed and established new air routes over the South Atlantic to Africa and over the North Atlantic to England. These routes were to be invaluable during World War II in ferrying thousands of aircraft to Europe, the Middle East, and India, Burma, and China.

World War II offered General LeMay a broad stage upon which his many talents could be put to maximum use in the defense of his country. As a proficient celestial navigator, technical observer, combat observer, and command pilot, General LeMay was well prepared to meet the demands which were to be made upon him during the war years.

He took the 305th Bomb Group and its famed B–17's to England and joined the 8th Air Force. He developed bombing procedures which enabled the B–17's and their crews to reach maximum effectiveness with the least loss of life and property. Less than 1 year after LeMay reached Europe he was the youngest major general in the Air Force, commanding the 3d Bombardment Division. His famous raid against Regensburg with its vast destruction of German industrial power did much to hasten the end of World War II.

The general was transferred to the Pacific in 1944 when victory in Europe was rapidly becoming a reality. Always a heavy bomber man, the general took charge of the B–29 heavy bombardment activities of the 20th Bomber Command in the China-Burma-India theater. He was later to command the 21st Bomber Command with headquarters on Guam and to become Chief of Staff of the Strategic Air Forces in the Pacific.

When World War II ended, General LeMay returned to the United States in characteristic style. He piloted a super fortress on a nonstop record flight from Hokkaido, Japan, to Chicago, Ill.

In 1947 the general was selected to command the U.S. Air Force in Europe. It was during this tour of duty that the Russians decided to close off access to Berlin. The general organized the famous Berlin airlift. He and his men used every available aircraft they could fly, and the Russians failed in their first major attempt after World War II to intimidate the United States. Resource-

fulness, the dynamic leadership of General LeMay, and the indomitable courage of his men made the airlift possible. The world will long remember this humanitarian effort to come to the aid of a besieged people heroically resisting communism.

It was as commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command that General LeMay was to make his greatest postwar military contribution. For nearly 10 years he was to command the most destructive force on earth. He was to make the airpower of the United States respected and feared by friend and foe around the globe.

He came to the Strategic Air Command when it had about 50,000 people, 20 bases, and less than 1,000 aircraft. When the general left SAC it numbered 224,000 officers and men stationed at 40 bases in the United States and 25 bases overseas. Its 2,500 aircraft included all jet B-47's and B-52's, KC-135 tankers, and B-36's. SAC was about to receive its first intercontinental ballistic missiles when Curtis LeMay became Vice Chief of Staff in 1957.

In 1961 the general became Chief of Staff of the Air Force. His tenure as chief of staff has been marked by a desire to strengthen all components of our Defense Establishment. He has fought for the heavy manned bomber as he believes that we must have a balanced defense structure.

The general feels that it would be unwise and dangerous for the United States to place its security on the missile alone. He believes there is no substitute for the human mind and the precision that can be obtained through the manned bomber. The general has not adopted the view that airpower alone can deter war or win the peace. His entire military philosophy has been based upon the balanced concept of weapons and services.

The general firmly believes that there is, and will continue to be, a place in the military structure for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. He is a realist, however, and knows that the nuclear power of the United States can, by the very nature of things, be delivered more rapidly and more effectively in time of emergency and great crisis by airpower.

Mr. Speaker, I have followed the career of General LeMay down through the years. It has been said that he has become a legend in his lifetime. This, in a sense, is true. The legend of General LeMay and the story of his devotion to his country and its military power will be an inspiration to other soldiers, sailors, and airmen in the decades ahead.

As he retires today from active duty he takes his place among other American military heroes with the realization that he played an active, vigorous, and effective role upon the military stage of his country, and indeed the entire world.

I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that we have not heard the last of General LeMay. He must not let his great talents remain idle. His country needs his counsel, experience, and dynamic leadership. There are more victories to be won in the fight for technological superiority and political, social, and economic freedom. General LeMay will, I feel sure, make himself felt and heard in all those broad areas of civilian endeavor which mean so much to the survival of our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, we extend our best wishes on his retirement. He has brought to its close a distinguished career in which he and his fellow Americans can take a just and lasting pride.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina for bringing to the attention of the Congress of the United States the retirement of one whom I consider to be one of the most outstanding soldiers this country ever had. General LeMay has been an outstanding spokesman for what he believes is and was necessary for the proper defense of this Nation. At times he has been a controversial figure. This is because of the fact that he has been outspoken and has tried to tell the American people what he thought was necessary for the defense of this country.

He leaves the service with the confidence of the American people. I, too, join the gentleman from North Carolina in hoping that the abilities and outstanding service that this fine soldier has rendered to this country will not be lost. I hope that there is some way that the tremendous abilities he has will be used in the future, because I think they are very badly needed. Certainly his advice and counsel are needed at this time in the history of our great Nation.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from Florida. I would say with reference to his remarks that General LeMay has at times appeared to be controversial, that in my judgment this was because of the absolute mental integrity of this man who has served his country well not only in time of war but at other times by expressing views which he thought were necessary to be stated if we were to maintain our freedom.

Mr. HALEY. I thoroughly agree with the statement that the gentleman just made.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend and compliment my able colleague from North Carolina for bringing to the attention of the House of Representatives, the Congress, and the country the fact that General LeMay will retire today. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, that I know of no one in the last 15 or 20 years who has served the cause of freedom better than General LeMay. He came at a time when Communist Russia had a preponderance of military strength with an overwhelming land, artillery, and tank force with which to overrun Western Europe, Africa, and all of Asia. It was General LeMay and SAC, the Strategic Air Command, that gave this country and the free world the protection so urgently and desperately needed during that critical time. When SEATO was being born and when NATO was being born his force was indeed an umbrella protecting these forces and giving these forces the opportunity to develop.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

THE OTHER GUY GOT THE ULCERS—LEMAY'S GRUFF, TOUGH LEGEND COMBINES FACT AND FICTION

(By John G. Norris)

There is a curious mixture of fact and fiction in the living legend of Curtis E. LeMay, the famed Air Force general who retires Monday.

His public image is that of a tough, able World War II hero, builder of the mighty Strategic Air Command and a somewhat warlike bomber general who publicly challenged current defense policy during last fall's election campaign. A closer look at this most prestigious American still in uniform modifies the picture a bit.

There is no question about LeMay's toughness and ability as a commander. He probably was the outstanding combat airman of his time, not just during the war but afterward in making SAC the most powerful and ready fighting force of all time.

Many of the stories of the LeMay legend probably are apocryphal, such as the one about the time he stepped out of an airplane with a lighted cigar—his trademark—in his grim mouth.

"That plane might blow up," whispered a nearby airman.

"It wouldn't dare," replied an old flight sergeant.

HOW TO EARN A STAR

A well-documented and more revealing anecdote about the man was told recently by Lt. Gen. Ira Eaker, U.S. Air Force, retired, who was LeMay's commander in England in 1942. Eaker said that while LeMay's bomb group earned a reputation as a well-trained, well-led outfit always over the target, high in bomb accuracy, and generally back with low losses, he soon received an inspector's complaint that "this guy wasn't human." After his crews returned from a long, hard mission, the inspector charged, LeMay sent them out to practice gunnery and formation flying.

Eaker says he went to see LeMay and received an explanation that ran like this:

"Yesterday German fighters flew by my plane so close I could have hit them with a Colt .45. My gunners must have fired a thousand rounds, but most of the ME109's escaped. If we don't shoot better than that tomorrow, we won't come back. These crews are great kids and I want to bring them back alive.

"So this evening, the gunners are down at the range learning how to hit a moving target, and some of the pilots who flew raggedly on the mission today are now out practicing formation flying. I don't mind being called tough, since I find in this racket it's the tough guys who lead the survivors."

Impressed, Eaker promoted the inhuman colonel to brigadier general at age 36. On the eve of his retirement, LeMay has been a general officer for 21 of his 35 years in uniform, the past 13 as a four-star officer.

Eaker tells another story which he doesn't vouch for but it is in the LeMay tradition. It seems that a flight surgeon told LeMay he was working too hard, worrying too much, smoking too many cigars and flying too many missions. "If you keep up this pace," he warned, "you'll wind up with ulcers."

LeMay's reply: "Doctor, I don't get ulcers, I give them."

NEW AIR TACTICS

This was the combat commander who led the tough raids, such as Regensburg, and devised new bombing tactics: straight runs over the target instead of taking evasive tactics to avoid flak. There was more chance this way of getting hit, but the bombs did not miss and bombers did not have to go back and repeat the mission with additional losses.

LeMay also devised successful new tactics for bombing Japan. His planes came in at 4,000 instead of 20,000 feet and used firebombs on the flimsy Nipponese cities.

As SAC commander for nearly 10 years, he devised the force and tactics that made American jet bombers the predominant military force in the world.

Some consider LeMay too warlike. It is true that in 1948 when the Russians blockaded Berlin, he favored sending an armed column into the city instead of launching the airlift, which he scorned. "A crock of stuff," he told me. And he has favored bombing North Vietnam to help resolve the southeast Asian war. But other top military men, considering America's great power, have backed bold action (although not necessarily bombing) in the conviction that it would win out without major war—as it did for President Kennedy in the Cuban crisis.

It is noted in this connection that LeMay supported, with some misgivings, the limited nuclear test ban treaty at Senate ratification hearings.

AND MISSILES, TOO

The term "bomber general" applied to LeMay implies more than that he is a champion of building new long-range bombers. It harks back to the term "battleship admiral" and suggests that LeMay opposed missiles, as many Navy and Army leaders opposed airpower before Warld War II. In fact, he has pushed development of ICBM's as the now predominant element of SAC, and he fought for more Minuteman ICBM's than Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara would approve in the same way that he battled for a new bomber. He believes both weapons are needed for the indefinite future to give the United States the deterrent power it needs.

There seems to be a widespread opinion that LeMay carried his Pentagon fight over the bomber, more missiles, and a greater military role in space, to the public, and that he slipped material to Barry Goldwater last year to assist him in the GOP campaign against the administration's defense policy.

All the evidence—including the fact that the Republican defense attack seemed badly advised and missed the real issues involved—is to the contrary.

It is clear that LeMay never broke the longstanding rules of conduct for a military leader in fighting for a cause. They are that an official should keep the fight within the Pentagon and express his personal views only when asked for them by congressional committees. The retiring Air Force Chief of Staff closely adhered to these rules, though he characteristically spoke more bluntly than most other military men have under a similar congressional examination.

All of his published comments taking issue with administration policy came from published closed door testimony that was cleared before release. Nor did LeMay aides plant questions with Congressmen or leak his case to the press, as have others who lost battles within the Pentagon.

LeMay, in fact, always held the press at more than arm's length, as he did almost everyone else. Newsmen, like others, respected him, but few, if any claimed his confidence or affection. They regarded him as a great man, but not as a friend.

THE WRONG SLOT

But the record of the nonpareil air commander suggests to some that LeMay should have been left in field command and never brought to Washington at all.

LeMay himself once commented to a woman guest who stood with him at the picture window of his Fort Myer quarters admiring the view of Washington: "I hate it."

Gen. Thomas D. White, now retired as Air Force Chief of Staff, brought LeMay from SAC in 1957 as his chief deputy. He wrote recently in Newsweek: "He did not relish Washington. He suffered tortures, because, as a long-time field commander, he had acquired the simple virtue of being able to resolve the pros and cons of a problem into black and white.

"At the far more complicated level of the Washington top command, new elements such as political considerations, public relations, budget planning, and philosophies had an important bearing on the decisionmaking process. What seemed to LeMay like a black-and-white affair often ended up as a shade of gray which was unpalatable to his practical and initially uncomplicated views.

"When LeMay himself became Chief of Staff of the Air Force 4 years later, he had learned much, broadened and, to a degree, mellowed. But he never compromised his convictions. His gruff and undiplomatic manner alienated him from Secretary of Defense McNamara and Air Secretary Zuckert. A man with more tact might possibly have succeeded in holding both his convictions and the good will of his civilian superiors."

But how could President Eisenhower in 1957 and President Kennedy and McNamara in 1961 have passed over LeMay for top Air Force command in light of his record both overall and as Air Force Vice Chief of Staff.

While long a champion of strategic airpower, he now took a leading part in recognition of the new role of tactical airpower and air-insurgency forces and of modern cost accounting and computerized planning as leadership tools.

LeMay, however, still held the war-experienced view that combat probably would not turn out the way elaborate planning visualized. And he worked, as always, for better pay and living conditions for Air Force personnel.

THE SUCCESSOR

His successor, able Gen. John P. McConnell, 56, probably will be more effective as U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff than LeMay was. He is of the new breed of U.S. military leaders, trained in joint staffs and commands and thus more broad gaged, and also more articulate in putting Air Force views to McNamara and his chief aides.

No yes-man to McNamara, McConnell is not as aloof as LeMay and already is on first name and casual drop-in terms with top Pentagon scientists and "whiz kids." Pentagon history shows that smoother service chiefs who follow more controversial leaders often slide their programs through.

What of LeMay, who at 58 still is vigorous and not ready for retirement? He is considering some job offers and may write a book, but has no intention of running around advocating his rejected views. There will be no farewell statement and no acceptance of invitations to appear on TV press panels. He wants to buy a small airplane and continue his sport car, wood- and leather-working, hunting, target shooting and other hobbies.

One thing is sure: he won't enter politics. Back after V-J Day, Ohio-born-and-bred LeMay, then the youngest of the big-name World War II combat leaders, was offered a seat in the U.S. Senate by then Ohio Gov. FRANK LAUSCHE to fill a vacancy left by the appointment of Senator Harold Burton to the Supreme Court. He turned it down and can be counted on to decline any similar offers now.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina for reserving this time and calling to the attention of the Congress and the United States the retirement of a very great general, one who has served his country well and who has been a prophet.

Yes, he sometimes was controversial but only in this way can you prove your greatness. He is the father of SAC and he has added much to the defense of our Nation. His contribution will long be remembered.

He has earned his retirement, and I am very happy to join my distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] in extending congratulations and good wishes to a brave and courageous individual, General LeMay.

I am sure that even though he has retired from active service, he will continue to serve our Nation in the years to come. His advice and counsel will always be valued by his countrymen as we face the challenges of the future.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for bringing to the attention of the House today the fact of the retirement of one of the alltime greats in the military annals of this Nation. I, too, have followed the career of General LeMay with much interest and enthusiasm. He was truly a legendary figure. His contributions to the military affairs of this Nation and indeed to the entire world will not soon, if ever, be equaled.

He is the father of the Strategic Air Command. He has probably contributed more to world peace than any other individual in the military history of these times. His contributions to this country have been of benefit to all of us. It is often said that service is the price we pay for the rent of the room we occupy here on earth. Certainly General LeMay, through his service to his country, has paid that price.

I hope that we will have the benefit of his advice and sound judgment, from which we have profited so much, in the days to come. We all wish him well.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his remarks. I am sure all of us have the same feeling of indebtedness to this great man who has at a young age served our country in so many outstanding ways.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank my distinguished colleague from North Carolina for reserving this time to pay a tribute to Gen. Curtis LeMay. General LeMay is truly one of the outstanding generals this country has ever produced. The legend of General LeMay will go down in history and show

him to be one of the outstanding generals and military men of our country. His contributions to world peace, to the development of superior air power in this country, are something we may be proud of and that he may be proud of. In Gen. Curtis LeMay we have a truly great American.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of knowing General LeMay for a number of years and particularly have had the opportunity of listening to his testimony before the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations. I can say without hesitation or qualification that he is one of our foremost military experts. His knowledge and experience go further than his particular interest in the Air Force. It has been my observation that he has contributed significantly to our total military thinking, admittedly with more emphasis, perhaps, on air power than otherwise. And I have heard him make recommendations which he felt were right and proper for the country but which were not necessarily those of his civilian superiors.

This I think is a good indication of his complete, his total devotion to the country, not necessarily to his own personal success.

In my judgment we need more top military leaders such as General LeMay who have this total dedication to the country and who are unafraid to speak their mind, even though their views may differ from other military or civilian leaders in the Pentagon.

Mr. Speaker, it has also been a great privilege to be on several trips with General LeMay and to enjoy his hospitality and his friendship. I can say that his record in every respect is one to which we can all point with pride. It is a record of military leadership that will be hard to match by anyone.

Mr. Speaker, we all wish General LeMay the very best. We all express, I am sure, our lasting gratitude for his efforts and accomplishments and our regret that he is leaving active service.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. I too would like to join in this well-deserved tribute. Having had the opportunity to serve on the Committee on Armed Services during some of the years that General LeMay has served in the very top leadership of the Air Force I have had an opportunity to observe the courage and the judgment which he has brought to his task.

Mr. Speaker, it has been very reassuring to have a man of General LeMay's capabilities in that very important job. I appreciate the fact that he is retiring at a relatively early age. But we can be confident that he will be on the scene to guide and counsel in this field to which he has given his life.

Mr. Speaker, we can be proud that a man like Curtis LeMay has come into this period of our Nation's history when we have been going through a transition in military power and development of new and sophisticated weapons, that he was present to speak forthrightly from the background of his knowledge and to guide us in these important decisions which we have had to make.

I know that it has been the purpose of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] in reserving this time today so that we Members of the House of Representatives may take notice of what is occurring today and record our admiration and respect for a great leader. I thank the gentleman for making this possible.

Mr. WHITENER. I certainly express to the gentleman from New York my deep appreciation for his remarks. I know that when he speaks of courage in connection with this great man he would agree with me that when we speak of the "legend of LeMay" that we could actually put it in one word, and that would be "courage."

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago we had the great pleasure of attending a presentation at the White House on which occasion Gen. Curtis LeMay was given the Distinguished Service Medal, with a third oak leaf cluster.

Mr. Speaker, during the 16 years that I have been on the Committee on Armed Services I have known Gen. "Curt" LeMay and the great work which he has done toward making this the greatest and the strongest military country in the world today. He is a man who spoke his mind forcefully, never with provocation but with a sense of assertion and a sense of righteousness so that one always knew, Mr. Speaker, where "Curt" LeMay stood. Yet, there were easier paths to follow, and there were other men that he might have followed. Nevertheless, he told us what he thought, based upon his tremendous native capacity and his wide experience.

So. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Armed Services was a better committee because it listened to the words and wisdom of "Curt" LeMay. Today, Mr. Speaker, the United States of America and the free world are better because we have had such a distinguished military leader as General LeMay serving the cause of liberty.

I submit as a part of this record the citation by the President of the United States:

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the United States in positions of great responsibility as Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, from July 1, 1957, to June 29, 1961, and as Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force from June 30, 1961, to January 31, 1965. In these two highest military offices of the Air Force, and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General LeMay consistently manifested a high degree of dedication, combining outstanding professional knowledge with leadership of the highest caliber. His vision and direction have given the Air Force a flexibility that provides the capability for controlled response to aggression at any level of conflict from guerrilla operations to strategic nuclear warfare. During a time of unprecedented change in weapon systems, he directed the introduction of intercontinental ballistic missiles into the Air Force weapons inventory as an effective segment of our strategic deterrent force. His interest in and knowledge of communications have been in great measure responsible for the development of the Air Force worldwide communications systems. Realizing the necessity for the United States to lead in space, he helped create a strong foundation for activities in space by the Air Force, and achieved increasingly effective cooperation with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. His personal concern led to major improvements in the housing, pay, promotion, and medical care of Air Force personnel. General LeMay has consistently demonstrated professional qualities which are in the best tradition of military service, and his accomplishments and leadership have contributed substantially to the security of the United States and the free world. His singular achievements as Chief of Staff of the Air Force culminate a long and distinguished career of more than 35 years in the service of his country. They reflect the highest credit upon himself and upon the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. WHITENER. I commend the gentleman for his fine remarks which come from an abundance of association with this great American to whom we are paying tribute today.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services it was also my privilege, along with members of the Military Affairs Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of this House, to represent the House of Representatives at the White House where General LeMay received the Distinguished Service Medal. That within itself is a rarity.

This man has been much decorated, and justly deserves it. He is a paragon of virtue of rugged principle. He has stood alone in organizing the great deterrent that this Nation has afforded the entire world against aggressors in the interest of maintaining peace. He was the founder of the Strategic Air Command, and the Chief of Staff of a great Air Force, the introducer of more "eggs in our basket," as he so well likes to refer to it, in the interest of deterring aggression.

He stated in great humility and with much emotion on this occasion today that he leaves, certainly with emotion, but without fear, because he leaves in the hands of the Commander in Chief what he considers to be the greatest staff that has ever been built, ever ready to defend this Nation, and to always act as a deterrent against those who might seek aggression, that individuals might gain for their sovereign nations. In addition to that he has performed great humanitarian missions whenever the Commander in Chief desired.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for giving many of us an opportunity to pay our tribute to General LeMay. Although I am not a member of the great Committee on Armed Services, I too share with my colleagues their admiration for this outstanding American. His ability and his patriotism have endeared him to all of his fellow citizens.

I wish to join with the gentleman from North Carolina and others in expressing to this distinguished general our heartfelt thanks for the magnificent service he has rendered his country.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my other colleagues who have joined in this expression of appreciation for the life and service already performed by Gen. Curtis LeMay. I know we will all look forward to many more years of outstanding service in the cause of freedom and of peace in the world. While his name will not be on the active roll of the military, I am sure it will be on the active roll of dedicated and patriotic Americans. Again, I salute this great American. Gen. Curtis LeMay, as he retires from active military duty.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the last of the great wartime figures is leaving the military service. Gen. Curtis LeMay, whose name was for years synonymous with Strategic Air Command and who subsequently has been charged with command responsibility for the entire Air Force, is retiring today as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force.

After 35 years in uniform, 22 of them as a general officer, he has earned all the blessings of retirement. As he leaves the service he carries with him the plaudits of a grateful Nation to which he has contributed much.

A perfectionist, he insisted on untmost precision and efficiency in every command—and he achieved it. Much of the Nation's immediate striking power since the Korean war has been in his hands and it was always maintained at the highest state of readiness.

There are not many Curt LeMays. He is a great warrior—one of the greatest of all.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, a great American is retiring from active service in the Armed Forces today. He is one of the true giants who has made the service of his country his lifelong career.

The distinguished record and the many contributions of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay will long be remembered by every American citizen who has acquainted himself with the defense and national security problems of our country.

His World War II record was an outstanding one but he will probably be remembered best for his achievements as Commander of the Strategic Air Command. As Commander of SAC for nearly 10 years, General LeMay was largely responsible for making the American jet bombers the predominant military force in the world today. His outstanding contributions to the defense needs of our country in its most critical period have earned him the gratitude of millions of Americans.

Great men who retire do not often fade away. It is to be expected and hoped for that the experience and counsel of General LeMay will long be available and utilized by his successors.

Mr. Speaker, General LeMay appeared often before our Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in recent years. He was always knowledgeable, but even more importantly he was a straightforward witness. His insights into the problems we face and the forces we need as we look into the future were extremely valuable to me and to the other members of our committee.

The Air Force and our country are losing the full-time services of a career officer whose every action was dictated by conviction, dedication to our national interest, and love of country. It is to be hoped that his valuable knowledge and experience will continue to be available for years to come.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, one of this Nation's most courageous military leaders retired this week after a distinguished career of service. On behalf of a grateful citizenry, I want to express appreciation and extend a most deserved "well done" to Gen. Curtis E. LeMay from the people of my congressional district in Kansas. We are indeed indebted to General LeMay for his monumental contributions to the freedom, defense, and security of the United States and the free world.

We will never forget the genius and vision of this man who contributed so much to America's formidable strength in the air. General LeMay was the father of the Strategic Air Command. There is no doubt that the power of SAC has served as America's greatest deterrent to war. General LeMay waged a determined effort to build a flexible weapons arsenal including both missiles and manned bombers.

Curtis LeMay certainly is not a "yes man." His leadership and counsel were based upon 38 years of military experience in hot and cold wars. He fought for what he believed was necessary to keep America strong. General LeMay believed that only through strength can we prevent war. On February 4, 1964, he told the House Armed Services Committee:

> It is my personal belief that only by being strong enough to win a war will our desire to prevent war have a true meaning.

He knows and understands communism; and I believe he demonstrated a know-how for stemming Communist aggression and ambitions. In those same hearings a year ago, he stated:

> The Soviet Union has periodically proclaimed peaceful coexistence and a gradual political change as the goal of international communism. But in the past, these proclamations have been followed by new forms of aggression.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation will always require the advice, counsel, and service of such leaders as General LeMay. We need such voices as his to speak out even though others in positions of leadership may not be in agreement. I know that General LeMay will continue to contribute to the greatness and strength of the United States. I believe the following excerpt from a recent editorial in the Wichita, Kans., Eagle may account for General LeMay's retirement as U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff at age 58; but it also points up the debt which all Americans owe to General LeMay:

> LeMay will be missed. His service to our Nation has been considerable over the years. And, while his nonconformism may have caused difficulties for the Defense Department and the administration, there is a certain value in having a man who is not afraid to speak his mind in the upper echelons of our Defense Establishment. Our Nation's defense is too important to have nothing but "yes men" running it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 1, a great American, a great patriot, and a great general—Gen. Curtis LeMay—retired from active service. I would like to add my tribute to the many already spoken for this outstanding man.

General LeMay's career speaks for itself. Entering the armed services as a flying cadet in 1928, he retires this year as Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

These 37 years of service saw so many achievements—the development of bombing techniques and the many bomber commands in World War II, the Regensburg raid, command of Strategic Air Forces in the Pacific, the Berlin Airlift—and the command and development of our Strategic Air Command.

General LeMay's influence and contributions to our air defense are unmeasurable. As commander of SAC, he built, from the remnants of World War II, an all jet manned bomber force, and supervised plans for the development and integration of an intercontinental ballistic missile capability.

As Commander of SAC, and as Chief of Staff, the general has always stressed the importance of maintaining a balanced military concept of manned bombers and missiles. He knows the danger of discounting the precision of the manned bomber and placing our reliance on the missile alone as a peacekeeping deterrent.

For his philosophy, his leadership, his ability—America and the entire free world are indeed indebted to Gen. Curtis LeMay. As he retires, Mr. Speaker, may I add my good wishes to the many he has already received, and my fervent hope that General LeMay will continue to lend his counsel, experience, and advice to a grateful nation.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respects to a great American of whom President Johnson just recently said "all freemen are in your debt." I am speaking of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, of the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fortunate and often noted fact of our history that during periods of crisis we have seen the rise of men of foresight, courage, and determination come to the forefront.

Time after time, the greatness of individuals has provided the rest of us with the leadership and inspiration needed to enable us to come through a period of torment, of potential catastrophe—not only to survive, but also to emerge from the trial with unprecedented

strength and a more solid confidence in the future.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay is one of those individuals. Today America is safer, more secure and faces a brighter future because of the leadership he gave us as U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should invite General LeMay to address a joint meeting to give us and the Nation a summation of a lifetime of dedicated service in defense of freemen the world over.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on General LeMay, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION ASSURING THE ORDERLY DISCHARGE OF THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 64)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1787, Benjamin Franklin remarked near the conclusion of the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, "It astonishes me, sir, to find this system approaching so near to perfection as it does."

One hundred and seventy-eight years later the relevance of that Constitution of 1789 to our society of 1965 is remarkable. Yet it is truly astonishing that, over this span, we have neither perfected the provisions for orderly continuity in the Executive direction of our system nor, as yet, paid the price our continuing inaction so clearly invites and so recklessly risks.

I refer, of course, to three conspicuous and long-recognized defects in the Constitution relating to the office of the Presidency:

1. The lack of a constitutional provision assuring the orderly discharge of the powers and duties of the President—Commander in Chief—in the event of the disability or incapacity of the incumbent.

2. The lack of a constitutional provision assuring continuity in the office of the Vice President, an office which itself is provided within our system for the primary purpose of assuring continuity.

3. The lack of a constitutional provision assuring that the votes of electors in the electoral college shall without question reflect the expressed will of the people in the actual election of their President and Vice President.

Over the years, as I have noted, we have escaped the mischief these obvious omissions invite and permit. Our escape has been more the result of providence than of any prudence on our part. For it is not necessary to conjure the nightmare of nuclear holocaust or other national catastrophe to identify these omissions as chasms of chaos into which normal human frailties might plunge us at any time.

On at least two occasions in our history, and perhaps others, American Presidents—James Garfield and Woodrow Wilson—have for prolonged periods been rendered incapable of discharging their Presidential duties. On 16 occasions in our 36 administrations, the office of Vice President has been vacant—and over the two perilous decades since the end of the Second World War, that vital office has been vacant the equivalent of 1 year out of 4. Finally, over recent years, complex but concerted campaigns have been openly undertaken—fortunately without success, as yet—to subvert the electoral college so that it would register not the will of the people of individual States but, rather, the wishes of the electors themselves.

The potential of paralysis implicit in these conditions constitutes an indefensible folly for our responsible society in these times. Commonsense impels, duty requires us to act—and to act now, without further delay.

Action is in the tradition of our forebears. Since adoption of the Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments to our Constitution—9 of the 14 subsequent amendments have related directly either to the offices of the Presidency and Vice-Presidency or to assuring the responsiveness of our voting processes to the will of the people. As long ago as 1804 and as recently as 1964, Americans have amended their Constitution in striving for its greater perfection in these most sensitive and critical areas.

I believe it is the strong and overriding will of the people today that we should act now to eliminate these unhappy possibilities inherent in our system as it now exists. Likewise, I believe it is the consensus of an overwhelming majority of the Congress—without thought of partisanship—that effective action be taken promptly. I am, accordingly, addressing this communication to both Houses to ask that this prevailing will be translated into action which would permit the people, through the process of constitutional amendment, to overcome these omissions so clearly evident in our system.

I. PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

Our Constitution clearly prescribes the order of procedure for assuring continuity in the office of the Presidency in the event of the death of the incumbent. These provisions have met their tragic tests successfully. Our system, unlike many others, has never experienced the catastrophe of disputed succession or the chaos of uncertain command.

Our stability is, nonetheless, more superficial than sure. While we are prepared for the possibility of a President's death, we are all but defenseless against the probability of a President's incapacity by injury, illness, senility, or other affliction. A nation bearing the responsibilities we are privileged to bear for our own security—and the security of the free world—cannot justify the appalling gamble of entrusting its security to the immobilized hands or uncomprehending mind of a Commander in Chief unable to command.

On September 29, 1964, the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 139, proposing a constitutional amendment to deal with this perplexing question of presidential disability—as well as the question, which I shall discuss below, of filling vacancies in the office of Vice President. The same measure has been introduced in this Congress as Senate Joint Resolution 1 and House Joint Resolution 1. The provisions of these measures have been carefully considered and are the product of many of our finest constitutional and legal minds. Believing, as I do, that Senate Joint Resolution 1 and House Joint Resolution 1 would responsibly meet the pressing need I have outlined, I urge the Congress to approve them forthwith for submission to ratification by the States.

II. VACANCY IN THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Indelible personal experience has impressed upon me the indisputable logic and imperative necessity of assuring that the second office of our system shall, like the first office, be at all times occupied by an incumbent who is able and who is ready to assume the powers and duties of the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief.

In our history, to this point, the office of the Presidency has never devolved below the first clearly prescribed step of constitutional succession. In moments of need, there has always been a Vice President, yet Vice Presidents are no less mortal than Presidents. Seven men have died in the office and one has resigned—in addition to the eight who left the office vacant to succeed to the Presidency.

We recognized long ago the necessity of assuring automatic succession in the absence of a Vice President. Various statutes have been enacted at various times prescribing orders of succession from among either the Presiding Officers of the Houses of Congress or the heads of executive departments who, together, comprise the traditional Cabinet of the President. In these times, such orders of succession are no substitute for an office of succession.

Since the last order of succession was prescribed by the Congress in 1947, the office of the Vice Presidency has undergone the most significant transformation and enlargement of duties in its history.

Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy have successively expanded the role of the Vice President, even as I expect to do in this administration.

Once only an appendage, the office of Vice President is an integral part of the chain of command and its occupancy on a full-time basis is imperative.

For this reason, I most strongly endorse the objective of both Senate Joint Resolution 1 and House Joint Resolution 1 in providing that whenever there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President,

provision shall exist for that office to be filled with a person qualified to succeed to the Presidency.

III. REFORM OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

We believe that the people should elect their President and Vice President. One of the earliest amendments to our Constitution was submitted and ratified in response to the unhappy experience of an electoral college stalemate which jeopardized this principle. Today there lurks in the electoral college system the ever-present possibility that electors may substitute their own will for the will of the people. I believe that possibility should be foreclosed.

Our present system of computing and awarding electoral votes by States is an essential counterpart of our Federal system and the provisions of our Constitution which recognize and maintain our Nation as a union of States. It supports the two-party system which has served our Nation well. I believe this system should be retained. But it is imperative that the electoral votes of a State be cast for those persons who receive the greatest number of votes for President and Vice President—and for no one else.

At the same time, I believe we should eliminate the omission in our present system which leaves the continuity of the offices of President and Vice President unprotected if the persons receiving a majority of the electoral votes for either or both of these offices should die after the election in November and before the inauguration of the President.

Electors are now legally free to choose the President without regard to the outcome of the election. I believe that if the President-elect dies under these circumstances, our laws should provide that the Vice-President-elect should become President when the new term begins. Conversely, if death should come to the Vice-President-elect during this interim, I believe the President-elect should, upon taking office, be required to follow the procedures otherwise prescribed for filling the unexpired term of the Vice President. If both should die or become unable to serve in this interim, I believe the Congress should be made responsible for providing the method of selecting officials for both positions. I am transmitting herewith a draft amendment to the Constitution to resolve these problems.

Favorable action by the Congress on the measures here recommended will, I believe, assure the orderly continuity in the Presidency that is imperative to the success and stability of our system. Action on these measures now will allay future anxiety among our own people—and among the peoples of the world—in the event senseless tragedy or unforeseeable disability should strike again at either or both of the principal offices of our constitutional system. If we act now, without undue delay, we shall have moved closer to achieving perfection of the great constitutional document on which the strength and success of our system have rested for nearly two centuries.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 28, 1965.*

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 66)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Fourth Annual Report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

In this report, submitted pursuant to law, the Agency describes its activities for the calendar year 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1965.*

MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1961—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-256, the Fulbright-Hays Act) I transmit herewith the annual report on the international cultural exchange program for the fiscal year 1963.

This report deals with the influence for peace and progress which exchange-of-persons activities have become in the world of the 1960's.

The varying stages of nationhood in the world today require a varying range of relationships on our part. I am convinced that exchanges of persons are uniquely appropriate and unusually effective activities for the needs and opportunities of these times. Such exchanges touch our societies at many points—involving students, teachers, professors, research scholars, athletes, government leaders, judges, economists, labor leaders, social workers, actors, authors, coaches, and many others—a broad panorama of professions and the arts.

In the single year covered by this report, some 10,000 people were overseas from this country, or here from other countries, in the friendly, constructive interchange the United States now sponsors. This exchange involved more than 130 countries and territories.

Congress can take particular and proper pride in this program. Since World War II—with full bipartisan support, as in Public Law 87-256—Congress has fathered and fostered this activity. Many Members of both Houses have a special knowledge of the vital role which exchanges now play in our relations and understandings with other nations. All along the way, the articulate leadership of the Congress has been a major strength for the program's success.

The warm and strong support of the American people likewise deserves our praise. The volunteer services and family hospitality which our citizens and communities give to thousands of students and visitors from other countries is of incalculable value to the interest of international understanding.

I hope that our exchange activities, public and private, may grow. An enlarging investment means an enlarging return—not merely from the understanding others may acquire of us, but from the understanding we acquire of those with whom we share the hopes of these times and the destiny of this planet.

We in the United States have an abiding faith in the value of education to our own society's success, and we are affirming that faith with a new and strengthened commitment to education in America. But education as a force for freedom, justice, and rationality knows no national boundaries—it is the great universal force for good. Our efforts in the exchange program give that force added strength and justified support. For when we help other peoples achieve their highest and best aspirations, we truly work for understanding, for progress, and for peace. In this work, let us continue with new enthusiasm and confidence, for out of the understandings among peoples will grow peace among nations.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1965.*

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College the following members on the part of the House: The gentleman from New York, Mr. CAREY, and the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. NELSEN.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 85-874, as amended, the Chair appoints as members ex officio of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts the following members on the part of the House: Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. THOMPSON, of New Jersey; and Mrs. REID, of Illinois.

LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88-630, the Chair appoints as members of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MORRIS, of New Mexico; Mr. RIVERS, of Alaska; Mr. BERRY, of South Dakota; and Mr. SKUBITZ, of Kansas.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, United States Code,

section 715a, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri; Mr. CONTE, of Massachusetts.

NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, United States Code, section 513. The Chair appoints as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission the following members on the part of the House: the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLMER, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SAYLOR.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 6, Public Law 754, 81st Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission the gentleman from California, Mr. MILLER.

PUBLIC LAND REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88-606, the Chair appoints as members of the Public Land Law Review Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ASPINALL, of Colorado; Mr. O'BRIEN, of New York; Mr. WHITE, of Idaho; Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania; Mr. BURTON, of Utah; Mr. MORTON, of Maryland.

ST. AUGUSTINE QUADRICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87-586, the Chair appoints as members of the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MATTHEWS, of Florida; Mr. CRAMER, of Florida.

UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(b), Public Law 88-271, the Chair appoints as members of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. O'BRIEN, of New York; Mr. MORTON, of Maryland.

UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri; Mr. HAYS, of Ohio; Mr. CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87-364, the Chair appoints as members of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey; Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title 6, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas; Mr. KING of California; Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. MAHON, of Texas; Mr. THOMAS, of Texas; Mr. BOW, of Ohio.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 401(a), Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CELLER, of New York; Mr. FEIGHAN, of Ohio; Mr. CHELF, of Kentucky; Mr. POFF, of Virginia; Mr. MOORE, of West Virginia.

U.S. DELEGATION OF THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Mexico from February 11 to February 18, 1965, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. NIX, of Pennsylvania, chairman; Mr. MCDOWELL, of Delaware; Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. JOHNSON of California; Mr. CAMERON, of California; Mr. SLACK, of West Virginia; Mr. GONZALEZ, of Texas; Mr. DERWINSKI, of Illinois; Mr. SPRINGER, of Illinois; Mr. MORSE, of Massachusetts, Mr. HARVEY, of Michigan; Mr. BELL, of California.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KU KLUX KLAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the year 1965 marks the 100th anniversary of the Ku Klux Klan. In December, a century ago, six young men formed a secret society in Pulaski, Tenn. The weird panoply of the order—along with the rigors of that day—quickly changed the Klan into a vehicle of terror. Soon excesses compelled its leaders to order it dismembered.

That was in 1869. For almost five decades thereafter, the Ku Klux Klan was but a memory. Then, in 1915 a new order arose in Atlanta, based upon old hatreds and fears.

The revised Klan found fertile ground, not only in the old Confederacy, but North, East, and West alike.

In 1921, the House Committee on Rules considered several resolutions calling for an investigation. Nothing happened. By 1924, membership in this "invisible empire" reached 4 million. Its influence touched courthouses and State houses, national conventions of both major parties, and Congress itself.

It grew and prospered on mystery and malice, changing the cross from the symbol of hope to a sign of hate.

For over a quarter century following its rebirth, the Klan was a potent factor in American life. But the Second World War brought sharp decline to the "invisible empire." Once again it slumbered—until the Supreme Court's decision of 1954. Since that date, but most significantly during the past 2 years, Klan manifestations have increased throughout the South. There are now visible signs of a westward spread.

Mr. Speaker, all this comes at a critical time for the South. We are rising to our full potential. We are struggling for orderly progress. We are turning to real problems and solid opportunities.

Yet, once again, this madness is in our midst. It impugns a lawful and generous people. It impairs compliance with the law. It impedes administration of justice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what shall be done? Shall we in the Congress ignore the veil of fear descending upon whole communities?

Shall we permit faceless men, under cover of robes and darkness, to imperil the liberties of our people?

I believe I speak for a vast majority of southerners in calling for action. For in doing nothing, we will inaugurate a second century for the Ku Klux Klan.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is charged to investigate "the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States." Honest men may differ on the precise limitations of the word "un-American." But, surely, all agree that activities which by force and violence seek to deprive others of rights guaranteed them by the Constitution are un-American.

The weapons of the Klan are secrecy, rumor, and fear. Plain fact and simple truth, amply imparted to the public, are adequate remedies. This committee can provide these remedies by thorough and detailed investigation.

Let us turn upon this "invisible empire" the light of public scrutiny. Let us examine in full its extent, character, and objects. Let us reveal for all to see the men behind the masks.

The boast of the Klan, "Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow" is true in part. For the Klan of yesterday is the Klan of today. Its means and methods remain unchanged. It will plague us tomorrow unless we quash it today.

The year 1865 witnessed the birth of the Ku Klux Klan. Let the year 1965 witness its final demise.

Mr. GRIDER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GRIDER].

Mr. GRIDER. Madam Speaker, I think it is fitting and appropriate that another southern Member of this body rise to endorse the excellent words of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER]. The gentleman from Georgia has said that "the weapons of the Klan are secrecy, rumor, and fear. Plain fact and simple truth, amply imparted to the public, are adequate remedies."

Madam Speaker, we in our community of Memphis, Tenn., and Shelby County have had a demonstration of that. We have a great newspaper there, the Commercial Appeal. In 1924 this newspaper was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for its exposure of the methods of the Ku Klux Klan.

Partly as a result of this, our city of Memphis, Tenn., is the only large southern city that has never had any major racial violence in all of the troubles that have come to the South since 1924. I believe that this is a proper subject for the House Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate, and I heartily endorse the suggestion of my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WELTNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

CHEATING SCANDAL AT THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY—AND THE IMPACT OF ATHLETIC PROFESSIONALISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRIFFITHS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Madam Speaker, last Monday I brought to the attention of this House some of the facts surrounding the Air Force Academy cheating scandal, pointing out specifically that the very large percentage of varsity athletes who were involved in this scandal indicated, in my judgment, that we had reached a time when it was necessary for us to put an end to the kind of athletic professionalism which has characterized all three of our service academies, the Air Force Academy situation indicates that some of the pressures that athletes are under at all these academies have made them particularly susceptible to the opportunities for cheating that had apparently been created both at the Air Force, and, back in 1951, at the Military Academy.

I advised the House that I had requested the Secretary of Defense to take steps to eliminate these practices in our three service academies. Today I rise, Madam Speaker, to advise the House that the Secretary of Defense informed me just this morning by means of a communication from Assistant Secretary of Defense Norman Paul that he will not make any comment on these matters until the current investigation of the Air Force Academy has been completed, sometime around the 10th of February. However, I might say, Madam Speaker, that since I spoke, there have come to me a number of comments on this general subject and a number of expressions of support for the position which I took.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning, February 1, commenting on the fact that the new Air Force Board appointed to look into the cheating scandal has already been requested to examine the whole proper role of intercollegiate athletics at the Academy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

ACADEMY INVESTIGATION

Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert has acted with commendable dispatch in convening a special committee to investigate the Air Force Academy in the light of the current crisis over cheating that has led to the resignation of more than 90 cadets. Further, the proposed scope of the inquiry, an examination of the entire system of cadet life and the role of athletics at the Academy in addition to the immediate conflict over the cadet honor system, shows a determination not to dismiss the incident as merely a case in which a few "bad apples" tainted the chivalrous young warriors in Air Force blue.

The committee, headed by former Air Force Chief of Staff Thomas D. White, is fortunate in having the services of Hardy Dillard, dean of the law school at the University of Virginia, an institution that possesses one of the oldest and most successful collegiate honor systems. But they will need to look much deeper than the cheating incidents themselves and the allegations of parents that their sons only tolerated cheating on the part of others. The service academies' curriculum, facilities and emphasis on bigtime athletics have all been criticized from time to time, often with justification. The White committee, if it uses the full scope of its directive, may be able to provide a guide for change and revision that will benefit the service academies and, ultimately, the officers who man our Defense Establishment.

Mr. STRATTON. May I also add, Madam Speaker, that although Secretary McNamara, unfortunately, is ill at the moment, I intend to examine him on the whole subject when he testifies before our Armed Services Committee, without waiting for any February 10 deadline.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. Yes. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and commend him for the stand he has taken. I would also like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House that this morning at a meeting of the Committee on Armed Services, the very first meeting our committee has had, the gentleman did raise this very point there very forcefully. Again I commend him for it.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank my distinguished friend from Michigan for his very welcome support.

Madam Speaker, some people have said to me personally, and some have commented in the press, "What do you mean by athletic professionalism? What is going on in our service academies that you are opposed to?" I would like very briefly, if I may, to spell out some of these things which I think most Members of the House are aware of, which have been going on, which I do think have impaired the effectiveness of these taxpayer-supported institutions to accomplish their mission, and which I would regard as "athletic professionalism."

Basically athletic professionalism involves an overemphasis, an emphasis well beyond any proper function which might play in service education, on intercollegiate athletics. Let me spell out just one or two examples of this which I think Members who have served in the Congress before are well aware of.

First of all, we have members of the academy coaching staffs spending a certain amount of time out on the road scouting for athletes. Some members of the academy staffs may tell you these coaches are not really looking just for athletes alone, that they are looking for all-around boys. But I submit, Madam Speaker, that if the football coach, let us say, is out looking for all-around boys he is much more likely to come up with one who demonstrates excellence in football or some other sport, than in the field of physics or nuclear energy.

Most young men who apply to us for appointment to the Academies are eagerly interested in a service career. They have a high degree of motivation.

Now what happens when members of the athletic staffs spend time—and I am not sure how much time they spend or whether their expenses are paid by the Academy or by the alumni—out scouting prospects? If the prospect is an athletic star, perhaps he may already be interested in another school. He may have no particular interest in a service career, no real motivation. But the coach endeavors to sign him up. In such circumstances is he really motivated for a military career?

I, for one, do not think it should be the job of the coaching staff to be out scouting candidates for the Academies, whether athletes or nuclear physicists. Perhaps some properly organized and regulated scouting or recruiting procedure for qualified candidates might be justified, but it should not be the prerogative of the coaching staff.

Now, secondly, Madam Speaker, we are all aware that members of these coaching staffs also spend a certain amount of time going up and down the corridors of the House Office Buildings at certain times of the year, trying to find appointments for some of these individual athletes whom they have scouted.

This too is athletic professionalism, and it is, in my judgment, improper.

In fact, Madam Speaker, I brought to the attention of the House back in 1962 a case where an athletic coach from West Point had specifically promised an appointment to a young man and actually delivered on that appointment without the applicant ever seeing the appointing Member.

Coaches have absolutely no business in the House Office Buildings soliciting appointments from Members of Congress, and certainly not trying to get some Member from State X to appoint a prospective athlete from State Y, a process that is both illegal and improper.

Then, Madam Speaker, there is a third thing which I mean by "athletic professionalism." That occurs when these individuals are recommended for appointment and find they cannot pass the college board examinations, which comprise the entrance requirements academically for all three of the service academies. One has only to score 500 on these examinations, as we know to be accepted, which is a score, incidentally, that is considerably less than is required to get into Harvard, let us say, or Yale or Princeton.

But if you do have a lad who is a good halfback who cannot score even this 500 minimum, then in some of our service academies there is an alumni association which will underwrite the bill to send these prospective athletes to some kind of a cram school, some kind of service academy preparatory school, if you will, in order to beef them up so they can achieve the minimum marginal passing grade to get in.

So this is how you can have athletic professionalism, Madam Speaker, even in a situation where all candidates have to pass a minimum college board requirement. The minimum is low in the first place, and some promising athletes get special tutoring to meet it.

In some academies I understand the authorities have required that only a certain percentage of those sent to "cram" school by the alumni can be prospective athletes. But I still find it hard to see alumni raising much money to send prospective nuclear physicists to a "cram" school.

Mr. HÉBERT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will let me complete my comment on this point I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Finally, the fourth specfic point which relates to athletic professionalism is the very heavy schedules which are usually booked for each of our service academies. They go out of their way to compete with colleges which admittedly have placed a heavy emphasis on athletics and have prided themselves over the years in building championship teams. If you are going to play ball in this kind of league you have to spend a lot of time preparing for the games. You have to do a lot of recruiting. You have to take away from your varsity athletes a lot of the time they would normally spend on the other aspects of their job.

That is what I mean by athletic professionalism. I do not know whether it has any place in the private college or not, but I submit it certainly does not have any place in the basic role of the service academies, especially when the taxpayers of the country underwrite the college education of the future leaders of our military forces. These are the things that should be brought to an end by the Secretary of Defense, who has made so much progress in other aspects of reform within the military services.

Madam Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks an article from the February 8 issue of the U.S. News & World Report, which came across our desks this morning, and which describes in summary form an analysis which recently appeared by Columbia University on cheating on U.S. campuses in general.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

THE AMOUNT OF CHEATING ON U.S. CAMPUSES

Just how much cheating goes on in colleges and universities? Far more than most college officials realize, according to a new nationwide study by Columbia University. Of the students questioned in the 99-college survey, more than half admitted having cheated.

Basic findings of the study are outlined in the chart on this page.

At the time when these results were released, a major cheating scandal was being investigated at the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado.

This scandal centered on theft and sale of examination papers. An official statement said it appeared to involve more than 100 cadets, including 30 football players. Twenty-nine cadets resigned at once, more later. Most said their violation was not cheating, but a breach of the honor system, which required that they report known cheaters. A full inquiry followed. All implicated cadets are being dismissed or asked to resign.

In civilian colleges, according to the Columbia survey, only a few of those who cheat are caught and punished, and "only relatively lenient punishments are imposed for academic dishonesty at most schools. Seldom are students suspended or dismissed."

Some ways to reduce cheating are indicated in the survey, based on questionnaires returned by 5,422 college students, 626 deans, and 502 student-body presidents. Conclusions include:

Colleges with honor systems, the study finds, "are less apt to have a high level of cheating than those with other arrangements for control."

Schools with high academic quality also are found to have relatively little cheating. Quality yardsticks: A large proportion of students living on campus, a selective admission system, a high ratio of faculty to students.

The attitude toward cheating instilled in the student body, however, appears to be the most influential deterrent to cheating. Where student disapproval is high, the frequency of cheating is low, and vice versa, the survey shows.

Overall, the student least likely to cheat in college is pictured thus: A girl attending a small, all-female college on an academic scholarship, with good grades and a record of not cheating in high school, taking tests under an honor system run by students, and aware of a tradition of strong disapproval of cheating by the student body.

The worst cheating risk: A young man attending a large university on an athletic scholarship, making poor grades and surrounded by an atmosphere of leniency toward cheating in the classroom.

WHO ARE THE CHEATERS IN COLLEGE?

Based on a survey of 5,422 students at 99 colleges and universities, coast to coast

Fraternity and sorority members cheat more than nonmembers:

Students:	*Percent who cheat*
Where no fraternities exist	46
Nonmembers where fraternities exist	49
Fraternity, sorority members	52
Members who live in fraternity or sorority houses	61

Students with lower grades tend to cheat more:

Grade average:	*Percent who cheat*
A	37
B	43
C	54
C or below	57

Family income or occupation has little to do with cheating:

Father's occupation:	*Percent of students who cheat*
Professional	45
Executive, managerial	49
Other white-collar	51
Blue-collar	54

Those with scholarships cheat less—except for athletes:

Scholarships based on—	*Percent who cheat*
Financial need	41
Academic ability	45
Students without scholarships	51
Athletic ability	74

Fewer cheat when student opinion disapproves of cheating:

Where disapproval is—	*Percent who cheat*
Very strong	23
Fairly strong	36
Moderate	50
Fairly weak	59
Very weak	69

Cheating is more common in coed colleges:

Type of school:	*Percent of colleges with a high level of cheating*
All female	19
All male	50
Coeducational	61

Source: Study by Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research.

Mr. STRATTON. I invite the attention of the Members to the fact this analysis points out 74 percent of those with athletic scholarships in our colleges cheat, compared to only 41 percent of those on scholarships based on financial need, and with 45 percent for those on scholarships based on academic ability.

Commenting on this same study in yesterday's Sunday New York Times, Mr. Fred L. Heckinger wrote: "Despite angry denials by coaches and football-minded alumni, the dishonesty ratio among athletes is staggeringly high—largely in the words of the study—because athletes are often in college 'for reasons totally unrelated to their academic abilities.' In fairness to the athletes—especially at the Military Academies where they must meet high entrance requirements—it should be added that they devote much of their time and energies to a college-sponsored enterprise of public entertainment as modern gladiators."

Mr. HÉBERT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. In this particular instance you are using this survey which points out that those of athletic ability cheat more than those on scholarships.

Mr. STRATTON. That particular report refers to colleges all around the country. We have nothing in our service academies comparable to the scholarships in other colleges. But the cadet who is recruited for his athletic ability and is allowed to cram to get in would be in a comparable position.

Mr. HÉBERT. Everybody in the service academy is there under the same conditions, on scholarships, so to speak. They are all on scholarships. If more are found to be cheating on athletics, we have to say that the people who do not participate in athletics cheat more than those others do because they are all on scholarships.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman brings out the fact there is not a direct correlation between academic scholarships in our private schools and service academies. But I have already suggested that in the service Academy the cadets who are specifically recruited for their athletic ability as a result of scouting by an Academy coach would be in a roughly comparable position to a civilian student on an athletic scholarship.

In the case of the Air Force Academy you have the situation where three-fourths of the varsity football team was involved, and I think more than a third of those involved in the overall scandal, according to the scanty figures we have, are engaged in athletics or varsity athletics. Surely this is a figure that raises some serious questions.

Mr. HÉBERT. I do not want to use all the gentleman's time. In using the word "professionalism" in athletics particularly, as related to our academies, let us keep in mind that these are the finest young men in the country who are recruited to get an education and to become officers of our military services. When they enter that Academy they enter the Academy as the purest you can find in this country, and they are screened.

When they enter that Academy they enter that Academy as the best young men in the country. If anything happens to them, which is most unfortunate here, and which we do not condone, let us not point the finger of accusation at the individual, let us point the finger of accusation at the circumstances that may have developed.

For instance, if a baby is born in a foreign country and comes to this country when he is 2 or 3 months old and becomes a racketeer, do you blame the country from whence he came or do you blame our own country? This is a matter in which we have to look into the system and what it means. There is the place to put your finger.

Remember this, this young man is not just becoming an athlete at a college, he sacrifices his professional career, he sacrifices his chance to make money. He is first recruited, and we expect that our boys in our academies should be the finest in the country. And they are made to qualify specifically. I do not believe the academies should have two standards of entrance, one for the man on the football team and the other for the man who is going to blow a horn.

Mr. STRATTON. I agree with the gentleman and he agrees with me. I am not directing my remarks to any individual or any Academy. This is a system which existed before the gentleman or I came to Congress. When you put a lad at the Air Force Academy or at West Point or Annapolis in a situation where he has been recruited because of his athletic ability, and in the case of the academies with an entering requirement lower than is required at places like Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and other colleges, and then require that lad to play against teams like Minnesota or even LSU, you are putting this young man who is trying to become one of the Nation's military leaders in a position that is almost impossible and which obviously makes him an easy prey to the kind of cheating ring that has been discovered at the Air Force Academy. I welcome the gentleman's support of my remarks but I must continue.

Mr. HÉBERT. Let me offer this one further thought. The individual who becomes a professional athlete can capitalize on that. But let us return to the system. If a boy wants to go to a college where the emphasis is on going to Oxford, on becoming a Rhodes scholar, I think the temptation, the challenge there is just as much on him to digress from the rules so that he may become a Rhodes scholar as an all-American. Do not put the blame on athletics. It is not the athletics, it is the system.

Mr. STRATTON. I brought this to the attention of the House 3 years ago, and I think the gentleman was here at that time. I commented then that where you had a system in which a young man got into one of the academies as a result of a procedure that was irregular if not downright illegal at the very outset, how could you then expect the young man to follow a code of honor that, as the gentleman knows, is much more rigid than anything that exists in any of our civilian colleges.

Mr. HÉBERT. I definitely agree with the gentleman. I think I was responsible more than any other one individual for the policy of not making an academy try to make a boy break his word. Because I think it is repulsive so far as I am concerned to get a high school kid to sign a contract and then have somebody try to make him break that agreement.

But the academies today do not do that. They have an agreement that any time any boy has signed a letter of intent to go anyplace else, they do not touch him. The gentleman and I are in full agreement and I am glad that he brought that out.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman and I have worked together to get through some changes in legislation which he so capably steered through the House last year increasing the appointments to the academies. We put these provisions, which the gentleman refers to, in the legislation. I just want to carry that fight a little bit further. I welcome the gentleman's support because he is one of the most effective and formidable Members of this body.

Mr. HÉBERT. I do not want to cast a shadow just over athletes. We are all under the same tent.

Mr. STRATTON. I agree. I think we ought to recognize the particular pressures that are on athletes and some of the circumstances under which they are recruited, so that in the future we do not put these athletes in this kind of untenable position. I have nothing against athletics. I think athletics are a great thing. I think athletics have a real place in college life. But I do not think this kind of high-powered, overemphasized professional athletics has any place in our service schools.

Mr. HÉBERT. Would the gentleman then deny the right to recruiting of potential scientists?

Mr. STRATTON. All I can say to the gentleman is that I doubt very much that our athletic coaches in their travels around the country are recruiting very many scientists whatever the officials may tell us.

Mr. HÉBERT. But the academic people are recruiting them.

Mr. STRATTON. Madame Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana bringing out this point because it underlines what I have been trying to say; namely, that I, too, am concerned with a system which I think is guilty of bringing unusual and improper pressures upon any young man. I am not opposed to athletics. I am not opposed to the Air Force. I am not opposed to our Academies. But I do think that over the years we have allowed, with very little vocal opposition in this House—except for the bill to which the gentleman refers, and except for some very effective discussion on this matter on the floor of the other body 3 years ago by the junior Senator from the gentleman's home State, the Senator who has just been appointed as the majority whip—we have allowed a tradition to grow up, whose tragic consequences are now reflected in the developments that have taken place at the Air Force Academy. Is it not time that we paused to look at this tradition and see whether we really mean to support activities of this kind in institutions where we are trying to train, at taxpayers' expense, the leaders who will guide our Armed Forces in an increasingly complex and highly technical world?

Surely we must recognize that brains have their place in military activity as well as brawn, and at this point I would like to include in my remarks, Madam Speaker, an article which appeared on the front page of the Washington Post on January 30 under the headline "Layton Says Police Needs Brains Not Brawn." Chief Layton of the District Police Department says that policemen today need specialized intelligence to do their jobs.

It is not enough, he says, for them just to have brawn. Certainly if this holds true for policemen, it holds true for our military leaders.

I ask unanimous consent to include this article in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

LAYTON SAYS POLICEMEN NEED BRAINS, NOT BRAWN

(By Jack C. Landau)

District Police Chief John B. Layton gave his first major policy speech yesterday since taking the chief's office and said that the future of the Washington police force depends or more brains, not more brawn.

Speaking to the graduating rookies at the Washington Police Academy, Chief Layton emphasized that urban law enforcement officers must go to school to keep abreast of the latest sociological research into the causes of crime and to learn about scientific techniques used by criminals.

"Average intelligence and general ability, which have long represented the minimum standards for selection (of policemen) cannot suffice much longer," Layton said.

"High school diplomas, undergraduate work, and, in time, college degrees will become requisites in the evolution of police officer selection."

Layton said that recruitment should not only eliminate those men who are physically, morally, and psychologically unfit; but should "exclude those whose limited formal educations cause them to function at a level below that required by the increasing demands of law enforcement."

"If we are to compete with the criminal, who now uses modern technological methods, we cannot rely on a bare basic education," Layton added.

"Only through education and training can we approach an understanding of so complex a problem as modern crime in urban communities."

Chief Layton told the young police officers that they "must seek education, not only in technical or vocationally oriented subjects. They must be trained in the humanities—law, medicine, psychology, sociology, philosophy, and other subjects that indicate not only the 'how' but also the 'why'."

"Nothing is so futile as the treatment of symptoms," Chief Layton said. "Only where causes are known and understood can inroads be made. Diligent study must be given the causes of crime, and these causes must be attacked directly and indirectly wherever they appear."

Chief Layton also pointed out that newly hired Washington policemen, who are not required to have college educations, earn salaries that are approximately $1,000 a year more than starting salaries for Federal employees with college degrees. Higher police officials, also not required to have college degrees, are paid salaries comparable to those paid other Government officials with equal responsibilities.

After the half-hour speech, Chief Layton personally congratulated the 1 woman and 48 men in the graduating class.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am glad to yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman is opposed to the system used at all academies, whereby the alumni conduct an athletic association and conduct activities in connection with the construction of stadiums, having the interests of the various schools at heart? Is the gentleman opposed to that system, whereby they try to induce athletes to come to the schools? Is that what the gentleman is opposed to?

Mr. STRATTON. I believe I can answer my good friend from Colorado best by going over what I have already said about what I regarded as athletic professionalism and what I regarded as having no proper place in our academies; namely, a process whereby paid members of the athletic staff go out to recruit athletes; a process in which they "shop around" in the House Office Buildings for appointments, oftentimes not even in the proper district from where the prospective appointee comes; a process whereby, if it turns out that a prospective athlete cannot meet the relatively modest qualifying college board score of 500 certain alumni underwrite his stay in a "cram" school for a year or so to get by the college board examination.

All of this I believe to be detrimental to the basic mission of the academy and puts the kind of undue pressure on these boys which leads readily to the cheating that has now been uncovered.

If there are alumni who wish to build a stadium, I cannot see any objection to that. I would certainly have no objection to those being built in the gentleman's own State. But I do not believe we ought to allow those who build the stadiums to set the athletic and academic policy of the academies.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I can assure the gentleman that under no circumstances has any athletic association, at least at the Air Force Academy, set any of the policies as they deal with the academic situation. We have a Dean the name of General McDermott, who, as pointed out by the gentleman from Louisiana, is interested in seeing how many Rhodes Scholars he can get and how many boys he can induce into getting masters degrees. He puts the pressures on them to see if he can obtain educational quality from those who graduate.

With respect to the question of activities as they relate to recruiting, I refer again to the question I raised with the gentleman. Is the gentleman opposed to the activities of these alumni associations, which I understand are the ones who do the recruiting? Does the gentleman have evidence of the fact that people on the payroll of the Air Force have been loitering in the halls and recruiting these boys?

Mr. STRATTON. I believe we are all aware that this goes on in respect to all our academies. From time to time, perhaps, one academy stresses one aspect more than another academy.

To answer the gentleman's questions specifically, I am opposed to a condition under which this emphasis on championship intercollegiate athletics interferes with the mission of the Academy. The kind of thing to which the gentleman refers does as a practical matter lead to pressures on the academic staff, on the faculty, and on the students themselves to come up with championship teams. We all know that well-meaning alumni are not going to raise money to build a stadium if they are not also going to be able to see championship teams play in that stadium.

This I believe is the kind of thing that has no proper place in our service academies, and which I should like to see eliminated.

I wish I could yield further to the gentleman, but my time is running short.

Mr. HUNGATE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will permit me to complete my statement, then, if there is any time remaining, I will be very happy to yield to him.

Madam Speaker, I might mention in connection with the point the gentleman from Louisiana was raising a moment ago that on the front cover of Time magazine today we have a picture of the members of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. The slogan at the top says, "Thinkers and managers replace the heroes." Certainly we do need thinkers and managers today if we are going to develop an adequate defense of our country and, if need be, wage warfare and wage it effectively. I do not think that we help ourselves if we forget that that after all is the basic mission of our service academies, not turning out a team which can regularly beat Notre Dame or Minnesota or Pitt or even LSU.

Madam Speaker, I was delighted to read in the announcement made the other day by the Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert regarding the appointment of a special committee to investigate the unfortunate scandal at the Air Force Academy, that one of the questions this distinguished committee will look into is the entire role of intercollegiate athletics at the Academies. This, I think, makes it perfectly clear that Mr. Zuckert himself also recognizes that when three-quarters of the varsity football team are involved in this current scandal, there is at the very least a red flag waving with respect to varsity athletics that deserves very careful consideration and concern.

There is one other aspect of this situation, Madam Speaker, which also disturbs me; namely, the fact that the Air Force continues to refuse to give out any information about the progress of its investigation, except for announcing a daily box score of resignations. Frankly, I think the attitude of top Air Force officials in trying to suppress all details of the current investigation, even to Members of Congress, is indefensible, shortsighted and, in the long run, far more harmful to the Academy itself. As other bureaucrats have discovered before, attempts to suppress the truth just to cover administrative embarrassment only lead to the wider and more vigorous circulation of even more damaging rumors.

Particularly ridiculous is the attempt to put a "classified" label on the whole investigation except for the current box score of resignations. National security is certainly not involved here; but apparently what the Air Force is trying to do is to sweep the whole matter under the rug until its own handpicked board comes up with a report and a recommendation. However distinguished may be the membership of this board it certainly cannot replace full public disclosure and discussion of the case. Nor can it replace the primary responsibility

of Congress for the soundness and effectiveness of our system of military tax-supported education.

What is particularly disturbing to me, Madam Speaker, is that at the very time the Air Force refuses to give out any information on the progress of its investigation inspired news reports disclose that it is seriously considering hiring high-priced public relations counsel, presumably at taxpayers' expense, to produce some kind of television spectacular to "improve the image," we are told, of the Academy.

At this point, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of January 30 on this particular subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY MESS

Many worrisome questions are raised by the cheating scandal now rocking the Air Force Academy. The Academy is one of the elite educational institutions of the country, charged with preparing officers who will have the character and knowledge required to defend the United States with the most modern and destructive of weapons. That students being prepared for such heavy responsibility should steal examinations and then conspire to sell them to fellow cadets must arouse shock as well as puzzlement about every phase of the Academy's life and organization. The special committee now appointed by Air Force Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert to study the Academy has a responsibilty that runs beyond an inquiry into the honor system alone. The country will expect it to examine everything from the criteria for selection through the methods of indoctrination and instruction.

Yet even as that committee prepares to begin its work there is disturbing evidence that some influential forces in the Air Force are primarily concerned with protecting the "image" of the Academy. This is suggested by the ridiculous lengths to which Academy officials are going to try to enforce secrecy. Their demand that cadets resigning because of the scandal pledge themselves not to speak about "classified information"—that is, their knowledge of the affair—to anyone, including their parents, represents a new low in bureaucratic obtuseness.

The sole justification for classifying military information is to protect national security, not to conceal administrative embarrassments. There is no need to add to the shame of individual cadets by putting a permanent stain on their future, but that is no excuse for an official blackout of detail on what happened and why. The effort to dam the flow of information is already showing predictable signs of breaking down as irate parents of ousted cadets express their outrage and start telling their sons' side of the story.

The national interest in this unhappy situation would be best served by ending any further abuse of "classification" and providing full opportunity for all concerned to state their views. The present policy only leads to suspicions that hurt the Air Force, its Academy, and the Nation.

Mr. STRATTON. Madam Speaker, I have myself now run into this paper curtain around the progress of the cheating investigation. I called up the Secretary of the Air Force last Thursday and asked him if he would give me a briefing on the progress of the investigation. He very kindly consented to do so and said, "I will send an officer over to see you." On Friday a brigadier general of the Air Force, the Deputy Chief of Legislative Liaison, came to my office in response to that request. I asked him to give me a report on the status of the investigation. He told me that all they knew was that as of last Friday 91 cadets had resigned and the investigation is continuing. Even that, incidentally, as it turned out, was incorrect information because the official box score as of Friday was really 93. That was all he would tell me. It was clear to me that the Air Force was trying to give me a "snow job" on the Academy situation.

When I protested to the general and then later to Secretary Zuckert, he informed me very curtly that he would not tell me anything unless I sent him my questions in writing in advance.

I suppose Secretary Zuckert's demand for questions in writing may have stemmed from irritation over my suggestion last week that it was time for all three of our academies to get away from athletic professionalism and concentrate on training career military leaders for a complex and technical world. But after all, the Secretary himself, as I have already pointed out, recognized the validity of my charge when he directed his own board to inquire not merely into details of the cheating scandal but also into the whole role of intercollegiate athletics at the Academy.

Madam Speaker, as a Member of the House and a member of the Committee on Armed Services I resent this attitude on the part of the Secretary of Defense. Surely we should be able to get information from a service Secretary without having to submit questions in writing in advance. This is not a press conference and it is not a British parliamentary question period. Nevertheless I submitted the questions and I am now waiting for the answers.

These are the specific questions I have sent to the Secretary for his reply. Members may find them of interest.

First. How many cadets in all are believed by Academy officials to have been involved?

Second. How did this ring get started and how did it operate?

Third. How was the existence of the ring discovered, and what steps did Academy officials then take to deal with it?

Fourth. How many of those involved in the scandal were guilty because they failed to report the existence of the cheating ring, as compared with how many were involved because they actually cheated?

Fifth. I understand that some of the cadets involved, who had been attempting to sell the exam questions to their fellow cadets, actually attempted to intimidate fellow cadets into purchasing the examination questions. Please give me the details of this aspect of the case.

Sixth. Is it true, as reported in the press, that new locks are now being put on file cases containing prospective examination papers? Does this mean that examinations previously were not safeguarded at the Academy in the same way that valuable papers would be safeguarded in the Pentagon?

Seventh. Please give me the full report on the action you took yesterday in establishing a special commission under General White to look into this matter.

Eighth. Does the Academy give the same examination on different days? If so, is not this too great a temptation to dishonesty?

Ninth. How many students have been separated from the Academy purely for academic reasons based in whole or in part on grades attained on the examinations in which cheating was involved?

Tenth. Were cadets separated from the Academy because of cheating given honorable discharges with the warning that if they talked to reporters about the cheating scandal their discharges would be downgraded?

I think Members of the House have a right to know the answers to these questions and the public does, as well.

May I conclude, Madam Speaker, by pointing out to the House that there appeared in the New York Times this morning a story by Martin Arnold, dateline Colorado Springs, which gives a detailed account of the entire scandal and answers some of the questions I asked the Secretary last Friday. Well, here is a perfect example of the truth that no matter how much you try you just cannot prevent the facts from coming out. If the Air Force had discussed the matter frankly and fully with Congress and with the public this would have been a much better way to improve the image of the Academy and the mission of the Academy than would be the hiring of a special television counsel.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

AIR CADET STOLE TESTS IN SPRING: HE FOILED SECURITY SYSTEM TO ENTER LOCKED BUILDING

(By Martin Arnold)

COLORADO SPRINGS, January 31.—The sequence of events that led to the uncovering of the large-scale examination cheating at the Air Force Academy goes back to May, when a junior cadet first thought up a plan to steal test papers.

It involves secret after-midnight forays into the Academy's academic building, electronic tampering with an elevator, and the shutting off of an alarm system that would have summoned the Air Police.

The events came to a crashing end 8 months later when the cadet decided to expand his operation to make some money.

This sequence was pieced together today from a series of telephone interviews with a number of parents of cadets who have resigned in the cheating scandal. All gave remarkably similar accounts.

So far, 93 cadets have resigned from the Academy as a result of its official investigation. That number is expected to rise to about 120. All cheated on the tests or were involved in the theft and sale of papers.

OTHERS FACE PUNISHMENT

Another group of cadets, presumably much smaller in number, face expulsion from the Academy or other punishment for knowing about the cheating but not reporting it, as is required by the cadet honor code.

As told by the parents, this is the development of the cheating and its method of operation:

In May the cadet—described by one parent as "very clever" and by another as "an adventurer, not a criminal"—decided to steal and have copies made of the spring-semester final-examination papers.

They were to be used by himself and a few close friends, and at this time there was no thought of making money with them.

The examinations are kept, mostly locked in file cabinets, on the top floor of Fairchild Hall, where the Academy's faculty and the dean of the faculty Brig. Gen. Robert F. McDermott, have their offices.

Fairchild Hall, like all the Academy buildings, is spare and functional in design. It is steel and aluminum, glass and white marble, and it is six stories high. It actually consists of two nearly separate buildings, which are connected on the first two floors and on the fourth, fifth and sixth floors.

Besides the faculty offices, this academic complex houses 168 classrooms, 45 science laboratories, an engineering laboratory, and 5 lecture halls. The school library is in the southern portion of the building.

The cadet who wanted to cheat acquired a key to the locked cabinets containing the examination papers in May.

He then was confronted with the problem of gaining access to the top floor of Fairchild Hall late at night or early in the morning.

The elevator in the library section of Fairchild Hall is operated to the upper floors of the building all night, but in the evening it is adjusted by special keys so that it does not stop on the second floor.

That is because there is an easy walkway connecting the library at the second floor to the northern part of Fairchild Hall, where much of the valuable laboratory equipment is kept and all the faculty offices are situated. This is the only way a cadet could get from one building to the other at night.

The cadet was unable to obtain the special key that would allow him to get off the elevator at the second floor at night and walk to the other part of the building.

He discovered, however, that between the first and second floors the power would go off in the elevator if he pushed the emergency button. The elevator would then glide to a stop on the second floor.

The doors would not open automatically with the power off, but he found that he could push them apart with his hands.

ALARM DISCONNECTED

It was also relatively simple for the cadet—all cadets are thoroughly trained in the sciences, including electronics—to disconnect the alarm-bell system, which automatically summons help when the elevator power goes off. At night, that help would have included Air Police.

From the second floor, the cadet walked to the northern side of the building and went up the four flights of steps to the faculty area, where the examination papers were kept. He made his first midnight raid in May, after the examination papers were prepared for spring semester finals. The spring semester ends early in June.

The papers taken then were used only by the junior and his close friends, said to have been about five or six cadets.

It is not clear whether, after the first raid on the papers was made, more than one cadet actually took part in the foray. Presumably this small group could easily have completed the junior and senior years and graduated from the Academy without being caught, had the cadets not decided to make some money out of the operation.

In December, however, when the semester finals were again coming up, the junior cadet again started to raid the file cabinets. This time he and his small band—grown now to 10 or 12—decided to sell the questions to carefully selected cadets.

They knew which cadets were having troubles with their grades, and with great caution and subtlety they approached them. To those who indicated a willingness, the prices ranged from about $5 to $10 a paper, depending on the financial resources of the purchasers.

Some of the cadets who were involved were said by Maj. Gen. Robert H. Warren, the Academy superintendent, to have been "top-notch" students.

Presumably, they were too lazy to study, he said.

About 30 football players are involved.

Some of the cadets who were approached but did not make purchases have testified before the investigation board that they were threatened with bodily harm if they reported the theft ring to authorities, parents of cadets have said.

Presumably, these latter cadets all fall in the so-called tolerator category, and the final dispensation on their cases will be made by the Academy's 24-cadet honor board members, who collectively in groups of 8 have the power to demand resignations and to grant varying degrees of forgiveness.

BUSINESS WAS GOOD

Business was good at first. Early in January, however, two cadets in the junior class were approached. They did not purchase papers and they were not frightened of physical harm. Instead they respected the honor code and on January 8 reported what they knew to authorities.

This code not only prohibits cheating, lying, and stealing, but also the toleration of any cadet who does lie, steal or cheat.

From the mightiest general down to the newest second lieutenant, the Air Force Academy is the great symbol of the Air Force itself.

Because of this misdeed, there was such great shock and almost disbelief on the part of the Academy administration when the first report was made on January 8.

A quiet investigation was begun and presumably at least some of the instigators were not aware that they had been turned in. A week later, on January 15, a Friday, two first-year cadets were approached about buying papers.

They were frightened. They apparently did not buy the papers, but they spent a disquieting weekend wrestling with whether or not they should report what they had learned to authorities.

On Monday, January 18, they told what they knew, and on the following day the Academy announced that it was investigating the cheating.

OPTIMISM VANISHED

Once the first-year cadets' accounts had been told, and verified, investigators from the Air Force Office of Special Investigation were flown in to conduct the investigation under the direction of General Warrren. This investigation is expected to be completed by about February 10. The status of the cadets who instigated the cheating scandal is not now known.

In another action, Secretary of Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert has set up a special committee to investigate the entire Academy program, including its honor-code system, its curriculum, and its intercollegiate athletic program.

The shock at the dimensions of the scandal has not been confined to the Air Force or even the military.

The Air Force has been reluctant to give out the details of the investigation, and today sources at the Academy have refused to deny, confirm or even comment on the sequence of the events unfolded in this scandal.

A group of five local residents, however, placed a quarter-page advertisement in today's issue of the Colorado Springs Gazette-Telegraph, a daily newspaper. It said:

"The merchants of misery are among us. Headline-hungry newsmen are busily shouting the unfortunate problems of the Air Force Academy. Their condemnations are on the front page, their praises are buried. Now is the time to stand up and be counted. The people of Colorado Springs should reaffirm their faith in the great majority of the cadets who have always maintained the highest standards of moral integrity. The cadet wing, the faculty, and the staff are valued neighbors in our community."

Mr. HUNGATE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Missouri and I shall now be happy to do so.

Mr. HUNGATE. Would the gentleman from New York advise, since the Academy bands have been mentioned in connection with this, whether the gentleman is aware of any instances of recruiting for musicians of the same nature described for athletes?

Mr. STRATTON. I did not mention the service academy bands and I am not familiar with that aspect of it.

Mr. PIKE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am very happy to yield to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

Mr. PIKE. The gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is well aware that on many occasions I have stuck my neck on the line in his behalf to extoll him for what he is doing. This is one occasion, however, when I am obliged to say that I am not sure I do not have mixed emotions about this.

The Washington Post, for example, today stated that the Secretary of the Air Force had moved with admirable speed to constitute this board of inquiry and to look into this more thoroughly. In view of this it might be appropriate to wait until this board does look into it and examines the facts before we start castigating them on the floor of the House.

Mr. STRATTON. Let me say to my good friend from New York that I am well aware of the support he has given to me on many occasions and I am deeply grateful to him for it. I am well aware of the fact that he is a man of independent views and that I am most fortunate when his views do happen to coincide with mine.

My only point was that I said last Monday that one of the real areas for concern in this whole investigation should be the role of intercollegiate athletics in our service academies. Since Secretary Zuckert has now directed his own board to examine this very subject he has apparently agreed with us that it does deserve looking into. In fact it may well be that my own comments last week prompted his action.

But I think we, too, in this Congress have a responsibility for the operation of our service academies. I do not accept the gentleman's view that we must remain silent until some board selected by the executive branch has first made its own report. To do so would be to abrogate our responsibilities as a Congress, something I am sure no member of the great Committee on Armed Services would ever propose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRIFFITHS). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HÉBERT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Madam Speaker, it is distressing to me, as I am sure it is to many Members of Congress, that before we have been officially informed about the Air Force Academy cheating scandal that Academy football and indeed all service academy football has been indicted as professional, sordid and the cause of a blight which will plague for years the Air Force Academy as it did its sister Academy, West Point.

To this day the American public has accepted the West Point investigations of the early 1950's scandal with a measure of skepticism. Two of the four classes received less than cursory investigation and though 90 were discharged the total involvement of the varsity football squad permitted a less than forthright discussion of the facts by creating the impression that this was the only group involved. Few have believed that this was confined to the football players but more have reasoned that Army ranks were closed, and Congress was requested not to investigate. I dare say that an unknown number of violators remained to graduate and serve their country well both in Korea and Vietnam.

It always seemed a paradox to me that if football corrupted the corps why did West Point continue this game with the emphasis undiminished by the scandal unless the authorities were convinced football was incidental to the cause of a breakdown of their honor system. To believe West Point continued football knowing that the game destroyed the character fiber of the corps is to suggest that Academy authorities were more venal than the accused cadets.

I review the West Point sad incident only in the light that it is headline material to condemn college football and to hang the present Air Academy scandal on a game which with all its faults is good for the youth of this country whether participants or not.

In my years of congressional service never have I known a case where any Academy has lowered the academic and character requirements in order to permit an athlete to be admitted. If it were otherwise the Members of Congress would be aware of any such dereliction. In fact, to compromise the entrance requirements by the admissions committee for any appointee would be a more damning indictment than the present charge against the air cadets.

The charge of football professionalism against the service academies is sheer nonsense. An air cadet arises at 6:30 every morning, spends the major part of every day in study or class, has little free time, and takes an academic course equivalent to 150 hours which is far more than is required in any college of this country in a curriculum which would do justice to a combined Harvard and MIT course.

Now I get to the essence of the past, present and future scandals involving honor violations. Undoubtedly there are a few bad characters who should have been dismissed. But before this is a wholesale exodus a civilian academic board of inquiry should be appointed by Congress to determine whether the ever increasing academic load carried by the cadets, the pressure from within, and the onus of failing from without has become so great as to cause a lessening of acceptance of academy standards. No internal faculty or officer group of inquiry will admit to such fact.

The extra burden to the athlete who carries the same academic course as all cadets leads me to ask who in this body buys the superficial statement that football at the Air Academy is professional and corruptive?

When large numbers are involved in a service academy violation the entire corps becomes suspect as who knows who else would have been involved if the opportunity arose. The service academies are made up of the Nation's top boys who are highly recommended and come from wonderful American families. When large numbers of such boys are involved in a scandal we must either indict their home communities or families which are so proud of them or indict a system which has failed to inculcate the honor code of which the academies often too fervently boast.

Gentlemen, the breakdown of the Air Force honor code has no genesis whatsoever in academy sports. It is rather, by the very number of fine young Americans involved—athletes and nonathletes—a failure to accept a system with deep conviction, a system which was borrowed from West Point where it had been badly breeched even though steeped in tradition. I do not excuse any infraction but I do regard the interpretation of all cases as either black or white just as unrealistic as the cavalry charge with fixed bayonets. And to believe otherwise is to condemn a generation of young America—as most assuredly the large majority of these involved represents a cross section of our finest and are measured by their home communities as superior young Americans.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am happy to yield to our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Madam Speaker, I apologize to the gentleman for asking him to yield at this point for a unanimous-consent request, but I do so at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit while the House is in session this afternoon and also, Madam Speaker, that this request be printed in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRIFFITHS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROCEDURAL IMPROVEMENTS IN CONTEMPT CITATION CASES

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam Speaker, on January 14, 1965, I introduced two bills in conjunction with the gentleman from New York, JOHN LINDSAY, to provide for procedural reforms in congressional contempt citation cases. The first bill, H.R. 2795 would set up new procedures in the House for the investigation and referral to the House of circumstances leading to possible contempt of Congress citations. The second bill, H.R. 2794, would amend judicial procedures by allowing courts to return declaratory judgments in these matters.

CONGRESSIONAL CONTEMPT CITATIONS

One of the necessary powers of this, or any other, legislative body is to protect itself against acts designed to undermine and contravene its functions. The means by which the American Congress protects itself is through the invocation of the contempt procedure, a process which calls to the attention of the Congress the act which threatens it and provides for punishment of the offender, either through the courts or before the bar of the House against which the contempt has been directed.

Most contempts today arise from actions of those called before committees of the Congress as witnesses. These actions range from refusal to cooperate to active obstruction of the committee's work. There is no need to call attention to the importance of our committee structure and the fact that the detailed legislative and investigative work which is done by the Congress is accomplished through committees. This is all clearly understood. The point to which I wish to address attention is the procedure by which contempts are brought to the attention of the parent body, the House or the Senate, by committes which have encountered such witnesses.

At present, it is the practice for the committee which has been the subject of the act of contempt to serve as first judge of the matter. It is the committee itself which reports the matter to the parent body, acting at once as victim and prosecutor. I question the soundness of this form of proceeding and the bill, I have introduced, would change this procedure. Basically, this bill provides a screening committee to which the complaint of contempt is brought and it is this screening committee, not the committee which has been subject to the action complained of, which would act as the agency reporting the matter to the parent body.

This new procedure commends itself because it places in the hands of an impartial body the investigation of the charge of contempt and does so in a manageable way. Surely the House or Senate could be considered impartial bodies to investigate the charge, but considerations of time prevent this and

there is no practical way in which outside witnesses could be heard on the question of guilt if the entire House or Senate heard the matter. There is real question if the committee which complains of contempt can properly be charged with the responsibility of impartially weighing the evidence to determine if a contempt should be reported to the parent body.

This committee to investigate contempt charges would be named by the presiding officers of the House and Senate respectively and would serve as a special committee. The committee would have seven members and be divided four to three along party lines. The creation of this committee, and its operation in the important area of protecting the Congress and its proceedings from the interference of those wishing to undermine its effectiveness, would provide a strong safeguard of the rights of those charged with contempt and would make more meaningful this type of protection for the Congress.

JUDICIAL PROCEDURES

I have also joined with my very able colleague from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] in supporting legislation which would provide for a declaratory judgment mechanism in connection with congressional contempt proceedings. These two proposals would represent a great step forward in the way in which the Congress deals with the contumacy of witnesses appearing before its committees.

The provisions of the declaratory judgment bill would be highly beneficial in that they would permit the clarification of the very difficult issues that often underlie potential contempt situations without resort to the difficult quasi-criminal procedure surrounding an actual contempt citation. Often the underlying point in a contempt situation is lost by concentration on the contumacy of the witness and not on the issue upon which the refusal to testify or produce papers is based.

Many recall, I am sure, the contempt citations offered against officials of the Port of New York Authority in 1960. It would have been far better had we been able to raise the issues of Federal-State relations that lay at the heart of the matter for consideration by a Federal court, through the declaratory judgment procedure, rather than using, as we did the criminal contempt mechanism that was necessitated when a witness refused to produce the information requested by the committee.

This declaratory judgment procedure would be open only to the Congress and not to witnesses. It would serve as a means of expediting congressional action, and could not be used as a means to deter the proper functioning of the Congress or its committees. Further, the use of the declaratory judgment's mechanism is optional and need not be invoked. Of course, there will be many contempt situations that will not raise issues calling for immediate determination by the courts. However, many situations do arise where there is a need for a clarification of the underlying issue of contempt without concern for the fact that the witness has failed to divulge information.

Linking this with my other proposal to establish a special committee in both Houses of the Congress, to consider contempt situations, it would be the function of that committee, not only to make recommendations as to whether a contempt citation should issue, but whether the Congress should obtain from a court of the United States, a declaration of the legal relations between the Congress and the recalcitrant witness. The House of Congress concerned would then be free to act on the recommendations of the committee as it sees fit.

With the tremendous workload facing the Congress there is a great need for improving the procedures of the House of Representatives. These two proposals on which the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] and I have joined represent substantial steps forward in the field of contempt procedures, increasing both the speed and the skill with which the Congress can deal with contempt situations.

BANK OF AMERICA REALLY IS THE BIGGEST

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Madam Speaker, in my remarks last Tuesday concerning the status of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I indicated that the CCC, a taxpayer-owned financial institution, is actually the biggest bank in the world.

In doing so, I did grave injustice to the Bank of America. I have since been supplied with a financial statement for the year 1964 which indicates that at the close of business on December 24, the total assets of the bank amounted to $15.5 billion. This is $1 billion more than the approved capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and therefore an apology is in order to the officers of the Bank of America. This I humbly offer.

MANY VERSIONS OF THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Madam Speaker, it is interesting that we are now beginning to get many versions of the Great Society and historically considerable information of how this same philosophy has been advanced by various rulers and economists in the past.

I was particularly struck with the analysis of this subject made by James S. Kemper, Jr., president of the Lumbermen's Mutual Casualty Co. of Chicago in an address before the Chartered Property & Casualty Underwriters all-industry conferment luncheon at Hamden, Conn., on December 3 of last year. In particular, I was interested in one of his final statements which was:

> Those of us who are skeptical, are skeptical only because we are concerned with the means by which these objectives are to be achieved, and with the danger that a gradual drift to a Socialist philosophy and economy may shatter great dreams of the future and destroy the Great Society we already have.

His full address follows:

THE GREAT SOCIETY

(An address before Chartered Property & Casualty Underwriters all-industry conferment luncheon, Hamden, Conn., December 3, 1964, by James S. Kemper, Jr., president, Lumbermen's Mutual Casualty Co.)

THE GREAT SOCIETY

This invitation to address a great professional society offers me an opportunity to make some observations above the concept of the Great Society about which we have heard so much and read so much during recent months.

First I am going to talk about the Great Society we already have, and the part the private insurance industry has played in creating it.

The people of the United States enjoy more material blessings than the people of any other country in the world, or of any other society in all recorded history. The concept of freedom from want for all our people is at the threshold of realization. We do not have a perfect society in this respect, or in any other respect, but I think even Plato would agree, were he alive today, that we have almsot succeeded in turning the goals of his philosophical abstraction into reality.

Private entrepreneurs, operating in a free enterprise system based upon the profit motive, are responsible for this achievement. Private enterprise has given us more and better food, clothing, housing, transportation, recreation, and luxuries, and longer life and better health, than would have been dreamed possible even a generation ago; and the distribution of these benefits of the free enterprise system has extended to the overwhelming majority of our population.

Without a strong and creative private insurance industry these fruits of the private enterprise system would not have been possible. This is a fact not understood by most people. If every producer of goods and services were required to maintain his own financial reserves to protect himself against loss by damage, destruction, and legal liability, billions of dollars of capital would be frozen in nonproductive sterility. It has been the existence of professionally managed pools of money, spreading the risk of loss over millions of entrepreneurs, which has freed the capital to speed our progress, to create the products of an abundant economy, and to pay the wages which have permitted an ever-increasing number of our people to participate in our prosperity.

Insurance against loss is just as important to the consumer as to the producer. As the material abundance of our free economy brought more possessions to more people, the private insurance system filled the need for protection of the owners of these possessions from loss. I think it is to the particular credit of the insurance industry—although hardly a matter for rejoicing on our part—that we have provided protection to the consumer-owner for a rate of profit that would be considered ridiculously small by the standards of any other industry; and in recent years for no profit at all.

In general, the fine record of the private insurance industry with respect to the insurance of things is neither widely understood nor particularly challenged by anyone.

It is in the realm of insurance of people that our record, while equally good, is definitely challenged.

For example, in recent years there has been a growing political clamor for cradle-to-the-grave health insurance, financed by taxes instead of premiums, and administered by the Federal Government. But what is the record of private insurance? I think our industry can be proud of its contribution to this important element of the Great Society we already have.

Last year more than $10 billion was paid out by private insurance companies for medical payments of all types under health and accident, workmen's compensation, and automobile bodily injury policies. Seventy percent of our population is covered under private health and accident insurance plans, economically administered with over 80 percent of every premium dollar going into direct benefits to policyholders. More than half of the 18 million people over 65 years of age now have health insurance, and the number is growing rapidly. This is hardly a record that calls for apology or for a violent change in the system.

So in considering the Great Society we already have, and the part played by our industry in bringing it to pass, I think we have done a good job, one to be proud of; and I think our big task in the future will be to maintain a record of strength and creativity which measures up to and continues the rate of progress of the past.

Now let's take a look at the concept of the Great Society that has been so widely discussed in recent months, and its possible impact upon the people of the United States and upon the private insurance system in particular.

So far most of the public statements have been generalizations. But these generalizations will soon be translated into specific programs and offered for action at the next and future sessions of Congress. No one can disagree with the stated objectives: peace and prosperity, a good education for everyone, removal of discrimination based upon personal prejudices, urban improvement, elimination of poverty, and an increase in the personal financial security of all individuals. Nor do I believe that the President of the United States, or the Vice President of the United States, or any responsible Member of Congress would deliberately lead the United States down the road to socialism in an effort to achieve these objectives. I do believe there is real danger that the laudable desire to bring about the millenium of the Great Society, accompanied by an impatient push toward greater centralization of power in the Federal Government, may well lead toward socialism in general. So far as our industry is concerned, there is already a discernible trend toward absorption by government of the functions performed by insurance companies in the insurance of people: i.e., a form of socialism in particular. So the private insurance industry is directly involved in all aspects of the blueprint for the Great Society which deal with the provision of financial security to the individual.

For example, some form of health insurance program for the elderly is at the top of the agenda. There is nothing new about this kind of proposal. As early as 1697, the author, Daniel Defoe, suggested a "pension office." Laborers of "honest repute" were to deposit 4 shilling a year into "a great chest locked with 11 locks"—1 for each trustee of the fund. Victims of accident or sickness (except those hurt while drunk or quarreling) would receive pensions of 12 pence a week. The fund would also provide for those too old or too ill to support themselves by putting them in special government institutions. It was Defoe's idea that this plan would "forever bannish beggary and poverty out of the Kingdom."

Almost 200 years later, toward the end of the 19th century, Chancellor Bismarck of Germany obtained enactment by the Reichstag of three compulsory insurance bills, one for sickness, one for accidents, and one for old-age pensions.

In more recent years a variety of health insurance plans has been adopted by many countries. As far as I have been able to determine, not one of these programs has worked out as anticipated; some of them have gone bankrupt; and all of them have cost several times the initial estimates of the planners.

Some discussion of the Canadian program may be appropriate. Canada has had a partial health insurance program for about 6 years, which has cost approximately double the original estimates. Now the Royal Commission on Health Services has recommended a full cradle-to-the-grave program. The Canadian Tax Foundation estimates that program will cost $4.5 billion a year by 1971. Considering the population difference, and the higher cost of health services in the United States, if such a program were enacted here the estimated cost would be approximately $60 billion per year.

My point is not that we have immediately to deal with a program of this comprehensive and expensive nature. It is, however, an historical fact that once a country adopts a mild or modest or partial program for Government health services financed by taxes rather than by premiums, public and political pressures inevitably expand the program to the point where it becomes an economic catastrophe. Are we so immune to such pressures in the United States that the administration in power, Republican or Democrat, will be able to hold a Government health insurance program within its original limitations?

Other programs, still in the suggestion stage and not yet blue-printed, point to the danger both to the public and to the insurance industry of pursuing the wrong road to achieve the Great Society. I read recently of a plan sometimes referred to as the "Reuther Formula." This is a proposal that the Federal Government reinsure or borrow from the $66 billion now held in private pension funds, in order to get money to finance the "War on Poverty" and other welfare projects which comprise part of the legislative program for the Great Society. If adopted, this plan could partially circumvent congressional authority over appropriations, postpone the inevitable day of repayment, and tend to conceal from the taxpayer the real cost of these projects.

There are other projects already enacted or on the drawing board which tend either to put the Federal Government into the insurance business or to gain access by the Federal Government to the policyholders' money. As an industry we will oppose bad projects; but the outcome will depend not upon our opposition as such, but upon our ability to demonstrate to the American people and to public officials at the Federal level that our opposition is not selfish, but is soundly based and consistent with the welfare of the public and the proper functioning of a free American economy.

We must make people understand the truth, which is that we are just as much interested as anyone else in providing for the poor, the stricken, and the elderly; that in the great majority of cases the private insurance industry can do the job more economically and more efficiently than the Federal Government; and that it can best do so under the present system of State regulation with a minimum of intervention and control at the Federal level. We all believe these things to be so—the problem is to get our story across to the Government and to the public. It is a problem primarily of demonstration and of communication.

I have four specific proposals to make.

First. Within our own companies, individually and competitively, let us redouble our efforts, through research and product development, to improve the quality and breadth of the services we sell to the public. Competition in this function should be fierce, uncompromising, and with no quarter asked or given. The public is entitled to the best service and the broadest protection which it is economically feasible to provide, and if we believe in the free enterprise system it is our duty to provide it.

At the same time let us pool our brains and our experience on an industrywide basis in the property and casualty fields to develop the best possible statistical and actuarial information upon which we can then individually, or through bureaus, develop competitive rates which permit a reasonable profit on our insurance operations. In this connection I was distressed to see the instant negative reaction on the part of spokesmen for some segments of the industry to the recent proposal by the presidents of 12 stock agency companies for a new actuarial and statistical organization. Whether or not this turns out to be the most desirable answer to our statistical needs, it is a proposal which deserves the most careful and serious consideration by all of us.

Second. I propose that we encourage each one of the 1,200,000 people employed by the private insurance industry to constitute himself a one-man public relations agent for our industry. We simply do not tell our story at the times and in the places where it will be both welcome and effective. I have particularly in mind the opportunities to engage in local community activities, directly related to the insurance industry and at the same time in the public interest. This is the practice of personal involvement, so impressively described by Governor Dempsey of this State in his talk before the recent annual convention of the National Association of Independent Insurors.

Today most crimes are crimes against property, and 90 percent of them are covered by insurance; we know from recent FBI reports that more than 50 percent of all serious crimes are committed by youngsters; therefore, is it not appropriate for insurance people to become active in their local communities in such projects as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Boys Clubs, and other groups teaching our young people the principles of good citizenship? We know that traffic safety bears a direct relationship to automobile insurance rates which go up and up and are still so desperately and consistently inadequate; therefore, is it not appropriate for insurance people to take an active part in traffic safety work in their own communities? These efforts will be welcome; they will be effective; and they will represent an individual contribution of high importance both to the insurance industry and to the public welfare. This is the kind of thing that will enable us to get our story across to our neighbors, and to make them understand that our objectives and theirs are identical.

Third. At the management and association level there is a great diffusion of effort in the whole area of relationships with the public and relationships with Federal Government officials. We coast along until some crisis appears on the horizon; then we scurry around indignantly complaining that this congressional committee or that Government agency is about to take some action harmful to the insurance industry. We have no central planning in the vitally important field of public affairs.

On no occasion except a CPCU conferment do we see a microcosm of the entire insurance industry, with every line of insurance and every system of producing and selling it represented by people gathered together in one room. Certainly we should have equally broad representation in our deliberations on public affairs of great consequence to the future of our industry.

I, therefore, propose the creation of a public affairs council, the members to be chairmen or presidents of insurance companies, serving without right of substitution and representing all major segments of our industry, and to be appointed individually by the present chairman or president of each major life, health, and property and casualty association. Additional members might be the incumbent president and vice president and the immediate past president of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and the incumbent presidents of the principal agents' associations.

I visualize this as a group large enough to represent the entire insurance industry but small enough to function effectively as a working organization. It would have a small, highly competent paid staff of people experienced in public affairs and social and economic research. It would meet at least twice a year, and preferably quarterly, to consider and act appropriately upon the relationships of the insurance industry to the public and to the Federal Government in their broadest aspects.

It is not my idea that this Council would serve as a focal point of opposition to measures of the type I have described as implicit in the concept of the Great Society. Rather it is my thought that it would seek ways in which the insurance industry might make an important and responsible contribution to the further sound development of the Great Society which we already have.

Fourth. The idea of a Public Affairs Council leads directly to the fourth proposal. I propose that this Council, when formed, consider asking President Johnson to appoint an Insurance Advisory Council to the President. The members of the Public Affairs Council would serve de jure, as members of the President's Council, augmented by the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the chairmen of appropriate committees of the Senate and the House, and such additional Federal Government personnel as the President might wish to appoint. The Insurance Advisory Council to the President would meet at least once a year, and preferably twice a year, to discuss all Federal legislation and all other significant matters involving the relationship among the Federal Government, the private insurance industry, and the public.

I do not envision this group as a sounding board for anyone, or as a platform for people to make speeches. I picture it as an actual working entity, offering the opportunity for an exchange of views and philosophies in an atmosphere of reason.

In his Thanksgiving message last week to the Armed Forces, President Johnson said: "Freedom is always in the midst of peril." Indeed it is. The peril from without is socialism by conquest. The peril from within is socialism by default.

As I said earlier, I believe that the objectives of the Great Society have been propounded in good faith. Those of us who are skeptical, are skeptical only because we are concerned with the means by which these objectives are to be achieved, and with the danger that a gradual drift to a Socialist philosophy and economy may shatter great dreams of the future and destroy the Great Society we already have. No part of our national economy is more directly involved in the plans for the Great Society than is the insurance industry. Our stake is as great as, and in fact is the same as, the stake of all Americans. Let us not lose it by default.

If these proposals, particularly the last two proposals, are worth discussion, I hope they will be widely and critically discussed by those in our industry who are concerned about our position in the American economy of the future. The time is short, if we are to make our proper contribution and to play our proper role in the great free society of tomorrow.

A BILL TO PROHIBIT FOREIGN PROCESSING VESSELS FROM OPERATING IN U.S. WATERS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to prohibit freezing, packing, or other processing of fish by foreign vessels in the territorial waters of the United States. This is similar to the bill I introduced last year just prior to adjournment.

Last year Japanese freezer ships, paying their nationals 33 cents per hour, operated in the vicinity of Cordova, Alaska. American pay scales exceed $3 per hour for similar work and Americans cannot meet the foreign competition.

Officials of the Cordova Aquatic Marketing Association now are using the competition of Japanese floating cannery operators to whipsaw American cannery operators in negotiating over the price of fish. According to reports a breakdown in negotiations between the Cordova fishermen and American fishpackers has occurred and the Japanese may be asked to return this year. This situation could occur not only in this one area but in the other areas of Alaska as well. In short, it could spell the doom of the entire Alaskan fishpacking industry because no bank will loan money to an industry unless it has assurance that the borrower can operate economically and at a profit. As a result, the jobs of thousands of American workers who work seasonally in Alaska in the fishing industry are jeopardized.

Of course, Madam Speaker, most of the American companies who operate canneries in Alaska also buy canned salmon from the Japanese. Perhaps these businessmen do not stand to lose so much but the workers and various skills that are engaged in the processing of fish could lose out completely.

How long, Madam Speaker, must American citizens stand by and see foreign nationals undermine their livelihoods?

Yet your State Department apparently feels under no obligation to protect them.

NEW HAMPSHIRE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PROTESTS VA CUTBACKS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Madam Speaker, the New Hampshire House of Representatives adopted a resolution on January 20 protesting the plans of the Veterans' Administration to cut back its regional offices in Manchester, N.H., and at White River Junction, Vt. Under unanimous consent, I offer a copy of this resolution for the RECORD.

This document speaks for itself. It expresses the displeasures and alarm felt by the distinguished House of Representatives of New Hampshire over the abrupt announcement by the Veterans' Administration. The New Hampshire House, like this House, is deeply concerned for the welfare of our veterans. I congratulate the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], for its decision to investigate the VA's plans in public hearings. Until the Congress has had an opportunity to look into the entire matter, I strongly believe that the VA, in recognition of the general concern felt by the States and the Congress, should delay execution of its plans until it has presented a full explanation to the Congress. It is for this reason that I have introduced a resolution calling on the President to delay all VA changes until hearings have been held by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a written report is filed.

The resolution by the New Hampshire House of Representatives is as follows:

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has ordered a cutback in the regional offices of veterans affairs at both Manchester, N.H., and White River Junction, Vt.; and

Whereas this action might cause a cutback in veterans services and the loss of employment at these facilities; and

Whereas although the Federal Government has justified the cutback of the offices on the grounds that it would reflect economy without affecting the services of veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the House of Representatives of the 1965 session of the General Court of New Hampshire strongly protest this cutback in the offices at Manchester, N.H., and White River Junction, Vt., because of the result of poorer services to veterans and hardship to people employed at these facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Veterans' Administration and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN THE SOUTH

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Madam Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include an article by Holmes Alexander on the Republican Party in the South. The article follows:

SOUTHERNERS IN THE GOP

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—We keep reading and hearing about Candidate Goldwater's "sordid" and "squalid" southern strategy, but that must be because the commentators are looking for adjectives instead of evidence.

Any honest eye can see that Barry's formula for republicanizing the Old Confederacy is the only strategy that worked at all. Had his conservative message been as

ineffective below the Potomac as it was practically everywhere west of the Chesapeake Bay, he would have been beaten worse than Landon, carrying only Arizona, leaving the GOP hardly an acre to reseed itself.

The reseeding commenced, although hardly noted in the national press which was focused on the defrocking of GOP chairman Birch, almost as soon as Republican House Members found their seats in the 89th Congress. At a meeting of the Republican conference on January 14, the GOP survivors passed a succinct but significant resolution which read:

"That the conference committee vice chairman and secretary be considered a part of the leadership with defined duties."

What significance? Well, the vice chairman is WILLIAM CRAMER of Florida and the secretary is RICHARD POFF of Virginia. By enlarging the official leadership to seven members, the House Republicans were moving two southerners into positions of party command. Their defined duties are to steer GOP policy in conference, enunciate it on the floor and perform the loyal opposition of heckling Democrats. Never within memory—and only because of Goldwater's good southern showing—have southerners been raised to party leadership.

Shortly after Congress convened, ALBERT WATSON, of South Carolina, switched parties and became a Republican—his State, his district and his junior Senator having followed Goldwater at the national election. The GOP leadership took account of its astonishing gains in House seats from the erstwhile solid South. Mississippi and Georgia, thanks to Goldwater, each contributed a Republican Congressman. Alabama contributed five. In all, the South now has an historically remarkable delegation of Republicans: two from Virginia, two from North Carolina, two from Florida, three from Tennessee, one from Kentucky, as well as the recruits from South Carolina, Mississippi, and Alabama. There are two semi-Southerners from Maryland and one from West Virginia.

If the GOP is to rise again, it will be because the South is rising as a two-party region. If these southern Republicans are to win reelection and build seniority, it will be because they make good in their jobs. In order to give the newcomers every chance to shine, the GOP leadership went out of its way to place them on major and suitable committees.

Contrary to derogatory comment, the southern rookies—I think I have met them all at least once—are easily equal and often superior to the Democrats they replaced. The country has a right to know that these new Republicans are not freaks or cornpone comedians.

GLENN ANDREWS, of Alabama, Princeton 1931, was district manager of Eastman Kodak and gained appointment to the Education and Labor Committee at his own request. JOHN H. BUCHANAN, JR., of Alabama, formerly a Baptist pastor, goes to the Un-American Activities Committee. JACK EDWARDS, of Alabama, a prominent railroad lawyer with many appearances before Federal commissions, asked and got a position on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee because he comes from the port city of Mobile.

JAMES MARTIN, of Alabama, past president of his local chamber of commerce, president of his own oil company, goes to the Public Works Committee that will handle most of the Appalachian rehabilitation. WILLIAM DICKINSON, of Alabama, for almost 5 years a circuit court judge and president of his chamber of commerce, goes to the Government Operations Committee.

HOWARD CALLAWAY, of Georgia, is a West Point graduate, class of 1949, with outstanding Korean war combat service and is assigned to Government Operations Committee. JOHN J. DUNCAN, of Tennessee, twice mayor of Knoxville, is assigned to the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Dr. TIM LEE CARTER, of Kentucky, is a medical physician and former teacher with assignment to the Commerce Committee, which handles food, drug, and public health legislation. PRENTISS WALKER, of Mississippi, owner of a poultry business and a Baptist church deacon, was assigned to the Agriculture Committee.

All the new southern Republican Members are positioned where they can do their best work, and the Nation has gained this much from Goldwater's southern strategy.

HORTON BILL TO REPEAL TELEPHONE TAX

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, I wish to make a few brief comments in support of the bill which I have introduced to repeal the Federal excise tax imposed on communication services and facilities.

At the present time this tax is levied at the rate of 10 percent on general and toll telephone service, telegraph, cable and radio messages and leased wires, and at 8 percent on wire and equipment service.

With the exception of the tax on local telephone service, which was instituted in 1941 to discourage telephone use during the war effort, these taxes have been in effect on a permanent basis since 1932.

At this time when we in the Congress are giving serious consideration to the elimination of various excise taxes, repeal of these discriminatory communications taxes should receive top priority.

While other utilities or modes of communications such as electricity, gas, water, or rail transportation enjoy exemption from this excise levy, these taxes on telephone calls, telegraph messages, and so forth, still remain as part of our revenue system imposing an unjust burden upon these industries and their consumers alike.

Taxation of these services cannot in any sense be justified on the grounds they are luxuries, for each and every one of us realizes they are absolutely essential for modern-day living. For example, not only is the telephone necessary in business and in everyday community life, but it is highly essential in reporting emergencies which will bring police, firemen, or doctors to our assistance when we need them most.

Such taxes must be borne by the consumer. They add to the cost we pay for these facilities and services. It also adds to the costs of business which again have to be passed on to the consumer in higher prices charged for goods and services.

Elimination of these taxes are even more imperative when we consider their regressive effects. They take a larger proportion of income from those at the lower income levels and bear most heavily upon those individuals who can least afford to pay them. Hence, they are restrictive and limit fuller usage of these services. At the present time, about 20 percent of American households are without telephones. Repeal of these taxes would enable more Americans to afford the convenience of such service.

These taxes bring in nearly $1 billion annually in revenues to our Federal Treasury. In the latest fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1964, tax collections from these excises totaled $910,196,000. In my own district, the Rochester Telephone Corp. collects for the Federal Government some $3.9 million a year alone in excise taxes from the citizens of the communities served. We can well imagine what elimination of these taxes will do for the people of the Rochester area, as well as of the entire country by releasing into their hands this additional purchasing power.

Even though the Federal Government will lose revenues should my measure be enacted, I am firmly convinced that such a loss would soon be offset by higher income tax revenues made possible by rising incomes generated by increased consumer demand and higher productivity.

We must delay no longer in removing these unfair and economically self-defeating taxes. Their repeal will give our citizens much needed relief from these taxes and will give our economy the stimulus it needs to keep our Nation moving forward.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Madam Speaker, the President has submitted a budget which will request new spending authority of almost $100 billion for fiscal year 1966. Already there is on the books an additional $100 billion of unspent appropriations which we have authorized in prior years. It should be quite obvious to this body, that if this Congress grants the President's requests—and my guess is that it will—the Federal agencies will have the authority to spend $200 billion.

As every Member of the House knows, once spending authority is given to the executive branch of the Government, the Congress loses control.

It should not be necessary for me to tell this body that unless we place an annual limitation against all expenditures, including current appropriations and unexpended balances, we will never be able to determine whether there is a deficit or a surplus.

I am, therefore, introducing a resolution, today, that would provide that the Congress place an annual expenditure limitation on every spending account. This is a companion resolution to one that has been introduced by Senator BYRD of Virginia.

In my opinion, this resolution is one of the most important measures that will

come before this Congress. It should be obvious to every Member of this body that to escape fiscal insolvency, to stabilize the purchasing power of our dollar, Congress must regain control of expenditures.

It is not enough to talk economy and pay lipservice to the necessity of maintaining a balanced budget. Five straight deficits and a national debt of $318 billion demands action.

To delay any longer effective expenditure control is to invite fiscal disaster and amounts to irresponsibility on the part of Congress to face up to its obligations.

PROPOSED REVIEW OF THE ADEQUACY OF LOCAL AIRLINE SERVICE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Madam Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution for a congressional review of the adequacy of local airline service. Along with others in this body, I am deeply concerned about present policies of the Civil Aeronautics Board which threaten more than 100 communities with the loss of scheduled airline service, bringing with it a loss of flow of business and employment-creating opportunities.

The city of Jackson, Mich., which I represent, is among those threatened by these policies. It is clear that the intent of Congress should be made known in order that the members and staff of the CAB may be guided by broad considerations of national policy in its decisions, which too often result in 3–2 divisions over policies which have never been made clear to us in Congress nor to the people who depend on airline service for their livelihood.

Local members of the Local Airline Service Action Committee in Jackson have expressed to me their interest in such a resolution, and I am pleased at this time to introduce legislation calling for a thorough review of the needs for airline service by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in order that a new interpretation of the law may soon be passed on to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

THE BUSINESS OF BASEBALL AND ANTITRUST LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRIFFITHS). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Madam Speaker, apparently today is sports day in the House. The gentleman from New York addressed his remarks to professionalism in sports at our Military Academies. I wish to call attention of the House to shortcomings in professional baseball.

On the opening day of this 89th Congress I introduced legislation which would strip organized professional baseball of its exemption from the Sherman-Clayton antitrust laws. This measure, H.R. 6, has been sent to the House Judiciary Committee where it currently is pending.

Today, Madam Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of this body the reasons which have caused me to sponsor this bill. Some will say it is a severe and sweeping attack on the privileged status of the baseball industry.

I believe, however, that stringent measures are necessary if public confidence is ever to be restored to what once was our "national pastime." Events of the past few months have convinced many observers that baseball is "sick" and badly in need of some bitter medicine if it is to be restored to health.

Among those events, two stand out: The purchase of the New York Yankees by the Columbia Broadcasting System, and the announcement that the Braves will leave Milwaukee after next season for a new home in Atlanta, Ga.

I personally am most familiar with, and concerned about, the latter situation. Milwaukee County Stadium, the "Home of the Braves" was located in my congressional district until the redistricting which took affect in 1965. The threatened loss of the team is causing serious repercussions in our community and in our State.

My bill, however, was not introduced as a means of blocking the move of the Braves from Milwaukee. If enacted, it would not affect that situation. It is only through court action that the transfer of the franchise to Atlanta can be prevented.

My proposal, introduced more in sorrow than in anger, simply seeks to end the legal fiction that baseball is somehow sacrosanct as an industry and must be privileged with an exemption from our antitrust regulations. It would point up the fact that baseball is first a business and only second a sport—and should be regarded as such under U.S. statutes.

If H.R. 6 is enacted, however, it could bear on the future of baseball in Milwaukee and other metropolitan areas. Should baseball lose its exemption from antitrust regulation, there is little doubt that its reserve clause arrangements, by which players are bound to their teams, and territorial assignments would be challenged in the courts as violating the Sherman Act. Should these two practices be declared invalid, there is a strong likelihood that moves would be made to establish a new, third big league. Or, to forestall such a move, the present leagues probably would be forced to expand.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand that the gentleman's bill, H.R. 6, only applies to baseball? Or would it apply to football and basketball?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Baseball is the only sport at the present time that is exempt from the antitrust laws. Football today does not have the privileges that baseball has. These privileges are based, as I intend to expound in my remarks, on Supreme Court decisions.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman will recall that about two sessions ago we passed legislation which would permit the combination of these leagues in entering into contracts with television stations, and with radio stations, saying that they would not violate the antitrust laws. We approved that portion of the amendment to the antitrust law so that contracts have now been entered into, as an example, the Columbia Broadcasting System entered into a contract with one of the football leagues to pay $28 million or $30 million over a certain period of time.

The question I would like to ask the gentleman is this: Do you intend to repeal the exemption that we gave to football people, and not permit them to enter into these contracts with the television and radio stations, as they have done as a result of that legislation?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I believe there should be a thorough review and study in this field, because there is no doubt that the sports of baseball and football, all sports, have been hurt. They are no longer sports, they have become big business. If this is the situation, I certainly hope that the legislation I have proposed will do just that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I have been a member of the Committee on the Judiciary throughout the time that all of this legislation dealing with football, baseball, and other sports has been before us as relates to antitrust violations. During that period of time it was represented to us just as it has been stated by the gentleman that baseball was something more than sports, it was big business, with the result that they represented to us, together with football and other major sports, that unless they found this protection under these laws they could not carry out the businesses in which they were engaged.

Does the gentleman intend to disrupt the exemption from the antitrust laws as it deals with sports and put them back in the same category as any other businesses that may be trying to go together and violate the antitrust laws?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If we do not do that we are contributing to the detriment of baseball and football as sports. If they are big business, then they should come under the antitrust laws. Does not the gentleman agree that most clubs are organized not for sports but for profit?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Let us be realistic. Nobody ever paid men to play baseball without hoping to make a profit, otherwise they would not last. It is the same with football. Football came before our committee and said, "We are trying to develop professional football, and we are getting on the way. If you will give us this protection you will get better

football games, but you have to exempt us from the antitrust laws."

As previously mentioned, some of the larger companies, the networks, have entered into contracts. We did not anticipate they would be that large. They have made it possible in the smaller areas—I say "smaller areas," and I mean in areas where the professional baseball team was not paying off—by the sums that they would get from television it would be possible for them to continue the operation. The problem the gentleman and I will have to meet is, are we going to put them back on the same basis as they were? Why does not the gentleman introduce a bill that just repeals this legislation we approved two or three Congresses ago? Then we are in the same category as we were before, before we put the cloak of protection around them. Are you going to repeal that or apply it to baseball alone?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Baseball at the present time is the only sport that is blatantly violating the antitrust provisions of the Sherman-Clayton antitrust laws. I will certainly agree with my colleague from Colorado that baseball certainly is operated for a profit, but I am sure he would agree that it is not good for baseball, that large baseball clubs use their monopoly in such a way that public confidence is destroyed.

What step must we take to prevent this? If we, two Congresses ago, made the error in giving professional baseball that added protection, then we ought to undo that action.

As the gentleman knows, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], a very able Member of the House, introduced similar legislation in the 82d Congress but it failed to pass. All that my proposal, as provided in the bill, H.R. 6, is intended to do, is exactly what Chairman CELLER proposed to do.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then whatever was introduced last time, as I understand it, has no relation to the TV and radio broadcasting or their combination because they enter into what is absolutely a violation of the antitrust law by saying, as an example, and we provided, that they be permitted to black out within certain areas and that until we approve it was admittedly a violation of the Sherman antitrust law. Now I understand from what the gentleman has to say that you are not trying to repeal that part of it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But only that part that deals with baseball in the contracts they have with the players.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. And certain regulations and restrictions that they have as to geographic locations—that part of it and I do believe that although the bill, H.R. 6, does not specifically negate the action of the 87th Congress, I firmly believe that we should review and restudy the privileges we gave baseball in regard to making radio and TV broadcasting contracts.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Would you include in that this agreement that exists in the football leagues whereby they agree to draft or give the privilege of first drafting of certain athletes throughout the United States? Would you repeal that as it relates to football?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Or are you just confining yourself to baseball alone?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. To baseball alone. It is the only professional team sport which the courts have adjudged exempt from antitrust regulation.

May the gentleman from Wisconsin ask the gentleman from Colorado this question? Do you think it was good for baseball as a sport to have a situation where the Columbia Broadcasting System buys the Yankee baseball team? Does this not point up that baseball is losing its sport image and has become a business?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I say to the gentleman, this is only made possible by virtue of the fact that Congress did authorize these agreements under which, if the New York Yankees wanted to make a contract with the Columbia Broadcasting System—although now that they own them they probably will not have to make the contract—but if they wanted to make a contract to say, "You and you alone will have the exclusive right to broadcast any games that the New York Yankees have and you alone shall make the determination if they are playing away from New York as to how far the blackout should go—and whether it should be blacked out at all or whether it should comply with the provisions of the law." Now those are the privileges that we gave them. Do you feel that these privileges are such that the broadcasting people and the baseball people have abused the privileges?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I submit that the action taken by the Columbia Broadcasting System indicates that the privileges that the Congress gave in Public Law 87-331 may have been abused and that we ought to review the situation. If H.R. 6 is taken up and hearings are had on it, it will be possible to ascertain the extent to which organized baseball has used and abused its exemption from antitrust regulation to make larger profits and flaunt the public interest.

If I may conclude, then I shall be glad to yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

In either case, Milwaukee—with its reputation as a good baseball town—would be a prime candidate to receive a team. Other cities, such as Oakland, Dallas, and Denver, could also qualify as "big league" cities.

Of all professional team sports, baseball alone is spared the full application of the Nation's antitrust laws. This favored position results from a series of rulings by the U.S. Supreme Court. The first of these was in the case of Federal Baseball Club of Baltimore against National League of Professional Baseball Clubs, decided in 1922. In that case, the Baltimore club, a member of an eight-team professional baseball league, brought suit against the American and National Leagues, charging that those leagues had conspired to monopolize the business of baseball with the result that the competing Federal League was destroyed.

The Supreme Court held that baseball was not subject to the antitrust laws on the ground that the business of presenting baseball exhibitions, was a "personal effort, not related to production, is not a subject of commerce" and the interstate transportation connected with the exhibitions was "a mere incident, not the essential thing."

This decision was reaffirmed in 1953 with the ruling in Toolson against New York Yankees. In that case, three baseball players brought separate suits against the baseball commissioner and against the owners of various member clubs in baseball. They challenged the legality of the defendants' restrictive practices and asked for treble damages.

The Supreme Court, without reexamining the underlying question, ruled that the suits did not lie under the antitrust laws, citing the previous Federal baseball decision. To this day, therefore, professional baseball retains its freedom from the antitrust laws.

It is interesting to note the dissent by Justice Burton, with Justice Reed concurring, in the Toolson case. It held that the development of radio and television and the growth of the farm system had made baseball into an industry engaged in interstate commerce.

This view is similar to one held by the New York Court of Appeals in Gardella against Chandler. In this case, Daniel Gardella, an outfielder for the New York Giants, violated the reserve clause by playing baseball in a Mexican league. Subsequently he was barred by the baseball commissioner, A. B. Chandler, from playing in the United States for 5 years. Gardella sued Chandler for treble damages under the Sherman Act. Although the trial court ruled against him, the New York Court of Appeals reversed the decision.

The respected jurist, Judge Learned Hand, wrote the opinion favoring Gardella. He based his ruling primarily on the lucrative radio and television contracts which the clubs held. He believed that the players, radio, television, clubs in general, and the public make up "an indivisible unit as much as actors and spectators in a theater, and are participating in interstate commerce."

The case was appealed to the Supreme Court, but was never heard because Gardella dropped his damage suit. It later was disclosed that he had settled the claim out of court for $60,000. It is my opinion that Gardella's decision was unfortunate since it did not settle the basic question for all involved in the sport. The size of the settlement indicates, however, that someone in baseball thought Gardella had justice on his side. Commissioner Chandler has been quoted saying that the settlement was "a cause of real rejoicing on our part."

The ruling by Judge Hand and the dissent by Justice Burton are important because of their concurrence on one significant point: that the radio and television contracts held by organized professional baseball have essentially altered the nature of that industry. These lucrative contracts have turned what once was primarily a sports activity into an adjunct of the entertainment business.

No close observer of the world of sports can deny the enormous impact which the growth of the broadcasting industry—particularly television—has had on organized baseball.

It primarily has been the televising of major league baseball games which has dealt a lethal blow to the minor leagues. As the minor leagues have collapsed one by one so has the farm system which once was the training ground for future big leaguers. This year, bowing to the reality that the majors can no longer depend on the minor leagues to provide talent to them, both the American and National Leagues have adopted a draft system for obtaining players. It marked a significant departure from traditional baseball procedures.

Another effect of television is seen in the decline of attendance at major league ballparks. Although the population of the country and of the big metropolitan areas where major league teams play has increased rapidly in recent years, baseball attendance has sagged. The reason seems obvious: when a man can sit in the comfort of his living room and watch a major league game on television, there is little reason for him to go to the ball park.

Team owners have not been slow to grasp this fact. The fan in the stands has been replaced by the fan in the armchair as first in their affections. Baseball today is being operated not so much to quicken the clicks of the turnstiles as to influence the clicks of TV channel selectors.

The situation is epitomized in the attempt to move the Braves from Milwaukee to Atlanta. It is not the fact that Atlanta is building a new stadium for the team that has caused this attempted franchise transfer. Milwaukee's county stadium is relatively new, well kept, provides easy access from all parts of the city and has ample close parking.

The motive of the Braves management is not Atlanta's reputation as a good "baseball town." In that regard Atlanta is an unknown quantity where Milwaukee has long since proved its support of the national pasttime. It was, after all, in Milwaukee that the National League alltime attendance record was set. Although the attendance figure for 1964 did not approach the record, it was close to 1 million—a respectable amount in any league.

Therefore, I repeat, Madam Speaker, it is not the new stadium or prospective attendance which has lured the Braves owners to Atlanta. It is the lure of extremely lucrative contracts for radio and television broadcasting of future Braves games.

Atlanta is the focal point of a large area of the South which has been relatively untouched by the growth and proliferation of professional team sports. There is a large potential market for the broadcast of the games.

In that respect, Milwaukee is at somewhat of a disadvantage. To the south lies Chicago with two major league clubs. To the east is broad Lake Michigan. To the northwest is Minneapolis-St. Paul with an American League team. Further, there are other popular team sports, such as professional football, to vie for the television sports advertising dollar.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the dollar has become all important in the operations of organized baseball. It is, I venture to say, behind the purchase of the New York Yankees by the Columbia Broadcasting System. It may be the reason that persons with substantial radio and/or TV interests have been, and are, board chairmen and presidents of major league clubs.

There is nothing wrong with advertising. There is nothing wrong with televising baseball games. But there is something wrong in claiming an exemption from antitrust laws as a sport and then using that exemption to promote strictly business interests.

Organized baseball cannot have the best of both worlds. Either it is primarily a sporting activity, or it is strictly a profitmaking adjunct of the entertainment industry.

With one or two notable exceptions, baseball owners have demonstrably chosen profit over pride. Recognizing their choice, let us in Congress act quickly to strip baseball of special privileges extended while baseball was still being operated as a sport.

H.R. 6 would take away baseball's exemption from the Sherman-Clayton antitrust laws. It has been referred to the House Judiciary Committee and its Antitrust Subcommittee. I have contacted the esteemed chairman of that committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], on this matter several times in the past. As the former sponsor of similar legislation early in the 1950's, Mr. CELLER has been favorable to the proposal and I am hopeful that early hearings can be arrranged.

Through these public hearings it will be possible to ascertain the extent to which organized baseball has used—and abused—its exemption from antitrust regulation to gain larger profits and flaunt the public interest.

I also have written to Chairman E. William Henry of the Federal Communications Commission, suggesting that the use of radio and TV advertising revenues to induce a sporting attraction to move from one city to another may not be in consonance with the intent and purpose of the Federal Communications Act.

He replied that he has directed his staff to look into the matter and that he will advise me of the findings when the study is completed.

Madam Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court in 1953 suggested that it was up Congress to legislate national policy on organized professional baseball. In the years which have followed, several attempts have been made—none successfully.

I am happy that my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconson, the Honorable LYNN STALBAUM, as well as other Members of this House and the other body have expressed their interest and concern in baseball's antitrust status. The legislative measures they have introduced are most welcome and demonstrates the need for action.

Now the time has come to take action. We must work to restore sanity to our national pastime.

I am delighted to yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I assume, from what the gentleman stated a moment ago, if it should develop in a hearing that the broadcasting people, both of television and of radio, have abused the privilege we granted to them as an exemption under the antitrust laws, the gentleman would have no objection to amending H.R. 6 to rectify that mistake.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would have no objection, but in the present form H.R. 6 does not deal with radio and television and does not negate the action taken two Congresses ago.

My bill simply would wipe out an exemption to the antitrust laws which was given to professional baseball, and to no other organized team sport, by the U.S. Supreme Court, not by Congress. It would affirm that in the view of Congress all professional team sports are businesses and that baseball has no claim to a privileged position.

Then having put all professional team sports on the same plane, Congress could act to grant exceptions from antitrust regulation for all of them as the need is seen.

I do not object to having the bill amended; not at all.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman did state he had called upon the Chairman of the FCC to make a study of this matter to see whether the revenues from advertising have resulted in a transfer of franchises.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I have; yes. If he advises that they have not, the gentleman from Colorado is asking me if I would accept an amendment to H.R. 6 which would exempt baseball and other sports from radio and television privileges they now have; is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It goes a little further than that. We authorized them to enter into certain agreements by the actions two or three Congresses ago, which admittedly without the legislation would have been in violation of the antitrust laws.

Does the gentleman believe that since we did permit them to enter into these agreements, these agreements resulted in abuse by baseball as related to player contracts or the transfer of franchises from one city to another? Does the gentleman believe that any part of the legislation resulted in those actions?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I submit that the matter needs study to determine if, indeed, those or other abuses have resulted.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If it has, that is the thing the gentleman wishes to correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes. I want abuses corrected.

BASEBALL AND ANTITRUST LEGISLATION

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM] may extend his remarks at this point

in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman ZABLOCKI, for the courtesy of allowing me to join him in expressing my views on this subject which is of great concern to the people of the State of Wisconsin.

This proposal is badly needed to place organized baseball in its correct perspective within the realm of the sports world and the laws of our land. It is an accurate fact that baseball, as it exists today, is a business venture first, and a sport second.

The scheduled more of the Braves from Milwaukee to Atlanta affects many people in our State. More directly, it involves taxpayers who invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in the construction of a vast baseball stadium only a few years ago.

This, I feel, gentlemen, is an important reason for all of us to examine more closely the attempt to pass off big-league baseball as a sport. I have the greatest admiration for the athletes but voice growing doubt about the manner in which responsibility is handled by the management. There has been a seeming lack of integrity by club owners in this regard. Publicly they attempt to hide behind a facade of being a sport to avoid antitrust regulations; yet, privately, and in their scheme of things, they have no qualms about acting in concert to make any move which will return them even greater profit, with no regard for the public's interest.

I feel, like other sports fans across the Nation, and indeed the world, that we have been unfairly "dusted off" by those who purport to be the leaders of this great game.

I am therefore, pleased to associate myself with my distinguished colleague, Mr. ZABLOCKI, by introducing my own bill, H.R. 3412, to show that all of us in Wisconsin are concerned by the present turn of events in major league baseball.

VA ORDER CLOSING FACILITIES SHOULD BE RESCINDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Speaker, the recent decision of the Veterans' Administration to close 31 facilities under its jurisdiction has caused much reaction, and rightly so. The $23 million saving which the VA claims will result from this action will certainly be welcomed by all fiscally responsible citizens, provided decreased services for deserving war veterans is not the price.

Unfortunately, knowledgeable letters from interested leaders in my district and my own investigation indicate that just the opposite is true and that the closing of additional facilities will be at the expense of service to needy veterans. For example, one veterans' post commander, in commenting on the merger of the Cincinnati regional office with that of Cleveland, states:

> Due to an already heavy load at the Cleveland regional office, it often takes months to process claims for benefits for our comrades and their dependents, and in many instances it causes a real hardship on the veteran and/or his dependents as they may be depending on this grant for the necessities of life.

Another post commander writes:

> It is the experience of this post, as with every other veteran-minded agency, that it is ever increasingly difficult to obtain benefits for the veteran and his dependents due to an already overburdened VA regional office staff, and in many cases it is only after a long waiting period that we are able to obtain hospitalization for our ill veterans due to long waiting lists at overcrowded Veterans' Administration hospitals.

If such is the situation prevailing at the present time, how does the Veterans' Administration hope to improve it with the closing of 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and 16 regional offices?

If a contact office replaces the present Cincinnati office, how long will it be before this office is closed as has happened with 187 other contact offices throughout the country?

In the light of past performances, veterans and their dependents are entirely justified in being apprehensive about the proposed program.

On August 12, 1963, the Administration authorized the activation of 2,000 nursing care beds to help alleviate the urgent need for hospitalized veterans who are, for the most part, bedridden, thus making available more beds for active hospital cases. The conversion of existing facilities for nursing care beds was stressed by the President.

So important was the utilization of existing facilities in the proposed program that former Administrator James S. Gleason stated that he would request $5 to $6 million to convert such facilities to accommodate nursing care patients.

However, when Public Law 88-450, authorizing a sum of $25 million over a 5-year period for 4,000 nursing beds, was enacted in August 1964, the urgency and advisability of converting existing facilities somehow lost its force. The Commissioner informed the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs that although a "mere redesignation of existing space would, of course, have been quicker and easier," it "would not have produced the necessary standards of nursing home care."

Is it any wonder, then, in view of the existing confusion, that out of the several thousand beds authorized, as of late 1964 only 46 new beds were in operation? Are the 11 hospitals and 4 domiciliaries totally beyond repair as far as conversion to nursing care beds is concerned? This possibility should be fully explored before the VA's phaseout program is put into effect.

At present, of the 2,909 hospital beds affected by the order, 2,183 are now occupied. Of the 3,220 domiciliary beds involved, the patient load is 3,101. The closing of these hospitals and domiciliaries would not only be a tremendous hardship upon these patients and their families, but could have a harmful effect on millions of the Nation's veterans.

Although we are assured that the reorganization will be carried out without impairment of essential services, promises and reassurances leave much to be desired. It was only a year ago that former Administrator James S. Gleason appeared before a House Subcommittee on Appropriations and assured the members that the new nursing care program would not mean a further phaseout of domiciliary facilities.

What happened?

On January 13 of this year the new Administrator announced that 4 domiciliaries would be closed, and the members of these domiciliaries would be relocated in the remaining 14 facilities.

If increased operating efficiency and reduced spending is the prime mover behind the VA's program, I trust the recommendations made by the General Accounting Office in its 1964 report on the Veterans' Administration have been fully implemented.

For instance, one such recommendation involved a double standard for the payment of compensation benefits to veterans with essentially the same disabilities. The GAO estimated that between $63 and $182 million will be paid by the VA in excess of the amount which would have been expended if a single disability standard applied to all.

I have strongly protested the closing of these hospitals, regional offices, and domiciliaries. Fortunately, Chairman TEAGUE, of the House Veterans' Committee, has responded to the many protests throughout the country and has promised to hold hearings on this so-called economy move. I trust that after these hearings bring the facts to light, America's veterans will not be shoved around in this arbitrary and unnecessary move.

TEXT OF AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON'S REMARKS AT MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Madam Speaker, on January 28 the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson delivered a magnificent and fitting tribute to the late and great Sir Winston Churchill at the memorial service at the National Cathedral.

This eloquent and moving address will stir and stimulate all who read it as it did those of us who were privileged to hear it. Hence, for my colleagues in the Congress and the citizens of the country who will read this RECORD I take particular pleasure in submitting it for incorporation in the body of the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 29, 1965]

TEXT OF STEVENSON'S REMARKS

Today we meet in sadness to mourn one of the world's greatest citizens. Sir Winston Churchill is dead. The voice that led nations, raised armies, inspired victories and blew fresh courage into the hearts of men is

silenced. We shall hear no longer the remembered eloquence and wit, the old courage and defiance, the robust serenity of indomitable faith. Our world is thus poorer, our political dialog is diminished and the sources of public inspiration run more thinly for all of us. There is a lonesome place against the sky.

So we are right to mourn. Yet, in contemplating the life and spirit of Winston Churchill, regrets for the past seem singularly insufficient. One rather feels a sense of thankfulness and encouragement that throughout so long a life, such a full measure of power, virtuosity, mastery and zest played over our human scene.

Contemplating this completed career, we feel a sense of enlargement and exhilaration. Like the grandeur and power of the masterpieces of art and music, Churchill's life uplifts our hearts and fills us with fresh revelation of the scale and reach of human achievement. We may be sad; but we rejoice as well, as all must rejoice when they "now praise famous men" and see in their lives the full splendor of our human estate.

And regrets for the past are insufficient for another reason. Churchill, the historian, felt the continuity of past and present, the contribution which mighty men and great events make to the future experience of mankind; history's "flickering lamp" lights up the past and sends its gleams into the future. So to the truth of Santayana's dictum, "Those who will not learn from the past are destined to repeat it," Churchill's whole life was witness. It was his lonely voice that in the thirties warned Britain and Europe of the follies of playing all over again the tragedy of disbelief and of unpreparedness. And in the time of Britain's greatest trial he mobilized the English language to inspire his people to historic valor to save their beleaguered island. It was his voice again that helped assemble the great coalition that has kept peace steady through the last decades.

He once said: "We cannot say the past is past without surrendering the future." So today the "past" of his life and his achievement are a guide and light to the future. And we can only properly mourn and celebrate this mighty man by heeding him as a living influence in the unfolding dramas of our days ahead.

What does he tell us for this obscure future whose outlines we but dimly discern? First, I believe, he would have us reaffirm his serene faith in human freedom and dignity. The love of freedom was not for him an abstract thing but a deep conviction that the uniqueness of man demands a society that gives his capacities full scope. It was, if you like, an aristocratic sense of the fullness and value of life. But he was a profound democrat, and the cornerstone of his political faith, inherited from a beloved father, was the simple maxim—"Trust the people." Throughout his long career, he sustained his profound concern for the well-being of his fellow citizens.

Instinctively, profoundly, the people trusted "good old Winnie," the peer's son. He could lead them in war because he had respected them in peace. He could call for their greatest sacrifices for he knew how to express their deepest dignity—citizens of equal value and responsibility in a free and democratic state.

His crucial part in the founding of the United Nations expressed his conviction that the Atlantic Charter he and President Roosevelt audaciously proclaimed at the height of Hitler's victories would have to be protected throughout the world by institutions embodying the ideal of the rule of law and international cooperation.

For him, humanity, its freedom, its survival, towered above pettier interests—national rivalries, old enmities, the bitter disputes of race and creed. "In victory—magnanimity; in peace—good will" were more than slogans. In fact, his determination to continue in politics after his defeat in 1945 and to toil on in office in the 1950's to the limit of health and endurance sprang from his belief that he could still "bring nearer that lasting peace which the masses of people of every race and in every land so fervently desire." The great soldier and strategist was a man of peace—and for the most simple reason—his respect, his faith, his compassion for the family of man.

His career saw headlong success and headlong catastrophe. He was at the height. He was flung to the depths. He saw his worst prophecies realized, his worst forebodings surpassed. Yet throughout it all his zest for living, gallantry of spirit, wry humor and compassion for human frailties took all firmness out of his fortitude and all pomposity out of his dedication.

Churchill's sense of the incomparable value and worth of human existence never faltered, nor the robust courage with which he lived it to the full. In the darkest hour, the land could still be bright, and for him hopes were not deceivers. It was forever fear that was the dupe. Victory at last would always lie with life and faith, for Churchill saw beyond the repeated miseries of human frailty and larger vision of mankind's "upward ascent toward his distant goal."

He used to say that he was half American and all English. But we put that right when the Congress made him an honorary citizen of his mother's native land and we shall always claim a part of him. I remember once years ago during a long visit at his country house he talked proudly of his American Revolutionary ancestors and happily of his boyhood visits to the United States. As I took my leave I said I was going back to London to speak to the English Speaking Union and asked if he had any message for them. "Yes," he said, "tell them that you bring greetings from an English Speaking Union." And I think that perhaps it was to the relations of the United Kingdom and the United States that he made his finest contribution.

In the last analysis, all the zest and life and confidence of this incomparable man sprang, I believe, not only from the rich endowment of his nature, but also from a profound and simple faith in God. In the prime of his powers, confronted with the apocalyptic risks of annihilation, he said serenely: "I do not believe that God has despaired of his children." In old age, as the honors and excitements faded, his resignation had a touching simplicity: "Only faith in a life after death in a brighter world where dear ones will meet again—only that and the measured tramp of time can give consolation."

The great aristocrat, the beloved leader, the profound historian, the gifted painter, the superb politician, the lord of language, the orator, the wit—yes, and the dedicated bricklayer—behind all of them was the man of simple faith, steadfast in defeat, generous in victory, resigned in age, trusting in a loving providence and committing his achievements and his triumphs to a higher power.

Like the patriarchs of old, he waited on God's judgment and it could be said of him—as of the immortals that went before him—that God "magnified him in the fear of his enemies and with his words he made prodigies to cease. He glorified him in the sight of kinds and gave him commandments in the sight of his people. He showed him his glory and sanctioned him in his faith * * *."

HUDSON HIGHLANDS NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAY BILL GETS SUPPORT

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ako I introduced H.R. 3012, a bill to establish a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in four counties of New York State. At that time I described the measure as part of a new conservation effort—an effort not only to protect and develop old resources, but to create new ones—not only to save our vanishing wilderness areas, but to preserve the green spaces and scenic river valleys near our metropolitan areas.

I am pleased to report that in the 14 days since I introduced H.R. 3012, the citizens of New York State from both political parties and from all walks of life have expressed overwhelming support for this measure. Most gratifying has been the enthusiastic bipartisan support received from people who have devoted their lives to conservation problems and to the Hudson Valley.

New York State Senator R. Watson Pomeroy, a Republican, and one of the State's most distinguished conservationists, recently made the following statement on my bill:

> I welcome any assistance from the U.S. Congress in preserving scenic resources. I am very pleased that these steps have been taken to preserve the natural beauty of the Hudson Gorge. The New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Natural Resources has also prepared a bill for consideration and introduction in the near future before the New York Legislature. This bill, which calls for the establishment of a Lower Hudson Valley Heritage Commission, strives for the same goal as H.R. 3012 and will have bipartisan sponsorship in the State Legislature. As for the Con Edison project on Storm King, I welcome delay so that all angles of the project may be studied further.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Pomeroy is intimately familiar with the problems of the Hudson River. As an assemblyman last year he was chairman of the Joint Legislative Committee on Natural Resources. Under his leadership, that committee held the first and only true public hearings on the problems of the river. I was pleased to be represented among the 107 witnesses who appeared to testify as to the urgent need for legislation to protect the Hudson highlands from decay and misuse.

TO ESTABLISH A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Madam Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. The purpose of this proposal is to provide Congress with a means by which it can reevaluate and revise certain of its outmoded methods and procedures.

There has been much discussion in recent years of the pressing need for congressional reorganization. The suggested joint committee—composed of six Members of the House and six Members of the Senate—would initiate a thorough review of the operations of Congress by Congress itself.

It has been nearly 20 years since the last major study and reform of our congressional system. In this time immense changes have taken place all about us, changes and developments which have resulted in ever-increasing pressures and responsibilities on the legislative branch of government.

If it is effectively to discharge its responsibilities in today's complex society, it is essential that Congress bring its own internal organization up to date. The machinery of government is meant to facilitate decisive action by Congress; we must not allow the machinery to impede the legislative process.

I am pleased, therefore, to join several of my colleagues in both the House and Senate in proposing this Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. I strongly urge early approval of this resolution as a sensible and highly useful approach to the need for congressional reorganization.

TO HELP NEEDY AND QUALIFIED STUDENTS OBTAIN A COLLEGE EDUCATION

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a bill designed to strengthen America's colleges and universities and to help needy and qualified students obtain a college education.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I join my colleagues, Chairman POWELL and the gentlewoman from Oregon, Representative GREEN, in introducing the Higher Education Act of 1965—legislation which incorporates the college aid proposals recommended by President Johnson in his January 12 education message.

One of the several significant new proposals included in this bill is a program of scholarships for up to 140,000 qualified high school graduates who could not otherwise afford to continue their education. I strongly endorse this much needed program which, as chairman of the Advisory Group on Higher Education of the House Education and Labor Committee, I recommended 3 years ago, in early 1962.

Other new proposals in the bill call for special assistance for smaller, less developed colleges, including a program of faculty exchanges between these struggling institutions and our leading universities; and a significant program of university extension and adult education to serve the needs of our growing urban communities. Just as the Land-Grant College Act was enacted to help what was in the last century a predominantly rural America, I am sure that the extension proposal in this bill will effectively assist the 70 percent of our population which today lives in America's cities.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 would also provide grants to help colleges and universities obtain books, periodicals, and other needed library materials, and would provide insurance and partial payment of interest on loans to college students under certain conditions.

As well as initiating these new efforts, the legislation would strengthen existing programs to help build college classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

This legislation represents a significant advance in the direction of full educational opportunity at the college level for qualified young Americans. Through helping able but needy students with scholarships and loan guarantees and by improving our college and university facilities, it will mean wider educational horizons for today's students—the leaders of tomorrow.

A summary of the Higher Education Act of 1965 has been prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office of Education and I would like to include the text of this summary and fact sheet at this point:

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Authorization for fiscal 1966

	Million
Title I: University extension and continuing education	$25
Title II: College library assistance and library training and research	65
Title III: Strengthening developing institutions	30
Title IV: Student assistance:	
(a) Undergraduate scholarships	70
(b) Insured, reduced-interest loans	15
(c) College work-study program extension and amendments	[1] 45
(d) Extension of national defense student loan program (no additional cost	----
Total	250

[1] In addition to $84 million contained in budget request for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452).

Estimated Federal payments under the Higher Education Act of 1965

State	Total estimated Federal payments	University extension and continuing education	Scholarships	College work-study programs
United States and outlying areas	$219,000,000	$20,000,000	$70,000,000	$129,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	214,646,115	19,626,115	68,600,000	126,420,000
Alabama	5,033,521	360,004	1,643,951	3,029,566
Alaska	269,685	118,869	53,051	97,765
Arizona	1,976,867	216,755	619,135	1,140,977
Arkansas	3,137,404	246,483	1,016,907	1,874,014
California	17,555,551	1,450,697	5,665,025	10,439,829
Colorado	2,321,636	247,716	729,520	1,344,400
Connecticut	2,397,545	309,097	734,630	1,353,818
Delaware	540,358	136,967	141,896	261,495
Florida	5,702,179	525,972	1,820,776	3,355,431
Georgia	5,681,445	424,774	1,849,080	3,407,591
Hawaii	828,825	152,756	237,813	438,256
Idaho	922,441	152,910	270,690	498,841
Illinois	9,786,575	899,574	3,126,080	5,760,921
Indiana	5,143,069	468,057	1,644,476	3,030,536
Iowa	3,682,710	312,178	1,185,614	2,184,918
Kansas	2,886,872	270,743	920,246	1,695,883
Kentucky	4,406,573	340,750	1,430,189	2,635,634
Louisiana	5,174,073	363,008	1,692,334	3,118,731
Maine	1,131,676	175,937	336,189	619,550
Maryland	3,218,435	358,156	1,006,128	1,854,151
Massachusetts	5,658,360	507,874	1,811,729	3,338,757
Michigan	8,361,732	718,511	2,688,570	4,954,651
Minnesota	4,451,308	368,938	1,436,010	2,646,360
Mississippi	4,299,709	276,057	1,415,355	2,608,297
Missouri	5,304,563	437,636	1,711,985	3,154,942
Montana	938,454	153,988	275,943	508,523
Nebraska	1,934,464	213,059	605,519	1,115,886
50 States and District of Columbia—Con.				
Nevada	$349,499	$129,959	$77,226	$142,314
New Hampshire	747,404	149,598	210,284	387,522
New Jersey	4,918,123	604,759	1,517,264	2,796,100
New Mexico	1,346,436	175,937	411,733	758,766
New York	15,713,873	1,462,865	5,012,917	9,238,091
North Carolina	7,378,367	468,673	2,430,546	4,479,148
North Dakota	1,105,428	149,675	336,194	619,559
Ohio	9,686,866	870,155	3,101,355	5,715,356
Oklahoma	3,392,171	287,995	1,091,921	2,012,255
Oregon	2,201,872	242,633	689,180	1,270,059
Pennsylvania	11,309,619	979,901	3,633,569	6,696,149
Rhode Island	984,852	168,698	287,089	529,065
South Carolina	3,993,122	292,847	1,301,604	2,398,671
South Dakota	1,154,353	154,527	351,698	648,128
Tennessee	5,525,596	388,577	1,806,992	3,330,027
Texas	12,720,907	887,714	4,162,430	7,670,763
Utah	1,529,921	174,782	476,681	878,458
Vermont	639,289	131,191	178,728	329,370
Virginia	4,914,858	429,780	1,577,666	2,907,412
Washington	3,367,720	328,043	1,069,233	1,970,444
West Virginia	2,670,941	239,629	855,236	1,576,076
Wisconsin	4,613,333	413,145	1,477,453	2,722,735
Wyoming	475,340	126,108	122,845	226,387
District of Columbia	1,160,195	161,458	351,315	647,422
Outlying areas	4,353,885	373,885	1,400,000	2,580,000
American Samoa	----------	26,625	----------	----------
Guam	----------	30,114	----------	----------
Puerto Rico	----------	289,458	----------	----------
Virgin Islands	----------	27,688	----------	----------

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Title I. University extension and continuing education

Background

Fifty years ago, when most Americans were engaged in agrarian occupations, the Nation looked for a way to enlist higher education in the important assignment of making farm families more productive and their lives more rewarding.

Congress responded with the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which made instruction, research, and extension services widely available through the land-grant colleges. Doubtless more than any other factor, this three-sided program has been responsible for the unparalleled progress of our farm and rural areas.

Today 70 percent of the people live in urban areas. Much work lies ahead to fully examine the meaning to the Nation of this shift in homes, occupations, and social problems. While land-grant colleges still provide the best schools of agriculture, few adequate programs exist that meet head-on the problems of urban life.

As it did with rural life, higher education can help find the answers. The unique and invaluable resources of the Nation's great universities can deal with such contemporary problems as poverty and community development.

"The role of the university," President Johnson said, "must extend far beyond the ordinary extension-type operation. Its research findings and talents must be made available to the community. Faculty must be called upon for consulting activities. Pilot projects, seminars, conferences, TV programs, and task forces drawing on many department of the university—all should be brought into play."

"This is a demanding assignment for the universities, and many are not now ready for it. The time has come for us to help the university to face problems of the city as it once faced problems of the farm."

Proposal

Title I proposes a 5-year program to assist in the solution of community problems in such areas as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use. It does so by making grants and contracts to help colleges and universities develop more effective methods and teaching in their continuing adult education and extension programs, and to strengthen their public service resources.

University-operated programs described in a State plan approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education might include professional retraining and refresher programs; training and consultative services to local, State, and Federal Governments; training in leadership and program planning for voluntary associations; continuing adult education, including special programs for culturally disadvantaged adults leading to better employment opportunities; educational services relating to aging; programs for women preparing to enter or reenter the labor market; and other training, demonstration, and public service programs.

A National Advisory Committee on Extension and Continuing Education would advise the Commissioner on policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans and of grants and contracts for special experimental approaches. During 1968, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would appoint a Review Council on Extension and Continuing Education to review the administration of this program and to make recommendations for needed improvements.

Eighty percent of the funds appropriated would be apportioned as follows: $25,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands; and $100,000 to each of the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Funds not consumed in this 80 percent distribution would be apportioned among the States and territories based on their population. Federal funds would cover 90 percent of the costs of the programs in fiscal year 1966; 75 percent in fiscal year 1967; and 50 percent in fiscal years 1968–70. Up to 5 percent of the expenditures for which Federal payment is made could be for developing and administering the State plan.

Twenty percent of the funds appropriated would be reserved for the Commissioner to use for grants or contracts with institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of experimental approaches to extension and continuing adult education related to the solution of community problems. These funds could also be used to augment grants made for programs under the State plan.

First-year authorization would be $25 million.

Title II: College library assistance and library training and research

Background

More than ever, excellence in teaching and research depends on an adequate selection of books, periodicals, scientific journals, and documents. Yet 50 percent of our 4-year institutions of higher learning and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted minimum standards in the number of volumes in their libraries.

Moreover, current national statistics show a decline in the number of college and university library books per student. The reason is that enrollments are increasing faster than per student expenditures for books. Today, an estimated $226 million is needed merely to stock the shelves of our universities with the books needed for the present student and faculty population. Meanwhile, rising college and university enrollments are expected to swell from today's 4.8 to 6.9 million by 1970.

Beyond the need for bringing libraries of institutions of higher learning up to minimum standards, there is the additional task of providing vastly improved library resources for an increasing number of students engaged in research for advanced degrees. The number of doctoral degrees is doubling every 10 years. Yet at least 15 universities which offer a Ph. D. degree in a variety of fields have libraries with fewer than 150,000 volumes—barely enough for a small liberal arts college. This inadequacy is further exaggerated by the 6 million professionals whose careers depend directly upon the availability of superior library resources.

A growing population with growing needs for library services will also create additional pressures for more librarians. To meet minimum staffing standards for the expanding system of school, public, and university libraries, an estimated 125,000 additional librarians are required. However, library schools are graduating only about 3,000 new professionals each year, and even at that, 50 percent of these schools are unable to meet minimum accreditation standards for lack of operating funds. Thus, these schools—which must somehow supply a vastly greater number of trained librarians—are still functioning at a level far below the immediate need.

The price for this lack of training facilities is paid ultimately by the Nation's schoolchildren. In the public schools, the ratio of qualified librarians to pupils is 1: 1,254; the accepted national standard is 1 trained librarian to 300 pupils.

In 1962–63, only 30,000 school librarians were employed in our public elementary and secondary schools. Of these, 22 percent had completed fewer than 15 semester hours of college work in library science.

In 84 percent of our elementary schools, there are no school librarians at all, and professional librarians are lacking in one-third of the State departments of education.

Proposal

Title II proposes a 5-year program to help institutions of higher education acquire library materials needed for their expanded responsibilities in research, teaching, and student use; to encourage new and enlarged college and university training programs to prepare individuals for service in the information sciences and in libraries; and to promote research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries and the library and information sciences.

The proposal is divided into two parts. The first would authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants to colleges or combinations of colleges for the purchase of books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials.

Institutions submitting appropriate applications would receive a basic grant of up to $5,000. The Commissioner would also be authorized to make supplemental grants, not to exceed $10 for each full-time student. Supplemental grants would be made on the basis of such criteria as size and age of the library collection, student enrollment, and endowment and other financial resources. Only the basic grant would be matched by the institution. Each institution or combination of institutions would provide assurance that their previous year's expenditure for materials would be maintained.

Twenty-five percent of the funds appropriated for this part would be used by the Commissioner to make special grants. These special grants might be made, for example, to institutions of higher education which demonstrate a special need for additional library resources; or to institutions which engage in meeting special national or regional needs in the library and information sciences; or to combinations of institutions which need special assistance in establishing joint facilities.

An Advsory Council on College Library Resources would be established to assist the Commissioner in the development of criteria for making of supplemental grants and special purpose grants.

First-year authorization for this part would be $50 million.

The second part authorizes the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education for training students in librarianship, including the training of communications specialists in the biomedical, physical, and social sciences. The Commissioner would also be authorized to make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations; and with individuals for research and demonstration projects and for the dissemination of information derived from this research and demonstration. However, no grant would be made to a private group other than a nonprofit one. The Commissioner would appoint panels of experts to evaluate various types of research and demonstration projects.

First-year authorization for this part would be $15 million.

Total first-year authorization would be $65 million.

Title III: Strengthening developing institutions

Background

Enrollments in institutions of higher education doubled in the 10-year period from 1954 to 1964 (2.4 to 4.8 million) and are expected to go up at least another 50 percent in the next decade. During that same period, enrollments in junior colleges increased 2½ times. The postwar years have, to be sure, brought a substantial increase in the number of American institutions of higher education—from 1,686 in 1946 to more than 2,100 in the fall of 1964.

The pace at which these institutions are increasing, however, lags far behind the rate at which students are seeking to enter. Moreover, many of our institutions of higher learning urgently need strengthening. Almost 10 percent of the colleges which grant baccalaureate or higher degrees are still unaccredited by appropriate regional or professional associations. Several hundred others lack essential research apparatus and teaching personnel. As recently as the 1961–62 academic year, one-fourth of the faculty members in our public liberal arts undergraduate colleges were paid $6,000 or less, and one-fourth of the faculty members in our private liberal arts undergraduate colleges were paid $5,870 or less.

Many of our developing institutions of higher education are striving for higher standards of quality but are short of the means to achieve them. They could be appreciably assisted in raising their standards through academic relationships with larger and stronger institutions. Such relationships will better enable the colleges to share fully and equally in the responsibilities ahead.

Proposal

Title III proposes a 5-year program to assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation but which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life.

The Commissioner would be authorized to pay part of the cost of planning and carrying out cooperative arrangements for strengthening the academic programs of qualified developing colleges. These cooperative arrangements might be between developing institutions, between developing institutions and other colleges, and between developing institutions and organizations, agencies, and business entities.

The cooperative projects might include: exchange of faculty or students, including visiting scholars; faculty improvement programs; introduction of new curriculums; development of cooperative education programs involving alternate periods of academic study and employment; joint use of facilities such as libraries or laboratories; and other arrangements which offer promise of strengthening the academic programs of developing colleges.

The Commissioner would also be authorized to award national teaching fellowships to graduate students and junior faculty members to encourage them to teach at developing institutions.

An Advisory Council on Developing Institutions would assist the Commissioner in identifying qualified developing institutions and in establishing priorities for use in approving applications for grants.

First year authorization would be $30 million.

Title IV: Student assistance

(a) Undergraduate scholarships.

(b) Insured, reduced-interest loans.

(c) College work-study program extension and amendments.

(d) Extension of the national defense student loan program.

Background

Since the end of World War II, the percentage of all 18-to-21-year-olds who enroll in college has risen from 22 percent to 40 percent. Twice as many young people are enrolled in colleges and universities this year as were enrolled 10 years ago. If projections prove correct, the present figure of 4.8 million students will rise to 6.9 million by 1970. There have been three main aspects of this upsurge in higher education enrollments: more students compete for the scholarship and loan assistance available at each college, more students compete for the part-time jobs available on or near each campus, and more students are being drawn from middle- and low-income families.

It is in the national interest that more of the country's young people have the opportunity to acquire better training and education. In a practical sense, opportunity comes in three forms: scholarships, loans, and work-study programs.

The present average cost for attending a public college or university for 1 year is $1,560 and for attending a private institution, $2,370. This is up from the $1,190 and $1,700 respectively in 1954–55. It is currently estimated that by 1970 the cost of attending a public institution for 1 year will reach $1,840 and for attending a private institution $2,780. Sums of this magnitude inevitably discourage many worthy young men and women of low-income families from pursuing their education after high school.

In 1960, there were 1,079,000 high school graduates who did not go on to college. Forty-two percent indicated that finances played a role in their decision not to go; of these, nearly half flatly said they could not afford to consider college at all. Thus, some 217,000 high school graduates who would have liked to have continued their education were prevented from doing so by financial inability. Of the number of young people who did go on to higher education, 22 percent dropped out by the end of the first year. Of these, 28 percent gave lack of money as the prime reason for dropping out.

These statistics are chiefly an expression of the plight of low-income families and their children. The relationship between family income and college attendance is clear: in 1960, for example, 78 percent of all high school graduates whose families had incomes of $12,000 or more per year went on to college. By contrast, only 33 percent of students in the $3,000-or-less family income bracket went on to higher education.

The problem of financing higher education is not limited to low-income families. Families of average income trying to provide a college education for their children also face a serious situation. The most serious difficulty occurs for such middle-income families when there are two or more children attending college at one time. Upon the enrollment of the oldest child as a college freshman, the family commits a large part of its resources to education for an extended period of time. When the second child arrives as a college freshman, expenditures double, and the family must meet costs of $5,000 or more a school year.

Students from middle-income families often find it difficult to obtain financial relief. The family's income may be too high for them to qualify for many scholarship or loan programs; but insufficient to carry the full burden of support for children in college. In addition, interest rates on loans are often too high to permit middle-income families to make long-term commitments. That the pinch is already being felt can be seen in the fact that three out of every four families now taking part in some kind of federally supported student loan program have brothers and sisters of college age.

Existing loan programs are under strong pressures with more than 600,000 students having borrowed approximately $453 million from the national defense student loan funds set up in 1,574 colleges and universities. Before the enactment of this program in 1958, most institutions of higher education had never made a student loan; not more than 100 institutions had loan programs that totaled more than a few thousands of dollars annually. Today, rising numbers of students are asking for the aid of this program to help them stay in school; in addition, new colleges are being created— 500 new institutions in the past 18 years—and each one is a potential subscriber to the NDSL program, requiring the Federal contribution. The 88th Congress, recognizing the increasing pressures on these federally supported student loan funds, authorized $163.3 million for the current fiscal year, $179.3 million for fiscal 1966, $190 million for fiscal 1967, and $195 million for fiscal 1968.

The third method of assisting needy students in colleges and universities is by making available to them part-time employment. College-paid undergraduate employment now totals about $145 million a year and provides 425,000 students with average earnings of $350 a year each. The work-study program of the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964 is underway with present grants to institutions totaling $71 million annually; but there is also much evidence that this is insufficient support to meet the demands of work needed by students, particularly those students from families of low income.

Proposal

Title IV proposes a 5-year program of student financial aids to make the benefits of higher education available to academically qualified students in need of financial assistance. The title provides four types of assistance: (1) undergraduate scholarships to qualified high school graduates from low-income families; (2) insured reduced-interest private loans to both undergraduate and graduate students through approved commercial lenders and certain State and nonprofit programs; (3) an expanded work-study program to provide part-time employment; and (4) extension and expansion of the National Defense Student Loan Program.

(a) Undergraduate scholarships:

The undergraduate scholarship program would provide grants of up to $800 per academic year for qualified high school graduates from low-income families. A student may receive the scholarship on an annual basis for a period of up to 4 years while pursuing a full-time undergraduate course of study at an eligible institution of higher education. It is not intended that this scholarship would be the sole financial support of the recipient. Loans under the National Defense Education Act and work-study opportunities could be combined in such a manner as to provide appropriate financial assistance—dependent upon the need and capabilities of each student.

In order for the student to qualify for the scholarship, he must be under 21; must be from a low-income family; must be capable of maintaining good standing at an institution of higher education; must have been accepted as a full-time student; and must have made application demonstrating his need for financial assistance. The selection of recipients would be made by the institution in which the student was enrolled. Preference would be given to students entering upon their freshman year and to students entering 4-year schools after have been graduated from 2-year institutions of higher education. In determining whether a student is from a low-income family or not, the institution would make an appropriate review of the student's entire financial status.

The amount of a scholarship would be determined by the institution on the basis of criteria or schedules provided by the Commissioner of Education. The scholarship could not exceed $800, nor could it exceed the cost of the student's education.

Student scholarships would be provided through institutions of higher education which have made agreements with the Commissioner. Institutions eligible would be those which have in operation agreements for loans under the National Defense Education Act and for employment under the college work-study program.

The Commissioner of Education would make an agreement with an institution of higher learning requiring the institution to make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths from low-income groups and encour-

age them to continue their education beyond secondary school. Colleges would establish close working relationships with secondary schools and could make tentative commitments of scholarships to qualified students enrolled in grade 11 or lower and to secondary school dropouts. Up to 5 percent of the funds received could be spent by the institutions for the administrative costs involved in this identification and encouragement program. An institution would also be required to maintain its efforts in its own scholarship and loan program.

Scholarship funds would be apportioned among the States in the following manner:

1. One-third on the basis of the number of full-time students enrolled in institutions of higher education in each State in relation to the total number of such students;

2. One-third on the basis of the portion of secondary school graduates in each State; and

3. One-third on the basis of the portion of children under age 18 from families with annual incomes of less than $3,000.

Up to 2 percent of the total appropriations could be allocated to Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

It is also provided that the Commissioner could enter into contracts, not to exceed $100,000 per year, with State and local educational agencies and other public or nonprofit organizations for the purpose of (1) identifying qualified youths from low-income families and encouraging them to continue their education, (2) publicizing existing forms of financial aid, and (3) encouraging secondary school dropouts to reenter educational programs.

The first-year authorization would be $70 million.

(b) Insured reduced-interest loans:

Insured, reduced-interest student loans would be provided by the establishment of the student loan insurance fund which would enable the Commissioner to insure eligible lenders against losses on loans made by them to students in eligible institutions who do not have reasonable access to similar loan programs. It is also provided that the Commissioner would pay a portion of the interest (up to 2 percentage points) on such loans and on certain other loans which are insured under a State program or by a nonprofit private organization or institution.

Students would be able to borrow up to $1,500 annually in order to pursue a course of study at an eligible institution. The aggregate insured unpaid principal amount could not exceed $9,000 in the case of a graduate or professional student or $6,000 in the case of any other student. The maximum amount of interest paid by the borrower would be set by the Secretary on a national, regional, or other appropriate basis.

Repayment of the loans would begin 1 year after the student ceases to carry at least one-half of a normal full-time workload or course of study. The period of repayment could not exceed 10 years and the complete term of the loan could not exceed 15 years.

A student would be eligible to obtain an insured loan if he (1) has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible institution; (2) if he carries at least one-half of a normal full-time workload; or (3) if he is already enrolled at an eligible institution and maintains good standing.

Eligible institutions in this program would be (1) institutions of higher education which are fully accredited and which offer courses creditable toward a bachelor's degree; or (2) business, vocational, and technical schools which are accredited and which admit only students who have completed or left secondary school. A student could borrow from an eligible institution of higher education or from any participating commercial lender which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or any State.

The total principal amount of new loans to students covered by insurance would not exceed $700 million in fiscal year 1966, $1 billion in fiscal year 1967, and $1.4 billion in fiscal year 1968 and each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

First-year cost would be $15 million.

(c) College work-study program extension and amendments:

The work-study program under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 would be transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education.

This program provides for contracts between the Commissioner of Education and institutions of higher education in which part-time employment opportunities are encouraged. The proposed amendments would expand the opportunities for part-time employment particularly for students from low-income families.

The period during which the Federal share of the compensation of students employed may not exceed 90 percent would be extended for 1 year, through June 30, 1967.

Authorization for fiscal year 1966 would be $129 million. Of this amount $84 million is carried in the budget requests for the Office of Economic Opportunity, $45 million for the Office of Education.

(d) Extension of national defense student loan program:

Title IV–D would extend the authorization of the National Defense Student Loan Program (title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended) for an additional 3 years with the following authorizations: $225 million for fiscal year 1969, $250 million for fiscal year 1970, $275 million for fiscal year 1971.

STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT OF 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise. Its proposed title is the State Technical Services Act of 1965. A similar bill was introduced on January 25 by the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, as part of the President's program.

My State of California, and indeed the entire Nation, has a profound and justified interest in using the results of our modern science and technology for the benefit of the people and our businesses and industries. The bill would give grants to States in support of plans for infusing existing scientific and technological information into the lifestream of our civilian economy, thus helping to create more jobs, enhance industrial development and improve the means for making this knowledge more readily available to businesses, both small and large.

At a time when military expenditures are leveling off, it is imperative that we find ways to encourage free enterprise to use science for the vast segment of the economy, not related to the space or defense mission. The provisions of this bill could be of invaluable assistance in this respect.

The Department of Commerce, which developed the proposal, is to be congratulated for its foresight in identifying and seeking to remedy this imbalance in our uses of science and engineering information. I am particularly impressed that the administration has recognized the essential need for universities to be actively engaged in furnishing this science and engineering information for the benefit of our commerce and industry.

REALISTIC, HUMANE IMMIGRATION POLICY IS LONG OVERDUE

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Speaker, as in the past, I am proud to join in the sponsorship of legislation to bring immigration policy in line with the inscription beneath the Statue of Liberty proclaiming to all nations, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

I am not, however, proud that it is necessary to introduce remedial legislation every session. Substantive changes in our immigration law should have moved through the U.S. Congress many years ago.

When President Truman vetoed the Immigration Act of 1952—known as the McCarran-Walter Act—he was, in fact, vetoing racism and injustice as landmarks of American thinking.

This law, unfortunately upheld by Congress, actually is a codification of all the restrictive immigration enactments of previous years, compounded by many new and severer restrictions and injustices under the soporific excuse of national security.

The words of President Truman in his veto message still remain a correct indictment of the 1952 restrictive, racist immigration law; that is, the law "discriminates, deliberately and intentionally against many peoples of the world."

Then 2 years later we heard the late, great Senator Herbert Lehman put it on the line when he stated:

> The system presupposes that persons born in one country are better suited to immigrate here and become American citizens than persons born in another. As reflected in our immigration quotas, an individual born in Britain is presumed to be 13 times more acceptable to America than one born in Italy and 200 times more acceptable than one born in Greece.
>
> This assumption is not only utterly false on the face of it; it is basically repulsive to the very spirit and tradition—to the meaning—of America.

And just a short time ago, Madam Speaker, we were privileged to hear in this Chamber, President Johnson in his state of the Union message, declaring, "We must open opportunities to all our people," including "to those in other lands that are seeking the promise of America, through an immigration law based on the work a man can do and not where he was born or how he spells his name."

I fully agree with the President's goal. In short, I respectfully submit that our immigration law should not be based on a national quota system, but based on a person's need, talent, and above all, our commitment to democratic concepts in judging others. I would hope that the pending immigration legislation, in line with this administration's objectives, would be a priority item for this Congress.

Madam Speaker, may I jog our collective national memory for just a moment by pointing out that way back in 1787, during the Constitutional Convention, James Madison said:

> That part of America which has encouraged them [the foreigners] has advanced more rapidly in population, agriculture, and the "art."

History has proved him right and we in Congress have an obligation to go along with the healthy tide of history by repealing the 1952 discriminatory immigration act as part of the law of the land.

FIFTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Madam Speaker, the week of February 7 through February 13 commemorates the 55th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America. In our present-day society, when from all sides, we hear voices raised in concern against the rising tide of discontent that seems to affect so many of our young people, it is pleasant and somehow reassuring to take notice of this fine and upstanding group of young men and boys, each of whom has pledged himself to the betterment of the world he lives in, with this simple oath:

> On my honor I will do my best; to do my duty to God and my country, and to obey the Scout law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

The Boy Scouts of America was incorporated on February 8, 1910, and the organization was granted a charter by the Congress on June 15, 1916, with the President of the United States as honorary president. Since 1910, 36 million American youths have become members. Since 1910, 36 million American youths have become better Americans.

Today, the national membership stands at 4 million boys and 1,500,000 adults. Today, in Cub packs, Scouting groups and Explorer posts, Scouts of all ages, under the capable guidance of their leaders, work toward character development, physical fitness and outstanding citizenship. And finally, today, as were the Scouts of more than one-half century ago, they are even mindful of the opening phrase of their oath:

> On my honor I will do my best.

No more can we ask of anyone.

The Boy Scouts of America are in the finest American tradition. America has always needed young men of strength and character—young men who know the value of good citizenship and who realize the responsibilities that are involved. Perhaps never before in the history of our democratic processes has this been more true. Scout training and adherence to the principles of scouting have had a profound effect upon the development of our future citizens and it is for this reason that I am more than happy to pay tribute to the Boy Scouts of America, who are, through the heritage of their organization, sincerely devoted to the concepts of courage, self-reliance, and patriotism.

I am grateful for and proud of the Scout groups in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky which I have the honor to represent. I consider these young people among our finest resources, and, at the same time, I want to recognize the quality of the leadership that these youths have received and the caliber of those who have given so tirelessly to this cause. The men and women who have contributed countless hours to perpetuate the teachings of this movement, do, indeed, deserve our respect.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to salute the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of their 55th anniversary. I want to congratulate them upon their achievements of the past and to wish them every success on their program for the future. We can depend upon the Boy Scouts of America to do their best.

VANISHING SILVER

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Madam Speaker, the concern of our colleague, the gentleman from Idaho, Representative COMPTON I. WHITE, JR., for the future of silver in our subsidiary coinage in the United States is well known and shared by Members of this body. It becomes more apparent each day that Congress must act with dispatch to insure a stable future for this vital metal, and the counsel of the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman WHITE, must be sought and given full consideration before a decision is reached on this urgent national problem.

A fine interpretation of Congressman WHITE's position as an expert on this matter is contained in an editorial published in the Washington Star on January 28. I submit this editorial for the RECORD:

VANISHING SILVER

Representative COMPTON I. WHITE, JR., of Idaho, stirred a good deal of talk the other day with a proposal to reduce the silver content in our coins. If his plan should become law, the Treasury would be authorized to cut down the amount of the precious metal to a third of its present 90-percent content.

Probably nothing will be done in Congress until the Treasury's own current study of the problem is released, but Mr. WHITE has given voice to rather widespread concern. Total world consumption of silver is now double the rate of production. Unless something is done, the Treasury's stockpile of silver will be exhausted within 4 or 5 years.

The reason lies largely in technology; silver enjoys a steadily widening range of uses in industry, space technology, and in expanding coinage to feed the vending machines, pay telephones, and parking meters.

Americans cannot help feeling a vague uneasiness about diluting the silver content in their money. They remember schoolbook stories about the "shinplaster" paper money of the early 19th century and the ancient Roman debasement of the coinage that went hand in hand with economic decline.

Yet most modern European countries have managed to prosper without a high silver ratio. German, Italian, British, and French coins under $1 in value are now made without any silver and even their larger denominations use a lower ratio than ours. The German 5-mark piece, for example, worth $1.25, contains only 62½ percent silver—yet no one suggests that nation's currency is ailing.

The truth is that coins, like paper money, are symbolic in their value, backed by the credit of their nation and its economic strength. And with our gross national product running at a record annual rate of $634 billion, both the economy and the currency looks healthy indeed. If symbolism is good enough for a $5 bill, why not for a 50-cent piece?

The Government a few months ago announced it would pay up to 75 percent of exploration costs to expand silver production, a sharp increase from the previous 50-percent subsidy. But it seems clear the only way to make the metal available for industrial use in ample quantities is to stop locking it up in those shiny coins.

FORT UNION TRADING POST NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDLIN. Madam Speaker, at the confluence of the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers in my State of North Dakota near the Montana border, lie the remains of Fort Union, one of the most important fur-trading posts of the 19th century.

When I was a young boy, I passed the Fort Union area many times and I was

always curious about it. All I could see was the outline of the fort's foundations, a few humps and mounds of earth and depressions in the ground. I would ask my father, "Why are there no buildings?" My curiosity was never satisfied.

Today I am introducing a bill that would redevelop Fort Union and acquaint the current generation and future generations with its significant role in opening up the West.

Following reports from Lewis and Clark about the rich fur-bearing potentials of the region, the American Fur Co., headed by John Jacob Astor, selected the Missouri-Yellowstone confluence area as a base for its activities, because the travel of the Indian tribes and the free trappers converged there. The American Fur Co. built a post named Fort Floyd in 1828; 2 years later the name was changed to Fort Union. In its early years Kenneth McKenzie, known as the "King of the Missouri," was in charge of the post.

For many years Fort Union was the head of navigation on the Missouri River, and it became the stopping place for nearly every important western explorer, frontiersman, trader, soldier, and traveler. The famous names included Jim Bridger, Stephen W. Kearny, Jedidiah Smith, Father Pierre-Jean De Smet, John J. Audubon, George Catlin, Prince Maxmilian of Wied, Manuel Lisa, and Karl Bodmer.

The importance of Fort Union diminished with a declining demand for beaver pelts; in 1865, it was sold to the Northwestern Fur Co. A year later the Army established Fort Buford nearby, and in 1867, purchased Fort Union to provide building material for the new Army post. Fort Buford, incidentally, was the post where Sitting Bull surrendered in 1881.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the local enthusiasm for re-creating the color and drama of this great historic crossroads. A group of citizens in the Williston, N. Dak., area has reestablished, on an honorary basis at their own expense, the 6th Infantry Unit, which was stationed at Fort Buford, complete with uniforms, rifles and Indian scouts. In addition, the group has devoted many hours of research in the effort to broaden public understanding of the need to preserve the fort area. Last year, the 6th Infantry Unit made an appearance at the World's Fair at New York.

My bill would enable the National Park Service to acquire the remains of Fort Union and to construct a visitors' center, administrative facilities and roads, as well as suitable markers and exhibits.

This project should be undertaken to help us understand the role of the fur trade in settling the West and of early relationships between the white man and the Indian.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the text of my bill to be reprinted at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 3957

A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, North Dakota, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to commemorate the significant role played by Fort Union as a fur trading post on the upper Missouri River, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or otherwise, the historic remains of Fort Union located in Williams County, North Dakota, and Roosevelt County, Montana, and such additional lands and interests in lands as he may deem necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 2. When the site of historic Fort Union and other required lands and interests in lands have been acquired by the United States as provided in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall establish such area or areas as the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer, protect, develop, and maintain the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 353), as amended and supplemented, and the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666).

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

HUMANITIES FOUNDATION WOULD BE CORNERSTONE OF GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Madam Speaker, 3 weeks ago I introduced a bill to create a National Humanities Foundation to help to redress the imbalance which has developed in American education.

Nearly 90 Members, of both parties, have joined with me in introducing similar or identical bills and more than 40 Senators are sponsoring similar legislation.

The bills are substantially the same as the bill, H.R. 12406, which I introduced near the end of the 88th Congress and which in turn was based on the report of the Commission on the Humanities produced under the sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

Partly as a result of sputnik, this country has made a national commitment to promote education in the sciences. Out of the Department of Defense, out of NASA, out of the National Institutes of Health have poured billions of dollars for scientific research and education. Symbolic of the broadest and best of all this scientific ferment has been the National Science Foundation.

Even as we praised the magnificent work done in the sciences we began to realize that a purely materialistic outlook cannot provide an adequate basis for human life.

Yet our young people looking about them see that in national policy our country is dedicated to promoting only the sciences.

For the good of our country we must redress this imbalance. We must inspire the education of generalists who can understand and articulate the critical values that give compelling meaning and a sense of direction to human life, who are as skilled in devising a general program of peace and progress as the specialists are in creating engines of destruction.

A symbol of our national decision is needed—a symbol no less visible than the National Science Foundation.

For this purpose I propose the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation "to promote progress in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes."

The bill, the National Humanities Foundation Act of 1965, has 15 sections after the title.

Section 2 expresses the congressional findings and declaration in seven subsections. The Congress would find that there is a social, cultural, and educational imbalance in the country, and that because of this, the encouragement and support of the humanities and the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government.

To carry out these findings, section 3 establishes an independent agency known as the National Humanities Foundation consisting of a Board and a Director.

Section 4 states the purpose of the Foundation in general terms to be "to develop and promote a broadly conceived policy of support for the humanities and the arts."

Section 5 defines "humanities and the arts" in the broadest possible terms. As used in the bill, "humanities and the arts" includes, but is not limited to, the study of languages, literature, history, and philosophy; the history, criticism, and theory of the arts; the history of law, religion, and science; the creative and performing arts; and those aspects of the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods.

Section 6 is a specific prohibition against Federal Government interference in the operation of the act.

Section 7 in five numbered subsections sets forth the functions of the Foundation.

Subsection (1) gives general policy guidance to the Foundation.

Subsection (2) provides for assistance to individual scholars, teachers, and artists at any stage of their growth.

While not so specifically limited, it is expected that programs for assistance to teachers in primary and secondary schools would be provided under this subsection and it is expected that the Foundation would consult with the Commissioner of Education, who is an ex officio member of the Board, in developing programs of this type. Similarly, where

programs for creative and performing artists are involved, it is expected that the Foundation will consult with the National Council on the Arts in developing programs of this type.

Subsection (3) provides for assistance to public and other nonprofit corporations to enable each institution to develop its own program for promotion of the humanities and the arts.

Subsection (4) provides for individual scholarships, fellowships, and grants, and while not so specifically limited, would probably not be designed for teachers in primary and secondary education.

In carrying out the purposes of subsection (4), it is expected that the Foundation will work in consultation with private and semiprivate institutions such as the Smithsonian Institution, and the American Council of Learned Societies which are presently carrying on programs of fellowships, scholarships, and grants. The Secretary of the Smithsonian is an ex officio member of the Board.

Subsection (5) authorizes assistance for the improvement of library and museum resources. It is expected that in carrying out the purposes of this subsection, the Foundation will, in the case of libraries, work in consultation with the Library of Congress and, in the case of museums, with the Smithsonian Institution. The Librarian of Congress and the Secretary of the Smithsonian are both ex officio members of the Board.

Subsection (b) states that one of the objectives of the Foundation should be to encourage the spread of excellence in the humanities and the arts throughout the United States and its possessions.

Subsection (c) requires the Foundation to render an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress.

Section 8 establishes a Board for the Foundation of 25 members with 20 members appointed by the President for 6-year terms by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and 5 ex officio members. Section 8 requires that the public members shall be eminent in the fields of the humanities or the arts selected solely on the basis of established records and in such a manner as to provide comprehensive representation of views of the humanities and the arts throughout the United States. The ex officio members are the Director of the Foundation, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Chairman of the National Council on the Arts.

Section 9 creates the office of Director of the Foundation and provides that he shall receive the same compensation as the Librarian of Congress.

Section 10 authorizes the Board to create an executive and other committees.

Section 11 grants general legal powers to the Foundation and specifically authorizes the Foundation to receive and use donated funds.

Section 12 contains miscellaneous provisions such as the hiring of personnel, per diem for members of the Board, and permits the transfer from other departments and agencies of the Government of funds available to them for development of the humanities or the arts.

Section 13 contains loyalty provisions modeled on those applicable to the National Science Foundation.

Section 14 authorizes the use of counterpart funds for programs in the humanities and the arts outside the United States.

Section 15 authorizes the appropriation of $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for years thereafter such sums as Congress may determine.

I think there is a new climate—a fundamental change in the attitude toward intellectual and cultural life in the United States. I think the time is right for the Federal Government to take steps to encourage this changing attitude. It would be of great help if members of the academic community would communicate with their own Senators and their own Representatives to enlist their support for the National Humanities Foundation.

The humanities are concerned with the improvement of the quality of life and an improved quality of life is the essence of the Great Society. I believe that the creation of the National Humanities Foundation by the Congress can be the cornerstone of the Great Society.

The Members of the House of Representatives who have introduced bills calling for the creation of a National Humanities Foundation include:

Mr. EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York.
Mr. RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana.
Mr. JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois:
Mr. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts.
Mr. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland.
Mr. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York.
Mr. WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio.
Mr. GEORGE RHODES, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey.
Mr. JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. JOHN C. KUNKEL, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. LEO W. O'BRIEN, of New York.
Mr. JAMES A. BYRNE, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. ED EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma.
Mr. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, of Maryland.
Mr. JOHN E. MOSS, of California.
Mr. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., of Massachusetts.
Mr. ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. THOMAS L. ASHLEY, of Ohio.
Mr. KENNETH GRAY, of Illinois.
Mr. HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin.
Mr. JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California.
Mr. B. F. SISK, of California.
Mr. JIM WRIGHT, of Texas.
Mr. GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska.
Mr. JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. ROBERT N. C. NIX, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. AL ULLMAN, of Oregon.
Mr. JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana.
Mr. SILVIO O. CONTE, of Massachusetts.
Mr. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut.
Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, of New Jersey.
Mr. JACOB H. GILBERT, of New York.
Mr. SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York.
Mr. KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia.
Mr. RALPH J. RIVERS, of Alaska.
Mr. J. EDWARD ROUSH, of Indiana.
Mr. HERMAN TOLL, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. HUGH L. CAREY, of New York.
Mr. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas.
Mr. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland.
Mr. LUCIEN N. NEDZI, of Michigan.
Mr. ARNOLD OLSEN, of Montana.
Mr. WILLIAM F. RYAN, of New York.
Mr. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, of Rhode Island.
Mr. STANLEY R. TUPPER, of Maine.
Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL, of Arizona.
Mr. MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota.
Mr. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., of California.
Mr. LAURENCE BURTON, of Utah.
Mr. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON, of California.
Mr. JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire.
Mr. DON EDWARDS, of California.
Mr. RICHARD FULTON, of Tennessee.
Mr. SAM GIBBONS, of Florida.
Mr. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, of California.
Mr. FRANK J. HORTON, of New York.
Mr. ROBERT L. LEGGETT, of California.
Mr. JOSEPH M. MCDADE, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, of Hawaii.
Mr. JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York.
Mr. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, of Connecticut.
Mr. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR., of Arizona.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, of California.
Mr. WALTER H. MOELLER, of Ohio.
Mr. DONALD J. IRWIN, of Connecticut.
Mr. BROCK ADAMS, of Washington.
Mr. FRANK ANNUNZIO, of Illinois.
Mr. CLAIR CALLAN, of Nebraska.
Mr. TIM LEE CARTER, of Kentucky.
Mr. JOHN CONYERS, JR., of Michigan.
Mr. KEN W. DYAL, of California.
Mr. JOHN J. GILLIGAN, of Ohio.
Mr. STANLEY L. GREIGG, of Iowa.
Mr. HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey.
Mr. RODNEY M. LOVE, of Ohio.
Mr. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, of New York.
Mr. ROY H. MCVICKER, of Colorado.
Mr. HERVEY G. MACHEN, of Maryland.
Mr. RICHARD L. OTTINGER, of New York.
Mr. JOHN A. RACE, of Wisconsin.
Mr. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, of New York.
Mr. GALE SCHISLER, of Illinois.
Mr. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, of Iowa.
Mr. ROBERT E. SWEENEY, of Ohio.
Mr. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. WESTON E. VIVIAN, of Michigan.

FEDERAL CHARTER LEGISLATION FOR MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of

our colleagues a very fine article which appeared in the January 25, 1965, issue of the United States Investor concerning my bill H.R. 14, which would provide for Federal charters for mutual savings banks.

It should be noted that both Chairman A. WILLIS ROBERTSON in the other body and Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN in this House indicated last year that they were introducing similar legislation by request.

The article follows:

IT IS SHOWDOWN TIME FOR THE FEDERAL MUTUAL SAVINGS BILL

So far as the Federal mutual savings bank bill is concerned, it is showdown time. This important piece of legislation has been hanging around Congress for 8 years since it was first introduced on February 4, 1957, by Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York.

The first National Association of Mutual Savings Bank-supported Federal chartering bill was introduced in both branches of Congress, and with bipartisan support in 1960. The bill finally reached the hearing stage in late 1963 when the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance of the House Banking and Currency Committee, under the chairmanship of Representative MULTER, held 3 days of hearings.

EDUCATIONAL CAMPAIGN

When the industry bill was first introduced, it was not the intent of either its congressional sponsors or NAMSB that it be pushed immediately. The purpose of its introduction at that stage was to obtain comments and criticisms from Government agencies and other interested parties on the bill as it was then drafted. Meanwhile, a broad educational campaign was initiated to win Government and private support.

The first real break came when the Commission on Money and Credit endorsed Federal charters for mutual savings banks. The CMC report—the first comprehensive survey in half a century of public and private financial institutions, policies and practices in the United States—stated:

"At present, commercial banks and savings and loan associations may obtain Federal charters. Since only 17 States now provide for the establishment of savings banks, it is not possible to establish savings banks in two-thirds of our States. Federal charters for savings banks would permit operation in any State, and this would stimulate competition and enterprise among financial institutions, improve the banking facilities in some communities and, perhaps, encourage greater conventional mortgage lending activity in all areas."

SECOND MAJOR BREAK

The second major break for the bill came in April 1963, when the President's Committee on Financial Institutions—the so-called Heller Committee—unanimously concluded that "voluntary Federal charters should be available for mutual savings banks subject to adequate supervisory standards and safeguards." However, the Committee stressed that its support of the principle did "not imply endorsement of any particular bill in Congress."

The culmination of the industry's educational drive came last summer with the introduction of administration approved Federal chartering legislation by Chairman A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat of Virginia, of the Senate Banking Committee and Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas, of the House Banking Committee. The legislation was drafted by the FHLBB and proposed by the Board.

In a letter of transmittal to Congress, FHLBB Chairman Joseph P. McMurray stressed that it had been developed in cooperation with other Federal agencies which would be affected or interested in the legislation. These included the Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Council of Economic Advisers—with Bureau of Budget acting as coordinating agency.

That bill has been reintroduced by Representative MULTER as H.R. 14. It is understood the Federal Home Loan Bank Board will again resubmit its request for the legislation with a few minor and some technical changes; but H.R. 14 is, essentially, the administration bill.

Meanwhile, NAMSB has been actively soliciting the support of other industries. So far, the National Association of Home Builders, the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, as well as individual savings and loan officials and others have added their support to the quest for Federal chartering.

And it is now time for legislative action.

The forces arrayed against the bill are formidable. The two largest and strongest financial trade associations—the American Bankers Association and the United States Savings and Loan League—are opposed to it. These two groups undoubtedly will work together to defeat the bill which, in the words of CMC, "would stimulate competition" among existing financial institutions. Also, the politically powerful National Association of Supervisors of State Banks has in the past taken the position that there is no need for federally chartered mutual savings banks.

This means that the drive for enactment of the bill is uphill all the way. This fact, plus the limited geographical support the industry enjoys in Congress, could give rise to the strategy of more study in the hope that more savings and loan support can be generated. It is true, for example, the National League of Insured Savings Associations had not gone on record in opposition to the proposal and, in fact, has expressed interest in the idea.

THE LEGISLATIVE TEST

But there comes a time when an industry—especially one whose almost entire legislative interest centers on one bill—must commit itself to action. Congress expects it, and Congress may lose interest in a proposal if after a reasonable time the measure is not put to the legislative test.

We, of course, would not presume to dictate strategy nor do we mean that the bill will not eventually be enacted if not passed by the 89th Congress. The decision of when to press for action is one only an industry itself can make. And, as the last 5 years have illustrated, it is sometimes good strategy to delay an encounter with opponents. The proof of this is the success of NAMSB's educational campaign.

Whenever industry leaders decide to go to the mat with the Federal chartering bill—whether this year, next year or the next—they will require the full and active support of the industry. With such support, there is a chance the bill can be enacted; without it, there is almost no hope for passage. This is why we say it is showdown time for the Federal mutual savings bank bill.

PROPOSED SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY OPERATION OF HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Madam Speaker, I have just introduced a House resolution to create a select committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all aspects of the operation of hospital facilities by the Veterans' Administration, the Public Health Service, and the armed services.

On January 19, within a few minutes after I had received notification that seven Public Health Service hospitals were to be closed, I pointed out on the floor of the House some of the items in the letter of transmittal and the press release which disturbed me greatly. It seemed clear that the alleged study of the closing of these facilities either had not been made or had not developed a true picture of hospital facilities available to those who have a statutory right to hospitalization and treatment in Government hospitals. The Veterans' Administration and the Public Health Service are proposing to close a total of 17 hospitals, the Department of Defense has a program for replacing 50 obsolete hospitals. I would be surprised if some new hospitals were not proposed by the Department of Defense.

I have discussed the resolution which I have introduced with the three distinguished chairmen of the committees which have the major responsibility for the three types of hospitals to which I have referred. The chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee has announced his intention to begin hearings on the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospitals. The chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], has indicated his willingness to look into the proposed closings of the Public Health Service hospitals; and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee this morning referred to a special subcommittee on military hospitals which he chaired in the last Congress and announced his continuing interest in this important matter.

But the whole problem is one which cuts across the jurisdictional lines of these three committees. It is for this reason that it seems appropriate that this whole subject be considered by a select committee, whose membership is made up from among the members of the major committees responsible for these facilities.

Madam Speaker, I hope that this resolution may be given prompt consideration in order that this important work can be begun immediately.

LET'S SEARCH OUT THE REAL FACTS ABOUT VA CLOSINGS

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Madam Speaker, the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has indicated he will soon hold hearings on the proposed closing of veterans' hospitals, domiciliaries, and regional offices. This will provide Members of the House an opportunity to make these hearings meaningful and productive, rather than perfunctory and mechanical.

We all know that Members of Congress are perpetually disadvantaged in dealing with the executive branch on questions of cost and efficiency. VA officials will doubtless come armed with reams of facts and figures selected to defend alleged economies generated from their proposals. Members of Congress do not have staffs of sufficient size or access to enough privileged information to dig out all the statistics necessary for effective rebuttal.

But this situation need not work totally to our disadvantage. If we cannot come up with the facts and figures ourselves, we can at least prepare questions detailed enough to pin down the exact reasons for each and every decision to close down a veterans' facility. The public deserves a detailed record of the reasons for all 32 decisions. Let us find out how many were arbitrary and unwarranted.

Every Member of New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Ohio as well as Congressmen from the Dakotas, Wyoming, and Nevada whose district will suffer from this proposal should be present at these hearings to meet the challenge of the VA head-on. It is my hope that these Members will prepare rebuttals showing that the false economies derived from these short-sighted proposals are insignificant when compared with the human needs of the aging veterans involved. We are entitled to know whether any of these proposed terminations were worked out by a computer without consideration of the human element involved. In dealing with the sick and disabled we are not dealing with commodities. Human beings should not be treated as holes in a punch card. My fellow Members can make the new Administrator and his aids realize that these "economies" simply shift the cost of an adequate veterans' program from the Government to the shoulders of aging veterans who cannot afford such additional burdens.

It is true Members who do not serve on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee cannot cross-examine witnesses appearing before that committee. But I urge those Members who are affected by the VA announcement prepare questions for cross-examination of the VA witnesses by members of the committee. In such a way perhaps we may be able to obtain the kind of substantial evidence that should have been made public by the Veterans' Administration well in advance of their recent closure announcement.

SPECIAL MERIT AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING COOPERATION IN FURTHERING ZIP CODE TO TIME, INC.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Madam Speaker, Time, Inc., was the recipient last week of the Post Office Department's first Special Merit Award for outstanding cooperation in furthering the zip code program. In presenting the citation, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski expressed his pleasure on being able to make the award and said that while it was the first of its kind, "we hope it won't be the last."

Time, Inc.—

He added—

has gone out of its way to cooperate with the Department in carrying out its various programs. In many ways, Time, Inc., has been the Post Office Department's testing ground for new postal ideas and programs.

Certainly—

He concluded—

no one has helped us more than Time, Inc., in carrying out the zip code program or cooperated to a greater extent in testing and giving effect to other programs designed to improve the mail service. It is with a great deal of pride and thanks, therefore, that I present this award to Time, Inc.

Somewhat over a year ago, it was my privilege, Madam Speaker, together with other members of the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, to visit Time, Inc.'s computer and production center in Chicago. At that time, we all were impressed with the great strides being made by that large publishing firm in the presorting and preparation of all of their mailings, so as to eliminate many handling operations formerly performed by the Post Office Department at great expense.

Based on my personal observation, I cannot help but agree with General Gronouski that the award is richly deserved. I commend General Gronouski and his staff for making the award and it is my hope that it will lead to greater cooperation between other large users of the mail and the Post Office Department to the end that even greater economies and additional improvements in the mail service will result.

Madam Speaker, I submit the following official press release of the Post Office Department concerning the award to be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

Postmaster General John A. Gronouski today presented Time, Inc., with the Post Office Department's first Special Merit Award for outstanding cooperation in furthering ZIP code.

"Each of the billion pieces of mail annually put into the postal system by the publishing organization is ZIP coded," he said, "Time, Inc., presorts mailings by ZIP codes, thus saving the Post Office thousands of dollars each week."

The Postmaster General also noted that for many years the company has served as a testing laboratory for new postal ideas.

"Time, Inc., has participated, along with other publications, in our customer education program by including advertisements in all of the firm's magazines promoting the use of ZIP codes among the public. The organization has contributed significantly by encouraging other members of the business community to convert to ZIP coded mailings.

"Nearly every major user of the mails knows the Time-ZIP code case history, and Time people have been generous in sharing their knowledge with other firms to assist them in cutting corners during their conversion to ZIP code."

David W. Brumbaugh, executive vice president and treasurer, Time, Inc., accepted the award in the Postmaster General's office.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1 OF THE IDAHO LEGISLATURE

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Madam Speaker, out of deep concern for future development of the vast and vital natural resources of Idaho, the 38th legislature of my State has memorialized the Congress and President to proceed with haste to provide an adequate forest service highway system into these areas of public domain. I include it and my full endorsement of its purposes as a part of the RECORD:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1 OF IDAHO LEGISLATURE

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas an adequate transportation system is necessary in the proper harvest and use of our natural resources; and

Whereas the lack of an adequate transportation system is the greatest deterrent to the full use of our natural resources in the State of Idaho; and

Whereas, under the present rate of road construction, it will take 100 years to complete an adequate forest highway transportation system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America, to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact legislation requiring all Government agencies involved to make sufficient funds available to expedite completion of an adequate transportation system on the main roads of national forests and public domain; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Rep-

resentatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

Passed the house on the 15th day of January 1965.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate on the 18th day of January 1965.

JACK M. MURPHY,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

ROBERT K. REMAKLUS,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SCHOOL PROBLEMS IN AMERICA'S LARGE CITIES

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Madam Speaker, the other evening many of us here in Congress had the pleasure of attending a dinner sponsored by the Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement. This fine organization represents school administrators and school board members of more than 15 of the Nation's large cities, and its principal purpose is to make studies of unique problems faced by the great cities in an effort to meet the comprehensive public school needs of the citizens therein and to coordinate projects designed to provide solutions to these problems.

This unique organization has already proven itself of invaluable assistance to us here in Congress and in particular to many members of the House Education Committee. The extraordinary research carried on by this organization has been helpful in formulating legislation dealing with school problems and the legislation submitted by the President reflects, in many instances, the views of the members of this research council.

The president of this very impressive organization is Dr. Benjamin Willis, who is superintendent of schools in Chicago and who is recognized throughout America and the free world as one of the truly great school administrators and educators.

I should like today to call my colleagues' attention to the pointed remarks delivered by Dr. Willis at the banquet last Thursday. He has put into dramatic form the problems confronting America's educational system, but, in particular, it is significant to note that out of 179 million residents of the United States, according to the 1960 census, 125 million lived in urban areas as compared to 54 million in rural areas.

Dr. Willis quite properly points out that the educational problems of our large cities can no longer be ignored.

Dr. Willis' excellent analysis follows:

The frontier of these United States is in the great cities of America. No longer do the problems of rural America represent the problems of 90 percent of our population. Gradually there has emerged two Americas, that which is in the metropolitan centers, and that which is not. During the decade from 1950 to 1960, more than 90 percent of the total increase in population in continental United States occurred in the great metropolitan areas. In 1960 the Bureau of Census reported that of the 179 million residents of the United States, 125 million lived in urban areas as opposed to 54 million in rural areas. Thus the problems of the great cities—New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, and the others—require and must receive the concerted action of good government.

The school systems of the large cities of America have experienced a decade of incredible increases in enrollments. In one large city, the public school enrollment increased more than 100,000 between 1950 and 1960, while the total city population decreased by 70,000. Increased annual number of births, continued in-migration of young and large families from economically and educationally deprived rural areas, and returned dropouts and increased holding power of the school contributed to this phenomenon. In addition to the ever-increasing number of children, the school systems of the large cities have been called upon to serve an expanding diversity of children's needs and to incorporate new knowledge and newer instructional methods and techniques, and this last during a period of national shortage of teachers and one of escalating costs. Dramatic stresses have occurred from changes in educational programs to meet the knowledge and technological explosion of our society.

Within the city, shifting population, changes in industrial needs, social trends, and economic factors influence demands on school space, especially in high density areas. Population explosions often result in the almost immediate enrollment of hundreds of additional children in a given school which are analagous to those which occur in federally impacted areas. Industrial needs, expressway construction, and public housing projects change school facility requirements in a particular city-community in a short span of time.

The great cities of America are confronted with the effects of four major factors shaping our society today: The tremendous mobility of our people, the mounting urbanization of the country, technological advances, and the social tensions of today's world. Each poses a challenge to education in the great cities. The large cities have risen to meet these challenges individually and as a group. The organization of the Research Council itself is an example of such group action.

I would like to tell you just briefly about the origin and history of the cooperative effort of the cities represented here to provide a quality education for their young people. The Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement is an organization of the large cities of the United States whose primary purpose is to make studies of unique problems faced by the great cities in their efforts to meet the comprehensive public school needs of their citizens, to coordinate projects designed to provide solutions to these problems, and to sponsor the implementation of the results and findings of studies to promote the improvement of education in the great cities.

The Research Council was organized in 1956 for the purpose of studying educational problems which were of special concern and interest to large cities. The initial meetings were attended by superintendents and board members, from 11 large cities. A major concern in these original conversations was the area of vocational education. From these very useful meetings developed The Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement which was incorporated on February 27, 1961, as a not-for-profit organization.

The original membership of 11 cities has been expanded to 15. The following large cities are now members of the research council: Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Houston, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, New York City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C.

The first study undertaken by the council was in the area of vocational education, "Preparation for the World of Work." Each city studied a different facet of vocational education, sharing its findings with other member cities.

Early in 1958 the great cities began to explore the educational needs of children whose backgrounds were so meager or so different from those of the prevailing urban culture that the children were handicapped in their classroom learning. Individual cities have conducted projects in these "gray areas" of the large cities, again each city sharing its findings with other member cities.

Studies in fiscal policies were initiated by the great cities late in 1960. The initial project consisted of a preliminary estimate of the immediate fiscal needs of the great cities, an estimate of the probable future revenue from fiscal policies, and an examination of tax sources as avenues for adequate funds. A second study in this area is now underway.

Teacher education for urban areas was examined by the council in the spring of 1962. The cities decided to study the unique problems related to the recruitment, preparation and retention of professional personnel, and there is now moving forward a program in this field of urgent need.

The rapid economic and social changes in America have created problems requiring new approaches to education and demanding bold action. The urgency and the dimensions of the problems facing the great cities have united us—city, State, or national leaders—in a common concern for education and a dedication to work toward a solution of these crucial problems. Your continued concern and dedication to action is required if the young people of this country are to realize the full development of their capabilities and make their maximum contribution to the advancement of the American way of life.

BAD BUOYS OF THE SEA

Mr. BOB WILSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Madam Speaker, the Russians have long been inventing things that are commonplace in American life. It has become a standing joke. No so funny, however, is the latest Russian caper, which consists simply of stealing U.S. equipment.

While L.B.J. talks sweetness and light with the Reds, the Communists have been raiding our scientific stations at sea. Prof. John Isaacs, director of the Scripps marine life research program, disclosed this week that a Navy radar picket ship chased a Russian fishing trawler away

from an anchored buoy off Point Conception, 150 miles north of San Diego. The Russians had stripped the buoy of instruments before steaming away. Recently another buoy was found adrift, with equipment removed.

Professor Isaacs said:

We shouldn't be surprised by all of this. The Russians are in a full speed race to learn the secrets of the sea. They know we are ahead of them in many aspects of oceanographic technology and they want to learn our methods. One easy way to do it, quite obviously, is to frisk our ocean buoys, take the instruments and copy them.

The Scripps project is a vast one, utilizing 5 weather station buoys which contain instruments for recording data on temperatures, winds, and currents. The data is radioed to shore stations and automatically recorded. Professor Isaacs said the buoys contain radar reflectors and are easy to find.

The loss of U.S. technical leadership to the Reds has been a sorry chapter in our history. The secrets of the atom were stolen by Red spies. Security risks were allowed to work in sensitive places. Espionage and subversion have been a steady profession in the United States. In Alaska, the Russians are running roughshod through our fishermen's nets, while L.B.J. entertains Red diplomats who assure him that they want better relations.

Perhaps it is high time for U.S. toughness—which might go a lot further than sweet talk and the plethora of promises that the Russians have offered.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 408. An act to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future natural disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 576. An act to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians and dentists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. STRATTON, for 45 minutes, today.

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. MARSH.

Mr. BANDSTRA.

Mr. DINGELL.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 2, 1965, at 12 o' clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	General counsel	$11,015.71
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	11,015.71
Christine S. Gallagher	Clerk	11,015.71
Hyde H. Murray	Assistant clerk	10,295.03
George Misslbeck	Printing editor	6,085.44
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	5,690.46
Betty M. Prezioso	do	5,690.46
Peggy J. Lamm	do	5,253.30
Martha S. Hannah	do	5,253.30
Jane C. Wojcik	do	5,060.74
Investigating staff:		
Robert C. Bruce	Assistant counsel	5,690.46
Marjorie B. Johnson	Staff assistant	3,348.54
R. Carolyn Windsor	do	2,711.79
Losie V. Watkins, Jr.	Staff assistant (July, August, and September).	1,650.75
M. Allen Paul III	Staff assistant (July, August, November, and December).	3,124.95
Thomas J. Kraeft	Staff assistant (August).	428.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	35,229.83
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	17,639.41
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	52,869.24
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	22,130.76

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth Sprankle	Clerk and staff director.	$10,999.98
Paul M. Wilson	Assistant clerk and staff director.	10,999.98
Carson W. Culp	Staff assistant	10,999.98
Robert M. Moyer	do	10,999.98
Jay B. Howe	do	10,999.98
Ross P. Pope	do	10,999.98
Frank P. Sanders	do	10,999.98
G. Homer Skarin	do	10,999.98
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	10,999.98
Robert L. Michaels	do	10,999.98
Aubrey A. Gunnels	do	10,295.03
Robert P. Williams	Editor	9,206.10
George E. Evans	Staff assistant	9,017.94
Francis G. Merrill	do	9,017.94
Earl C. Silsby	do	8,393.46
Samuel R. Preston	do	7,778.46
Keith F. Mainland	do	6,849.54
Lawrence C. Miller	Assistant editor	5,909.88
George A. Urian	Clerical assistant	5,011.68
Stephen B. Miller	do	4,607.52
James E. Moore	do	4,607.52
Austin G. Smith	do	4,567.62
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	2,937.06
Isabelle Gladney	Clerk to the majority.	6,323.09
Mabel E. Hammett	Clerk-stenographer	767.92
Grace W. Beirne	do	4,607.52
Patrick W. Hayes	do	4,607.52
Ruth V. Hedgecock	do	4,607.52
William J. Neary	do	4,442.39
Harry E. Reynolds	do	4,607.52
John E. Ringwald	do	3,972.60
Mary L. Schwarzmann.	do	4,607.52
Mary H. Smallwood	do	4,607.52
Janice J. Stalcup	do	4,607.52
Phyllis N. Troy	do	4,368.07
Mary F. Wilson	do	3,735.30
George S. Green	Clerk to the minority	3,431.67
Jack W. Watson	do	6,863.36
Agnes Ainilian	Clerk-stenographer	4,607.52
William J. Baroody, Jr.	do	4,607.52
Alice Beach	do	2,832.24
James H. Bersie	do	3,782.77
Josephine Birdsall	do	4,607.52
Jessemine A. Falls	do	4,607.52
Catherine L. Kennett	do	4,607.52
Sophia Moreland	do	3,901.43
Geoffrey L. Nichols	do	3,972.60
Clara B. Posey	do	4,607.52
Bernice R. Lynch	do	1,416.12

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964 ..... $307,906.87

GEORGE MAHON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIONS STAFF)

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Rowland C. Halstead	Director, surveys and investigations staff.	$9,084.42
Leo E. Conroy	do	9,621.06
Charles Bolz	Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff.	9,339.99
Lillian M. Mackie	Stenographer	4,505.76
Mary A. Sauer	do	4,230.42

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Agriculture, Department of:		
Canada, T. C	Investigator	$6,843.40
Sherman, J. I	do	3,043.20
Atomic Energy Commission:		
Moore, J. R	do	6,441.93
Commerce, Department of:		
Bershad, Max A	do	1,056.72
Jenkins, W. B	do	7,330.21
Krevor, N	do	2,874.82
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Bennett, C. L	do	7,955.52
Billings, C. G	do	4,329.52
Byrnes, R. C	do	7,479.68
Carson, W. D	do	8,166.48
Currall, W. G	do	7,781.28
Flatley, J. M	do	6,874.56
Franklin, R. M	do	7,312.80
Hayes, E. J	do	7,975.68
Health benefits		773.65
Ivy, C. M	Investigator	7,523.52
Law, W. C	do	6,042.96
Life insurance		454.45
McCloskey, J. J	Investigator	6,849.36
McDowell, L. L	do	7,734.48
McEliece, R. F	do	4,873.44
Magee, E. H	do	7,781.28
Murphy, P. J	do	7,312.80
Reproduction of staff exhibits,		81.90
Retirement fund		8,788.62
Shannon, A. J	Investigator	7,955.52
Sullivan, J. V	do	7,479.68
Use of automatic data processing facilities.		305.00
Van Wagoner, R. L	Investigator	7,955.52
Welch, W. H	do	8,194.08
Wood, H. B	do	7,955.52
Federal Communications Commission:		
Carey, R. B	do	4,859.98
General Services Administration:		
Chapman, H. K	do	7,219.16
Collinet, P	do	8,251.27
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of:		
Duffy, H. C	do	3,523.31
Interior, Department of the:		
Ulmer, S	do	2,928.44
Library of Congress:		
Rose, J. K	do	5,251.39
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:		
Carey, B	do	6,277.04
Navy, Department of the:		
Murray, W. S	do	5,138.64
Post Office Department:		
Petitt, R. E	do	4,942.36
Reclamation, Bureau of:		
Stradley, H. E	do	6,967.00
Standards, Bureau of:		
Tipson, S	do	977.00
Veterans' Administration:		
Austin, W. C	do	8,032.42
Travel and miscellaneous expense.		62,421.95

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$700,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	347,099.19
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	352,900.81

GEORGE MAHON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JANUARY 4, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John R. Blandford	Chief counsel	$10,999.98
Philip W. Kelleher	Counsel	10,999.98
Frank M. Slatinshek	do	10,999.98
William H. Cook	do	10,160.16
Earl J. Morgan	Professional staff member.	10,160.16
Oneta L. Stockstill	Executive secretary	6,766.68
Berniece Kalinowski	Secretary	5,909.88
L. Louise Ellis	do	5,909.88
Edna E. Johnson	do	5,909.88
Dorothy R. Britton	do	5,909.88
Doris L. Scott	do	3,948.90
James A. Deakins	Bill clerk	4,427.94

SUBCOMMITTEE FOR SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 84, 146, AND 607, 88TH CONG.)

John T. M. Reddan	Counsel	$10,999.98
Walton Woods	Investigator	9,651.78
Phyllis Seymour	Secretary	5,629.56
Rose Beck	do	3,972.60
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	3,806.52
Jerome K. Small, Jr	Messenger	267.82

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 146, 607, and 833)	$154,990.56
Amount of expenditures previously reported	88,553.72
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	31,548.93
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	120,082.65
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	34,907.91

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JANUARY 11, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John R. Stark	Clerk and staff director.	$10,999.98
John E. Barriere	Professional staff member.	10,999.98
Orman S. Fink	Minority professional staff member.	10,999.98
Alvin Lee Morse	Counsel (as of Aug. 1, 1964).	7,344.60

STANDING COMMITTEE—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Paul Nelson	Economist-assistant to the chairman (as of Dec. 1, 1964).	$1,575.20
Katherine M. Greene	Assistant counsel (as of Nov. 1, 1964).	2,505.94
Roger J. Brown	Editor (through Nov. 30, 1964).	6,183.40
Jane M. Deem	Administrative assistant.	5,629.56
George C. Hill	Assistant clerk (from July 15 through Nov. 30, 1964).	3,514.09
Paul F. Jessup	Economist (from July 1 through July 31, 1964).	789.98
Mary W. Layton	Secretary of minority.	6,320.16
Margaret H. Moorhous	Assistant clerk (from July 1 through July 15, 1964).	390.45
Curtis A. Prins	Staff investigator (as of Dec. 1, 1964).	1,166.66
Regina Swanner	Assistant clerk (from July 1 through Oct. 31, 1964).	3,123.64
Donald G. Vaughn	Assistant clerk	5,625.30
Total		77,168.92

INVESTIGATING STAFF (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 547 AND H. RES. 833)

Beller, Charles S	Counsel, Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance.	$10,426.49
Benston, George J	Economist (from Mar. 15 through June 30, 1964, $2,474.64; and from July 1 through Nov. 30, 1964).	2,824.69
Brown, Roger J	Editor (as of Dec. 1, 1964).	1,236.68
Clark, James D	Research assistant (through Sept. 7, 1964).	974.78
Frank, Walter S	Economist (from Sept. 1 through Sept. 30, 1964).	325.18
Fulton, Wilbur D	Minority professional staff member (through Sept. 30, 1964).	5,499.99
Hayden, Helen E	Assistant clerk	4,368.07
Hill, George C	Assistant clerk (from July 1 through July 15, 1964, and as of Dec. 1, 1964).	1,171.36
Hill, Stephen P	Assistant clerk (through July 4, 1964).	55.58
Holstein, Charles B	Professional staff member, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs.	10,999.98
Holt, Shirley W	Assistant clerk (as of Dec. 1, 1964).	440.35
Jacobs, Donald P	Economist	2,401.44
Jessup, Paul F	Economist (from Aug. 1 through Sept. 30, 1964).	1,579.96
Johnson, Janice L	Secretary (as of Oct. 26, 1964).	1,280.33
Kennedy, Stephen D	Research assistant	3,557.35
Lumer, Marc A	Assistant clerk (through Nov. 6, 1964).	1,833.17
Mitchell, Mildred S	Assistant clerk	4,421.99
Morse, Alvin Lee	Counsel (through July 31, 1964).	1,468.93
Nelson, Paul	Economist (from Oct. 15 through Nov. 30, 1964).	2,415.31
Pontecorvo, Giulio	Economist (through July 31, 1964).	257.61
Roberts, Harriet L	Staff assistant (through Oct. 25, 1964).	2,790.72
Robinson, Donald L	Professional staff member, Subcommittee on International Finance.	4,739.88

INVESTIGATING STAFF (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 547 AND H. RES. 833)—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Schulkin, Peter A.	Research assistant (through Sept. 15, 1964).	$1,120.29
Scott, Ira O., Jr.	Economist (through Sept. 15, 1964).	1,952.27
Swanner, Regina	Assistant clerk (as of Nov. 1, 1964).	1,561.82
Taylor, Patricia A.	Assistant clerk, Subcommittee on International Trade (as of Aug. 1, 1964).	1,798.40
Terry, Patricia A.	Clerk-typist (from Sept. 1 through 30, 1964).	430.64
Watson, Winston Lee	Research assistant (through Sept. 7, 1964).	931.42
Whitaker, Gilbert R., Jr.	Economist	2,401.44
Young, Doris M.	Assistant clerk, Subcommittee on International Trade.	4,607.52
Total		79,873.64

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 735 AND H. RES. 833)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Battle, Virginia Anne	Secretary (from July 20 through Sept. 15, 1964).	$770.96
Burrows, Kenneth W.	Housing economist	10,999.98
Hamilton, Eleanor	Research assistant	4,194.48
Ireland, Casey	Minority staff member.	10,160.16
Leary, Margaret J.	Secretary	4,685.42
McEwan, John J., Jr.	Deputy staff director-housing economist.	10,999.98
Perry, Grady, Jr.	Chief clerk	10,721.01
Tucker, Margaret E.	Secretary	5,519.82
Weintraub, Robert E.	Senior economist	6,670.50
Total		64,722.31

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$703,202.14
Amount of expenditures previously reported	438,685.29
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	171,718.47
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	610,403.76
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	92,798.38

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JANUARY 7, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel	$10,295.03
Clayton D. Gasque	Staff director	8,174.40
Donald J. Turbridy	Minority clerk	7,452.66
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator	7,344.06
James T. Clark	Clerk	$10,999.98
Ellen M. Coxeter	Assistant clerk	5,017.73
Jennie H. Cavanaugh	Assistant clerk (resigned Oct. 30, 1964).	2,959.96
Jean Quarles	Assistant clerk	4,439.94
Frances D. Noland	Clerk	4,284.16
Cynthia Potts Corbin	Typist (resigned Sept. 10, 1964).	789.03
Total		61,756.95
Thomas M. Owen III	Employed as special investigator for Subcommittee No. 4 at gross salary of $639.36 per month.	

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures for 88th Cong	$25,000.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	3,826.26

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Chief clerk	$10,999.98
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff director	10,999.98
Deborah Partridge Wolfe.	Chief of education (to Oct. 31, 1964).	7,333.32
Leon Abramson	Chief counsel for labor management.	9,484.63
Odell Clark	Chief investigator	8,157.96
C. Sumner Stone	Special assistant to the chairman (from Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1964).	3,000.46
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant.	5,072.10
Jeanne E. Thomson	do	5,072.10
Corrine Annette Huff.	Secretary	4,905.99
MINORITY		
Philip Ray Rodgers	Minority clerk and counsel.	10,999.98
Charles W. Radcliffe	Minority counsel for education.	8,157.96
Total		84,184.46

Amount of expenditures previously reported Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	$215,426.76
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	84,184.46
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	299,611.22

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE
(INVESTIGATIVE STAFF)

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Donald Louis Anderson.	Assistant labor counsel.	$4,776.48
Goldie A. Baldwin	Administrative assistant.	3,561.28
Donald F. Berens	do	5,072.10
Nicholas Delgado	Assistant counsel (from Oct. 1 to Nov. 30, 1964).	1,100.50
Aurora E. Harris	Secretary	4,272.30
Grace S. Jackson	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 31, 1964).	1,067.19
Sandra L. Paxton	Secretary (to Oct. 15, 1964.)	2,237.76
Michael Schwartz	Assistant labor counsel (from Aug. 1, 1964).	3,888.64
Mary L. Shuler	Secretary	3,563.28
John Everett Warren	Assistant clerk	1,527.69
Harriet W. Ziskin	Assistant to education chief (to Dec. 15, 1964).	3,801.05
MINORITY		
Annette S. Guibord	Secretary	2,583.85
Crawford C. Heerlein	Administrative assistant.	6,531.48
Richard H. Missner	Associate counsel (from Sept. 1 to Sept. 30, 1964).	333.61
Robert D. Olson	Minority associate counsel.	5,017.73
Phyllis P. Schweickert.	Staff assistant (from Sept. 1, 1964).	2,106.96
James W. Shue	Staff assistant (to Aug. 31, 1964).	789.03
Total		52,230.93

GENERAL SUCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 1
(CARL D. PERKINS, CHAIRMAN)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Freda Tuttle	Secretary	$3,901.43
Hartwell Duvall Reed, Jr.	Counsel	10,545.43

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$52,156.20
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	14,446.86
Other expenses	3.45
Amount expended and previously reported from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	35,341.55
Total amount expended Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	49,791.86
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	2,364.34

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 2
(JAMES ROOSEVELT, CHAIRMAN)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Adrienne Fields	Clerk	$5,597.82
John D. Schuyler	Counsel	7,688.64
Margie Mae Powell	Secretary (from Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1964).	2,082.27
Carol T. Foreman	Assistant to counsel (from Nov. 16 to Dec. 31, 1964).	1,056.11

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$61,148.60
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	16,424.84
Other expenses	7,903.57
Amount expended and previously reported from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	34,152.37
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	58,480.78
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	2,667.82

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 3
(EDITH GREEN, CHAIRMAN)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William F. Gaul	Counsel	$6,782.10
Marilyn Rae Stapleton.	Clerk (from July 1, 1964).	3,474.30

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$50,941.36
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	10,256.40
Other expenses	401.47
Amount expended and previously reported from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	34,839.24
Amount expended, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	45,497.11
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	5,444.25

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 4
(FRANK THOMPSON, JR., CHAIRMAN)

Mary E. Corbin	Secretary (to October 11, 1964).	$2,323.35
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	9,906.76
Anne G. Thompson	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to August 31, 1964).	753.74
Lelia W. Troup	do	753.74
Mark Morris	Assistant clerk (to July 15, 1964).	50.39

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$52,043.98
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	13,787.98
Other expenses	286.61
Amount expended and previously reported from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	36,119.52
Amount expended Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	50,194.11
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	1,849.87

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 5
(JOHN H. DENT, CHAIRMAN)

Gordon Clagett	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 15, 1964).	$396.48
A. R. Kelley	Assistant clerk	1,585.92
Eleanor Carson Keown.	Clerk	3,260.34
Kassian A. Kovalcheck, Jr.	Assistant clerk (to Sept. 15, 1964).	988.50
Harry L. Wright	Director	6,243.90
Barbara Crissey Dash	Assistant clerk (from Oct. 1 to Nov. 30, 1964).	607.26

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$51,343.76
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	13,082.40
Other expenses	3,315.26
Amount expended and previously reported from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	32,885.89
Amount expended Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	49,283.55
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	2,060.21

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 6
(ELMER J. HOLLAND, CHAIRMAN)

Curtis G. Aller	Director (to Sept. 15, 1964): reappointed (from Dec. 15 to Dec. 31, 1964).	$4,951.70
Edward Lee Dale	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 15, 1964).	272.63
Walter James Graham, Jr.	Clerk	3,871.79
Richard Wilson	Assistant clerk (from Aug. 17 to Aug. 31, 1964).	132.33

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 6
(ELMER J. HOLLAND, CHAIRMAN)—con.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert E. L. Knight	Director (from Sept. 1, 1964).	$5,001.00
Norman Hartness	Assistant clerk (from Dec. 14 to Dec. 31, 1964).	396.71
Regina M. Ridder	Assistant clerk (from Nov. 5 to Dec. 31, 1964).	884.87

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$52,075.82
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	15,511.03
Other expenses	1,818.90
Amount expended and previously reported from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	31,061.21
Amount expended Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	48,391.14
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	3,684.68

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE—A NATIONAL RESEARCH DATA PROCESSING AND INFORMTION RETRIEVAL CENTER NO. 7

(ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, CHAIRMAN)

Patricia Marie Matthews, clerk	$1,915.11
Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense Aug. 26, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	10,700.00
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1964:	
Salaries	1,915.11
Other Expenses	188.73
Amount expended and previously reported from Aug. 26, 1963, to June 30, 1964	6,962.11
Amount expended, Jan 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	9,065.95
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	1,634.05

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL NO. 8

(DOMINICK V. DANIELS, CHAIRMAN)

Funds appropriated for subcommittee expense, Oct. 22, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	$5,000.00
Amount expended from July 1, 1964:	
Salaries	None
Other expenses	None
Amount expended and previously reported, Oct. 22, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	4,002.66
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1964	997.34
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	154,669.08
Amount of expenditures previously reported, Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1964	83,477.57
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	[1] 57,088.59
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	140,566.16
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	14,102.92

[1] Salaries, $52,230.93; other expenses, $4,884.66.

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JANUARY 12, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator	$10,999.98
Roy J. Bullock	Senior staff consultant.	10,999.98
Albert C. F. Westphal	Staff consultant	10,999.98
Franklin J. Schupp	do	10,999.98
Robert F. Brandt	Investigator-consultant.	10,999.98
Harry C. Cromer	Staff consultant	10,709.70
Philip B. Billings	Special assistant	9,017.94
Marian A. Czarnecki	Staff consultant	10,233.24
Melvin O. Benson	do	9,862.43
June Nigh	Senior staff assistant	8,802.48
Helen C. Mattas	Staff assistant	7,420.08
Helen L. Hashagen	do	7,262.58
Mary Louise O'Brien	do	7,086.66
Mary Medsger	do	4,836.49
Doris B. McCracken	do	5,909.88
Jean E. Smith	do	3,836.16
Robert J. Bowen	Clerical assistant	4,697.58

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$220,741.14
Amount of expenditures previously reported	132,485.74
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	53,273.15
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	185,758.89
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	34,982.25

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to January 2, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses, July 1, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965:	
Full committee (expenses)	$1,910.30
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	54,468.97
Military Operations Subcommittee	45,706.74
Government Activities Subcommittee	32,894.89
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee	48,610.57
Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee	46,485.22
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee	55,841.71
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee	28,123.07
Special Government Operations Subcommittee	2,792.23
Total	316,833.70

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Salaries, full committee, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964:		
Christine Ray Davis.	Staff director	$10,999.98
James A. Lanigan	General counsel	10,999.98
Miles Q. Romney	Associate general counsel.	9,484.63
Earl J. Wade	Staff member	7,778.46
Dolores Fel'Dotto	do	5,349.18
Ann E. McLachlan	do	5,241.24
Patricia Maheux	do	5,241.24
Charlotte C. Bickett.	do	4,770.06
John Philip Carlson	Minority counsel (July 1 to Sept. 15, 1964.	3,910.15

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Rodney F. Moulton	Minority counsel (Sept. 16 to Dec. 31, 1964).	$4,121.36
Raymond T. Collins.	Minority professional staff member.	8,157.96

FULL COMMITTEE EXPENSES, JULY 1, 1964 TO JAN. 2, 1965

(HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, CHAIRMAN)

Travel, publications, telephone, stationery supplies, etc. $1,910.30

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

(HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, CHAIRMAN)

Elmer W. Henderson	Counsel	$10,822.99
Arthur Perlman	Investigator (July 1 to Dec. 30, 1964).	8,924.04
Louis I. Freed	Investigator	8,911.46
Barney A. Bradshaw	Research analyst (Oct. 15, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	2,927.08
Francis J. Schwoerer	Staff member	6,140.56
Peter S. Barash	Assistant counsel	5,073.48
Veronica B. Johnson	Clerk	4,823.06
Mabel C. Baker	Stenographer (Sept. 7, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	2,587.38
John L. Dodson	Clerical staff	2,718.58
Expenses		1,540.34
Total		54,468.97

MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

(HON. CHET HOLIFIELD, CHAIRMAN)

Herbert Roback	Staff administrator	$11,127.45
John Paul Ridgely	Investigator	7,143.68
Douglas G. Dahlin	Staff attorney	6,805.95
Daniel W. Fulmer	Staff attorney (Aug. 2, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	4,957.74
Robert J. McElroy	Investigator	5,482.57
Catherine L. Koeberlein.	Research assistant	5,165.10
Mollie Jo Hughes	Clerk-stenographer	4,823.06
Expenses		201.19
Total		45,706.74

GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

(HON. JACK BROOKS, CHAIRMAN)

Ernest Cornish Baynard.	Staff administrator.	$10,143.18
Daniel L. Power	Investigator	5,445.62
William David Allred	Research assistant (July 1 to Oct. 3, 1964; Nov. 4, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	3,956.61
Roland J. Williams	Investigator	4,471.12
Irma Reel	Clerk	4,543.75
Lynne Higginbotham	Clerk-stenographer.	3,986.77
Expenses		347.84
Total		32,894.89

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

(HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN, CHAIRMAN)

James R. Naughton	Counsel	$10,011.77
Delphis C. Goldberg	Professional staff member.	10,011.77
George O. Serini	Investigator	7,502.53
William Donald Gray	Research analyst	6,805.95
Eileen M. Anderson	Clerk-stenographer	4,823.06
Bebe B. Terry	do	4,537.68
Herbert B. Warburton	Minority Counsel, July 1 to Sept. 30, 1964.	4,692.18
Expenses		225.63
Total		48,610.57

NATURAL RESOURCES AND POWER SUBCOMMITTEE

(HON. ROBERT E. JONES, CHAIRMAN)

Phineas Indritz	Counsel	$10,409.42
Sidney McClellan	Professional staff member.	8,710.40
Harry V. Lerner	Assistant counsel (Sept. 1, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	5,771.45
George L. Milstead	Investigator	5,975.55
Richard P. Crane, Jr.	Legal analyst (Oct. 13, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	1,357.60
Catherine L. Hartke	Stenographer	4,823.06
Josephine Scheiber	Research analyst	3,872.78
Francine Shacter	Clerk-stenographer	3,872.78
Expenses		1,692.18
Total		46,485.22

FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE (HON. JOHN E. MOSS, CHAIRMAN)

Samuel J. Archibald	Staff administrator	$10,409.42
Vincent J. Augliere	Chief adviser	9,972.01
David Glick	Chief counsel	9,466.12
Jack Matteson	Chief investigator	8,894.71
Benny L. Kass	Assistant counsel	5,692.11
Helen K. Beasley	Stenographer	4,823.06
Glenna G. Donat	Secretary	3,872.78
Dorrie Bosley	Clerical assistant (July 1 to Sept. 30, 30, 1964).	1,143.84
Expenses		1,567.66
Total		55,841.71

LEGAL AND MONETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

(HON. DANTE B. FASCELL, CHAIRMAN)

M. Joseph Matan	Staff administrator	$10,011.77
Charles Rothenberg	Counsel	9,229.52
Clara Katherine Armstrong.	Clerical staff	4,313.71
Millicent Y. Myers	Stenographer	4,416.60
Expenses		151.47
Total		28,123.07

SPECIAL GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, CHAIRMAN)

Norman G. Cornish	Staff administrator (Oct. 26, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965).	$2,792.23

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, H. Res. 80, H. Res. 615, H. Res. 833, 88th Congress	$1,239,045.96
Amount of expenditures previously reported	777,694.21
Amount expended from Jan. 4, 1963, to June 30, 1964	777,694.21
Total amount expended from July 1, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965	316,833.70
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 2, 1965	144,518.05

C. E. GALLAGHER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 12, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	$10,999.98
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk	9,651.78
David S. Wolman	Personnel analyst	4,289.68
Louis Silverman	Assistant clerk	6,554.94
Mary F. Stolle	do	4,607.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$5,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	1,483.37
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	2,290.46
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	3,773.83
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	1,226.17

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JANUARY 14, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Sidney L. McFarland.	Professional staff director and engineering consultant	$10,999.98
T. Richard Witmer	Counsel and consultant on national parks.	10,743.72
John L. Taylor	Consultant on territorial and Indian affairs.	10,743.72
Milton A. Pearl	Consultant on mining, minerals, and lands.	10,743.72
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold	Chief clerk	9,451.20
Dixie S. Barton	Clerk	5,102.28
Patricia Ann Murray.	do	5,102.28
Virginia E. Bedsole	do	4,866.72
Patricia B. Freeman.	do	4,499.76
Susan A. Whitener	do	4,224.41

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	40,450.92
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	7,915.87
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	48,366.79
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	11,633.21

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JANUARY 21, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the

following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson	Clerk	$11,000.00
Kenneth J. Painter	First assistant clerk	9,284.00
Marcella Fencl	Assistant clerk	5,508.00
Glenn L. Johnson	Printing editor	7,669.00
Joanne C. Neuland	Clerical assistant	4,548.00
Mildred H. Lang	do	4,548.00
Mary Ryan	do	4,548.00
Elsie M. Karpowich	do	4,548.00
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	4,308.00
Marion M. Burson	Staff assistant (minority).	9,969.00
Helen M. Dubino	Staff assistant (minority) (H. Res. 17 and H. Res. 588)	9,018.00
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	11,000.00
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	11,000.00
William J. Dixon	Professional staff member.	10,778.00
James M. Menger, Jr.	do	11,000.00
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 17 and H. Res. 588:		
Gladys Johnson	Clerical assistant	5,361.00
William T. Denman III.	Staff assistant (Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics).	6,871.00
John A. Canfield	Staff assistant (Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance) (to Aug. 15, 1964).	1,717.50
Clark Crocker de Schweinitz.	Staff assistant (Subcommittee on Communications and Power) (to Aug. 31, 1964).	912.00
William W. Gauldin.	Staff assistant (Submittee on Public Health and Safety).	5,909.00
Rosalee Ann Peterson.	Minority clerical assistant (to Aug. 18, 1964).	795.44
Carolyn Sue Browning.	Minority clerical assistant.	3,616.00
Diana L. Dewey	Minority clerical assistant (from Aug. 24, 1964).	2,296.00
Lewis E. Berry, Jr.	Minority counsel	11,000.00
Charles L. Honey, Jr.	Staff assistant	6,132.00
Wallace L. Briscoe	Staff assistant (to Oct. 15, 1964).	4,005.00
Isaac Wilson, Jr.	Messenger (from July 1 to 31, 1964).	417.05
Patrick Westbrook Murphy.	Messenger (from Aug 1 to 31, 1964).	417.05
William Boyd Ward.	do	417.05
Special Subcommittee on Investigations:		
Charles P. Howze, Jr.	Chief counsel	11,000.00
George W. Perry	Associate counsel	10,777.70
Herman Clay Beasley.	Subcommittee chief clerk.	9,194.94
Stuart C. Ross	Consultant	11,000.00
Zelig Robinson	Staff attorney (to Oct. 31, 1964).	4,580.92
Elizabeth G. Paola	Clerical assistant	4,547.67
Catherine C. McLees.	do	4,457.67
Mary E. Bainbridge.	Stenographer-clerk	4,188.49
Dorothy Dimpel Howze.	do	4,188.49
Victoria Williams	Clerical assistant	4,188.49

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, 1964	$319,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	110,958.04
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	132,391.96
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	243,350.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964 (approximate)	75,650.00

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick	Staff director	$10,999.98
William R. Foley	General counsel	10,999.98
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant (to Sept. 15).	4,583.33
Murray Drabkin	Counsel	10,999.98
Stuart H. Johnson, Jr.	do	10,999.98
Garner J. Cline	Assistant counsel	7,955.34
William H. Copenhaver.	do	8,305.86
Carrie Lou Allen	Clerical staff	4,993.62
Lorraine W. Beland	Clerical staff (from Aug. 7).	3,609.41
Anne J. Berger	Clerical staff	7,344.06
Gertrude C. Burak	do	5,544.23
Jane C. Caldwell	do	5,422.32
Frances F. Christy	do	6,320.16
Mary Dematteis	Clerical staff (to Aug. 6).	731.07

SALARIES PAID PURSUANT TO H. RES. 36, H. RES. 100, H. RES. 587, AND H. RES. 833, 88TH CONG.

Appel, Leonard	Assistant counsel	$9,428.94
Beland, Lorraine W.	Clerical staff (through Aug. 6, 1964).	902.35
Benn, Donald G.	Assistant counsel	6,935.94
Cors, Allan D.	Deputy associate counsel.	5,204.94
Dobriansky, Lev E.	Consultant (Nov. 1 through Nov. 30, 1964).	1,502.99
Eisenberg, Roberta E.	Clerical staff	4,607.52
Fuchs, Herbert	Counsel (through Aug. 31, 1964).	3,498.16
Greenwald, Andrew E.	Clerical staff (through Aug. 28, 1964).	735.44
Haardt, Alma B.	Clerical staff	3,853.98
Hall, Patricia J.	do	3,634.49
Harkins, Kenneth J.	Special consultant (as of Aug. 14, 1964).	8,372.21
Jett, R. Frederick	Counsel	9,428.94
Kelemonick, Michael	Clerical staff	4,248.36
Lee, Charles R.	Messenger	2,995.86
Levy, Joseph M.	Clerical staff (through Oct. 31, 1964)	4,048.62
McGrady, Florence	Clerical staff	3,972.60
Marcus, Philip	Associate counsel	10,420.80
Meekins, Elizabeth G.	Clerical staff	4,607.52
Reast, Ann W.	Clerical staff (as of Aug. 12, 1964).	2,136.43
Rosenman, Louis	Associate counsel	8,741.70
Shattuck, William P.	Counsel (through Aug. 31, 1964).	3,431.67
Toppins, Juanita	Clerical staff (through Sept. 15, 1964).	1,415.50
Zelenko, Benjamin L.	Assistant counsel	7,778.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$466,235.06
Amount of expenditures previously reported	284,474.04
Amount expended from July 1 through Dec. 31, 1964	113,735.84
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1963, through Dec. 31, 1964	398,209.88
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	68,025.18

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE, SALARIES PAID PURSUANT TO H. RES. 35, H. RES. 497, H. RES. 653, AND H. RES. 833, 88TH CONG.

Baskir, Lawrence M.	Counsel (as of Oct. 26, 1964).	$1,553.59
Breslow, Jerome W.	Assistant counsel	5,570.03
Broussard, Geraldf	Clerical staff	3,084.01

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE, SALARIES PAID PURSUANT TO H. RES. 35, H. RES. 497, H. RES. 653, AND H. RES. 833, 88TH CONG.—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Cohen, Felice D.	Counsel (as of Nov. 16, 1964).	$1,075.56
Cooley, Alford W.	Clerical staff (as of Oct. 1, 1964).	1,808.34
Durand, Gerard F.	Clerk (as of Nov. 1, 1964).	757.28
Faircloth, John W. F.	Counsel	7,512.37
Haik, Theodore, Jr.	Clerical staff (through Aug. 21, 1964).	768.39
James, Raymond K.	Clerical staff	4,096.64
Lane, Esther C.	do	3,634.49
McGrath, James P.	do	3,634.49
Melville, Robert F.	Senior economist (July 20 through Oct. 18, 1964).	4,689.62
Partridge, Anthony	Counsel (through Nov. 8, 1964).	6,744.63
Randazzo, Toni Marie.	Clerical staff (through Aug. 17, 1964).	708.12
Rigler, Douglas V.	Clerical staff (through Sept. 4, 1964).	1,401.94
Spirt, Linda E.	Clerical staff	2,814.45
Sutherland, David A.	Counsel	9,484.63
Toppins, Juanita	Clerical staff (as of Sept. 16, 1964).	1,981.70
Zeifman, Jerome	Counsel	7,512.37

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditures	$355,277.98
Amount of expenditures previously reported	200,948.36
Amount expended from July 1 through Dec. 31, 1964	70,610.78
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1963, through Dec. 31, 1964	271,559.14
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	83,718.84

FUNDS FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES CODE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1964	$437.52
Legislative Appropriation Act, 1965	150,000.00
Total	150,437.52
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	13,859.68
Balance, Dec. 31, 1964	136,577.84
B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code:	
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1964	2,949.47
Legislative Appropriation Act, 1965	100,000.00
Total	102,949.47
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	16,500.48
Balance, Dec. 31, 1964	86,448.99
C. Revision of the laws, 1964:	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1964	930.65
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	149.81
Balance, Dec. 31, 1964	780.84
D. Revision of the laws, 1965:	
Legislative Appropriation Act, 1965	20,765.00
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	11,031.98
Balance, Dec. 31, 1964	9,733.02

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

DECEMBER 31, 1964.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry	Chief counsel	$10,999.98
Bernard J. Zincke	Counsel	10,607.76
Ned P. Everett	Assistant counsel	9,367.62
W. B. Winfield	Chief clerk	10,845.66
Frances P. Still	Assistant clerk	6,108.90
Ruth E. Brookshire	do	4,770.06
Edith W. Gordon	Secretary	4,770.06
Vera A. Barker	do	4,770.06
E. M. Tollefson	Minority clerk	5,788.02

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$37,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	23,482.28
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1964	10,010.68
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963 to Dec. 31, 1964	33,492.96
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	4,007.04

H. C. BONNER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

DECEMBER 31, 1964.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles E. Johnson	Staff director	$10,999.98
B. Benton Bray	Professional staff member.	10,999.98
John H. Martiny	Counsel	10,999.98
William A. Irvine	Professional staff member.	10,607.76
Lillian H. Hanninen	Assistant clerk	6,554.94
John B. Price	do	5,422.32
Lucy K. Daley	do	5,422.32
Elsie K. Thornton	Secretary	5,253.30
Barbara M. Wells	do	5,011.68
Blanche M. Simons	do	4,830.47

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$127,219.90
Amount of expenditures previously reported	73,887.61
Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1964	34,971.41
Total amount expended from Feb. 27, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	108,859.02
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	18,360.88

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 1, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	$10,999.98
Joseph R. Brennan	Engineer-consultant.	10,999.98
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	10,999.98
Edward J. McNeal	Staff director (as of Dec. 1, 1964).	1,833.33
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk	7,778.46
Helen M. Dooley	Staff assistant	9,017.94
Helen A. Thompson.	do	7,884.13
Dorothy A. Beam	do	6,666.00
Sterlyn B. Carroll	do	4,176.53
Florence C. Waters	Staff assistant (through Sept. 30, 1964).	3,435.69

STANDING COMMITTEE—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1964, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, H. RES. 566, AND H. RES. 833, 88TH CONG.

John A. O'Connor, Jr.	Subcommittee clerk	$5,909.88
William B. Short	do	5,909.88
Audrey G. Warren	do	5,909.88
James R. Phippard	Subcommittee clerk (through Aug. 31, 1964).	2,106.72
Maurice B. Tobin	Subcommittee clerk (as of Sept. 15, 1964).	3,680.43
Paul R. S. Yates	Minority staff assistant.	7,922.46
Erla S. Youmans	do	5,458.91
Milton Weil	Staff assistant (through Nov. 26, 1964).	5,952.42
Marina M. Gentilini	Staff assistant	4,258.08
Salig L. Bendit	Staff assistant (as of Nov. 1, 1964).	1,501.92
Murray S. Pashkoff	Investigator	2,907.67
Randal C. Teague	Minority clerk	3,397.20
Flavil Q. Van Dyke, Jr.	Minority clerical assistant.	3,853.98
Martin Baker	Legislative assistant (through Aug. 20, 1964).	550.91
Nancy R. Beiter	Clerical assistant (through Aug. 31, 1964).	1,061.32
M. Rae Olsen	Clerical assistant	1,918.86
John Williams	Clerical assistant (through Sept. 30, 1964).	959.55
Charles R. O'Regan	Clerical assistant (as of Oct. 4, 1964).	927.45

H. Res. 236	$110,000.00
H. Res. 566	125,000.00
H. Res. 833	7,823.91
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	242,823.91
Amount of expenditures previously reported	159,681.78
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	69,817.06
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	229,498.84
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	13,325.07

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1964, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, H. RES. 566, AND H. RES. 833, 88TH CONG.

Walter R. May	Chief counsel	$10,000.98
John P. Constandy	Assistant chief counsel.	10,636.08
Robert L. May	Minority counsel	10,562.46
George H. Martin	Administrative assistant.	9,562.62
John N. Dinsmore	Associate counsel	8,229.18
Salvatore J. D'Amico	do	8,064.89
John P. O'Hara	do	7,940.45
Robert G. Lawrence	do	7,025.09
Patrick J. Cunningham.	do	4,439.94

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1964, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, H. RES. 566, AND H. RES. 833, 88TH CONG.—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	$10,047.84
Sherman S. Willse	Investigator	8,064.89
Richard A. Cordasco	do	7,512.37
Carl J. Lorenz, Jr.	do	7,204.58
Edward J. Gilhooly	do	4,439.94
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	5,349.18
Erwin Greenwald	Research assistant	4,776.12
Mildred E. Rupert	Staff assistant	4,374.06
Dolores K. Dougherty.	do	4,242.36
Agnes M. GaNun	do	4,224.41
Sylvia H. Reppert	Minority staff assistant.	4,146.60
Sara L. Vollett	Staff assistant	3,747.18
Shirley R. Knighten	do	3,464.52
Anna S. Rosch	do	2,711.99

H. Res. 236	$340,000.00
H. Res. 566	325,000.00
H. Res. 833	20,118.61
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	685,118.61
Amount of expenditures previously reported	481,211.33
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	167,109.42
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	648,320.75
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	36,797.86

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1964, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 237, H. RES. 609, AND H. RES. 833, 88TH CONG.

Ruth M. Heritage	Chief clerk (through July 31, 1964).	$1,362.40
Henry H. Krevor	Chief counsel	10,999.98
Robert J. Bolger	Minority counsel	10,562.46
Joe W. Ingram	Associate counsel	8,103.19
Thomas M. Stewart	do	7,512.37
Rosalyn P. Woodmansee.	Staff assistant (as of Aug. 1, 1964).	6,812.00
Dorothy S. Martin	Secretary	5,428.39
Ruth Butterworth	Minority staff assistant.	5,078.15
Meriam R. Buckley	Staff assistant	4,511.76
Eloise Luckett	Staff assistant (as of Dec. 1, 1964).	283.56

H. Res. 237	$125,000.00
H. Res. 609	150,000.00
H. Res. 833	8,661.92
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	283,661.92
Amount of expenditures previously reported	177,609.39
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	63,799.41
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	241,408.80
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	42,253.12

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JANUARY 7, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, to-

gether with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
T. M. Carruthers	Counsel (P), standing committee.	$8,393.46
Mary Spencer Forrest	Assistant counsel (P).	5,909.58
Frank E. McCarthy	Minority counsel (P).	5,909.58
T. K. Leachman	Staff assistant (July 1 to Sept. 15, 1964).	1,346.25

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

JANUARY 5, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles F. Ducander	Executive director and chief counsel.	$10,999.98
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk and counsel.	10,999.98
Philip B. Yeager	Counsel	10,999.98
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	do	10,602.06
W. H. Boone	Chief technical consultant.	10,999.98
Mary Ann Robert	Secretary	4,739.88
Emily Dodson	do	4,535.70
Carol F. Rodgers	do	4,421.99
June C. Stafford	do	4,146.60
Elizabeth M. Fleming	do	4,146.60

INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Richard P. Hines	Staff consultant	$10,602.06
James E. Wilson	Technical consultant.	10,160.16
Peter A. Gerardi	do	10,160.16
Joseph M. Felton	Assistant counsel	4,739.88
Katherine V. Flanigan	Assistant clerk	5,564.23
Denis C. Quigley	Publications clerk	2,984.10
Virginia Robison	Secretary	4,146.60
Elizabeth S. Kernan	Scientific research assistant.	5,349.18
Elizabeth A. Rothman.	Clerical assistant (to Aug. 21).	800.53
Patrick J. Mahoney	do	800.53
Philip Dickinson	Technical consultant (from Oct. 1).	4,500.69

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$325,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	143,128.55
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	121,288.17
Total amount expended from Feb. 27, 1963 to Dec. 31, 1964	264,416.72
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	60,583.28

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 13, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Appell, Donald T.	Chief investigator	$9,523.62
Gittings, Helen M.	Research analyst	5,528.23
Hitz, William	General counsel (transferred to standing committee Nov. 1, 1964).	3,666.66
Joray, Juliette P.	Recording clerk	6,957.49
McNamara Francis J.	Director	10,999.98
Nagel, Isabel B.	Secretary to counsel	4,607.52
Purdy, Rosella A.	Secretary to general counsel.	5,641.74
Tavenner, Frank S., Jr.	General counsel (July 1 to Oct. 21)	6,783.30
Turner, Anne D.	Chief of files and reference service.	7,011.30
Veley, Lorraine N.	Secretary to investigators.	4,638.01
Wheeler, William A.	Investigator	8,907.43

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Baldwin, Beatrice P.	Clerk-typist	$3,113.40
Bienvenu, Marcelle R.	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Aug. 14).	662.92
Broussard, V. Kenneth.	Clerk-typist (appointed Sept. 1, 1964).	1,613.84
Brown, Frances Rosalyn.	Information analyst (resigned Dec. 15, 1964).	2,864.67
Buglio, Theresa J.	Clerk-typist (appointed Dec. 1, 1964).	455.88
Burke, Gerald F.	Clerk-typist	3,189.84
Butler, Daniel	do	2,878.31
Collins, William R.	Editor	4,421.99
Cunningham, Anniel	Information analyst	4,776.12
Curll, Jean W.	Clerk-stenographer	3,515.83
Doyle, Florence B.	Clerk-typist	2,261.22
Edinger, Elizabeth L.	Editor	5,017.73
Ellsweig, Rochelle J.	Clerk-typist	2,187.66
Finn, Peter B.	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Aug. 21).	768.39
Fivehouse, Cynthia	Clerk-stenographer (resigned Sept. 24, 1964).	803.32
Francis, Emily R.	Information analyst	2,878.31
Gaffney, Metje Q.	Clerk-typist	2,261.22
Gallagher, James L.	Research analyst	5,629.56
Hague, Howard, Jr.	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Aug. 21).	132.55
Hitz, William	Counsel (transferred to standing committee Nov. 1, 1964).	7,283.33
Holton, Katherine R.	Research clerk	3,231.00
Huber, Walter B.	Consultant	9,017.94
Jenkins, Pennye P.	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Aug. 21).	768.39
Kelly, Maura Patricia	Research analyst	3,806.52
Kennedy, Jo B.	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Oct. 31).	2,240.59
Kocis, Evelyn M.	Secretary to director	4,421.99
McLaughlin, Carol E.	Clerk-typist	2,303.58
Manuel, Philip R.	Investigator	5,349.18
Margetich, William	do	4,793.88
Masumian, Alberta	Secretary	5,253.30
Monts, Esther L.	Clerk-stenographer	3,664.14
Muffley, David E., Jr.	Clerk-typist	3,195.72
Nittle, Alfres M.	Counsel	9,172.68
Petersen, Neal H.	Clerk-typist (July 1-31).	375.32
Pfaff, Alma D.	Research clerk	3,242.70
Phillips, Katharine	Switchboard operator.	2,966.46
Randolph, Josephine S.	Research clerk	3,711.60
Riehl, Joseph, Jr.	Clerk-typist (July 1 to Aug. 20).	753.32
Russell, Louis J.	Investigator	7,172.82
Salathe, Doris R.	Information analyst	2,589.71
Stiles, Lela Mae	do	3,545.52
Sweany, Donald I.	Research analyst	5,422.32
Valente, Mary M.	Secretary	5,751.43
Vernor, Dorothy H.	Clerk-stenographer	3,260.34
Walton, Stanley F.	Clerk-typist	2,420.77
Wetterman, Neil E.	Investigator	6,011.63
Wheeler, Billie	Clerk-stenographer	2,282.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$678,195.86
Amount of expenditures previously reported	470,790.73
Amount expended from July 1, 1964, to Jan. 3, 1965	$183,406.63
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1963, to Jan. 3, 1965	654,197.36
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1965	23,998.50

E. E. WILLIS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director (P)	$10,999.98
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel (P)	10,999.98
John R. Holden	Professional staff member (P).	9,423.36
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aid (P)	8,064.89
George W. Fisher	Clerk (C)	10,999.98
Helen A. Biondi	Assistant clerk (C)	6,267.36
Carol A. Davis	Clerk-stenographer (C).	5,873.34
Alice V. Matthews	do	5,132.47
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk (C)	5,132.47
Investigative staff:		
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	8,377.07
Wilma Jean Johnson	Clerk-stenographer	4,368.07
Ann L. Loupot	do	834.11
Leila W. Osborne	do	3,830.22
Sharon L. Wright	do	834.11
Susan J. McNeill	do	234.05
John E. Miller	Clerk-messenger	417.05
Joan Phyllis Orringer.	Clerk-stenographer	1,765.51
David C. Thomas, Jr.	Clerk-typist	2,085.25
Philip E. Howard	Investigator	1,220.39

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$145,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	83,851.77
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1964	39,965.44
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to December 31, 1964	123,817.21
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	21,182.79

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JANUARY 10, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leo H. Irwin	Chief counsel (C)	$10,999.98
William H. Quealy	Minority counsel (P).	10,999.98
John M. Martin, Jr.	Assistant chief counsel (P).	10,999.98

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Lincoln Arnold	Professional assistant (P).	$1,550.24
John P. Baker	do	8,841.18
Thomas P. Kerester	do	8,813.52
Florence Burkett	Staff assistant (C)	4,290.24
Virginia Butler	do	5,660.04
William Byrd	do	2,790.12
Mary K. Daniel	do	3,563.28
Grace Kagan	do	5,660.04
June Kendall	do	6,138.24
Max Mehlburger	do	3,972.60
Elizabeth Price	do	3,836.16
Martha Sue Ritner	do	3,942.96
Dolores Rogers	do	3,753.12
Gloria Shaver	do	5,180.82
Eileen Sonnett	do	4,745.88
Susan Taylor	do	6,437.58
Irene Wade	do	5,229.24
David West	do	5,489.34
Hughlon Greene	Document clerk (C)	3,931.08
Walter Little	do	3,931.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$12,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	3,433.95
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	3,531.51
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to Dec. 31, 1964	6,965.46
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	5,534.54

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

JANUARY 22, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Harold J. Warren	Clerk and counsel	$10,295.03
Edward Hart	Professional staff member.	9,651.78
George T. Ault	do	7,172.82
Edward O. McCue III.	Professional staff member (through Nov. 13, 1964).	4,843.37
Janice M. Maguire	Secretary	3,616.69
Susan Talbot	Secretary (through Aug. 31, 1964).	861.29
atricia Ann Terry	Assistant research clerk (Aug. 1-31, 1964).	430.64
Prudence Mahaffey	Secretary-clerk-typist (through July 7, 1964).	93.47

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$65,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	37,009.90
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	27,990.10

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

JANUARY 13, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Edward M. O'Connor	Staff director	$10,999.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$20,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec 31	10,999.98
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	9,000.02

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1964, to January 1, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Colin F. Stam	Chief of staff (retired July 31, 1964).	$1,833.33
L. N. Woodworth	Chief of staff	10,984.65
Nicholas A. Tomasulo	Attorney	10,182.65
Lincoln Arnold	do	9,166.65
G. D. Chesteen	Corporation auditor	10,036.56
James H. Symons	Statistical analyst	9,969.18
Robert R. Smyers	Attorney	9,929.82
Grace T. Gunn	Statistical analyst	9,194.94
Robert J. Moody	Attorney	8,163.42
James M. LaMarche	Administrative assistant.	7,338.60
Harrison B. McCawley.	Attorney	6,742.97
Joseph E. Fink	Statistical clerk	6,508.01
Carl A. Nordberg	Attorney	4,354.32
Anastasia F. Connaughton.	Statistical clerk	6,508.01
Cleo H. Fonelli	Secretary	4,427.94
Blanche F. Nagro	do	3,960.78
Joanne B. McDermott	do	3,723.48
Jacqueline S. Pfeiffer	do	3,397.20
Ila Coe	do	3,036.96
June M. Matthews	do	3,036.96
Nicki Rae Fairfax	do	2,878.31
Gloria J. McCabe	do	2,878.31
Mildred Feldt	do	2,688.71
Betty L. Balkum	do	2,642.10
Contract personnel:		
P. W. Meekins	Tax consultant	4,500.00
Russell M. Oram	do	4,450.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$344,440.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported (Jan. 1 to June 30, 1964)	139,709.29
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1964	152,533.86
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1964, to Jan. 1, 1965	292,243.15
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1965	52,196.85

HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

JANUARY 2, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert L. Hopper	Staff director	$10,999.98
Micah H. Naftalin	Deputy staff director and counsel (July 1 to Oct. 18).	5,112.47
Stephen P. Strickland	Chief clerk	8,297.30
William B. Farrington	Science director (July 1 to Oct. 31).	7,230.44
R. Evelyn Alvis	Secretary	3,260.34
David G. Battle	Staff assistant (July 1 to Dec. 15).	7,478.13
Elizabeth B. Bedell	Assistant clerk	4,452.32
Salig L. Bendit	Staff assistant (July 1 to Oct. 31).	4,162.60
Donald P. Cole	Staff assistant (July 1 to Sept. 23).	2,313.72
Davis O. Couch	Clerical assistant (July 1 to Oct. 31).	1,989.40
Bertha L. Davison	Research assistant (July 1 to Dec. 15).	2,988.65
Walter L. Fitzpatrick, Jr.	Staff assistant	8,297.30
Mary P. Flanagan	Secretary	3,836.16
Edward T. Fogo	Staff assistant	8,297.30
Frances M. Geddes	Secretary	3,836.16
Zel M. Lipsen	Staff assistant	5,017.73
Rowena G. Lovette	Administrative assistant.	4,531.30
Edna Ruth McNutt	Clerical assistant (July 1 to Aug. 31).	716.98
Annelle K. Murray	Staff assistant	5,017.73
George Norris, Jr.	Assistant counsel	8,157.96
Mary Belle Osborne	Secretary	3,942.96
Helen C. Pigott	Administrative assistant.	4,531.30
Russell Saville	Staff assistant	5,017.73
Leo S. Tonkin	Assistant counsel	6,871.38
Sue G. Jennings	Secretary (Aug. 26 to Dec. 31).	1,867.17
Allie James Quinn	Staff assistant (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31).	3,441.41
Donald F. Bent	Staff assistant (July 1 to July 31).	1,000.20
Mary P. Allen	Staff assistant	6,871.38
Catherine S. Cash	Secretary (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31).	1,650.82
Carl E. Moore	Staff assistant (Sept. 15 to Dec. 31).	3,846.32
Harry L. Selden	Editorial director (Sept. 1 to Dec 31).	8,867.94

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	[1] $573,881.04
Amount of expenditures previously reported	140,545.34
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1964	179,025.21
Total amount expended from Sept. 11, 1963, to Dec. 13, 1964	319,570.55
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	254,310.45

[1] Original appropriation, $553,000; supplemental, $20,881.94.

CARL ELLIOTT,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JANUARY 18, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

July 1 to December 31, 1964, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Justinus Gould	Counsel	$9,651.78
Marsha Y. Darrah	Research analyst	2,332.04
Sarah L. Cox	Secretary	3,397.20
Myrtle Ruth Foutch	Clerk	4,487.82
Gertrude M. Dean	Secretary	518.90
Astrid E. Gram	do	3,759.05
Helen C. Hitz	do	4,140.61
Bryan H. Jacques	Staff director	10,999.98
Sylvia U. Keel	Secretary	4,140.61
Maxine La Cava	do	1,698.60
B. C. William	Consultant	1,678.38
Eugene W. Loehl	Assistant minority counsel.	3,046.80
Barbara Wright McConnell.	Secretary	6,671.94
Richard L. Mitchell	General counsel	10,999.98
Charles E. O'Connor	Counsel	9,651.78
Harry Olsher	Consultant	10,840.02
Dorothy M. Perdieu	Secretary	3,638.44
Gregg R. Potvin	Counsel	10,295.03
William H. Reddig	Research analyst	5,629.56
Henry A. Robinson	Counsel	8,813.53
JoAnn L. Sloane	Research analyst	1,166.02
Audrey R. Smith	do	4,830.47
Penelope Walcott	Secretary	4,140.61
John J. Williams	Minority counsel	6,876.77
Ralph Moody	Research analyst (July and August).	760.80
James J. Saxon, Jr	do	557.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$543,181.50
Amount of expenditures previously reported	348,182.20
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec 31, 1964	143,118.20
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1963 to Dec. 31, 1964	491,300.40
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1964	51,881.10

JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1964

JANUARY 15, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the period from August 1, 1964, to January 2, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 5-month period
John Warren McGarry.	Chief counsel (contract).	$7,000.00
Hal Gerber	Associate counsel (contract).	7,000.00
Charles W. Halleck	Minority counsel (contract).	5,000.00
Ruth M. Heritage	Chief clerk (appointed Aug. 1, 1964).	6,902.83
Barbara H. Bourgeois.	Secretary (appointed Sept. 1, 1964).	2,336.37
Mildred R. Basinger	Secretary (appointed Dec. 1, 1964).	503.23

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount expended from Aug. 1, 1964, to Jan. 2, 1965	$29,631.71
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 2, 1965	[1] 5,368.29

[1] Not including current obligations for which bills have not been received.

CLIFFORD DAVIS,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

450. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 21, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Rahway River, N.J., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted September 14, 1955. It is in full response to an item in the Flood Control Act approved June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 67); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

451. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 1, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 68); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 11 illustrations.

452. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting report of the actions taken by Federal agencies relative to the 1964 amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act for period August 16, 1964, through December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 7 of Public Law 88-451; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

453. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a quarterly report of the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government as of the end of the second quarter of fiscal year 1965, pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

454. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

455. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to furnish discharge gratuities to persons released from imprisonment"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

456. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

457. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to furnish cash gratuities to needy patients of the Glenn Dale Hospital"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

458. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay expenses of members of the Metropolitan Police Department for attending pistol matches"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

459. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the appropriation for the District of Columbia of expenses in case of emergency"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

460. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the 17th Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Armory Board and the 7th Annual Report and Financial Statements of the District of Columbia Stadium for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to Public Laws 80-605 as amended and 85-300 as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

461. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co. transmitting a copy of a balance sheet of the company as of December 31, 1964, pursuant to paragraph 14, section 6 of 37 Stat. 979; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

462. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the company for the year 1964, pursuant to chapter 1628, acts of Congress 1904, and a comparative general balance sheet; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

463. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the January 1965 report pertaining to fair labor standards in employment in and affecting interstate commerce, pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

464. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize checks to be drawn in favor of banking organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

465. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, a report on unnecessary costs incurred because obsolete weight design goal was used for the design, integration, and test of Numbus spacecraft by the Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

466. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overstated requirements for replacement of high-endurance vessels, eastern area, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

467. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on planned disposals of needed automotive repair parts, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

468. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary transportation costs incurred because available Government-owned containers were not used for the movement of household goods, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

469. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs resulting from excessive dental services to hospital patients at general hospitals, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

470. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, transmitting the sixth annual report, pursuant to Public Law 86-380; to the Committee on Government Operations.

471. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of the final valuations of properties of certain carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, pursuant to section 19a of the act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

472. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission authority to prescribe regulations for the manufacture, import, sale, shipment, or use of devices which cause harmful interference to radio reception"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

473. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to venue"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

474. A letter from the Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, transmitting the first report on progress, pursuant to 78 Stat. 481; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

475. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to regulate archeological exploration in the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

476. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report with respect to certain civilian positions during calendar year 1964 established by section 1851, title 10, United States Code, pursuant to section 1582 of the act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

477. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for a flat fee for services performed in connection with the arrival in, or departure from, the United States of a private aircraft or private vessel, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

478. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the annual report for 1964 of the Commission, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 3912. A bill to limit the purposes for which funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may be used; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3913. A bill for the relief of Licking Valley Local School District, Licking County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3914. A bill to provide direct aid to the States and territories for educational purposes only for the benefit of the taxpayers and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3915. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3916. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3917. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 3918. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 3919. A bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 3920. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND (by request):

H.R. 3921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide an addition to the reserve for bad debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 3922. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3923. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 3924. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 3925. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the furnishing of economic assistance to any country which does not grant to the United States most-favored-nation treatment with respect to the admission of our exports; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3926. A bill to establish a U.S. Trading Corporation to meet the challenge of attempted Soviet penetration of world markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3927. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3928. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide that button blanks, regardless of state of finish, shall be subject to the same duty as buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 3929. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3930. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $3,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as retirement annuities or pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 3931. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 3932. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the naturalization as citizens of the United States of persons over 50 years of age who have been living in the United States for periods totaling at least 20 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3933. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a preliminary survey of the proposed George Rogers Clark Recreation Way within and adjacent to the Shawnee National Forest in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3934. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3935. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain Spanish-American War veterans eligible for pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 3936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit to an individual taxpayer for tuition and fees paid to an institution of higher education, and to allow a tax credit to all taxpayers for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 3937. A bill to provide annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund in additional cases for certain widows and widowers by eliminating the required period of marriage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 3938. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act for the purpose of prohibiting certain sales below cost; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3939. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 3940. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3941. A bill to repeal the Federal taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage and handbags, general telephone service, general admissions, transportation of persons by air, and safe deposit boxes, effective for period after March 31, 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3942. A bill to permit an individual to obtain coverage under title II of the Social Security Act on the basis of service which was not covered employment at the time it was performed, if service of that type has since become covered employment and such individual makes payment of the applicable social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 3943. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 3944. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 3945. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 3946. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 3947. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make certain medical institutions and hospitals engaged primarily in furnishing domiciliary care eligible for donations of surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3948. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in every State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3949. A bill to provide that retired Federal officers and employees shall not be required to pay any fee for admission to national parks, forests, and monuments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3950. A bill to amend section 18 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide free transportation on any railroad carrier subject to that act for individuals receiving pensions or annuities under that act, and for their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3951. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the applicability of benefits under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3952. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to authorize the issuance of subpenas by the U.S. Civil Service Commission in connection with hearings under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3953. A bill to amend chapter 71 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the right of a veteran to appeal to the U.S. district court from the decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in compensation and pension claims shall not be abrogated; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 3954. A bill to amend the act prohibiting fishing in the territorial waters of the United States by vessels other than vessels of the United States in order to expand the definition of the term "fisheries"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3955. A bill to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the ex-vessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3956. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide for the duty-free entry of certain kinds of limestone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 3957. A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3958. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 3959. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for additional personnel engaged in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 3960. A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3961. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3962. A bill to establish a new program of loans to be made from a revolving fund by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to assist in the provision and rehabilitation of housing for middle-income families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3963. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to provide Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for individuals purchasing dwelling units in cooperative housing projects in the same way that such insurance is provided for individuals purchasing other single-family residences; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3964. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to prohibit the construction of luxury housing in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3965. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require the establishment of more effective procedures for the relocation of individuals, families, and business concerns from the area of urban renewal projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3966. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that individuals, families, and business concerns displaced by an urban renewal project shall have a priority of opportunity to relocate in the project area after its redevelopment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3967. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide more adequate relocation payments for individuals, families, and business concerns displaced from urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3968. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to remove the existing 15 percent limit on the amount of assistance which may be provided thereunder for low-rent public housing in any one State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3969. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to remove the existing dollar limit on the amount of annual contributions which may be contracted for by the Public Housing Administration to assist low-rent public housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3970. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to increase by $1,000 per room the statutory limit on the cost of a low-rent housing project; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3971. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to permit occupants of dwelling units in low-rent public housing projects to purchase such units; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3972. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to provide that a tenant in a low-rent public housing project may not be evicted therefrom without a public hearing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3973. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3974. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to provide that the amount of an individual's medical, dental, and related expenses shall be subtracted from his outside earnings before determining under such section the amount of any reduction in his benefits by reason of such earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3975. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the owner of an apartment building or other multifamily structure to establish and utilize a repair, replacement, and maintenance reserve as a condition of the allowance of a depreciation deduction with respect to such structure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 3976. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1956, to authorize the Muscatine Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 3977. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 3978. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 3979. A bill providing for the distribution and viewing within the United States of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 3980. A bill to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3981. A bill relating to rates of postage on certain materials for blind persons; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3982. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer who is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3983. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income dislocation allowances received by members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3984. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of flags of the United States manufactured in foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3985. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 3986. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from overpressures generated by U.S. aircraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3987. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act in order to extend the provisions of that act to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 3988. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3989. A bill to extend to 30 days the time for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3990. A bill to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3991. A bill relating to the retirement of judges of the territorial district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3992. A bill to amend section 753(f) of title 28, United States Code, relating to transcripts furnished by court reporters for the district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3993. A bill to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3994. A bill to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling and paying certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. aircraft at Wichita, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3995. A bill to transfer certain functions to the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3996. A bill to amend provisions of law relating to the settlement of admiralty claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3997. A bill to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3998. A bill to increase the fees of jury commissioners in the U.S. district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3999. A bill to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4000. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to relieve applicants from certain provisions of the act if he determines that the granting of relief would not be contrary to the public interest, and that the applicant would not be likely to conduct his operations in an unlawful manner; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 4001. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from gasoline-powered or diesel-powered vehicles, to establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 4002. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to enforce the duty imposed on each carrier to provide adequate services in connection with the transportation authorized by its certificate of public convenience and necessity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 4003. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the present provisions permitting the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4004. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARSH (by request):

H.R. 4005. A bill to fix the boundary of Shenandoah National Park in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 4006. A bill to make permanent the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954 as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 4007. A bill to regulate the labeling and advertising of cigarettes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4008. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that a survivor annuitant shall not lose his or her annuity by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after attainment of age 62; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4009. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide that a survivor annuitant spouse under such act shall not lose the survivor annuity by reason of remarriage after attainment of age 62; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4010. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that a widow shall not lose her entitlement to benefits under that title by reason of a remarriage which occurs after she attains age 62; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 4011. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 4012. A bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title 7 of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4013. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to increase the minimum amount of the monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4014. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4015. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze with only four quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4016. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 4017. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration center at Bonham, Tex., as the Sam Rayburn Memorial Veterans Center; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4018. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4019. A bill to amend section 204 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to permit adjudication of the claims of additional persons for certain World War II losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 4020. A bill to reduce the price at which feed grain may be sold by the Commodity Credit Corporation in acute distress areas and major disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 4021. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit the issuance of marketing orders for onions for canning or freezing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4022. A bill to supplement the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution with a National Transportation Museum in order to make the complete history of transportation available for the benefit of the people of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4023. A bill to authorize and direct the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, and to provide that such building shall be designated "The President James Madison Memorial Library"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.J. Res. 258. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the apportionment of districts from which members of a State legislature or members of governing bodies of subordinate State units are to be elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.J. Res. 260. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 261. Joint resolution limiting the height of certain radio and television antenna towers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.J. Res. 262. Joint resolution to provide for a conference consisting of Federal, State, and local officials, and members of public and private groups or organizations to consider and propose methods of, and to coordinate action for, combating the traffic in obscene matters and materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.J. Res. 264. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the selection of a new Vice President whenever there is a vacancy in the office of

Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 266. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations shall not exceed revenues of the United States, except in time of war or national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 267. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide a method for nominating and electing judges of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution for establishment of a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution authorizing a study of the organization and operation of the Congress, and establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 152. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution authorizing a study of the organization and operation of the Congress, and establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 155. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Con. Res. 156. Concurrent resolution to provide for the U.S. Information Agency film of the late President John F. Kennedy to be shown in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H. Con. Res. 157. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on increasing the authorized bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Con. Res. 158. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 159. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from Soviet occupation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution providing for one General Expenditure Authorization Act for each fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 161. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TOLL:

H. Con. Res. 162. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the U.S. mission to the United Nations should seek the adoption by the United Nations of a resolution condemning the recent manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 163. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to recent manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, and calling upon the Soviet Union to guarantee human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on increasing the bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H. Res. 150. Resolution to prohibit the Civil Aeronautics Board from discontinuing service by local service airlines until after a thorough review by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 151. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct certain studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 152. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 151; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. Res. 153. Resolution providing for a review of the needs for local airline service by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H. Res. 154. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Res. 155. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 156. Resolution to amend rule XXVIII of the rules of the House to permit 1 hour of debate on a motion to agree or disagree to a conference report; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. Res. 157. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the operation of hospital facilities by the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. Res. 158. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 159. Resolution providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 42, a joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H. Res. 160. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H. Res. 161. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of small business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 162. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H. Res. 163. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Res. 164. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 165. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H. Res. 166. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TOLL:

H. Res. 167. Resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. Res. 168. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WATSON:

H. Res. 169. Resolution to amend rule XVIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that certain information be contained in committee reports accompanying general appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico: Memorial of the New Mexico State Legislature, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to reconsideration on the order closing the Fort Bayard Hospital by the Veterans' Administration, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to urging Congress to proceed to enact legislation requiring all Government agencies involved to make sufficient funds available to expedite completion of an adequate transportation system on the main roads of national forests and public domain; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to drafting appropriate resolutions of condolences in memory of Sir Winston Churchill; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to requesting such actions as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the U.S. Public Health Service hospital in the Brighton district of Boston; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting such action as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the veterans' facilities at Rutland Heights; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to protesting the announced closure of the Veterans' Administration hospital located at Miles City, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 4024. A bill for the relief of Lewis H. Nelson III; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4025. A bill for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford M. Springberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4026. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Porter F. Sheldon, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4027. A bill for the relief of Capt. Ted M. Richardson, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4028. A bill for the relief of Capt. Richard A. Ingram and Capt. Arthur R. Sprott, Jr., U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4029. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John E. McRoberts and T. Sgt. Harold C. Fisher, Jr., U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 4030. A bill to require, in the alternative, delivery and return of property of the estate of John F. Hackfeld, deceased, vested by the alien property custodian, on the basis of ownership by an enemy alien, or the repayment of income and estate taxes to said estate, collected on the basis of American citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4031. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maureen Fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4032. A bill for the relief of Carlo Antonio DeLuca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 4033. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Dal Bo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4034. A bill for the relief of Andriana K. Anagnostopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4035. A bill for the relief of Vlasis Ritsinias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4036. A bill for the relief of Luigi Giovani Borelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4037. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Bakas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4038. A bill for the relief of Zaferios Malamis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4039. A bill for the relief of Persefoni G. Katarahias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4040. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Demirakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4041. A bill for the relief of Theodore Giannopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4042. A bill for the relief of Antonio Catanzariti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4043. A bill for the relief of John Konstas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 4044. A bill for the relief of Roberto Anaya Pulido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4045. A bill for the relief of Manuel Miranda Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4046. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Guerrero Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4047. A bill for the relief of Abel Cruz Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4048. A bill for the relief of Armando Castillo Valencia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4049. A bill for the relief of Luis Gonzalez Capistran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4050. A bill for the relief of Gilberto Perez Medinia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4051. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Gonzalez Arriaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4052. A bill for the relief of Jose Rosario Becerra Estrada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4053. A bill for the relief of Jesus Becerra Estrada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4054. A bill for the relief of Andres Aguirre Cisneros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4055. A bill for the relief of Jaime Pena Pena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4056. A bill for the relief of Tomas Rodarte Mireles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4057. A bill for the relief of Loreto Castro Lares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4058. A bill for the relief of Brigido Montoya Iniguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4059. A bill for the relief of Salvador Salazar Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4060. A bill for the relief of Cirilo Gracia Tovar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 4061. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Caputo and Carluccia Caputo, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 4062. A bill for the relief of Jankiel Borsuk and wife, Sylvia Borsuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 4063. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wanda Zybaczinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 4064. A bill for the relief of Ivana Geriol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 4065. A bill for the relief of Lt. Donald C. Klien, U.S. Navy, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4066. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4067. A bill for the relief of Joseph Aizig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4068. A bill for the relief of Raffaele and Franceschina Piscitelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 4069. A bill for the relief of Clifton M. Chippewa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 4070. A bill for the relief of Dedrick A. Maanum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4071. A bill for the relief of Prof. Visweswara L. Madhysatha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4072. A bill for the relief of Sylvie D. Bouganim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 4073. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Zuchowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 4074. A bill for the relief of Dr. Soo Hyun Nam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 4075. A bill for the relief of John F. Reagan, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 4076. A bill for the relief of Chung Un Bok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 4077. A bill for the relief of Jean A. Quaintance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4078. A bill for the relief of William L. Minton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4079. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary C. Ryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4080. A bill for the relief of Shaoul Shammah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4081. A bill for the relief of Maria Persic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4082. A bill for the relief of Kenneth C. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4083. A bill for the relief of Mr. Leonardo Tusa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4084. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Paola Campo Amorelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4085. A bill for the relief of Francesca Santangelo Ardini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 4086. A bill for the relief of Lauria A. Empleo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4087. A bill for the relief of Miss Junia Kirton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 4088. A bill for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4089. A bill for the relief of Dante Giovanni Nomellini, his wife, Lina Nomellini, and their minor children, Adolfo Nomellini and Rosella Nomellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 4090. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Christos Pappas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKIE:

H.R. 4091. A bill for the relief of Jamil Hamady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 4092. A bill for the relief of Shu Hsien Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4093. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Soos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 4094. A bill for the relief of the estate of Newton Watson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4095. A bill for the relief of Serrafettin Tombuloglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 4096. A bill for the relief of Lt. William R. Broadwell, U.S. Navy, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 4097. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rizalino M. and Mrs. Natividad Encarnado Buyoc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4098. A bill for the relief of W. R. Wade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4099. A bill for the relief of Charles Sakellaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4100. A bill for the relief of Joseph P. Hennessey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 4101. A bill for the relief of Susie Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4102. A bill for the relief of Florencio D. Ponce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4103. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4104. A bill for the relief of Leo Arlington Haynes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4105. A bill for the relief of Flora and William Bisof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4106. A bill for the relief of Wie Lie Bong and Jenny Kim-Yang (nee Lie) Bong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4107. A bill for the relief of Stamo Mihalitsianou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 4108. A bill for the relief of Theodora Arvaniti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4109. A bill for the relief of Tong Chik Pak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 4110. A bill for the relief of Mr. Antonino Baiardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4111. A bill for the relief of Jolan Steiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4112. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Garma Alony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4113. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marcelle Bean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4114. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Shimon Beatus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4115. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gerard Frank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4116. A bill for the relief of Marcene Sonja Godfrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4117. A bill for the relief of Domenico Perrotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4118. A bill for the relief of Farid Selim Tawfik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 4119. A bill for the relief of Juliana Barrigos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4120. A bill for the relief of Jorge Antonio Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4121. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ivy Rosalia Ferdinand de Richards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4122. A bill for the relief of Seoung Lek Rim and his wife, Chun Hye Rim (nee Choe); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4123. A bill for the relief of Maria Clara Rua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4124. A bill for the relief of Irfan Mavruk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4125. A bill for the relief of Flora Lee (Shih-yu Li); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4126. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yellamaty Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4127. A bill for the relief of Eliahu Haymovitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 4128. A bill for the relief of Joyce Zohelyn Manderson Tillman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4129. A bill for the relief of Phebe Norman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4130. A bill for the relief of Vladimira Saveri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4131. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Phoebe Thompson Neesham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4132. A bill for the relief of Librande P. Caltagirone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4133. A bill for the relief of Russell D. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 4134. A bill for the relief of Lessie Mae (Saxon) Wilson and Mrs. Beatrice Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4135. A bill for the relief of Chariklia Karakatsani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4136. A bill for the relief of Joanna Stavropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4137. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jan Rosciszewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 4138. A bill for the relief of Julio Machado Mendes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 4139. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eugene E. Laird; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

85. By the SPEAKER: Petition of James R. Frankenberry, Bronxville, N.Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the seating by the House of Representatives of the Representative from the 25th Congressional District of New York; to the Committee on House Administration.

86. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting Congress, through the appropriate committee, to publish and circulate a handbook on Federal governmental abbreviations and explanations thereof; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1965

(Legislative day, January 29, 1965)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

O Thou Father of our spirits, who hearest prayer: Breathe upon us now, we beseech Thee, the benediction of Thy holy calm, as those in this forum, to whose hands has been committed the stewardship of public affairs, face the demands of another week.

Lift the burdens of drab duty from jaded hearts, changing stern statutes into glad songs. Soothe the anxieties of our baffled minds, so that with the shield of Thy peace and the sword of Thy truth, we may face—free and fearless—whatever tests this day may bring.

If there is any kindness we can show the comrades by our side, may we not neglect or defer it, seeing that we pass this way but once. Spurning and scorning anything unworthy of our best, may we find our joy only in honor untarnished.

We ask in it the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 29, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REPORT OF U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 66)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Fourth Annual Report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

In this report, submitted pursuant to law, the Agency describes its activities for the calendar year 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1965.*

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961—Public Law 87-256, the Fulbright-Hays Act—I transmit herewith the annual report on the international cultural exchange program for the fiscal year 1963.

This report deals with the influence for peace and progress which exchange-of-persons activities have become in the world of the 1960's.

The varying stages of nationhood in the world today require a varying range of relationships on our part. I am convinced that exchanges of persons are uniquely appropriate and unusually effective activities for the needs and opportunities of these times. Such exchanges touch our societies at many points—involving students, teachers, professors, research scholars, athletes, government leaders, judges, economists, labor leaders, social workers, actors, authors, coaches, and many others—a broad panorama of professions and the arts.

In the single year covered by this report, some 10,000 people were overseas from this country, or here from other countries, in the friendly, constructive interchange the United States now sponsors. This exchange involved more than 130 countries and territories.

Congress can take particular and proper pride in this program. Since World War II—with full bipartisan support, as in Public Law 87-256—Congress has fathered and fostered this activity. Many Members of both Houses have a special knowledge of the vital role which exchanges now play in our relations and understandings with other nations. All along the way, the articulate leadership of the Congress has been a major strength for the program's success.

The warm and strong support of the American people likewise deserves our praise. The volunteer services and family hospitality which our citizens and communities give to thousands of students and visitors from other countries is of incalculable value to the interest of international understanding.

I hope that our exchange activities, public and private, may grow. An enlarging investment means an enlarging return—not merely from the understanding others may acquire of us, but from the understanding we acquire of those with whom we share the hopes of these times and the destiny of this planet.

We in the United States have an abiding faith in the value of education to our own society's success, and we are affirming that faith with a new and strengthened commitment to education in America. But education as a force for freedom, justice, and rationality knows no national boundaries—it is the great universal force for good. Our efforts in the exchange programs give that force added strength and justified support. For when we help other peoples achieve their highest and best aspirations, we truly work for understanding, for progress, and for peace. In this work, let us continue with new enthusiasm and confidence, for out of the understandings among peoples will grow peace among nations.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1965.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 33 of the 87th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints the following to be minority members of the Special Committee on Aging: Senators ALLOTT, MILLER, and PEARSON.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON ACTIONS TAKEN BY FEDERAL AGENCIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 88-451

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the actions taken by the Federal agencies under authority of Public Law 88-451, for the period from August 16, 1964, through December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED OR DETAILED TO DUTY AT THE SEAT OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of December 31, 1964, there was an aggregate of 2,167 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FINAL VALUATIONS OF PROPERTIES OF CERTAIN CARRIERS

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on final valuations of the properties of certain carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN CRIMINAL LAWS APPLICABLE TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of that company, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overstated requirements for replacement of high-endurance vessels, eastern area, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred because obsolete weight design goal was used for the design, integration, and test of Nimbus spacecraft by the Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on planned disposals of needed automotive repair parts, Department of the Army, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1391, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to venue (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON FAIR LABOR STANDARDS IN EMPLOYMENTS IN AND AFFECTING INTERSTATE COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports pertaining to fair labor standards in employments in and affecting interstate commerce, dated January 1965 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

A letter from the Postmaster General transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CIVILIAN POSITIONS

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on certain civilian positions in that Administration, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"House joint resolution applying to Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the senate concurring therein)*, That this legislature respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'; be it further

"*Resolved*, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Represenatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Approved:

"ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
"*Governor.*"

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachu-

setts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO PREVENT THE CLOSING OF THE RUTLAND HEIGHTS HOSPITAL

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Massachusetts House of Representatives that the medical-surgical facilities of the Veterans' Administration located at Rutland Heights in the Commonwealth will be closed effective June 30 of the current year; and

"Whereas the closing of this facility is in direct conflict with the general philosophy behind veterans' benefits in the United States as it has evolved over a long period of years and will result in derogation of veterans' benefits; and

"Whereas the removal of this hospital will work a particular hardship on the veterans of the Commonwealth and the present facilities should be retained to serve those who have served so well: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the veterans' facilities at Rutland Heights; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the United States rescind the order providing for the closing of the medical-surgical facilities located at Rutland Heights; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Surgeon General of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, January 20, 1965.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

The petition of Everett N. Gibson, of Ionia, Mich., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MORNING HOUR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no morning hour. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and other Senators have some questions that they would like to ask when the unfinished business is placed before the Senate.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Judiciary Committee and the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill S. 3, to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 3, to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I shall yield, but first I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor so that a few additional Senators may come to the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—SUBMISSION OF MINORITY VIEWS ON INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, I announce that at the conclusion of the vote on the Appalachia bill now pending, it is our intention to call up the nomination of Mr. W. J. Driver to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Following consideration of that subject, the Senate will take up the International Coffee Agreement.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to discuss very briefly the plans for scheduling consideration of the International Coffee Agreement. I have prepared minority views on that subject. If it is agreeable to the majority leader and other Senators, I ask unanimous consent for the privilege of submitting those views for printing tonight so that they will be available tomorrow. They are not now available.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be delighted to have the Senator do so. I have discussed that subject with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. We have proceeded on that assumption.

Mr. CARLSON. That is satisfactory to me.

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

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 3 to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I rise in enthusiastic support of the Appalachian regional development bill.

No region has suffered more from economic fate than Appalachia. No people have been more patient. Shut off by their mountains from many of the benefits of the industrialization of America, they have borne their burden like men, and like men have now found a way to remove it.

This bill is in redemption of promises made to the people of Appalachia for many years. It is a constructive and forward-looking approach. Every dollar authorized is a sound investment. We passed it last year. It should be passed, unencumbered, today.

At the same time, Mr. President, I desire to speak for my own region of New England which, though far in advance of Appalachia in most respects, economically, can benefit greatly by a later extension of what we are doing today.

For a number of years it has been evident that the economic growth of New England and the wages and incomes of our people are not keeping pace with the Nation as a whole. There are areas in many of our States which have had unacceptable levels of employment for well over a decade. There are serious pockets of poverty throughout southern New England, and there are whole areas of poverty across our three northern New England States. For instance, parts of southeastern Massachusetts, the Merrimack Valley, and the Berkshires, in my State, have been in the labor surplus category for over 15 years, and between 20 and 30 percent of the families in Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine have an income of less than $3,000 a year. Similar problems exist in Rhode Island and Connecticut.

Much of the land area of New England has no industrial or other productive activity coming from it. In northern New England the industrial structure is limited to a small number of industries, not sufficiently diversified. At the same time, this area's highway and transportation systems, together with its community facilities relating to health, education, sanitation, housing, and vocational training, are in serious need of improvement in order to encourage new industry to settle in the area.

In the Southern New England States—Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut—the new electronic space age industries have been experiencing fluctuations in employment with the changing needs of technology and defense, and many of our traditional industries such as cotton and wool textiles, shoes, nonelectrical machinery, and furniture are continuing to move out, or go out of business altogether. This has led to a substantial decline of manufacturing jobs, coupled with an increase of available workers who are not being sufficiently absorbed into the industrial and service fields. The result is poverty, disillusionment, and regressive growth.

I do not mean to say that the New England economy is in real danger, or in crisis, or faces anywhere near the long road back to health that Appalachia faces. On the whole, our situation is stronger and stabler than 12 years ago,

when President Kennedy addressed himself to its problems from this floor. New England continues to enjoy in a number of its areas a good reputation in education and skills, and in the income of many of its people. We are still the research hub of America. But in marking our progress, we must not overlook the basic problem areas which remain.

Like their northern neighbors, the Southern New England States have serious problems of water pollution, sanitation, substandard housing, and manpower training and rehabilitation. These States shoulder a special burden of mass transit and intercity passenger travel by rail and air. In addition, the population explosion has begun to work a crisis in the educational field. This is especially true with respect to the high school dropout, or graduate who does not have the means for further education, but who must seek work in an increasingly technological and intellectual labor market.

The forests of New England are one of the region's richest resources. We need to develop and protect them through modern methods of conservation and technology. Our fishing industry has a tremendous potential with the increased demand for high protein food in our own country and throughout the world. We must embark on programs of ocean engineering and research to improve and modernize the harvest of valuable materials from the sea.

As population increases, there will be a greater demand for agricultural products, such as milk, poultry, potatoes, and various perishable products. The New England farmer has an excellent competitive advantage in being close to his New England markets, and with a good road system, close to other large cities outside New England. We must utilize new farming and marketing techniques to make better use of our unproductive land.

By 1970 there may have to be a doubling of generating capacity to meet New England's power needs. With an increased growth rate, even more capacity will be needed. We must seek the implementation of new power sources, such as Passamaquoddy, nuclear energy and hydroelectric generation, with grid tieins to sources outside New England. At the moment, we should work together in an all-out effort to eliminate quotas on residual oil in order to keep down manufacturers' fuel costs, and the cost of generating electricity for consumers.

The supply of high-quality water is an important industrial and municipal asset of New England. However, increasing abuse over the past years has impaired the quality of many streams and rivers, and in some instances have periled parts of our fishing industry. There is a basic need for a strong multistate water pollution program. Likewise, we need to develop comprehensive programs for the conservation of water, and greater use of our rivers for recreation, navigational and other purposes.

There is a great untapped potential in the vacation business in New England. With an improved transportation network, and roads, the New England seashores and mountains can become a vast year-round retreat for the people who live and work in our northeastern urban centers. There is ample area for expansion throughout New England in this industry.

One of the most important keys to the economic future of New England is an improved transportation network. A coordinated, easy access, high speed interstate expressway will give industry fast truck service to railheads, seaports and air cargo centers. A rejuvenated and modernized rail freight system, both bulk and piggyback, can help New England maufacturers to reach more domestic markets competitively, can improve the use of the port of Boston for export at cost savings to shippers, and to provide for the fast, efficient supply of materials for industry.

The development of a New England regional air network is also fundamental. With the advance of short-range jets, and improved regional airports and electronic guidance and service equipment, commercial and recreational travel will be stimulated and the need for more frequent schedules will be created.

Of strategic importance is the establishment of fast, new rail passenger and rapid transit service to move people safely and efficiently in and out of our major urban areas. Massachusetts has made a splendid initial effort in creating the Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority to relieve the New England railroads of their commuter passenger burden. But beyond mass transit, studies indicate the feasibility of a high speed intercity rail passenger system between Boston and New York and Washington, with possible extensions to other New England cities. Any substantial development in this direction could have great impact on providing incentives to industry to locate in our areas. Such a system, whether mass transit or intercity, logically fits into the development of a regional growth program.

However, the most crucial area for improvement concerns our human resources. We want to see the President's primary and secondary educational school program lift up the quality and opportunity for modern education in our underprivileged and underdeveloped areas. We need a regional program of vocational education centers, an increased number of regional community colleges, and higher education centers, which can provide intellectual and technological talent to attract industry at the growth centers. We must develop a regional approach to job placement, which might help to clear away some of the confusion that exists today in this area.

We must make a thorough review of our hospital facilities and services, with a view toward providing for modern regional psychiatric, medical, and surgical hospital care, and the use of the latest diagnostic equipment, special treatment rooms, an increase in available beds, and the availability of good nursing care. Of great importance should be the improvement and new construction of nursing care facilities and centers for our older citizens who need attention.

DAY CARE CENTERS

We will require a broadening of our welfare services, better programs to combat juvenile crime, and an expanded poverty program, all a vital part of any regional recovery program. Many of our New England cities have begun to take on a new look of progress thanks to the urban renewal program, but much more, especially in the field of housing, has to be accomplished. Logically, the accelerated development and improvement of urban growth areas is fundamental to any long-range growth plan.

Our communities must be helped in meeting their burden of water sewage and sanitation services through coordinated Federal-State assistance programs. The increasing costs to growing communities to build local roads and streets can be offset by more Federal funds for major intercity highways.

All of these basic improvement programs are critical to New England's economic improvement. I speak of them today because we are about to pass a bill that embodies the best possible approach to regional development. What Appalachia has done can be a model for all regions.

Our main concern is to concentrate Federal and State funds in a manner which will do the most good on a long-range basis. This can only mean that we cannot stop at borders of our communities, or of our counties, or even our States, to bolster areas of lagging economy. We must coordinate the potential of regions and subregions to lift up and stimulate the distressed and underdeveloped centers that are the logical ones for future growth.

The need for a special Federal-State economic development program is by no means peculiar to New England, or to Appalachia. It exists in varying degrees in many other sections of the country. It concerns multi-State regions, as well as isolated areas. It involves cities, the poorer suburbs, the rural areas, and underdeveloped lands. President Johnson has indicated his awareness of this need for regional planning in his state of the Union message, when he called for "a regional recovery program to assist the development of stricken areas left behind by our national progress." In a recent speech before the AFL–CIO National Legislative Conference, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] chairman of the Senate's Select Subcommittee on Poverty and its Public Works Committee, recommended that special funds be appropriated to a National Regional Development Council which would then allocate them for expenditure by Federal agencies in accordance with plans approved by regions and local redevelopment districts. Other legislators are coming forward to request that their regions be included in the Appalachia legislation pending before the Congress, both for the purpose of study, and for special aid. This is healthy and necessary. It should not encumber the Appalachia bill. It should supplement it. Indeed, there is very active consideration of regional growth planning at all levels of government, from the city and county planners to the

White House. Now is time for those of us in New England to get busy, and prepare our plans for economic improvement, so that we can be ready to advise the President of our needs when this new legislation becomes effective.

Of particular interest in the anticipation of Federal assistance for growth programs are the projections of Dr. Walter Heller, former Chief of the Council of Economic Advisers, who estimates that up to $6 billion a year in new revenues may be available in the next few years for additional Federal spending. Dr. Heller suggests that this money be returned to the States in the form of a rebate, but I feel that this approach is lacking in both guidelines and control and would be neither politically feasible, nor economically effective. Rather, a better approach to assisting the States in their public improvements and growth might be to apply these additional revenues within the limitations of regional growth programs. Based upon the real needs of the communities and coordinated by Federal authority.

It was President Kennedy who, during his first months as a Senator, called for the "united efforts of the entire New England delegation" to seek and promote solutions for New England's economic ills. The President strongly supported the idea of a New England Governors' conference, and as both a legislator and as President, he gave serious attention to the Governors' recommendations. It was largely through his stimulation that the New England Senators formed a conference group for the discussion of basic problems, and he strongly supported the work of the New England Council, representing some 2,000 New England businessmen, labor organizations, consumer and financial groups.

These have been worthy efforts. All of these organizations have been continuously concerned with New England's economic future, they have done an excellent job; but a broader and more coordinated approach is needed. A New England regional development program, under Federal-State coordination is a logical extension of what we have done in the past.

HOW WE CAN DEVELOP THE PROGRAM

The concept of a broad, regional economic growth program, developed and coordinated by one authority in which all the States of the region participate, is a great step ahead in Government planning.

The first task of such a group would be to make an economic base study and industrial analysis of the New England region and its subregions. It could collect all existing studies of the region, of the States and of the political subdivisions completed during the past 10 years, and identify each of the research projects which are presently in process by Federal, State and local agencies. This information would be analyzed by a broad group of working teams, which could conduct further investigations in order to provide the latest background material for the study. Industry, labor, the consumer, and the academic profession should be asked to participate in this study.

Hopefully, within a year there could be a first report with recommendations as to those basic growth problems which need immediate and special financial assistance, and Federal-State coordination. Its recommendations could be of a regional, or subregional nature, depending upon the extent of the problems. It is most important that study take into consideration local development districts in the framing of regional programs.

In addition, the report could give us preliminary recommendations as to how these programs could be implemented, and suggest new areas of legislation directed to regional development. This regional planning program should be concerned first with the improvement of public facilities and public resources, to assist the underprivileged areas and to bolster the economy. Thus its emphasis initially might be on education, roads, housing, health facilities, transportation, sanitation, or manpower training. However, the program must also be concerned with the private sector, such as methods of improving investment in new industry; better use of our natural resources—water, forests, fisheries, vacation areas—the stimulation of greater export activity; and more effective ways of advertising the advantages of New England to the business community.

We have in our New England States some of the best academic institutions in the world. Many of these schools have departments and programs specifically directed to the study of social and economic problems and their solutions. There are nationally known experts in regional planning presently located in our State universities and in our larger private universities, such as Harvard, Yale, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston College, Boston University, and others. Our State commerce and planning departments have a wealth of information which can be utilized in order to put together the broad picture. We are in excellent shape to begin the task which, I am confident, will be one of the most important things that New England has undertaken in recent years.

NEW ENGLAND MUST ACT NOW

For some time, I have felt that New England should follow the lead of the Appalachian States in moving ahead its own growth plan. As we know, the Appalachian Governors joined with Federal agency representatives and experts to form the Appalachian Regional Commission and make a comprehensive study of the economic and social needs of an 11-State area, reaching from New York to Georgia. Within a year, this group sent to the President a detailed report, together with recommendations for special regional action programs designed to rehabilitate the Appalachian area, and spur its economic growth. This effort, in turn, has led to the bill before us. I think this is a good bill, and I intend to support it.

This cooperative approach of State and Federal experts, legislators, and others to promote an effective regional development plan is a significant example for New England. I feel that now is the time for us in New England to find out where we stand, and how we, as a community of States, mutually dependent and traditionally associated, can develop the great potential of New England for the benefit of all New Englanders. By cooperation, and by organization, I believe that we, too, can fashion an effective regional program, and present our case with the same persuasive enthusiasm as did the Appalachian Governors and their congressional delegation.

I am confident that the administration looks favorably on such a regional program. I have received assurances from the administration that it intends to include, in the new area redevelopment bill, soon to come to Congress, provisions for setting up regional organizations to study, recommend and coordinate broad Federal-State programs of economic improvement for distressed and underdeveloped areas, and that this will include New England.

I am further encouraged by the letter from the Bureau of the Budget, which the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] has submitted for the record indicating further the administration's views on regional development. The letter states in part:

> The President is convinced that we can apply the sound principles of regional economic planning toward assisting in the economic redevelopment of depressed areas throughout the Nation. The proposals which we will submit will provide the authority and funds to accomplish this purpose.

I am hopeful that in the debate in the Senate today on the Appalachia bill we may further clarify the legislative and administrative direction in which we will go in this area of regional economic development, after the Appalachia bill is passed.

I should like to say that I was pleased to cosponsor the legislation introduced last Thursday by the senior Senator from Michigan, providing for the establishment of regional growth studies, which I feel could be a sound first step in moving ahead with realistic regional development programs. I am also looking forward with interest to the development of a broader bill which may be introduced by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], establishing regional commissions patterned after the Appalachia Regional Commission, and providing for special funds for action programs to meet basic regional needs in public improvements and economic recovery.

At the same time, I have been working with my staff with experts to develop various legislative approaches to regional economic development which would be effective in the New England area. These, in essence, would seek the coordination and concentration of existing Federal assistance in programs and in areas where it would be best for long-range growth, and would provide for special assistance to those regional programs which have priority in importance, and need immediate acceleration to be effective. The emphasis of this legislation I am considering is not so much on regional planning as it is on making the plans work. I shall have more to say on this in the near future.

I intend to support and promote this regional approach to economic growth

during this Congress. I feel that the Appalachia legislation is a good start, but that those of us from other regions where economic distress and underdevelopment are substantial, should now move rapidly ahead to frame our own programs, and develop legislation which will provide for our basic growth needs.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement made by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and a letter be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

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

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUSKIE

I commend my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], on his active interest in and promotion of the concept of regional planning for New England. I am convinced that this approach, coupled with regional development based on such planning, offers real hope for economic revival and growth in our region. Economic need is not limited to Appalachia and regional economic unity is as apparent in New England as it is in the 11-State region which has been designated as Appalachia.

New England's identity as a region predates the independence of our Nation. It has continued throughout our history with an accelerating effort to create institutions which recognize and take advantage of our geographic, economic, and social interdependence. We do not always see eye to eye on specific issues, but we recognize that our fortunes are ultimately intertwined.

We also recognize that the pockets of poverty and economic distress cannot be treated as isolated problems. The ills of a single community or group of communities are influenced by, and influence, the health or disability of a region. Furthermore, economic problems tend to repeat themselves throughout a region—as, for example, in the case of the New England textile industry.

I support the Appalachia bill (S. 3) because I believe the Nation has a responsibility toward the people who live in that region and because I believe the Nation's economic health is affected by the problems of Appalachia. In addition, I believe the attention and the treatment being given Appalachia should be applied in New England and in other similar regions.

The administration, through the Budget Bureau, has advised us of its general intention to assist regional planning and development under the Area Redevelopment Act. This has been set forth in a letter I received from Mr. Phillip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, dated January 27, 1965, which I attach to this statement. The details of that approach have not been spelled out, but we anticipate that they should be in a message from the President. Senator MCNAMARA, of Michigan, in his regional development bill (S. 812)—which I have cosponsored—suggests a different Federal approach to regional development.

We have not had an opportunity to examine these proposals so as to decide on the best vehicle for regional planning and development which incorporates Federal, State, and local assistance and cooperation. The administration and the Congress should do so without delay. Passage of the Appalachia bill (S. 3) does not relieve us of our regional development responsibilities. Those responsibilities can only be met with a sound Federal program which offers comparable financial and technical assistance for regional planning and for the programs and projects necessary to implement such plans on a regional basis.

I am pleased to join with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and my other New England colleagues in announcing our determination to obtain the same kind of assistance we are supporting for the region designated as Appalachia.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1965.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: During consideration of the Appalachian Regional Development Act (S. 3), a number of Senators have raised questions about the administration's intentions with respect to making provision for redevelopment planning on a regional basis for other areas of the country.

The President is aware of the benefits to be gained from planning and carrying out economic redevelopment along regional lines. For areas outside of Appalachia, however, the appropriate regional groupings vary widely in terms of their size, their economic problems, and their economic resources. As a consequence, the careful definition of regional boundaries and the development of regional plans can best be undertaken as part of a general program for area redevelopment.

With this in mind, the administration intends to propose very shortly, as part of the extension and improvement of the Area Redevelopment program, measures to encourage and assist regional planning for the redevelopment of distressed areas.

The President is convinced that we can apply the sound principles of regional economic planning toward assisting in the economic redevelopment of depressed areas throughout the Nation. The proposals which we will submit will provide the authority and funds to accomplish this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has marked his return to the Senate with a significant statement on the need for a coordinated program to deal with the problems of the New England area. New England's problems cannot be compared to the problems of the Appalachian region in terms of economic severity. My own State of Connecticut is prosperous and growing and we are working on those few pockets of unemployment and underemployment that do occur from time to time. But Connecticut and all of New England—and all the other regions of the Nation—can take a page from Appalachia's book and begin to think and plan for the future in terms of regional growth and development.

This is true and necessary not just in the economic field, but in others as well. Pollution, for instance, is not the problem of one State alone in New England, or anywhere for that matter. Even now a Federal water pollution control enforcement case is pending between the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut. This problem must be attacked on a regional basis if it is to be successfully solved.

Transportation is another example of the need for regional action. Last week the Governors of Connecticut and New York joined together in an effort to solve the desperate commuter problem on the New Haven Railroad. The entire transportation problem requires regional solution. Again, one State alone cannot solve the problem alone.

For these reasons I have joined with the Senator from Massachusetts in cosponsoring S. 812, introduced last week by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] providing for the establishment of regional growth studies. This is a good first step forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Appalachia bill. But, before I do so, let me say how pleased I was to hear the voice of the junior Senator from Massachusetts in the Senate Chamber. We missed him and are very happy to see him back again.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am sorry that I had to be present at a meeting of the Appropriations Committee to hear Under Secretary of State Ball and thus missed the speech of my colleague, Senator KENNEDY. However, I had an opportunity to read the speech that he just delivered. We have many problems in New England.

I intend to vote for the Appalachia bill. I believe that Congress should give consideration to the problems which exist in New England.

I commend the junior Senator from Massachusetts for bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by my colleague. The senior Senator from Massachusetts has been concerned with these problems over a long period of time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for giving me the privilege to join the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in expressing the view that we both share in hearing the junior Senator from Massachusetts speak again in this forum.

It is also gratifying to know that both the Senators from Massachusetts feel that there are problems within that area which demand the cooperative partnership spelled out in the pending proposal.

I assure the Senators from Massachusetts that within the Committee on Public Works, there will be every prompt, yet thorough, effort made not only to study the bill, but also to listen to those persons, including the Senators from Massachusetts, who come before the committee with comprehensive and constructive programs. I believe the programs which exist in many areas of the country—as I have indicated more than once in the Senate Chamber, including September 25, last year, when the Appalachian bill was under debate—should be given attention.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, today the Senate is considering the Appalachian Development Act of 1965, a legislative measure aimed at helping the

mountainous Appalachian region—an area which has been bypassed by America's growing economic prosperity.

The public works and economic development legislation we are considering here today is not a welfare dole for Appalachia. It is a carefully prepared program aimed at helping resourceful people to help themselves.

It has been authoritatively estimated that our gross national product would be $12 billion higher this year if Appalachia's economy was equal to the national level. Our Nation cannot afford to continue supporting such an economic burden. I think this is the reason why so many of my non-Appalachian colleagues are supporting this regional development program.

This legislation is designed to strike at the heart of the cause of Appalachian poverty. Combined with programs initiated by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, it will form a total approach for concerted community action to establish the Great Society.

Frequently I am asked by people unfamiliar with Appalachia what makes it different from other regions of our country?

Appalachia is a 167,000-square-mile rural area, comprising all or part of 11 great States and 355 counties. Only 30 percent of its population live in cities of over 10,000 as compared to 56 percent of our Nation's total population.

The average Appalachian farm produces an annual crop worth only $1,000. Contrast this with the average non-Appalachian farm income of about $4,000. Most Appalachian farmers labor hard to eke out a bare subsistence from their poor hillsides.

Thousands of small communities have not been able to construct badly needed sewer and water systems, decent schools, and hospitals; items that we recognize as essential to the health and well-being of people in a modern technological society. The lack of an adequate tax base frequently makes it impossible for these communities to improve their facilities without outside financial assistance. These communities have been prevented from participating in existing Federal aid programs because they are too poor to raise their share of the needed matching funds.

The major Appalachian industries—mining and agriculture—are declining employers. Vast sections of the region lack any form of manufacturing, particularly in the nonurban areas.

Appalachia's mountainous terrain frequently makes it difficult to locate suitable industrial sites. Much of the flat area requires flood protection before it is usable. Access is a continuing and real problem. Good roads are urgently needed to develop tourism and attract industry. These roads would link the heart of Appalachia with the markets of the eastern seaboard and the Midwest. Additional roads would run north and south through the great mountain valleys. These improvements must be made if Appalachia's disproportionately high rate of unemployment is to be reduced. Improved roads will not do the job alone; there is a need for improved rail and air transportation. Railroads, where they exist, are being permitted to deteriorate while many cities in the area either lack or have unsafe airports.

The mountainous terrain makes it imperative that airports in the region have the best navigation and safety facilities available. Only then will commercially scheduled airlines be able to service them adequately.

Two million people left their Appalachian homes during the past 10 years to join the work forces of the surrounding metropolitan centers. They left seeking greater opportunity. Most were young. Some were the skilled and well-educated—needed to provide the leadership in the impoverished communities they left; many were the unskilled unemployables who added to the burdens of city health and welfare programs. Appalachia is the only region in our country that has experienced a large out-migration during the past 15 years.

The picture is not all bleak however. Wonderful opportunities exist for the people of Appalachia if we provide them with the financial assistance they need to begin on their ambitious and farsighted economic development programs.

Appalachia extends from New York to Georgia, near and across several giant urban complexes. Its natural resources of rainfall, timber, coal, yet undiscovered minerals, farm land, and scenery can and must be properly developed—for the good of our entire Nation.

Coal, the major resource of Appalachia, continues to decline in use as a fuel, but modern research promises new and more profitable uses for it.

New methods of utilizing timber and the rapidly growing need for wood products provides the Appalachian region with an increasing market for its forest products. The United States today has to import millions of dollars worth of wood products each year.

I believe that the development of proper timber farming programs can go far toward meeting our domestic timber needs.

Agricultural employment will continue to decline as it has in the past, but many Appalachian farms can be made more profitable. Perhaps most important is the fact that farmland will play an increasing role in conservation and recreation as our Nation becomes more and more urbanized.

Earlier, I pointed out that Appalachia lies between two giant population centers. In time to come, half of the Nation's population will look to this scenic mountain area as a year-round playground. The creation of lakes, using double purpose dams, will not only serve to increase recreational opportunities but will also insure a constant water supply for a major portion of the Eastern United States. Deep Creek Lake in Garrett County, Md., is a shining example of how an artificial lake can increase the economic opportunities of an area.

We are all aware that many fine colleges and universities are located in Appalachia. Needless to say, their continued growth is essential to the region. I do not need to tell you of the importance of facilities for higher education in an expanding technological society. Increasingly, modern industry is seeking locations convenient to education and research centers.

Appalachia has the potential to be part of President Johnson's Great Society. I am convinced it will be part of that society if we give it the financial assistance necessary to break through the vicious and continuing circle of poverty which has firmly gripped the region.

Maryland's three westernmost counties fall within the purview of Appalachian poverty and within the promises of Appalachian development. The economic future of Allegany, Garrett, and Washington Counties will largely depend upon the passage and successful execution of the Appalachian Development Act.

The Appalachian counties of Maryland are typical of vast areas of the region. Although they represent 15 percent of the State's total land area, they accommodate only 6.3 percent of the State's population.

The economic difficulties of Appalachian Maryland trace back over a period of 40 years. The decrease in coal mining and agriculture and the more recent decline in railroading have all contributed to the existing unhealthy economic situation.

The coal mines which once employed 6,000 provide jobs for only 500 today.

Farming provides employment for one-third of the work force in Garrett County, but in Allegany and Washington Counties for only 5 and 3 percent respectively.

Persistent unemployment coupled with low income and inadequate housing and school facilities in much of the area has resulted in the heavy out-migration typical of the Appalachian region.

In 1963, the per capita income in the State of Maryland was $2,314. During this same year, per capita income in Appalachian Maryland ranged from only $1,272 in Garrett County to $1,935 in Washington County. In other words, per capita income in Garrett County was only 55 percent of that found in the rest of the State.

Unemployment has decreased as a result of the Nation's renewed economic prosperity under the administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, but underemployment remains a major problem in the rural area.

The percentage of substandard housing ranges from 20 percent in Allegany County to 39 percent in Garrett County.

Appalachian Maryland does however share in the potential of the entire 11-State region despite its present handicaps.

Our State government has worked hard in cooperation with local and Federal authorities to improve highways going into the area. Other programs dealing with water resource development, new and better housing, new and expanded educational facilities and hospitals, park and recreational development, public utility expansion, and industrial development have been carried as far as existing finances will permit.

I am proud that it was the Governor of my own State who, in 1960, called the first conference of Appalachian Governors to consider what action had to be taken to solve the region's problems.

In Maryland, special attention is focused on our Appalachian counties through the newly created State office of economic opportunity. This office's director also serves as the Governor's representative to the President's Appalachian Regional Commission.

I know from personal experience that there is active leadership in all three counties—Allegany, Garrett, and Washington. They have wrestled with their problems for many years, only to be forced to curtail their plans because of insufficient sources of revenue.

The three counties, having recognized their many common problems, are working together with the State and Federal authorities. An Appalachian Maryland Community Action Committee has been organized under the leadership of my good and very able friend, the Honorable R. Samuel Dillion, Jr. This tricounty group symbolizes the cooperative spirit that I find existing in Appalachia. Each county delegation consists of a State legislator, a county elected official, a representative from business and one from organized labor.

This kind of broad representation is essential if the economic development of Appalachia is to succeed. Government, business and labor must work together to do the job. One billion dollars spread over 167,000 square miles of hills, mountains and valleys will not do very much unless it is carefully spent and unless it results in stimulating the private sector of Appalachia's economy.

I strongly believe that the Appalachian Development Act will help greatly to inspire confidence in the future of the region. This in turn will help to generate hundreds of millions of dollars in private economic activity. Appalachia will not only become a greater producer—but also a greater consumer.

Specifically, what will S. 3 do to help develop Appalachia's potential?

Title II, section A of the bill, creates a number of new programs that the President's Appalachian Regional Commission recommended as necessary to meeting the special problems confronting the region.

Over 80 percent of all the funds authorized—$840 million—will be spent on a 5-year road building program. Federal funds would be provided on a matching basis for a carefully planned network of development and access roads.

Seventeen million dollars is provided for land improvement and erosion control. Grants to any landowner under this section will be permitted up to a maximum of 80 percent of the cost of improving and developing 25 acres.

Five million dollars will be authorized to assist the development of private nonprofit timber development organizations. Such groups will result in the better utilization of existing timber resources.

Twenty-one and a half million dollars will be earmarked for mining area restorations. Such activities may include sealing and filling in abandoned coal mines, and expanding and accelerating fish and wildlife restoration projects.

Five million dollars is authorized for water resource surveys. Such surveys are necessary if a practical plan for efficient water utilization is to be developed.

Title II, section B, supplements and modifies existing programs so that they are better able to meet the real needs of Appalachia.

Sixteen million dollars would be available for the construction of the vocational education facilities needed to train people so that they can obtain employment.

Sixteen million dollars would be authorized to construct sewage treatment works. Such facilities are essential to prevent the continued pollution of the region's streams. The pollution that now occurs almost always takes place above the water intake of most urban areas in the eastern half of our country.

The Housing Act of 1954 is amended to allow for comprehensive planning for the Appalachian region using 701 funds.

Ninety million dollars is authorized to supplement existing Federal grant-in-aid programs. This is a key feature. It would permit many impoverished communities to make necessary improvements that would otherwise be impossible. Many Appalachian communities have previously been denied Federal assistance because they could not raise the needed local contribution. The authorization of this supplemental section is most important.

This legislation is designed to further enhance the partnership of Federal, State, and local governments. It specifically encourages a cooperative effort. Furthermore, it clearly prevents a possible diminution in State financial participation.

I urge the prompt passage of this vitally important legislation so that the development of Appalachia can move forward. The promise of Federal assistance has given the people of the Appalachian Mountains reason for hope with the prospect of a bright future. There is no doubt in my mind that as Appalachia prospers—so will the rest of the Nation.

I am proud to have had a part in the initial consideration of this proposal as a member of the Public Works Committee in the last Congress. I have spoken for its prompt enactment on numerous occasions. I shall cast my vote for it today, and work for its effective implementation in Maryland tomorrow. I urge all my colleagues, Appalachian and non-Appalachian, to do likewise.

Mr. President, I congratulate my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for the careful hearings that he has conducted and for the leadership role that he has personally undertaken in the development of this program toward the passage of the bill which we all anticipate today.

ACTION FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senate has had before it two proposed amendments, which I sponsored, one which would create an Upper Great Lakes Regional Development Authority and one which would simply authorize funding for research and planning needed in other depressed regions of the Nation.

I have cosponsored the upper Great Lakes regional development amendment because I believe this region of the country is not only much in need, but because its people are organized, its officials are aware of the region's problems, and because basic research and general planning for the development of this area has already been done. In short, the region is ready to go—and I believe we should move now to establish a development authority and get on with the work of changing, improving, and generally upgrading the region's economy.

But the upper Great Lakes region is not the only one which has lagged behind the Nation. There are many other regions which are not meeting the problems of a growing, changing America. As the President said in his state of the Union address: We should establish and "carry out a new program to develop regions of our country now suffering from distress and depression."

The second amendment before the Senate speaks to this general problem. It recognizes that there are many areas in the country which suffer from regional problems, but which are not ready to go in the sense that all of the preparation has been done for the establishment of a commission and for immediate action. What these areas need is the kind of work which resulted in the detailed, full-blown legislation now being considered for Appalachia. They need support, guidance, and help in the development of immediate action plans.

The second amendment would amend the Appalachia legislation simply to authorize immediate planning for no more than six other regions which generally meet the criteria established in the statement of purpose of the Appalachia bill approved by the Senate last year.

The amendment would not establish new commissions nor authorize major expenditures. It would only provide $10 million for immediate planning which would help other qualified depressed regions to prepare carefully drafted plans and proposals, as was done in the preparation of the Appalachia bill.

No more than $2.5 million could be spent on regional planning in any one area.

The planning would be authorized only if the basic research and public sentiment of the region were sufficiently solid so that a viable action plan for development could be produced in 18 months.

Most important, passage of the amendment would put the Congress on record for immediate regional development action.

In addition to the upper Great Lakes area, the standards in this bill might be met by the Ozarks; the northwestern mountain regions; parts of the New England area; the desert high plateau-Four Corners area of Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona; the upper Great Plains area; and parts of the Deep South.

I am a cosponsor of the Appalachia legislation. I believe that now, at the time we approve action for one depressed area of the country, we should also begin to act for the other needy regions of the Nation. There is no reason to wait.

I recognize that the Public Works Committee has before it a bill authored by the chairman, Senator McNamara. This would authorize the President to go beyond my amendment. It would authorize him to establish not only a number of areas for full development work, but regional development commissions along the lines of the Appalachian Commission.

I believe this bill is a good one. It is, in fact, part of a much broader bill described by Senator McNamara in a recent speech proposing a new National Regional Development Council as part 2 in the war against poverty. Both the more limited bill, and the broader one, I believe, are constructive efforts to aid the depressed regions of this Nation. They deserve sympathetic review, and, although I have not yet had a chance to study either measure with care, in principle, I believe they should be supported.

I also recognize that the Bureau of the Budget, through a lower official—Phillip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference—has made commitments to Senator Muskie regarding regional development planning funds through ARA programs. Again, this is all to the good, although I am not satisfied that the commitments are sufficiently specific, nor that they will put the Congress or the administration fully on record in support of the idea of new development authorities with adequate power to carry out planning, development, training, and public works programs designed to alleviate the distress within such regions as New England, the Upper Great Lakes, the Upper Great Plains, the Ozarks, the Four Corners, and others.

Nonetheless, the commitments offered by the Bureau of the Budget are welcome ones. The only question before us is whether the Congress should also make some commitments—more specific ones—and I, for one, feel that it should.

There is no reason, so far as I can see, why Congress should wait to mark with its approval the idea of full development planning for other regions in the Nation. At the time we are voting approval in specific for one region of the country—Appalachia—I think we should also vote approval in principle for other regions. And we should authorize funds for the development of action plans for such regions. There is no reason to wait. Planning can begin immediately. Hopefully, within a year or 18 months, we will have before us solid, specific, carefully designed and practical proposals which will permit us to take a major step forward for other regions such as we are now taking in the case of Appalachia. To wait for further study of proposals which might only involve further study would be to further delay the start of a constructive regional development process which we can begin today.

I do not wish to take the Senate's time with a full description of the problems of all the Nation's regions. But let me sketch out, as examples, the problems of some of the regions.

In my own upper Great Lakes region, there are pockets of extreme poverty. Unemployment much higher than the national average persists. An unemployment rate three times the national average is not uncommon in this region in the winter months. A year ago the Upper Peninsula of Michigan had an unemployment rate of 14.6 percent. The last detailed census figures taken in 1960 showed a regional unemployment rate of 8.6 percent compared to 7.1 percent for Appalachia, a rate 20 percent above that of Appalachia. Families in the poverty class—under $3,000 in annual income—are 25.9 percent of the population as compared with the national share of 21.4 percent.

Because of the fall in job opportunities, the younger people are leaving the north woods. The aged remain. In my own State of Wisconsin, current estimates show that over 80 percent of the area included in the upper Great Lakes region lost population in the last 5 years. This area now has only about 7 percent of the population of Wisconsin. Yet its share of the number of recipients of State public assistance for the aged is 17 percent.

Figures for last year show that the overall dependency rate for this area is 5 percent higher than its share of the State population. These figures do not show, however, how hard it is for the people of the north woods to turn to public welfare.

In my longer presentation last Friday on the need for an Upper Great Lakes Development Authority, I attempted to show how regional development for this region could be implemented—and how, especially, the region's magnificent recreational resources might be wisely and economically utilized. I would like to call the Senate's attention to this longer presentation, for I believe it may speak of the problems not only of my area, but of other depressed areas with similar problems and similar prospects.

Indeed, another such area may well be that of the Ozarks. I would hope that development planning for this region could be started immediately if my amendment were to pass. Senator Fulbright has recently described the problem of the Ozarks in a letter to Senator McNamara supporting my amendment, as follows:

In justification of a special Appalachian program the Appalachian Regional Commission cited the fact that as of 1960 30.7 percent Appalachian families had an annual income of less than $3,000 against 20.5 percent for the balance of the United States. By the same 1960 census the percentage of families in northern Arkansas with incomes of less than $3,000 was substantially greater. The following counties are representative:

	Percent
Stone County	78.0
Newton County	76.7
Fulton County	70.2
Searcy County	69.8
Madison County	68.8
Sharp County	67.7

As you will note from a map of the region these counties constitute the core of northern Arkansas.

The President's Commission also noted the close association between education and economic development. As of 1960 11.6 percent of the persons over 25 years of age in Appalachia had less than a fifth-grade education against 8 percent for the balance of the United States. The overall figure for Arkansas was 15.4 percent and for the Ozark mountain counties to which I have referred as follows:

	Percent
Stone County	16.4
Newton County	15.5
Fulton County	12.4
Searcy County	12.3
Madison County	14.5
Sharp County	14.3

Recently, addressing the Senate, like Senator Fulbright, Senator McGovern described problems in his own Upper Great Plains area as follows:

Economic growth of the region has lagged behind that of the Nation as a whole because of drought, unwise requirement of cultivation of some lands in the early homestead laws, and necessary readjustments, lack of development of economic means for utilizing lignite and similar large but lower grade mineral resources, major dependency on farm income which is depressed, and need for development projects.

Senator McGovern, too, in collaboration with Senators Metcalf, Burdick, and McGee, has urged a regional solution to his area's problems.

And so, too, has Senator Montoya. He must contend with the regional problems of the desert high plateau area where the four corners of Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona come together. His region has not participated in the economic growth which is enjoyed by other sections of the Southwest and of the Nation. The people have been left behind as the people of Appalachia have been left behind—trapped in a mire of economic and social problems.

The land of the four corners region is a dry and rugged land with often breathtaking scenery. It is the land of the painted deserts and deep canyons. It is also a land of unemployment on Indian reservations and unemployment in the towns. When farmed, the lands provides a very meager living.

A good portion of the land in this region is in Apache, Navajo, and other Indian reservations. Though much has been done by the Federal Government, and much has been done by the Indians themselves, the economic problems of our Indian Americans in this region is still staggering. In Apache County, in the northwest corner of Arizona, 70 percent of the population is Indian. It is shocking to note that over 52 percent of the families in this county had incomes in 1959 which were under the poverty level of $3,000. This compares to 21 percent for the entire State, in itself a percentage that is disturbingly high.

Figures on education are equally appalling. Fifty percent of the adult population in Apache County had completed less than 5 years of school in 1960, compared to only 10 percent for the State as a whole.

In New Mexico, 35,000 Indians, over 60 percent of the State's total, live in San Juan and McKinley Counties adjacent to Arizona's Apache County. In McKinley County, which is over half Indian, 37 percent of all families had incomes under $3,000. Over a third of

the total adult population has failed to go beyond the fifth grade of school.

In San Juan County, which has fewer Indians than McKinley, the county was near the State's income and education level. Among its Indian population, however, less than half of the adults had gone beyond fifth grade and the Indian family income was $1,572.

This region might well be considered for immediate action planning.

These are not the only ones which deserve attention. In a recent speech, Senator MUSKIE described the problems of New England. A great expert on Federal-State relations, Senator MUSKIE suggested the vital importance of regional development and interstate cooperation. He emphasized, for his own region, that:

> Citizens of our region have every right to expect—yes, to demand—that public powers and responsibilities be shared to insure that no problems are ignored; that each level of government is equipped to do its part of the job competently; that each problem is dealt with effectively; and that each jurisdiction has enough authority to meet its responsibilities but no more.

Senator MUSKIE has given me much help in connection with the amendment we are now considering, and I wish here and now to publicly thank him for his support, and to suggest that parts of the New England region deserve the attention of the Federal Action Plan Administrator my amendment seeks to establish.

With time, one could describe the detailed problems of many regions of the Nation. But the information is readily available for all to see. Suffice it to point out, as one further example, that another cosponsor of my amendment is Senator FRANK CHURCH. He has made available to me a report, prepared by the ARA, which details some of the problems of his State:

> The Idaho Panhandle area has a diversified economy, but one which is seriously affected by the problem of unemployment and underemployment due to the seasonal nature of its basic industries—lumbering, mining, tourism, and agriculture. The winter months represent the nadir of economic activity and the summer months, the peak.

The ARA study offers much hope for the region—if proper steps are taken to expand and develop recreational activities. But the panhandle is only part of one region—a region which involves the neighboring States of Washington and Montana. Again, I believe this northwestern mountainous area might well meet the criteria for action planning set out in my amendment.

Such are some of the problems of some of the regions of the Nation. I do not claim to be an expert on this question. I do know, however, that my own region and others lag substantially behind the rest of the Nation in economic growth; have an uneven past development which has not permitted self-sustaining growth; have demonstrated that local people and governments are prepared for immediate planning and development; have common problems which make a regional solution feasible.

And because there are regions which meet these criteria—which are the general ones established in the statement of purpose of the Appalachia bill—I believe we should begin to work for them now. My amendment will permit us to do so. And it would authorize a careful review of all relevant information to determine precisely which regions are appropriate and ready for regional treatment.

Perhaps the best way to look at the problem is to recognize that some regions have fallen far behind the Nation as a whole. Others are only now beginning to slip behind. For the first, action now will help pull the regions up. For the second, action now will stop the slide downward and, hopefully reverse it. For both, what is needed is an action plan—a plan which cannot hope to solve all problems, but which can offer hope to begin the solution of many.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], under date of January 22, 1965, by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 22, 1965.

Hon. PAT MCNAMARA,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I know that the Public Works Committee has sought to conclude its consideration of the Appalachian redevelopment bill as soon as possible, and for that reason I have not asked to appear before the committee. I hope, however, that the comments in this letter will receive your careful consideration before the bill is reported to the Senate.

The report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission from which the pending bill was developed is an excellent review of the economic circumstances of the Appalachian region. It is obvious that as an area Appalachia does lag behind the Nation in income, employment, and other indicators of prosperity. The relation between the economic conditions in this region and the national economy is also well documented. The Public Works Committee put it very well in your report on the Appalachian bill last year in saying that "the well-being of the national economy as a whole is dependent on the continued progress of all segments and sectors of the economy."

Credit for the development of the Appalachian program must be given to the Appalachian Governors' conference and to the President's Commission. Only a sustained effort to publicize and analyze the ills of the Appalachian economy could have produced the strong support which exists for the legislation now before your committee. It is unfortunate, however, that the bill now under consideration has been generated as a special relief program for Appalachia rather than in the context of a more comprehensive plan for the development of other sections of the country having similar economic characteristics.

I am particularly concerned with the Ozarks region which includes a substantial portion of Arkansas. We have made substantial progress in recent years in the attraction of new industry and the expansion of old enterprises in my State. Our rate of increase in per capita income is one of the highest in the Nation, and many of our towns and cities are experiencing considerable and healthy growth. But much of the Ozark region continues to suffer from the same deficiences that plague Appalachia—a depreciating tax base, inadequate schools, insufficient public facilities, and a limited road network. Due to the topography of the area, which bears great similarity to the Appalachian chain, subsistence agriculture is no longer feasible in many sections of the Ozarks. Limited water and sewer systems and routes of access have been a deterrent to the development of new industries.

The Federal Government has made a substantial contribution to the region through the construction of a number of Federal reservoirs in north Arkansas and southern Missouri through area development, accelerated public works and other grant-in-aid programs. Through these efforts and the hard work and initiative of local people we are moving ahead. To some extent, however, a maximum return has not been gained on these investments because they have not gone far enough. For example, the potential for tourism in the area which exists because of the great natural beauty of the Ozarks, its impoundments and streams and the very fine people who inhabit the area has not been fully realized because of insufficient highways leading to and through the Ozarks.

It is not my purpose to give the committee a complete résumé of the Ozark region. Its characteristics are familiar to you. I would only point out that its economic problems are in many ways similar to those to be dealt with in the Appalachian regional development bill and that similar attention should be directed to the Ozarks. A gross injustice would be done if a billion-dollar Federal program is voted for Appalachia without equal time for the Ozarks and other areas of the country which do not have a fair share of the Nation's prosperity.

In justification of a special Appalachian program the Appalachian Regional Commission cited the fact that as of 1960 30.7 percent Appalachian families had an annual income of less than $3,000 against 20.5 percent for the balance of the United States. By the same 1960 census the percentage of families in northern Arkansas with incomes of less than $3,000 was substantially greater. The following counties are representative:

	Percent
Stone County	78.0
Newton County	76.7
Fulton County	70.2
Searcy County	69.8
Madison County	68.8
Sharp County	67.7

As you will note from a map of the region these counties constitute the core of northern Arkansas.

The President's Commission also noted the close association between education and economic development. As of 1960 11.6 percent of the persons over 25 years of age in Appalachia had less than a fifth grade education against 8 percent for the balance of the United States. The overall figure for Arkansas was 15.4 percent and for the Ozark mountain counties to which I have referred as follows:

	Percent
Stone County	16.4
Newton County	15.5
Fulton County	12.4
Searcy County	12.3
Madison County	14.5
Sharp County	14.3

It is not my purpose to propose to you immediately an Ozark regional development program. Such an undertaking will require considerable planning and close cooperation between Federal, State, and local officials. It has been determined that the prime need in the Appalachian region is highways, and the bulk of the funds authorized by the legislation which you are considering would be devoted to that purpose. It may be that this is also the principal need in the Ozarks. We will only know when a thorough survey has been completed.

I believe it is incumbent upon the Congress, however, to recognize the needs of other areas while attending to those of the Appalachian region and that this can best be accomplished by the addition of a new title to the Appalachian regional development bill to authorize the planning of additional regional programs, and particularly an Ozarks program. Such an amendment has been introduced by Sentor NELSON. I do not know that it is perfect in every detail, but I believe it offers the basis for discussion and I would be happy to work with you and your committee in devising an addition to the bill which will provide for the proper and orderly planning of further regional development programs.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

Mr. NELSON. There are statistics for the upper Great Lakes region, the Ozarks, and other regions which show that there is a need for regional planning money. But, granted that these three or more other regions in the country did qualify within reasonable standards for planning money and assistance, various Senators have had assurances, including a letter from the Bureau of the Budget and from the leadership. I would like to ask the majority leader if there are at present plans for the provision of regional planning money for other regions in the country with the support of the administration, and whether and how soon such plans would be considered in the Senate.

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

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and in line with the remarks made by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] relative to the letters received by either the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and/or the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], after meeting with those two Senators, of the Public Works Committee, and also the Senator from Wisconsin, on Friday afternoon last I had a visit with the President of the United States in which I raised these questions.

The President informed me that the administration intends, as a part of its proposals to extend and improve the area redevelopment program, to emphasize economic planning on a regional basis. Among the proposals being considered is increased cooperation with State and local governments in planning for economic redevelopment along regional lines.

In our view—this is speaking for the President—the Appalachia bill is not the best legislative vehicle for authorizing regional planning in areas other than Appalachia. Aside from Appalachia, appropriate regional groups vary widely from area to area in terms of population, economic resources, and economic problems—as the Senator from Wisconsin brought out. Moreover, unlike Appalachia, regional boundaries appropriate for economic redevelopment planning may not be the same as those appropriate for water resource planning, which in turn may not be coterminous with boundaries suitable for regional highway planning.

In view of these considerations, it is clear that legislative authorization for regional planning can best be developed in the context of a general program of area redevelopment. As indicated earlier, the administration intends to make such proposals a part of general area redevelopment legislation. The details of this proposal are now being worked out, and I am confident it will provide the most desirable framework in which to consider questions of regional development.

Mr. NELSON. Has the majority leader any idea of how soon such legislation may be before us for consideration?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say that they are working on the legislation at the moment, and have been for the past several days at least, to the best of my knowledge. I would anticipate that it would be before us before too many weeks have passed.

Mr. NELSON. Am I to understand from that statement that if another region, or several regions, in the country should qualify by something roughly approaching the Appalachia standards—that is, slow economic growth and high unemployment—planning money will be available for those regions, and if a reasonable plan is proposed it will receive the support of the administration, as it has supported the Appalachia proposal?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding. That is the reason the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] introduced the bill; and I believe intends to introduce another bill shortly.

Mr. NELSON. I have nothing further.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. NELSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan have been confronted with a similar problem arising from diminished economic activity and growth that have faced us in these States.

We are proud of the progress made in Minnesota in our mining areas as a result of cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments, between both political parties, businesses, unions, and the cooperative movement and involving contributions by private citizens, at great personal sacrifice and with a selflessness that has marked one of the finest pages of the history of our great State.

We have been much aided by our great Governor, Karl Rolvaag, who has been helpful in a host of areas, by the now present Vice President of the United States, by Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY and by Representative BLATNIK, the best Congressman a distressed area has ever had. They have worked together to see that every possible help has been obtained for this area. Industry, the unions, and cooperative movements have worked together to establish a $1 million study to promote the economy of this area. Such men as Mr. Jeno Paulucci, of Duluth, have contributed both time and money to accomplish things which might have been considered impossible. And Mr. Bob Nickoloff, of Hibbing, has done more through his creativity and energy than I have time to describe.

We have received the help of Mr. Vladimir Shipka, the gifted State administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration, who has shown us the best and most effective way to diversify our economy.

We have banded together to adopt a State constitutional amendment relating to taconite, to assure that Minnesota is a desirable State in which to make a huge investment of money in taconite. For this and other reasons, the taconite industry is beginning to move in a most encouraging way.

Our port of Duluth is beginning to boom, which means an increase of business not only for Duluth, but for the entire Midwest.

But despite these facts and despite the fact that northeastern Minnesota has had the best possible educational program and a highly skilled labor force, and despite other activities too numerous to describe here today, we still have economic problems and substantial unemployment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the progress made under the Area Redevelopment Act, as well as a speech made by Mr. Shipka, State Area Redevelopment Act administrator on January 30; and also an address I made to the Hibbing Chamber of Commerce on May 26, 1964, as attorney general of the State of Minnesota, which describes the many efforts made by public and private industry, labor and the cooperative movements, which have contributed to the goal of economic progress and health in northeastern Minnesota.

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

PROGRESS REPORT OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

(The following is a progress report of the Area Redevelopment Administration activities in the State of Minnesota as of December 31, 1964.)

There have been 22 ARA projects approved to date totaling $4,484,571.88. In these projects the Federal ARA has provided $2,913,371, the State ARA $869,114.88, the local ARA agencies $464,345.00, and the applicants have provided $237,741.00. When these ARA projects have been completed and in operation for a year they will provide approximately 670 permanent and full-time jobs.

As of this date there are on file 17 applications in which the Federal ARA is being requested to provide $4,023,748.25, the State ARA $1,330,707.14, the local ARA agencies $920,686.27, and the applicants will provide $373,679.82 totaling $6,648,821.48. If these applications for ARA loans are approved by the State and Federal ARA, they will provide approximately 690 new and permanent job opportunities after a year's operation.

As of August 31, 1964, the Federal ARA has provided $1,408,399.00 for technical assistance for 21 feasibility studies. At present there are five requests for technical assistance funds involving $161,918.00.

Since the inception of the ARA program in Minnesota to the present date there has been a total of 55 ARA projects submitted for requests for funds. Of these submitted

projects, 22 have been approved, 17 are on file and 16 have been denied. Denied projects total $987,118.80.

I hope this information is helpful to you.

VLADIMIR SHIPKA,
Administrator, Minnesota ARA.

ARA projects approved

Project	Total	Federal ARA	State ARA	Local funds	Applicant
Tobiason Bros	85,000.00	55,250.00	17,000.00	8,500.00	4,250.00
H. C. Hill & Sons	455,000.00	292,500.00	90,000.00	45,000.00	27,500.00
Lutsen Ski Corp	245,750.00	149,750.00	51,000.00	40,000.00	5,000.00
Mesabi Cores, Inc	100,000.00	65,000.00	20,000.00	10,000.00	5,000.00
Deerwood Sportswear, Inc	200,000.00	144,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00	16,000.00
Kainz Bros. (1st loan)	144,050.00	93,600.00	20,000.00	15,000.00	15,450.00
Green Forest, Inc	30,310.00	18,000.00	5,000.00	3,310.00	4,000.00
Sturgeon Lake Industries	70,000.00	45,000.00	14,000.00	7,000.00	3,500.00
Minnesota Wild Rice Harvesters Association	45,000.00	29,250.00	9,000.00	4,500.00	2,250.00
Echo Timber Products	80,000.00	52,000.00	16,000.00	8,000.00	4,000.00
Sun Plant Products, Inc	126,474.00	82,000.00	25,000.00	12,800.00	6,674.00
Atscott Manufacturing Corp	105,000.00	68,150.00	21,000.00	10,500.00	5,250.00
Giant's Ridge, Inc	100,000.00	65,000.00	20,000.00	10,000.00	5,000.00
Kainz Bros. (2d loan)	10,000.00	6,500.00	2,000.00	1,000.00	500.00
McGrath Lumber	20,000.00	13,000.00	4,000.00	2,000.00	1,000.00
Hibbing Precision Industries	550,000.00	357,500.00	110,000.00	55,000.00	27,500.00
Carlton Machined Products, Inc	533,663.88	346,450.00	108,263.88	53,300.00	25,650.00
Quadna Mountain Corp	661,148.00	429,757.00	132,216.00	66,117.00	33,058.00
Universal Fiberglass Corp	628,176.00	408,314.00	125,635.00	62,818.00	31,409.00
Taconite Electric Co	135,000.00	87,750.00	27,000.00	13,500.00	6,750.00
Meritt Plastics, Inc	100,000.00	65,000.00	20,000.00	10,000.00	5,000.00
Frank Mochet	60,000.00	39,000.00	12,000.00	6,000.00	3,000.00
Total	4,484,571.88	2,913,371.00	869,114.88	464,345.00	237,741.00

NOTE.—Unallocated balance ARA revolving fund Dec. 31, 1964, $1,209,060.60.

ARA project proposals

Project	Total	Federal ARA	State ARA	Local funds	Applicant
Arrowhead Briquette	287,000.00	182,000.00	60,000.00	30,000.00	15,000.00
American Power Control	245,000.00	159,250.00	49,000.00	24,500.00	12,250.00
International Tool & Engineering Corp	46,313.11	30,104.17	9,262.82	4,631.41	2,314.71
Pal-O-Fab, Inc	97,700.00	63,505.00	19,540.00	9,770.00	4,885.00
Northern National Peat Co	154,414.78	91,000.00	28,000.00	16,000.00	19,414.78
Sun Plant Products, Inc	457,000.00	297,050.00	91,400.00	45,700.00	22,850.00
Grasston Pelleting, Inc	366,020.00	237,913.00	73,204.00	36,602.00	18,301.00
Sarvie Tool	138,500.00	90,025.00	27,700.00	13,850.00	6,925.00
Rigid Insulation Co	536,700.00	345,705.00	109,140.00	54,570.00	27,285.00
Organic Fertilizer Corp	543,000.00	325,800.00	108,600.00	54,300.00	54,300.00
Lawrence Beier	45,000.00	29,250.00	9,000.00	4,500.00	2,250.00
Burns Manufacturing	2,358,978.00	1,415,386.00	471,797.00	353,846.00	117,949.00
Sawtooth Mountain Recreation Area	697,477.00	348,744.00	139,114.00	174,746.00	34,873.00
Industrial rubber applicators	217,249.20	141,211.98	43,449.84	21,724.92	10,862.46
Penco Truckstop, Inc	170,469.39	110,090.10	33,973.88	16,938.94	9,466.47
Hunter Como Recreation Area	202,000.00	100,814.00	40,325.60	50,407.00	10,453.40
Total	6,562,821.48	3,967,848.25	1,313,507.14	912,086.27	369,379.82

MINNESOTA'S TASK FORCE FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY

(Address to Hibbing Chamber of Commerce by Attorney General Walter F. Mondale, May 26, 1964)

I am happy to be able to discuss with you today some of the facts, problems, and opportunities involved in our common objective of a healthy, expanding, economy for northeastern Minnesota. Since the Iron Range economic downturn which began in the late 1950's, this chamber has distinguished itself as a forum for the discussion of reasonable, progressive ideas for solving our economic problems. I suspect that a compendium of the papers delivered to this body would provide one with the most complete treatment of the subject available in any one place. The activities of the Hibbing Chamber of Commerce, and of Helmer Olson, your active, energetic, and effective secretary, stand as a classic example of what a chamber should do.

I had originally hoped to touch on all the elements which affect the economic revival of this area, but find that such a discussion would exceed the time available to me, exhaust you, and is—in fact—beyond the total comprehension of any one person. When trying to study a problem as complex and interdependent as a functioning free enterprise economy, the best one can do is to try to break the problem into manageable, understandable segments of critical importance and try to deal with them as best you can.

As we all know, the root of our current economic problems is the iron mining industry, where total employment has dropped from a peak of 18,900 in 1957 to 11,200 in 1963, in the face of a steadily increasing population. The resulting human tragedy, skyrocketing welfare costs, rising unemployment insurance costs, the shock to small business all across the range, the out-migration of some of our brightest and most talented young people and older citizens, and the other heartrending results of this economic catastrophe are too well known to all of you to need recounting from me.

Some people argued that nothing could be done, that economic forces must be left to run their pitiless course, even if it meant reducing a prosperous, vital segment of Minnesota to a series of ghost towns. Fortunately, most of us would not surrender because of our firm belief that what men have done, men can change, and because of our limitless faith in the magnificent resources and people of this great area. Our people are as efficient a labor force as exists anywhere in the Nation, the sons and daughters of a people who for generations have believed in and supported the Nation's finest school system. In a time of increasing technological change, we knew and appreciated the value of a skilled, intelligent, people in achieving economic expansion.

We knew that taconite, developed in Minnesota, was revolutionizing the steel industry, and existed in bountiful quantity right here in this State.

We knew that northeastern Minnesota has outstanding recreational features, that the Duluth port, at the head of a 2,400-mile inland waterway, holds great promise for the future as a funnel for the commerce of an 11-State economy, and many other resources and opportunities are known to exist here in this world-famous area.

I predict on this, that those who have faith in the future of northeastern Minnesota will prove correct. I shall go further and predict that within a few short years the economy of this area will be more vibrant and more healthy than at any time in its long and glorious history. What some people saw as the death pangs of this region will soon be interpreted as growing pains.

* * * * *

The worst of the economic dislocations of northeastern Minnesota are over. While serious problems remain, this area is on the move, and the trend is decidedly upward.

Why do I make this prediction? Let us begin with taconite. Last Thursday evening in Virginia, Dr. Richard Klemme, a top economist for the Northern Natural Gas Co., predicted that taconite production in Minnesota will increase fourfold in the next 11 years.

According to the president of the Hanna Mining Co., W. A. Marting, as quoted in the New York Times of November 24, 1963: "It would not be an overstatement to say that there is still a shortage of the most desirable kind of iron ore, that is, high-grade pellets."

On June 3, at Forbes, ground will be broken for the Ford-Oglebay-Norton plant, with an annual capacity of approximately 1½ million tons, and a projected employment of 500 year-round employees. On the State land exchange commission we are currently processing an application by the M. A. Hanna Co. for a proposed magnetic and semi-magnetic taconite plant in the Nashwauk-Keewatin area which they hope will go forward in the next few years. We are all aware that United States Steel will build a new taconite plant near Mountain Iron with at least 4½ million tons annual capacity and an employment of 1,200, if the taconite amendment is adopted. It is to be noted that United States Steel, in its announcement, pointed out that the plans for this facility are such as to allow rapid expansion, should the need occur, and I am sanguine that it will occur.

We are also aware of strong interest by Jones & Laughlin in a possible taconite plant near Biwabik, and we recently dedicated the opening by Erie Mining Co. of an attractive and potentially prosperous new ore body in the Dunka River area which will make Erie's operations more profitable and more economically feasible in the event increased output is demanded. So confident am I in the sustained prosperity of this great Nation, that I am certain such increased output can be, and will be, demanded.

I have reason to hope for expansion of both Erie and Reserve within the reasonably near future.

The well-paying jobs created by the taconite industry will be year-round jobs, many—if not most—of which will be located in or near existing population centers, near the heart of the iron range, giving rise to strong reason to believe that not only will dislocation of existing population, and hence existing businesses, be stopped, but that new service industries, notably in rod-and-ball and magnesium cover manufacture, will spring up as satellites of the new plants.

At this juncture, I would like to mention the importance of the taconite amendment to this picture of prosperity. * * * The present amendment, represents to me a good faith compromise in the best tradition of democracy. It pledges only our generation—not the next—for a period of 25 years, not to raise occupation and royalty taxes in an amount greater than the increases imposed upon general business corporations in the State. The production tax is specifically excluded and may be increased to provide for increased local and general government costs, in the discretion of the legislature. Just as importantly, the United States Steel Corp. has pledged it will return this expression of good faith by the immediate construction of its plant—breaking the log-

jam on the expansion of taconite in Minnesota.

In supporting this amendment, I am joined by both our Senators, Congressman BLATNIK, Governor Rolvaag, Lieutenant Governor Keith, and by many other leaders, and by resolution of my political party in its last convention. It is of crucial importance to the people of the entire State that this amendment be adopted next November.

In addition to supporting the amendment, the Governor's task force, believe we have aided taconite development in a substantial manner by accelerating land exchanges and water permits, expediting State mineral leases, and by other equally important means.

Having described the critical importance of taconite to the future of this area, I would like just as forcibly to express my view that taconite alone does not, will not, and cannot solve our problems. If we mistakenly think so, we will not only be proven wrong by the facts, but will miss our opportunity to create the balanced, diversified type of economy so essential to the long-range prosperity of any area.

Much of our present problems stem from a sometimes blind reliance upon, and confidence in, a one-product economy—a type of economy which has demonstrably failed to produce true, lasting prosperity in any area of the world where it might exist. It is just as short-sighted, just as foolish, for northeastern Minnesota to rely on taconite to solve all its economic problems as it was—and is—for the citizens of Brazil to rely on coffee. As the saying goes, "there's an awful lot of coffee in Brazil," but it doesn't go on to show how violent fluctuations in the supply and demand for its one product has subjected Brazil to damaging inflations and deflations which have made continuous prosperity impossible.

The need for diversification was recently pointed out in an editorial of May 14, 1964, in the Minneapolis Star. In citing the opinion held by many that passage of the taconite amendment will solve the problems of northeastern Minnesota, the editorial states:

This is, we feel, an overly optimistic viewpoint of what the amendment will accomplish—a viewpoint that could lead to some disillusionment and dissatisfaction later. Let's not oversell the amendment.

Locally in northeastern Minnesota, the taconite industry will create thousands of jobs that will help make up for those lost through the decline of natural ores. But this doesn't mean that every miner thrown out of work when the natural ore mines shut down will have the skills needed for work in a toconite plant.

Northeastern Minnesota needs taconite. But it also needs further development of recreation, manufacturing and wood products industries for a well-rounded economy.

Even if taconite production reaches 50 million tons by 1975, and assuming that 300 new jobs are created for each million tons produced, this will still provide only about 15,000 iron mining jobs—less than in the peak year of 1957. Thus any predictions which are optimistic about the future of this area—as are my own—rest upon the premise that diversification and balancing of the economy of this area will occur.

In a small southern town, I am told, there is a large statue of a cotton boll weevil, erected by the citizens out of gratitude to this insignificant but dangerous insect. The statue was erected, the story goes, because the boll weevil, by destroying the cotton crop, impressed upon the citizens as nothing else could, the value of diversification. Farmers changed to other crops, industries were brought in, and the resulting prosperity was greater than could ever have been achieved by a reliance on cotton.

If we do as we must, we will look back upon these years of trial as the Iron Range's boll weevil. We will be able to look back and say that, hard as times were, they at least shocked us into the economic reappraisal we so desperately needed, in time for something to be done about it.

We realize the need for this diversification. At the same time we realize that if it is to be sound, if it is to be successful, it must be the product of free enterprise, and of the character and efforts of the local people. Government can provide only the favorable conditions and the necessary pump priming and initial assistance necessary to get the process moving.

And government has been active. Senators HUMPHREY and MCCARTHY have sponsored legislation to help local industry, as Congressman BLATNIK. Our Governor, Karl Rolvaag, sent the first special message on northeastern Minnesota in history to the 1963 session of the legislature, with many carefully thought-out and specific proposals for assisting the people of this great area. By executive order he has created the task force for economic recovery, whose primary task has been to propose and execute programs for the economic improvement of this area. In addition, the Governor created a committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Charles Mayo to urge passage of the taconite amendment, and finally, he has backed and assisted the task force in all its efforts.

It has been the specific task of the task force to bring for the first time, a true, centralized coordination into the many, and sometimes confusing, government programs of assisting so-called distressed areas.

As our work started, we were impressed by what has been said, and sometimes done, both in and out of government, to solve the economic problems of this area. But we also found that, although the Iron Range is probably the most studied, most discussed piece of real estate in the Nation, we still lacked much basic information which was vitally necessary to any thoughtful program of diversification and revivification. We found that while many communities had programs for economic development underway, there was no overall regional program to harness the forces of free enterprise and coordinate information about the richness of the whole area. In a word, we knew entirely too little about too much, and we soon decided we had to take a regional, overall view if we were to do a good job.

To this end, we sent Bob Nickoloff, of Hibbing, to three areas of the United States where it appeared a good job had been done in regenerating formerly distressed areas—one in New England, one in Virginia, and one in upper Mississippi. We found that these areas had organized regional development corporations, hired top experts in economic development, and successfully promoted their areas. As an example, the upper Mississippi Development Council had developed industries hiring some 40,000 new employees in the 15 years of its existence.

It was accordingly determined that such a regional development corporation was needed here to achieve two specific aims:

1. to undertake a specific, detailed inventory of the economic resources of the whole region, and

2. to approach economic development from a logical, areawide approach, where economic, rather than political, boundaries would be put under primary consideration. Such an undertaking, as we all know, costs money.

Last Friday, May 22, it was announced in Hibbing that the NEMDA corporation had been formally organized and funded by at least $1 million of voluntary contributions, to be spent over the next 5 years.

I speak on this point at some length because I fear some may miss the significance of this organization. This is a most impressive example of genuine labor-management cooperation, of submerging of partisan and political differences, in the interests of the common good. Importantly also, it is not another governmental study, but a private group, stimulated by the action of government but not controlled by it, whose members will not be mere passive recipients of information, but members of the community who are powerful enough to put such information to immediate, constructive, practical use.

The corporation is now seeking top-flight economic development talent to head up a similarly top-flight program for this entire region. Its purpose will be to amass the specific facts business must know to locate in the community, and to promote the six counties which make up the northeastern Minnesota economic unit. This group hopefully will provide us what we have always lacked—a sophisticated, organized, and adequately financed promotional agent for the entire area.

In the governmental half of the task force's coordinated program, we have been achieving significant successes in diversifying and expanding the northeastern Minnesota economy. A great deal of credit for these achievements must go to Congressman BLATNIK, whose wholehearted cooperation and effort has been instrumental in the growth of the ARA program.

Minnesota is one of the two States in the Union to have a State ARA agency to assist the Federal authorities. I am happy and proud of having been a part of the effort which brought this about in the 1961 session. I am also happy that Mr. Vladimir Shipka, our State coordinator, has proved to be such a competent and dedicated executive.

The Federal ARA, in cooperation with the State, will lend up to 85 percent of the cost of land, plant, and equipment for new or expanded plants in so-called distressed areas. The Federal money is loaned at slightly over 4 percent, the State money, up to 20 percent of the cost of the projects, costs 3 percent.

From July 1961 to April 1964, some 14 projects have received assistance totaling an investment of $2.9 million. These projects, when in full swing, will employ approximately 444 people. There are currently under consideration another 12 applications which appear to be sound and will, if built, provide another 500 jobs. A prominent financial journal has estimated that for every 100 jobs created in basic manufacturing, another 65 are created in service-related industries, ranging all the way from banks through grocery stores.

Also, the ARA industries are diversified. The Hibbing Precision Industries Co. is one example, and there are also six wood products companies, three machine tool manufacturers, two agricultural products firms, two ski complexes, and a fiberglass manufacturer who have received ARA assistance.

The value of diversification is indicated by the kind of economic activity it generates right within the area of the diversified industries. For example, the Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation Commission recently helped purchase equipment for the Minnesota Prosthetics & Orthopedics Co. plant in Virginia. This plant will use cured aspen which, fortunately, is produced by the Kainz Brothers ARA timber plant in Ely. Once in production, the prosthetics plant may require precision equipment which could be ordered from Hibbing Precision, and so on.

In addition to its loan programs, ARA also provides technical studies. Fourteen have so far been approved in Minnesota, involving an investment of $1 million. These studies involve mining, production, and marketing of remaining natural ores, briquetting, transportation rates, the tourist industry, and the timber industry.

For instance, the present cost of transportation is of fundamental importance to northeastern Minnesota. Many firms in this

area now producing primarily for local consumption could compete effectively on national markets if freight rates were lower. There will shortly be released a study of our transportation system by a recognized specialist which will show the way to reducing these costs. This study will hopefully be followed by ARA-financed action program to assist local industries in implementing the report in their own businesses. We must look upon transportation as a resource and an important cost factor deserving of study and consideration as an independent factor in the economic equation. This report will be the first step in this long-overdue effort.

We have also been extremely interested, in the Task Force, in the port of Duluth, a natural advantage which is generally overlooked but is of immense long-range importance to this entire area. The port started out slowly in 1959, but it is now in the black and beginning to boom. New records are being established daily. Last season alone 25 new commodities moved through the port for the first time.

A tank farm for fats and oils was doubled in capacity last year and it is already booked for the season. Last year the port produced approximately $13 million in wages and services for Duluth and the area. As tempo picks up, the frequency and reliability of shipping service naturally follows hand in hand. Within a few years, I predict, the port will be seen to be one of the key assets, not just of Duluth, but again of the whole economic region. We have helped on the task force in several concrete ways—obtaining funds for promotion, challenging discriminatory freight practices, challenging water diversion by Chicago and other lake communities which affect water levels and hence shipping capacities, intervening with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other officers to obtain increased use of the port for Government shipping and storage.

We have spoken of shipping and transportation as important cost factors. Another such important factor is fuel, which brings up another activity of the task force. Northern Natural Gas Co. has applied to the Federal Power Commission for authority to build a gas pipeline through the heart of the Iron Range, from Grand Rapids on the west to Hoyt Lake on the east. I will intervene soon before the Federal Power Commission to expedite this application on behalf of the State of Minnesota, and if construction can begin in the fall of 1965, as we hope, it will involve an investment alone of $10 million, not considering the tremendous fuel advantages the pipeline will bring to this area. For not only will natural gas in itself be a cheaper source of fuel, it will bring in a hitherto not present element of competition which should help reduce costs of other fuels both to industry and to the consumer.

I see my time is running short. I wish I could discuss some of the other exciting developments we hope to achieve by a new spirit of genuine and constructive partnership between business and government, and between management and labor. For example, our work with defense and Government contracts generally, to stimulate contracts such as those which employ 800 people at Duluth and 50 at Hibbing in plants of the Duluth Avionics Co.

Last December, for instance, the task force sponsored the Minnesota Industrial Procurement Conference in Duluth, which was well attended and opened up many new channels of Government business for northeastern Minnesota businessmen. You know, it is mighty confusing to do business with an organization as big and as complex as our Federal Government. Conferences such as this are invaluable in achieving the sort of man-to-man rapport you need to do business with anyone, and as a direct means of disseminating concrete, how-to-do-it information to businessmen who have not previously done Government business.

I had also hoped to discuss our work with respect to the tourist industry and the timber industry, where we are attempting to stimulate training programs for tourist trade employees and were successful in obtaining the preliminary approval of $235,000 appropriations for a forest products marketing laboratory at UMD.

We also do not have time to discuss the accelerated public works program, which has brought $22.7 million in urgently needed public improvements into northeastern Minnesota, and produced 22,584 man-hours of work in the process. Nor is there time to discuss the progress which is being made in airport construction, conservation, the natural resources program Governor Rolvaag first advocated before this chamber in 1962, nor the acceleration we have been able to achieve in acquiring right-of-way for the area's Interstate Highway System, nor the progress of manpower retraining, or the other important programs we have initiated, worked with, or coordinated in focusing all possible attention on northeastern Minnesota.

Any program is people, both in and out of government. We all know that. On the private side we have such splendid examples of successful contributions to prosperity as those of this chamber, and of the Hibbing Development Corp., which is so justly famous. We have such individuals as Jeno Paulucci, who has given so much of his heart and his pocketbook to the struggle for an improved economy for this area. It would require another full speech to recount the many contributions he has made to this area. I single Jeno out because I think he typifies the spirit of dedication of hundreds of men of this area, to whom a problem is merely a challenge, and failure is just a word.

And on the Government side we have just the same kind of dedicated people, all committed to finding practical, concrete ways to assist the people of this area in achieving their destiny of prosperity and happiness.

Talking about people, I note that Governor Rolvaag asked the task force to recommend to him proposals for State legislation to aid in our total effort. I am pleased to announce that your own representative Jack Fena has agreed to assume the heavy burden of consulting with the people throughout this entire area to develop preliminary proposals. I don't wish to overwork him, but if any of you have ideas along this line, I strongly urge that you communicate them to Jack.

In closing, I would like to leave with you a summary of our attitudes in Government and what we hope to achieve in northeastern Minnesota. Our fundamental belief is that the public good is best served when all elements of the community are permitted and encouraged to bring their efforts to bear on the solution of common problems. This means, on the Government side, a coordination of programs and a deliberate and continuous effort to make the road to prosperity both clear and easy, and a conscious effort to remove roadblocks to progress, while at the same time keeping the public interest uppermost.

It means the creation of a genuine spirit of partnership, a genuine devotion to programs which, as ARA best exemplifies, truly involve a cooperation, a partnership between business and government with each doing what it knows best how to do.

On the private side, we hope to see increased realization that northeastern Minnesota is not a coalition of separate and possibly hostile regional economies, but an economic unit, a definite region, with problems which cannot be solved by fragmented, uncoordinated local efforts. We hope also to see increased realization that diversification is the only long-range hope for this area, and we hope that we will never again be lulled into the false security of a one-product economy, however prosperous in the short run.

The most exciting thing which distinguished a free people from a slave, a buoyant economy from a totalitarian, is the ability of free men to work together toward the solution of common problems. The present effort in northeastern Minnesota should show, and I firmly believe does show, the type of enlightened cooperation which realizes with Ben Franklin that we must all hang together or we'll all hang separately, and which, if continued, will result in a prosperity hitherto undreamed of both in northeastern Minnesota and in the State as a whole.

Thank all of you—ask for help. We are on the move—let's keep going.

Area Redevelopment in the State of Minnesota

(By Vladimir Shipka, State ARA Administrator, Department of Business Development, St. Paul, Minn.)

The problem of dislocation and displacement of people as a result of changing attitudes and economies is as old as history. Even during times of prosperity such as we have in the Nation today there are always geographical areas whose economies lag behind and where conditions of excessive unemployment and low income persist. These areas represent an intolerable condition of human suffering and eroded self-respect as well as a national waste of potential wealth creation. The acute lack of jobs in these areas is not the fault of the people who live in these areas. Northern Minnesota is one of these areas and is basically no different from the 50 or so other labor surplus areas of the Nation which suffer this continued and persistent unemployment while other areas of the Nation have a relatively continued high rate of prosperity.

All of these areas throughout the Nation with high unemployment are areas in which they are basically dependent upon one industry and the employment has declined and may continue to decline because of the following reasons:

1. The natural resource has been depleted or there has been a technological change in the mining of iron ore, timber, coal, copper, and other natural resource extracting industries in the Nation.

2. Automation of the industry, as in railroading, mining, forestry, and agriculture.

3. Changing consumer buying habits such as in the metal, communications, textile, and food processing industries.

All geographical areas that are subject to these factors will continue to face these problems and possibly at a more dramatic and sudden accelerated rate of change in their economy. All we have to do is look about us and see what tremendous changes are occurring in consumer buying habits, changing production techniques, etc., which dislocate and displace workers in these one industry areas of the Nation. Northern Minnesota, even though it may at the moment have a sudden spurt in its economy because of technological changes that are going on in its basic industry of mining, may again find its economy sagging because of the uncontrolled changes that I have mentioned in that industry.

Therefore, northern Minnesota must never again completely have its economy based exclusively on the extracting and exploiting of its natural resources such as mining, forestry, and agriculture where the basic raw material is exported from that area and manufactured or processed elsewhere. With continued exporting of its natural resources the State must—

1. Establish industries within that area to process or manufacture as much of that natural resource as possible;

2. Develop satellite industries providing the basic industries within the area with services and/or materials; and

3. Development of industries that utilize the talents of the people within the area in the new emerging science oriented industries.

We in Minnesota are fortunate that the 1961 legislature recognized the need of diversification of industry and of creating new job opportunities in the labor surplus areas of northern Minnesota by passing legislation establishing an Area Redevelopment Administration to take advantage of the Federal ARA program. As a result of this legislation, Minnesota is considered more successful than either of our neighboring States or other States throughout the Nation in establishing new industries within the northern part of the State. The ARA law has given Minnesota firms and communities advantages that other States do not provide. These advantages are:

1. An ARA agency within the Department of Business Development which deals directly with labor surplus areas and provides for coordination of efforts between Federal and local ARA agencies in seeking firms to take advantage of ARA loan funds.

2. The appropriation establishing an ARA revolving fund of $2,250,000 to participate with Federal and local ARA loans.

In no other State with the exception of Pennsylvania, does the State contribute loan funds to an ARA project. This has greatly helped local communities in establishing new industries because in the remaining States where there are no State loan funds the local community must provide the entire local participation with Federal ARA funds.

The State has made modest gains toward the goal of diversification of industry in northern Minnesota. Our State executive council has approved 22 loans amounting to $869,114.88 to industries either expanding or locating in northern Minnesota.

The Federal Government has provided $2,913,371, with local and private funds amounting to $702,086. These industries are broken down in the following categories: Two agricultural products industries, three industrial machined parts industries, eight forestry products industries, two satellite taconite service industries, four recreation type industries, two plastic and fiberglass industries, and one textile industry. These industries, when in full operation, will employ approximately 670 people, plus substantial indirect job opportunities.

In addition to these approved loans there are presently 17 loan applications requesting $1,330,707.14 in State funds to establish industrial plants in that northern area. The Minnesota ARA revolving fund at present has approximately $1,200,000 in unallocated funds to match local, private, and Federal funds for new industries in northern Minnesota.

The modest progress indicates that we are making gains toward diversification of industry in northern Minnesota. The goal to provide a healthy economy in northern Minnesota must be a continuing one and this administration will continue to work toward the achievement of this goal. The importance of better understanding the problems of the area and to determine the feasibility of industries which might be located in the area we have, by coordinating our efforts with the various Federal agencies, requested and received technical assistance funds for 21 projects involving $1,408,399 Federal and private funds for research studies in the following areas: 10 mineral feasibility studies, 2 forest products, 1 plastic and chemical industry study, 1 peat feasibility study, 1 transportation study, 1 commercial fishing industry study, 1 wild rice processing study, 1 paper mill, and 2 recreation feasibility studies.

One of the most important studies is the study of transportation in northern Minnesota. This study by Federal ARA technical assistance is conducting studies in many areas of transportation. An example of this is a joint study of package freight on the Great Lakes between the State ARA and W. B. Saunders & Co. This package freight study is for the purpose of determining whether or not a package freight industry could be again revitalized to aid the economy of northern Minnesota. This study will contact and interview firms throughout the Great Lakes area who presently ship their products by means other than Great Lakes package freight. Based on preliminary studies package freight can be shipped more cheaply via the Great Lakes than by other present means of transportation.

I have given you a list of some of the projects and some of the accomplishments under the Federal and State ARA program. We have made a small beginning and it is my opinion that because areas of chronic and persistent unemployment will be a continuing one we must recognize the fact that area redevelopment if properly administered can provide the tools to bring new economic activity to areas such as northern Minnesota. I might add that because of the dramatic changes that go on in our economy, places other than northern Minnesota who are presently enjoying a high level of prosperity may suddenly find themselves with high unemployment and may then be in need of such a program as area redevelopment.

ARA is a comparatively new program only 3 years old and it is important that such a new program as ARA be reviewed and strengthened where experience indicates that there are opportunities to improve it. The ARA program as I indicated is to generate new job opportunities in areas suffering from chronic unemployment and underemployment. It is a vital beachhead in the war against poverty and the essential underpinning of special regional programs.

As administrator of the State ARA program it has been our experience that there are some changes that should be made in both the Federal and State ARA laws. This is a New Frontier program and it has had some problems and has not worked as effectively as administrators such as myself believe that it can.

I would recommend certain administrative changes and amendments to the laws in the following ways:

SUGGESTED ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 87-27

I. Administrative procedure

(A) Processing, approval or disapproval of the ARA project applications done at the ARA and SBA offices rather than ARA offices in Washington for loans which do not exceed a total of $300,000.

Reasons

1. One of the greatest criticisms of the ARA program is the long delay in approving or disapproving of project proposal applications.

2. In many cases the regional office staff has firsthand knowledge and information as to the project including the applicants, the product, the market, etc., and therefore, a decision could be made on the application much more quickly.

3. The applicant is placed at a great disadvantage because of distance in providing the additional information that is requested by the loan processors of the application. As a result there is a great deal of time lost in transmitting to the Washington office the required additional information.

(B) Recreational project proposals: (1) Rescind the order that provides a lower percentage of participation by the Federal ARA on recreational project proposals and allow the Federal ARA to participate up to 65 percent of the cost on recreational projects that provide year-around recreational activity.

Reasons

1. Based on our experience in Minnesota the approved year-around recreational projects are a great stimulus to the economy and are generating many new indirect job opportunities and will prove to be some of our most successful projects.

(C) Greater emphasis and recognition to indirect employment in the processing of an ARA project.

1. ARA approved projects in Minnesota in many cases have provided more indirect job opportunities than direct opportunities.

II. Loans and participation

(A) Local 10-percent equity:

1. Local participating loans should not be placed in an equity position and repayable after the Federal and other financial institutions such as banks are repaid in full. Local 10-percent participation should be paid on a concurrent basis with other Federal and financial institutions.

2. Allow applicants to participate in the local 10 percent in an amount not to exceed 25 percent of the local 10-percent participation.

(a) Alternative: Allow applicant to participate up to 10 percent of the cost of the project and thereby reduce local participation to 5 percent of the total project where hardship is demonstrated by the local redevelopment agency.

Reasons

1. Allowing the local 10-percent participation to be paid off concurrently with the Federal and private institution funds will provide immediate and continued seed capital for future ARA projects within the local development area.

2(a) Because of the difficulty local ARA agencies have in raising the 10 percent local equity some applicants are desirous in placing additional funds in the project where local agencies are not able to raise the funds within the area.

III. Redevelopment areas

(A) Redefine local development areas from a definition based on political subdivisions to a regional economic development area.

Reasons

1. Local development areas defined on a political subdivision basis do not:

(a) Provide for sound planning because the boundaries in many cases have been established on an artificial basis rather than on an economic or trade area basis. (Counties are excellent examples. Many of their boundaries have been established by using lakes, rivers, old logging trails or section lines as boundary lines.)

(b) Provide for broader source of funds for local participation in projects.

(c) Provide for greater selection of talent to serve on the regional economic development agency.

(d) Prevent the duplication of project proposals which presently come from the small local development agencies within the trade area.

(e) Prevent future competition between the small local ARA agencies who sponsor similar project proposals especially in the natural resources and recreational industries.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT 1965 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Proposal I

A legislative act amending the present ARA act to authorize the participation of Area Redevelopment Administration revolving funds with Small Business Administration loan funds as provided for in title 4 of the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964. These loans would be long term to small business such as the tourist industry in the

area redevelopment counties of the State of Minnesota.

Reason

Both of these acts would have the effect of providing additional financing to the tourist and resort industry. It is a well-established fact that the present resorts in the State of Minnesota are badly in need of updating and expansions in order to meet the ever-increasing number of vacationers in the Nation. With greater leisure time the number of people seeking vacations will increase and with these additional methods of financing the resorters will have greater opportunities to obtain the necessary financing for the needed expansion and development of their facilities. Presently both private lending institutions and the Small Business Administration in many cases cannot provide loans to resorts because of the limited income the resorters have for the repayment of these loans.

Under these proposals longer term financing could be arranged so that the amortization period is longer and therefore the loans would be made more attractive to the tourist and resort industry.

Proposal II

An amendment to the State ARA Act granting authority to political subdivisions who have established local ARA agencies permissive legislation to reimburse local ARA agency members payment of certain expenses to members of that agency.

Reason

The purpose of this act is to provide certain expenses to members of the agency in the processing of applications and necessary meetings and travel incurred in carrying out the responsibilities as ARA agency members.

Proposal III

The following proposal also provides a method by which ARA agency members can be reimbursed.

An amendment to the State ARA Act granting authority to local agencies to charge the applicant for ARA funds a fee for the processing of ARA loans based on a percentage of the loan or on a flat fee basis.

(NOTE (administrative change).—Allow State ARA revolving funds to be used for capital loans up to 10 percent of the cost of the proposed project with local development corporation and Small Business Administration 502 loan funds.)

Reason

The purpose of this administrative change is to aid local development corporations in meeting their portion of the SBA 502 loan requirements. Under the existing 502 loan program local development corporations can receive up to 80 percent from the SBA for a proposed industry in their community. The requirements on the part of the local development corporation are that they must provide 20 percent of the cost of the project. Therefore by providing ARA revolving funds to local development corporations up to 10 percent of the project it would greatly aid the development of new industries desiring to take advantage of SBA 502 loan funds.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, despite all this, however, I must report that in January of 1964, in Itasca County, in the western part of the Mesabi Iron Range, there was an unemployment rate of 23.8 percent; in St. Louis County in the heart of the Mesabi Range, it was 15.2 percent, and in Lake County the unemployment rate was 15.9 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a tabulation of unemployment statistics for January 1959, 1963, and 1964.

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

Work force of unemployed and employed by counties, excluding Duluth, for January 1959, 1963, and 1964

	January 1959	January 1963	January 1964
Itasca County:			
Total labor force	13,300	11,800	12,600
Total unemployed	2,900	3,300	3,000
Unemployment rate (percent)	20.3	28.1	23.8
St. Louis County (excluding Duluth):			
Total labor force	40,400	37,900	36,300
Total unemployed	5,100	7,800	5,500
Unemployment rate (percent)	9.5	20.6	15.2
Lake County:			
Total labor force	5,935	4,982	4,261
Total unemployed	658	654	679
Unemployment rate (percent)	11.1	13.1	15.9

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I could cite many other figures to show that persistent unemployment is still with us.

Although the unemployment figures improved during the summer, it is still the case that the seasonal character of much of our work and the unemployment problems persist and remain.

Despite the vast potential of our greatly gifted people, our resources, water, taconite, timber, minerals, and other resources, we still have a great need to diversify, and a compelling need for a regional approach which will help us—somewhat in the fashion of Appalachia—to do a better job than we can do by ourselves. We will continue to make progress—and we will achieve our goals—but this type of aid would be most helpful.

We would like to have a Federal development road stretching from the Vermilion Range in northeastern Minnesota through the great Mesabi and down through the Cuyuna Range. We would like to have assistance in filling the ugly and now abandoned huge, open pit mines, some of which have lost any conceivable economic usability. If they were filled we could use these areas for housing, businesses, industrial parks, or for any number of other purposes—and a serious eyesore would have been removed.

We would like to have technical help in improving the development of our timber industry in terms of both timber processing and marketing. We could use additional help in water resource planning and also in conservation planning. We could use additional help in vocational training, so that we can train our men to occupy the industrial positions which we have created and hopefully will create through ARA, SBA, and other programs, public and private.

I was pleased to hear that the administration will support programs for a regional approach to the upper Great Lakes. The original idea, I believe, for an Upper Great Lakes Development Agency came during a conference held with Mr. Jeno Paulucci and others in northeastern Minnesota. We proposed to the then Kennedy administration that there be created such a regional development organization.

The late, great President Kennedy, in a speech on September 25, 1963, to the Duluth Land and Peoples Conference, proposed and pledged the creation of such a development for the upper Great Lakes.

I am pleased to support and be a sponsor of the Appalachian regional development bill, but I believe it must be understood that many of its provisions which would help Appalachia would also be most helpful to us, even though the basic nature of the problem is different in many respects.

REJECT FEDERAL GRANTS FOR CATTLE IN APPALACHIA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, previously in this debate it has been argued that those of us from the Middle West should not object, because this proposal is tailored after the model of the Great Plains conservation program. That statement is partly true, Mr. President, but only partly. There are significant differences.

In the first place, all we have attempted to do in the Middle West is to stabilize our livestock economy and prevent further deterioration of the soil. We have not tried to use Government money to build up additional beef cattle productivity. In Appalachia, by contrast, the effort is to create new productive capacity, by bringing new land into use. It is certain that such lands would be used for livestock. There is no other use to which improved pasturelands can be put.

Moreover, it is contemplated by the sponsors and advocates of the bill that this use be made of it. Page 12 of the Senate report reads:

> It [sec. 203] offers no special provisions for assisting livestock operations in Appalachia. The committee assumes that after the land is restored and revegetated, the operation of free markets factors, in conjunction with already established Federal programs, will supply this need.

More important, this bill definitely contemplates a Federal contribution of 80 percent. I realize it has been pointed out that the statute governing the Great Plains conservation program does not specify the percentage which would be paid by the Federal Government, and it has been argued that theoretically the Federal contribution in this case, also, might be as much as 80 percent or more. That is pure theory, however. The fact is that the Great Plains program for the most part proceeds on the basis of a Federal contribution of 50 percent, with the landowner paying a full one-half of the cost of the improvement. In a relatively few cases, the Federal contribution has been as high as 60 percent. In recent years, so far as I have been able to determine, the Federal Government in no case has approved a Federal contribution in excess of 60 percent.

In this Appalachia bill, however, the whole spirit of the various programs—not just the program of agriculture improvement, but the other programs as well—seems to be in terms of a Federal contribution of 70 or 80 percent in most cases. The highway grants contemplate a Federal contribution of as much as 70 percent. The health facilities under section 202 provide for 80 percent grants.

Section 203, the agriculture assistance permits 80-percent grants, and so on.

Now to return to the program for pasture improvement as originally discussed in the hearings held last year. Both Secretary Freeman and Assistant Secretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., spoke last year of bringing 9½ million acres into productive use in Appalachia through this program.

This year, speaking for the administration, Mr. John L. Sweeney, Chairman of the Federal Development Planning Committee for Appalachia, used the figure of 8.6 million acres amount of land requiring erosion control. Either way that is a tremendously large acreage to be added to the land available for beef production. Mr. Sweeney said further that the Government expected to help improve approximately 3.3 million acres during the life of this program or approximately 500,000 acres a year.

It has been argued that this program would not really result in additional production of cattle. On that point, let me read from the testimony of Mr. Sweeney:

> Within the normal program of the Federal Government, primarily through the Farmers Home Administration's loan program, the farmers will have available some loans to increase their herds or put new feeder calf operations into these pastures. But this program contained in S. 3 is primarily patterned after the Great Plains conservation program which helped achieve, in that broad region of the country, the water resource and land treatment improvement that so desperately is needed in the Appalachia region.

Further on Mr. Sweeney said:

> We hope also that the Farmers Home Administration loan program can be increased to provide for better land treatment, and also, where it seems feasible, for the farmer to better utilize that pasture by an increase in his livestock.

A little later he said:

> This can be done by establishing an adequate vegetative covering on some of the land or by turning it into pastureland capable of supporting economical livestock operations. Section 203 will provide to eligible farms, grants covering the cost of 80 percent of the improvement of up to 25 acres of land which either has no protective covering or which needs improvement in order to make it economically feasible for livestock production.

Mr. President, let me remind you that we are now, today, paying farmers in the Midwest and elsewhere to take land out of production through the conservation reserve program. How is it possible to argue that there is no inconsistency here? Why bring land to a state of productivity when we already have national policies based, in effect, on the assumption that there is a surplus of productive land? Certainly, that is the whole theory and justification of the conservation reserve or soil bank.

If we must do something for the farmers of Appalachia, perhaps it would be more sensible to pay those farmers not to improve their land and not to bring it back into production, either with or without Federal assistance. Perhaps that suggestion sounds facetious, but it is more sensible than spending Government money to bring land into production in Appalachia while simultaneously we are spending other Government money to take land out of production elsewhere in the country.

But there is an even more undesirable and disheartening aspect to this program, Mr. President. In fact, it creates and compounds a most cruel hoax on those farmers who would want to avail themselves of the grant of 80 percent of the cost of improving 50 acres of land occupied by such owner, operator, or occupier.

It will raise false hopes that he will be able to make it by entering into the agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture and receiving proceeds of the grant it provides. He would be led to believe that by investing his 20 percent of the cost and "in conjunction with already established Federal programs" he would be able to establish a productive and profitable economic unit.

This just would not be so.

According to Secretary Freeman's testimony, such a result could not be achieved even with the pasture improvement assistance.

Twenty-five acres of pasture in Appalachia would support at most 6 to 8 animal units. Fifty acres would double this to 12 to 16 units. This simply is not enough to do the job. It is not enough to make a cow-calf operation economic. A much larger farm unit would be needed.

Let us consider that we are dealing with an area and a farmer which admittedly are among the most poverty stricken in Appalachia.

Yet, the farmer-owner would be expected to raise a 20-percent contribution to these programs. Where would he get the 20 percent? Very likely he would be helped out in one way or another by the same source which supplies the 80 percent. So the subsidy would be 100 percent—but that would be only for the pastureland which in due time will become capable of producing feeder calves.

But the farmer-owner would then need breeder stock. Granted that he would get the money to prepare the pasture where would he get the capital to get the breeder stock—this farmer-owner who is among the "most poverty stricken in Appalachia"?

The committee report seeks to supply the answer to this by saying:

> The committee assumes that after the land is restored and revegetated, the operation of free market factors in conjunction with already established Federal programs will supply this need.

There is the path and the way.

A grant upon a grant to prepare the land. A further resort to other Federal programs "already established" to get breeding stock and to maintain the operation until it gets into full production.

And when it does get into full cycle, it will be found to be uneconomic and inadequate. This would necessitate a continuance of subsidy into the future and much beyond the scope provided by the bill.

A subsidy to the degree and in a duration it would be highly unfair to those who are not similarly favored and who are trying to make it on their own.

Up to now, Mr. President, I have been talking about the farmer-owner. Last year's bill was limited to landowners.

Not so this year. Something new has been added. The financial and other assistance can now be furnished to any landowner, operator, or occupier of such land. It would be available to the land occupied by such owner, operator, or occupier.

Mr. President, if such a unit is uneconomic to the landowner, it is inevitable that it would be even more uneconomic in the hands of an occupier who does not even own it. Unless, of course, the Federal Treasury will be requested to borrow even more money for a longer period of years to get the job done.

This obvious and inescapable necessity for long time and maybe even indefinite grants or subsidies to the 50-acre Appalachia units, most severely distinguishes it from the Great Plains program, in addition to the points already set out.

But the worst cut of all is that at its very best, and with all the Federal help he can get, the operator or occupier will not have a future to look to. At best, it will be but a submarginal income and a substandard of living.

Mr. President, last year when similar legislation relating to Appalachia was under consideration, the people of this country had adequate warning as to what it contained. The bill was reported in good time, it remained upon the Senate Calendar for a reasonable period, and its terms were matters of widespread public knowledge. Cattlemen and others who might be interested had an opportunity to inform themselves, and to waken public interest and understanding of the implications and consequences of the various provisions of the bill.

As a result, ranchers and cattlefeeders had an opportunity to make their protests heard against the ill-advised proposal to stimulate increased beef production through Federal subsidies. Last year section 203 was stricken from the bill on the basis of those protests.

This year, for reasons that have not been made clear, this bill is being acted upon on a hurry-up basis. We are given to understand that there is some urgent need for the Senate to act upon it immediately, today, although it was not even reported until last Thursday. No doubt it will be argued that we need take no time with it this year, because we have already considered and passed the bill once before, that is, last year. But we did not pass section 203 before; in fact, we specifically rejected it on that previous occasion. It is argued that the new section 203 is totally different, but if so, it deserves full consideration and broad public attention, instead of this hurry-up treatment.

Although this bill is being considered so hurriedly, already I have received a protest from the National Livestock Feeders Association, which reads as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1965.

Hon. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The National Livestock Feeders Association is firmly opposed to section 203 of S. 3 which would allow subsidized development of agricultural and livestock production in new areas when supplies are already adequate

and burdensome in some instances. The association objects to legislation which amounts to overriding the free working of economic forces which should determine the existence and development of livestock and agricultural production.

DON F. MAGDANZ,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer,
National Livestock Feeders Association.
OMAHA, NEBR.

Evidently this great national organization feels strongly about the matter. If more time had been permitted for the terms of this bill to become publicly known, no doubt many, many protests from cattlemen and their organizations would have been received. At least, if the proposal is as harmless as its sponsors say it is, there would have been time to debate that argument publicly, and perhaps clear up the matter.

It is my suggestion that if this proposal is meritorious, it be deleted from this bill and introduced by its supporters as a separate bill, instead of being smuggled through as part of a larger measure dealing principally with highway construction for Appalachia. If it were reintroduced separately, it could be referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, for study by those familiar with farm problems.

It will be recalled that all during the long struggle of the past 2 years by the cattle industry to hold its head above water in spite of the distressing level of prices, the Secretary of Agriculture insisted, over and over again, that the great source of our troubles was our own U.S. overproduction. When some of us pointed to the rapid increase and multiplication of imports of beef, we were advised that the American cattle industry should get its own house in order. We were told to cut back on our own production, and thus relieve the market of the great oversupply of beef.

Now we learn that a cutback in cattle numbers produced in the West and Middle West are likely to be replaced by an increase in cattle numbers from the Appalachian region.

If the steel mills of Pittsburgh and Chicago were shut down for lack of sales, would the Federal Government adopt a program of subsidizing the construction of additional facilities for producing steel elsewhere in the country, and then argue that it had created new jobs by doing so? If the coal mines of Kentucky and West Virginia were closed down for lack of markets—as some of them are, I understand—should Federal funds go to help their competitors? Of course not.

Certainly, the situation is the same for beef. New beef production artificially brought into existence in the Appalachian region must certainly displace a corresponding production of beef somewhere else.

Last year we were also told that these additional feeder calves and cattle from Appalachia would substitute for the imported feeders we now receive from Mexico and Canada. What an argument of sophistry that is. Feeder cattle have been imported from Mexico and Canada for a good many years. It is not because we could not produce enough stockers and feeders here at home. The number of beef calves and of feeder steers produced in this country has steadily increased but imports have continued to come in. In practice, Mexico and Canada will continue to send us their surplus feeder cattle and calves as long as our tariff remains low and as long as we place no other impediments in the way of such trade.

Increased supplies of such cattle from Appalachia will not displace these imports. Rather, this will simply add that much supply to the market and compete directly with our own feeders produced in other parts of this country.

It is regrettable that in the presentation of this amendment the issue is made to appear as a sectional conflict, as if one part of our country were opposed to the aspirations of another. If it does so appear, that is not the result of any deliberate intention on my part. Although the cattlemen of my State may be in competition with those of Appalachia or other sections, there is no animosity in our competition. To the farmers of Appalachia, we say, "We wish you well. You are welcome to compete with us, utilizing any means that your skill and your brains enable you to use, in our great American competitive system. We ask only one thing; that the competition be on a fair and equal basis."

Because this proposal is essentially discriminatory against the beef producers of other parts of the country, I ask that the Senate adopt the amendment proposed by me and eight cosponsors, and delete section 203 from the bill. If the program envisioned by section 203 is as sound, worthwhile, and fair as its supporters appear to believe, it is suggested that they reintroduce it as a separate measure so that it can be referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and there be studied, both as to its soundness from the standpoint of agricultural development and conservation, and also as to its effect upon the farm production and price situation, particularly of the beef cattle industry, in other parts of the country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point Public Law 1021, 84th Congress, 2d session, which authorized the Great Plains conservation program.

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

H.R. 11833

An Act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended (a) by inserting "(a)" after the period following "SEC. 16," and (b) by adding the following subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) the Secretary is authorized, within the amounts of such appropriations as may be provided therefor, to enter into contracts of not to exceed ten years with producers in the Great Plains area determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms or ranches covered thereby. Such contracts shall be designed to assist farm and ranch operators to make, in orderly progression over a period of years, changes in their cropping systems and land uses which are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water conservation measures needed under such changed systems and uses. Such contracts shall be in effect during the period ending not later than December 31, 1971, on farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming, designated by the Secretary as susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. The producer shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming operations which incorporates such soil and water conservation practices and principles as may be determined by him to be practicable for maximum mitigation of climatic hazards of the area in which the farm is located, and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes in cropping systems and land use and of the conservation measures which are to be carried out on the farm or ranch during the contract period to protect the farm or ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes. Under the contract the producer shall agree—

"(i) to effectuate the plan for his farm or ranch substantially in accordance with the schedule outlined therein unless any requirement thereof is waived or modified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection;

"(ii) to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder upon his violation of the contract at any stage during the time he has control of the farm if the Secretary determines that such violation is of such a nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to make refunds or accept such payment adjustments as the Secretary may deem appropriate if he determines that the producer's violation does not warrant termination of the contract;

"(iii) upon transfer of his right and interest in the farm or ranch during the contract period to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder unless the transferee of the farm or ranch agrees with the Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;

"(iv) not to adopt any practice specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

"(v) to such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of the program or to facilitate the practical administration of the program.

In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree to share the cost of carrying out those conservation practices set forth in the contract for which he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in the public interest. The portion of such cost (including labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the physical installation of the conservation measures under the contract;

"(2) the Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof;

"(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm entered into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas

under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract;

"(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out the contract entered into under the program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

"(5) in applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U.S.C. 1340(6)), relating to the reduction of storage amount of wheat, any acreage diverted from the production of wheat under the program carried out under this subsection shall be regarded as wheat acreage;

"(6) the Secretary shall utilize the technical services of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in determining the scope and provisions of any plan and the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes of the program. In addition the Secretary shall take into consideration programs of State and local agencies, including soil conservation districts, having for their purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water conservation;

"(7) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitations, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection: *Provided*, That the total cost of the program (excluding administrative costs) shall not exceed $150,000,000, and for any program year payments shall not exceed $25,000,000. The funds made available for the program under this subsection may be expended without regard to the maximum payment limitation and small payment increases required under section 8(e) of this Act, and may be distributed among States without regard to distribution of funds formulas of section 15 of this Act. The program authorized under this subsection shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such area authorized by this or any other Act."

SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with the 1957 crop of wheat, by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(g) If the county committee determines that any producer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather conditions, and the operator of the farm notifies the county committee not later than December 1, in any area where only winter wheat is grown, or June 1 in the spring wheat area (including an area where both spring and winter wheat are grown), that he does not intend to see his full wheat allotment for the crop year because of the unfavorable weather conditions, the entire farm wheat allotment for such year shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments: *Provided*, That if any producer on a farm obtains a reduction in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat by reason of underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U.S.C. 1340(6)), or by reason of producing less than the normal production of the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to section 326(b) of this Act, this provision may not be made applicable to such farm with respect to the crop of wheat for which the farm acreage allotment was established."

Approved August 7, 1956.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak briefly and that the rule of germaneness be waived.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the hour is late. The time is at hand for the President to make a change in South Vietnam. I urge that our President replace Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor as U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, nominating Kenneth Keating, of New York, to succeed him in that extremely important diplomatic post.

I began to lose confidence in General Taylor when, as a member of the Committee on Armed Forces, I listened to his testimony as a witness before our committee, that the South Vietnam forces were winning the war against Communist aggression and infiltration from the north. He told of the then new military policy under the instruction of American military advisers of forming defensive compounds behind barricades, and that time after time the Communist guerrillas would attack some of these compounds and be repulsed and leave such and such number of dead; and the defenders suffered a fewer number of dead. Also, sometimes their attacks succeeded, he admitted. General Taylor testified that in this manner South Vietnam was winning the war against the Vietcong.

Frankly, Mr. President, I wondered at the time and I spoke out asking the question: How could any nation win a war by keeping its forces restrained and simply waiting for the enemy to attack then claiming a great victory as they believed the enemy suffered more casualties than they? My view is that the only way the forces of South Vietnam can possibly win the civil war in which they are invaded by their Communist neighbors from the north, is to roll back the invaders by offensive tactics. However, Mr. President, General Taylor is a famed American military leader. I served for 37 months in World War II, most of the time in Italy and North Africa. I was never anything other than a civilian in uniform. Parenthetically speaking, I could never understand the tactics of our great military leaders in World War II invading Italy from the southerly part of the "boot" of that long, narrow peninsula and slowly fighting desperately contested battles over the rough mountain terrain, finally to Rome and to the Po Valley. It was beyond my comprehension why the 5th Army instead of landing at Salerno did not land on the side of Italy north of Naples, perhaps at Anzio and cut across Italy meeting our Allies coming from the other side. In the long history of the world Rome was captured many, many times by enemy armies, but the 5th Army with which I served in a humble capacity was the very first to capture Rome the hard way from the south.

Frankly, Mr. President, I take a dim view of generals, or former generals, serving as Ambassadors of the United States. The Founding Fathers, in writing the Constitution of our country, provided that in the United States of America, civilian authority must always be supreme over military authority. It is, of course, for our President to determine who it is he wishes as Ambassador to South Vietnam. An Ambassador is the personal representative of our Chief Executive. Admittedly, the situation has gone from bad to worse in South Vietnam. In the Washington Daily News of last Saturday, January 30, there was published a most informative statement under the headline "Taylor Is Doing a Poor Job in South Vietnam," written by a news correspondent and columnist, Walt Friedenberg, a Scripps-Howard staff writer, returning from a half year in Saigon where he observed the entire situation in his professional capacity. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

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

TAYLOR IS DOING A POOR JOB IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Walt Friedenberg)

Is Maxwell D. Taylor doing a good job as our Ambassador to South Vietnam?

Granted it's like being captain of a leaking ship with a mutinous crew in a stormy sea, the answer, in my judgment, is definitely "No."

The 63-year old general, who performed with distinction as a soldier, has been unable to become an effective diplomat amid the complications and subtleties of Saigon.

He is the clean-cut American over his head operating in Asia.

He is too self-confidently dedicated to the official preset solution to the Communists' guerrilla war.

He is too insensitive to the curves and curlicues of Vietnamese politics.

TOO COOL

He is too cool and aloof toward the Vietnamese generals to become their confidant.

And in General Taylor, the United States has just about put all its Vietnamese eggs in one basket.

Since 1961 when President Kennedy sent him to Saigon for an urgent assessment, General Taylor has been the chief author of the plan.

Since July when he replaced the subtly effective Henry Cabot Lodge, General Taylor has been the executor of the plan.

And inasmuch as General Taylor has forestalled top-level visits by the Secretaries of Defense and State, only he can be the prime judge of his own performance.

HANDICAPPED

From the start, this West Point general was handicapped by his earlier associations.

His admiration for Maj. Gen. Duong Van (Big) Minh, the politically passé Chief of State, ran crossgrain to General Minh's arch rival Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, then Premier, who had dumped General Minh from real power but still suspected his ambitions.

The first Taylor-Khanh public clash came soon over the issue of infiltration from North Vietnam.

General Khanh insisted it was large scale. General Taylor, either because of unsound intelligence or instructions to keep the Vietnam temperature down in an election year, pooh-poohed General Khanh's appraisal.

Also in July, General Khanh publicly called for a "to the north" campaign, partly to deflect attention from his own failures, partly from conviction that American planes and warships ought to be brought into action. General Taylor again put General Khanh down.

INFILTRATION

As it turned out, the United States this week announced that 10,000 Communists infiltrated into South Vietnam in 1964. And General Taylor last November came around to advocating air strikes in Laos and North Vietnam.

Because of these differences, General Khanh did not take General Taylor into his confidence over a new charter he proclaimed in August.

The move roused Buddhists and students and these two factions toppled General Khanh.

To a large degree General Taylor is prisoner of the American idea that any problem can be solved if enough money, men, and machines are applied to it. This is patently not working so far.

General Taylor also has fretted unduly—as has Washington—about the legitimacy of any Saigon government, rather than its effectiveness.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, at this time, we have 12 generals in South Vietnam. We have more than 20,000 men in our Air Force and ground forces in this unhappy civil war-torn country. I have reliable information that the situation there is now even worse than it was when we had but a few hundred military advisers instead of our present Armed Forces in excess of 20,000. Our forces over there are not headed like a conventional American Army with one or two generals but it seems more like the army of a Latin American Republic, top heavy with generals. There is a song in the night clubs of Saigon "O dear what can the matter be, 12 generals and no strategy."

Mr. President, my view is that our President would manifest wisdom and judgment were he to replace Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor with Kenneth Keating, of New York. Former Senator Keating is not a military man other than that he is a general in our Reserves. I have already voiced the fact that I take a dim view of professional generals occupying high official civilian positions in our Government from the Presidency down. History demonstrates that in the main this has not worked out. Kenneth Keating is internationally known as a former Congressman and U.S. Senator knowledgeable in the foreign affairs of our country. He would have the confidence of the American people. That he is a man of good judgment and integrity, loyal to his country and its institutions, personable and tactful is unquestioned. He has the confidence of his colleagues in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, and of high government officials with whom he, as a Member of the Congress, has had contact. It is our international policy that politics ends at the water's edge. Furthermore, the Communists of the Soviet Union and Red China have full knowledge of the actions of former Senator Keating at the time and preceding the time of the Khrushchev and Castro threat to the peace of the Western Hemisphere back in 1962. Kenneth Keating, of New York, was an able U.S. Senator. I believe, Mr. President, that he would prove an exceedingly able Ambassador to South Vietnam.

May I add, Mr. President, that I have had no conversation on this matter whatever, directly or indirectly, with former Senator Keating or with anyone representing him.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has just made an altogether excellent speech on the problems of New England. While our problems may not be as acute or may not be a century old, as are those of Appalachia, they are still burdensome and full of pitfalls and problems.

I, for one, hope to see the establishment of a regional development program in New England with a subregional program that might include the northern part of the State of Rhode Island, northeastern Connecticut, and the southern part of Massachusetts. This is not so large an area as the Appalachian region, but there is misery, hunger, poverty, and illiteracy there too. I thoroughly congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts on the initiative and forward thinking he has shown in this regard. I know that this idea has been germinating in his mind for many months. I look forward to seeing its fruition as soon as possible.

With regard to the Appalachia bill now before this body, it has been the subject of long, painstaking hearings and careful draftsmanship, tailoring legislation to meet the specific and unique economic needs of that region. It is a sound bill, which should set the guidelines for future regional plans. No area, no land, no region is an island unto itself; and for this reason I intend to support the Appalachia bill.

I commend the excellent work that has been done by the chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. MCNAMARA] and the principal sponsor of the bill [Mr. RANDOLPH]. They have taken the lead in promoting a philosophy of regional economic planning and development which I would like to see gain national acceptance.

But I reiterate that my own region of New England, which for generations had enjoyed a high climate of prosperous industrial advance, widespread trade, important commercial fisheries, developed natural resources, and specialized agricultural activities, has been experiencing in recent years serious economic dislocation. Each State in New England has specialized problems, but all of them can be met by cooperative regional planning because of our geographic and economic integration.

I ask such a plan for New England, just as I fully support one to meet the needs of the people and industries of Appalachia. I am confident that our State officials will cooperate in developing a regional plan specifically geared to the character of New England.

My hope is that the near future will see New England returned to its position as a leader in industry and commerce. I intend to do all I can to see this objective reached. I am pleased to see the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] take the lead he has taken in this matter.

THE HUMANITIES AND THE ARTS—ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD BEFORE THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently in New York City, before the annual dinner of the American Council of Learned Societies, Representative WILLIAM MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, spoke on the subject of the humanities and the arts.

This address sets forth in both meaningful and eloquent terms the need for a national foundation which would assist and stimulate the development of both these cultural areas, highly important to our national welfare and the future goals we seek.

As one who has introduced legislation with similar concepts in the Senate, I would like to extend my commendations to Congressman MOORHEAD for his informative and thoughtful presentation, which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues.

Because I feel that this address is very pertinent to the legislation which we will be considering in this session of the Congress to advance our Nation's cultural progress, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Congressman MOORHEAD's remarks entitled "A Great Audience for the Great Society" be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

A GREAT AUDIENCE FOR THE GREAT SOCIETY

(An address delivered by Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, before the annual dinner of the American Council of Learned Societies, New York City, January 21, 1965)

Walt Whitman: "To have great poets, there must be great audiences, too."

T. S. Eliot: "A religion requires not only a body of priests who know what they are doing, but a body of worshipers who know what is being done."

As I appear before you, in awe of you, in awe of the total learning represented by this distinguished group, I am reminded of the admonition by Alexander Pope:

"A little learning is a dangerous thing;
Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring."

It is a dangerous thing for me who has only tested, to appear before you who have partaken so deeply of the waters of the Pierian spring.

A little learning proved to be a dangerous thing for that Kentucky mountaineer named Joshua who pleaded not guilty before a very learned judge. When the very learned judge heard that the defendant's name was Joshua, he asked, "Are you the Joshua who made the sun stand still?" The reply came, "No, Your Honor, I am the Joshua who made the moonshine still."

A little learning also proved to be a dangerous thing for the repentant sinner who appeared before his priest and confessed that in the 20 years that he had worked for a building supply company he had stolen enough material to build a house for himself and even one for his son and daughter-in-law. The priest, who was shocked, said, "Son, you

had better make a novena." The repentant sinner said, "OK, Father, if you've got the plans, I'll supply the lumber."

Dangerous though it may be to talk with this learned assembly about a National Humanities Foundation, I am going to make the venture, first discussing the political situation which this legislation faces and then discussing with you whether the arts, creative and performing, properly belong in, or whether they should be separated from, the National Humanities Foundation.

First, what is the general political climate in the United States today and, second, what are the specific political hurdles which the National Humanities Foundation legislation faces.

I come to you after having endured and enjoyed 4 days of a national political celebration—the inauguration of a President of the United States.

Before the inauguration some of the commentators surmised that it might resemble the inauguration of Andrew Jackson. They had not realized that the change in America inspired, or epitomized, by the late President and Mrs. John F. Kennedy has continued.

Let's look at the inaugural record. On Monday evening the President's special adviser on the arts—an office which, incidentally has been in existence less than 4 years—gave a reception for 50 persons prominent in the arts and letters. Here poets and painters, architects and historians, dancers and actors rubbed shoulders with and talked to Senators and Congressmen, Cabinet officers and members of the White House staff.

This was the political leadership of the country trying to indicate its awareness of the importance of the intellectual and cultural leadership of the country.

It was a tribute by the men of politics to the men of arts and letters—and, let me point out that the arts were not separated from the letters.

Later that evening there was a function—I can think of no other word—called the inaugural gala at which prominent persons in show business—Carol Channing, Julie Andrews, Carol Burnett, and others—charmed a huge crowd. The tickets to the gala were free—distributed by the national committee to deserving political workers. Despite the great wealth of talent, this audience gave its greatest ovation to the ballet performance of Dame Margot Fonteyn and Rudolph Nureyev.

The highlight of Tuesday was a sellout concert at which pianist Van Cliburn and violinist Isaac Stern performed with the National Symphony Orchestra.

This was followed by a reception in the State Department at which the political leaders were given an opportunity to meet and welcome these artists to Washington.

But this froth of inaugural activity is not the only thing indicative of a change. Let us remember that on January 12 of this year when the President sent a massive $1.6 billion aid-to-education message to Congress, the voices of opposition, so strident in the past, were almost silent.

Another straw in the political wind, of particular importance to this group as a sponsor of the Commission on the Humanities, is the fact that on the opening day of Congress, 57 Members of the House of Representatives introduced bills identical to my bill H.R. 334 to establish a National Humanities Foundation. As of now there are more than 80 similar or identical bills.

In the U.S. Senate there are more than 40 Senators cosponsoring legislation for a National Humanities Foundation.

In addition, there are at least three bills in the Congress calling for the creation of a National Arts Foundation.

I am convinced that there is a growing awareness in the United States that an imbalance exists in our educational system and in our commitment to culture. The Congress, I believe, is ready to do something to rectify that imbalance.

But even though the time is ripe for something like the National Humanities Foundation, that does not mean that the legislation will be enacted.

As you know, there are many pitfalls (or should I say pratfalls) between the introduction and enactment of legislation. One of the greatest of these is the danger that * * * infighting among the groups most directly involved will tempt the Congress to say "A plague on both of your Houses, we will do nothing until you settle your own internal differences."

There is just such a danger between men of letters and men of arts.

It is not well enough recognized that while a National Humanities Foundation is broad enough to include the creative and performing arts, a National Arts Foundation is not broad enough to include the other humanities.

One of the questions which must be decided is whether all areas of creativity and learning which are not scientific should be gathered into one foundation or whether the creative and performing arts should be separated from the other humanities.

Politically, of course, it would be easier to obtain legislation for one foundation than for two and it would avoid an unnecessary proliferation of agencies.

At the present time, in the White House, a debate is going on as to whether the administration should support one foundation or two, and if there are to be two, what should be the order of priority.

If the decision is for two foundations, priority will probably be given to an arts foundation. Such legislation has been before the Congress for many years but until this year, the only bill to create a Humanities Foundation was the one I introduced last August.

A decision for two foundations and priority for the arts would probably mean a delay in the enactment of a foundation for the humanities for 2 or more years.

If you agree that there should be no delay in establishing one all-encompassing foundation, I think that the 100,000 scholars you represent should make their voices heard.

From the point of view of the scholar, one foundation seems preferable. Almost everything that scholars study was produced by an artist. Should scholars limit their association with artists to dead artists? I think that most of you would agree that an artist should know something of the history of art. I submit to you that an art historian should know something of the actual work of creative painting.

From the point of view of the artist, the concern is expressed that in competition for funds, artists will be forgotten unless they have their own foundation.

I do not think this concern recognizes the political facts of life. With one broad foundation, charged with support of the humanities and the arts, artists will seek meaningful financial assistance from a board of 25 members, "eminent in the humanities and the arts." Humanists and educators, with their superior organizational resources and advantageous geographical dispersion will be in a better position, politically, to lobby for money. If there are two foundations, the artists will be left to lobby on their own for financial support—they will, in fact, be competing with the NHF for cultural seed money.

But we should be asking ourselves whether one foundation or two are better means of attaining the national goal.

The national goal is twofold in nature.

It is to promote excellence in the creation and the understanding of art or as President Johnson called it, "the love of learning and the capacity for creation."

Great creativity in the arts alone is not enough, the Great Society must have a great audience.

What do I mean by that phrase?

I mean that a great civilization, at least in modern times, must have not only great creativity, but great receptivity. To reach this goal, it is quite clear to me that an arts foundation alone is not enough. By itself, it cannot perform the function of increasing the exposure of the creative and performing arts, but this is to water unplanted soil. The arts and the humanities are only artificially separable.

The humanities not only give us what is beautiful to see or to hear, but they also teach us what to look for and what to listen for. And it is important that an audience know these things. A great civilization needs the man who communicates to us in paint—but it is a greater civilization which can understand that communication to the fullest. And that understanding inspires the artist to even greater heights of creativity.

I conceive it to be a central function of a National Humanities Foundation to promote excellence in the creation and the understanding of art in America—to develop a great audience for great creative artists. Let me explore more fully the ways in which the National Humanities Foundation might do this in the fields of the performing and visual arts.

Because New York City is the theatrical capital of the Nation, let us consider this first in relation to the performing arts. I have in mind two different varieties of ventures which the National Humanities Foundation could support.

The first type of program would have as its primary focus the development and cultivation of "the great audience." As Walt Whitman said of poetry:

"Poetry like a grand personality is a growth of many generations. To have great poets, there must be great audiences, too."

In this task, one has to begin somewhere, and I propose that a good beginning point is with traditional theater productions. I am not suggesting that the National Humanities Foundation mount a full scale Broadway production, but it would support efforts to bring established classics to broader and more diverse audiences.

Last summer, on the street corners of New York, for example, a troupe of young and enthusiastic players brought Shakespeare to a Harlem audience. Most of those in that audience had never seen a play before. Their initial bewilderment changed rapidly to approval and delight. Such an undertaking offers the theater a splendid opportunity to fulfill its traditional function of illuminating for its spectators unfamiliar corners of life; it also begins to develop the potential of a vast and as yet untried audience.

In addition to the anniversary of the Magna Carta, we have been celebrating the 400th year after the birth of Shakespeare. Suppose that out of the wealth of acting talent in New York, there were organized several traveling Shakespearean repertory companies whose visits to communities would be coordinated with high school literature courses so that the students who had been reading and discussing Shakespeare in a humanities course would suddenly have it brought alive to them in a three-dimensional form by professional actors on the stage.

The primary objective of such programs would be to awaken a love for and an understanding of the live theater in the hearts of people throughout the United States.

However, there would also be byproducts beneficial to the theatrical profession. In addition to the opportunities it would offer to the underemployed acting profession, such a program might well bring into the open an acting genius whose talents might otherwise never have been discovered. We would hope that the immediate benefits of such

a program in terms of jobs for members of the theatrical profession would be dramatic. But our primary focus in this type of venture, that of educating broad audiences to be willing theatergoers, will have the long-range product of developing the very large audience which is necessary if the theater arts and its practitioners are to flourish in this country.

I mentioned another type of program, which the National Humanities Foundation might appropriately support. I think the National Humanities Foundation could and on occasion would, subsidize a theatrical production thought to be of unusual merit without reference to the audience it would attract. The young performer, the experimental production, the untried director, would be the primary object of such a program. They would be offered a stage on which to develop their craft, a way to obtain recognition of their talents, and also, of course, a way to earn a living in their chosen profession. The focus of these efforts could be actors' workshops, small theaters, or college campuses. For example, in a statement last year to the House Committee on Education and Labor, Walter Caro, the executive director of the Theater Guild-American Theater Society, said:

"Just the other day I attended a production of a new play which could not be produced on Broadway, but for which we finally persuaded the University of Michigan to appropriate some money in order to get the play on the boards. They sustained a loss. It is a new, important, and challenging work. It never would have come to light."

In a university setting, there would be the added advantage of an unusual opportunity to develop the powers of comprehension of the audience and increase their receptivity to the experimental and innovative productions which are the seedbed of future theater. We would be building an audience on which we could depend to support the performing arts in years to come. And this, rather than Government support, should be the economic foundation for the performing arts.

And who knows, in this audience which we are building, we may "strike a spark" of response in a potential Ibsen, Albee, or Brecht.

The primary aim, of course, of subsidizing experimental works of unusual merit would be providing outlets for underemployed professional talents. The primary aim of sponsoring the more conventional efforts, such as the traveling Shakespearean troupes, is the development of a responsive supporting audience. And it is hoped that in the more experimental productions, we would be developing a great audience, as a secondary aim, while the support of the conventional theater, albeit in unconventional ways, would open up many new jobs for actors and directors.

Thus, the two forks of National Humanities Foundation aid to the theater arts are supplementary. Each is necessary, if we are to achieve the twin goals of excellence in creativity and understanding of the arts. I stress both sides of this coin because it is so clear to me that the National Humanities Foundation must aid in the development not only of a great American theater, but also of a receptive and educated audience which will be able to support that theater. And this, a National Humanities Foundation, working with educators and humanists such as yourself, would be uniquely prepared to do.

The foundation would not, of course, confine its attention exclusively to the theater. Additional programs might be of inestimable value to the other performing arts. I can think of fellowships or internships for musicians with symphony orchestras or with the recognized masters of their instruments.

Universities should be encouraged to have poets and composers, musicians, authors, and playwrights in residence. There should be encouragement of conferences which would bring together and stimulate interaction among educators and the visual and performing artists. Exposure to practicing artists in a university setting may stimulate students' interests in music or painting or sculpture, develop a broader and better audience of humanistically trained people, who can appreciate and stimulate an artist's work.

This points up how unnatural it would be to divide artists from other humanists. How would we classify Paul Hindemuth, or Robert Penn Warren at Yale, or Leonard Baskind at Smith.

Insofar as the visual arts are concerned, a National Humanities Foundation can do anything that an arts foundation could do, but it can also do much more. The visual arts, like all other arts, do not exist and never have existed in a social vacuum. They are part and parcel of the history and philosophy of their times, and to be properly appreciated, they must be understood as such. For example, Picasso's "Guernica," viewed in isolation, has a powerful impact, but how much more powerful, how much more moving it is when seen as a vivid and immediate symbol of the intellectual turmoil and disillusion acompanying the ravages of the Spanish Civil War, when we understand the anguish and fury which prompted a disillusioned Picasso to make this comment on the horrors of war.

We do not do the artists a service if we concentrate our efforts only on the artist himself and neglect the people for whom he paints. The visual arts need a great audience, too. In rare instances there may be a Gaugin who must retire from civilization to attain his fullest creative powers, but in most instances, the artist is a part of society and is affected, either favorably, or unfavorably, by the people for whom he paints.

In its report to the Commission on the Humanities, the American Society for Aesthetics said:

"There has been a remarkable growth of interest in the arts in this country since World War I. Unfortunately, this great wave of interest has not been adequately matched by efforts directed toward an understanding of the arts."

I can conceive of support for programs which would bring exhibits of contemporary art and artists, too, to college campuses where the artist might discuss his work with the members of the art department. The exchange would be a rewarding experience for both artist and professor.

Not only would such a program give direct financial assistance to the particular artist but it would also help to establish future support for the arts. Exposure to the practicing artist in a university setting may stimulate students' interest in painting and sculpture, develop a broader and better audience of humanistically trained people, who can appreciate, stimulate, support, and believe in artists' work.

A National Humanities Foundation program of assistance to museums would also mean support for artists and development of an audience for their work.

A National Humanities Foundation would help to bring attention to the valuable potential for museums in the enrichment of American life. There are more than 5,000 museums now in existence in the United States with an annual attendance totaling over 200 million visits. But this asset cannot be fully utilized, mainly because the rapid growth of our museums, spurred on by public interest, has far outstripped the ability of the museum community to provide trained personnel for its scholarly, civic, and educational obligations.

The National Humanities Foundation will encourage training and participation in the arts themselves, giving to some the impetus and training needed to develop their creative talents, and to others, the training in the arts necessary to increase their receptivity.

Above all we should not establish institutions which separate artists from other humanists. As the late T. S. Eliot in his "Notes Toward the Definition of Culture," said:

"Nor does it follow that in a society of whatever grade of culture the groups concerned with each activity of culture will be distinct and exclusive: on the contrary, it is only by an overlapping and sharing of interests, by participation and mutual appreciation, that cohesion necessary for culture can obtain. A religion requires not only a body of priests who know what they are doing, but a body of worshipers who know what is being done."

A great society needs great artists and a great audience. It is my hope that scholars and educators, working with artists and performers can, with the help of the National Humanities Foundation, build that audience, will inspire those artists.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the problems of Appalachia are well known. They are, as was stated by President Johnson, "a challenge to the ingenuity as well as to the compassion of Congress." That challenge has been well met in the provisions of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

I join my colleagues, however, in concern for other areas throughout the country which have similar economic problems. In my own State of Missouri, the economy in certain sections of the southeast and southwest part of the State has faltered and lags far behind that of the Nation as a whole.

Strip mining has left a scarred landscape. Marginal lands bring bare subsistence. Population is sliding. In many counties, median family income falls well below $3,000. This area of Missouri joins that of Arkansas and Oklahoma. Similar topography and similar problems here in this three-State area offer hope of common solution.

It is my feeling that the administration should offer a comprehensive proposal to prepare plans similar to those undertaken on behalf of Appalachia looking forward to development and restoration of other regions capable of development—including the Ozark region of Missouri.

I should like to inquire as to the position of the leadership on this matter.

Are there any plans now along the lines I suggested in the brief statement I have made?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the statement of support of the Appalachian Regional Development Act by the very eminent Senator from Missouri.

Definite efforts will be made in the near future to give careful consideration to the presentation of the Ozark and other proposals. The mechanism for

such presentations is embodied in S. 820 now at the desk, where it will remain through the end of business on Wednesday. Perhaps the Senator from Missouri would like to be a cosponsor of such a measure with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] and many other members of the Public Works Committee, who have signed their names as cosponsors. They have indicated, by their signing, that the work will go forward in the committee.

I say to the Senator that any area which can make a case puts the responsibility on Congress to give attention to its proposals.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his remarks. I deeply appreciate the position he takes. It is typical of the fine work he does, not only for his State of West Virginia, but for the people of the country as a whole.

AID TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that there has been a great deal of going and coming with respect to the action of the House in cutting off aid to President Nasser.

I have received a communication from the State Department in which it stated that our aid program with the United Arab Republic is still under consideration to determine whether it is still serving the purpose of advancing U.S. objectives in the United Arab Republic and the Middle East generally.

In my judgment the President of the United States should make the foreign policy of the United States, unless he puts us in a position where it is impossible to feel that he is carrying out the consensus of the country. In that case Congress, as it has done before, will again take the matter into its own hands.

Therefore, if the President of the United States wishes us to leave his hands free on this question of foreign policy, he should make a declaration that we will not aid the United Arab Republic so long as it torpedoes the cause of world peace and the foreign policy of the United States. Otherwise, the President leaves the Senate no alternative but to follow the action of the House. If he wishes to have a free hand, he must act. I hope that he will do so. I say that because I agree that he should have a free hand; but having a free hand does not mean being free from the responsibility to do what the situation demands.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate contains the title "Mining Area Restoration."

Under the language of the bill the Federal Government would be authorized to spend money to restore strip-mining lands. The lands to be restored, under the present language of the bill, would include not only privately owned property but also Federal, State, and local government land holdings.

I am of the opinion that it is imprudent to contemplate spending taxpayers' money at this time on private land for the purpose of breaking down high walls, leveling ridges, and planting grass and trees and shrubs.

I have no objection to the spending of Federal money on Federal, State, and local government property, but the moneys ought not be spent in restoring land owned by the very entities that destroyed the land.

AMENDMENT NO. 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 11 o'clock having arrived, the Senate will proceed under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 25, line 3, beginning with the word "Projects", it is proposed to strike out all through the word "with." on line 16.

On page 28, line 12, following the words "this section.", it is proposed to insert "No moneys authorized by this Act shall be expended for the purposes of reclaiming, improving, grading, seeding, or reforestation of strip-mined areas except on lands owned by Federal, State, or local bodies of government, until authorized by law after completion of the study and report to the President as provided in subsection (c) of this section."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. The Senator has available under the unanimous-consent agreement 10 minutes. Ten minutes are available to the opposition.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the bill contains a section which would command and authorize the Department of the Interior to make a study of the problem of strip-mined lands. The study is to be completed by July 1, 1967. Heretofore, I have argued on the floor of the Senate that the subject of restoring lands owned by private individuals and companies ought not to be taken up until the study which would be authorized is completed. As I have said, that study will be completed on July 1, 1967.

My amendment would allow restoration of lands owned by the Federal, State, and local governments. It would not allow the restoration with taxpayers' money of lands owned by companies and private individuals, who, as I have previously stated, have destroyed the very lands that we now contemplate reclaiming.

My amendment deals only with privately owned lands. No moneys would be authorized to be spent in the reclamation of those lands until there was specific authorization by law after the study contemplated in the bill is completed.

Mr. President, I believe my amendment is sound. I believe the Senator in charge of the bill looks with favor upon it. A very anomalous situation exists. We are witnessing and tolerating the strip mining of land. That operation is rendering the land useless. Unless my amendment is adopted, the money of taxpayers will be used to reclaim, repair, and make right what the strip miners themselves should have done.

That is my case. I believe it is sound. It would be unjust and the height of folly to take the money of the ordinary taxpayer and spend it on the reclamation of lands, the ownership of which will be in private individuals, even though there would be a provision that such land might be used by the general public.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from West Virginia yield to himself?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, that portion of the bill to which the able Senator from Ohio has directed the attention of the Senate was the subject of study and hearing during consideration of the bill last year as well as this year. It has been the subject of continuing counseling by members of the Committee on Public Works with the Senator from Ohio.

In general, in essence, and in the broad outlook we have agreed with the Senator from Ohio. It has been the purpose of the committee to have provision in the legislation to restore, reclaim, and rehabilitate the strip-mined lands in areas which were public and from which the public would benefit. For a time it was thought that certain private lands might be involved. Those private lands might lend themselves to development into industrial parks or in other uses for which public benefits would be assured. For that reason the language in the bill seemed to be valid.

However, no Senator has had a more intimate knowledge of the subject of strip mining than has the Senator from Ohio, who is a former Governor of his State. We know his efforts while chief executive of Ohio, to improve and redevelop the scarred land that has resulted from strip mining. Both the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from West Virginia know that more than 800,000 acres of land have been strip mined in approximately a dozen States. We also know that there has been a voluntary reclaiming of the lands in some States, and in other States there has been reclamation as a result of the passage of State laws.

We also recognize that this land which has been scarred, eroded, and made ugly was made so because of certain strip-mining operations that of necessity were required to go forward. So we would not make a blanket indictment against strip-mining operations. But we would

say only that there has been a failure, in part the result of State law and in part caused by the operator, who oftentimes has been without financial resources, to provide for the reclaiming of the land.

Therefore, today we find that of the approximately 500,000 acres of affected land within the Appalachian area, only a portion of such land has been reclaimed. I believe only about 40 percent of the strip-mined territory of the United States has been reclaimed as of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There was no desire on the part of the committee or the Senator now speaking in any sense to bring a windfall to any corporation. What we desire to do is for the public good. We would do it for the general welfare.

Therefore, because of the constructive suggestion and the broad experience of the Senator from Ohio, and because this is not a point easily arrived at but has been the subject of a considerable number of conferences, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, and the Senator from West Virginia are in a position to accept the language of the amendment as modified by the Senator from Ohio. We will therefore proceed with this work as was intended at the outset, of course, but now it will proceed only on public lands until completion of the study authorized in the pending bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I appreciate very much the very sound approach that the Senator from West Virginia has taken to this subject.

Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation showing the dollar value of the coal taken out of the ground in the States of the Union together with a tabulation of the depletion allowance that has been granted to the companies that did the mining.

The coal industry has a 10-percent depletion allowance. That means that 10 percent of the money received for the coal is set aside as nontaxable. The depletion allowance for coal-mining companies in 1960, which is the last tabulation I have, was $44 million. I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation be printed in the RECORD.

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

Estimated maximum depletion deduction allowable—Bituminous coal, lignite (strip mining), year 1960

SCHEDULE NO. 1

State	Number of strip mines (1)	Production, net tons (2)	Average value f.o.b. mine (3)	Estimated total gross value (4)	Estimated royalty exclusion, at 15 cents per ton (5)	Estimated adjusted gross income depletable (6)	Estimated depletion allowable, at 10 percent rate (7)	Percent total coal production by stripping (8)
Alabama	39	2,558,414	$5.06	$12,945,574.84	$383,762.10	$12,561,812.74	$1,256,181.27	19.6
Alaska	6	655,489	8.90	5,833,852.10	98,323.35	5,735,528.75	573,552.88	90.7
Arkansas	10	296,249	7.30	2,162,617.70	44,437.35	2,118,180.35	211,818.04	72.4
Colorado	7	692,849	3.73	2,584,326.77	103,927.35	2,480,399.42	248,039.94	19.2
Illinois	69	22,670,585	4.01	90,909,045.85	3,400,587.75	87,508,458.10	8,750,845.81	49.3
Indiana	47	10,784,967	3.82	41,198,573.94	1,617,745.05	39,580,828.89	3,958,082.89	69.4
Iowa	25	867,924	3.41	2,959,620.84	130,188.60	2,829,432.24	282,943.22	81.3
Kansas	11	884,690	4.71	4,166,889.90	132,703.50	4,034,186.40	403,418.64	99.6
Kentucky	129	19,672,192	3.34	65,705,121.28	2,950,828.80	62,754,292.48	6,275,429.25	29.4
Maryland	37	487,636	3.32	1,618,951.52	73,145.40	1,545,806.12	154,580.61	65.2
Missouri	23	2,801,937	4.28	11,992,290.36	420,290.55	11,571,999.81	1,157,199.98	96.9
Montana	5	197,430	2.12	418,551.60	29,614.50	388,937.10	38,893.71	63.0
New Mexico	1	45,000	4.59	206,550.00	6,750.00	199,800.00	19,980.00	15.3
North Dakota	31	2,522,552	2.29	5,776,644.08	378,382.80	5,398,261.28	539,826.13	99.9
Ohio	265	23,883,289	3.64	86,935,171.96	3,582,493.35	83,352,678.61	8,335,267.86	70.3
Oklahoma	15	1,093,965	6.29	6,881,039.85	164,094.75	6,716,945.10	671,694.51	81.5
Pennsylvania	553	20,875,533	3.68	76,821,961.44	3,131,329.95	73,690,631.49	7,369,063.15	31.9
South Dakota	1	20,448	4.08	83,427.84	3,067.20	80,360.64	8,036.06	100.0
Tennessee	71	1,763,913	3.36	5,926,747.68	264,586.95	5,662,160.73	566,216.07	29.8
Virginia	35	1,370,864	3.17	4,345,638.88	205,629.00	4,140,009.88	414,000.99	4.9
Washington	1	16,177	9.75	157,725.75	2,426.55	155,299.20	15,529.92	7.1
West Virginia	140	6,754,001	3.66	24,719,643.66	1,013,100.15	23,706,543.51	2,370,654.35	5.7
Wyoming	9	1,713,384	2.80	4,797,475.20	257,007.60	4,540,457.60	454,056.76	84.6
Total	1,530	122,629,664		459,147,443.14	18,394,449.60	440,240,494.36	44,024,049.44	
Overall average			3.74					

NOTES

(1) Col. 1 from table 29, p. 86, Minerals Yearbook, 1960, vol. II, "Fuels," U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

(2) Col. 2 from table 28, p. 86, Minerals Yearbook, 1960, vol. II, "Fuels," U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

(3) Col. 3 from table 63, p. 137, Minerals Yearbook, 1960, vol. II, "Fuels," U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

(4) Col. 5 assumed royalty payments based on estimated average of 15-cent-per-ton royalty, for bituminous and lignite.

(5) Col. 7 maximum percentage depletion allowable on 10 percent of adjusted gross income.

(6) Col. 8 table 15, p. 67, Minerals Yearbook, 1960, vol. II, "Fuels," U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

Estimated maximum depletion deduction allowable—Bituminous coal, lignite (strip mining), year 1961

SCHEDULE NO. 2

State	Number of strip mines (1)	Production, net tons (2)	Average value f.o.b. mine (3)	Estimated total gross value (4)	Estimated royalty exclusion, at 15 cents per ton (5)	Estimated adjusted gross income depletable (6)	Estimated depletion allowable, at 10 percent rate (7)	Percent total coal production by stripping (8)
Alabama	44	2,701,052	$4.79	$12,938,039.08	$405,157.80	$12,532,881.28	$1,253,288.13	20.9
Alaska	4	627,537	8.17	5,126,977.29	94,130.55	5,032,846.74	503,284.67	85.2
Arkansas	10	230,341	6.75	1,554,801.75	34,551.15	1,520,250.60	152,025.06	58.3
Colorado	6	521,368	3.68	1,918,634.24	78,205.20	1,840,429.04	184,042.90	14.2
Illinois	61	22,785,504	3.96	90,230,595.84	3,417,825.60	86,812,770.24	8,681,277.02	50.4
Indiana	40	10,497,306	3.79	39,784,789.74	1,574,595.90	38,210,193.84	3,821,019.38	69.5
Iowa	26	779,600	3.43	2,674,028.00	116,940.00	2,557,088.00	255,708.80	84.1
Kansas	9	661,876	4.67	3,090,960.92	99,281.40	2,991,679.52	299,167.95	99.7
Kentucky	111	21,453,691	3.36	72,084,401.76	3,218,053.65	68,866,348.11	6,886,634.81	34.0
Maryland	33	470,263	3.21	1,509,544.23	70,539.45	1,439,004.78	143,900.48	62.1
Missouri	19	2,867,037	4.25	12,184,907.25	430,055.55	11,754,851.70	1,175,485.17	2.4
Montana	4	271,008	2.04	552,856.32	40,651.20	512,205.12	51,220.51	73.1
New Mexico	1	15,248	5.03	76,697.44	2,287.20	74,410.24	7,441.02	3.7
North Dakota	31	2,724,289	2.25	6,129,650.25	408,643.35	5,721,006.90	572,100.69	99.9
Ohio	260	22,463,370	3.57	80,194,230.90	3,369,505.50	76,824,725.40	7,682,472.54	69.7
Oklahoma	17	882,844	6.18	5,455,975.92	132,426.60	5,323,549.32	532,354.93	85.6

See notes at end of table.

Estimated maximum depletion deduction allowable—Bituminous coal, lignite (strip mining), year 1961—Continued

SCHEDULE NO. 2

State	Number of strip mines (1)	Production, net tons (2)	Average value f.o.b. mine (3)	Estimated total gross value (4)	Estimated royalty exclusion, at 15 cents per ton (5)	Estimated adjusted gross income depletable (6)	Estimated depletion allowable, at 10 percent rate (7)	Percent total coal production by stripping (8)
Pennsylvania	535	20,744,848	$3.60	$74,681,452.80	$3,111,727.20	$71,569,725.60	$7,156,972.56	33.1
South Dakota	1	17,805	4.20	74,781.00	2,670.75	72,110.25	7,211.02	100.0
Tennessee	65	1,761,170	3.39	5,970,366.30	264,175.50	5,706,190.80	570,619.08	30.1
Virginia	36	1,412,341	2.98	4,208,776.18	211,851.15	3,996,925.03	399,692.50	4.7
Washington	1	6,382	9.71	61,969.22	957.30	61,011.92	6,101.19	3.3
West Virginia	154	5,860,083	3.55	20,803,294.65	879,012.45	19,924,282.20	1,992,428.22	5.2
Wyoming	9	2,224,121	2.91	6,472,192.11	333,618.15	6,138,573.96	613,857.40	88.0
Total	1,477	121,979,084		447,779,923.19	18,296,862.00	429,483,060.29	42,948,306.03	
Overall average			3.67					

NOTES

(1) Col. 1, table 30 p. 96, Minerals Yearbook, 1961, vol. II, "Fuels," Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

(2) Col 2, table 30 p. 96, Minerals Yearbook, 1961, vol. II, "Fuels," Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

(3) Col. 3, table 64 p. 148, Minerals Yearbook, 1961, vol. II, "Fuels," Department of Interior, Bureau of Mines.

(4) Col. 5, assumed royalty payments based on estimated average of 15 cents per ton royalty for bituminous and lignite.

(5) Col. 7, maximum percentage depletion allowable on 10 percent of adjusted gross income.

(6) Col. 8, table 14, p. 76, Minerals Yearbook, 1961, vol. II, "Fuel," Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am ready for the vote on the amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia wishes to point out further that more acres have been strip mined in Ohio than in any other State. We sometimes think of West Virginia and Pennsylvania as the leading coal-producing States; but strip mining has been done more extensively in Ohio than in any other State.

Again, as the Senator in charge of the bill, I say that I am in agreement with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], that the amendment as now modified is acceptable.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio is of tremendous value. We know of the effort he has been making for 2 years to have a survey made of the problems that arise from strip mining.

Two or three years ago, I was informed by the Forest Service, of the Department of Agriculture, that there was little knowledge of the types of things that could be done to correct the ravages resulting from strip mining. Studies have been made of the damages caused in flat country, but the Forest Service said there was little information about the types of vegetation or timber that could be established upon the ravaged lands.

The only research that has been in progress on this problem to date is that conducted by Berea College, in Kentucky, through the efforts made by the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD] and the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER and Mr. MORTON]. Two years ago we were able to secure a small appropriation to permit this investigation to go forward. Now it is necessary to have more money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this morning I asked Mr. Leary, of the Department of the Interior, what experiments had been made concerning the kinds of vegetation that can be grown on the strip-mined lands. He told me that the Department had made two experiments on two small plots of land. I had to chuckle when he gave that answer, because we in Ohio have been conducting experiments for 16 years, trying to find out what kind of trees and grasses will grow and how the ground can be prepared to produce vegetation where the coal has produced a toxic condition when water has fallen on it.

Since we have entered into this discussion, I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that it strengthens my judgment that the only intelligent way to handle this situation is, first, to make a study, and then to formulate a program concerning what shall be done.

Mr. COOPER. Despite the provisions in the bill, unless some support is given to research to determine the types of vegetation that can be produced, how forestry can be conducted, and how the acid water that comes from the strip mines can be treated to make it potable again, all of this action will not mean very much.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, has all time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I desire to yield myself 1 minute, to complete my remarks.

In furtherance of the colloquy between the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Ohio, I recall inviting the Secretary of Agriculture, last year, to travel with me over some of the strip-mined area in West Virginia. We found that in our conservation districts, headway was just beginning to be made in the development of cover crops that seemed to be, at least in part, successful. But the Department representatives themselves were the first to indicate that a further study in depth was needed in order to solve the problem completely.

So as we proceed with this reclamation work, interim reports will be made. This, I feel certain, is the desire of the Senator from Ohio and of the members of the committee, as well.

Mr. President, I ask that the Chair put the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, would it be in order for me to ask unanimous consent to speak on the bill, even though no amendment is now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota must ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I supported the Appalachia bill last year, and I intend to support it again when it comes to a vote this year. But I shall do so with the full understanding that this is the first bill in a list of regional development programs that are to be implemented.

The problems of the Appalachian region are serious. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has brought that situation forcefully to the attention of Congress over a long period. But there are also serious and stubborn problems in other areas of the country. Not the least of them is concentrated in the Great Plains area.

Not wishing to encumber the bill now before the Senate with another amendment, but recognizing, nevertheless, the serious problems of the Dakotas, Montana, Wyoming, and other States of the upper Great Plains area, I introduced a bill a week ago to encourage much the same kind of regional and economic development in that section of the country as is provided for in the Appalachia concept.

I hope that we may count on the assurances that were given this morning from the administration that regional planning and development will go

forward in my section of the country, as it will in other parts of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain economic data prepared by my staff relative to economic problems in our area be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ECONOMIC DATA ON SOUTH DAKOTA AND THE NORTHERN GREAT PLAINS

I. From "Family Income and Related Characteristics Among Low-Income Counties and States," Welfare Research Report I, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, September 1964.

(a) South Dakota's median family income is the ninth lowest in the Nation.

(b) Most of the 10 lowest median family income States registered the sharpest improvement in the Nation for median family income from 1949–59. But of the 10 lowest States, South Dakota was an exception with the lowest intercensal improvement (24.6 percent) of any State in the Nation. The national average gain was 50.5 percent over the 10-year period.

(c) Oliver County, N. Dak., registered the largest decline in median family income from 1949 to 1959 among the 10 lowest States, 41 percent.

(d) There are 128 counties which reflect various degrees of economic stagnation that calls for special attention with a minimum of delay. Of the 49 most severe counties, South Dakota has the largest number, 12.

(e) Another measure of significance in relation to the low-income States and counties is the ratio of persons in the dependent ages (under 18 and 65 or over) for each 100 persons in the so-called nondependent ages (18–64). Here, South Dakota's ratio is 96.1, second highest in the Nation.

(f) The aid to families with dependent children recipient rate, based on the number of children under age 18 receiving aid per 1,000 children under 18 years of age, is another good indicator. Among the lowest median family income States, this rate was below the national average in only 3 of the 10 lowest States, one of which was South Dakota.

II. From "Converging Social Trends: Emerging Social Patterns" welfare administration report, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964.

(a) The 20.9 percent of the families in South Dakota have annual income below $2,000.

III. From Department of Commerce report, the Washington World, May 11, 1964.

(a) South Dakota suffered a 6-percent decline in per capita personal income from 1962 to 1963. This was the second highest percentage decline in the Nation. North Dakota suffered the highest, 12 percent.

IV. From "Economic Progress Bulletin," Upper Midwest Research and Development Council, April 6, 1964.

(a) If South Dakota had not had net migration of 94,466 in the 1950–60 period, 2.8 percent could have been added to total personal income.

(b) The national per annum percent of population growth for the period 1950–60 was 1.7 percent. For the upper Midwest it was 0.93 percent. For South Dakota, 0.42 percent. Forty-six of South Dakota's counties showed a decline in population from 1950 to 1960. Only three counties did not show a net migration.

(c) It is estimated that the number of South Dakota farms will decrease from 63,000 in the 1954–58 period to 49,900 in 1975, or a 20.8-percent decline.

V. From "Education and the Upper Midwest Economies," by Jack I. Stone, upper Midwest economic study, a joint undertaking by the Upper Midwest Research and Development Council and the University of Minnesota, January 1964.

(a) Estimates of average salaries of classroom teachers in 1962–63 show that only two States rank lower than South Dakota's $3,950 per year. North Dakota, with $4,275 ranks 43d in the Nation. Montana is 29th with $5,150.

(b) In North and South Dakota, less than one out of five elementary school teachers has a bachelor's degree—far fewer than in any other State in the Nation.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I would find it difficult to support the Appalachia bill if I assumed that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget was speaking for the administration with respect to farm policy. In some of the statements that we read coming from the Budget Director with respect to agriculture policy, not only affecting my State, but all 50 States, there is cause for alarm. When we read, as I did a few days ago in a leading journal, a statement by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that American agriculture can support only 1 million farm families, when in fact 3,500,000 families are now living on the land, that is, indeed, cause for great concern.

I am sure that that does not represent the position of the President. We shall get a message on agriculture from the President later this week. We have good reason to believe that the President will refute the line of reasoning set out by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

This is what the President had to say concerning agriculture when he spoke to a farm audience in Des Moines, Iowa, last October 7. He said:

> This campaign is going to give the people of America a clear mandate for a farm policy that will restore full parity of income and opportunity to all of the American farmers who live on American farms.

That means not just 1 million, but all of the American farmers who live on American farms. That is 3½ million farmers, not 1 million, as one would conclude from the article by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have had great difficulty in reconciling the statement of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that 2½ million farmers ought to leave the land and go to the cities, while at the same time we propose in the Appalachian bill to give up to $500 to each farmer in Appalachia to improve his pasture land for the purpose, in my mind, of increasing the cattle population.

The two things just do not go hand in hand.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the point of the Senator may be well taken. But, beyond that there is also the larger problem of how we shall deal with poverty in this country. It does no good simply to transfer rural poverty into the cities, which are already overly congested and troubled with unemployed and poverty.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator be permitted to speak for 4 minutes, and that he may yield a half minute to me.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield a half minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I saw the ravages of unemployment in the big cities during the depression. I was on the bench. I saw replevin actions and mortgage foreclosures brought before the courts.

If depression were to strike, I should pray that there would be more people on the farms where they are able to sustain themselves, rather than that they all be in the cities.

If we should ever have a recurrence of what happened and all of the people were to be concentrated in the cities, there would be an unbearable problem.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I think the point of the Senator is well taken. Many of the serious depressions began on the farms. The depression of 1929 had its origin 8 or 10 years before that time, with the very severe depression of income in the agricultural areas.

Mr. President, to further assure our farm families that the philosophy outlined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget does not represent the view of the President, I should like to quote three or four other statements made by President Johnson last October. He said:

> We intend to continue, but to improve, commodity programs. We intend to strengthen farm income.
>
> We intend to assure rural Americans full partnership in the building of our Great Society.

Then he said:

> You can choose our proposal to continue but to improve commodity programs, or you can choose the contrary proposal, to wipe those programs out altogether.

Then the President reveals what would happen if we were to eliminate our farm commodity programs. He said:

> First, net farm income throughout the Nation would be cut in half, or $6 billion. Do you want that to happen?
>
> Second, one out of five farmers would be bankrupt. Do you want that to happen?

The President does not even want 1 out of 5 farmers to be bankrupted, let alone to drive 2½ million farmers out of the total of 3½ million farmers off the land and into the cities to join the unemployed—or to sign up for the Job Corps.

The President then said:

> We know from bitter experiences that depressions are farm-led and they are farm-fed, and I say to you that the Democratic Party under my leadership, as long as I am President, is not going to repeat that experience. * * *
>
> The Democratic goal is parity of income for the farmer.

Mr. President, it is because I believe President Johnson's pledge, which I have just read, that I feel I have the assurance which I think I need to support programs of public assistance for other

sections of the country such as Appalachia. The greatest need in my State, among several, is improved farm income. The President's own policy statements, plus assurances in regard to regional development given today, reassure me that South Dakota problems are to be met.

I urgently hope and expect that when the President outlines his views on agriculture to Congress on Thursday, we shall have a strong reaffirmation of his pledge to improve our farm commodity problems, to raise farm income—which is now only about half the national per capita average—and to strengthen in every way that we can the agricultural sections of the country.

Mr. President, there is a very fine letter to the editor in this morning's Washington Post. This is authored by Mr. Leon Keyserling, the distinguished economist. It is entitled "Farmers' Plight." I ask unanimous consent that that letter to the editor may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FARMERS' PLIGHT

Your editorial of January 27 deals with the plight of agriculture, challenges any cutbacks in Government efforts to bolster farm income, and focuses upon the low-income commercial farmers, whom you state to be 1½ million, or almost 43 percent of total farm families, of whom 821,000 have incomes of less than $5,000, and the rest average between $5,000 and $10,000. You also refer to about 1 million farm families—almost 29 percent of the total—as large commercial operators with gross income of $10,000 a year or more. I would like to commend the general thrust of your editorials, but add that the farm income problem is far more serious than your figures would indicate.

Among those you class as large commercial operators, a majority have actual (net) incomes of less than half their gross incomes, and many work for substandard wages, after deducting costs of operations and taxes, and interest payments on their burdensome debts. As income is usually measured, in 1963 only 8 percent of farm families (not 29 percent) were at $10,000 or more, contrasted with 20.7 percent of nonfarm families. Meanwhile, 43.4 percent of farm families were under $3,000, contrasted with only 17 percent of nonfarm families; 17 percent of the former were under $2,000, contrasted with only 6.2 percent of the latter; and 11.1 percent of the former were under $1,000, contrasted with only 3.3 percent of the latter. And the $3,000 figure is only a benchmark for poverty, not an acceptable level of income.

Putting aside the 4 percent of all farms which are really large or giant in nature, and which receive far more help from the Government than they need, almost all of the rest of the farm population needs a drastically reoriented farm-income policy, which would also benefit the whole economy.

You are also correct in deploring the misconception that our economic problems can be ameliorated by an accelerated egress of people from agriculture. I estimate that probably a third and maybe a half of total excess unemployment in the United States today is due to reduction of the farm population since 1953; and that, in view of unusually high spending by farmers in ratio to their incomes, at least a fifth of our total national production gap of $590 billion (in 1963 dollars) during the 12-year period 1953–64, was due to deficient farm income.

More important still, and again counter to the general impression, we will need a farm labor force practically as large in 1975 as now, despite the rapid advance in farm technology, if we really intend to provide a nutritious diet for all American families as part of the war against poverty, to meet our domestic food and fiber requirements (including industrial requirements) under conditions of sustained maximum employment and production, and to elevate to appropriate levels our food assistance to the more than half the world's population who are now dangerously underfed.

The farm problem is thus an acute illustration of what happens when we do not project meaningful quantitative estimates of our needs and resources as guides to public policies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the RECORD show that it is the Senator from New York?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] proposes the following amendment:

On page 44, add to section 403 the following:

"*Provided*, That the Commission is hereby authorized and directed to study and consider the inclusion of such counties of the State of New York as are contiguous to the Appalachian region as defined in this section and counties contiguous thereto, in the "Appalachian region" for the purposes of this Act; and if the Commission shall decide after consultation with the State of New York, that these counties share the social and economic characteristics of the region, and that the inclusion of these counties would further the purposes of this Act as set forth in section 2, then the Commission is authorized and directed to invite the State of New York to participate in the Commission on an appropriate basis: *Provided further*, That the Commission may extend the invitation to the State of New York for inclusion of such of the described counties the inclusion of which would further the purposes of the Act: *And provided further*, That if such invitation is accepted by the State of New York, those counties shall be included in 'the region' or 'the Appalachian region' for the purposes of this Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from New York yield to himself? The Senator has 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, this program has been led by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

I commend them for the efforts that they have made.

I spent a good deal of time in the Appalachian area, in both West Virginia and Kentucky. I know the needs that exist there. I commend the two Senators for the efforts which they are making to help and assist the people of that area.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that the Governors of several of the States first invited to participate in the planning of a program for Appalachia did not accept the invitation. As the potential worth of this excellent program became more clear, however, three Governors modified their earlier positions; and their States are now full participants.

The State of New York, however, has never taken part in this program. As a result, no New York counties are included in the "Appalachian region" for the purposes of the act.

This omission, I believe, is contrary to the purpose of the bill to provide true regional planning and development for this needy area. The counties of the southern tier of New York are, of course, immediately adjacent to the northernmost counties of Pennsylvania included in S. 3. Geographically, they are part of the great mountain chain of the Appalachians. Economically, they have many close ties with counties included in S. 3.

And, tragically, these counties share another characteristic trait of the areas now covered by the bill. They are poor. Of the 199,000 families in the 13 counties of the southern tier, for instance, more than 23,000—nearly 12 percent—have incomes of under $2,000 a year, according to the 1960 census. In fact, these New York counties are less free from poverty than many of the counties now included in S. 3. In the Pennsylvania counties to which they are contiguous, for example, only about 11 percent of all families have incomes of under $2,000 a year. And in Allegheny County, Pa., only 5.2 percent of all families are in this unfortunate class.

In several southern New York counties—like Allegany, Otsego, and Delaware—about 15 percent of all families have incomes under $2,000 yearly. These counties are in this repect more like West Virginia—where in many counties about 17 to 18 percent of all families have incomes in this range—than they are to the counties of Pennsylvania which they adjoin.

These facts have many sad consequences. One of the most ominous is that young people are leaving the region in ever-increasing numbers. The birth rate of the region is about the same as that for the Nation as a whole. But while 14.6 percent of the Nation's population is in the vital age bracket from 15 to 24, counties like Steuben and Chautauqua have only 11.6 percent of their population in this group. A region's future, like a Nation's future, is in its youth; if these counties continue to lose their young people, they will have no future.

It is for these reasons that I believe that the inclusion of many of the counties of the southern tier of New York would materially further the purposes of this bill.

Addition of these counties would follow ample precedent. Only as recently as the Senate's consideration of S. 2782 last year did the State of South Carolina ask to participate. South Carolina was then included in the bill. Last week, the committee added four counties of the State of Ohio to the "Appalachian region" for the purposes of the act.

Unfortunately, it would be impossible at this time to include the counties of which I have spoken in the bill. The President's committee has had no opportunity to study the facts I have noted,

in an effort to decide whether, and on what basis, these counties should be included in the planning and action programs to be carried out under this bill. Indeed, even if the committee, or Congress, had decided that their participation was appropriate, that participation would not now be possible. For this program is based on voluntary State participation. And the Governor of my State, regardless of the poverty found in these counties, has not seen fit to agree to their inclusion in the bill.

But the door should be kept open. My amendment would direct the Commission to study the inclusion of the counties of the southern tier—defined as "counties—contiguous to the 'Appalachian region'—as now defined in the bill—and counties contiguous thereto"—in the planning and action programs established under the bill. The Commission would have to decide whether any of these counties share the social and economic characteristics of Appalachia and whether their inclusion would further the purposes of the act—whether their inclusion would assist in the regional development of an area which now "lags behind the rest of the Nation in its economic growth," the people of which "have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity."

If the Commission decided that these criteria were met, it would invite the State of New York to participate in the Appalachian Regional Commission proposed to be established by the bill. If the Governor then accepted this invitation, the appropriate counties, as decided by the Commission, would be included in the "Appalachian region" for the purposes of the act.

I would like to stress two points about this amendment.

First, it is not an enlargement of S. 3, nor does it extend S. 3 beyond its original intended bounds. This is a bill for the entire Appalachian region. I do not think there is any question but that southern New York is a part of that region.

Second, the amendment would not allow these New York counties to participate until a majority of the States now represented on the Commission, and the Federal cochairman, decide that their inclusion is appropriate—in light of their needs and the suitability of integrating their planning with counties already participating.

In sum, this amendment would keep open the possibility of correcting the omission of these counties, so sorely in need of regional planning and assistance, from this forward-looking program. It is my hope, as it is the hope of the communities of southern New York, that the Governor will reconsider his position and allow them to develop their lagging economies. Should he do so, the bill should not prevent them.

The counties of New York which I would expect to be affected by this amendment are Allegany, Broome, Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, Chemung, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware, Otsego, Schuyler, Steuben, Tioga, and Tompkins.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield back his time?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I wish to reserve my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield time to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I recognize and appreciate the interest and concern of the distinguished Senator from New York in this area of New York, and in the specific counties to which he has referred in his statement, but his amendment gives me some concern. This concern causes me some difficulty because my own State is a beneficiary of this bill. In such a position one is in the danger of being thought to be interested in his particular State and not in other areas.

That is not my reason for opposing the amendment. I believe the amendment to be in contradiction to the history of the development of the act. Also, it contradicts the policy to which the committee has adhered with respect to similar proposals.

Speaking to my first point, the Appalachian bill came primarily from the States. The plan was worked out in specific detail by the Governors of the States and representatives of the Federal Government. After having reached certain conclusions and findings concerning the entire area, the late President Kennedy established the Appalachian Regional Commission to work out the details for an action program.

Subsequently the bill was presented to the Congress. It is an approach based upon the characteristics of the region, and it specifically names the counties which are to be eligible for development. Several counties in States have been added, but they have been added by the action of the committee, and last year they were confirmed by the Congress.

The amendment that has been proposed would not follow this careful procedure. It would delegate to the Commission the authority to review the problems of this particular area in New York and to decide whether the area should be included, contingent upon the consent of the State.

I am sympathetic to the interest of the Senator. It is possible that these counties should have been included. We have had presented no evidence, however, of their specific problems and characteristics which would lead us to include them at this time.

I am concerned that this amendment gives to the Commission, rather than the Congress, the power to add additional areas.

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

Mr. COOPER. May I have one more minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. COOPER. In addition, to support the amendment would be contrary to the action we have been taking toward other areas that are asking for consideration. We have asked that they present their specific reasons.

It is a matter of some regret that I take this position. I believe, in all honesty, that I must take it. I shall vote against the amendment of the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the State of New York has heretofore felt, through its Governor, that the Appalachia program was applicable to a region of the country which did not include New York.

Whatever may have been the reasons for that in the past, the amendment which my colleague from New York has now drafted leaves it to the State of New York to determine whether or not it shall enter into this program, because the operative words are "if the invitation is accepted," at the end of the amendment. This is different from the structure of the act as submitted to the State and as submitted to the Governor heretofore.

As the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, in this structure of the bill, an invitation to the State is to be accepted as a part of the bill. I do not see that the State should or could properly object to the provision. However, I point out the State can be put in a difficult position by a definition to which it may not be a party, and as to which it may have strong opposition.

Therefore, I have suggested to my colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] that I shall be glad to join with him in the amendment which he has proposed if we can make a few changes in it, which I should like to detail now.

Mr. President, if I offer an amendment to the amendment, I am entitled to 10 minutes, am I not?

May I ask the Senator in charge of the bill, if it is agreeable, to ask that time on the amendment be extended by 5 minutes, so we may wrap the whole thing together?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I suggest that we would deal with the fundamentals of the problem if the amendment were revised in the second line as indicated. As I said, I shall join in support of the amendment, with the consent of my colleague from New York, if he accepts these changes. The amendment now reads:

Provided, That the Commission is hereby authorized and directed to study and consider the inclusion of such counties of the State of New York as are contiguous to the Appalachian region.

And so forth.

I suggest, after the word "consider," that the following language be inserted:

to study and consider in consultation with the Governor of the State of New York or an appropriate official or officials designated by him.

Mr. President, I shall send that language to the desk in a moment.

To conform with that change, in the sixth line, the words "State of New York" are no longer necessary, and it should read, "after such consultation," inserting words that go with the provision I have proposed.

Finally, in the 16th line, which provides for the acceptance of the invitation, after the word "is" I would insert the words "duly accepted," so it is in accordance with the constitutional processes of the State.

The words which I first used, "in consultation with the Governor of New York or an appropriate official or officials, designated by him" are words of art. Similar language is to be found on page 36, section 223 of the bill, which refers to consultation with the appropriate official or officials before grants can be made under the program. These words are the result of an amendment which I introduced last session to the pending bill and which was adopted and passed by the Senate on September 25, 1964. They provide a necessary requirement, I believe, for State participation in the Appalachian program.

One other point of qualification with regard to my colleague's proposal. The language contained in the amendment, "as are contiguous to the Appalachian region as defined in this section and counties contiguous thereto," may take us all the way to the Canadian border.

In short, the language itself may be unlimited in terms of the counties to be affected. I therefore suggest to my colleague, not as a part of the amendment—we can leave that to be clarified in conference—that we actually name for the RECORD the 13 counties which my colleague has in mind.

I should be happy to read them, if he wishes me to do so. This will nail down, for the purposes of debate and legislative history, exactly what counties we have in mind, defining or rather implementing the words which might be misconstrued and take us into a much broader area than my colleague has in mind in proposing his amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I believe the language is quite clear as to what area would be included. I would have no objection, specifically, to including the names of the counties. The amendment was drawn up with some care, so I do not believe that it could possibly be considered as stretching beyond 12 or 13 counties. But I would have no objection to including the names of the counties, as an amendment to my amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall name the counties in this debate, because I do not believe that we need to include them in the amendment. For the purposes of legislative history, they are as follows:

Allegany, Broome, Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, Chemung, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware, Otsego, Schuyler, Steuben, Tioga, and Tompkins.

Is this list correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

I have made a study of this proposed legislation, which has been conducted through the Senate with such skill by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. I am impressed with the amount of good which it will do in the areas of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky. I know that the inclusion of these counties will make a vast difference in areas in the State of New York which suffer from the same kind of problem.

Mr. JAVITS. Are we to assume that the Senator has modified his amendment in accordance with the modification which I have just recited?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] agree to modify his amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. JAVITS. If it is acceptable to the Senator, I urge that the Senate adopt the amendment as modified for the reasons set forth, and I thank my colleague for his cooperation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from West Virginia yield himself?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Five minutes. I have 6 minutes remaining; do I understand correctly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Certain counties in the State of New York were originally considered as a part of the Appalachian region, but the State of New York, as was the case with the State of Ohio at a certain point, and also the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of South Carolina, did not originally certificate themselves for membership in the Appalachian region.

Senators know that last year the Committee on Public Works added six counties in South Carolina. This was done at the request of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Governor of that State.

This section was approved last September in the Senate when it passed S. 2782. This year, the Committee on Public Works added four more counties in the State of Ohio, these counties being added at the direct request of the Governor of Ohio. These counties were, therefore, included in the amendments which were submitted from the committee and which were approved en bloc during the consideration of Senate bill 3.

I believe that the amendment which is before the Senate, as submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and now as modified by his colleague, with the coauthorship of the now pending and modified amendment, does not require specific congressional approval or action. I believe that these counties will be the subject, naturally, of close study by the Commission. Also, it shows that initiative must be taken by the State of New York in responding to the invitation of the Commission in connection with the 13 counties which have been named in debate.

Finally, the amendment as modified would assure that the future inclusion of certain counties in the Appalachian area within New York State will be adopted or added only if a majority of the Commission, after study, would agree that it should be done. Of course, there must be concurrence by a Federal member as well as by the Governors or their representatives in the State.

Therefore, I believe that the interests of other States—and specifically now New York—and the Federal Government seem to be adequately protected in the language as modified by the two Senators from New York, [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. Kennedy].

Let me reiterate that the amendment does not automatically include the 13 counties of the State of New York. Therefore, personally, I shall vote for the amendment as offered by my colleagues from New York and modified at the suggestion of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] with the concurrence of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. JAVITS. The language of the amendment in its operative clause is:

Provided further, That the Commission may extend an invitation to the State of New York for inclusion of which would further the purposes of the Act.

The Senator from West Virginia stated that a majority of the Commission must decide that it wishes to extend the invitation, but let me point out that the language may be more restrictive than that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the Senator from New York may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. The amendment provides that the Commission is authorized and directed to invite the State of New York to participate. I am rather concerned about those words "and directed" in terms of actually mandating the Commission, whatever the majority of the Commission might think. I raise that point—as I am sure there will be plenty of opportunity to do, and the Senator may have that in mind—so that the legal points may be resolved. What we have in mind is that the Commission shall, by an exercise of its judgment, decide that it does or does not, based upon this study, wish to invite the State of New York.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe that is correct. The concern voiced can be taken care of by the Commission.

Mr. JAVITS. One other point is understanding whether the counties named are the maximum counties. I understand that with respect to some of them we have had an opportunity to check this point only briefly. They are counties which were distressed areas but

which now have come out of the distressed area status. But by at least fixing the county we are talking about, we do, in a sense, make it a maximum one. There are many more counties in New York State which are eligible for accelerated public works funds and ARA aid.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has expired. The Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield time to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the colloquy between the two Senators from New York. I must hold to my view that the amendment is not in harmony with the history of the development of the bill. It is certainly not correct to clothe the Commission with general authority to include counties or areas in the bill. It is the prerogative of Congress to do so.

I maintain my position in opposition to the amendment, not without sympathy for the areas affected.

I hope very much that when the bill goes to the House, the House will hold hearings on the amendment, at which time the Senator from New York may present his arguments for the inclusion of these counties, and if the House finds proper, it will write an amendment specifically naming the counties which should be included. If that were done, it would satisfy my objections. That would be the proper way to consider the amendment.

I make my statement now for the record: I hope that when the House handles the bill, it will include these counties by name, if it wishes to do so. If it does so, it will be acting on established grounds. I must therefore vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senators from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not intend to offer an amendment, but I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes to discuss one phase of the bill which deals with Federal employment and State and local employment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in the proposal before the Senate at this time, several sections deal with the Federal service, Federal employment, and employment that will be carried out jointly between the States, the Federal Government, and the local communities involved.

I refer to section 101 of the bill. The subject is carried through into section 106.

The bill provides that the Federal Government shall make arrangements with the State governments and local communities in regard to the benefits that the Federal employees are to receive.

Before I go any further, I have the very highest regard for the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. He and I are members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, where we deal with these matters all the time.

I wish to make the record clear, however, that in establishing these agencies there is always the danger of increasing Federal employment. There is no limitation in the bill as to the number of employees that shall be engaged. I would be less than frank if I did not say that it could not be spelled out specifically. However, problems are involved. I hope that those who administer the program will keep in mind that these funds are for relief and to help people in these counties, and not to set up as large payrolls as possible—Federal or State or local payrolls.

I have discussed this subject with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I wonder if he has any comment to make.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Kansas, with whom I have the privilege of serving on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, has brought up the matter of the operation of the Commission.

The proposed legislation would establish one of the most favorable ratios of administrative expenses to program funds that I have seen in any major legislation. It would authorize $1.1 million for administrative expenses of the Commission to oversee a program of $1,092 million. Thus the administrative costs will be only one-tenth of 1 percent of the total authorized. I feel that that consideration is worthy of the attention of the Senate at this time. The cochairman would receive not more than $27,000 in annual salary. The executive director would receive not more than $24,500 a year; presumably there would be a general counsel at a GS-17 rating; and the designated representatives of the States in question would be paid at the rates established by those States.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I expected exactly the response that the chairman of the committee has made. He and I have been working on civil service matters for many years and have been concerned about a situation that may develop. I bring this up because situations like this have developed in the past, though I do not say it will develop with the new agency that is proposed to be established. It has developed in connection with the poverty program. I have before me an article published in the Kansas City Times of last Saturday morning. Kansas City had received $500,000 for the program. I read the first sentence of the article entitled "Poverty Group Stirs Council":

> Costs of $100,000 a year for local coordination of the Federal poverty program set off a city council wrangle yesterday that centered on paying staff salaries up to $31,250 a year.

Quoting further from the article:

> TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS TO DIRECTOR
>
> Under the proposed budget, a director would be paid from $25,000 to $31,250 and an assistant director could be paid from $15,000 to $18,750. Two stenographers would receive $6,000 and $5,000 a year.
>
> In addition, $59,335 would go to a consulting agency to aid coordination and research poverty projects.
>
> Two members of the consulting staff would be paid $15,000 and $12,000 a year and a stenographer would receive $4,000.

I mention this because that is a danger connected with these programs, when we set them up without any limitations or strings attached to them. Here is a half-million-dollar program, of which $100,000 will be paid to Federal employees.

I hope that in connection with the program in Appalachia, which I believe to be the beginning of a large number of regional programs, some attention will be paid to this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BASS in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] I call up my amendment No. 8. I ask that it not be read, but that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

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

On page 1 strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"CHAPTER 1—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

"Short title

"SECTION 1. This chapter may be cited as the 'Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965', and all references in this chapter to the words 'this Act' shall be held to refer to 'this chapter.' "

At the end of the bill add the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 2—OZARK REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

"Title V—Short title and statement of purpose

"Short Title

"SEC. 501. This chapter may be cited as the 'Ozark Regional Development Act of 1965'.

"Findings and Statement of Purpose

"SEC. 502. As a result of changes in the nature of its resource base and changing requirements of the national economy, the Ozark region of the United States lags behind the Nation in its economic growth, and its people have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity. The region's historical reliance on a few basic industries and marginal agriculture have failed to provide the economic base necessary for self-sustaining

growth. In some cases the uneven distribution of productive Federal expenditures has left the region at a comparative disadvantage. Nonetheless, the State and local governments and the people of the region understand their problems and have been and are prepared to work purposefully toward their solution. It is the purpose of this chapter to assist the region in meeting its special problems and promoting its economic development by helping to develop policies and programs for Federal, State, and local efforts essential to growth on a coordinated and concerted basis.

"Title VI—The Ozark Development Commission

"Membership and Voting

"SEC. 601. (a) The Ozark Development Commission (referred to as the 'Commission') shall be composed of seven members, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows: Three members appointed, one from each participating State, from among one or more nominees by the Governor of such State; three members appointed, one from each participating State; and one member appointed at the discretion of the President who shall serve as Chairman and full-time executive officer of the Commission.

"(b) Decisions by the Commission, unless delegated to the Chairman, shall require the affirmative vote of the Chairman and three other members.

"(c) The Chairman shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. There shall be a Deputy Chairman appointed by the Chairman with the approval of the Commission, who shall serve as his alternate and who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, and when not serving as an alternate for the Chairman shall perform such duties as are delegated to him by the Chairman. Other members of the Commission shall receive compensation at a rate of $75 per diem for each day on which they are engaged in the performance of duties of the Commission, and shall be reimbursed by the Commission for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"Functions of the Commission

"SEC. 602. In carrying out the purposes of this chapter the Commission shall—

"(1) develop, on a continuing basis, comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs, including those for land use and public works, and establish priorities thereunder, giving due consideration to other Federal, State, and local planning in the region;

"(2) conduct and sponsor investigations, research, and studies, including where necessary, inventory and analysis of the resources of the region and, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies, sponsor demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth;

"(3) prepare detailed plans, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, for scenic highways in the region to include planning for the development of recreational sites in such region;

"(4) make grants for graduate fellowships to encourage students in the areas of community and resource development and planning and such other areas of study as the Commission deems will carry out the purposes of this chapter;

"(5) review and study, in cooperation with the agency involved, Federal, State, and local public and private programs and, where appropriate, recommend modifications or additions which will increase their effectiveness in the region and assist in their financing;

"(6) formulate and recommend, where appropriate, interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation, and work with State and local agencies in developing appropriate model legislation;

"(7) support existing local development districts and encourage their formation where needed and make grants for professional and technical assistance to such local development districts as are certified by the Commission;

"(8) encourage private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects;

"(9) serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Federal, State, and local programs in the region;

"(10) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and proposed solutions and establish and utilize, as appropriate, citizens and special advisory councils and public conferences;

"(11) designate such other counties in the States of Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma as part of the Ozark region for the purposes of this chapter as the Commission determines necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter; and

"(12) recommend to the President for transmittal to the Congress a program of development projects with proposals for Federal participation in their funding as the Commission deems warranted by the studies begun under this chapter.

"Administrative Powers of the Commission

"SEC. 603. To carry out its duties under this chapter, the Commission is authorized to—

"(1) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the conduct of its business and the performance of its functions;

"(2) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Authority to carry out its functions, in accordance with the civil service laws of the Classification Act of 1949;

"(3) request the head of any Federal department or agency (who is hereby so authorized) to detail to temporary duty with the Commission such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as the Commission may need for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status;

"(4) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or local government or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

"(5) accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible;

"(6) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation;

"(7) establish a permanent office at such location as it may select and field offices at such other places as it may deemed appropriate; and

"(8) take such other actions and incur such other expenses as may be necessary or appropriate.

"Title VII—Miscellaneous

"Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 701. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the period ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed $7,500,000 to carry out this chapter, and for fiscal years thereafter such amounts as the Congress shall hereafter authorize.

"Local Development Districts: Certification

"SEC. 702. For the purpose of this chapter, a 'local development district' shall be an entity certified to the Commission either by the Governor of the State or States in which such entity is located, or by the State officer designated by the appropriate State law to make such certification, as having a charter or authority that includes the economic development of counties or parts of counties or other political subdivisions within the region. No entity shall be certified as a local development district for the purposes of this chapter unless it is one of the following:

"(1) A nonprofit incorporated body organized or chartered under the law of the State in which it is located;

"(2) A nonprofit agency or instrumentality of a State or local government;

"(3) A nonprofit agency or instrumentality created through an interstate compact; or

"(4) A nonprofit association or combination of such bodies, agencies, and instrumentalities.

"Annual Report

"SEC. 703. Not later than six months after the close of each fiscal year, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Governor of each State in the region and to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report on the activities carried out under this chapter during such year.

"Consent of States

"SEC. 704. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be interpreted as requiring any State to engage in or accept any program under this chapter without its consent.

"Definition of Ozark Region

"SEC. 705. As used in this chapter, the term 'Ozark region' or 'the region' means that area of the United States consisting of the following counties (including any political subdivision located within such area):

"In Arkansas—Benton, Crawford, Madison, Johnson, Boone, Searcy, Polk, Stone, Baxter, Sharp, Randolph, Washington, Franklin, Carroll, Newton, Marion, Van Buren, Cleburne, Izard, Fulton, Independence;

"In Missouri—Cooper, Cedar, Newton, Stone, Greene, Camden, Cole, Benton, Dade, McDonald, Taney, Polk, Morgan, Miller, Hickory, Lawrence, Barry, Christian, Dallas, Moniteau, Osage, Maries, Laclede, Douglas, Carter, Phelps, Webster, Ozark, Ripley, Shannon, Pulaski, Wright, Howell, Butler, Wayne;

"In Oklahoma—Bryan, Delaware, Adair, Cherokee, Sequoyah, Haskell, Latimer, Le Flore, Pushmataha, McCurtain, Choctaw, Atoka, Coal, Hughes, Johnston, Love, McIntosh, Okfuskee, Muskogee;

"Such other counties in such States as are designated by the Commission under section 602."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region and to provide the planning and coordination needed to assist the economic development of the Ozark region."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This amendment to the Appalachia bill would provide assistance for the Ozark region. The natural beauty of Arkansas is hardly surpassed by that of any other State in the Union. Naturally, this is a constant source of pride to all the people of Arkansas.

Arkansas also is enjoying great prosperity, as is the Nation generally. But the fact remains that some areas of Arkansas, and also of the Ozark region in our neighboring States of Missouri and Oklahoma, lag behind the rest of the country in economic development. This lag is not due to any lack of spirit or determination on the part of the people in the area but, rather, appears to be

one of the unfortunate circumstances of our economic life.

In the pending bill, the administration and Congress appear bent on doing something about lagging economic growth. But we seem to be a little nearsighted in that in approaching this problem the pending measure seeks only to look after one spot that needs this kind of legislative attention, namely, the Appalachian area. I have read the economic statistics on Appalachia, but I have also lived with the economic facts of life in the Ozarks. So perhaps I can appreciate the conditions prevailing there a little better than I can those in the Appalachian area.

I remind the Senate that in Arkansas we have our pockets of poverty, too. We have families earning less than $3,000 a year. We have some unemployment. We have people whose education is wanting, as does the area in the section of our country that the pending bill seeks to aid. I cite these facts not to receive sympathy, although I can and do sympathize with those who have similar problems. I cite them to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the problems of Appalachia are not peculiar to that area alone. Our section of the country has like conditions and like problems. If the Senate deems it to be a Federal responsibility to enact legislation to bolster the lagging economy in one area, it should see to it that such legislation is applied to another, similarly situated area like the Ozarks, and the bill should be amended accordingly. That is what the pending amendment seeks to do.

I am aware that the Committee on Public Works has introduced a new bill to authorize the President to establish commissions to aid in the development of other regional areas which suffer from a lack of economic growth. I also understand that the Ozark region will probably qualify under the terms of that bill. Therefore, I assume that the Senate will be asked to pass the Appalachia bill now, and that when it is out of the way we shall attend to the economic problems of other sections of the country, including the Ozarks.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. President, I have a better idea. Let us amend the Appalachia bill so as to take care of the Ozarks, as is proposed by the pending amendment, before we pass the bill. Or let us send the whole package back to the Committee on Public Works with instructions to report the bill back to the Senate with adequate provisions to assist other sections of the country which have comparable situations, although they may not be so extensive as those that prevail in the Appalachian region.

Mr. President, I submit that the problem in some areas of the Ozarks is no less compelling than it is in some sections of Appalachia.

Mr. President, surely our State, our people, and those of the entire Ozark region are no less deserving.

My distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is necessarily absent today, has joined with me as a cosponsor of this amendment. So has the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. President, I should now like to yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the work that has been done concerning the needs for regional development in the Ozark region by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

I appreciate the opportunity to join with him in bringing the great needs of that area to the attention of the administration, the Senate, and the country.

I appreciate also the understanding of the senior Senator from West Virginia of the problems of other areas throughout the country, and his interest in the development of other areas, and particularly the Ozark region. The Senator from West Virginia has done an outstanding job for his own general area, for those 11 States involved in the program, and for the country as a whole, in bringing the great needs of the people of that area to the attention of the country in a dramatic way, by means of initiating a pilot study which I hope will spread to other areas of the country, in an effort to see that the people of the country who are in poverty in a time of prosperity are not ignored, but that this Government endeavor in helping in a spirit of sympathy, understanding, and assistance to bring together the resources of local, State, Federal, and private institutions, and individuals, in a cooperative way to see that their needs are met.

Mr. President, I am proud to be a member of the Committee on Public Works under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], who, together with the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], has worked toward arriving at some means by which the needs of other areas of the country may be recognized and met.

I join in this amendment as a means of bringing the needs of this area to the attention of all those concerned. I cite briefly the fact that in eastern Oklahoma, as is true also in western Arkansas, there are 18 counties in which more than 50 percent of the families have annual family incomes of less than $3,000.

There are six counties in eastern Oklahoma, in which more than 60 percent of the families have less than $3,000 annual income.

These are needs that we must meet, as we are now meeting them in the Appalachian region.

I heartily join in the proposal of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment by inserting on page 10, line 6, at the end of the line, and after the semicolon:

Strike out the semicolon and insert the word "Pittsburgh";.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, West Virginia and Arkansas were the only two States of the Republic which suffered a loss of population in the years from 1950 to 1960. West Virginia lost its population during that period at an approximate rate of 7.6 percent. The rate of loss in Arkansas was only slightly less.

I cite these figures to indicate the seriousness of the problem which is presented by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, ably assisted in his presentation today by the capable junior Senator from Oklahoma. In so doing, however, I must indicate that with respect to the area contemplated for special attention—I do not call it preferential treatment in that area or any other area where the need is spelled out—the purpose of the Senators from Arkansas and the junior Senator from Oklahoma would be well served by allowing this problem to be presented to the Committee on Public Works within the framework of the legislation which has been introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which proposed legislation is now cosponsored by 23 other Senators.

We hope before S. 812 has been referred to the committee by the Senate that 30 or 35 Senators will have cosponsored the measure.

I say to the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas that the case can be made, and a partial case has already been made. But I would remind those who would propose this amendment that the Appalachian program has been under study and consideration for more than 4½ years. The study brought into being the effort which finally culminated in Senate 2782 being brought before this body last fall, and again in Senate bill 3 this year.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] referred in his remarks earlier today to the needs that exist in the Ozark region and to the problem which we shall have within the Committee on Public Works. With assurance from the administration—which was given earlier in debate by the distinguished majority leader—these problems will be addressed by the Congress at an early date.

I would hope that with this assurance, the amendment would not actually be pressed to a vote. I am thinking in terms of the presentation having been adequate. But it would be better—since the Appalachian bill was the result of more than 4 years of study—to allow the measure introduced by Senator McNAMARA to be taken up within a very short time.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator can recognize, I am sure, the awkward, and perhaps untenable position that some of us are placed in with respect to legislation such as this.

The Senator pointed out that in my State for a number of years, as in his State, we lost population. We did have some problems.

I am happy to report, however, that that trend now is reversed. In the last 3, 4, or 5 years, my State has been gaining population.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, may I be permitted 2 additional minutes? I should like for the able Senator from Arkansas to have time to complete his discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Our economic condition is improving. Compared with the other States of the Union, the economic conditions in our State are very favorable today. But if it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to go into any area of a State, or region of a State, or parts of regions of a State, and institute a program of this character, I must insist that, if I support such legislation, other sections of the country should not be ignored wherever those conditions prevail anywhere under the jurisdiction of our Government. My belief is that those areas should be included.

It is somewhat comforting to have the assurance that we are going to look into other areas, but it does not satisfy my idea of how these matters should be authorized. It should be done on a national basis, instead of on a regional basis.

I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for just 1 minute I shall conclude by indicating, as has been stated often during the debate, that the idea of an Appalachia Regional Commission was not conceived in Washington, but was developed in the States of the Appalachian region by the Governors of those States, and the request was made for the assistance of the Federal Government by those jurisdictions. President Kennedy, and, at the present time, President Johnson, have brought forward the partnerships, as it were, between the Federal Government and the States involved. This is for the purpose of bringing into being a more wholesome climate for economic growth than previously had been possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. President, I am ready for a vote. I hope the Senator will not press for a yea-and-nay vote. However, I will understand, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote, but I think the amendment has been presented and should be voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, as modified.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Does the Senator from West Virginia yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], as modified.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, identified as No. 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with its reading and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (amendment No. 10) offered by Mr. LONG of Louisiana is as follows:

On page 36, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this Act involving any scientific or technological research or development activity unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions effective to insure that all information, copyrights, uses, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will be made freely available to the general public. Nothing contained in this subsection shall deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity, without his consent, of any right which that owner may have under that patent. Whenever any information, copyright, use, process, patent or development resulting from any such research or development activity conducted in whole or in part with appropriated funds expended under authorization of this Act is withheld or disposed of by any person, organization, or agency in contravention of the provisions of this subsection, the Attorney General shall institute, upon his own motion or upon request made by any person having knowledge of pertinent facts, an action for the enforcement of the provisions of this subsection in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which any defendant resides, is found, or has a place of business. Such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such action, and to enter therein such orders and decrees as it shall determine to be required to carry into effect fully the provisions of this subsection. Process of the district court for any judicial district in any action instituted under this subsection may be served in any other judicial district of the United States by the United States marshal thereof. Whenever it appears to the court in which any such action is pending that other parties should be brought before the court in such action, the court may cause such other parties to be summoned from any judicial district of the United States."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment was drafted to apply to the bill as introduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How much have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 5 minutes.

This amendment was originally keyed to the bill as introduced, and therefore it should be modified to read as follows:

On page 40, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new subsection:

And the subsection should be renumbered (d).

I wish to modify my amendment accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, my amendment presents identically the same principle, and I believe in identical language, as contained in a similar amendment on which the Senate voted last week, which had to do with assuring that research and development paid for with Federal money under research and development authorized by the bill will be available to all the people.

I do not know whether or not, in using $5½ million of Federal money, something might be developed that would aid other parts of the country; but in the event it should be, it would be fair to see to it that this information would be freely available for the benefit of all the people.

I was happy to note that the Senator in charge of the bill voted for my amendment when I offered it to the water pollution bill, supporting the same position, which he has consistently supported, that when the Federal Government spends money for research and development programs, the benefits of the research should go to all 180 million people of this country and protect ourselves from the possibility that a contractor would undertake to secure patent rights for himself on such information and exercise patent rights to deny the public free use of that which it paid to develop. The benefits of such research should be available freely and generally to all the citizens of the country.

My understanding was that the distinguished manager of the bill was in support of the amendment when I discussed the matter last week. I hoped the amendment could be agreed to. Of course, if there is serious opposition to it and a Senator insists on having a rollcall, I shall be happy and agreeable to having the amendment go to a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. COOPER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank the two leaders.

I am under no illusions that the Senate will oppose this amendment, because a similar one was adopted the other day. However, there are a few fundamental thoughts which I would like to express concerning the whole question of patent rights under Government research and development contracts.

I am against the amendment. This is a subject which concerns the proper disposition of patent rights to inventions, uses, processes, and other information realized under Government research and development contracts.

A right has both legal and moral import. Applied to this subject, I think it proper to say that it denotes something to which one has a just claim as the power or privilege to which one is justly entitled. Proper protection of these rights as they relate to Government research and development contracts can be made only upon analysis of facts applicable to specific contracts. They cannot be assured if based upon prior general conclusions applicable regardless of the circumstances surrounding a particular contract.

This amendment would preclude a contractor from receiving any proprietary rights to information, copyrights, uses, processes, patents, and other developments realized from research and development contracts awarded by the Government under the Appalachia program. This absolute prohibition is imposed regardless of the amount of Federal funds involved under a contract. I do not regard this approach as equitable or reasonable.

There is considerable authority both within and without the Government which rejects the proposition that the answer to proper disposition of patent rights under Government research and development contracts can be found either in an absolute title policy or an all license policy on the part of the Government. Illustrative of this is the statement on Government patent policy promulgated by the late President Kennedy in October 1963. There are statutes which contain patent clauses providing for waiver of title to the Government in cases where certain conditions exist and equity requires that waiver be granted under a particular contract.

The President's statement and these statutes reject a policy that would prevent a contractor from ever receiving patent rights under Government research and development contracts. Even in those cases where the Government reserves the right to take title to all inventions realized under these contracts, provision is made for Government waiver of title in behalf of the contractor. Under this arrangement, the Government will retain an irrevocable, nonexclusive, nontransferable royalty-free license. Yet, the amendment under consideration contains no such provision.

The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana and others have recognized the need for legislation to establish a defined Government patent policy. I, too, have introduced legislation during the last as well as in the present Congress which seeks to accomplish this purpose.

To interpolate, I was a member of the Armed Services Committee when we were working out this provision for the Department of Defense. I also worked with the present occupant of the White House, President Lyndon Johnson, on the NASA patent proposal when he brought out that bill.

These bills differ; so, I believe, do the opinions of many Senators concerning this subject. However, the very existence of these differing views confirms the need for hearings by the Senate Judiciary Committee which will give due and careful consideration to this complex subject. We should not be asked by the simple expedient of an amendment to dispose in advance of all rights to any inventions which may be realized under Government research and development contracts awarded under the Appalachia program.

It is not unrealistic to assume that each research and development contract entered into under this program may vary as to the amount of Government financial involvement compared to funds obligated by a contractor or others. There may well be other compelling factors such as background experience, technical know-how, and competence which should be considered. I suggest that these are factors to be weighed and considered under each research and development contract. They should not be ignored which would be the case if this amendment is adopted.

I ask that the amendment be defeated and express the hope that the entire subject with which it deals be considered fully by the appropriate committee.

I realize the Senator from Louisiana states that when final legislation concerning this subject is enacted, that amendments such as the one which he now offers will be subject to that legislation. However, the more we attempt the approach taken by this amendment—and there are numerous other instances—the more difficult it becomes to obtain final legislation.

These are the reasons why I oppose the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, whether we like it or not, experience under Government patent policies has been that where the Government agency handling the money is left with discretion to spend its research money, almost without exception it uses its powers as an agency to give away the rights of 180 million people to a handful of contractors.

In some instances, we find that this has resulted in a complete rape of the public interest, where those rights have been given away.

For example, the Department of Defense has no statute telling it what to do in research. Here are two studies made by the General Accounting Office, one of them on Lockheed Corp., which is a major contractor for defense, and the other the Thompson Ramo Wooldridge which is also a major contractor for the Defense Department.

What do we find?

In both instances, these contractors get literally hundreds of millions of dollars of Government money, and they have been withholding the information which the contracts themselves required them to divulge. They have been withholding it in the hope of making even greater profits than the contracts contemplate.

Not only do they hope to get the patents, but also in order to get the patents on Government research, they are not telling the Government what they are discovering under these Government contracts. But these two contractors have been withholding what they have been finding on Government research for as long as 4 long years. In some instances, they have not divulged some information at all.

The knowledge of these discoveries is needed by Government, in our race to excel our adversaries in space and defense. This is a familiar example of what has happened when the Government's authority has the power to give away patent rights to these individuals. In other cases, we have had so-called flexibility. NASA had some flexibility where they could give patent rights if the Administrator found it in the public interest. What did they do? They just gave them all away. So far as flexibility and discretion which they are supposed to exercise, they wound up, notwithstanding the memorandum to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has just referred, with giving away all the rights contracted without even knowing what rights they were giving away.

We have laws in other fields that keep this kind of thing from happening. We have such a law in the Atomic Energy Commission, where we are ahead of the Russians. We have such laws that bind the Department of Agriculture in its research, where we are so far ahead of the Russians that they cannot even catch up with our aid because the research programs have been so good. This is because we do not give away private patent rights on research.

Where we are behind is in those areas where we have this withholding of information, where we have these people who are encouraged in the hope of making gigantic profits from the taxpayers and the consumers, and by virtue of which hopes they are holding out the information when it is developed and should be available to all the American people so it can be put to use by all scientists in moving to the next frontier of knowledge.

The incentive for people to have private patents historically was the incentive to spend their own money. But, in this instance, we are providing the incentive with the Government's money. This research should be developed for

the benefit of the taxpayers. They should be entitled to the benefit that flows from free and full use of the information rather than to have it under these private patents where the contractor can deny the use of the information to the public for 17 long years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me finish my statement, and I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The Department of Agriculture, TVA, the Atomic Energy Commission are bound by such laws as I advocate. Just in the last two Congresses we insisted on such provisions on the Coal Research and Development Act. We did the same on the helium gas, saline water, the disarmament bill, the mass transit bill. We did it on the water resources bill, and this year also on the Water Pollution Control Act.

So this is the position that the Senate has repeatedly taken. It is perfectly correct to vote it on this bill. This is an issue of principle, of whether to spend this money for the benefit of certain private interests or whether we want the Government's money, which is spent by the millions, and in some cases by the billions, to be directed to the benefit of all citizens who are paying taxes.

To me it is a simple issue.

Where this discretionary power has been available, in almost all cases, the rights have been given away without even knowing what was being given away.

In any event, the person actually doing the research has the same incentive. He is not going to get the patent rights. He is a scientist, or an engineer working for a contractor. But in this instance, we wind up with the Government not knowing what the patent rights are it is giving away, and contractors are withholding information on some problems which could result in quicker exploration of space and also in lower costs for new products.

Where this research has been under the Department of Agriculture, under TVA, the Atomic Energy Commission, or the Federal Aviation Agency, where research has been developed without private patent rights, we have had outstanding success, not the sort of corruption I have just pointed out to the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana, as I listen to him, that in those instances where the Government pays for all the research performed under a research and development contract, the Government should receive rights to that which is developed under the contract. I believe, however, that the Senator from Louisiana is weak in his argument that disposition of rights under these contracts can be made before a contract is negotiated. It is only when the contract is let that the parties can know what they are entitled to receive.

Second, we must have——

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The other point I make is that it is in the national interest to insure that the best qualified sources are used to perform Government research and development contracts. If we remove all incentive by providing that no rights of any character shall be given to their inventiveness, we limit the opportunity of the Government to establish new facilities and research efforts which will be for the advantage and benefit of all of us. We must have a patent policy, but I do not believe it can be done through this amendment nor the amendment offered to the water pollution bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Where the Government has not given private patents on Government research, we have had outstanding success with the research program. The areas where failure and downright corruption has existed has been in those areas where companies get these big contracts and try to keep the patent rights and withhold the information which should be available for 180 million people.

Our experience has been that, whether we like it or not, we shall get it one way or another. We shall either get the benefits for the 180 million people of our country, or we shall get the kind of conditions that I have been trying to point out on the floor of the Senate for some time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

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

The Senator from Kentucky has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. COOPER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. I ask the junior Senator from Louisiana whether he does not agree with me that a firm, clear, overall policy with respect to patents, particularly where the Federal Government is putting money into research—and we know it is putting up approximately $12 billion a year for that purpose—would be desirable. There should be an overall, clear policy established between the people who invent and the Government, so that we may establish a clear policy, and not proceed with the kind of catch-all endeavor that is being attempted here.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would like to see a policy established whereby the Government would not permit private patents to be obtained on research paid for by all the people.

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

The Senator from Kentucky has 3 minutes remaining. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. COOPER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted, out of order, to introduce some bills and make comments.

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

The Chair would like to inquire of the Senator from Idaho how much time he is yielding to himself.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to speak for 10 minutes. I believe that will be sufficient.

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

STRENGTHENING THE PEACEKEEPING WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as Members of the Senate are aware, President Johnson has proposed that 1965—which the United Nations has officially designated as "International Cooperation Year"—should be dedicated not only to the pursuit of peace but also to new forms of cooperation to promote the welfare of nations that "bypass the politics of the cold war."

The culmination of the U.S. celebration of International Cooperation Year will be a White House conference to be held next fall in which distinguished private citizens from many walks of life will present practical proposals not only on arms control and peacekeeping but also on economic and technical cooperation.

In this connection, I should like to call the attention of Members of the Senate to a new book, "In Pursuit of World Order: U.S. Foreign Policy and International Organizations," which was written especially for International Cooperation Year by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. It offers the American citizen a factual and up-to-date account of the problems and possibilities which the U.S. Government faces in strengthening the peacekeeping work of the United Nations and in the related areas of world law, outer space, trade and aid, human rights, and the population explosion.

Ambassador Adlai Stevenson calls this "a lively and important book for everybody interested in the practical problems of peace in the nuclear age."

I wholeheartedly agree. Perhaps the best introduction to the book is the eloquent foreword written by Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that Cleveland's remarks may appear at this point in the RECORD:

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

FOREWORD OF HARLAN CLEVELAND TO "IN PURSUIT OF WORLD ORDER"

In every time and culture, men have perceived the need to build institutions of cooperation, for safety and for the advancement of the interests they share. But only in our time has this urge become global in extent—witness the fact that 1965 is being celebrated the world over as International Cooperation Year. No one who reads this book can doubt that there is already plenty of international cooperation to have a year about.

The trouble is that the thunder and tumult of the cold war has obscured a great spurt in international cooperation in the years since World War II. The polemics of a bipolar world and the awful reality of the nuclear arms race have hidden the foundations of the rising international community. And the notion persists that agreement or disagreement among nations at any given time is total—that you cannot hold opposing views on subject A and simultaneously cooperate on subject B.

This, of course, is nonsense, and the proof can be found between the covers of this book—or wherever else you look. We disagree with the Soviet Union, for example, on Berlin, Vietnam, and Cuba. But, at the same time, we cooperate with the Soviet Union in cultural exchange programs, in allocating radio frequencies, in forecasting the weather, in fighting disease, in studying the oceans, and in dozens of other technical ways. We even cooperate, where we can, on the peaceful settlement of our own and other people's disputes.

International cooperation for survival and welfare has become a plain necessity. An increasing number of subjects of importance to our Nation can only be dealt with on a world basis. If you like long words, you can call this the technological imperative. Or you can simply repeat the truism—which is every day more true—that it's a small world.

Someone recently put it even better. He defined a "typical American" as a fellow who has just driven home from an Italian movie in his German car, who sits on his Danish furniture drinking Brazilian coffee out of an English china cup, writing a letter on Irish linen paper with a Japanese ballpoint pen—a letter complaining to his Congressman about too much American gold going overseas.

The technological imperative, the need to build worldwide technical agencies, stems, of course, from the headlong pace of scientific discovery. Every time that science chalks up another success, a new demand is created for a new institution to tame or exploit the new accomplishment. More and more frequently, it is an international institution. Whenever the scientists achieve a breakthrough in what can be done by man for man, it suddenly seems outrageous not to be channeling the new power that new knowledge confers upon us.

Before we knew how to commit mass murder among the mosquitoes that carry malaria, nobody thought of eradicating malaria from the face of the earth because it couldn't be done. Now that we know it can be done, we are well on our way to the doing of it—even if the task is proving somewhat longer, and the insects more resistant to our attempts to poison them, than scientists thought when they proudly swept every Anopheles mosquito from the island of Sardinia just after World War II.

Before there was radio, we did not need large international conferences to divide up the frequency spectrum. Before there were airplanes flying across frontiers and oceans, we did not need an International Civil Aviation Organization. We are used to the idea that necessity is the mother of invention. But in the technology of international relations, the reverse applies as well: Invention is the mother of necessity.

Nowadays, Congress and the rest of us take international organizations, and the conferences they spawn, as part of a familiar landscape. The United States belongs today to 53 international organizations. We contribute more than a third of a billion dollars to them and to 22 international operating programs, mostly sponsored by these same organizations—and that does not count the activities of international lending agencies. In the past 2 years, the United States has participated in more international conferences than we attended in our entire history from the founding of the Republic to the beginning of World War II.

International organizations exist simply because they are needed; we belong to them simply because it serves our national interest to belong—and because it would damage our national interest to remain aloof. So while nations cling to national sovereignties and national purposes, science is creating a functional international community whether anyone likes it or not.

It is certainly good that, within the frontiers of special areas like agriculture, health, or the physical sciences, we are beginning to demonstrate that men can get along with each other without an intolerable amount of friction and confusion, just as we are beginning to demonstrate within the frontiers of nations that men can get along with each other without an intolerable amount of bloodshed. It is good that scientists can "speak the same language," even through an interpreter; that physicians can cooperate with each other in a global war on disease; that farmers can teach each other how to get higher yields without politics getting too much in the way.

All this is good, but it is not enough. The spawning of new technologies is not always or necessarily beneficent. The technology of nuclear fission and fusion can provide electric power for national development; it can also incinerate all life in the Northern Hemisphere.

The parochialism of each major field of knowledge is not necessarily an improvement on the more familiar parochialism of nation-states, unless the demonstration that experts can work with each other on food and health leads in fact to nations working with each other to keep the general peace.

A civilization that guarantees people enough to eat and a longer life—and then exposes them to lethal radioactivity—is not moving onward and upward. It is moving sideways toward a precipice. If a workable pattern of peace must be constructed patiently by building first its component parts, the parts must in the end add up to international organizations that work for peace and freedom as well as health and welfare.

Beyond the technological imperative, therefore, is a political imperative. It stems from our basic value-system: the kind of safe and open world we want to live in, the kinds of rights and opportunities we want to see secured to every human being. So we naturally are working toward a world of peaceful change under a system of order based on consent in which cooperation is an international way of life. Our belief in diversity and our need for safety together define the goal of American foreign policy: "to make the world safe for diversity."

The first requirement of a foreign policy so defined is to avoid the cataclysm of nuclear war. That is why the administrations of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson have invested so much Presidential time and attention on the attempt to wrap the new-born weaponry of fission and fusion in the swaddling clothes of social constraint and political responsibility.

The United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom—joined now by nearly a hundred other nations—have confirmed by formal treaty that they have a common interest in not polluting the common atmosphere with radioactive particles, and a common interest in putting a brake on the nuclear arms race. They have agreed that this common interest requires such a treaty despite irreconcilable ideologies, incompatible values, and antithetical ways of organizing political power.

What is new and hopeful here is the dawning realization that national rivals can remain rivals and still agree on what is in the interest of both. Mutual suspicion and mistrust are certainly not dispelled, but the nuclear weapons are not poisoning the atmosphere while negotiations proceed on their control and inspection.

Perhaps we are learning that national rivals do not have to kiss and make up before they agree not to annihilate each other. International politics is not what the "war-game" men call a "zero-sum game": A foot gained on one side does not necessarily mean a foot lost on the other.

Perhaps the world is beginning to fumble its way toward a pragmatic modern approach to the ancient dream of peace, toward a manageable, workable system of order based, as President Kennedy said at American University, "not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned."

Beyond the control and reduction of arms, a world safe for diversity requires a wide range of international institutions and procedures to deter the resort to war, and encourage the resolution of conflict without war.

The United Nations is sometimes called a safety valve, a place to let off steam. Much steam is in fact let off there, and the valve has a certain value. It is good that a building exists on the East River in which every nation, large and small, can grumble for the record about his neighbor—and provide his neighbor equal time to grumble about him.

But the Security Council and the General Assembly are not at their best when they are adding heat to an already overheated dispute. They function at their best as devices for recording solutions arrived at by honest—which is to say, quiet—negotiation.

The growing value of the U.N., as peacekeeper and peacemaker to the world, lies not so much in its public debates as in its operating machinery—its mediators, its observers, its inspectors, its truce supervisors, and its emergency peacekeeping forces.

In spite of our great power, the United States cannot alone be policeman to the world. The rest of the world would not like it, and the American people would not stand for it—which is reason enough to build international peacekeeping machinery to take on the sometimes unhappy policeman's lot.

Thus we share with most of the rest of the world an interest in spreading the risk and the responsibility for international peacekeeping. Important as this has been in the past, especially in Korea, Kashmir, the Middle East, the Congo, and Cyprus, it is likely to be much more important in the future. For the nuclear stalemate appears to have loosened the inhibitions that kept the lid on incipient disputes. Having concluded that we may not after all die of a nuclear thrombosis, the world seems to have broken

out in a rash of smaller local disputes, each carrying the virus of general war.

How much further can—or should—the U.N. develop its peacekeeping capacity? It is a fair question, but no answer today is certain to make sense tomorrow.

For the U.N. has whatever capacity its members can agree to endow it with, at any given time for any given purpose. Until one knows the nature of a future emergency and then plumbs the will of the U.N.'s majority to act in the face of common danger, one cannot say what the capacity of the U.N. is to act in defense of the peace.

The day before the Korean invasion, the day before the Suez crisis, the day before the army mutiny in the Congo, nobody would have dreamed that the U.N. could or would take on the peacekeeping tasks it did in fact assume. The capacity of the U.N. is the sum of the wills of its members to act together.

Dag Hammarskjold said it well, in remarks which Prime Minister Pearson of Canada quoted in his Hammarskjold memorial lecture: "The basic policy line for this Organization is that the United Nations simply must respond to those demands which must be made of it * * *. The United Nations should respond and should have confidence in its strength and capacity to respond."

Obviously, there is always the question of how great an administrative load can safely be taken on. Obviously, too, there is the sticky and contentious problem of finance, and the always difficult matter of recruiting and training first-rate people capable of doing unprecedented jobs in a fog of controversy and frustration. The U.N.'s small operations in Greece, Palestine, and Kashmir helped to put it in training to climb what Hammarskjold called "the very steep hill of Suez"; in turn, the operation in the Gaza Strip served as calisthenics for the Congo; and what was learned in the Congo deeply affected the mandate, the strategy, and the tactics of the Cyprus operation.

Yet if there is one lesson to be drawn from the 13 alarms to which the U.N. has responded, it is that each peacekeeping task is unprecedented, that the U.N.'s resources are never fixed or exhaustible, that being busy in one place must not preclude being busy in another.

So the measure of future United Nations actions for peace, here and there around the world, is not some predetermined quantum of "capacity to act," but rather the complex circumstances under which the requisite majority of its members can agree to pool their strength and act together for the charter's purposes. This is the real variable in the equation—not the age or experience of the Organization, not the state of its bank account, not the level of its current workload.

The U.N.'s future capacity to act will be deeply affected by the outcome of issues that are unresolved as this is written. To be an effective instrument, its members will have to develop a way of financing peacekeeping operations that does not create a constitutional crisis over each half-billion dollars. The organization will also have to find some way to reflect the political facts of life in the United Nations where equal votes are endowed with unequal influence and unequal responsibility for the consequences of inaction.

This does not imply that the stronger members must lead the less strong around by the nose—any more than that the "one country, one vote" principle subordinates the U.N.'s big-power minority to its small-power majority. It implies, rather, that in a responsible organization, the less strong must have the realism to know the U.N. depends on its stronger members for its capacity to act—and the good sense to know that when the most powerful members can agree, the less powerful are often protected by that agreement.

All this is to say that the United Nations is and will continue to be a political body, and anybody who has worked in a legislature or on a school board or even on a student council knows the limitations imposed by the policies of consent.

International cooperation is uphill work all the way. Nuclear arms—clashing ideologies—conflicting ambitions—contradictory principles—economic interests—territorial disputes—racial, religious, and tribal animosities—personal greed—the lust for power: these, too, are realities. And so is the stubborn addiction of the human race to the ways of the past, its adamant resistance to change, its persistence in prejudice, bias, and hatred.

International cooperation must push against all the traditional, provincial, reactionary instincts of the human race. And if it seems hard for us, let us keep in mind that it is even more difficult for those nursed on dogma, weaned on historical determinism, and schooled on the inevitability of, say, the class struggle.

But we are in a very early stage of the journey toward world order. Both the technical and political pressures for international cooperation will not diminish but rise.

These are some of the reasons why our enthusiasm for what we call "international cooperation" must be grounded in reality and focused on practical expectations. International cooperation does not just happen. It is not an ideal, a spirit, a principle, a wish, or a policy. It is represented by institutions, treaties, laws, negotiations, agreements, and actions—hard, concrete realities that often are difficult to come by.

Peace is not an abstraction: It is an organized system for the peaceful resolution of difference and the peaceful management of needed change. The alternative to missiles is not merely the absence of missiles: The alternative is the presence of workable, reliable institutions—governed by accepted laws and agreed procedures, administered by flesh-and-blood men and women.

A decent world order will only be built brick by brick. Those who wish to help build it, and not merely to talk about building it, will concentrate on the next brick—on how it can be fashioned, where it belongs, how it will fit, when it should be added to the structure.

This book describes some of the main bricks, and indicates where the United States thinks they belong. Its author, Richard Gardner, has helped fashion most of them during the past 4 years as part of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. He understands the process of international institution-building as clearly and deeply as any American of our time.

HISTORY MAGNIFIES GREAT MEN, GREAT IDEAS, AND GREAT EVENTS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of the traditional sources of American strength has been the pride of Americans in their collective achievements. De Tocqueville spotted this more than a hundred years ago, and foreign visitors comment on it even today. Yet, one element of our society, the radical right, seems bent upon degrading the path this country has traveled since World War II, and sowing distrust for the leaders of all segments of society. One of the remarkably successful rhetorical tricks they have employed is to misrepresent American history, or idealize it beyond all recognition. The distinguished Pocatello, Idaho, editor, Perry Swisher, has said of them:

> They leap from their belief that we are descended from visionary giants, to the conclusion that the ordinary mortals they see around them are a depraved society ruled by stupid or sinister men.

In a recent issue of Look magazine, I have written:

> To put this world, and the Nation, in a proper perspective for the American people—this is the urgent business of statesmanship today.

Perry Swisher is helping to expedite that urgent business. In a column reprinted in the Aberdeen Times of November 19, he has written:

> History magnifies great men, great ideas, and great events.

His explanation of this statement is certainly worthwhile reading for all those who wish to put American history in perspective and thereby draw strength and pride from the events of today as well as yesterday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column "History Skips the Ordinary, Evil" be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Aberdeen Times, Nov. 19, 1964]

HISTORY SKIPS THE ORDINARY, EVIL

(By Perry Swisher)

The other night I attended a convention session of the State Parent-Teacher Associations. The opening speaker warned in detail against the infiltration methods and blind dogmatism of the extremists. The next speaker sang hosannahs to the greatness, the wisdom and the vision of our forefathers.

The second speaker was defeating the purpose of the first. The victim-members of the John Birch Society, the Billy Hargis crusade and the Smoot-Manion forums have in common a wholly fictitious picture of the past. They leap from their belief that we are descended from visionary giants, to the conclusion that the ordinary mortals they see around them are a depraved society ruled by stupid or sinister men.

History magnifies great men, great ideas and great events. It skips over the masses who for nearly all of history were living—compared to our own times—in poverty, sickness, slavery, illiteracy and in continual fear of all men unlike themselves.

It is because of the Founders' forward-looking faith in a society of men who would be equal before the law that this Nation enjoyed such an incredible birth, so full of promise. The conditions from which the country sprang, and the society into which it was born, did not consist of a society of free and enlightened men. They were, through their leaders, a society in search of freedom, knowledge, and a better life, which is a very different thing.

We would do our children a favor—seeing to it that so many of them do not remain children politically all their lives—if we taught them not merely the greatness of a few men dead but also of the relative which our recent ancestors lived.

At this country's birth you could not vote if you were female, if you owned no land (as most did not), if you were indentured or a slave. Most children didn't go to school as we know school; they were chattel.

In mills and factories and mines, tens upon tens of thousands of children worked for as little as 50 cents a week paid to their parents

or to owners-by-indenture. If you were born to such a life, here and more especially in the lands from which our ancestors emigrated, your life expectancy did not exceed 40 years.

Many Birchers are at most the great-grandsons of Irishmen who died for no greater offense than being Irish; Greeks and slaves, guilty of their race; Calvinists, Catholics, Jews, and then Mormons, who lost life or property or citizenship because of their religion or nationality.

Idaho's constitution adopted in 1890 denied the franchise to Mormons and orientals. Foresight? Vision? A hundred years ago our American ancestors were slaughtering each other; less than half that long ago real warfare was waged in the mining camps and railroad yards and in the streets and docks of industrial cities.

In hundreds of communities it was only in the schools, as education became a birthright, that children of different ancestry met—and by no means unanimously, and by no means is the process over—and learned however grudgingly to believe that persons reared differently from themselves might be entitled to the same rights and opportunities as themselves in a free society.

We have come a long, long way. We are freer, happier, healthier, and more knowledgeable and peaceable than any generation of our ancestors. The difference is phenomenal. Many an extremist is simply a child who never learned this, and remains a child.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 3, to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 12

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 12 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 44, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

"LIMITATION

"SEC. 404. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no funds authorized in this Act, other than those authorized in section 201, shall be expended for any program or project except to the extent such program or project is carried out in a 'redevelopment area', designated as such by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act. With respect to funds authorized in section 201, in the case of areas covered by this Act which are not designated 'redevelopment areas', Federal funds shall be furnished on the same basis as in the case of all other areas not so designated."

On page 44, line 24, in lieu of "SEC. 404." insert "SEC. 405.".

On page 45, line 5, in lieu of "SEC. 405." insert "SEC. 406.".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Iowa yield himself?

Mr. MILLER. I yield myself as much time as is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I discussed this amendment to some extent on the preceding legislative day. I repeat that the amendment is not designed to hurt the bill; neither is it designed to move away from the concept of the bill. It is designed to make it very clear that preferential treatment is not to be given to counties in this area which are not entitled to preferential treatment.

The Appalachia bill has come before the Senate under the aura of being a bill to uplift a distressed area. That there are distressed counties in this area, no one will deny. But when one goes through the list of counties that are covered by the bill, each of which would be eligible for assistance under the bill, one finds at least 67 counties which cannot qualify as distressed counties under the definition of the Area Redevelopment Act. Therefore, I believe we ought not to grant relief under the bill to those counties. If we do, we should let the American people know exactly what we are doing. Let us not try to tease anyone with the thought that this is a bill to aid only distressed counties, because the bill would do no such thing.

I invite the attention of Senators to a table which I have prepared. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Selected examples of counties which cannot qualify as "distressed" but are nevertheless eligible for all benefits under the Appalachia bill

[Figures for 1959]

State and county	Percent of families with income under $3,000	Percent unemployed	Percent of occupied housing units with TV	Percent of occupied housing with automobile
Alabama: Chambers	37.6	4.0	72.8	51.4
Georgia: Catoosa	22.2	3.7	90.6	61.3
North Carolina: Burke	29.0	3.1	84.7	61.7
South Carolina: Greenville	26.4	2.9	86.1	56.6
Tennessee: Sullivan	27.2	4.7	87.0	62.2
Virginia: Smyth	35.0	5.9	80.5	65.0

Source: "County and City Data Book," 1962, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, publication prepared under the direction of Edwin D. Goldfield, Chief, Statistical Reports Division.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, it will be noted that I have selected at random certain counties in the States that are covered by the Appalachia bill. For example, in Alabama there is Chambers County. Thirty-seven and six-tenths percent of the families in that county have incomes under $3,000. The rate of unemployment is 4 percent. Seventy-two and eight-tenths percent of the occupied housing units have television. Fifty-one and seven-tenths percent of the occupied housing units have automobiles.

These figures are for 1959. They are the latest figures available. I presume that the percentages with respect to television and automobiles would be much larger as they pertain to the past 5 years.

In Georgia, Catoosa County is listed in the coverage of the bill. In that county, only 22.2 percent of the families have incomes under $3,000. The percentage of unemployed is 3.7. More than 90.6 percent of the occupied housing units have TV, and 61.3 percent of the occupied housing units have automobiles.

In Burke County, N.C., only 29 percent of the families have incomes under $3,000. The rate of unemployment is 3.1 percent. Eighty-four and seven-tenths percent of the occupied housing units have television. Occupied housing having automobiles is 61.7 percent.

In Greenville County, S.C., only 26.4 percent of the families have incomes under $3,000. The rate of unemployment is 2.9 percent; 86.1 percent of the occupied housing units have television; and 56.6 percent of the occupied housing units have automobiles.

In Sullivan County, Tenn., only 27.2 percent of the families have incomes under $3,000. The rate of unemployment is 4.7 percent; 87 percent of the occupied housing units have television; and 62.2 percent of the occupied housing units have automobiles.

In Smyth County, Va., 35 percent of the families have incomes under $3,000. The rate of unemployment is 5.9 percent; 80.5 percent of the occupied housing units have television; and 65 percent of the occupied housing units have automobiles.

The source of this information is the County and City Data Book for 1962, published by the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. I am quite sure that a careful review of this book will show that countless counties throughout the United States are in, if anything, much worse condition than these counties. These counties could not qualify as distressed counties; yet they will receive benefits under this bill, unless we do something about it.

In my own State of Iowa, in 17 of the 99 counties more than 40 percent of the families receive incomes under $3,000; 17 counties in Iowa have more than 4 percent unemployment. I cannot in good conscience vote to tax the people of Iowa in order to give preferential treatment to counties in other States which cannot qualify as distressed counties. I do not think I should be asked to do so.

We might consider another viewpoint: Are the States in which these counties

are located doing what they should be doing to alleviate their distressed conditions?

Pennsylvania and Ohio are probably the major recipients, aside from West Virginia, of assistance under the proposed act.

I have no brief for West Virginia. West Virginia is a distressed State, in a distressed area. But when we look at Pennsylvania and Ohio, for example, we find some very interesting figures relating to per capita disposable personal income and the State and local tax per capita in those States as compared with other States.

I now refer to a table for 1963, showing the per capita disposable personal income and the State and local tax per capita in a group of States.

The table reads as follows:

State	Per capita disposable personnel increase	State and local tax per capita
Pennsylvania	$2,124	$208.70
Ohio	2,147	207.40
Iowa	2,036	244.75
Hawaii	2,097	256.47
Colorado	2,134	259.48
Kansas	1,973	249.45
Minnesota	2,011	268.57
Montana	1,950	241.41
Rhode Island	2,123	230.71
South Dakota	1,706	223.96
Utah	1,862	221.78
Vermont	1,864	231.66
Washington	2,146	271.28
Wisconsin	2,024	254.01

Mr. President, the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio are not levying enough taxes on their people, when compared to other States.

In my own State of Iowa, the per capita disposable personal income was only $2,036. That is $100 less than the figures for Ohio and Pennsylvania. Yet, the per capita tax was $244.75. There are a great many other States which are levying more taxes per capita. Those States had a smaller per capita disposable personal income than the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio. Yet, it is proposed to tax the people of these various States in order to provide the assistance proposed by this bill.

I wish to make it clear that I would like to be able to support legislation which was aimed at relieving distress, not only in the area covered by the Appalachia bill, but also in other areas throughout the United States.

One naturally wants to assist the distressed areas in his own State. But at the same time, I do not think any of us should be so provincial as to say that unless we have a corresponding amount of assistance under a particular bill for our counties, we will never consider giving assistance to other counties which may be intended to receive it.

My point is that there is no reason to grant assistance to nondistressed counties, as this bill proposes to do. The only argument that possibly can be made against it is, "If we do not allow some of these nondistressed counties to come within the coverage of this bill, we may have difficulty with the road program."

The answer to that argument is that my amendment would specifically exempt that situation and would provide that when highways go through nondistressed counties, the nondistressed counties shall receive benefits in no greater degree than any other nondistressed county throughout the United States.

If, in the case of other nondistressed counties, the States must put up 50 percent and the Federal Government put up 50 percent in constructing highways through those counties, such should be the case in the Appalachian bill, in which area there are nondistressed counties.

I think it is a fair amendment. I think it is designed to do no more and no less than what the proponents of this legislation say they intend.

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

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized. How much time does the Senator from West Virginia yield to himself?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa. It is a slightly altered version of the amendment offered last year, which was rejected by the Senate. It was also rejected by the House Committee on Public Works, when the measure was considered there. The bill did not reach the House for consideration. So, we have had the expression of the Senate itself in its Chamber, and the House within its Committee on Public Works.

I indicated last week when I had the privilege of discussing this matter with the able Senator from Iowa that there are limitations and shortcomings inherent in this amendment. I shall summarize them briefly today.

First, the amendment would reject the basic regional concept of the bill. This is not an area redevelopment measure. I must repeat that, as I said last week, it would be fallacious to attach to this measure completely extraneous and, I think, irrelevant criteria which have been developed under the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Second, I do not believe that the privileged treatment which is indicated with respect to the Appalachian area is a valid argument. The proposed amendment would strike out the effectiveness of the multicounty development district as determined in this legislation.

We have noted in committee—and we have called attention to it in the Senate—that the counties of greater economic strength will often be the nucleus, the anchor, as it were, for the development district. Technical assistance funds, as well as projects funds, would frequently be allocated not to single counties but to multicounty development districts.

Third, with respect to the amendment, the provision for allocating funds under section 201, which is the road program, I believe the proposed amendment contains language that is either meaningless or unworkable.

Frankly, I do not know what is meant by the language on page 2, lines 3 and 5, which refers to the highway funds, as the Senator from Iowa set them forth. It reads:

> Federal funds shall be furnished on the same basis as in the case of other areas not so designated.

I do not know what this means. As the Senator said, in all Federal aid highway programs, as in the pending bill, the allocations made by the Secretary of Commerce to the States are not made to the counties. If, on the other hand, the related language is not meaningless, but declares that the funds for assistance in building specific roads would be apportioned differently, as the road program transverses from one county and jumps over another county, such a provision would be completely unworkable. I think that it would be impossible to administer such a provision.

For the reasons I set forth last week and which I reemphasize now, I shall oppose, on behalf of the committee, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa. The Senator is able and conscientious. I understand his concern.

However, I believe that in this instance his argument is not valid.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the rollcall be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 11

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 11, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska for himself and other Senators (amendment No. 11) will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, beginning with line 14, on page 18, strike out through line 12 on page 21.

Renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska must first yield himself time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

I understand the Senator from West Virginia wishes me to yield for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that on this amendment, No. 11, the committee, which is opposed to the amendment,

shall have an additional 10 minutes. That will give us 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the 10 minutes be taken out of the time before 3 o'clock, or will the time for voting be extended beyond that time?

Mr. RANDOLPH. There is plenty of time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There may be many other amendments.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Very well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why not extend the time beyond 3 o'clock?

Mr. RANDOLPH. We cannot do it. The time has already been fixed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from West Virginia will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the Senator from Nebraska is now recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, am I to understand that my 10 minutes starts now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am grateful for the 1-minute "spot."

Amendment No. 11 involves the deletion of section 203 of the bill (S. 3).

In considering this amendment, we are really plowing old ground again, because section 203 was deleted from the similar bill that we considered last year.

The question is whether the revised language of section 203 as contained in the bill this year has been changed from last year's version sufficiently to affect our decision.

It is said that section 203 in its present language is patterned after the language authorizing the Great Plains conservation program. If the 10 Midwestern States think highly enough of the Great Plains program to vote appropriations for it each year, it is argued that we should not prevent the application of the Great Plains program to the Appalachia region.

It is further argued that to refuse approval of section 203 would be regionalism of an extreme form; and that section 203 as revised would be not the slightest threat to the beef-producing States of this country.

As to the first point, that to refuse adoption of the provision would be regionalism of an extreme form, it is argued that section 203 gives to the Appalachia region nothing not already enjoyed by the 10 Midwestern States under the Great Plains program; and that Appalachia as a 50-acre limitation and a $2,500 limitation per farm; whereas the Great Plains program has a limitation of $25,000 on a contract, rather than $2,500 for 50 acres.

I should like to explore for a moment what the Great Plains program is. It is authorized by Public Law 1021 of the 84th Congress. There are some 17,000 contracts under it. The average allowance under those contracts is a little more than $3,600 a contract—not $25,000. Most projects in recent years have been on a level of 50–50 participation, and there are very few providing for as large a Federal contribution as 60 percent.

The average size of the operating unit in the Great Plains program is not 50 acres as a limit, but 2,055 acres.

What does that tell us? That tells us that the conditions in the Great Plains area are the antithesis of what we find in Appalachia.

It is not fair, it is not even common sense, to say that we should apply the Great Plains program to the Appalachia region, and that here are sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and we will lift those out of the Great Plains and put them in a program for Appalachia, which is not comparable in geography, area, or economic conditions.

Some 422 counties, after careful selection, were made eligible for the program, and only 392 of them have projects under it. The Great Plains bill, Public Law 1021, was adopted following action by the appropriate committee. It contained 2,500 printed lines, carefully prepared, with appropriate safeguards, and with provisions that were calculated to meet the circumstances in that 10-State area. That is the handling that I recommend for section 203 of the present bill, so that knowledgeable committees in the Senate and House dealing with agricultural problems will have an opportunity to go into it, and to see that what comes out is a workable bill.

The greatest single difference between the two programs is that in the Appalachian program we are dealing with uneconomic units, held by the most impoverished of the people of the region. Nothing can be accomplished by investing $2,500 apiece in those small units, as grants for land conservation practices, in the hope of making those units self-sustaining from an economic standpoint. Fifty acres will support no more than 12 to 16 head of cattle. That is not enough to do the job.

In my judgment, one of the most cruel hoaxes in this whole situation is that the landowner in Appalachia, when he gets into the program, will be given the idea that the program will enable him to make a living. Under all the laws of economics, he cannot make a living through such a program. All the Federal help he can get will not give him any real future to look toward. It will be a future with a submarginal income and a substandard living.

As to whether the program creates a threat to the beef industry, last year we heard testimony by two administration spokesmen—namely Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and Under Secretary of Commerce, Franklin Roosevelt. The testimony was that the added marketings of beef cattle in Appalachia, with this program of increased production, would amount to $230 million. That comes to a million head of cattle. That means a billion pounds of beef on the hoof.

Is that not a factor?

Is that not plenty of additional competition for the beef industry?

I would say that it is, particularly when Secretary Freeman states that the big trouble with the cattle industry is it is overproducing.

What is his remedy? His remedy is to establish a system subsidized with Federal funds, not only in pasture improvement but also in the buying and maintenance of breeder stock which would increase marketings by a million head of cattle a year. These marketings would be added to an already burdensome overproduction, which the Secretary states is at the bottom of the situation.

It is argued also, "We are importing a million feeder cattle a year from Mexico and Canada. Why not raise them in Appalachia?"

I will go along with that argument. I believe most Senators would. But the administration refuses to put limits on the imports of feeders from Mexico and Canada. We are going to receive them whether we like it or not. Even if Appalachia should furnish a million more head a year, we are going to get them from Canada and Mexico also. Thus, it is not a matter of substituting feeders from the Appalachian area; it is putting them into the market in addition to the surplus feeders from Mexico and Canada which will come in, nevertheless.

I know that the situation in Appalachia is grave. The impoverishment there and the lack of food is not a bright prospect, to say the least.

It is not my position that this program be rejected and then forgotten.

If there is merit to this proposal, let us strike it from the bill now. To determine whether it has merit, let it be put in the form of a separate bill, and referred to the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate for them to process. Let them process it along the same lines as Public Law 1021 was processed in 1956. Have it geared to the problems of the area in which it is to be applied, so that it will stand up as a workable proposal.

Then, if it passes the judgment of those people, I believe it should be considered by each Chamber and then enacted into law, but not on the basis of hearings held on January 19 and 21 of this year, during the very week of the inauguration ceremonies, when many other things were going on in the Capitol; also under circumstances when there was not sufficient time for the cattlemen's associations to come to Washington and prove the points which I have tried to make in the Chamber today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has consumed 10 minutes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. HRUSKA. This is a hurry-up call. We are told we must pass this bill today. We must vote on it by 3 o'clock. I say that is not fair to the organizations representing the beef producers, who will be seriously affected by a proposal so harmful to their interests. This may be relieving, in part, those in Appalachia, but at the expense of those already in the beef industry who are trying to hang on, in spite of the adverse market conditions in the cattle industry today.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I congratulate the Senator from Nebraska on having offered the amendment dealing with the problem in connection with this bill, which could have very serious and injurious economic consequences throughout the agricultural areas. The Senator has taken a reasonable and moderate approach in trying to correct the situation which, if left in the bill, could create genuine economic distress in widespread areas of the country.

I wonder whether the Senator from Nebraska feels, along with me, that if the bill should remain in its present form, and if his amendment should be rejected—in effect resulting in the enactment and approval of all that is now in the Appalachia bill—it would have the result of transferring pockets of poverty from Appalachia out into the range and cattle country of America, where we already are suffering serious economic consequences.

Mr. HRUSKA. There is no question about that. In the last 2 or 3 years, many persons in our area have been pushed into bankruptcy or near bankruptcy. If we are to have a portion of the industry subsidized in competition with us, of course it will aggravate that situation.

Mr. MUNDT. I see no good economic sense at all in creating new areas of poverty in order to correct existing problems. This is a nation of 50 sovereign States. By moving economically distressed locations from one area on some kind of magic carpet, by impinging upon the agricultural activities of a normally agricultural area of the country, it seems to me we would be walking down the hill toward more poverty, in certain sections of our country, instead of toward a high plane of national prosperity.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his observations.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I feel that the Senator from Nebraska has made a significant contribution to this debate in his forceful statement on his amendment. I offered the same amendment in committee, and for the same reasons the Senator from Nebraska has so eloquently stated.

I feel that the Great Plains area is being discriminated against in this amendment. As the Senator from Nebraska has already pointed out, the cattlemen of my area, and the cattlemen of Nebraska, are suffering from overproduction.

Last year, when Secretary Freeman appeared before the committee, I interrogated him concerning the amendment. It was called the pastureland amendment then. This year "pastureland" has been removed from the amendment each time. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who has been handling the bill in the committee, is to be commended for his frankness and forthrightness in stating that they took the word "pastureland" out, but it applies to the same thing.

It is difficult for me to oppose a soil conservation and a soil erosion amendment, but this amendment, which appears to give special privilege to the Appalachian area at a time when the administration is cutting soil conservation all over the rest of the United States, comes with ill grace

In the budget message, the President proposes a reduction of $20 million for 1966 under legislation authorizing the establishment of a public enterprise revolving fund. The finance report calls for technical services provided to soil conservation districts for soil conservation already in operation, in cooperation with farmers, ranchers, other landowners in the design and layout and installation of planned water and soil conservation practices. The proposal is that a revolving fund be established by the farmers themselves, or by the States, or by the soil conservation districts, whereby to contribute to technical services.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in other words, the administration is coming around, on the one hand, with a tin cup, collecting from all the farmers who are participating in soil conservation for their technical service, and then distributing the largess it collects to the people of Appalachia.

The Presidential budget message at page 89 states:

> But in view of the market outlook for farm commodities at home and abroad, farming alone cannot be expected to provide a decent living in the future for more than about 1 million farm families, even with continued Government assistance. Many low-income farm families will have to find other ways of earning a living.

Mr. President, that means that the administration is saying to Congress that two and a half million of the 3 million farmers in America will have to leave the farms. Then it says that we shall have to give special subsidies and special consideration to return them to the farm in special areas of America.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I heartily concur in the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska and hope it will be added to the bill.

May I have an additional half minute yielded to to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield another minute to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I have supported this principle in other areas, such as in connection with the Great Plains program. I cannot justify in my mind a program which on the one hand would contribute to further poverty, as has been pointed out, in other areas of the United States, and then take that same poverty to build up something in the Appalachian area.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I hope very much that my colleagues on this side of the aisle will give consideration to the arguments that I am about to make in response to the presentation made by my friend from Nebraska.

All of us are aware of his concern, and of the concern of other Members of the Senate, about the problems of the great cattle-producing States.

Last year many of us joined in support of the efforts of the Senator from Nebraska to secure application of quotas to the importation of beef. But I believe that the Senator and his cosponsors are unduly concerned about the effect on the cattle situation of section 203 of the bill which he seeks to strike.

They assume that this section, if it is used by the small farmers in the Appalachian area, and if they improve their small tracts of land to the limit of 50 acres, that it will go into pasture and all will be used for the production of beef. I say to them that they do not know this area. I say that with great respect for my friends.

The chief purposes of the bill are two. The first purpose is not particularly relevant to the discussion of the amendment, but it is to establish facilities, such as roads, vocational schools, and health facilities, which will in time bring the region into parity with other more fortunate regions of the country.

The second purpose is to assist in the restoration, conservation, and rehabilitation of the natural resources of this region—land, water, and timber. Certainly no resource is more important than land.

The vast areas in the West, acres stretching out in flatlands, bear little comparison with the hills in Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee. It is a rugged country, cut with steep hillsides and narrow valleys. There are a few farms in the bottom lands of the streams, but most are hillside farms. The timber has been cut away. The land has been cultivated in corn, and in other row crops.

It is poor soil with little limestone, and much sandstone. The hills have been gullied, and a great deal of the topsoil has washed away.

The bill provides that these small farmers, with small resources, who have not been able to take advantage of the 50–50 divisions in our farm programs, such as the Soil Conservation Service and the ACP, and so forth, shall be provided opportunity on a ratio up to 80–20, in conservation practice, to develop their small 50 acres.

I can speak with some experience on this subject, as I live in the area and have traveled it many times.

These small farmers will improve their land and use it for gardens. They may keep a cow or two. I hope they will. They may keep some sheep and hogs. They will live on the land cheaply, and have a better way of living.

My friend from Nebraska said a few moments ago that this program would not help those people, because they could not develop a good farm program

on 50 acres. Mr. President, it will enable them to live, and that is the important thing. It will not hurt the people in the cattle States. There may be those who may have 5 or 6 cattle, or 10. How many cattle can one raise on 50 acres? These people want to stay where they are. They are miners out of work, or farm families growing poorer all the time. They are afraid to leave their homes, for it is difficult to secure employment. They do not want to lose the land and their homes.

I believe this section of the bill to be one of the most important sections in the bill. It will give these people a chance to live.

They may raise berries, fruit, vegetables, and market them through cooperatives.

I say to my dear friends: Do not be afraid of this section. It is not a cattle-producing section. It will give a better life and opportunity to people who desperately need a better chance.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in response to the presentation of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] let me say that 50 acres, multiplied over and over again, may do to the cattle business precisely what less than 15 acres multiplied time and time again has already done to the wheat market.

We have found that when we protect the right of people to raise unlimited wheat on 15-acre tracts, and then are faced with 50,000 farmers in certain States taking advantage of that provision, it has a detrimental effect on the price received by wheat grown throughout the country. The same thing can occur here if we do not add the Hruska amendment to protect our cattle industry against a new form of subsidized competition.

I do not believe it was the purpose of the Appalachian bill to subsidize one section of the country in waging economic war against another section of the country. However, that is exactly what is taking place at a time when parity is already down to 75 percent in the farming areas. I hope the Hruska amendment is adopted.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, last week I spoke on this subject. I expressed the view that I could not bring my judgment to coincide with a proposal which would have the Federal Government paying money to farmers to take land out of production on the one hand, and then, on the other, paying them money to put land into production.

That is the factual situation that exists with respect to the proposed program.

We have a number of programs in which we say to the farmers, "Take your land out of production. If you do so, you will remove the glut in the market. You will help stabilize prices. If you do that, we will pay you for your failure to produce."

That has been the philosophy, and it has been adopted by the Congress. However, in the present instance, completely in conflict with what has been past practice, we would say to farmers, "If you improve your land with fertilizer, tile, irrigation, and fences, so that you will be able to graze your stock better, we will pay you. It will not be a loan; it will be a gift."

It is beyond my ability to reconcile those two programs. One would pay the farmer to take land out of production; the other would pay the farmer to put land into production.

How can Senators reconcile those two programs? One or the other is wrong.

Certain counties in Ohio are involved in the bill. My natural impulse would be to say, "We will go along with the program." But, Mr. President, already it has been pointed out that there will be at least six other "Appalachias." How long can we continue to give money to take food out of production and give money to increase production?

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield an additional minute? I am making a good argument.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The prospects are that there will be six new areas of the country which will come under the proposed program. I visualize that within 2 years there will be "Appalachias" in every part of the country. I do not see how we can continue to pay the Great Plains States at a ratio of 50 to 50 and pay others at a ratio of 80 to 20.

I should like to go along with the provision in the bill which we are discussing, but I cannot do so.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from West Virginia in asking for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the bill has been somewhat reworded compared with the bill passed last year. But I think it is quite apparent that the result would be about the same as it would be under the pastureland section, section 203, of last year's bill. At that time I pointed out that section 203 of the bill was inconsistent with the land retirement provisions under the current feedgrain program. I believe that the same thing can be said about section 203 as it is presently worded.

Additionally, I point out that I believe that Congress is going far afield when it delegates responsibility to the Secretary of Agriculture, as this section would do. I quote from subsection (d) on page 19:

> (d) In return for such agreement by the landowner, operator, or occupier the Secretary of Agriculture shall be authorized to furnish financial and other assistance to such landowner, operator, or occupier in such amounts and subject to such conditions as the Secretary determines are appropriate and in the public interest for the carrying out of the land uses and conservation treatment set forth in the agreement:

Mr. President, that question is not for the Secretary to determine; it is for the Congress to determine and set down guidelines as to what is or is not appropriate, or what is or is not in the public interest. That is merely another example of what I believe is improper language tied in with a very unfortunate section of the bill.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to ask how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 7 minutes remaining under his control.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I hope that what I shall say will be taken in good spirit. If we were to talk about preferential treatment—and I do not like the bill to be discussed in those terms—certainly there are areas of our country, including the Great Plains area, which have had attention in the past. I shall not call it preferential treatment, but I say that for 8 years in the Great Plains area they have been carrying forward special programs. In the Great Plains program 341 million acres have been eligible for attention. If the program in the Appalachian region were similar to that in the Great Plains area, we would have approximately 8 million acres eligible for assistance and would hope for treatment of approximately 2.5 million acres over the life of this act. The present funding level of section 203 would treat approximately 350,000 acres.

Mr. President, the committee has attempted very realistically—and I shall say very considerably—to bring in this year a substitute for the amendment which was offered last year to meet the arguments which have been discussed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and others today and prior to today. We are thinking in terms of help within the Appalachian region, not merely for the plains areas. If we had any plains, we would have the production of cattle. But we are thinking, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has said, of orchards which would be developed and of other programs—for example, the production of certain types of

berries, as well as livestock production. All of those endeavors would be within the program of conservation, land improvement, and erosion control.

I cannot see how that program would be a threat to the beef industry in the section of the country from which the Senator from Nebraska comes. If the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], cosponsored by other Senators who are interested in the Great Plains States, were agreed to, it would be regionalism in the extreme. We are asking only for what I think is valid.

I quote now from page 1610 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1965. The Senator from Nebraska opposed "special Federal subsidies on a basis which discriminates in favor of one section of the country and against all other sections."

That is a quotation from the statement of the Senator. I accept it at its face value, and reply that section 203 of the pending measure, as reported, offers to the farmers of the Appalachian region nothing that has not been available to the farmers of the designated counties in Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Texas, North Dakota, South Dakota, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Montana since enactment of the act of August 7, 1956, to which reference has been made, and which established the Great Plains program under the administration of the Soil Conservation Service. The maximum allowable grant under the proposed legislation now before the Senate is substantially less than—and would probably average approximately one-tenth of—the maximum allowable assistance under the program in the Great Plains.

I have read with care the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. I have also read the remarks and listened to the statements today of the Senators from Nebraska and Ohio. I say to them with respect—and I respect them highly—that I believe their comments are not responsive to the purpose of section 203 as we have drafted it this year in S. 3. Section 203 does not give special preference to the farmers of the Appalachian region. I invite the attention of Senators to the colloquy on January 29. It was presumed by both Senators that the Great Plains program is operated on a 50–50 basis of participation between the Federal Government, on the one hand, and the farmer, on the other. It has since been brought to my attention that while a 50–50 ratio may prevail in many instances, the law provides for Federal grants up to 80 percent of the cost of each eligible project.

In Nebraska, of the 21 practices installed under the program, 6 are at 80 percent, 10 are at 73 percent, 3 are at 60 percent, and only 2 at 50 percent.

In South Dakota, of the 23 practices installed, 9 are at the ratio of 80 percent, 6 at 75 percent, 9 at 65 percent, and only 2 at 50 percent.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly for a question?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. For what years were those projects approved? If they were in the initial years, that statement is true; but in recent years the average has been about 50 percent.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Different practices have been instituted and contracted for over the years. The list to which I refer includes all 24 practices installed under the program and has been updated to 1964. The Senator from Nebraska has indicated that these programs have no applicability to Appalachia. This is not a fact. I mention, for example, permanent vegetative cover. Certainly we have reasons for that practice. Then there are the practices of field strip-cropping, contour strip-cropping, contour farming operations, terrace construction, furrowing, ripping, and pitting or listing; also detention of sediment and retention dams; stream-bank or shore protection; construction of dams for irrigation; developing springs; and control of competitive shrubs. All of these stabilization and erosion control practices are applicable to the farms of Appalachia.

I refer Senators to pages 119 and 120 of the Federal Budget for fiscal 1966, in which the Great Plains program, after which this section of the pending measure has been patterned, is discussed. I quote from that section of the budget:

> Program regulations provide that the cost-share rate offered in any contract shall not exceed 80 percent of the average cost of installing each eligible practice within the designated county. * * * There is also a cost-sharing limitation of $25,000 for any one contract.

I emphasize that whereas the comparable program for Appalachia under section 203 is limited to not more than 50 acres, which at the average cost of $50 per acre would be a maximum of $2,500, the Great Plains program limits a single contract to $25,000, or 10 times the amount which would be allowed the Appalachian farmer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The 10 minutes allotted to himself by the Senator from West Virginia have expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield myself 3 minutes.

I find it difficult to understand how Senators could seriously entertain the argument of preferential treatment in Appalachia in the face of the facts which have been presented by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], which I have placed in the RECORD. I do not advocate establishing a 50-acre limitation in the Great Plains. Obviously, in the wide expanses of the Western States, such a limitation would be inappropriate and ineffective. But I do argue for at least equal treatment for the farmers of Appalachia with the farmers of the Great Plains. Equal treatment means the equal, though not identical, application of the resources of our Government to the needs of the farmers.

Should the soil of the farms of West Virginia and eastern Kentucky be allowed to wash away into the Ohio and Big Sandy Rivers, while the soil of the farms of Kansas and Nebraska is protected from erosion? I do not believe that the Senate will adopt an amendment which embodies such apparent inequities as the pending one, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for himself and other Senators.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The point we are missing is that the limitation provided in the bill is 50 acres. This is an antipoverty program. As the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has already said, the 50 acres is nothing more than a family farm. We are trying to provide a little sustenance for those people to enable them to provide for their families. It was never intended that industry in any other part of the country should be dislocated. This is an antipoverty program; we must understand that. The reason for the limitation of 50 acres is that it is a family farm program. We are merely trying to assist people to raise some cattle and some food in order to support their families.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Rhode Island is succinct and correct, as always. There is no attempt in the bill to do violence to a program which, for 8 years, has worked effectively in the Great Plains. We know that. But there is a desire to provide equal treatment to the farmers of the Appalachian region, a region of high ridges, steep slopes, and narrow valleys, and where, as has been said by the Senator from Rhode Island, only the small acreages of farmers are under consideration.

Mr. President, I reserve the time I have remaining.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I support the Hruska amendment. I believe that the language in the bill before us is a substitute for the language that was in the bill last year, only it is a little subtle. The language of last year's bill indicated an intention, as part of the Appalachian program, to expand the livestock production of the country, particularly cattle. If through the ingenuity of the sponsors and the use of the help that is extended to all sections of the country, someone wishes to go into the livestock production business, certainly he should not be retarded by the Government. On the other hand, if there is an industry, such as the cattle industry, in which someone is suffering from depressed prices, an industry which has been subjected to excessive foreign import competition, certainly the Treasury of the United States should not be used to build up additional competition for the existing livestock industry.

It is true that the language in the pending bill does not mention livestock or cattle; but I believe it must be admitted that the purpose is the same.

I support the Hruska amendment for another reason. The language in the bill is not necessary. It has been shown that the Appalachian region has not exhausted the possibilities of solving this problem under existing law. I speak primarily of the Soil Conservation Act.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, would the Senator from West Virginia prefer to finish his debate?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I should like to do so. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I address myself to the argument that we should not raise the investment of funds for one region while the budget has established cuts for other regions. This refers specifically to proposed budget cuts for the Department of Agriculture. While I am sensitive to the problem this poses for Senators from other States, and indeed, I have indicated my resolve to resist such cuts, let us not mix apples and oranges. Let us refer to the budgeted funds for comparable programs.

Section 203 would authorize $17 million for soil conservation and erosion control for fiscal years 1966 and 1967. The budget for 1966 requests for the Great Plains program alone an appropriation of $14,864,000—an annual rate of almost twice that which would be authorized for Appalachia by section 203—and an increase over the 1965 estimate for the Great Plains of $14,744,000 and the 1964 expenditures of $13,617,000.

Mr. President, section 203 would authorize for Appalachia slightly more than half the annual appropriations made for the Great Plains program. Section 203 would authorize assistance to some of the 218,000 farmers in the designated counties of the 11 Appalachian States; the Great Plains program has under contract 17,111 farmers and ranchers in the designated counties of 10 Great Plains States. And section 203 would establish for Appalachia a maximum allowable grant limitation of 50 acres, or approximately $2,500; the Great Plains program authorizes a maximum allowable grant under one contract of $25,000 though I do not know whether a single operator or occupier is limited to one contract.

In the light of these facts, the argument of preferential treatment for Appalachia is, in this Senator's opinion, completely fallacious, and I hope that the Senate will decisively reject the proposed amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I find myself completely in accord with the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. Too many of our Federal programs have encouraged competition against industries which were already severely depressed.

I can think of ski areas being put out of business by new ski areas which were financed by the Federal Government. I can think of wood manufacturing businesses being put out of business by new businesses financed by the Federal Government. I have mentioned just two of many such programs whereby Government-financed businesses have adversely affected businesses established through free enterprise.

It seems to me that in a time and place where we already have a surplus of cattle, according to the Secretary of Agriculture, when the price of cattle is depressed, that we should not enact a bill with a provision such as section 203 whose purpose is to place new areas in competition with another industry which is already in distress, and thereby exaggerate it.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask for 10 additional seconds.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield that much additional time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am very much persuaded by the arguments of the minority report. I am convinced that the whole concept of the bill, in addition to the defects I see in section 203, is to create an unprecedented opportunity for logrolling. Federal funds will gush forth without the restraint of reason. The necessary "needs" test will become simply a matter of "who is the most adept at rolling his log" instead of "where are the needs most acute in areas that have demonstrated their inability to alleviate their economically depressed condition by attempting self-help to the full extent of their capability prior to requesting Federal assistance." The latter should be the test, not the former.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge the generosity and fairness of the senior Senator from West Virginia for the manner in which the debate has been conducted.

It has been said that section 203 offers nothing to Appalachia that has not been enjoyed for 8 years now by the Great Plains under Public Law 1021.

We have in the Great Plains an area in which the average farm unit is 2,000 acres, compared with 50 acres per farm in Appalachia. That means $18 an acre in the Great Plains as against some $50 plus an acre in Appalachia. That is one great difference.

Another difference is that we have built into section 203 a need for constant and continued subsidies indefinitely into the future.

If the program is started, the units there are uneconomic. They cannot be self-sustaining, even if given all favorable conditions. A total of from 12 to 16 animal units on each one of those 50-acre tracts will not do the job, and that is all those farms are capable of supporting.

Federal grants of 80 percent of the cost to restore vegetation will be necessary, but also breeder stock must be procured and maintained in order that the program may become operational at all.

Will this program do any harm to the existing cattle industry? The addition of 1 million head of cattle marketed per year, within a very few years after this program has been put into effect, will certainly be harmful to the cattle industry. Let us not pretend that this is a program for orchards, gardens, poultry, or a cow or two.

This is how the report reads with respect to section 203:

> It offers no special provisions for assisting livestock operations in Appalachia. The committee assumes that after the land is restored and revegetated, the operation of free market factors, in conjunction with already established Federal programs, will supply this need.

Refer, if it is so desired, to the testimony of Mr. Sweeney, who states the same thing and amplifies it.

This provision is for the purpose of increasing the cattle production capability of those 50-acre units in the Appalachia region. There is no question about it. One million more head of cattle added to the cattle marketings that we have now, 1 billion pounds of beef on the hoof to be added to the market, will have a destructive effect on the market in our free economy.

Let us strike this section from the bill. Let us refer this matter to the Committee on Agriculture. Let them mull over it and see whether the arguments advanced by the cattle industry and other citizens last year are true. They will be verified. In support of the statement that these units are uneconomic and cannot be self-sustaining, we have one of the greatest experts in the business—Secretary Freeman himself.

I do believe, therefore, that we ought to refer this to the House Committee on Agriculture and to the Senate committee, and let them process it as it should be processed.

The amendment should be sustained. I hope the Senate does so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, amendment No. 11.

The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 56, as follows:

[No. 10 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Aiken	Harris	Mundt
Allott	Hruska	Murphy
Bennett	Jordan, Idaho	Prouty
Boggs	Kuchel	Simpson
Burdick	Lausche	Thurmond
Carlson	Mansfield	Tower
Church	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak
Dirksen	Miller	
Fannin	Montoya	

NAYS—56

Anderson	Hartke	Morton
Bartlett	Hayden	Nelson
Bass	Hill	Neuberger
Bayh	Holland	Pastore
Bible	Inouye	Pell
Brewster	Javits	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Cannon	Kennedy, Mass.	Ribicoff
Case	Kennedy, N.Y.	Robertson
Clark	Long, Mo.	Russell
Cooper	Long, La.	Smathers
Cotton	Magnuson	Smith
Douglas	McGee	Sparkman
Eastland	McGovern	Stennis
Ellender	McIntyre	Symington
Ervin	McNamara	Tydings
Fong	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hart	Morse	

NOT VOTING—16

Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Saltonstall
Dodd	Johnston	Scott
Dominick	McCarthy	Talmadge
Fulbright	Moss	Yarborough
Gruening	Muskie	
Hickenlooper	Pearson	

So the amendment offered by Mr. HRUSKA, for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have been present during much of the debate on the pending bill. I move to strike out section 405. I will take 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Tennessee restate his amendment?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I take 2 minutes time and move to strike out section 405.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. I have been present during much of the debate on the pending bill. I rise to express my gratitude to and my admiration for the able, adroit, considerate, and effective way in which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has conducted the debate and piloted this bill to the threshold of passage by the Senate.

The State of West Virginia is in the heart of the region known as Appalachia. Therefore, the citizens of West Virginia can be rightfully proud of the diligence which their senior Senator has displayed in the passage of this bill, rightfully proud of his knowledge of the problems of this great, this beautiful but this blighted area, and rightfully proud of the esteem in which he is held by all Senators.

I congratulate the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and express the appreciation of the people of Tennessee, many of whom are likewise living in the Appalachian region, for the diligence and ability he has shown in bringing this bill to successful passage.

I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield 1 minute to my colleague.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senate is now operating under a unanimous-consent agreement as to time, it will not be my intention to speak at this point except briefly. As a cosponsor of S. 3, I wish to state that I enthusiastically support the bill and that, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I shall work to secure adequate funds for the implementation of the programs envisioned by this act. These programs will be very beneficial in that they will provide for the mounting of a regional attack upon problems confronting Appalachia.

I wish to compliment my colleague, Senator RANDOLPH, for the excellent work that he has done in conducting the Senate Public Works Committee hearings on this legislation and in bringing S. 3 to its present stage of development in the Senate. A similar bill passed the Senate under his managership by a large majority during the last Congress, and I am confident that the Senate will today pass the bill presently under discussion.

I commend President Johnson on his support of this legislation, and I hope that the House of Representatives will act quickly to enact the bill in that body so that the President's drive to stimulate the economy of Appalachia may be accelerated and made more meaningful.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We of the Public Works Committee are appreciative of, and I am personally grateful for the generous remarks of my able colleague from West Virginia. He is, indeed, a diligent and effective member of the Appropriations Committee, and I know we can count upon his faithful attention to the need of adequate funding for the Appalachian program. He is a cosponsor of this legislation, as he was of its predecessor last year. His support has been valuable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there are no further amendments——

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed, without regard to the offering of amendments, for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works this measure has been brought to the Senate to aid the Appalachian region.

I wish to express the very sincere appreciation, first of all, to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for his personal words about me. I shall always cherish this expression from him.

I express my thanks to all the Members of the Committee on Public Works. I commend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], as I commended him last week, for the diligence with which he has pursued this bill to hoped-for final passage within a matter of minutes.

At all times, even though we have had differences, we have had a sincere desire to proceed constructively in the consideration of this bill.

I thank the Members of both the majority and minority within the committee. I express my tribute to the staff members of the Committee on Public Works, the chief clerk, Ron M. Linton, and, at this time to invite the attention of the Senate to the services of Richard B. Royce, the professional staff member, who has stood at my side during the consideration of this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, the passage of the proposed legislation, the further passage of the bill in the House, and final enactment by signature of the President of the United States, I hope by April 1st, will bring not only new opportunities to 15 million people in this region but also will give them the opportunity to realize that it involves more than payments of public welfare, that there are programs of public works and resource development which will be instituted in this area. These programs will bring a new surge of economic development to the area, which will be reflected in the further sustained prosperity of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, if no other Senator desires time, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it has been a great honor and opportunity to work with the distinguished chairman of this committee and its members in the development of this bill. I want to pay tribute to the great work and leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from

West Virginia, and I want to say that his understanding and patience has been reflected in the consideration and deliberation given to this bill by all of the members of the Public Works Committee, and of the Senate.

Although some members of the committee opposed certain features of the bill, I believe that on the whole the debate in committee and on the floor has been very constructive. I believe it is a bill which is national in its purpose, although it is directed toward a region; and I believe that it is a carefully constructed bill which has grown out of much thought and effort in the States and in the Senate over the last 6 years.

I recall that in 1959, when I first introduced a bill looking to the coordination of such programs as are included in this legislation, the concept of area development was just gaining wider interest. If this bill now enjoys the success we hope, it may very well serve, and properly so, as a model after which other parts of our country may seek to develop carefully constructed development programs based on initial effort and consultation and coordination in and by the people and officials of the areas affected.

From my own observation, this has already given hope to the people of this region, as they have looked toward its enactment. I hope very much that the States will continue to give the same creativity and spirit of cooperation to the administration of this program that they have in its development. I believe it could be a model type of program, demonstrating how to achieve the fuller development of what I have called in years past the underdeveloped regions of our country, and I think our debate in the Senate has contributed to the strength of the program on which we now vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, inasmuch as I voted against the so-called antipoverty bill, and as I intend to vote this year, as I did last year, for the pending bill, I should like to preserve in the RECORD a brief statement as to why I regard this type approach as vastly preferable to the shotgun approach—if I may use that term—of the antipoverty bill.

I am familiar with several of the areas covered by the pending bill, particularly the State which is so ably represented by the distinguished Senator who has handled the bill on the floor, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and certain areas in Pennsylvania and eastern Kentucky, as well as other areas where there is no question that poverty is rampant and is holding back the progress of very fine people who are relatively without reasonable opportunity for self-advancement.

I favor this type of approach because it is addressed to an area which very badly needs some of the advantages which are sought to be given, in part, at least, by the provisions of this bill.

I know from personal experience how rugged is much of the terrain and how difficult of access it is.

I particularly approve of the fact that a majority of the money proposed to be used in the bill is to be used in the giving of better highway transportation than has ever been available or even possible under former conditions and present conditions obtaining there.

The other objectives of the bill are good, such as health improvement in the communities, through giving them health facilities; also the emphasis on reforestation, because much of this area will have to depend on reforestation; also land erosion control in steep and inaccessible places; and all the other features of the program, which I shall not mention.

In my judgment this kind of approach, meeting the needs of the region involved—and the whole Nation knows what it is to be suffering from poverty—is the type of approach that we ought to adopt, rather than a broad, general program which will set up an administration from one end of the Nation to the other, with all of the objections that necessarily arise from that kind of administration.

I am glad to support the bill. I hope it will bring—and I believe it will—much better conditions to a large number of American people who by any reasonable standard are now underprivileged as compared with the great majority of our people. I hope the bill will be enacted.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am grateful for the comments of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida and am most appreciative of the support he gives this measure. He has family ties to West Virginia and Appalachia and he knows our people and our problems. We hold him in highest esteem.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, in the closing minutes of the debate on the pending measure, I rise to join my senior colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] in paying tribute to the able leadership of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] in the management of the pending bill and the leadership he has shown, not only in committee, but also on the floor of the Senate.

Last year he did an able job in having the proposed legislation passed by the Senate, although it was not passed in the other body. He came back this year with the same diligence and dedication to duty, and has brought it back to the Senate as the first piece of major legislation during this session of Congress.

I believe that the people of West Virginia owe him a separate and individual tribute and vote of thanks for the work he has done.

Not only do the people of West Virginia owe him that vote of thanks, but also the people of Tennessee and the other States in the Appalachian region, as well as all the people of America. They all owe him a vote of confidence and commendation for the work he has done.

He has been patient. He has been able to answer every question that has been asked of him on this very important and technical legislation.

I deem it an honor to be privileged to tender the Senator from West Virginia my personal thanks and the thanks of the people of the State of Tennessee for the work he has done on this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The junior Senator from Tennessee continues in this body the distinguished record of service to his State which he established in the House of Representatives. I welcome this occasion to serve with him in advancing the welfare of our region and our Nation, and I am deeply appreciative of his remarks concerning my role in this effort.

REGIONAL AREAS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, many of the problems which have plagued the Appalachian region, and which we rightfully seek to solve, are the same as those which have hindered the economic growth of the State of Wyoming and of the entire upper Great Plains and Rocky Mountain region.

As I mentioned in my remarks on January 22 in support of Senate bill 662, introduced by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], on behalf of himself, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], and me, to create an Upper Great Plains Regional Development Act, the problems of poverty that we face in Wyoming may not be as graphic or as concentrated as they are in Appalachia, but they exist nonetheless.

For example, throughout the United States an average of 21.4 percent of our families must exist on incomes of less than $3,000 a year. Six of Wyoming's 23 counties have a low-income percentage substantially above the national average, reaching as high as 28.5 percent in one instance. These figures represent not only those with low incomes whose jobs do not provide them with sufficient funds to enable them to live on anything other than a marginal scale, but also those who, through unemployment, have no incomes whatsoever.

In addition to the problems of poverty and unemployment, Wyoming, like Appalachia, has seen a flourishing coal industry all but succumb to the technological changes in fuel usage. This industry had a potential to provide a backbone of economic support for industrial expansion and development. That potential now lies moribund.

We in the upper Great Plains also suffer from inadequate transportation and communication networks. Perhaps in Appalachia the distances are measured more up and down than are those in our wide open spaces; but distance and its attendant problems are there, nonetheless.

I would also note, Mr. President, that if the present indications of curtailment of many of the agricultural-support programs and other aids to the small farmer are confirmed, our problems in Wyoming will be severely—and, I should think, unnecessarily—aggravated by the creation of a large number of unemployed who previously had been small farmers, and who had, in addition to supporting themselves and their families, provided the economic backbone to many small agricultural communities across the State and the region.

The picture this situation paints is not a pretty one, Mr. President. Furthermore—and perhaps this is more dangerous—it is not an obvious one, for side by side with this poverty, progress exists. We in Wyoming have a good record for

economic growth and development. Many of our people have more than adequate incomes, and have very successfully made the adjustment to space-age technology and economics; but I am convinced that until all our people have bridged this gap, we cannot and we must not claim that we are presently living up to our potential for human and economic progress.

Mr. President, the proposals outlined earlier today by the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] seem to me to be a reasonable and potentially effective method of establishing the means with which to combat the problems I have mentioned. I am anxiously awaiting an opportunity to examine in detail these proposals, so that we can move ahead as soon as possible with this important work.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by the distniguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], who is unavoidably absent.

Senator SCOTT was one of the first sponsors and supporters of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. He has proposed helpful amendments. He has brought his broad knowledge to our hearings and to the debate on the floor of the Senate. He has fought hard, effectively, and with sympathy for the people of Pennsylvania, in connection with the development and the passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT ON SENATE BILL 3

I regret that I am unable to vote on the question of the passage of S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, of which I have the honor to be a cosponsor. My absence is occasioned by a longstanding engagement in England, to attend the Ditchley Foundation conference on Anglo-American relations, to which I and a group of Senators and Representatives, headed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. FULBRIGHT, were invited by Her Majesty's Government.

Neverthless, I take this opportunity to reiterate my support of this proposed legislation. The report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission, issued in April of last year, and subsequent hearings in committees of both Houses of Congress have demonstrated convincingly the need for an economic development program to be undertaken by a partnership of the Federal Government, the States, and local communities throughout Appalachia, so that the region can share in the prosperity enjoyed by most of the rest of our great Nation.

I am especially gratified that the Committee on Public Works accepted an amendment to S. 3 jointly proposed by my colleague [Mr. CLARK] and me, at the request of the Governor of Pennsylvania, William W. Scranton. As a result, the bill now authorizes funds to assist the Appalachian States in reclaiming and rehabilitating strip mined lands. This new provision in the bill will in no way detract from the desirability or necessity of the strip mine study to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior. My Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, however, has already completed many studies in this field, and is therefore, prepared to move to the action stage.

This feature of Senate bill 3 and the development highway construction program and the assistance to deal with the problems of coal mine subsidence and underground mine fires are of great significance to my Commonwealth. Therefore, I am satisfied with this bill as presently drafted, and urge its passage by the Senate.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will now vote. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. SIMPSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If present and voting the Senator from Colorado would note "nay" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

The pair of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] has been previously announced.

The pair of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 22, as follows:

[No. 11 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Aiken	Hart	Mondale
Anderson	Hartke	Monroney
Bartlett	Hayden	Montoya
Bass	Hill	Morse
Bayh	Holland	Morton
Bennett	Inouye	Nelson
Bible	Javits	Neuberger
Brewster	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Prouty
Cannon	Kuchel	Randolph
Case	Lausche	Ribicoff
Church	Long, Mo.	Russell
Clark	Long, La.	Smathers
Cooper	Magnuson	Smith
Dirksen	Mansfield	Sparkman
Douglas	McGee	Symington
Ervin	McGovern	Tydings
Fong	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Harris	Metcalf	

NAYS—22

Allott	Fannin	Robertson
Boggs	Hruska	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Carlson	McClellan	Tower
Cotton	Miller	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	Murphy	
Ellender	Proxmire	

NOT VOTING—16

Dodd	Johnston	Scott
Dominick	McCarthy	Simpson
Fulbright	Moss	Talmadge
Gruening	Muskie	Yarborough
Hickenlooper	Pearson	
Jackson	Saltonstall	

So the bill (S. 3) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. COOPER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRESS AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if we may have the attention of the Senate for a moment, I should like to query the majority leader as to what will be scheduled by way of Senate business tomorrow and, so far as he knows, for the remainder of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President with the permission of the distinguished minority leader, I should like to furnish a little background as to what the Senate has been able to accomplish so far.

Thanks to the outstanding leadership shown by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senate was able to pass the water pollution control bill.

Under the management of the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senate has passed a bill to creat a Joint Committee on the Budget.

Thanks to the indefatigable Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], a veterans' housing bill has once again been passed.

A resolution has been adopted for the study of methods to help provide for relief from future flood and earthquake disasters, a measure sponsored by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Both the latter measures were ably aided and abetted by the distinguished Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Also, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senate has passed a bill to encourage physicians and dentists to practice in shortage areas, a bill, by the way, which has had the very strong, personal interest of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] for many years.

In addition, under the outstanding leadership of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and his colleague, the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senate has just passed the Appalachian regional development bill.

In addition, the Senate has approved 4,730 nominations.

It is the intention of the leadership shortly to move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination of Mr. W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. It is our hope that the nomination can be disposed of this afternoon.

It is our intention, further, if the nomination can be disposed of, to have laid before the Senate the coffee agreement implementing legislation and to make it the pending business before the Senate tomorrow.

I wish to report that the Committee on Armed Services will report, possibly within the next few weeks, on the materials reserve stockpile bill, S. 28, which was approved on January 29, by the Stockpile Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

It is my understanding that the Committee on Armed Services has scheduled hearings to start February 9 on the annual military procurement authorization bill.

Tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] expects to start hearings in the Committee on Banking and Currency on the gold-cover bill.

This week, also, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold hearings on four or five bills.

I am hopeful that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary will report shortly to the full committee, and that as shortly thereafter as possible, the bill relating to presidential inability and presidential succession will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My understanding is that a quorum of the committee was present and that the bill was reported to the Senate today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Committee on Appropriations will meet at 3:30 this afternoon to consider the disposition of the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

JOINT RESOLUTION OF NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the 1st session of the 27th New Mexico State Legislature, 1965, the legislature adopted Senate Joint Memorial 1, asking reconsideration of the order to close the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Bayard, N. Mex. I ask unanimous consent that Senate Memorial 1, as adopted by the New Mexico State Legislature be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1 OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

A joint memorial asking reconsideration of the order to close the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Bayard

Whereas the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Bayard has been of service since 1930 to citizens of New Mexico and the Southwest who served their country in time of need; and

Whereas the closing of this facility would leave veterans of southern New Mexico, southern Arizona, and western Texas without a nearby Veterans' Administration hospital for the first time in 35 years; and

Whereas the closing of this facility would be false economy causing great injury to the welfare of veterans of the Southwest and removing almost $2 million a year from the economy of Grant County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the order closing the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Bayard be reconsidered in the light of the best interests of the veterans of the Southwest and the economy of Grant County; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States and to each member of the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States.

MACK EASLEY,
President of the Senate.
BRUCE KING,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I send to the desk a certified copy of a resolution entitled: "Resolutions Memorializing Congress To Draft Appropriate Resolutions of Condolences in Memory of Sir Winston Churchill," adopted by the House of Representatives of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on January 27, 1965.

I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO DRAFT APPROPRIATE RESOLUTIONS OF CONDOLENCES IN MEMORY OF SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Whereas it was with great sorrow that the people of the United States learned of the death of Sir Winston Churchill; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States granted him a most unusual honor in 1963 when he was made an honorary U.S. citizen, which citizenship was conferred upon him in absentia by President Kennedy in April of that year; and

Whereas the memory of this great statesman should be perpetuated in the hearts and minds of the people of the free world and particularly of the United States where he was held in such high regard and esteem: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully request that the Congress of the United States draft appropriate resolutions of condolences in memory of Sir Winton Churchill; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, adopted, January 27, 1965.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 52).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 10. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations (Rept. No. 14);

S. Res. 12. Resolution to extend the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1966 (Rept. No. 37);

S. Res. 13. Resolution authorizing the continuation of certain studies and the initiation of others by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service (Rept. No. 34);

S. Res. 14. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ one additional assistant (Rept. No. 35);

S. Res. 15. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters relating to public and private housing (Rept. No. 15);

S. Res. 22. Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of a history of the Pima Indians and the San Carlos irrigation project (Rept. No. 39);

S. Res. 23. Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of certain censuses of the Territory of New Mexico and Territory of Arizona (Rept. No. 40);

S. Res. 24. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and study matters relating to migratory labor (Rept. No. 33);

S. Res. 28. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine and study the foreign policies of the United States (Rept. No. 16);

S. Res. 29. Resolution authorizing the printing of the compilation entitled "Mineral Potential of Eastern Montana—A Basis for Future Growth" as a Senate document (Rept. No. 41);

S. Res. 32. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Select Committee on Small Business (Rept. No. 36);

S. Res. 33. Resolution to print as a Senate document a report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects (Rept. No. 42);

S. Res. 36. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (Rept. No. 20);

S. Res. 39. Resolution to study administrative practice and procedure (Rept. No. 21);

S. Res. 40. Resolution to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States (Rept. No. 22);

S. Res. 41. Resolution to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations (Rept. No. 24);

S. Res. 43. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights (Rept. No. 23);

S. Res. 44. Resolution to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization (Rept. No. 26);

S. Res. 45. Resolution to study and examine the Federal judicial system (Rept. No. 25);

S. Res. 47. Resolution to investigate national penitentiaries (Rept. No. 28);

S. Res. 48. Resolution to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office (Rept. No. 29);

S. Res. 49. Resolution to investigate problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from communistic tyranny (Rept. No. 30);

S. Res. 51. Resolution to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act (Rept. No. 31);

S. Res. 52. Resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency (Rept. No. 27);

S. Res. 54. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government (Rept. No. 17);

S. Res. 56. Resolution to provide funds to study and evaluate the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government (Rept. No. 18);

S. Res. 58. Resolution to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to economy and efficiency of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government (Rept. No. 19);

S. Res. 60. Resolution to authorize additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 32);

S. Res. 61. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences (Rept. No. 51); and

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Peter Marshall in the Senate during the 80th and 81st Congresses (Rept. No. 38).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 11. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Public Works (Rept. No. 50);

S. Res. 37. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Armed Services (Rept. No. 44);

S. Res. 42. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments (Rept. No. 47);

S. Res. 46. Resolution to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act (Rept. No. 48);

S. Res. 50. Resolution to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States (Rept. No. 49);

S. Res. 57. Resolution to study certain aspects of national security and international operations (Rept. No. 46); and

S. Res. 59. Resolution authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities (Rept. No. 45).

BESSIE V. BOSE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 70) to pay a gratuity to Bessie V. Bose, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Bessie V. Bose, widow of Louis Bose, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

LULU M. McDANIEL

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 71) to pay a gratuity to Lulu M. McDaniel, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Lulu M. McDaniel, widow of Samuel L. McDaniel, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELEANOR C. JENKINS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 72) to pay a gratuity to Eleanor C. Jenkins, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eleanor C. Jenkins, widow of John F. Jenkins, Junior, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to three months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 73) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Jordan of North Carolina; and Mr. Scott, of Pennsylvania.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; Mr. Jordan of North Carolina; Mr. Pell, of Rhode Island; Mr. Clark, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Cooper, of Kentucky; and Mr. Scott, of Pennsylvania.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for use during the 89th Congress, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-ninth Congress, that said Rules and Manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that one thousand six hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining four hundred and fifty copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

STUDY OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION (S. REPT. NO. 43)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 75) to authorize a study of the Standing Rules of the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and submitted a report thereon, which resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the Standing Rules of the United States Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That if more than one counsel is employed the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2100 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The Committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $87,000.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CARRYING OUT OF OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT, 1962—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 53)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 701) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed together with minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 898. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain period of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 899. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CASE, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 900. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 901. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for refreshment, service, and merchandise at roof gardens, cabarets, and similar places; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 902. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 903. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers;

S. 904. A bill to amend section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes;

S. 905. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity;

S. 906. A bill to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes;

S. 907. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; and

S. 908. A bill to authorize the Department of Commerce to adopt improved accounting procedures; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 909. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 910. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.; and

S. 911. A bill for the relief of Jacques Maseri and his wife, Adela Maseri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 912. A bill to extend second-class mailing privileges to certain publications of offices of State secretaries of state; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 913. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 914. A bill for the relief of Estanislao Aranguena-Ortunondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 915. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for increased eligibility for and greater utilization of the displaced business disaster loan program established under section 7(b)(3) of the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 916. A bill for the relief of Debra Lynne Sanders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 917. A bill to fix the boundary of Shenandoah National Park in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 918. A bill to permit certain land in Clatsop County, Oreg., to be used for public park and recreational purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 919. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 920. A bill for the relief of Tiang H. Ong and Hian Mio Tan Ong; and

S. 921. A bill for the relief of Angela Nemec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. METCALF):

S. 922. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961 (Public Law 87-383) so as to permit the use within Canada of certain funds appropriated pursuant to such act for the conservation of migratory waterfowl; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 923. A bill for the relief of Sperandio Bortot;

S. 924. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John R. Devereux, of Chevy Chase, Md.; and

S. 925. A bill for the relief of William S. Hwang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS):

S. 926. A bill for the relief of Laura Hui-Wei Wong and her children, Janet Wong and Simon Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mrs. SMITH) (by request):

S. 927. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development,

construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

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

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 928. A bill for the relief of Teresa Jennie Wu Chien; and

S. 929. A bill to amend section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 930. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on luggage, handbags, and similar items; and

S. 931. A bill to repeal or limit certain retailers excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate hearing.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. DOMINICK):

S. 932. A bill to amend section 613 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. DOMINICK and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 933. A bill to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 934. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer a deduction from gross income for water assessments levied by irrigation ditch companies; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MONTOYA, and Mr. MCGEE):

S. 935. A bill to authorize the appropriation of the receipts of the Colorado River Development Fund for the purpose of making allowances to the Hoover Dam powerplant for deficiencies in firm energy generation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 936. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. HARTKE, and Mr. TYDINGS):

S. 937. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to enforce the duty imposed on each carrier to provide adequate services in connection with the transportation authorized by its certificate of public convenience and necessity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 938. A bill to declare a national policy on conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. CANNON:

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote in presidential elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to develop proposals for the expansion of trade by the establishment of a high-level advisory council; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATIVE TO THE EXTENSION OF THE WEST GERMAN STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AFFECTING NAZI WAR CRIMINALS

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. RIBICOFF) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) to express the sense of the Congress relative to the extension of the West German statute of limitations affecting Nazi war criminals, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

RESOLUTIONS

STUDY OF NEEDS OF AIRLINE SERVICE BY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. NELSON) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 69) to authorize the Committee on Commerce to study needs of airline service and recommend legislation for a progressive national policy, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

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

BESSIE V. BOSE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 70) to pay a gratuity to Bessie V. Bose, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

LULU M. MCDANIEL

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 71) to pay a gratuity to Lulu M. McDaniel, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ELEANOR C. JENKINS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 72) to pay a gratuity to Eleanor C. Jenkins, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 73) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate manual for use during the 89th Congress, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 75) to authorize a study of the Standing Rules of the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INCORPORATION OF CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators BARTLETT, BREWSTER, CASE, CHURCH, CURTIS, DOUGLAS, FONG, HRUSKA, INOUYE, JAVITS, MCINTYRE, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk for 3 days for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 899) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCORPORATION OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators BARTLETT, BREWSTER, BOGGS, CASE, CURTIS, DOUGLAS, FONG, HRUSKA, INOUYE, JAVITS, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk for 3 days for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 900) to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPEAL OF CABARET TAX

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal the excise tax on refreshments, service, and merchandise paid for in cabarets.

Not long ago, the Senate in its wisdom reduced the cabaret tax from 20 to 10 percent. That action brought about a remarkable expansion of the entertainment business which is an important segment of the economy of my State. Mr. President, the Members of this distinguished body well know that the drastic increases in excise taxes were intended as a temporary wartime expedient to increase Government revenue. Previous reductions in excise taxes and the income tax reductions for corporations and individuals enacted last year have conclusively proved the value of selected tax cuts in stimulating the economy.

In view of all these facts, I respectfully urge my colleagues to give serious consideration to the repeal of the excise tax on cabarets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 901) to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for refreshment, service, and merchandise at roof gardens, cabarets, and similar places, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PAINTING, ILLUMINATION, AND DISMANTLEMENT OF ABANDONED RADIO TOWERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, together with an explanation of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 903) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., December 31, 1964.

The Honorable CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 89th Congress a proposal to amend section 303(q) of the Communications Act to require that abandoned radio towers continue to meet the painting and lighting requirements applicable to towers used in connection with the licensed transmission of radio energy, and be subject to dismantlement at the Commission's direction in the event the tower constitutes a menace to air navigation.

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill and explanatory statement on this subject.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the Committee to which this proposal is referred.

Yours sincerely,

E. WILLIAM HENRY,
Chairman.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 303(Q) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO THE PAINTING, ILLUMINATION, AND DISMANTLEMENT OF ABANDONED RADIO TOWERS

This proposal would amend section 303(q) of the Communications Act of 1934 to require that abandoned or unused radio towers continue to meet the same painting and lighting requirements that would be applicable if such towers were being used in connection with the transmission of radio energy pursuant to license issued by the Federal Communications Commission (47 U.S.C. 303(q)). It further empowers the Commission to direct dismantlement of such towers when the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency determines that there is a reasonable possibility that they may constitute a menace to air navigation.

Concern has been expressed by aviation interests, both Government and non-Government, and by the general public, over the potential air navigation hazards posed by abandonment of tall antenna towers, particularly those over 1,000 feet, left standing unlighted and unpainted. The seriousness of this hazard is aggravated by the current trend toward the construction of more and higher radio antenna towers. Being of latticed construction, radio towers are inherently less visible than solid structures such as buildings, water towers, smokestacks, and the like.

Abandonment can occur by voluntary act of licensee, as when the license is permitted to expire or is submitted for cancellation, or when the licensee fails to contest an order to show cause, in consequence of which the license is revoked. Involuntary abandonment normally results from bankruptcy, death, or other legal disability affecting the licensee. Since the events leading to abandonment normally coincide with expiration, cancellation, or revocation of the station license, the Commission is at this juncture powerless to compel continued obstruction marking by invoking the administrative sanctions normally available to it except in those cases where other radio licenses are outstanding in the name of the same person.

The concern about the potential hazard to aviation safety prompted the Air Coordinating Committee to establish a Joint Industry Government Tall Structures Committee (JIGTSC) to investigate the problems raised in the joint use of airspace by the aviation and broadcast industries and to recommend appropriate action establishing the position of the Federal Government in this matter. One of JIGTSC's recommendation was that "the Federal Communications Commission require the removal or appropriate lighting and marking of unused or abandoned towers if it has such authority, and if such authority does not exist * * * that the Federal Communications Commission seek appropriate legislation to attain this objective."

After study and consideration of the JIGTSC and other parallel recommendations, the Commission, convinced that the public interest would best be served by implementation of such recommendations, submitted a legislative proposal which was introduced in the 85th Congress. That proposal would have amended section 303(q) of the Communications Act to authorize the Commission to require the continued lighting and marking of radio towers although the tower has since ceased to be used for radio transmitting purposes. The same proposal was introduced in both the 86th and 87th Congresses; however, in the 87th Congress the Senate Commerce Committee added an amendment authorizing the Commission to require the owner to dismantle and remove the tower when there is a reasonable possibility that it may constitute a menace to air navigation (S.

Rept. 214, 87th Cong.). The Senate passed the bill, S. 684, 87th Congress, with the Committee amendment.

At present, section 303(q) of the Communications Act of 1934 reads as follows:

"Sec. 303. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the Commission from time to time, as public convenience, interest, or necessity requires shall—

* * * * *

"(q) Have authority to require the painting and/or illumination of radio towers if and when in its judgment such towers constitute, or there is a reasonable possibility that they may constitute, a menace to air navigation."

The subject proposal would amend section 303(q) to read as follows:

"(q) Have authority to require the painting and/or illumination of radio towers if and when in its judgment such towers constitute, or there is a reasonable possibility that they may constitute, a menace to air navigation. The permittee or licensee shall maintain the painting and/or illumination of the tower as prescribed by the Commission pursuant to this section. In the event that the tower ceases to be licensed by the Commission for the transmission of radio energy, the owner of the tower shall maintain the prescribed painting and/or illumination of such tower until it is dismantled, and the Commission may require the owner to dismantle and remove the tower when the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency determines that there is a reasonable possibility that it may constitute a menace to air navigation."

The criteria which have been adopted pursuant to the authority under the present section 303(q) against which aeronautical hazard is gaged in particular cases are set forth in part 17 of the rules of this Commission and entitled "Construction, Marking, and Lighting of Antenna Structures." In general, these criteria provide that radio towers exceeding 170 feet in height require obstruction marking irrespective of location, and under these criteria the number of radio towers that can be approved without obstruction marking greatly exceeds those requiring such marking. The painting and lighting specifications imposed under part 17 provide an adequate vehicle for the protection of aviation interests and otherwise meet the Commission's responsibilities under present law; however, these criteria are applicable at this point only to towers used in connection with authorized radio operation. Accordingly, these criteria would not be applicable under present law and regulations to towers presently not used in connection with the licensed transmission of radio communications. Such abandoned towers constitute the particular problem sought to be remedied by this proposal.

The language suggested is essentially that approved by the Senate in the 87th Congress (S. 684). The sole difference from S. 684 is that the FCC's authority to require that a tower be dismantled is based upon a finding by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency that there is a reasonable possibility that it may constitute a menace to air navigation.

We believe that the proposal constitutes an effective and desirable solution to a problem raised by the joint use of airspace by the broadcast and aviation industries.

(Adopted: December 9, 1964, Commissioner Bartley dissenting and stating: "I know of no necessity for this legislation." Commissioner Lee absent.)

AUTHORITY FOR CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD TO EXAMINE CERTAIN BOOKS AND PAPERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, together with a statement of the purpose and need for the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 904) to amend section 407 (e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement of purpose presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1965.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the enclosed draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes."

The Board has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the transmission of the draft bill to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN S. BOYD,
Acting Chairman.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A bill "To amend section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes."

Section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act provides that the Board shall have access to all accounts, records, and memorandums kept by air carriers and may inspect and examine the same. However, under the language of the section as written there is doubt as to the authority of the Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by an air carrier, under common control with an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers. The activities of such persons and organizations are known to the Board in varying degrees from information presented at hearings and common carrier pooling agreements relating thereto submitted to the Board for approval. The Board has no means of determining the accuracy of financial data relating to such persons included in submissions to it, and, specifically, of compliance with the terms of agreements and the equity of formulae included therein.

The legislation herein proposed would implement the recommendation of the Comptroller General of the United States contained on pages 3 and 91 of his "Audit Report to the Congress of the United States, Civil Aeronautics Board, October 1955."

Accordingly, the Board believes that section 407(e) should be amended to make it clear that the Board's authority under section 407 embraces persons controlled by an air carrier, under common control with an air carrier, and service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers.

There is attached a detailed analysis of the proposed amendments and a comparison with existing law.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 407 OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Section 407 of the Federal Aviation Act provides for the filing of reports, the prescription by the Board of the forms of accounts, and for the inspection of accounts and other records of air carriers by the Board. In addition, section 407(e) provides that "the provisions of this section shall apply, to the extent found by the Board to be reasonably necessary for the administration of this act, to persons having control over any air carrier, or affiliated with any air carrier within the meaning of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended."

Thus the provisions of this section are limited in application to (1) air carriers, (2) persons having control over an air carrier, and (3) persons affiliated with any air carrier within the meaning of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act. "Affiliates," as defined in "section 5(8)," now section 5(6), of the Interstate Commerce Act does not specifically make reference to persons controlled by an air carrier, persons under common control with an air carrier, or to associations controlled by groups of air carriers. Consequently, there is doubt as to whether the provisions of section 407(e) extend to such persons or associations.

It is proposed to clarify this matter by amending the last sentence of section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act as heretofore indicated.

Precedent for the enactment of legislation along the lines here recommended may be found in the action taken by Congress relative to the auditing and inspection powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Originally, the accounting and inspection provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to regulation of railroads extended only to rail carriers. In November 1938, the Interstate Commerce Commission recommended to the Congress that noncarrier railroad subsidiaries be brought within its jurisdiction with respect to accounting. See the 52d annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, page 121. In 1940 and 1949, the Interstate Commerce Act was amended so as to greatly enlarge the scope of section 20(5) relating to the keeping of accounts and their inspection. The Commission was given authority to inspect the accounts of carriers, lessors, and associations and to inspect the accounts of any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with any such carrier. Further, "association" was defined in section 20(8) to mean "an association or organization maintained by or in the interest of any group of carriers subject to this part which performs any service, or engages in any activities, in connection with any traffic, transportation, or facilities subject to this act."

These changes were brought about, in part at least, as a consequence of the decision of the Commission in Refrigeration Charges

on Fruits, etc., from the South (151 ICC Reports, pp. 649, 651, 693 (1929)). That case involved the Fruit Growers Express Co., which was not a common carrier but all of its stock was owned by 18 railroads. The Commission stated that the express company was not subject to its jurisdiction, and further stated on page 693:

"We are further of the opinion that when the carriers perform a part of their transportation service through a separate agency having a monopoly and not subject to the restraint of competition, they should, as they do here, control that agency, but its accounts and the contracts which it makes with the carriers should be subject to our jurisdiction. The investigation which we have made in this proceeding is essential to the determination of reasonable charges for a special service which by statute has been included in the transportation duties of respondents. Yet this investigation, so far as it involves the accounts and records of the express company, has been made as a matter of favor. Under the present law we have no access to the records of that company which we could have enforced as a matter of legal right. Plainly this is an indefensible situation which ought not to be permitted to continue."

COMPARISON WITH EXISTING LAW

TITLE IV—AIR CARRIER ECONOMIC REGULATION

Accounts, records, and reports

Inspection of Accounts and Property

[Stricken matter in black brackets; new matter in italics]

SEC. 407(e). The Board shall at all times have access to all lands, buildings, and equipment of any carrier and to all accounts, records, and memoranda, including all documents, papers, and correspondence, now or hereafter existing, and kept or required to be kept by air carriers; and it may employ special agents or auditors, who shall have authority under the orders of the Board to inspect and examine any and all such lands, buildings, equipment, accounts, records, and memoranda. The provisions of this section shall apply, to the extent found by the Board to be reasonably necessary for the administration of this Act, to persons having control over any air carrier, or affiliated with any air carrier within the meaning of section [5(8)] *5(6)* of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended [.], *to persons controlled by, or under common control with, any air carrier, and to associations or organizations maintained by or in the interest of any group of air carriers which perform any service, or engage in any activities, in connection with any traffic, transportation, or facilities subject to this Act.*

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's letter, together with a statement of the purpose and need for the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 905) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1965.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity," and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO EMPLOY ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY

The proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity without regard to statutory provisions prohibiting the payment of compensation to aliens. Such employment would be subject to adequate security investigations and to a prior determination that no qualified U.S. citizen is available for the particular position involved.

On various occasions, agencies of the Department of Commerce engaged in scientific or technical work have found that the only persons qualified and available for certain highly specialized positions are not citizens of the United States. However, in many cases these individuals cannot be employed by the Department due to provisions in appropriation legislation which prohibit, with certain stated exceptions, the compensation of aliens from appropriated funds. The current prohibition is contained in section 502 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1965, approved August 30, 1964 (Public Law 88-511) and applies to all appropriations for the current fiscal year.

The need to utilize the services of these talented foreigners is due in part to the general shortage of scientists and engineers in this country. More significant, however, is the fact that some of the Department's technical programs are outside the popular or currently fashionable areas of modern science, and, therefore, are not particularly attractive to American students and scientists. In many such fields, the supply of talent is much more plentiful abroad.

For example, the National Bureau of Standards has experienced great difficulty in recent years in recruiting physicists trained in atomic spectroscopy. At the same time, the demands upon NBS for precise data on atomic properties, obtainable through spectroscopic studies, have increased sharply. Such information is essential in interpreting astrophysical data associated with the space program, in measuring and understanding plasmas such as those involved in thermonuclear fusion research, and in understanding the physical processes involved in rocket propulsion.

Though American universities have been producing few trained personnel in this field, spectroscopy has continued to be an active field of study and research abroad. Among the major producers of atomic spectroscopists is Sweden; however, Swedish nationals may not be employed by the Bureau under the present statute.

A similar situation exists with respect to applied mathematics, where the general shortage of trained mathematicians is aggravated by the lack of individuals interested and qualified in certain specialized branches of mathematics. The Bureau of the Census, for example, recently was denied the services of an exceptionally well qualified statistical consultant with extensive experience in censuses and surveys because the individual was a citizen of Sweden. The National Bureau of Standards has been unable to recruit persons skilled in numerical analysis. This is a relatively new mathematical field in the United States, but is increasingly important because of the applicability of these techniques to the analysis of extremely complex problems in science and technology. One of the most valuable sources of trained personnel in this field is Switzerland, but NBS is precluded from the employment of Swiss nationals.

The varied programs of the Weather Bureau frequently require unique combinations of talent that are extremely rare. For example, the Weather Bureau recently needed physicist-meteorologists with specialized experience in the measurement and analysis of atmospheric ozone. Two well qualified candidates were found to be available—one from Switzerland and one from India. Neither could be employed under the present statute. Sweden, which has produced world renowned meteorologists and has an International Institute of Meteorology, also is out of bounds for recruitment to fill the highly specialized needs of the Weather Bureau.

Numerous other cases might be cited, ranging from a Swedish specialist on the rheological properties of paper, who would have been ideally suited to a position at NBS, to an Egyptian oceanographer, who had exceptional qualifications for general circulation research with the Weather Bureau. The proposed legislation would enable the Department to take full advantage of such unique and long-sought combinations of talent and experience from abroad whenever suitably qualified U.S. citizens are not available.

Authority similar to that here sought was granted by the 88th Congress to the Smithsonian Institution. In earlier action, the Congress exempted the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense from the prohibitions against employment of noncitizens. The Department of Agriculture, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Public Health Service also are among the various agencies authorized by the Congress to employ aliens for certain necessary purposes.

MEASUREMENT OF GROSS AND NET TONNAGES OF CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary, together with a comparative statement showing changes in existing law made by the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 906) to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request,

was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and comparative print presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, January 14, 1965.

The Honorable CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A proposed bill is enclosed, "To provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks and for other purposes."

The proposed legislation would aid provisions to and amend existing law so that in measuring vessels for documentation as vessels of the United States certain spaces available for cargo and stores and certain other spaces would be excluded from gross tonnages even though such spaces are closed to the weather in a permanent manner and tonnage openings presently required for exemption are not fitted. The bill is drawn in accordance with recommendations formulated by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization and transmitted to member nations by the Secretary-General of IMCO with a request that the relevant provisions be included in the national tonnage measurement regulations. Enactment will extend safety and tonnage benefits to vessels of the United States comparable to those which will be enjoyed by vessels of other nations upon adoption of the IMCO recommendations. An accompanying analysis and comparative type explain the proposed bill in more detail.

It will be appreciated if you will lay the enclosed draft bill before the Senate. A similar proposal has been transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

COMPARATIVE PRINT SHOWING CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY PROPOSED BILL

Changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets, new matter is in italic):

Section 4149 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 46, sec. 72):

"SEC. 4149. *The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe how evidence of admeasurement shall be given.* [The officer or person by whom such measurement is made shall, for the information of and as a voucher to the officer by whom the registry is to be made, grant a certificate, specifying the build of the vessel, her number of decks and masts, her length, breadth, depth, the number of tons she measures, and such other particulars as are usually descriptive of the identity of a vessel, and that her name, and the place to which she belongs, are painted on her stern in a manner required by this title; which certificate shall be countersigned by an owner, or by the master of such vessel, or by some other person who shall attend her admeasurement, on behalf of her owner or owners, in testimony of the truth of the particulars therein contained; without which the certificate shall not be valid.]"

Section 4150 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 46, sec. 74):

"SEC. 4150. *A vessel's marine document shall specify such identifying dimensions, measured in such manner, as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.* [The registry of every vessel shall express her length and breadth, together with her depth and the height under the third or spar deck, which shall be ascertained in the following manner: The tonnage-deck, in vessels having three or more decks to the hull, shall be the second deck from below; in all other cases the upper deck of the hull is to be the tonnage-deck. The length from the fore part of the outer planking on the side of the stem to the after part of the main stern-post of screw-steamers, and to the after part of the rudder-post of all other vessels measured on the top of the tonnage-deck, shall be accounted the vessel's length. The breadth of the broadest part on the outside of the vessel shall be accounted the vessel's breadth of beam. A measure from the under side of the tonnage-deck plank, amidships, to the ceiling of the hold (average thickness), shall be accounted the depth of hold. If the vessel has a third deck, then the height from the top of the tonnage-deck plank to the under side of the upper-deck plank shall be accounted as the height under the spar deck. All measurement to be taken in feet and fractions of feet; and all fractions of feet shall be expressed in decimals.]"

Section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U.S.C., 1958 edition, title 46, sec. 77):

"SEC. 4153. *The tonnage-deck, in vessels having three or more decks to the hull, shall be the second deck from below; in all other cases the upper deck of the hull is to be the tonnage-deck. All measurements are to be taken in feet and decimal fractions of feet.*

"The register tonnage of every vessel built within the United States or owned by a citizen or citizens thereof shall be her entire internal cubical capacity in tons of one hundred cubic feet each, to be ascertained as follows: Measure the length of the vessel in a straight line along the upper side of the tonnage-deck, from the inside of the inner plank, average thickness, at the side of the stem to the inside of the plank on the stern-timbers, average thickness, deducting from this length what is due to the rake of the bow in the thickness of the deck, and what is due to the rake of the stern-timber in the thickness of the deck, and also what is due to the rake of the stern-timber in one-third of the round of the beam; divide the length so taken into the number of equal parts required by the following table, according to the class in such table to which the vessel belongs:

TABLE OF CLASSES

* * * * *

REGULATION OF RATES AND PRACTICES OF CERTAIN AIR CARRIERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, together with a statement of the purpose of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 907) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement of purpose presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1965.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the enclosed draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes.

The bill implements a recommendation in the Statement on International Air Transport Policy approved by President Kennedy on April 24, 1963, that Congress should enact legislation giving the Civil Aeronautics Board authority, subject to approval by the President, to control rates in international air transport to and from the United States.

The Board has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the draft bill would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN S. BOYD,
Acting Chairman.

(Enclosure.)

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958 TO PROVIDE FOR THE REGULATION OF RATES AND PRACTICES OF AIR CARRIERS AND FOREIGN AIR CARRIERS IN FOREIGN AIR TRANSPORTATION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The draft bill would amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to give the Board discretionary authority, subject to approval by the President, to prescribe rates and practices and to suspend tariffs of U.S. and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation under the same ratemaking standards that are applicable to interstate air transportation. In addition, an affirmative duty would be placed on the carriers to establish just and reasonable rates and practices relating to foreign air transportation. Also, the existing powers of the Board over rates and practices in oversea air transportation would be modified so as to correspond with those which it has with respect to interstate air transportation, and which are proposed for foreign air transportation.

The bill implements a recommendation in the Statement on International Air Transport Policy approved by President Kennedy on April 24, 1963, that Congress should adopt legislation giving the Board authority, subject to approval by the President, to regulate rates in foreign air transportation because of the need "for more effective governmental influence on rates" to protect the needs of the traveler and the shipper. This recommendation is consistent with the views of the Board, which has sought legislation of this nature since 1942.

At the present time, the Board has no really effective method by which it can protect travelers and shippers against foreign rates which are too high, or prevent the establishment of rates which are so low as to endanger the financial health of the carriers. Although the Board must approve or disapprove the rates established by the International Air Transport Association (IATA), the basic mechanism for determining rates and fares in the first instance, its power to affect the level of the rates—that is whether they are too high or too low—is not only indirect but ineffective. In fact, the only direct authority which the Board has over rates charged by either United States or foreign air carriers is the power to remove any discrimination found to exist after notice and hearing.

On the other hand, virtually all other countries have authority, derived from decrees, regulations, the constitutional structure of their governments, and bilateral agreements having the effect of law, to suspend and fix the rates of their carriers as well as those of the United States. As a result U.S.-flag carriers, who are generally the low-cost carriers, have been unable to put lower rates into effect even when they desired to do so. Thus, foreign governments have been able to take unilateral action against carriers of the United States, while this Government has not been able to do the same with respect to theirs.

Making the new powers discretionary, and subjecting their exercise to the approval of the President, would give recognition to the foreign policy factors involved in foreign air transportation, as well as assure that such powers would be exercised in conformity with our international obligations and with the overall policy interests of the United States. Moreover, such discretion would provide the necessary flexibility for continuing the International Air Transport Association (IATA) as the basic mechanism for establishing international air transport rates and fares, as recommended in the Statement on International Air Transport Policy.

In summary, giving the Board the power to fix rates and suspend tariffs in foreign air transportation, as it may now do with respect to interstate air transportation, would not only place it on an equal basis with its counterparts in foreign governments, but would also enable it to take effective action in the foreign field for protection of the traveler and the shipper. Moreover, vesting the Board with such authority would be consistent with the objective of the air transport policy of the United States to provide a system of reasonable rates that will take into account both the interests of the carriers and the needs of the consumer.

There is attached a section-by-section analysis of the draft bill, and a comparison of its provisions with existing law.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF A BILL "TO AMEND THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958 TO PROVIDE FOR THE REGULATION OF RATES AND PRACTICES OF AIR CARRIERS AND FOREIGN AIR CARRIERS IN FOREIGN AIR TRANSPORTATION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES"

Section 1: Amends subsection (a) of section 404 of the act, requiring air carriers in interstate and oversea air transportation to provide through service, adequate equipment and facilities, and establish just and reasonable rates and practices, by adding provisions making it the duty of air carriers and foreign air carriers to establish just and reasonable rates and practices relating to foreign air transportation. Since the Board is being given the power in section 5 of the bill to pass upon the justness and reasonableness of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, such carriers should have the duty of establishing just and reasonable rates and practices for such transportation.

Section 2: Amends section 801 of the act, subjecting the issuance, denial, etc., of certificates for oversea or foreign air transportation and permits for the latter to Presidential approval, by adding provisions requiring that orders of the Board, other than those relating to the removal of discriminations, directing an air carrier or foreign air carrier to discontinue a rate or practice for foreign air transportation, and actions of the Board suspending tariffs filed by such carriers for such transportation, shall be subject to the approval of the President. Copies of such orders and of statements containing reasons for suspension must be submitted to the President prior to publication. Orders relating to the removal of discriminations have been excluded from Presidential approval since the Board presently has authority to issue such orders without such approval.

Section 3: Amends subsection (d) of section 1002 of the act, authorizing the Board to prescribe rates and practices of air carriers in interstate and oversea air transportation, so as to remove the limitation that the Board may prescribe only a "just and reasonable maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum rate, fare, or charge" for oversea transportation. The amendment is required in order to avoid the anomaly of the Board having less authority over rates and practices in oversea air transportation than it would have in foreign air transportation under section 5 of the bill.

Section 4: Amends subsection (e) of section 1002 of the act, setting forth certain criteria for the determination, among other things, of the justness and reasonableness of rates and fares for the transportation by air of persons and property, so as to make its provisions applicable to foreign air carriers as well as to U.S.-flag carriers. Since section 5 of the bill gives the Board the power to pass upon the justness and reasonableness of foreign air carrier rates, the standards of subsection (e) should be applicable to the rates of such carriers as well as to those of U.S.-flag carriers.

Section 5: Amends subsection (f) of section 1002 of the act, permitting the Board to order an air carrier or a foreign air carrier to remove a discrimination, preference, or prejudice in its foreign air transportation rate structure if, after notice and hearing, such a discrimination, preference, or prejudice is found to exist, so as to give the Board discretionary authority to alter a rate or practice in foreign air transportation to the extent necessary to correct unreasonableness or discrimination. Such authority may be exercised only where the Board is of the opinion, after notice and hearing, that a rate or practice is unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory or unduly preferential. The Board also would be given discretionary authority to require discontinuance by the carrier of the unreasonable or discriminatory rate or practice, as well as to prescribe the lawful rate or practice, or the maximum and/or minimum of the rate. As stated in the discussion of section 2 of the bill, orders of the Board under this subsection, except for those relating to the removal of discriminations, are subject to the approval of the President under section 801 of the act.

Section 6: Amends subsection (g) of section 1002 of the act, authorizing the Board to suspend rates and practices of air carriers in interstate and oversea air transportation pending hearing, so as to give the Board the same authority to suspend the rates and practices of an air carrier or foreign air carrier in foreign air transportation pending hearing as the Board now has in interstate and oversea air transportation. Deletion of the words "interstate and overseas" gives the Board authority to suspend pending hearing the operation of any tariff filed by an air carrier, and this would include tariffs to be effective in foreign as well as interstate and oversea air transportation. Insertion of the words "or foreign air carrier" following the words "air carrier" wherever they appear in the subsection, gives the Board authority to suspend the rates and practices of foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation pending hearing. However, as stated in the discussion of section 2 of the bill, actions of the Board suspending tariffs filed by air carriers or foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation are subject to the approval of the President under section 801 of the act.

Section 7: Amends subsection (i) of section 1002 of the act authorizing the Board to prescribe through services and joint rates for interstate and oversea air transportation, so as to remove the limitation that the Board may prescribe only "just and reasonable maximum or minimum or maximum and minimum joint rates, fares, or charges" for oversea air transportation. The amendment is required in order to conform the provisions of the subsection to those of subsection (d) as amended by section 3 of the bill.

Section 8: Provides that the amendments made by the bill shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

COMPARISON WITH EXISTING LAW

FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Title IV—Air carrier economic regulation

Rates for Carriage of Persons and Property

Carrier's duty to provide service, rates, and divisions

[New matter in italic; matter to be omitted in brackets]

SEC. 404. (a) (*1*) * * *

(2) *It shall be the duty of every air carrier and foreign air carrier to establish, observe, and enforce just and reasonable individual and joint rates, fares, and charges, and just and reasonable classifications, rules, regulations, and practices relating to foreign air transportation; and, in case of such joint rates, fares, and charges, to establish just, reasonable, and equitable divisions thereof as between air carriers or foreign air carriers participating therein which shall not unduly prefer or pejudice any of such participating air carriers or foreign air carriers.*

* * * * *

Title VIII—Other administrative agencies

The President of the United States

SEC. 801. (*a*) * * *

(b) *Any order of the Board pursuant to section 1002(f) requiring that an air carrier or foreign air carrier discontinue demanding, charging, collecting, or receiving a rate, fare, or charge for foreign air transportation, or enforcing any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare, or charge, and any action of the Board pursuant to section 1002(g) suspending the operation of a tariff filed with the Board by an air carrier or foreign air carrier stating a new individual or joint rate, fare, or charge for foreign air transportation, shall be subject to the approval of the President: Provided, That any order of the Board directing an air carrier or foreign air carrier to alter any rate, fare, or charge, or any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare, or charge, to the extent necessary to correct any discrimination, preference, or prejudice, and any order that the air carrier or foreign air carrier shall discontinue demanding, charging, collecting, or receiving any such discriminatory, preferential, or prejudicial rate, fare, or charge or enforcing any such discriminatory, preferential, or prejudicial classification, rule, regulation, or practice, shall not be subject to such approval. Copies of any such proposed orders, and of proposed statements containing reasons for suspension, shall be submitted to the President by the Board before publication.*

* * * * *

Title X—Procedure

* * * * *

Complaints to and Investigations by the Administrator and the Board

Filing of complaints authorized

SEC. 1002(a) * * *

Power to prescribe rates and practices of air carriers

(d) Whenever, after notice and hearing, upon complaint, or upon its own initiative, the Board shall be of the opinion that any individual or joint rate, fare, or charge demanded, charged, collected, or received by any air carrier for interstate or overseas air transportation, or any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate,

fare, or charge, or the value of the service thereunder, is or will be unjust or unreasonable, or unjustly discriminatory, or unduly preferential, or unduly prejudicial, the Board shall determine and prescribe the lawful rate, fare, or charge (or the maximum or minimum, or the maximum and minimum thereof) thereafter to be demanded, charged, collected, or received, or the lawful classification, rule, regulation, or practice thereafter to be made effective[:]. [*Provided,* That as to rates, fares, and charges for overseas air transportation, the Board shall determine and prescribe only a just and reasonable maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum rate, fare, or charge.]

Rule of ratemaking

(e) In exercising and performing its powers and duties with respect to the determination of rates for the carriage of persons or property, the Board shall take into consideration, among other factors—

(1) The effect of such rates upon the movement of traffic;

(2) The need in the public interest of adequate and efficient transportation of persons and property by air carriers *and foreign air carriers* at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service;

(3) Such standards respecting the character and quality of service to be rendered by air carriers *and foreign air carriers* as may be prescribed by or pursuant to law;

(4) The inherent advantages of transportation by aircraft; and

(5) The need for each air carrier *and foreign air carrier* for revenue sufficient to enable such air carrier *and foreign air carrier,* under honest, economical, and efficient management, to provide adequate and efficient air carrier *and foreign air carrier* service.

[Removal of Discrimination in Foreign Air Transportation

[(f) Whenever, after notice and hearing, upon complaint, or upon its own initiative, the Board shall be of the opinion that any individual or joint rate, fare, or charge demanded, charged, collected, or received by any air carrier or foreign air carrier for foreign air transportation, or any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare, or charge, or the value of the service thereunder, is or will be unjustly discriminatory, or unduly preferential, or unduly prejudicial, the Board may alter the same to the extent necessary to correct such discrimination, preference, or prejudice and make an order that the air carrier or foreign air carrier shall discontinue demanding, charging, collecting, or receiving any such discriminatory, preferential, or prejudicial rate, fare, or charge or enforcing any such discriminatory, preferential, or prejudicial classification, rule, regulation, or practice.]

Rates and Practices in Foreign Air Transportation

(f) Whenever, after notice and hearing, upon complaint or upon its own initiative, the Board shall be of the opinion that any individual or joint rate, fare, or charge demanded, charged, collected, or received by any air carrier or foreign air carrier for foreign air transportation, or any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare or charge or the value of the service thereunder, is or will be unjust or unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory, or unduly preferential, or unduly prejudicial, the Board may alter the same to the extent necessary to correct such unjustness, unreasonableness, discrimination, preference, or prejudice and make an order that the air carrier or foreign air carrier shall discontinue demanding, charging, collecting, or receiving any such unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, preferential, or prejudicial rate, fare, or charge, or enforcing any such unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, preferential or prejudicial, classification, rule, regulation, or practice. The Board may in the aforesaid order set forth and prescribe the lawful rate, fare, or charge (or the maximum or minimum or the maximum and minimum thereof) thereafter to be demanded, charged, collected, or received, or the lawful classification, rule, regulation, or practice thereafter to be made effective.

Suspension of Rates

(g) Whenever any air carrier *or foreign air carrier* shall file with the Board a tariff stating a new individual or joint (between air carriers, *between foreign air carriers, or between an air carrier or carriers and a foreign air carrier or carriers*) rate, fare, or charge for [interstate or overseas] air transportation or any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare, or charge, or the value of the service thereunder, the Board is empowered, upon complaint or upon its own initiative, at once, and, if it so orders, without answer or other formal pleading by the air carrier *or foreign air carrier,* but upon reasonable notice, to enter upon a hearing concerning the lawfulness of such rate, fare, or charge, or such classification, rule, regulation, or practice; and pending such hearing and the decision thereon, the Board, by filing with such tariff, and delivering to the air carrier *or foreign air carrier,* affected thereby, a statement in writing of its reasons for such suspension, may suspend the operation of such tariff and defer the use of such rate, fare, or charge, or such classification, rule, regulation, or practice, for a period of ninety days, and, if the proceeding has not been concluded and a final order made within such period, the Board may, from time to time, extend the period of suspension, but not for a longer period in the aggregate than one hundred and eighty days beyond the time when such tariff would otherwise go into effect; and, after hearing, whether completed before or after the rate, fare, charge, classification, rule, regulation, or practice goes into effect, the Board may make such order with reference thereto as would be proper in a proceeding instituted after such rate, fare, charge, classification, rule, regulation, or practice had become effective. If the proceeding has not been concluded and an order made within the period of suspension, the proposed rate, fare, charge, classification, rule, regulation, or practice shall go into effect at the end of such period: *Provided,* That this subsection shall not apply to any initial tariff filed by any air carrier *or foreign air carrier.*

Power To Establish Through Air Transportation Service

(i) The Board shall, whenever required by the public convenience and necessity, after notice and hearing, upon complaint or upon its own initiative, establish through service and joint rates, fares, or charges (or the maxima or minima, or the maxima and minima thereof) for interstate or overseas air transportation, or the classifications, rules, regulations, or practices affecting such rates, fares, or charges, or the value of the service thereunder, and the terms and conditions under which such through service shall be operated[:]. [*Provided,* That as to joint rates, fares, and charges for overseas air transportation the Board shall determine and prescribe only just and reasonable maximum or minimum or maximum and minimum joint rates, fares, or charges.]

AUTHORIZATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO ADOPT IMPROVED ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Department of Commerce to adopt improved accounting procedures. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of the purpose of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 908) to authorize the Department of Commerce to adopt improved accounting procedures, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement of purpose presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1965.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To authorize the Department of Commerce to adopt improved accounting procedures," and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO ADOPT IMPROVED ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to give the various bureaus and offices of the Department of Commerce more effective control and better accountability of the services and administrative operations and expenses conducted jointly for two or more appropriations within a bureau or office when the costs are not susceptible of immediate distribution directly to those appropriations. Specific examples of such operations and expenses are: the maintenance of inventories of stores used by several appropriations; utilization of personal services of technicians paid from one appropriation but whose services are partially utilized on programs financed by other appropriations; and the charging of administrative and technical overhead to one appropriation with subsequent distribution and charge to the proper appropriation or fund.

The proposed legislation would permit the Department to realize the benefits of cost accounting and administer its programs on a cost basis. It would facilitate the distribution of overhead charges and permit the recapture of costs for technical services now given to various programs without reimbursement. The legislation would simplify payrolling by permitting a technician's salary to be charged to one appropriation with later distribution of charges to all appropriations benefited by his services. The legislation would permit stores to be purchased from one appropriation and other appropriations to be charged for them upon issue of the stores from inventory.

The Comptroller General has held that under the provisions of section 2678, Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 628), reimbursement and transfer of funds between appropriations are not authorized in the absence of legislation such as is here requested.

The Weather Bureau, which prior to the Comptroller General's decision had been distributing charges to appropriations in the manner which would be authorized by this bill, will be severely handicapped in the effective and economical administration of its programs unless such authority is granted. The Bureau would purchase expendable supplies for inventory and charge them to the various appropriations using them; would charge overhead to a single appropriation with costs later distributed to the benefiting appropriations; and would charge benefiting appropriations for maintenance services performed by technicians paid under another of its appropriations.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey would use the proposed authority to purchase instrumental equipment and general purpose supplies and stores from its salaries and expenses appropriations, and issue such stocks for fitting out new surveying ships. Under present law, because the initial outfit of new ships is required to be borne from the appropriation for construction of the ships, a separate purchase from the supplier must be made. This increases paperwork, slows delivery and loses the Government the advantages of quantity purchasing. A similar situation exists with respect to the equipping of magnetic and seismological facilities which is required to be borne by the appropriation for construction and equipment.

Similar legislation applicable only to the Weather Bureau was requested by the Department during the 88th Congress and introduced as S. 2315 and H.R. 9154. S. 2315 passed the Senate.

The attached draft bill incorporates a technical amendment suggested by the Comptroller General in his letter to Chairman MAGNUSON, of the Senate Committee on Commerce, of December 20, 1963, concerning S. 2315. The Comptroller General's letter is printed in Senate Report No. 1470, 88th Congress.

Since the proposed legislation would be applicable to each Bureau in the Department, it is also proposed to repeal the similar authority for the Bureau of Census enacted during the 87th Congress (Public Law 87-489, 13 U.S.C. 14).

PROGRAM FOR COOPERATION WITH THE STATES FOR THE CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE NATION'S ANADROMOUS FISH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States.

Anadromous fish are those important species of fish which are born in fresh water, migrate to salt water for most of their lives, returning to fresh water again only to spawn and die. Some of the principal species are the Atlantic salmon, striped bass or rockfish, alewives, sturgeon, five species of Pacific salmon, steelhead, American shad, and in some locales, sea run trout.

These fish are an excellent food source and support valuable commercial and recreational fisheries. This bill would further authorize the Secretary of the Interior in accomplishing the purpose of this act to: First, conduct investigations, engineering and biological surveys, and research where necessary; second, construct, install, maintain, and operate devices and structures for the improvement of feeding and spawning conditions and for facilitating free migration of anadromous fish; third, construct, operate, and maintain fish hatcheries; and fourth, purchase, lease, or accept donations of lands and any interest therein. The Secretary would also be authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with Federal, State, public, or private agencies or organizations and colleges and universities to conduct studies, research, investigation, and for such other purposes as may be necessary to accomplish the aim and intent of this act.

This bill would require prior approval of other Federal agencies when activities would be carried out on lands administered by such other agencies.

To carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary shall enter into cooperative agreements with one or more States, and when he deems it appropriate, with other non-Federal interests that are primarily concerned with the development and conservation of anadromous fishery resources. Such agreements shall describe: First, the actions to be taken by the Secretary in cooperation with the States; and second, the benefits that are expected to be derived by these States or other non-Federal interests.

To provide funds for this bill an appropriation of $25 million is authorized for the 5-year life of the bill which has an expiration date of June 30, 1969. The Federal share, including the operation and maintenance of any facilities constructed, shall not exceed 50 percent of such costs exclusive of the value of any Federal land involved. Not to exceed 20 percent of all funds expended or obligated in any fiscal year may be expended in any one State.

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior, based on studies conducted pursuant to this legislation and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, to make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the elimination or reduction of pollution when found to be detrimental to fish and wildlife in interstate waters or tributaries thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 909) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SAWTOOTH NATIONAL PARK IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, in the State of Idaho.

Mr. President, the beginnings of three major Idaho rivers—the Salmon, Boise, and Payette—rise in one of the most magnificent and primitive settings in the United States. Jagged, snowy peaks march across the skyline. Beneath them, myriad lakes of turquoise blue lie undisturbed, remote, and aloof from the works of man. This is the high country, a spinelike upthrust of mountains which lends itself appropriately to the name "Sawtooth." They have inspired awe since the first mountain man trapped for beaver in the headwaters of the rivers; and many Idahoans have long believed this most rugged and pristine area to be more than worthy of inclusion in our national park system. Bills proposing the creation of a Sawtooth National Park have been introduced in Congress by the distinguished Senator James P. Pope and the late, great Senator William E. Borah. Creation of such a park was urged in memorials to Congress passed by early Idaho legislatures. Executive interest has been attracted by this great wilderness since the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

Five years ago, to determine the interest of Idaho citizens in a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, I conducted a poll, which drew approval for a feasibility study from four-fifths of those responding. Since then, some of the most enthusiastic backing for such a park has come from the few areas which originally were the most cautious about supporting the feasibility study. Letters and postcards have since increased in their endorsement, reiterating the need to preserve this remarkable primitive area for all time, and to facilitate its enjoyment by vacationers from all parts of the Nation.

During the 88th Congress, I introduced a bill calling for creation of a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, but this action was primarily designed to provide the vehicle for a thorough feasibility study by both the Forest and National Park Services. This study is scheduled to be completed early this year. If the reports are favorable, I believe hearings in Idaho on the proposed park should be scheduled, so that the opinion of the people of my State can be fully ascertained.

The park concept which I am now advancing would consist of the present primitive area, subject to an absolute congressional mandate that it be preserved as wilderness, plus additional forest land to include the lakes and wooded areas lying along the base of the mountains. This base area would provide access to the wilderness portion of the park, and space for administrative offices, as well as expanded public accommodations such as lodges and camp and picnic grounds needed for the added number of visitors who would be drawn to a national park.

The majority of visitors will probably camp or stay for a few days along the attractive lower lakes or streams in specially designated areas, basking in the grandeur of the mountains, and entering only briefly the wilderness portion of the park. However, the more adventurous spirits could freely enter the wilderness, on foot or on horseback, and would be asked only to comply with the usual regulations preserving the wilderness character of the environment.

Some ranch owners in the Stanley Basin have expressed fear of expansion of Federal holdings or restrictions throughout the surrounding area, but actually park status would be an advantage over the arrangement under which the area is presently administered, in that the boundaries would be fixed by act of Congress and could not expand into areas presently used for grazing without a further specific act of Congress. Presently the boundaries of the area can be altered and extended by the Secretary of Agriculture. With the park as provided by this bill, the present status of the wilderness area would be maintained, and the future interests of users of adjoining lands would be protected, to a much greater extent than they are now.

The entire State of Idaho would stand to gain from such a national park. Because the proposed park lands are already federally owned their use for park purposes would not remove them from any tax rolls. Increased tourist trade would benefit the economy of all central Idaho and generate more tax revenue. As other Western States have prospered from the display of their scenic resources in national park form, so should Idaho.

Our burgeoning population and the growth of our residential centers emphasize the increasing demand for scenic and recreational resources. More than 72 million persons visited the national parks at the beginning of this decade, and the forecast for 1964 was for 102,544,000 visitors. The National Park Service, concentrating its resources on a limited number of defined areas, can insure full development of this recreational potential for the enjoyment of the greater number of people, and effectively draw attention to the Sawtooth country. The area is also convenient for that great number of summer travelers who want to visit a number of parks during one vacation trip.

Mr. President, Idaho needs the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, as do the people of the United States. The area proposed for inclusion in the national park system comprises less than 1 percent of the 20 million acres of national forest land within the State of Idaho. No economic dislocation would be involved, since no substantial grazing, lumbering, or mining occurs in the area affected.

The funds available to the Forest Service are necessarily spread thin over an immense region, which includes more than a third of the State. The Sawtooth uplands presently fall under a primitive area classification, and I think they fully qualify for designation as a wilderness area, which the Forest Service has proposed. But national park classification would equally preserve the upland wilderness, while more effectively developing the recreational potential of the adjoining baselands. A national park would boost the economy of the State and region, guarantee the integrity of the wilderness, and provide a designation of magnetic attraction to phenomena spiritually uplifting for the thousands who come to view these most beautiful of mountains.

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

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

The bill (S. 913) to provide for the establishment of a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That an area in the State of Idaho possessing superlative scenic, scientific, and geological features is hereby authorized to be established as the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park for the inspiration, benefit, and use of the public.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act wilderness is defined as an area where earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain, where the land retains its primeval character and influence without permanent improvements or human habitation, and is protected and managed so as to preserve its condition of natural beauty and grandeur. That portion of the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park identified in accordance with subsection (a) of section 3 of this Act, unless expressly provided otherwise by this Act, shall be preserved and administered, in perpetuity, as wilderness.

SEC. 3. The Sawtooth Wilderness National Park shall, subject to valid existing rights, consist of an area in the State of Idaho described as follows:

(a) Beginning at McGowan Peak, located approximately 1¼ miles southerly from the southeast corner of section 32, township 11 north, range 12 east;

thence in a southerly direction along the ridge between Stanley Lake Creek and the head of Crooked Creek to a point directly north of Upper McGowan Lake;

thence in a westerly direction along the main divide approximately one-half mile;

thence southwesterly to Stanley Lake Creek; thence southward up Stanley Lake Creek to a point on the main divide between Stanley Lake Creek and Trail Creek approximately three-fourths mile east of Observation Peak;

thence southward approximately three-fourths mile down Trail Creek to the mouth of the drainage from Trail Creek Lakes;

thence southeastward on the ridge south of Trail Creek Lakes to the main divide between Trail Creek and the North Fork of Baron Creek;

thence following the main divide westerly to a point on the South Fork of the Payette River approximately one-half mile downstream from the mouth of Baron Creek;

thence southwesterly to the main divide between Wapiti Creek and the South Fork of the Payette River;

thence southerly along the main divide to Picket Mountain, located approximately 1⅜ miles easterly from the northeast corner of section 25, township 9 north, range 10 east;

thence in a westerly direction along the main divide between the headwaters of Wapiti Creek and the North Fork of the Boise River to a point in the southeast quarter of section 23, township 9 north, range 10 east;

thence southeasterly along the divide between Ten Mile Creek and North Fork of the Boise River to a point near the center of section 36, township 9 north, range 10 east;

thence southwesterly along the main divide to a point at the head of Lightning Creek in the southeast quarter of section 10, township 8 north, range 10 east;

thence southeasterly along the ridge to a point on the North Fork of the Boise River one-eighth mile downstream from the mouth of Ballentyne Creek;

thence southeasterly along a ridge to Big Buck Mountain;

thence southeasterly crossing Johnson Creek one-eighth mile upstream from the mouth of Cahhah Creek;

thence southeasterly along a ridge to the north end of Tackobe Mountain, which is approximately one-fourth mile due west of Alidate Lake;

thence southerly along the main ridge between Black Warrior Creek and Little Queens River to a point on the Little Queens River, located 300 feet upstream from the mouth of Neinmeyer Creek and approximately one-half mile downstream from the mouth of Scenic Creek and 100 feet north of the point where Forest Service trail numbered 566 crosses Little Queens River;

thence eastward on the ridge to a point approximately 1¾ miles north of the northeast corner, section 5, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence southeasterly along the ridge between Scenic Creek and the Little Queens River to Nahneke Point located approximately one-fourth mile northeastward from northwest corner of section 3, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence easterly approximately one-half mile;

thence southerly along the main ridge on the west side of Queens River to the north quarter corner of section 15, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence southerly along a ridge one-half mile crossing Queens River near the center of section 15, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence southeasterly along a ridge approximately three-fourths mile to a point on the main divide approximately 500 feet south of the northeast corner of section 22, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence southeasterly along the main ridge approximately 1¼ miles to a peak in the southwest quarter of section 24, township 6 north, range 11 east;

thence northeasterly along the ridge to Greylock Mountain;

thence southeasterly along the ridge to the Middle Fork of the Boise River, crossing the river about one-fourth mile below the mouth of Leggit Creek;

thence easterly up the ridge about one-half mile to a point on the ridge between Leggit Creek and the Middle Fork of the Boise River;

thence in a southerly direction along the ridge between Leggit Creek and Grays Creek to Leggit Mountain, located approximately 1⅝ miles easterly from the southeast corner of section 12, township 5 north, range 11 east;

thence southeasterly along the divide between Leggit Creek and Decker Creek to a peak on the national forest boundary common to the Boise and Sawtooth Forests located approximately three-eighths mile southeasterly from Leggit Lake;

thence northeasterly along the divide between the South Fork of Ross Creek and Leggit Creek to Rossview Peak;

thence northeasterly along the divide being the Camas-Elmore County line between the North Fork of Ross Creek and Mattingly Creek to the point common to Elmore, Camas, and Blaine Counties;

thence northeasterly about 2 miles following the Elmore-Blaine County line to a point on the divide between the heads of Mattingly, Alpine, and Alturas Lake Creeks;

thence northeasterly along the divide between Alpine and Altura Lake Creeks crossing Alpine Creek approximately three-fourths mile above its mouth;

thence northerly along the divide between Pettit Creek on the west and the headwaters

of Cabin and Vat Creeks on the east to a point one-fourth mile south of the westernmost end of Pettit Lake;

thence following an arc to the northwest, north, and northeast having a one-fourth mile radius with the point on high waterline at the westernmost end of Pettit Lake as the center to a point one-fourth mile north of the westernmost end of Pettit Lake;

thence due north to a point west of the north end of McDonald Lake;

thence norwestward following the ridge around the head of Mays Creek to a point on the ridge between Mays Creek and Hell Roaring Creek drainages approximately 1 mile southeast of Hell Roaring Lake;

thence north approximately 1⅜ miles to a point 100 feet south of the junction of Forest Service trails numbered 6091 and 6097;

thence northward parallel to and 100 feet west of Forest Service trail numbered 6091 crossing Decker Creek and to a point at the top of the ridge between the Decker Creek drainage and the next unnamed drainage north;

thence southwestward along this ridge approximately 1 mile;

thence northward along the ridge around the head of the first drainage north of Decker Creek and the ridge between this drainage and the drainage into Redfish Lake keeping 100 feet west of Forest Service trail numbered 6091 where it follows this ridge to a point approximately three-fourths mile southeast of the southwest end of Redfish Lake;

thence due west approximately three-fourths mile to a point on an imaginary north-south line passing one-eighth mile west of the southwest end of Redfish Lake;

thence due north approximately 1⅝ miles to a point on the ridge between the Redfish Lake and Bench Lake drainages;

thence northeastward along this ridge to a point one-eighth mile southeast of the lower Bench Lake;

thence due north to the top of the first ridge north of this lake;

thence following this ridge northwestward approximately one-half mile to a point one-fourth mile north of the second highest of the Bench Lakes;

thence due north approximately 1¾ miles to a point 100 feet south of Forest Service trail numbered 2528 where it crosses the section line common to sections 32 and 33, township 10 north, range 13 east;

thence northwesterly parallel to and 100 feet south of Forest Service trail numbered 2528 approximately 8 miles to a point three-fourths mile northeast of McGowan Peak;

thence southwesterly along the ridge approximately three-fourths mile to McGowan Peak, the point of beginning.

(b) Not more than 34,000 acres lying adjacent to the area described in subsection (a) of this section, to be reserved for administrative uses and for such recreational facilities, campsites, picnic grounds, and other accommodations as are required to provide for the needs of visitors to the park.

(c) Within one year from the date of approval of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed description of the component parts of the park identified in the foregoing subsections, and he shall thereupon give notice of the establishment of the park.

SEC. 4. Within the area designated for the park, the Secretary may acquire lands and interests in lands by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise. Any lands or interest therein owned by the State of Idaho, or by any political subdivision thereof, may be acquired only with the concurrence of the owner. The Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the park and, in exchange therefor, he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction, notwithstanding any other provision of law. Property so exchanged shall be approximately equal in value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in such exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. Federally owned lands and interests in lands within the area designated for the park, or selected in accordance with section 7 of this Act, shall be administered as a part of the park upon its establishment as provided in section 3.

SEC. 5. (a) The grazing of livestock on any Federal lands included within the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, where established prior to the effective date of this Act pursuant to a lease, permit, or license issued or authorized by any agency, department, or establishment of the United States, shall be permitted to continue subject to such regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary to protect this area from undue harm or destruction. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any of the Federal lands.

(b) The Secretary may, in cooperation with the appropriate Secretary having jurisdiction over these lands, recommend the use of areas within adjacent or nearby Federal lands for grazing purposes, in place of existing grazing lands included within the boundaries of the park.

SEC. 6. (a) In order to provide suitable access to the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park and facilities and services required in the operation and administration of the park, the Secretary may select the location or locations of an entrance road or roads to such park and to points of interest therein, including necessary entrance and related administrative and headquarters sites upon lands located outside the park, and he may select a suitable location or locations outside the park for connections between entrance roads and between roads lying within the Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, except that no access or connection roads provided under this section shall be located within that portion of the park identified pursuant to subsection (a) of section 3. When such roads traverse lands within a national forest, the routes or sites selected pursuant to this authority shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of Agriculture. Lands selected pursuant to this section and acquired or transferred in accordance with section 4 hereof as rights-of-way for said entrance roads and connections shall not exceed an average of one hundred and twenty-five acres per mile. Rights-of-way for entrance roads and administrative sites acquired pursuant to this authority shall be administered as a part of the park pursuant to such special regulations as the Secretary may promulgate in furtherance of the purposes of this section.

(b) When title is in the United States, the Secretary may construct, reconstruct, improve, and maintain upon the lands or interests in lands selected pursuant to this section, an entrance road or roads and connection of parkway standards, including necessary bridges and other structures and utilities as necessary.

SEC. 7. The Sawtooth Wilderness National Park established pursuant to this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, except that the portion of the park identified in accordance with subsection (a) of section 3 of this Act shall, unless expressly provided otherwise by this Act, be administered and preserved as wilderness wherein the primeval character and influence is retained and wherein there shall be, subject to existing private rights, no commercial enterprise, no permanent road, nor shall there be any use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any temporary road, nor any structure or installation, in excess of the minimum required for the administration of said portion of the park for the purposes of this Act, including such measures as may be required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within such portion.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

EXTENSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR DISPLACED BUSINESS DISASTER LOANS TO ADDITIONAL SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for increased eligibility for and greater utilization of the displaced business disaster loan program established under section 7(b)(3) of that act. As it presently stands, Mr. President, section 7(b)(3) authorizes the Small Business Administration to make so-called displaced business disaster loans to small concerns forced to move as a result of urban renewal, highway, or other Federal or federally assisted projects involving land condemnation. It is the purpose of my bill to extend eligibility for such loans to certain groups of small businesses that are not now eligible but which are no less deserving and no less affected, economically, by the activities of their government. It is my further purpose, by this bill, to encourage greater utilization of this important loan program both by those now eligible and those that the bill would make eligible.

The groups not now covered, to which my bill would extend entitlement, are:

First. Small-business concerns not physically displaced, the premises of which have not been condemned and taken, but which nevertheless have suffered substantial economic injury as a result of an urban renewal, highway, or other public project carried on in whole or in part with Federal funds.

Second. Small-business concerns which have suffered substantial economic injury as a result of the actual or threatened loss, through Federal action, of a major source of employment in the area in which they are located. This last refers specifically to the shutdown of a Federal installation, such as a military base, or to cutbacks in substantial Federal procurements made in the area.

In explanation of this legislation, it may be best to begin with a brief background review of the SBA's business and disaster loan programs in general and the displaced business disaster loan program in particular. The Small Business Act, as originally enacted in 1953, set up two main classes of lending operations within the Small Business Administration. The first class, of course, was loans to small-business concerns, under specified criteria and limitations, for ordinary and usual business purposes. Authorization for this activity is now contained in section 7(a) of the amended act. The second class was the so-called disaster loan, now authorized by section

7(b) of the amended act. Disaster loans, in addition to being available to individuals as well as small businesses, may generally be made for longer terms and at lower interest rates than business loans.

From 1953 until 1961, the types of disasters which could entitle small businesses and others to obtain SBA disaster-loan assistance were limited to natural catastrophes, with floods, drought, and excessive rainfall expressly mentioned. For some time prior to 1961, however, recognition had been growing in the Congress that certain types of governmental activity could deal as disastrous an economic blow to small-business concerns as some of the natural catastrophes. The Senate Small Business Committee and the Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Housing, both of which it is my privilege to chair, had long been concerned, in particular, with the problems of small business displaced by urban renewal projects, and other public works projects involving land condemnation. As early as January 1960, in its 10th annual report, the Senate Small Business Committee discussed "Small Business and Eminent Domain" and stated its "aim to discover whether legislative action is required to lessen the impact of such projects upon the small businesses they displace."

In its next annual report, the 11th, issued in February 1961, the Small Business Committee again discussed "Small Business and Eminent Domain" and noted with approbation, attempts—during 1960—by SBA to utilize its existing business loan authority for more flexible aids to condemnation-displaced small business.

After expressing the hope that these programs would be continued under the new administration, we also observed:

> Nevertheless, your committee feels that the severe impact of eminent domain on one-fourth of all the small businesses it affected in the cities studied by [a] University of Connecticut research team cannot lightly be dismissed. Accordingly the committee will continue to work during 1961 for improvement of the treatment of small businesses displaced by public projects.

Just a little over 5 months after that report was issued, the Congress enacted the Housing Act of 1961—Public Law 87-70—which contained another major improvement of the type toward which both the Small Business Committee and the Housing Subcommittee had long been working. Section 305 of the 1961 Housing Act added to section 7(b) of the Small Business Act a new paragraph (3). That new paragraph established for the first time statutory recognition of the principle—so long urged by the Senate Small Business Committee—that displacement by a public project can be as much of a "disaster" to a small-business concern as displacement by a flood. And the new paragraph made these displaced businesses eligible for disaster loans from SBA, if the project was Federal or federally assisted.

These loans differ from the section 7(a) business loans in important respects. The borrower, in a displaced business disaster loan is not required to put up collateral. The loans can be made for 20 years, which is 10 years longer than under the regular business-loan program. The interest rate on SBA's portion of such a loan can be no higher than the average annual rate on all U.S. interest-bearing obligations at the end of the last fiscal year, plus one-fourth of 1 percent. This is currently 3¾ percent. And an amount for working capital can be included in the loan.

Mr. President, I was proud of the displaced business loan program when it became effective in June 1961, and I am still proud of it. But, as often happens with a new program, it has not entirely lived up to the expectations many of us had for it. There has been some disappointment, first, because we have been informed by small-business interests that the program should cover certain situations that it presently does not; and, second, because the program has not been utilized as much as we expected it to be by persons in the situations that it does cover. In the bill I am now introducing, I am attempting to cure both of these disappointments.

This program was set up to assist small-business concerns physically displaced—forced to move—by Federal and federally assisted projects utilizing land condemnation. But small businesses not actually displaced can often be as grievously hurt by such projects as those whose premises are condemned and taken. A simple example would be the case of two gasoline service stations. A Federal highway project takes the premises of one, and that one can get a loan. The same project does not take the other, but the new road diverts most of the traffic on which it depended. The second station owner is in an even worse fix than the first, but he cannot get one of these loans because he is not displaced. My bill would make him eligible.

Recently many of us in this body have become only too familiar with another type of Government action that can portend disaster for hundreds or thousands of small-business concerns, and for whole communities. I refer to the closing of a Federal defense installation, or to the termination of large Federal defense procurement programs that provided heavy percentages of the payrolls and disposable personal income of an area. As I have pointed out in this Chamber previously, the city and county of Mobile, Ala., face a situation akin to disaster with the scheduled closing of Brookley Air Force Base. The base provides 12,000 of a total of about 95,000 jobs in the area. I have protested this closing to the Secretary of Defense. I protest it now, and I shall continue to protest it. But whether Brookley stays open or not, the problems that such actions pose for the economies of cities, counties, and even whole States will be with us yet—very much with us. For Brookley is but one of 669 U.S. defense installations that have been wholly or partially closed or scheduled for closing in the last 4 years. When all of these actions are complete, 149,000 job positions will have been eliminated.

Mr. President, what happens to the small businessman in retailing, wholesaling, of the services when 13 percent of the jobs in his area are abolished? That is the percentage that will apply in Mobile if Brookley is closed. Of course, the same situation will exist whether the job loss is due to the closing of a base or to the termination of a payroll producing defense contract.

Last summer the Senate Small Business Committee started looking into this matter in an effort to find answers to such questions. We held 2 days of public hearings on "the impact of defense spending shifts and curtailments on small business." We also arranged for publication of the proceedings at an American Management Association briefing session on "planning to meet major shifts in defense programs." Our study will continue this year.

During our hearings last June and July, two conclusions emerged in my own mind as I listened to the testimony of small-business witnesses who had watched their defense contracting and subcontracting orders decline drastically: One was that the small manufacturer of defense hardware needs and deserves assistance from Government in finding new markets which he might serve in the nondefense sector of the economy. The other is that he needs capital with which to undertake the conversion of his plant and the retraining of his personnel necessary to compete in such new and strange markets.

We explored with some of the witnesses ideas for possible further aid by Government in meeting the first of these needs, the matching of a defense plant's capital equipment, experience, and personnel skills with existing needs in the civilian marketplace. The committee will continue to explore this subject, and it is my hope that we may be able to come up with helpful legislation. Meanwhile, I offer the present bill to help with the second need—long-term financing.

Just a word now about the second disappointment that I mentioned earlier; that is, the fact that the displaced business loan program has been terribly underutilized. From its inception, June 30, 1961, through December 31, 1964, only 353 loans for $20,890,000 had been approved. This number must be compared with an estimate contained in the recently released, distinguished study of the House Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition. Referring to all past condemnation activity, the report says:

> Displacements for business under all programs totaled 10,900 per year. Nearly all of these, some 10,620, occurred under federally assisted programs. Direct Federal programs accounted for approximately 280 displaced businesses per year.

In the Housing Act of 1964, Public Law 88-560, in section 305, the Congress took note of the tremendous gap between displacements and loans and directed the Small Business Administration to make particular effort to publicize the displaced business loan program to local public agencies administering urban renewal programs, and to small-business concerns. In the bill I am introducing today, I provide for an expansion of this directive to SBA, in line with the views of

the House Real Property Acquisition Subcommittee.

I should also mention, in this connection, another important new provision contained in last year's Housing Act—section 314. That section included an amendment proposed on the Senate floor, which I accepted on behalf of the Banking and Currency Committee and successfully carried to conference on behalf of the Senate. The amendment added to the urban planning grant program established under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 a provision that such grants may be made for planning by localities to deal with problems created by the total or partial closing of Federal installations—including defense installations—or by substantial reductions in employment opportunities occasioned by cutbacks in Federal purchases in the locality. The language of section 7(b)(3) of the Small Business Act, as my bill would revise it, follows, in relevant part, the language of last year's conversion amendment to the urban planning grant program.

Mr. President, today's bill is the second in a series of measures I expect to introduce—three or more bills in all—intended to provide assistance to areas hard hit in their local economies by base closings and defense-contract terminations. The first bill in this series, S. 728, to liberalize the Civil Service Retirement Act, was introduced on January 26. The next bill will be introduced soon.

I have directed the professional staffs of both the Senate Small Business Committee and the Housing Subcommittee to review thoroughly all Federal laws that might be used, in their present form or with amendments, to ease the economic impact of shifts and curtailments in our defense programs. I shall introduce at once any further amendments that these continuing studies may from time to time indicate to be necessary or desirable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 915) to amend the Small Business Act to provide for increased eligibility for, and greater utilization of the displaced business disaster loan program established under section 7(b)(3) of that act, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRESERVATION OF WET LANDS IN CANADA FOR MIGRATORY WATERFOWL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the preservation of sufficient wet lands for the maintenance of the duck population continues to be a problem of the utmost seriousness, even though progress is being made.

An idea of what has been accomplished to date is given by the most recent annual report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, of which I have the honor to be a member. This report points out that when the Migratory Bird Conservation Act was approved in February of 1929, there were only 44 migratory bird refuges totaling 268,000 acres. As of June 30, 1964, there were 278 migratory bird refuges with a total acreage of 7,318,000 acres, including lands acquired otherwise than through the Commission procedure.

Nevertheless, much remains to be done, particularly since the land in swamps and wet lands is still declining as a result of drainage and filling for agricultural and other purposes. Several years ago, Congress enacted emergency legislation in the form of Public Law 87-383, authorizing a temporary increase in appropriations for land acquisition. Under this program, significant progress has been made.

There has been one major gap in this acquisition program, however. It is limited to lands in the United States, whereas most of the summer nesting areas, the producing areas, are in Canada. Since the purpose of the program is to maintain and increase the production of ducks, the funds should be spent where they will do the most good for that purpose, that is, in Canada in many cases.

Until recently Canada has shown less interest in this problem than we have. Now, however, it is a pleasure to report that the Canadian Government has initiated a pilot program of acquiring wet lands. It is to be hoped that this program will be expanded. Certainly there will have to be cooperation by the United States with the Canadian Government on this matter, since the ducks produced in Canada winter in the United States and American hunters share in the benefits.

Therefore, on behalf of myself, my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I am introducing a bill which would permit the use in Canada, under appropriate arrangements with the Canadians and subject to such limits as may be set by Congress in appropriation acts, of the funds already authorized by the provisions of Public Law 87-383. No additional expenditures would result from enactment of this bill, since it proposes the use only of funds heretofore authorized.

Mr. President, I ask consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of the latest report by the International Migratory Bird Committee, which is composed of representatives of the United States and Canada, and which reports on steps recently taken by Canada to initiate a program of wetlands conservation similar to that followed by this country.

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

The bill (S. 922) to amend the act of October 4, 1961 (Public Law 87-383), so as to permit the use within Canada of certain funds appropriated pursuant to such act for the conservation of migratory waterfowl, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The report presented by Mr. HRUSKA is as follows:

SECOND INTERIM REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL MIGRATORY BIRD COMMITTEE

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. HARRY HAYS,
Minister of Agriculture,
Ottawa, Ontario
Hon. ARTHUR LAING,
Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources,
Ottawa, Ontario.

INTRODUCTION

Since the Committee submitted its first interim report of December 15, 1961, it has met at Washington, D.C., on February 20 and 21, 1962; at Regina, Saskatchewan, on May 20 and 21, 1962; at Mattamuskeet, N.C., on December 10 and 11, 1962; at Quebec, Province of Quebec, on June 10 and 11, 1963; and at Klamath Falls, Oreg., on October 21 and 22, 1963.

When the Committee was formed in May 1961, it was directed to lay the groundwork for effective cooperation between Canada and and the United States in migratory bird management. The Committee was to recognize that farmers and sportsmen, as well as governments, are involved in providing habitat for ducks and geese, and that it is a matter of mutual concern to direct to farmers a growing share of income derived from hunting waterfowl and from recreational activities associated with farmlands.

In 1961, as for several years previously, members of North American waterfowl were at a low ebb. Since then, the prairies have had more rain, the potholes have begun to fill up again, and duck production has improved. However, our experience indicates that this improvement in water levels and numbers of waterfowl is only the upward swing of a recurring cycle. The problem of wet lands and waterfowl diminishing in the long term is still with us. The trend of waterfowl numbers over the past 10 years is shown by graph 1 (not printed in the RECORD).

RESULTS OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

Both Governments have acted upon the recommendations made by the Committee in 1961.

1. Expanded information programs are underway.

In the United States general habitat acquisition needs and procedures are described in a new popular style leaflet "Establishment of National Wildlife Refuges." Planning for public support of proposed management of major refuge complexes is illustrated in the popular brochure titled "National Wildlife Refuges of the Klamath Basin." The pamphlet "Duck Stamps and Wildlife Refuges," issued in 1955, is being revised and updated.

The statement of needs for waterfowl research and management investigations in the United States and Canada, prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Canadian Wildlife Service, endorsed by the Committee, has been adapted to a U.S. version and expanded to include an outline of U.S. project priorities. This statement has been distributed to all flyway councils and will provide a common basis for planning by all U.S. agencies interested in waterfowl research.

One hundred and thirty of the 150 national wildlife refuges under active management are now described in 114 individual pamphlets for public distribution.

The Migratory Bird Population Station at Patuxent, Md., has initiated a new administrative report publication series for the

purpose of rapid dissemination of waterfowl research and survey findings. The mailing list includes approximately 900 waterfowl technicians and administrators in the United States and Canada.

A multicolored identification pamphlet entitled "Ducks at a Distance" was prepared and then published in July 1963. Approximately 900,000 copies were distributed free to waterfowl hunters in the United States and the pamphlet was made available for sale at a nominal amount by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office.

The process of reproducing and distributing the annual regulatory announcement was speeded up to the extent that supplies of this announcement were made available to post offices selling duck stamps well before the opening of the 1963 waterfowl season with instructions that they be handed out to each individual as he purchased his stamp.

Finally, to facilitate dissemination of local information and to foster a better understanding of the Bureau's programs including waterfowl, an Information and Education Coordinator was recruited for each of the five regional offices during the past year. A program of regional news releases supplements the departmental and Bureau program.

In Canada the brochure "Waterfowl—A Resource in Danger?" was published in September 1963; the edition numbered 150,000 copies in English and 24,000 in French. In that publication, the need to maintain habitat for waterfowl is explained. An illustrated presentation of the same information designed for young readers is being prepared.

An explanatory leaflet on the regulations governing the hunting of migratory game birds has been printed in English (250,000 copies) and French (24,000 copies).

Release to the press of information on waterfowl and their management has been accelerated.

Production of a 20-minute color motion picture on waterfowl and waterfowl habitat has begun. This film is expected to be finished by the end of 1964.

2. Progress has been made in securing the maintenance of duck habitat in the prairie region.

In the United States progress in assuring the preservation of the prairie pothole breeding habitat has been substantial but not as rapid as scheduled. Land acquisition has been delayed by local opposition to purchase which removes these lands from tax rolls. By September 30, 1963, 28,778 acres of these wet lands had been acquired in fee in the two Dakotas, Minnesota, and Nebraska, and an additional 26,839 acres were protected by 20-year, 30-year, and perpetual easements which assured they would not be drained, burned, or filled.

Two new congressional acts have given emphasis to the preservation of these prairie wet lands. The Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1963 prohibited Federal Government assistance for drainage of class III, IV, and V wet lands. (These are the more permanent types.) The Drainage Referral Act of 1962 has the effect of giving the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife the opportunity to make an offer of purchase or easement on all class I's for which drainage assistance was requested if it believed they should be preserved for waterfowl. With the experience of the past 2 years, procedures have been streamlined and a greatly stepped-up easement program is now underway. Although purchase acquisition of migration and wintering habitat is ahead of schedule, it appears unlikely the purchase program to preserve wet lands in this prairie breeding area can reach a significant rate until some means can be found to offset local tax loss.

In Canada, during the first stage of a pilot project, 20-year agreements for the maintenance of potholes were concluded with 11 landowners in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. The agreements cover 1,184 potholes, totaling 1,011 acres scattered throughout 6,560 acres of farmland. Payments offered averaged $13.86 per acre and the total amount spent for pothole easements was $14,029.

3. The means of obtaining improved information on the kill of waterfowl have been considered and limited progress has been made.

In the United States, a waterfowl kill survey was initiated in 1952. The method involves a random selection of post offices where duck stamps are sold, obtaining names and addressses of hunters purchasing stamps at these post offices, and mailing these hunters a questionnaire concerning their kill and hunting activity immediately following the season.

Recent improvements in survey design include a greater degree of control in the geographic distribution of the sample and the development of a ratio estimating procedure using electronic computers for determining the total kill. In 1959, a duck-wing collection survey was initiated for the purpose of measuring species, age, and sex composition of the kill. During 1962 a goose-tail collection survey was initiated for the purpose of obtaining the same information for geese as for ducks. In addition to the waterfowl species, sex, and age data that are obtained, the hunter is requested on each envelope to fill out the place, date, and time the bird was killed. From these data much information has been obtained concerning distribution of hunting effort by time and place and the characteristics of hunting activity in relation to the regulations which were set.

In Canada the Government approved in principle the carrying out of a nationwide waterfowl kill survey. Further implementation has been delayed pending consideration by the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers of a proposal for institution of a Federal migratory bird hunting license.

4. The problem of directing a more economic return to the landowners on whose lands waterfowl breed, nest, rest, and feed is a difficult one.

In the United States the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 authorized a land conversion program administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

A $10 million pilot program in 13 States (41 counties) provides for sharing with the farmer the cost of taking land from production and putting it to recreational or other use. This legislation is broad enough to cover marsh development-hunting lease projects, etc., for individual farmers.

No workable system has yet been evolved for compensating the farmers for the waterfowl values of the wetland areas. A number of proposals have been made whereby conservation agencies might act as information centers to better enable landowners and potential hunter leasees to get together. This approach has not been widely accepted nor implemented. A program of information and education has been established in the regional offices of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife which will call the attention of the farmers to the value of managed wet lands for recreational and for production purposes. An organized study of this approach and the alternatives will begin January 1, 1964. The objective is to find means to make it profitable for the landowner to preserve waterfowl wetland habitat apart from easement or purchase by public agencies or in combination with their program.

In Canada payments made in consideration of the agreements with landowners for the maintenance of waterfowl habitat were calculated on the basis of the market value of the surrounding lands. Sums paid were actually those values discounted at 5 percent for 20 years. During the first phase of the program, 13 landowners were contacted and 11 accepted the agreements. The Canadian Wildlife Service has associated itself with the National Land Capability Survey, sponsored by ARDA. An aspect of that survey will be the development of better methods of evaluation of wildlife and wildlife habitat. This should eventually lead to a greater public knowledge of the value of wildlife and thus help to create better economic return to the producers of wildlife.

5. Research programs and facilities are being extended and improved.

In the United States a new center for research on waterfowl breeding habitat is being developed at Jamestown, N. Dak. It will consist of a combination office and laboratory building on a 500-acre site in the vicinity of Jamestown and a station and a smaller laboratory on a 1,400-acre area of prime pothole habitat near Woodworth, N. Dak. A new building with 10,000 square feet of floor space, which will relieve crowding in the bird banding office at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center is expected to be ready for occupancy by September 1964. A small building and several enclosures are being constructed at the Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge for development of artificial propagation techniques for rare and endangered migratory bird species.

The statement of needs for waterfowl research and management in the United States, mentioned earlier, is expected to provide a common basis for waterfowl research planning.

In Canada, in spite of limitations on expansion of staff, research projects are going ahead with the object of increasing our knowledge of different types of potholes and different types of pothole country. Research is also being carried on which is basic to the development of plans for multiple use of agriculturally marginal lands.

Working plans are being prepared for the construction of a laboratory office building for the Canadian Wildlife Service on the University of Saskatchewan campus at Saskatoon. Construction will begin in the spring of 1964.

6. Improvement in water conditions on the prairies and prohibition of hunting of redhead and canvasback have resulted in some improvement in the status of those two species.

In the United States there has been a closed season on redhead and canvasback since 1960.

In Canada, except in British Columbia and the Atlantic Provinces, a closed season on those species since 1962 followed a progressive reduction in the bag limit begun in 1959.

Studies of the white-fronted goose have been stepped up and information basic to better management has been obtained. In Canada the daily bag limit on white-fronted geese in Saskatchewan has been three since 1962. The daily bag limit for other geese is five.

In the United States a cooperative project between the Bureau and the States in the central flyway has been developed for the purpose of increasing knowledge concerning status and management of the white-fronted goose. These studies have included periodic surveys during the fall migration period, a stepped-up banding program, and the determination of age ratios in the kill by hunters.

FURTHER CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Your Committee believes that the limited action so far taken to maintain and develop continental waterfowl populations for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of Canada and the United States has been properly directed. The Committee also believes that the programs begun must be continued and expanded, especially in Canada, if they are to be of measurable benefit.

Specifically, the Committee now recommends as follows:

1. The nationwide information programs which have been commenced should be continued.

2. The Federal Governments in cooperation with States and Provinces should continue their pilot project program for evaluation of methods of securing waterfowl habitat. In the United States a major program of acquiring waterfowl habitat is now underway. The Committee believes that Canada should begin planning for a major program of controlling waterfowl habitat.

3. A national survey of migratory bird harvest should be established in Canada in order to provide a complete body of information on utilization of the continental resource.

4. The liaison and cooperative action between agricultural and wildlife interests which have been established in both countries should be continued and improved.

SUMMARY

Your Committee would like to take this opportunity to reiterate the conclusions and recommendations stated in its first interim report. One of the concluding statements in that report was as follows: "The management of migratory birds for optimum use * * * should be developed in a coordinated way by all responsible agencies. The United States and Canadian Federal Governments have a responsibility to give leadership in this field, as the populations of birds involved are international. More and better statistics, more research and active cooperation between landowners and all levels of government are necessary if continental waterfowl are to find the necessary breeding, resting, and wintering areas to maintain adequate stocks for the mutual benefit of all people in both countries."

Your Committee seeks approval of the conclusions and recommendations presented herein.

Respectfully submitted.

THE INTERNATIONAL MIGRATORY BIRD COMMITTEE.

For the United States:

FRANK P. BRIGGS,
DANIEL H. JANZEN,
JOHN A. BAKER,
GLADWIN E. YOUNG.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 13, 1964.*

For Canada:

_____ _____.
_____ _____.
_____ _____.

OTTAWA, ONTARIO, *March 2, 1964.*

LAURA HUI-WEI WONG AND HER CHILDREN, JANET WONG AND SIMON WONG

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], at the request of the University of Oklahoma Research Institute and the Department of Physics, I introduce a bill for the relief of Laura Hui-Wei Wong and her children, Janet Wong and Simon Wong.

The bill is a special bill to grant permanent resident status to the widow and two minor children of Dr. Wen Nong Wong, a very able nuclear physicist who joined the physics staff of the university in September 1963, and died on January 24, 1964.

Dr. Wong graduated from the Graduate School of Indiana University. He received a Ph. D. degree in physics in 1959 and was employed for 4 years by Midwestern Universities Research Association at Madison, Wis., until he joined the University of Oklahoma faculty in September 1963.

When Dr. Wong resigned from his position at Midwestern Universities Research Association his first preference classification lapsed. However, upon petition by the University of Oklahoma, it was reestablished on December 26, 1963, and the paroles of his wife and children were extended.

Because of the preference status that the deceased husband enjoyed, I believe it would be fitting and proper to grant this relief to the children and wife who, had the father not died, would have been permanent residents of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 926) for the relief of Laura Hui-Wei Wong and her children, Janet Wong and Simon Wong, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPROPRIATIONS TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, together with a letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, requesting the proposed legislation, and a sectional analysis of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 927) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mrs. SMITH), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the sum of $5,260,000,000, as follows:

(a) For "Research and development," $4,575,900,000 for the following programs:

(1) Gemini, $242,100,000;
(2) Apollo, $2,997,385,000;
(3) Advanced missions, $10,000,000;
(4) Physics and astronomy, $172,100,000;
(5) Lunar and planetary exploration, $215,615,000;
(6) Bioscience, $31,500,000;
(7) Meteorological satellites, $42,700,000;
(8) Communication satellites, $2,800,000;
(9) Applications technology satellites, $28,700,000;
(10) Launch vehicle development, $63,600,000;
(11) Launch vehicle procurement, $194,500,000;
(12) Space vehicle systems, $35,000,000;
(13) Electronics systems, $34,400,000;
(14) Human factor systems, $14,900,000;
(15) Basic research, $22,000,000;
(16) Nuclear-electric systems, $27,000,000;
(17) Nuclear rockets, $58,000,000;
(18) Solar and chemical power, $14,200,000;
(19) Chemical propulsion, $30,000,000;
(20) Aeronautics, $42,200,000;
(21) Tracking and data acquisition, $246,200,000;
(22) Sustaining university program, $46,000,000;
(23) Technology utilization, $5,000,000.

(b) For "Construction of facilities," including land acquisitions, $74,700,000, as follows:

(1) Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California, $2,749,000;
(2) Electronics Research Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts, $10,000,000;
(3) Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, $2,400,000;
(4) John F. Kennedy Space Center, NASA, Cocoa Beach, Florida, $8,595,000.
(5) Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia, $8,250,000;
(6) Lewis Research Center, Cleveland and Sandusky, Ohio, $867,000;
(7) Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas, $4,400,000;
(8) George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama, $4,776,000;
(9) Michoud Plant, New Orleans and Slidell, Louisiana, $300,000.
10) Mississippi Test Facility, Mississippi, $2,121,000;
(11) Wallops Station, Wallops Island, Virginia, $1,048,000;
(12) Various locations, $21,624,000;
(13) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, $7,500,000.

(c) For "Administrative operations", $609,400,000.

(d) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) contracts may be entered into under the "Administrative operations" appropriation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the

fiscal year following that for which the appropriation is made.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed $35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) for maintenance, repairs, alterations, and minor construction shall be used for the construction of any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $100,000.

(h) When so specified in an appropriation Act, any appropriation authorized under this Act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may initially be used, during the fiscal year 1966, to finance work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Administration and appropriate adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

SEC. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12), of subsection 1(b) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed a total of $67,200,000.

SEC. 3. Not to exceed 2 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and when so transferred, together with $30,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (13) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and,

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 5. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1966."

The letter and section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. ANDERSON are as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Herewith submitted is a draft of a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, together with a sectional analysis thereof. It is submitted to the President of the Senate pursuant to rule VII of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The bill would authorize fiscal year 1966 appropriations to be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the sum of $5,260 million, as follows: (1) for research and development, $4,575,900,000; (2) for construction of facilities, $74,700,000; and (3) for administrative operations, $609,400,000.

Apart from changes in program line item titles and dollar amounts, the major changes from the NASA Authorization Act, 1965 (Public Law 88-369, 78 Stat. 310) are discussed below.

Clause (2) of subsection 1(e) of the bill incorporates a proposal to the effect that when so specified in an appropriation act, any amount appropriated for administrative operations may be available for contracts for maintenance and operation of facilities and other services to be provided during the fiscal year after that for which appropriations would be authorized in this bill.

Under currently applicable law, "administrative operations" appropriations are not available for payments under severable contracts for services rendered at any time after the end of the fiscal year for which the funds were appropriated. In order to obtain such services in the following fiscal year (which might start only a month or two after entering into such contract), either the entire procurement process must be undertaken again, or the initial contract must be entered into on the basis of options or some similar device which still places a further administrative burden on the Government and is unattractive to contractors because of the obvious risks involved. In consequence, contractors' bids will not be as low as otherwise possible, particularly where substantial start-up costs are involved; and, as above indicated, such procurements require some form of additional administrative handling at the end of the fiscal year in which the contract is entered into. Thus, the July to June procurement cycle results in excessive administrative costs, scheduling difficulties, and high bids.

Enactment of the proposed language would enable NASA to enter into contracts, during fiscal year 1966, for procurement of maintenance and other services, performance of which may be rendered at any time until the close of fiscal year 1967. Thus, contract administration could be improved and the higher costs of contracting on a July–June cycle could be reduced.

Subsection 1(h) of the bill incorporates a proposal to the effect that any appropriation authorized for NASA under this act may be initially used during the fiscal year 1966 to finance work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Administration, and appropriate adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

The proposed language would provide authority for initially financing such procurements as common-use supplies or services related to approved work or activities from any appropriation available to NASA, with subsequent distribution of the charges to benefited appropriations, such distribution being based on later information as to actual application of charges. The use of this authority would be restricted to situations in which an accurate distribution of such charges is not possible at the time of obligation, but is possible at a later date based on receipt of additional information. This authority would enable NASA to expedite payments to its contractors and simplify its accounting by eliminating the numerous adjustments now necessary to reflect final distribution of charges. For example, under the proposed authority, inventories of common-use supplies, materials, and equipment would be purchased exclusively from one appropriation, with subsequent charges to other appropriations on the basis of stock issues from inventory.

The proposed authority would be particularly useful in connection with many types of consolidated contracts in which the services contracted for are utilized by a number of programs and projects, and for purposes associated with more than one appropriation, such as utilities; computer rentals; contractor furnished support services involving technical support to in-house effort; arts and graphics services; security services; and contract administration services. In each of these contracting situations, the distribution of services received between appropriations cannot be determined accurately at the time of obligation, since such distribution will necessarily be based on demand for these services. Also the information for such distribution may not be available at the time of payment, but would become available later, at which time a final adjustment between appropriations could be made.

All necessary adjustments between appropriations would be made before closing the accounts at the end of each fiscal year, in order to provide, for budget submissions and other purposes, an accurate distribution of all charges to appropriations for the fiscal year.

The authority proposed is comparable to an authority provided the Atomic Energy Commission (Public Works Appropriation Act, 1965, 78 stat. 682, 691–92).

The special interagency transfer authority contained in section 5 of the 1965 NASA Authorization Act (and in identical provisions of the authorization acts of the 3 prior years) has not been requested this year as it has been found to be unnecessary.

The President, in the fiscal year 1965 budget, has recommended appropriations to NASA in the amounts stated above. Section 4 of the act of June 15, 1959 (73 Stat. 73, 75),

provides that no appropriation may be made to NASA unless previously authorized by legislation; and it is the purpose of the instant bill to provide such requisite authorization. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration recommends that the enclosed draft bill be enacted. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH L. DRYDEN,
Deputy Administrator.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

SECTION 1

Subsections (a), (b), and (c) would authorize to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the sum of $5,260 million, as follows: (a) for research and development, $4,575,900,000; (b) for construction of facilities, $74,700,000; and, (c) for administrative operations, $609,400,000. Subsection 1(a) for research and development is further subdivided into 23 line items comprising the various NASA research and development programs. Subsection 1(b) for construction of facilities, is further broken down into 13 line items—11 locational, one consisting of a number of projects at various locations, and one for facility planning and design not otherwise provided for.

Subsection 1(d) would authorize the use of appropriations for research and development for: (i) items of a capital nature (other than the acquisition of land) required for the performance of research and development contracts; and, (ii) grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities. Title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution. Moreover, each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall find necessary to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant.

In either case no funds may be used for the construction of a facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000 unless the Administrator notifies specified committees of the Congress of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

Subsection 1(e) would provide that, when so specified in an appropriation act, (1) any amount appropriated for research and development or for construction of facilities may remain available without fiscal year limitations, and (2) contracts may be entered into under the "Administrative operations" appropriation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the fiscal year following that for which the appropriation is made.

Subsection 1(f) would authorize the use of not to exceed $35,000 of administrative operations appropriations for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses, including representation and official entertainment expenses.

Subsection 1(g) would provide that no funds appropriated pursuant to subsections 1(a) and 1(c) for maintenance, repair, alteration and minor construction may be used to construct any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $100,000.

Subsection 1(h) would provide that, when so specified in an appropriation act, any appropriation authorized under this act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may initially be used, during the fiscal year 1966, to finance work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Administration and appropriate adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

SECTION 2

Section 2 would authorize the 5-percent upward variation of any of the sums authorized for the construction of facilities line items (other than facility planning and design) when, in the discretion of the Administrator, this is needed to meet unusual cost variations. However, the total cost of all work authorized under these line items may not exceed the total sum authorized for construction of facilities under subsection 1(b), paragraphs (1) through (12).

SECTION 3

Section 3 would provide that not more than 2 percent of the funds appropriated for research and development, may be transferred to the construction of facilities appropriation and, when so transferred, together with $30 million of the funds appropriated for construction of facilities, shall be available for the construction of facilities and land acquisition at any location if (1) the Administrator determines that such action is necessary because of changes in the space program or new scientific or engineering developments, and that deferral of such action until the next authorization act is enacted would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. However, no such funds may be obligated until 30 days have passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to specified committees of Congress a written report containing a description of the project, its cost, and the reason why such project is necessary in the national interest, or such committee before the expiration of such 30-day period has notified the Administrator that no objection to the proposed action will be made.

SECTION 4

Section 4 provides that, notwithstanding any other provision of this act—

(1) No amount appropriated pursuant to this act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences;

(2) No amount appropriated pursuant to this act may be used for any program in excess of the amount acutally authorized for that particular program by subsections 1(a) and 1(c); and

(3) No amount appropriated pursuant to this act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

unless (A) a period of 30 days has passed after the receipt by each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SECTION 5

Section 5 would provide that the act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1966."

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I also introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The Immigration and Nationality Act now requires that a foreign exchange student reside abroad for 2 years before he or she is eligible to apply for U.S. citizenship, with certain provisions for hardship cases. It does not, however, allow a foreign exchange student to remain here under normal circumstances even when the student's own government has no objection.

The bill which I introduce would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to provid that the Attorney General may waive the requirement of a 2-year residence abroad for foreign exchange students when the government of the student's country files written notification that it has no objection, and the Attorney General finds that the student's admission to the United States would be in the public interest.

I see no valid reason why a person should be required to leave this country for 2 years if it is in the public interest for him to remain here and his own government has no objection to his doing so. I hope that the Congress will see fit to change the law in this respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 929) to amend section 212 (e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two excise tax bills. Early in the 88th Congress I introduced S. 154, to repeal the excise tax on luggage, handbags, and similar items. Senators will recall that the Senate adopted an amendment to the Excise Tax Rate Extension Act of 1964 which included a repeal of that particular tax. I was greatly gratified by the action which the Senate took on that occasion, but the action did not stand; the amendment was dropped by the conference committee, and the bill as finally adopted by both bodies did not repeal the tax.

Nevertheless, I was heartened by the Senate action, and I believe that the Senate as a whole is convinced now of the inequity of continuing that particular tax. Today I reintroduce the measure to repeal the tax on luggage and similar items, in the confident expectation that in this Congress the wisdom of the Senate will finally prevail.

Included in the amendment to the 1964 excise tax bill, in addition to luggage and other leather goods, were cosmetics and the first $100 of the sales price on furs and jewelry. I was convinced last year that the Senate was right in repealing all those taxes, and I therefore submit a bill which would accomplish that purpose. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on

the table for 1 week to allow other Senators to join as cosponsors, if they so desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bills, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 930. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on luggage, handbags, and similar items; and

S. 931. A bill to repeal or limit certain retailers excise taxes.

DETERMINATION OF BOUNDARIES OF UTE MOUNTAIN AND NAVAJO RESERVATIONS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the bill I introduce today passed the Senate on October 22, 1963, but failed to receive final committee action in the House of Representatives prior to adjournment of the 88th Congress on October 3, 1964.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Ute Mountain Tribe or the Navajo Tribe to commence litigation in a three-judge district court to determine the location of a part of the common boundary between their two reservations. The situs of the disputed boundary is in northwestern New Mexico, and the bill appropriately specifies the U.S. District Court of the District of New Mexico as the judicial forum, and authorizes a direct right of appeal to the Supreme Court. I believe that the three-judge district court is the appropriate judicial vehicle in this instance since the dispute will call into question the treaty of June 1, 1868—15 Stat. 667—and a Federal statute—28 Stat. 677, February 20, 1895.

It seems that the boundaries established by the treaty and the statute overlapped; however, the dispute did not become active until recent years when oil and gas was discovered in the area and indeed under the very lands in controversy—a strip of land 2 miles wide and 10½ miles long. The Navajo boundary, as established by the 1868 treaty, was surveyed and monumented in the following year, but the monuments cannot now be located.

In order that mineral development could continue in this area, the Navajo and the Ute Mountain Tribes entered into an agreement on May 9, 1957, which had the approval of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The agreement permitted joint leasing of the area with the revenues deposited in a joint account pending the resolution of the dispute. Due to the leasing pattern in the area, the joint account agreement also includes an area 2 miles wide on each side of the disputed strip. Therefore, two-thirds of the lands subject to this agreement are outside the disputed strip, and two-thirds of the funds in the joint account are not subject to dispute.

Several million dollars have accumulated in the joint account, dollars that might better be used to further the development of the respective tribal educational and industrial projects. It is my sincere hope that the Congress will act quickly on this legislation so that the matter may progress toward an early and final judicial resolution. The parties are anxious for the settlement of the matter, and the Congress should be equally anxious to provide the means whereby the dispute may be settled.

On behalf of Senators DOMINICK, ANDERSON, and myself, I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred, and that the bill lie on the desk for the remainder of the week so that other Senators who wish to join in sponsoring this bill may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 933) to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEDUCTION FROM GROSS INCOME FOR WATER ASSESSMENTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which would allow farmers to deduct as expense all amounts paid to irrigation ditch companies or similar entities for water assessments. This bill is prompted by the position taken by the Internal Revenue Service last year when its agents were auditing 1963 returns. I received letters from several of my constituents saying that the IRS had departed from its prior practice, and was disallowing portions of the water assessments.

The mutual ditch company is a legal entity which was first introduced in our Western States. It is largely unknown and little understood east of the Missouri River. It may take any one of several forms, but basically it is organized simply as a means of conveying irrigation water from the point of diversion on a stream to the final user, the farmer who irrigates his land. The company or association will hold naked legal title to the diversion works and canals. The shareholders of the association are entitled to water in proportion to their stockholdings, and the shares of stock in such companies have often been held in Colorado to be real property. The company may make assessments against the shares of stock, and unless those assessments are paid in full, the owner thereof is not entitled to receive water from the ditches of the company. Further, the assessments become a lien against the stock, and thus against the water rights represented thereby, and if the assessments continue unpaid, the stock may be sold by such association to enable it to recover the amount of such assessments.

Internal Revenue agents, from what I have been told, have not all treated these assessments in the same way, and there seems to be some question whether certain portions of the assessment should or should not be deductible. The great bulk of the assessments, however, are for operation and maintenance of the canal and reservoir systems. The bill which I introduce today, Mr. President, would clarify the situation and provide even-handed treatment to all farmers who must irrigate their lands. It is my sincere hope that the Senate will be able to adopt this measure in this Congress, perhaps as an amendment to a House-passed revenue measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table for 1 week to allow Senators to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 934) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer a deduction from gross income for water assessments levied by irrigation ditch companies introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOOVER DAM POWERPLANT DEFICIENCIES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it has truly been said: "The mill cannot grind with the water that is past." The truth of this statement was apparent to delegations of the Upper Colorado River Basin States, and the Secretary of the Interior took heed of it on May 11, 1964, when he announced the closing of the gates at Glen Canyon Dam in Arizona, marking the termination of the misappropriation of Colorado River water belonging to the upper basin.

At that time, Lake Mead, behind Hoover Dam, was quite low, primarily as a result of allowing water far in excess of downstream entitlements to pass over the dam for power production purposes. To make the announcement more palatable to the lower basin, the Secretary also announced his intention to charge the upper basin fund with the cost of furnishing deficiency power to Hoover Dam power contractors; but the Secretary failed to indicate the source in law of this claimed authority to make such an arbitrary decision.

If the upper basin were withholding water beyond its legal entitlement, there might be some basis for the charge to the upper basin in equity, if not in law. But, during the past 10 years the upper basin has already delivered to the lower basin approximately 20 million acre-feet of water in excess of its legal obligation under the Colorado River Compact. What kind of justice would require the upper basin to pay for the privilege of keeping what lawfully belongs to it? The injustice of it is doubly apparent when one realizes that the water retained behind Glen Canyon Dam will turn its generators and produce revenues for the repayment of the Federal investment at Glen Canyon and will later be available downstream to turn the generators at Hoover Dam. Naturally, generators had to be installed at Glen Canyon Dam and a minimum power pool

had to be established before we could commence producing power at two locations on the river with the same water, and it was the minimum power pool that the upper basin was fighting for. A delay in establishing this minimum power pool meant a delay in reaping the benefit of double beneficial use of the water. The bill I introduce today is designed to help relieve the upper basin of this unfair and oppressive burden. It will spread the cost between both the upper basin and the lower basin, and this is fair since Glen Canyon Dam spreads its benefits to both basins. In addition to receiving power generated at Glen Canyon Dam, the lower basin is greatly benefited by the better regulation of the river afforded by the dam.

The effect of this bill is to charge the Hoover Dam power deficiencies to the special fund established by the Boulder Canyon Project Act entitled "Colorado River Development Fund," into which $500,000 per year is transferred from the Colorado River dam fund. The Colorado River development fund is presently authorized to be used for the "investigation and construction of projects" in the Colorado River Basin, including both the upper basin and the lower basin. I believe that this approach is both reasonable and equitable to all concerned; and it is the hope of its sponsors that this bill will receive early and favorable consideration.

Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk for Senators ANDERSON, BENNETT, DOMINICK, MCGEE, MONTOYA, MOSS, and SIMPSON, and myself, and ask that it be appropriately referred. It gives me great pleasure to announce that the sponsors of this bill represent virtually the entire upper basin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 935) to authorize the appropriation of the receipts of the Colorado River Development Fund for the purpose of making allowances to the Hoover Dam powerplant for deficiencies in firm energy generation introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished senior colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish in Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

A similar bill passed the Senate in December of 1963, but was not acted upon by the House Interior Committee.

Happily I can report that support for this legislation has grown markedly both in Michigan and in the Nation as a whole. Citizens everywhere are every day more aware of the need to safeguard for the enjoyment of future generations the last remaining stretches of beautiful shoreline. Particularly is this a matter of urgency in those parts of the country—like the Middle West—which are near to huge concentrations of population. Increasing, too, is recognition that existing improved properties in areas of unique beauty are protected from changes which diminish the beauty of the setting when the area is established as a national lakeshore.

The bill which we offer today differs in only two minor respects from the one passed by the Senate 13 months ago. The changes are:

One. Elimination of a 420-acre strip of shoreline west of the town of Empire. This stretch, 1¾ miles long was not included in our original proposal, and I believe this initial decision was a wise one. I hope the committee will be persuaded to omit this stretch.

Second. A precise description of the route of the scenic highway along the highlands to the east of the proposed lakeshore. This highway was authorized in the Senate-passed bill but the right-of-way was not clearly defined.

This proposal has the support of the major national conservation organizations, the Michigan conservation organizations, leaders from all sections of our State, and—if the ballot box is a barometer of such things—from the people of Michigan. I hope the Senate Interior Committee will be able to schedule it for early action, and that we can send it to the House early enough in the session to permit that body to consider it in the 89th Congress. If we are to save this magnificent area for future generations, it must be done now.

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

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

The bill (S. 936) to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. MCNAMARA), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 936

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to stabilize and preserve for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreational use, and enjoyment of the public a significant portion of the diminishing shoreline of the United States and its related geographic and scientific features, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to take appropriate action, as herein provided, to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

(b) In preserving the lakeshore and stabilizing its development, substantial reliance shall be placed on cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments to apply sound principles of land use planning and zoning. In developing the lakeshore full recognition shall be given to protecting the private properties for the enjoyment of the owners.

SEC. 2. The area comprising that particular land and water described in section 12 of this Act and generally depicted in a map identified as NPS-101-SB which is on file in the office of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, is hereby designated for establishment as the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Advisory Commission.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of ten members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) Four members to be appointed from recommendations made by the counties in which the lakeshore is situated, two members to represent each such county;

(2) Four members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Michigan; and

(3) Two members to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the lakeshore and with respect to the provisions of sections 9, 12, 13 of this Act.

(f) Any member of the Commission appointed under this Act shall be exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (g) of this section.

(g) The exemption granted by subsection (f) of this section shall not extend—

(1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment; or

(2) during the period of such appointment, and the further period of two years after the termination thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his appointment during the period of such appointment.

SEC. 5. In administering the lakeshore the Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction in accordance with the laws of Michigan. The Secretary, after consultation with the Michigan Department of Conservation, may designate zones and establish periods where and when no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment and issue regulations, consistent with this section, as he may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 6. (a) The administration, protection, and development of the lakeshore shall be exercised by the Secretary, subject to the provisions fo this Act and of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, relating to the areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service; except that authority otherwise available to

the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) In the administration, protection, and development of the area, the Secretary shall prepare and implement a land and water use management plan, which shall include specific provision for—

(1) development of facilities to provide the benefits of public recreation;

(2) protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment; and

(3) such protection, management, and utilization of renewable natural resources as in the judgment of the Secretary is consistent with, and will further the purpose of, public recreation and protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment.

(c) In developing the lakeshore the Secretary shall provide public use areas in such places and manner as he determines will not diminish the value or enjoyment for the owner or occupant of any improved property located thereon.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting any governmental jurisdiction in the State of Michigan from assessing taxes upon any interest in real estate retained under the provisions of section 10 of this Act to the owner of such interest.

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the limitations, conditions, and restrictions imposed by this Act, to acquire the land, water, and other property, and improvements thereon, and any interests therein (including easements) comprising the area defined in section 12 of this Act by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or condemnation; except that such authority to acquire by condemnation shall be exercised only in the manner and to the extent specifically authorized in this Act.

(b) In exercising his authority to acquire property under this Act, the Secretary shall give immediate and careful consideration to any offer made by an individual owning property within the lakeshore to sell such property to the Secretary. In any case in which an individual owning property within the lakeshore submits evidence to the Secretary that the continued ownership by such individual of that property would result in hardship to him, the Secretary shall immediately consider such evidence and, if he determines on the basis of that evidence that a hardship would so result, he shall, within the one year following the submission of such evidence, subject to the availability of funds, purchase such property if offered for a price which does not exceed its fair market value.

(c) Any property or interests therein, owned by the State of Michigan, or any political subdivisions thereof, may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any property owned by the United States on the date of enactment of this Act located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(d) With respect to that property which the Secretary is authorized to acquire by condemnation under the terms of this Act, the Secretary shall initiate no condemnation proceedings until after he has made every reasonable effort to acquire such property by negotiation and purchase.

(e) In any case where the owner and the United States agree, the power of condemnation may, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, be used as a means of acquiring a clear and marketable title, free of any and all encumbrances.

(f) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property located within the area designated for inclusion and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area. Properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in value: *Provided,* That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. The Secretary shall report to the Congress on every exchange carried out under the authority of this Act within thirty days from its consummation, and each such report shall include a statement of the value of the properties involved and of any case in which equalization payments are made or received.

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary shall, at the request of any township or county in or adjacent to the lakeshore affected by this Act, assist and consult with the appropriate officers and employees of such township or county in establishing zoning bylaws for the purpose of this Act. Such assistance may include payments to the county or township for technical aid.

(b) No property within the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore shall be acquired by the Secretary by condemnation during the one-year period following the date of enactment of this Act. Thereafter the Secretary shall be prohibited from acquiring by condemnation any improved property so long as the affected county or township has in force and applicable thereto a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section and the use of improved property is in compliance therewith. In the event that the affected county or township does not have in effect and applicable to any improved property a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw so approved, the Secretary shall be prohibited from acquiring such property by condemnation, if the owner therof notifies the Secretary in writing of such owner's agreement to use his property in a manner consistent with the applicable standard set forth in subsection (d) of this section, and such prohibition against condemnation shall remain in effect for so long as such property is so used.

(c) If the Secretary determines that any such property referred to in subsection (b) of this section covered by any such bylaw is being used in a way which is not in substantial compliance with such bylaw, or that any such property referred to in subsection (b) with respect to which an agreement has been made is being used in a manner which is not substantially consistent with such applicable standards, he shall so notify the owner of any such property in writing. Such notice shall contain a detailed statement as to why the Secretary believes that such use is not in substantial compliance with such zoning bylaw or why such use is not substantially consistent with such applicable standards, as the case may be. Any such owner shall have sixty days following the receipt by him of that written notification within which to discontinue the use referred to in such notification. Discontinuance of such use within such sixty-day period shall have the effect of prohibiting the Secretary from acquiring such property by condemnation by reason of such use. In any case in which such use is not discontinued within such sixty-day period and condemnation proceedings are thereafter initiated by the Secretary, no condemnation shall be ordered in any such proceedings if the Secretary fails to demonstrate to the court by substantial evidence that such a use was not in substantial compliance with such bylaw or was not substantially consistent with such applicable standards.

(d) Any zoning bylaw or amendment thereto submitted to the Secretary for approval for the purposes of this Act shall be approved by him if such bylaw or amendment contains provisions which—

(1) contribute to the effect of prohibiting the commercial and industrial use (other than a use for a commercial purpose as authorized under section 13 of this Act) of all property within the boundaries of such area which is situated within the county or township adopting such bylaw or amendment;

(2) are consistent with the objectives and purposes of this Act so that, to the extent possible under Michigan law, the scenic and scientific values of the lakeshore area will be protected;

(3) are designed to preserve the lakeshore character of the area by appropriate restrictions upon the burning of cover, cutting of timber (except tracts managed for sustained yield), removal of sand or gravel, and dumping, storage, or piling of refuse and other unsightly objects or other uses which would detract from the natural or traditional lakeshore scene;

(4) provide that no construction, reconstruction, moving, alteration, or enlargement of any property, including improved property as defined in this Act, within the lakeshore area shall be permitted, if such construction, reconstruction, moving, alteration, or enlargement would afford less than a 50-foot setback from all streets measured at a right angle with the street line, and a 25-foot distance from the abutters' property lines. Any owner or zoning authority may request the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether a proposed move, alteration, construction, reconstruction, or enlargement of any such property would subject such property to acquisition by condemnation, and the Secretary, within sixty days of the receipt of such request, shall advise the owner or zoning authority in writing whether the intended use will subject the property to acquisition by condemnation; and

(5) have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under and of exception made to the application of such bylaw or amendment.

(e) The approval of any bylaw or amendment pursuant to subsection (d) shall not be withdrawn or revoked by the Secretary for so long as such bylaw or amendment remains in effect as approved. Any such bylaw or amendment so approved shall not be retroactive in its application.

SEC. 10. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property situated within the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain, for a term of not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner or owners, the right of use and occupancy of such property for any residential purpose which is not incompatible with the purposes of this Act or which does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the value on such date of the right retained by the owner. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(b) Any deed or other instrument used to transfer title to property, with respect to which a right of use and occupancy is retained under this section, shall provide that such property shall not be used for any

purpose which is incompatible with purposes of this Act, or which impairs the usefulness and attractiveness of such area and if it should be so used, the Secretary shall have authority to terminate such right. In the event the Secretary exercises his power of termination under this subsection he shall pay to the owner of the right terminated an amount equal to the value of that portion of such right which remained unexpired on the date of such termination.

SEC. 11. As used in this Act, the term "improved property" means a detached, one-family dwelling, construction of which was begun before December 31, 1964, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, such land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the lands so designated. The amount of the land so designated shall in every case be at least three acres in area, or all of such lesser acreage as may be held in the same ownership as the dwelling, and in making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use in which the dwelling and land have customarily been enjoyed: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any beach or waters on Lake Michigan, together with so much of the land adjoining such any beach or waters, as the Secretary may deem necessary for public access thereto. If the Secretary makes such exclusion, an appropriate buffer zone shall be provided between any residence and the public access or beach.

SEC. 12. The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore shall consist of the following described areas together with adjacent waters:

SOUTH MANITOU ISLAND

(a) All of an island in Lake Michigan officially designated as South Manitou Island lying in townships 30 and 31 north, range 15 west, and adjacent waters for one-quarter mile offshore.

GOOD HARBOR—SLEEPING BEAR BAY AREA

(b) Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at the northern line of section 6, township 29 north, range 12 west, and continuing east along said line to the east line of said section and thence south along the said east boundary to the south boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the north-south quarter section line of section 7, township 29 north, range 12 west,

thence south along said quarter section line to the east-west quarter section line of said section, thence west along said quarter section line and east-west quarter section line of section 12, township 29 north, range 13 west to the north right-of-way of a public road following the north shore of Little Traverse Lake,

thence in a general westerly direction along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 10, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south of the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 22, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west along the north boundary of said section to the northwest corner of the section, thence south along the west boundary of said section to the east-west quarter-quarter line of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west to the west boundary of said section, thence north to the northeast corner of section 17, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence west to the northwest corner of section 18, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the southeast corner of section 24, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the south boundary of said section to the east right-of-way of county highway 675, thence continuing northwesterly along said right-of-way to the projected intersection of the west right-of-way of a north-south county road in the northwest quarter, southwest quarter of section 24,

thence southerly along the said right-of-way to the south line of section 24, thence west to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 23, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said quarter section, thence east to the north-south quarter section line of said section,

thence north to the south boundary of section 14, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence east along said south boundary to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southeast quarter of said section,

thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of said section, thence west 660 feet, thence north to the north boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the shore of Lake Michigan,

thence offshore one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore, thence along said shore in a general easterly direction at a distance of one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore to a point one-quarter mile offshore perpendicular of the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

GLEN ARBOR AREA

Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at a point 1,491 feet due east of the west boundary of section 21, township 29 north, range 14 west and running south to the south boundary of said section, thence running east to north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northwest quarter section of section 27, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said quarter section, thence east to the west right-of-way of monument 22, thence south along said west right-of-way to the north line of section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the north line of section 34 to a point which is 400 feet west of the northeast corner of Government lot 1, section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south 200 feet, thence west 430 feet, thence south 805 feet,

thence west 485 feet more or less to the west line of Government lot 1, thence south on the west line of Government lot 1 to the southwest corner of Government lot 1, thence east 144 feet more or less to a point 661.49 feet west of the northeast corner of Government lot 2, section 55, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 131.9 feet, thence north 81 degrees 02 minutes west 335.0 feet, thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 100 feet, thence south 30 degrees 37 minutes west 149 feet, thence south 89 degrees 38 minutes west 225.0 feet,

thence south 18 degrees 13 minutes west 235 feet, thence north 71 degrees 30 minutes west 45 feet, thence south 18 degrees 30 minutes west 450 feet,

thence south 71 degrees 30 minutes east 400 feet, thence south to the south line of Government lot 2, thence east on the south line of Government lot 2 to a point 418.35 feet east of Glen Lake on the south line of Government lot 2,

thence south 15 degrees 43 minutes west 100 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 2 degrees 59 minutes west 1,100.12 feet, thence west 43.1 feet, thence south 200 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 775 feet, thence west 225 feet, thence south 434 feet to the south line of section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the south line of section 34 to the east line of section 4, thence south along said east line to the north right-of-way of Forest Glen Road,

thence northwesterly along the north right-of-way of said public road to the north line of section 32, thence west along the north line of section 32 to the shore of Glen Lake,

thence continuing northwesterly along the shore of Glen Lake from the intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the south line of section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, to a point of intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the east line of Government lot 2,

thence north along the east line of Government lot 2 to the south sixteenth latitudinal line, thence west along the south sixteenth latitudinal line to its intersection with the west line of Government lot 2, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south on the west line of Government lot 2 to the shore of Glen Lake,

thence westerly and southerly along the shore of Glen Lake to a point 664.77 feet east and 1,308.75 feet north of the southwest corner of Government lot 1, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north 89 degrees 39 minutes west 236.33 feet to the east right-of-way of Michigan Highway 109,

thence southerly along the east right-of-way to a stake on the east right-of-way of monument 109 located north 345.5 feet and north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 1,190 feet from the northwest corner of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence from stake on east right-of-way of monument 109 north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 229.5 feet, thence south 18 degrees 03 minutes west 400.0 feet,

thence south 89 degrees 12 minutes west 1,242.0 feet to the west line of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south along the west lines of Government lots 1, 2, and 3, section 31, to the southwest corner of Government lot 3,

thence east on south line of Government lot 3 to the west right-of-way of monument 109, thence southeasterly along the west right-of-way to its intersection with the north line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east along the north line of section 5 to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 5,

thence by a straight line in a southeasterly direction to the intersection of the east line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west, and the south right-of-way of a public road lying on the south line of Government lot 5,

thence east along south right-of-way of said public road to its intersection with Michigan Highway 22, thence east across monument 22 to the south right-of-way, thence northeasterly along monument 22 to a point 476.5 feet west and 1,519.0 feet north of the southeast corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4,

thence south 400 feet, thence east 476.5 feet, thence north on the east line of the southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 4, to a point of intersection with the south sixteenth latitudinal line,

thence east on the south sixteenth latitudinal line to a point on the west boundary of a cemetery which point is north 89 degrees west 222.75 feet from the intersection of the south sixteenth latitudinal line with the east line of section 4,

thence south to the southwest corner of said cemetery, thence south 89 degrees east 222.75 feet to the west line of section 4, thence continuing east on the same bearing 33 feet more or less to east right-of-way of a public highway,

thence north to a point 554.2 feet south and 33 feet east of the meander corner at the north end of the west line of section 3, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence

east 233.0 feet, thence north 374.14 feet to centerline of a public highway, thence south 69 degrees 55 minutes east 49.01 feet,

thence north 0 degree 47 minutes west 11.3 feet, thence east to north right-of-way of said public highway, thence southeasterly along north right-of-way of said highway to its intersection with the south right-of-way of a private road listed on the plot of McFarlane Woods numbered 2 as Beech Tree Road,

thence southeasterly along the south right-of-way of Beech Tree Road to the northeast corner of lot numbered 14 of McFarlane Woods numbered 2, thence north 37 degrees 24 minutes east to the shore of Glen Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore of Glen Lake to a point 1,850 feet due east of the west line of section 11,

thence south to the east-west quarter section line of section 14, thence west to the shore of Lake Michigan and east-west quarter section line, section 13, township 28 north, range 15 west,

thence continuing due west to a point one-quarter mile offshore, thence northerly and following along the shore at a perpendicular distance of one-quarter mile offshore to a point perpendicular to the point of beginning,

thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

PLATTE BAY AREA

Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at a point 700 feet due north of the south corporate line of the village of Empire,

thence east to a point on the east said corporate line, 700 feet north of the southeast corner of said corporate line,

thence north to the north line of section 30, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter section of said section,

thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said section, thence east to the east line of said section, thence south to the southeast corner of said section, thence west to the north-south quarter section line of section 31, thence south to the north line of section 18, township 27 north, range 14 west,

thence east to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of said section, thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of section 19,

thence west to a point 500 feet perpendicular to, in a general easterly direction, monument numbered 22 and continuing along 500 feet from monument numbered 22 in a general westerly direction to a point 1,500 feet west of the east line of section 31, township 27 north, range 15 west, thence north to the southerly right-of-way of monument numbered 22,

thence westerly along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of section 36, township 27 north, range 16 west, thence south to the east-west quarter section line of said section, thence east to the shore of Long Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore to the east line of said section,

thence south to a point 1,000 feet south of the south line of said section, thence west to the west line of section 1, township 26 north, range 16 west, thence north to the shore of Lake Michigan, thence perpendicular to the shore one-quarter mile,

thence following along the shore at a perpendicular distance of one-quarter mile to a point one-quarter mile offshore and due west to the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

SCENIC PARKWAY

(d)(1) In order to facilitate visitor travel, provide scenic overlooks for public enjoyment and interpretation of the national lakeshore and related features, and in order to enhance recreational opportunities, the Secretary is authorized to construct and administer as a part of the national lakeshore scenic roads of parkway standards generally located in accordance with the location description in paragraph (2) and lying within the parkway zone designated on map numbered NPS–101–SB. Such scenic roads shall include necessary connections, bridges, and other structural utilities. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary may procure for this purpose land, or interest therein, by donation, purchase with appropriated or donated funds, or otherwise: *Provided*, That land and interests so procured shall not exceed one hundred and fifty acres per mile of scenic road, except that tracts may be procured in their entirety in order to avoid severances. Property so acquired in excess of the acreage limitation provided in this section may be exchanged by the Secretary for any land of approximately equal value authorized for acquisition by this Act.

(2) The scenic roads authorized in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be located in accordance with the following generally described route, in three segments:

GLEN LAKE TO EMPIRE BLUFF SEGMENT

From the national lakeshore in section 7, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence meandering southerly through section 18 and portions of sections 13 and 24, township 29 north, range 14 west, to the top of the morainal bluff overlooking Glen Lake and Sleeping Bear Bay,

thence continuing through sections 19, 30, 31 and 32, township 29 north, range 13 west, and crossing the Burdickville, Maple City Road in section 5, township 28 north, range 13 west, continuing past Bow Lake through sections 8, 7 and 18, with a spur into the Kettle region of section 17,

thence continuing westerly through township 28 north, range 14 west, including sections 13, 14, 15, and 22 with an entrance and contact station in section 23, crossing M72 into sections 26 and 27,

thence traversing the rim of an ancient glacial drainage channel through sections 28, 33, 32 and 31, township 28 north, range 14 west, and section 5, township 27 north, range 14 west, meeting the national lakeshore in section 36, township 28 north, range 14 west.

GLEN ARBOR SEGMENT

A shore segment connecting the Glen Haven portion of the national lakeshore with the Pyramid Point portion, traversing parts of sections 27 and 26, township 29 north, range 14 west.

PLATTE LAKE SEGMENT

A scenic drive overlooking the Platte Lakes and Crystal Lake Embayments, connecting the national lakeshore to U.S. 31 and traversing sections 12, 11, 10, 9, 4 and 5, township 26 north, range 15 west, and section 32, township 27 north, range 15 west; with an alternate spur through section 6, township 26 north, range 15 west.

SEC. 13. In any case, not otherwise provided for in this Act, the Secretary shall be prohibited from condemning any commercial property used for commercial purposes in existence on December 31, 1964, so long as the use thereof would further the purposes of this Act, and such use does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore. The following uses, among others, shall be considered to be uses compatible with the purposes of this Act: Commercial farms, orchards, motels, rental cottages, camps, craft and art studios, marinas, medical, legal, architectural, and other such professional offices, and tree farms.

SEC. 14. The Secretary shall furnish to any interested person requesting the same, a certificate indicating, with respect to any property which the Secretary has been prohibited from acquiring by condemnation in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority is prohibited and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $4,750,000, as may be necessary for acquisition of properties under the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I introduce at this time on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Senators BURDICK, HARTKE, and TYDINGS, proposed legislation which would amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to enforce the duty imposed on each carrier under that act to provide adequate service in connection with the transportation authorized by its certificate of public convenience and necessity.

Mr. President, this amendment is designed to assure the enforcement of adequate air service at airports across the Nation. Experience has shown that neither the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 nor the administrative policies of the Civil Aeronautics Board are presently adequate to provide the American public with the air service so vital to its needs.

As was the case in relation to railroad service earlier in our history, today proper air service is indispensable for the development of an American city and its metropolitan area.

The crucial significance of air service to the modern city was recognized as far back as 1935 in the report of the Federal Aviation Commission. Recommendation No. 4 in the Commission report said:

> Certificates of convenience and necessity should be issued under proper safeguards and specifications. Provisions should be made to specify a minimum quality of service and a frequency of schedule on airlines.

During the early years of the airline industry, the matter of adequacy of service generally took care of itself as a result of the competition between carriers seeking to obtain a foothold in desirable markets. Today, however, the record shows that certified competition has not and will not insure adequate service for all the markets in this country.

Present policies and practices of the Civil Aeronautics Board require that cities, metropolitan areas, or individual airports which consider the service of a certified airline to be inadequate have no recourse but to initiate an expensive and lengthy administrative procedure in the nature of an "adequacy of service case." The history of such cases is a dismal record of neglect of the public interest. The experiences of the city of Baltimore in seeking adequate service from certified airlines at Friendship Airport will demonstrate the problem.

In May 1956, the Greater Baltimore Committee filed an adequacy of service petition with the Civil Aeronautics Board. The case was not finally decided until November 1960, and improved service did not begin to be received until

well along in 1961, 5 years after the Baltimore business community called the matter to the attention of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The inadequacy of these procedures to protect the public interest is apparent. During the time in which a case is in litigation, the supporting data on which the case rests may change entirely and any improvements which might result therefrom are likely to be too little and too late.

I am convinced that the impracticality of this method of adjudication of disputes between the public and a transportation industry which undergoes consistent and rapid change is the explanation for there having been only four adequacy-of-service cases resolved by the Board since its creation in 1938.

During 1963, the concerned, enterprising, and dedicated leadership of the Baltimore Airport Board initiated inquiries regarding service at airports across the country. The replies which they received from Ohio, New York, Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, North Carolina, Indiana, West Virginia, Kentucky, Virginia, Tennessee, and Rhode Island indicate the deep concern of airport operators in these States for improved service and improved enforcement of adequate service on the part of certified air carriers.

Mr. President, it is only fair to admit that the Civil Aeronautics Board has recognized its obligation in the rendering of certain opinions and the establishment of certain machinery. In the course of its opinion in the Baltimore case, the Board stated:

> The obligation of the Board to guarantee adequate service is made clear in section 404a of the act. The use of the word "minimum" in connection with adequacy under section 404 does not mean that the adequacy standard is a narrow or insignificant one, nor does it mean that only minimum service should be provided. It means only that the adequacy standard is the basic floor laid down by the act, and that service below that floor will be found by the Board to be insufficient. The fact that broader policy considerations apply in certification cases where the Board is concerned with promoting the maximum development of a market does not mean that the standards in an adequacy proceeding are not sufficiently broad to protect the community's right to reasonable service. While section 404 may not be a major vehicle for attaining maximum service benefits, it is, nonetheless, a substantial shield safeguarding the communities from poor service.

The Community Relations Bureau, created in March 1961, was to provide machinery for the informal resolution of adequacy of service and other problems between carriers and cities. This office has proved useful; however, its lack of power to issue binding orders, its limited personnel and facilities, have prevented it from dealing with the problem of adequate service on a broad scale.

Students of air transportation have recognized from the beginning that the problem of reconciling the needs of cities for adequate service with the needs of carriers for adequate profits is not a simple one. Nevertheless, the importance of this problem to American cities is so critical as to require more attention from the Congress.

Let me give you an example of the service rendered to Baltimore, the sixth largest city in the country.

Let me remind you that the public investment in this modern jet terminal is $24 million, 20 percent of which is Federal funds. Let me also remind you that the facility is uniquely located to serve not only Baltimore, but much of Washington and all of the populous Maryland suburbs.

Friendship Airport has no service at all to or from La Guardia, and an average of only eight daily flights to and eight from Newark. Even in the Newark service, there is an afternoon gap of 6½ hours between flights. On Saturday, there is no service to Newark between 8 o'clock in the morning and 7 o'clock in the evening. Baltimore has no nonstop daytime service to Detroit, and none to Augusta. We have service in only one direction to Charlottesville, Memphis, Mobile, and Jacksonville. We have only one flight daily to Minneapolis and Milwaukee, and it originates at 11 p.m. Between Baltimore and Cincinnati, there is considerable community of interest; yet the only flight from Friendship originates at 6:45 a.m. and makes five stops before arriving at 11:15 a.m.

This schedule of service becomes effective February 6 of this year. Our present actual schedule is even less adequate.

Let me cite another example of the CAB philosophy. In 1963, Allegheny Airlines applied for certification to institute frequent nonstop service between Friendship and Newark—the downtown airport for New York City. This service was badly needed. The CAB ruled against Allegheny, and declared it ineligible for Federal subsidy. Allegheny replied that it could operate profitably on the Friendship-Newark run without the subsidy, and would like certification to do so. The CAB then ruled against Allegheny on grounds that four trunklines were already certified to supply this service. The Baltimore Airport Board appealed to the CAB to grant the Allegheny certification since the presently certified trunklines were unwilling to supply adequate service. The CAB refused to certify Allegheny, and the case was closed.

Mr. President, I contend that a quasi-judicial Federal agency which has the power to grant valuable franchises should also be legally required to see that the holders of the franchises provide adequate service, and, if not, to grant franchises to someone who will provide service. I contend that the Federal Aviation Act must be amended to provide relief from the unilateral scheduling decisions made by airlines who service their own interests without due regard to the public's interest. I contend that previous legislation has emphasized the ability of an airline to serve, rather than its willingness to serve best as a criterion for certification. I contend that, after certification has been granted, the Civil Aeronautics Board makes no attempt to enforce adequate service, and that the economic interest of the carrier is frequently paramount in decisions which are made. I contend that the lengthy adequacy of service proceedings, which are the public's only present recourse, are impractical, and that a more expeditious method of controlling airline scheduling must be written into the Federal Aviation Act. I contend that the act under which the Civil Aeronautics Board functions should be amended to require the Board to analyze the service rendered by certified carriers at each location, and to initiate corrective action where necessary. This is similar to the powers possessed by many other regulatory agencies, and this is the purpose of the legislation which I am now proposing.

Let me summarize the provisions of the legislation I am presenting. Under these amendments to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the Civil Aeronautics Board would be required to maintain a continual surveillance over the adequacy of service provided by air carriers by establishing a set of guides and tests to determine minimum levels of airline service to be provided between each pair of cities in the United States receiving scheduled service from a certified carrier. These guide lines or tests for minimum levels of service would be developed from the periodic reports and indicators provided by the Department of Commerce for determining the potential air market between each such pair of cities.

I might suggest that in conjunction with the preparation of these indices, the Department of Commerce and such other agencies as might be appropriate, could render a great service to other carriers and to the public by preparing similar indices of the potential market for other means of commercial transportation.

The Board would be required, within a reasonable time after its periodic review and comparison, to issue a notice of deficiency to each airline providing air service between pairs of cities when the Board determines it to be less than that which is necessary to provide adequate service. If such airline fails to provide the adequate service within a reasonable time, the Board would then be required to institute immediate proceedings for the carrier to show cause why service should not be increased and the Board would be empowered to issue orders or take action, including the revocation of certification and its award to another carrier, necessary to insure the maintenance of adequate service. In such proceedings it will, of course, be the right of any interested party to submit evidence in its behalf.

In addition, the Board shall, upon its own order or upon the motion of any city or State, public agency, or public body, institute an investigation to determine whether the public interest requires the authorization of new, additional, or improved service between any two or more cities. Upon determination that the public interest requires it, the Board shall issue such certificate and take such other action as may be necessary to insure adequate and efficient air service.

The corrective action sought in this bill is long overdue. Provisions of the legislation are in line with the resolution adopted by the Airport Operators Coun-

cil at its recent New York convention. The inquiries made of officials in other cities by officials in Baltimore and my own personal conversations with colleagues in the Senate assure me of broad support. With this in mind, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at the close of my remarks, and that the bill lie on the table until the close of business on Friday, February 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

The bill (S. 937) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to enforce the duty imposed on each carrier to provide adequate services in connection with the transportation authorized by its certificate of public convenience and necessity, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 937

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1482) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"SURVEILLANCE AND ENFORCEMENT OF ADEQUATE SERVICE

"(j)(1) In exercising and performing its duties with respect to maintaining adequate levels of air service for the public convenience and necessity, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 401(e)(4) or any other provisions of this Act, the Board shall maintain a continuing surveillance over the adequacy of service provided by air carriers pursuant to the requirements of section 404(a) of this Act by, from time to time, establishing standards and tests to determine minimum levels of air carrier service to be provided between each pair of cities in the United States receiving scheduled service from a certificated air carrier, taking into account the periodic reports available from other governmental departments, including those furnished by the Department of Commerce, of indicators susceptible for use in determining the potential air market between each such pair of cities in the United States. The Board shall use the standards and tests established by it to periodically, but not less than once each year, determine the adequacy of air service provided by the certificated airlines between each pair of cities in the United States certificated to receive scheduled airline service. The Board shall, within a reasonable time after its periodic review, issue a notice of deficiency in the form of an order to show cause to each air carrier providing service between pairs of cities where the Board determines it to be less than that which is necessary to provide adequate service.

"(2) Each air carrier receiving a notice of deficiency shall, within the time specified by the Civil Aeronautics Board, correct the deficiency cited, or notify the Board of its reasons for inability or refusal to conform. In the event the air carrier does not correct the deficiency cited, parties of interest shall have the right to reply and comment on the air carrier's reason for its inability or refusal to conform. The Board may thereafter revise or rescind its notice of deficiency, or it may hold a public hearing upon the issues raised by the original or revised notice of deficiency. The Board shall issue such orders and take such action (including the revocation of any certificate to engage in air transportation issued under this Act), as may be necessary to insure the maintenance of adequate air service to all points designated in any such certificate. In said proceedings it shall be the right of any person or body with a substantial interest to become a party to the proceedings and to submit evidence in favor of or against the adequacy of the level of air service.

"(3) Notwithstanding any provision of this section, the Board shall, upon its own order, or promptly upon motion of any State, city, or other public agency or public body, institute an investigation to determine whether the public interest requires the authorization of new, additional or improved service between any two or more cities, and upon determination that the public convenience and necessity requires authorization of new, additional, or improved service, shall, subject to the other provisions of this Act, issue such certificate or order and take such other action as may be necessary to insure adequate and efficient air service between such cities for the present and future needs of air commerce."

(b) that portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the heading "SEC. 1002. Complaints to and investigations by the Administrator and the Board." is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"(j) Surveillance and enforcement of adequate air service."

SEC. 2. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 3 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the collection and publication of statistics, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 104. Report relating to air transportation services."

The Secretary shall undertake and produce in the Bureau or by contract with a private organization, a periodically updated report, of the community-of-interest indicators between each city or area in the United States and each other city or area in the United States designated by the Civil Aeronautics Board on the certificates of public convenience and necessity of the United States scheduled air carriers. These periodic reports will be in such form and include such data as will assist the Civil Aeronautics Board, the communities, the air carriers, and others in determining the potential air transportation needs, including the character, frequency and times at which air service is needed, for each city or area designated by the Civil Aeronautics Board on the certificates of public convenience and necessity of the scheduled United States air carriers.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, and others interested in these reports, shall advise the Bureau, upon the Bureau's request or otherwise, from time to time, as to the nature of the facts, data, statistics, and information which will be pertinent and helpful for the above purpose.

Such report shall be revised periodically, quarterly if possible, but in no case less than annually, and shall within a reasonable time after the end of each period, be forwarded by the Secretary to the Civil Aeronautics Board for use as a guide in determining the adequacy of air service between each city or area in the United States, and each other city or area in the United States designated to receive air carrier service. Copies of said report shall be made available to the public through the Office of the Superintendent of Documents if the demand warrants it, and in any event it shall be available for public inspection at the office of the Bureau. Copies of the report, or any portion thereof shall be furnished to those who request it upon the payment of such reasonable charges as the Bureau may from time to time establish. Such copies shall be admissible as evidence to establish any of the facts or opinions contained therein, in Federal courts and before Federal administrative agencies, including the Civil Aeronautics Board. The information obtained from this report may be used by the Department of Commerce for information and guideline purposes for such other activities as it sees fit.

(b) The analysis of chapter 3 of title 13 of the United States Code, immediately preceding section 41, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"104. Reporting relating to air transportation services."

ASSURING RESOURCES FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, this Nation has now entered its fifth year of uninterrupted economic growth. We have had 49 months of unbroken advance in our economy. Gross national product has gone to more than $600 billion with unusual stability and absence of overall inflation.

There can be no question that the Employment Act of 1946, the work of the White House Council of Economic Advisers and the Joint Economic Committee of Congress have played a major role in this unusual economic record.

Since the enactment of the Employment Act, the administrators of our Government have been aware of both the ability and the responsibility, through carefully planned and coordinated Federal economic policy, to keep the national economy operating at an adequate growth rate. Our adjustment from World War II has been a remarkable contrast to the adjustment after World War I.

We have been through one period in which administrators were reluctant to use Federal authority and did not initiate programs quickly to reverse recessionary forces, but corrective steps were taken before any deep depression occurred. We are in a period now in which coordinated Federal programs affecting economic growth have succeeded in lifting our growth rate from about 3 to 5 percent annually.

We still have a great deal to learn about economic policy. As a Senator from an agricultural State, I feel we have some unsolved farm problems, of serious dimensions. That is an area in which there is still vital work to be done.

We have, however, learned a great deal since 1946, and we have demonstrated that violent cyclical economic swings—booms and busts—are not inevitable or irreversible. The Employment Act of 1946, which declared the maintenance of a high employment economy a matter of Federal concern and responsibility, and established an administrative and a legislative agency to provide continuing national leadership in the economic field, has worked to the tremendous benefit of the Nation.

The many agencies which once initiated programs affecting the economy, without thought to their consistency with actions of other agencies, or their economic effects, now have guides and goals in the annual Economic Reports of the

Council of Economic Advisers which make coordinated action possible.

We now have a system of analysis and communication so when economic weaknesses appear, the President, Congress, and other administrators know quickly that steps to strengthen the economy are needed. Economic policies, programs and actions are no longer based on hunches, but on a continuing flow of information and interpretation of events and trends in economic affairs.

I send to the desk, Mr. President, for myself and 15 other Senators who have joined as cosponsors, a measure to be known as the Resources and Conservation Act. The nature of the bill is familiar to most Members, for a similar measure was first proposed in the 86th Congress by the late Senator James E. Murray, of Montana, legislative author of the Employment Act of 1946.

Senators joining me in authorship of the bill are Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I ask unanimous consent that it lie on the desk the remainder of this week for additional signatures.

The bill establishes a White House Council of Resource and Conservation Advisers paralleling the Council of Economic Advisers. It establishes select committees in the Senate and the House, each composed of members of the four committees dealing with resources legislation, Interior, Public Works, Agriculture, and Commerce, which will meet at least once annually, early in each session of Congress, to consider an annual national resources report by the Council.

It would establish the same sort of centers of informed, continuing resources and conservation leadership in the executive branch and Congress we have successfully and beneficially set up in the economic field.

Abundant resources—biological, land, water, air, minerals, timber—are basic to a sustained, affluent economy. Yet our attention to resources problems has been quite sporadic in the past.

Just after the turn of the century, President Theodore Roosevelt tackled resource problems of that day very vigorously. They did not get the same sort of major attention again until the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt when the Soil Conservation Service, TVA, land use planning, the National Resources Planning Board, and other programs were initiated by the New Deal.

In the past 6 or 7 years, we have fortunately had considerable resource leadership from Members of Congress. Senator Murray led efforts to create a Missouri Valley Authority, parks, and seashores. Our distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, first proposed the landmark study of water resources problems which the late Senator Robert S. Kerr conducted brilliantly and which the senior Senator from New Mexico, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, still works with determination to implement. Senator ANDERSON has not only provided leadership on water resources legislation, he was the father of our recently adopted recreation resources programs. The recreation bills were the result of a 6-year effort which started back in 1958 when the Senator successfully proposed an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. It culminated last year with our enactment of the land and water conservation fund bill and the wilderness preservation bill. Senator ANDERSON's name is identified also with a helium conservation program, the saline water conversion effort, study of weather modification, phreatophyte control, and other similar resource measures. It is a pleasant recollection of mine that I sponsored companion measures on wilderness and recreation in the House of Representatives. Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, came to the Senate 2 years ago with a national reputation as a conservation-minded Governor. He is brilliantly forwarding that reputation as a Senator. The conservation interest and effective work of Senator METCALF, both as a U.S. Representative and as a Senator, is well known.

We have a land policy review commission now getting underway which has been brought about through the leadership efforts of the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL, with whom I had the privilege of serving two terms in the House of Representatives. Also on the House side, Congressman JOHN BLATNIK provided early leadership in regard to pollution control.

We do not suffer from a lack of interest in resources and conservation problems. I have never known a group of men with a greater dedication to their responsibilities than the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the House and Senate with whom I have served. They are both extremely hard-working groups. But all are Senators and Congressmen with neither the uninterrupted time, the staff, nor the authority to make the necessary studies in depth and to develop the comprehensive and continuing understanding, information, and recommendations on resources policies and programs the Nation needs.

In their campaign for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency in 1960, Senators John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson endorsed Senator Murray's proposal for a Resources Council in the same pattern as the Council of Economic Advisers.

Senator Kennedy, in his major campaign speech on resources at Billings, Mont., made it his domestic point four. In outlining a 9-point resources program, he said:

> Fourth, we will establish a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers in the Office of the President * * *. We have had many short-term limited, piecemeal studies. We have not had enough of the long-range, continuing and comprehensive surveys, determining the needs of our country, the increase in our population, the available resources and how they can be fitted together to build a strong and vital country.
>
> We need a permanent inventory of where we stand now, and where we want to be tomorrow, in water, power, timber, recreation and other resources. We need a rational schedule of action, instead of a hit-or-miss development that depends upon annual political or budgetary pressures. We need a national as well as a local or regional view, planning, for example, how we might profitably link the power systems of the Columbia and the Missouri Rivers, and decide where public and cooperative power systems require steam as well as hydro plants. I believe the time is coming in the Missouri River Basin, for example, when power user groups will operate thermal generating plants, utilizing the lignite fields of the Dakotas, Montana, and Wyoming, to supplement the hydropower of the Missouri River dams.

Mr. Kennedy discussed and advanced the Council proposal in a half dozen other speeches in terms of the resource problems most familiar to those localities.

In the period following the 1960 election, and before he took office, the President-elect initiated broad studies of the functions of the Government he would soon direct. He was urged by political economists to cut back the number of White House offices and establishments and he determined to undertake it. He called on the National Academy of Sciences for a study and report on our natural resources situation. He assigned a study and report on resources research to the Office of Science and Technology.

When the bill I have now reintroduced was brought to hearing, the Kennedy administration asked that action on it be delayed until the science agencies had reported and the administration had a clearer picture of natural needs in regard to resources. This request was respected and the bill has gone over to this time.

The reports which President Kennedy requested have been before us for several months. The National Academy of Sciences made a series of reports on different classes of resources in 1962. The Office of Science and Technology reported in May 1963.

The Office of Science and Technology gave us recommendations for research which should be undertaken on biological resources, water, land, air, and minerals. It also recommended research on the economics of resources—the role of resources in economic growth, their impact on our social and economic institutions, the efficacy of the methods and techniques with which we are approaching resource problems, the soundness of present resources policies and programs, the prospects for growth in demand on resources due both to our own population growth and international developments, prospective cost trends, and significance of various technological developments.

It outlined a whole series of important research undertakings on which there should be followup, but I doubt if there is a single Member of this body—including myself—who knows what has become of all those recommendations. I know of no progress report. I am aware that we have authorized some additional water resources research under the Anderson Research Act of 1964, and that a number of research budgets have been increased. Staff members advise me, after a brief check, that a few of the many recommendations have been partially implemented in the budgets but that 2 years after the recommendations were made it is still pretty much a hit-and-

miss business, depending on whether some interested Member of Congress or official has picked up an isolated recommendation and pressed for action on it. The OST report, like so many commission reports, appears destined to fill shelf space in the libraries unless machinery is established to assure followup on it and other major studies in the resources field which have been made, filed, and forgotten in the past.

The National Academy of Sciences, in its report on renewable resources, put its finger on our needs in proposition VII—its final finding—which read:

> In view of the principles set forth in the preceding six propositions, it is evident that optimization of natural resources for human use and welfare cannot be achieved by fragmentary and sporadic attention given to isolated parts of the problem, but that the issues involved must be made the subject of a permanent, systematic process of investigation, recording and evaluation, carried on continuously in reference to the total perspective. It would appear mandatory, therefore, to entrust an independent organization with the task.

This finding, Mr. President, was the very essence of the case for a continuing Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers.

We are not going to achieve the best use of our resources by fragmentary and sporadic attention to isolated parts of the resources problem. We are fortunate that administrators and Members of Congress, in the absence of a permanent, systematic approach, have taken the leadership on some aspects. But as our population burgeons, and the pressure on our natural resources grows, we cannot and must not trust to resource crises forcing belated attention to some aspect of resource conservation and development, or to the chance of some individual interested in one or two aspects of resources problems making an appearance to stimulate action in time to avert shortages, waste, or permanent loss.

I am convinced that if President John F. Kennedy had survived to study and act upon the recommendations he got back from the two scientific agencies in regard to resources, he would have taken the initiative in urging the enactment of the resources and conservation bill. I am convinced that when the matter comes to President Lyndon Johnson's attention, he will favor moving ahead on the proposal.

We are reintroducing the bill today, Mr. President, in the conviction that there is now general agreement on the need and even urgency of creating the "permanent, continuing" center of resource leadership Senator Murray and his colleagues, Senator McGee, Senator Engle, many others of us in the Congress, and the scientists have pointed out.

The 88th Congress is being called a variety of names. The President said when he signed the land and water conservation fund bill and the wilderness bill last fall, that if it were not famed for the tax cut, the nuclear test ban, education legislation, antipoverty measures, and the civil rights law, the 88th might be called "the Conservation Congress."

It did enact landmark conservation legislation. It passed the acts authorizing the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and a land and water conservation fund. It authorized the establishment of several new national recreation areas and Canyonlands National Park. It passed a water resources research bill. We stepped up pollution control and abatement activity. We cleared the way for high voltage transmission to link the States on the west coast. Compared to other Congresses, there is no question that the 88th was resource and conservation minded, and accomplished much more than most. It is entitled to the credit and praise it has received.

But, it can also be asked if the 88th Congress did enough. We were still dealing with resource problems in a fragmentary way. There were a number of urgent tasks which the 88th Congress left undone.

In spite of the urgency of the water supply problems in four southwestern river basins, and the Upper Missouri Basin, Congress did nothing on a bill to speed research in weather modification. The Select Committee on Water Resources recommended the development of plans by 1970 for optimum development of all river basins in the Nation. It recommended aid to States to speed their water planning. It called for a biennial assessment of water supply and needs by region so all areas would be kept aware of their situation.

The water planning bill was not passed, although we have been aware of need for such plans since the National Conservation Conference in 1908. We hope that it will pass early in this Congress.

No steps have been taken in Congress or the executive branch to provide the biennal assessment of water supply and demand by regions, a continuing, systematic oversight of that problem which some regions should be following as closely as the weather reports, because of its urgency.

The 88th Congress did nothing of significance in the mineral resources field, although there is great need for relief for some of our key mineral industries, and even greater need for expanded research into methods of exploring for mineral deposits and handling lower grade ores.

The Congress did little to speed up the programs for the national forests, or to hasten replanting of private forest lands, although that is a most critical resource area.

Chandler and Morse, authors of a study of our resource situation sponsored by Resources for the Future, found that timber products are the one major commodity for which we have to pay more, in terms of real costs, than we did back in Malthus' time. They find that it takes less input—less materials and human effort—to produce a unit of agricultural or mineral commodities than it did a century ago, when we had rich new lands and the richest ore deposits.

Timber products alone require more input now than then. We have frequent reports on the possibility of increasing timber production, reforesting idle lands, improving existing forest management and ending losses to insects, disease, and fires. But we do not follow up because we are not regularly advised where we stand. Most of us read a pamphlet on "The Program for the National Forests" 3 or 4 years ago and have dismissed the matter from our minds for a decade or until someone becomes alarmed again, because we are not effectively made aware each year that the program for the national forests is not being adequately implemented to meet future needs.

I have been advised, Mr. President, that the President's Task Force on Natural Resources and Conservation—one of the score of task forces he had studying Federal problems last fall—suggested a need for a White House center of leadership on resources.

It must, in my opinion, be a White House agency. There is such a multiplicity of bureaus and offices working on parts of our resource and conservation problem that there is no single point in Government, except the executive office, where it is possible to have an overall view. Senator Anderson found, in his study of water and water research problems, that at least 27 different Federal agencies deal with aspects of that one resource alone. The National Academy of Science, in its proposition VII, called for an agency apart—an independent agency.

It is the judgment of the sponsors of the Resources and Conservation Act that leaders of the principle legislative committees in the House and in the Senate which deal with resources, and there are at least four of them—on each side—Commerce, Agriculture, Interior, and Public Works—that can profitably meet together as a Select Committee on Resources and Conservation in each House once a year to go over an annual report on the subject and agree on areas of responsibility for legislative action in the various fields.

This proposal has aroused widespread public interest and support.

My own initiative in the matter is a response to discussions with at least a score of major groups in labor, agriculture, various conservation fields, and civic groups such as the League of Women Voters.

I hope and trust, Mr. President, that the measure will be enacted at an early date.

One of the great needs for better understanding of our resources and resource development opportunities is illustrated in the regional development problem which is before us right now.

Several regions of the United States have grown and withered as a result of the depletion, or original improper use, of resources.

Kentucky is suffering as a result of the decline of its coal industry.

The northern Great Lakes area is suffering from depletion of forests and high grade mineral deposits.

In the upper Great Plains—the area of my own immediate concern—we lag in economic growth partly because of a national misjudgment of the proper type of agricultural development in the area at the time of its original settlement. Homestead laws required the cultivation of lands which should not have been plowed. The great droughts and dust storms of the thirties followed, and a

vast readjustment in land use—not yet completed—has had to be made.

There are alternate resource opportunities in each of these areas, and in other depressed areas. We would be much further along toward the solution of their economic problems today, and have a better basis for legislative action on depressed areas—if a Council of Resource and Conservation Advisers had been created a half dozen years ago and could advise us of national resource needs and the potentialities for resource development in each of these regions. We fortunately are aware, due to a recent survey, of pressing recreation needs.

In my opinion, the prompt establishment of the Council now could in a matter of months bring us guidance on resource needs and regional potentialities which could add tremendously to the permanent good which can be achieved by the economic opportunity program, and by any regional agencies we finally authorize.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The bill (S. 938) to declare a national policy on conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McGOVERN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LOWERING OF VOTING AGE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which seeks to extend the right to vote to citizens who have attained the age of 18.

The arguments which favor such legislation are well defined, but I believe they are more applicable today than ever before in the life of our Nation.

It seems to me that we are calling upon our young people to assimilate all the challenges of a society which grows increasingly complex.

We seek to institute programs which will encourage our young people to take a greater role in our national life.

There definitely is a trend toward young people in government and I submit that if the precious right to vote is extended to those who have reached the age of 18, we will be backing up our faith, hope, and confidence in youth in the most tangible possible form; indeed, in a manner which will encourage our youth toward a fuller participation in every aspect of American life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote in presidential elections, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COUNCIL FOR EXPANDED TRADE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a high-level Council for Expanded Trade, composed of leading private citizens from the business, labor, and academic communities, to advise Congress and the President of the extent to which, and the methods by which, trade in nonstrategic goods and services between the United States and countries within the Communist bloc can profitably be expanded in furtherance of the national interest.

The proposal embodied in this resolution presents a natural and logical step in the evolution of our policies toward trade with the bloc countries. "History is again on the march in Eastern Europe," President Johnson has told us, "and on the march toward increased freedom. These people—and some of their rulers—long for deeper and steadier and more natural relations with the West. We understand this longing, and we intend to respond to it in every way open to us."

The President set forth our national policy in bold and challenging terms:

> We will welcome evidence of genuine willingness on the part of Eastern European governments to cooperate with the U.S. Government in joint endeavors. We will reject no such overtures out of hand. We will judge them in terms of the true interests of our own people and the people of these countries. We wish to build new bridges to Eastern Europe—bridges of ideas, education, culture, trade, technical cooperation, and mutual understanding for world peace and prosperity.

This policy reflects the growth of a broad national consensus that vigorous—if prudent—trade with those Communist states, which neither threaten us nor make war on our allies, serves our greater national interest. It is a consensus which is embraced, not only by traditional free traders, but by such advocates of the conservative viewpoint as the Wall Street Journal and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. As William S. White has said:

> Trade is the best weapon of the true conservative, and the alternative to the ultimate weapon nobody wants to use, the weapon of war.

Of 125 leading American businessmen polled by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last summer, no fewer than 105 spoke out in favor of expanded U.S. trade with Eastern Europe.

Then, late last fall, American business leaders representing 63 major manufacturing corporations met in Moscow with Soviet trading officials in extensive exchanges of views on trade potential. Upon their return to the United States, they reported their conclusions to the President. They, too, pressed for the broadening of commercial channels between East and West.

In the past, business leaders and Government officials have each tended to let the other take the lead in urging innovations in our trade policies toward the bloc countries. As a result, businessmen in general remain confused and uncertain of the guidelines of national trade policy, while the Government is unable to grasp the commercial realities involved in the pursuit of expanded trade with the East. What should be a great national debate is too often obscured by myth and misconception. Before we will be able to establish a rational exchange of goods and services with the bloc countries, we must establish a rational machinery for the exchange of ideas, experience, and fact between our own business and Government.

Thus President Johnson warmly welcomed the opportunity to exchange views with the businessmen returned from Moscow. The Council on Expanded Trade, which I propose, is designed to insure that such exchanges continue on a permanent, comprehensive, and orderly basis.

The Council would reach out into the private sector to enlist the services of "citizens of outstanding qualifications" from "business, agriculture, labor, the academic community, and nonprofit organizations concerned with matters of world trade." Directed to conduct continuing studies "with a view to determining the extent to which and the methods by which trade between the United States and countries within the Communist bloc can be expanded in furtherance of the national interest," the Council would be expected to pursue many of the practical commercial issues and unanswered questions in East-U.S. trade.

Once we have set out upon a course of expanded trade with the East, how do we go about it? Are U.S. firms reluctant to engage in East-West trade? If so, why? Can the Council recommend ways to encourage U.S. businessmen to engage in active pursuit of eastern markets?

What can we sell the Hungarians? What can we buy from the Rumanians? Do Russian innovations in electronic medical technology have any potential market in this country?

What can we learn from the experience of the West Europeans in trading with the East? Have they developed improved operational techniques which we can profitably accept or adopt?

Can our Commerce Department-sponsored export expansion activities fruitfully be expanded to Eastern Europe? Is there a potential return for trade fairs, trade missions, the assignment of commercial attachés to the capitals of Eastern Europe?

Would it be possible to achieve a larger volume of trade in goods and services without the need for long-term credit?

How do private firms learn to deal with state trading agencies? How are the divergent commercial practices and procedures prevalent in bloc countries to be harmonized with standard practices prevailing in the United States? The Council might explore the proposal to establish a national clearinghouse to inform and assist firms interested in entering the Eastern European markets.

Perhaps, as many businessmen have suggested, we need to consider the establishment of a quasi-governmental trade association to negotiate general terms and conditions with the state trading agencies, including such critical items as

arbitration, patent and license protection, terms of payment and guarantees.

Expanded trade, no matter who our trading partner, serves our economic self-interest. More than that, expansion of trade with the Communist bloc serves our strategic self-interest in building a bridge, not only of goods, but of ideas to the peoples of Eastern Europe. I believe that the Council for Expanded Trade would be the keystone of such a bridge and that we shall soon begin to see how relatively independent a satellite nation can become when all roads and all bridges no longer lead to and from Moscow.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) to develop proposals for the expansion of trade by the establishment of a high-level Advisory Council, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. J. RES. 36

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a council to be known as the Council for Expanded Trade (hereinafter referred to as the "Council").

(b) The Council shall be composed of fifteen members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Persons appointed to the Council shall be private citizens of outstanding qualifications, including persons whose experience has been closely identified with business, agriculture, labor, the academic community, and nonprofit organizations concerned with matters of world trade.

(c) The President shall designate one of the members of the Council as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman. A majority of the members of the Council in office shall constitute a quorum, but the Council may function notwithstanding vacancies.

SEC. 2. (a) The Council shall conduct continuing studies with a view to determining the extent to which and the methods by which trade in nonstrategic goods and services between the United States and countries within the Communist bloc can be expanded in furtherance of the national interest.

(b) The Council shall report its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress annually, and at such other times as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. (a) The Council may, in carrying out this joint resolution, sit and act at such times and places, hold such hearings, take such testimony, administer such oaths, procure such printing and binding, and make such expenditures as it deems advisable. Any member of the Council may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Council.

(b) The Council shall have the power to appoint an executive director and such other personnel as it deems advisable, and to fix the compensation of such personnel in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Council may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(c) The Council is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Federal Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this joint resolution; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Council, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

SEC. 4. Members of the Council shall receive $75 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Council, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STUDY OF LOCAL AIRLINE SERVICES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of Senators NELSON, MCCARTHY, MONDALE, HART, MCINTYRE, MCGOVERN, LONG of Missouri, BOGGS, AIKEN, COOPER, MORTON, and HARTKE I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution authorizing a thorough review by the Committee on Commerce of the national needs for local airline service. The resolution expresses the sense of the Senate that pending the outcome of the review air service shall be maintained to all points now served.

This resolution grows out of complaints from cities, States, and national organizations, such as the Local Airline Service Action Committee, that local airline service is inadequate. Furthermore, cases before the Civil Aeronautics Board threaten the discontinuance of service to 100 localities of some 540 now served.

The concept of a truly national local air transportation system appears endangered by the possibility that service will be discontinued at almost one-fifth of the 540 air service points.

This threat of curtailed service is based on two policies now apparently guiding the Civil Aeronautics Board.

One is the so-called use-it-or-lose-it policy, whereby a community can be cut off from local airline service if it has less than five airplane passengers daily.

More than 80 of the communities facing loss of service are victims of this policy. Many other cities are uncomfortably close to this limit and may soon find themselves in the same situation. Almost 60 cities enplane only between 5 and 7 passengers a day.

The communities losing service under this policy have hopes of generating greater use of airline service and ask merely for the chance to do so.

Another is the "regional airport" policy adopted jointly by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency, whereby efforts are being made to consolidate airline service at airports which serve two or more cities each. In some cases, under this policy, cities now served by nearby fields would be as far as 50 miles from the proposed regional airports.

There is a real danger that this policy will decrease airline use even further. A study of the experience of a "feeder" airline in my State, conducted by the Wisconsin attorney general's office, shows that airline use declines as the ground distance to the airport increases. The study showed that as the distance reached 30 miles, use declined to 35 percent and at 50 miles it fell to 20 percent.

These 100 communities, and the Federal Government itself, have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to provide adequate airport facilities with the implied promise, both from the airlines and the Federal Government, that they would receive adequate airline service.

In my State recently, the Federal Aviation Agency joined with a community to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to construct an airport facility for use by a "feeder" airline, only to find that the Civil Aeronautics Board later authorized the "feeder" line to discontinue service.

How often is this happening elsewhere? The Congress should know. When two arms of the Federal Government are working at such obvious cross-purposes and creating such an extravagant waste, the need for review is apparent.

The expenditures made by local communities in these cases were made not as a matter of civic pride, but in recognition of the fact that cities with good transport facilities are at a great advantage in gaining and holding business and industries. Those without it are at a great disadvantage.

Many of the cities involved have lived on farm income and are dependent on air transportation to develop new industries. Some of these cities are in depressed areas where farming is no longer profitable, or where timber or mineral resources are now depleted, and are seeking to attract industry to bolster their economies. The discontinuance of air service may deal these aspirations a crushing blow and accelerate the economic decline of these communities.

The hearings before the Civil Aeronautics Board on the service cuts are replete with just such testimony. The Board itself is split on the matter and often decided such cases by a 3 to 2 vote.

The Federal Aviation Act was adopted to promote "an air tranportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States."

I believe that the sense of Congress has been that smaller and medium-sized cities require for their economic development air service to major trade centers.

This is why Congress has authorized the local airline system for which 13 local airline companies are paid $65 to $70 million a year in Federal subsidies.

Because this is a subsidized program and the outlay of Federal funds is substantial, a Senate study is in order to determine if the taxpayer's dollars are being used as efficiently as possible within the framework of the goals of the program.

In view of this, and because the Civil Aeronautics Board itself is split on the

question, I think a review by the Commerce Committee would be appropriate. This is especially true since the Federal Aviation Agency and local communities have apparently spent huge sums on airport facilities one year only to find the Civil Aeronautics Board directing discontinuance of service the next. This is a transparent waste of millions of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be allowed to be on the desk through Friday, February 5, for additional sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The resolution (S. Res. 69) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S. RES. 69

Whereas the Federal Aviation Act recognizes that air transport is essential to economic progress, and hundreds of communities, with or without aid under the Federal Airport Act, have financed airports to keep their place in a growing nation; and

Whereas complaints as to lack of adequate airline service have been sent to Congress; and

Whereas cases before the Civil Aeronautics Board threaten the discontinuance of airline service at more than 100 points and there is narrow division within the Board between a policy of restriction and one of expanding service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce shall make a thorough review of the needs of airline service, to set a progressive national policy and recommend any necessary legislation; and

That it is the sense of the Senate that, pending the outcome of such review, airline service be maintained to all points now served, on a frequency not less than at present.

AMENDMENT OF CLEAN AIR ACT—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 13)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 306) to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling and emission of pollutants from gasoline-powered or diesel-powered vehicles, to establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF EXPIRATION DATE OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 14)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 512) to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 15)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 596) to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT, TO PROVIDE FOR A PROGRAM OF GRANTS FOR ADEQUATE MEDICAL LIBRARY SERVICES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 16)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 597) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO SUPPLEMENTAL AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 2, after line 3 after the amount, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That not more than $220,000 of the funds appropriated for 'Salaries and Expenses, Research, Agricultural Research Service' in the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1965 (78 Stat. 862), shall be available until expended, without regard to any limitations included in that Act, for alterations necessary in connection with the installation of temperature and humidity control equipment for the Metabolism and Radiation Laboratory, Fargo, North Dakota."

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment (No. 17), intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.J. Res. 234) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 2, after line 3, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under Public Law 88-573, approved September 2, 1964, shall be used to formulate or administer a program to eliminate agricultural research stations or lines of research until after the Congress has considered and acted upon such plans for the elimination of research in its regular consideration of the research appropriation estimates for fiscal 1966."

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment (No. 18), intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, do the votes on the notices which have just been sent up by the order of the Committee on Appropriations require a two-thirds vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They do require a two-thirds vote.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for yielding.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR TO S. 296

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added to S. 296, a bill which I introduced, seeking to bring about the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF SENATE BILL 400

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 400) to authorize assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act for certain additional areas which has sustained, or are about to sustain, sudden and severe economic hardship.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional co-

sponsors for the following bills and resolution:

Authority of January 19, 1965:

S. 600. A bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education: Senators BARTLETT, BREWSTER, DOUGLAS, FONG, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KENNEDY of New York, LONG of Missouri, MCCARTHY, MCGOVERN, MONDALE, MOSS, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, PROXMIRE, RIBICOFF, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 610. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of the Chief Justice of the United States and of Associate Justices of the Supreme Court: Senators CHURCH, DOUGLAS, and HART.

Authority of January 26, 1965:

S. Res. 62. Resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of material from speeches in the United States by Mr. Churchill: Senators BYRD of Virginia, FANNIN, KUCHEL, LONG of Missouri, and PROUTY.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska as members of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87–364, the Speaker had appointed Mr. GALLAGHER of New Jersey, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey as members of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 16 United States Code 715a, the Speaker had appointed Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri, and Mr. CONTE of Massachusetts as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 16 United States Code 513, the Speaker had appointed Mr. COLMER of Mississippi, and Mr. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88–606, the Speaker had appointed Mr. ASPINALL, of Colorado, Mr. O'BRIEN, of New York, Mr. WHITE of Idaho, Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURTON, of Utah, and Mr. MORTON, of Maryland, as members of the Public Land Law Review Commission, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87–586, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MATTHEWS, of Florida, and Mr. CRAMER, of Florida, as members of the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2(b), Public Law 88–271, the Speaker had appointed Mr. O'BRIEN, of New York, and Mr. MORTON, of Maryland, as members of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88–630, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MORRIS, of New Mexico, Mr. RIVERS of Alaska, Mr. BERRY, of South Dakota, and Mr. SKUBITZ, of Kansas, as members of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. CAREY of New York, and Mr. NELSEN of Minnesota as members of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. NIX of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCDOWELL of Delaware, Mr. WRIGHT of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. CAMERON of California, Mr. SLACK of West Virginia, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DERWINSKI of Illinois, Mr. SPRINGER of Illinois, Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts, Mr. HARVEY of Michigan, and Mr. BELL of California as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Mexico from February 11 to 18, 1965, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 401(a), Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. CELLER of New York, Mr. FEIGHAN of Ohio, Mr. CHELF of Kentucky, Mr. POFF of Virginia, and Mr. MOORE of West Virginia as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 85–874, as amended, the Speaker had appointed Mr. WRIGHT of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mrs. REID of Illinois as members ex officio of the board of trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title 6, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, Mr. KING of California, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. MAHON of Texas, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, and Mr. BOW of Ohio as members of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures, on the part of the House.

TRIBUTE TO SUMNER SEWALL, FORMER GOVERNOR OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, one of Maine's most illustrious sons has passed away—Sumner Sewall—who was a good friend of mine. He was a statesman of many accomplishments, having served two terms as Governor of Maine and having served in both houses of the Maine State Legislature.

He was a military man of great distinction as a World War I "ace" and as a World War II military governor in occupied Germany. He was a business leader, especially in the establishment of commercial airlines.

But I think what I shall always remember most about Sumner Sewall was the manner in which he conducted himself in the 1948 Republican senatorial primary. He waged one of the cleanest, fairest and most ethical campaigns I have every experienced. He never stooped to smearing or to personal attacks. He was never negative—always positive. He was never unkind—always considerate and pleasant.

The beloved ones that he has left behind have much of which to be very proud. For he gave of himself to others—and for his kindly life this has been a better world.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials and press reports on the Honorable Sumner Sewall be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, Jan. 27, 1965]

EX-GOVERNOR SEWALL'S FUNERAL TO BE HELD ON THURSDAY

BATH.—Maine mourned Tuesday its World War II Governor—Sumner Sewall, a flying ace of World War I and a pioneer in developing commercial aviation in the United States.

In Augusta, where he sat as chief executive from 1941 to 1945, the House and Senate extolled their alumnus—he served in both branches—as one of the most "colorful, vigorous, friendly and effective" leaders the State ever had.

Sewall died unexpectedly of heart disease in his Bath home Monday night. He was 67.

His funeral will be at 3 p.m. Thursday in Christ Episcopal Church in Bath.

HELPED FOUND PAA

Gov. John H. Reed said Sewall's vigorous leadership long will be remembered.

"As a wartime Governor," Reed said, "Mr. Sewall was called upon to discharge a heavy burden of responsibility, which he did in an outstanding manner * * *."

As a pilot in the famed 95th Pursuit Squadron in the first world conflict, Sewall was credited with downing seven German planes and observation balloons.

He and Juan Trippe, who later founded the Pan American Airways system, organized Colonial Air Transport, the first Boston-New York airline. Sewall, as its traffic manager, sold the Nation's first commercial passenger ticket.

TWO TERMS AS GOVERNOR

Later he became a director of United Airlines and still later president of American Overseas Airlines.

After his two terms as Governor, he served a year as U.S. military governor of the German state of Wuerttemberg-Baden, then made an unsuccessful try, in 1948, for Republican nomination to the U.S. Senate.

Since then he had devoted himself to business affairs, primarily the presidency of the Bath National Bank.

Sewall leaves his widow, Elena; four children, Nicholas of Bath, David, who is traveling in Europe, Mrs. William Mackey of Grosse Pointe, Mich., and Mrs. Robert Charles of Washington, D.C., and two sisters, Mrs. John K. Jayne of New Canaan, Conn., and Mrs. Fred Hector of Fargo, N. Dak.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, Jan. 29, 1965]

SUMNER SEWALL, GOVERNOR AND AIR PIONEER, GAVE MUCH TO HIS STATE

Sumner Sewall, whose death this week the State mourns, was as genuinely a part of Maine as its lakes and mountains and the sturdy ships his family built and sailed to all parts of the world.

When only 18 and still in Harvard, he left to join a corps of U.S. ambulance drivers on the western front of World War I. When this country came in, the young Sewall turned to flying, and became a foremost American ace, winning numerous decorations.

Once the fighting was over he joined Juan Trippe, another aviation pioneer who later organized Pan American Airways, to establish Colonial Air Lines and fly the first regular airmail service between Boston and New York.

But Maine remembers him best as its wartime Republican Governor—World War II, that is—a post he filled with vigor and honor in the 1941–45 period. Earlier he had been elected from his native city of Bath to both the Maine House and Senate. After the war he accepted an appointment to be military governor of the State of Wuerttemberg in defeated Germany, and in 1948 made his final and this time unsuccessful bid for public office.

In whatever field he chose, his record did him honor; his liking for people, coupled with a temperament that was rarely anything but good natured and progressive, made him innumerable friends. With them, we lament the loss of a good man who was good for Maine.

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, Jan. 28, 1965]

DEATH ENDS A DISTINGUISHED CAREER

Sumner Sewall of the famed Bath shipbuilding family served his Nation and State well.

In World War I, he went overseas with a college ambulance unit when he was 19 years old. Upon U.S. entry into the war, he became an American aviator and an ace. He downed nine enemy planes and observation balloons and won decorations from the Governments of France and Belgium as well as the United States. He later became a pioneer in the development of commercial aviation.

Maine citizens remember him best as their Governor during World War II. He worked long hours at the statehouse and kept his staff busy. He was given extensive emergency powers but never abused them and constantly reminded his associates that the powers were given only to help the war effort. He served two terms, 1941–45, but rejected urgings to run for a third term although his reelection seemed assured.

Failing to win nomination for a U.S. Senate seat in 1948, Sewall busied himself with banking and other affairs in private life and remained active until stricken Monday with a fatal heart attack at the age of 67.

His was an active career made notable by distinguished public service. The tributes accorded him were well deserved.

EARTHQUAKE PREDICTION: A POSSIBILITY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, man and his science have a very long way to go before an adequate earthquake warning system is devised.

This does not mean, however, that interesting and important work is not now being undertaken. The Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense is now building a most promising, interesting and complex installation centering on Miles City, Mont., the large aperture seismic array (LASA).

This installation has developed from our Government's intensive efforts to improve its capabilities in detecting and identifying underground nuclear explosions. These explosions are detected by means of seismographic measurements with equipment similar to that used in the detection of earthquakes. In essence, LASA will be a superlarge seismograph taking measurements from what is in effect a sounding board several hundred miles in diameter. According to the Defense Department, this sounding board—"aperture array"—acting as a directional antenna will perhaps, with the use of modern computers, make possible a type of warning system for tsunami waves caused by the earthquake. The array will be completed by June 1965, and the data from it should be available by 1966.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from Director R. L. Sproull of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY,
Washington D.C., January 25, 1965.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: It was a pleasure to talk with you recently about possible ARPA projects in your State. As I mentioned then, one of our projects is perhaps the most promising new scientific facility in many years for the study of earthquakes. It is the large aperture seismic array (LASA) that ARPA is building in Montana, with the Air Force Technical Applications Center and Lincoln Laboratory as agents and technical helpers.

The prime purpose of this array is an experiment in the detection and identification of underground nuclear explosions from great distances. "Identification" means the distinguishing of a signal produced by a nuclear explosion from the common, background, "noise" signals that are always coming from small earthquakes all over the world. This primary purpose is in keeping with ARPA's project VELA, the research and development for the detection and identification of nuclear explosions.

However, this facility will also be a significant new instrument for the study of earthquakes. It would be rash indeed to predict just what its contribution will be to the study of earthquakes, but it is easy and safe to predict that it will make an important contribution.

Last year ARPA put together data from its seismological research observatories and from linear arrays established by the United Kingdom's Atomic Energy Authority and concluded that a major improvement could be made. Our basic conclusion was that a very large aperture array, covering several hundred miles by several hundred miles, may possibly improve underground nuclear test detection capabilities by a sizable factor. It is by no means obvious that just a "more and bigger" array will do this; the conclusion is based on a rather sophisticated study of the properties of the signal and the properties of the noise ("coherence lengths").

The experimental array now being built in Montana is described schematically in enclosure No. 1; most of this illustration has to do with an individual piece ("subarray cluster"), but at the left of this chart is a diagram on a very much smaller scale of the extent of the array. Enclosure No. 2 locates the array on the map of Montana. Enclosure No. 3 gives a schematic of some of the data processing. This array will act analogously to a very large directional antenna, such as used in radar. The data processing equipment will permit "pointing" the array at various regions of the earth, and for example, concentrating its attention on a single suspicious event or on an earthquake, rejecting noise from other areas of the world. Ultimately, the data will be processed in real time (not just stored on tape and aanlyzed at leisure), and therefore it may be possible to study earthquake activity in selected areas of the globe in great detail continuously. For example, concentrations on low level earthquake activity in selected regions near the seashore could conceivably lead to early information that an earthquake had occurred in a region where tsunamis have been known to be generated. Such information could, if the development is successful, be available in time to provide assistance to a warning system. The elapsed time between the event and its actual location might be sufficiently short to permit identification of possible areas of tsunami damage in time to evacuate the population. I should repeat, however, that so far this is all speculation, and that we are looking forward anxiously to the data from this new device to tell us just what its capabilities are.

Incidentally, ARPA supports some research work at the University of Alaska, and the professor of seismology there is, I believe, well aware of the LASA project.

The construction and installation of this large array is expected to be completed in June 1965. Estimates of its performance are expected by the fall of this year, and evaluation using all data channels will be completed (we hope) by January 1966.

Sincerely,

R. L. SPROULL,
Director.

FOR THE FISHERMEN

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I was extremely pleased to learn that on Monday, January 25, the Department of the Interior conducted the first hearing on an application for a subsidy under Public Law 88–498, the "U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act." This act, passed by the last Congress, will be of great value in the vital, much needed revitalization of our fishing fleet.

This act was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the committee responsible for the bill's passage, and cosponsored by myself. The late Senator from the State of California, Mr. Engle, and the distinguished Senators from the State of Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. SALTONSTALL] were also cosponsors. In fact, it is interesting to note that the first applicant for a subsidy is from the great fishing State of Massachusetts.

The first vessel to be constructed under this act will be owned by the Pat San-Marie, Inc., of New Bedford. The vessel will be steel hulled and approximately 30 feet longer than the present average boat length in the New Bedford fleet. Her range will be 2,800 miles, or more than twice that of existent boats in this fleet, and her newly developed gear will include larger winches, specially designed gallows frames, enclosed

work spaces, and can readily be converted from the scallop fishery into the groundfish fishery. In addition, the vessel is designed with a stern ramp for easier handling of the trawling gear—an innovation that both the Russians and the Japanese have used to advantage for many years.

This vessel construction program was designed for the fishermen. The Congress has insisted that redtape be kept to a minimum. The preliminary application, used by the Secretary of the Interior to determine eligibility is not complicated. A qualified settlement broker can assist the vessel owner in its preparation, for the cost of perhaps $15. The preliminary plans for the vessel are usually drawn up without cost by a naval architect, and the total cost of the final specifications are included in the subsidy payment. The easy procedure should eliminate the necessity of protracted legal sessions, and should serve to increase the interest of the fishermen themselves in the improvement of fleet and fishing conditions.

As established by the Secretary of the Interior, an applicant for this subsidy must meet several requirements: The vessel itself must be suitable for use in the fishery for which it is designed; suitable for use by the United States for national defense; and suitable for the upgrading of the U.S. fishing fleet.

In addition, the vessel must be of advance design, which will enable it to operate in expanded areas; be equipped with newly developed gear, defined as the most modern gear available at the time of construction; and must not operate in a fishery where the operation would cause economic hardship to efficient vessel operators presently in that fishery. It is for this last reason that a hearing is to be scheduled prior to the granting of a subsidy to insure that no unfair advantage is created. As far as the applicant is concerned, he must possess the ability, experience, and resources necessary to maintain and operate the proposed vessel in an efficient manner. Further, the applicant is restricted to employing only citizens of the United States or aliens legally living here.

This act provides for a fishing vessel construction differential subsidy which amends the act of June 12, 1960—Public Law 86-516. The act increases the maximum percent of subsidy from 33⅓ to 50, increases the maximum amount of annual Federal funds available from $2½ to $10 million, and extends the program to June 30, 1972, as well as providing certain technical amendments.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to pay the difference between the cost of construction in domestic and foreign shipyards provided that this difference is less than 50 percent of the vessel's initial cost. The determination of the foreign cost is to be made by the Maritime Administrator.

We are all aware that in the shipyards of certain foreign nations, the cost of building fishing vessels is 40 to 50 percent lower than in American yards, yet our laws prevent American fishermen from purchasing these cheaper vessels for use in domestic fisheries. Not only must our fishermen purchase more expensive vessels, they must also compete on the market with imports of fishery products produced at much lower cost. The Fishing Fleet Improvement Act will at least remove the inequity caused by the high cost of American-made boats.

I applaud the wisdom of the 88th Congress in passing this act, and I look to the future for further development of the Nation's fisheries.

THE 119TH ANNIVERSARY OF CITY OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on this day, February 1, 1965, Milwaukee, Wis., officially celebrates her 119th anniversary as a city. It is one of the most significant birthdays in the long and splendid history of that community, for today Milwaukee becomes the first major American city to adopt a community renewal plan, perhaps the boldest new approach toward achieving planned, long-range development of cities through establishing a lasting partnership between local and Federal Government.

Milwaukee Mayor Henry W. Maier signs into law today a document which may very well set a pattern for future development of American cities. This plan provides for a comprehensive, long-range, fiscally sound method of preventing both residential and nonresidential blight; of redeveloping areas in which conservation is not feasible; of revitalizing Milwaukee's economically important downtown; of efficiently and effectively utilizing all Milwaukee's community resources and of increasing the city's tax base while improving the overall physical quality of the community.

I have known Mayor Maier for many years. He was a colleague of mine in State government when I was Governor of Wisconsin. He has long been recognized as a keen student of urban affairs—both in Milwaukee and nationally, as his election as president of the National League of Cities will attest to.

He took office as mayor in 1960 with a concept for the total development of his community which has become known as the Milwaukee idea.

This concept called for a comprehensive program for dealing with urban problems in the three interrelated areas of physical blight, economic obsolescence and human waste.

In the 5 years since he took office, Mayor Maier has done much to make the Milwaukee idea into an ideal. He established a pioneer economic development unit in his office which has made great advances in strengthening the business and industrial climate in his community. He established a social development commission which has made Milwaukee a leader in implementing the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

And today his city takes a giant stride in making the Milwaukee idea a precedent for development for other cities to follow—today he completes the cycle by officially adopting for his city the blueprint for long-range development which is the community renewal program.

On this occasion, Mr. President, I wish to commend Milwaukee for the progress she has made in providing a mechanism for solving the pressing problems of growth and change which beset that city, in common with other great cities of the Nation.

Mayor Maier has expressed his views on a strategy of total development for his city in an article. In view of the progress evidenced by Milwaukee today, I believe that excerpts from this article are very significant today and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

MAYOR'S PLAN FOR CITY PROGRESS

(The need for overall, step by step development of Milwaukee on a broad physical, economic, and social basis is stated by Mayor Henry Maier in the following article which he wrote for the Milwaukee Journal.)

Milwaukee's renaissance is well underway, but to bring it into full bloom Milwaukee must support an all-out plan of progress and improvement—a strategy of total development.

WHAT ABOUT FUTURE?

Now, while the spirit of renaissance is on the rise in the city, is a good time to think in terms of the design of the broad programs (in contrast with a specific project) that will not only serve the present generation but also present the pattern for a dynamic city in generations to come. What is the need for broad programs?

Why not let things go on as they have in the past? We have an enviable reputation for good housekeeping in government; we have streets so clean by contrast with other large cities that visitors commend us; we have a citizenry noted for its integrity. People say that this is a fine community in which to bring up children.

So why rock the boat when the passengers and the crew feel that the good ship Milwaukee is pursuing a steady course?

The best place to look for the answer is on the ship's bridge. Here signals have been arriving that other large urban ships of similar age are not in good shape. There is frantic activity on them because they are in more trouble than Milwaukee.

COMPLEX ORGANISM

Warning signals from our own ship indicate that some of the machinery is not functioning as well as it could, that some parts are in need of replacement, that some of the crew are not getting along as well as they might, that some of the navigators disagree about the course that has been plotted.

Now if Milwaukee were as simply organized as a real ship we could take her into port and get her overhauled. Instead, we are speaking of a complex organism—metropolitan Milwaukee.

Some see a big city as an organization for service to produce roads, sewers, street lights, snow removal, refuse disposal and the like.

Some who have fled it see it as a place of drabness and noise, but as a place of income. But some see it as home, and one they like in its variety.

ETHNIC ORIGINS DIFFER

It is a galaxy of people of different ethnic origins, and organizations—churches, labor unions, businesses, schools, welfare societies, manufacturing companies and others.

And when you are in the middle of all this it is somewhat like being in the middle of the forest: Unless you climb the tallest tree you can't take a look at the whole of it. Even then you need a powerful set of binoculars to see the necessary detail and a microscope to see invisible forces at work.

For invisible to the naked public eye is a disease in the public body that causes lassitude, immobility and inability to focus attention. Unless this disease is conquered, decay will set in, and every organ of the metropolitan area will be affected. Fortunately, unlike many other central cities, Milwaukee has experienced only the first symptoms.

NEED PRIORITIES

The enlightened planner says that the remedy is a vague thing called "comprehensive planning." And the political scientist talks about forms of government. A disgusted citizen says, "Those guys at city hall ought to get together."

Each of these answers may be involved in the cure, but none recognizes the real cause of the ailment.

The truth is this: This illness that could destroy the central city is caused by deficiencies in the system of making decisions. The system has failed in solving the main problem—the problem of establishing priorities for coordinated action on the broad economic, social and physical fronts.

The question comes right down to this: What should we do to add to the sureness of our decisions, to bring about the understanding that eliminates delay, and to condition our citizens and our decisionmakers to rational processes in government?

EMPHASIZES POINTS

My answer to this is that our strategy for development must emphasize:

A step-by-step approach to change that will reduce fear of change.

A formal process that will identify problems, assemble facts concerning them, differentiate between facts and assumptions in planning, formulate alternatives and calculate consequences.

Coordination of individual and group efforts.

Our strategy must make the foes of progress contend with logic. It must provide a better basis for resolving conflict. It must confront special interest groups with surer public policy in terms of priorities that serve broad public purposes.

Milwaukee's development program is made necessary by changes that inevitably overtake a city. Neighborhoods seemingly change overnight; or perhaps it is simply that people wake up one morning and suddenly become conscious of the accumulated change. Old industries become obsolete, the city must compete for new industries to replace them. Traffic is no longer a problem of a single street but of complicated patterns of urban highways with the attendant problems of city parking.

PROBLEMS OF GROWTH

And a development program for Milwaukee must consider the problems of growth as well as change. Few other older cities have Milwaukee's growth potential. Large acreages remain that can be developed on an orderly basis if our strategy for development includes a land bank reserved for future economic development, the proper development of our industrially zoned vacant land and the future use of the redevelopment tool for land clearance.

With the challenges of both change and growth before it, Milwaukee faces its decisions on development problems. How shall we proceed?

First, decisions in government move from level to level, or from branch to branch. To be accepted they must be understood, and they must not stimulate too large a fear of change. As the decisions move they must embrace acceptable steps resembling evolution. Revolutionary proposals simply cause explosions without results. This may be a sad revelation to the impatient, but it is a basic truth. So a step-by-step approach to change must be used.

LAID GROUNDWORK

An example of this process was seen in the creation of the department of city development, the first major reorganization in city government in decades. It was on the face of it accomplished in record time. But much consent was negotiated before it was finally a legal entity. And when the idea for the department was presented to the common council, it was not an all encompassing reorganization that called for the abolishment and the recreation of all existing apparatus in the field. It was presented as the longest acceptable step that could be taken without stimulating so much opposition that it would have been delayed interminably or killed. It laid the groundwork for the next steps.

Second, decisionmaking involves a choice in terms of how we use our resources. Today in our complex urban society when the choices are complex the old process of choice by intuition will not serve. A formalized process is needed. Problem areas must be identified, facts assembled, assumptions and facts disengaged (an amazingly difficult feat for some people whose credentials would indicate that they could do this with ease), assumptions laid out, alternatives selected and consequences calculated. This process enables the decision to stand well in the face of attack. It considers the fact that we must base our policy decisions on careful analysis.

ANSWER DIFFERS

What organization can best coordinate the many individual and group efforts, gather the facts, set the goals and priorities, and supply the creative inventiveness that is necessary for future decision? The answer differs according to whether the problem is physical, economic, or social in nature.

The department of city development was organized to attack our city's physical problems as a first step in the strategy. Organizing the division of economic development in the mayor's office is the first organizational attack on our economic problems. The newly organized commission for social development, recognizing that an organization including various governmental and private agencies is needed here, is a first step to attack our social problems on a broad front.

Let us take the community renewal program as a sphere of decisionmaking within the organizational framework of the department of city development. This is a gigantic effort to lay down the strategy for the future physical improvement, renewal, and development of Milwaukee's physical plant—yet no program is more misunderstood or less understood. Above all, it is an effort to lay down priorities for action in terms of a realistic total perspective. It is the basis for the step-by-step decisions of the future. It is planning for a program of action—action based upon calculated decisions, based upon alternative use of resources and the practicalities of development within our resources.

MUST DEVELOP APPROACH

The commission for social development must develop an approach that enables it to set priorities in terms of developing our human resources.

It may be that the areas laid down by the community renewal program will be used by the commission for social development to construct social profiles for the areas including such things as unemployment rates, spending habits, public assistance statistics, crime incidence, and so on.

Thus, the community renewal program may well provide the bridge between programs of physical and social development. Simultaneously, a pattern of economic development will be nearing completion. Thus, a pattern of total development begins to emerge that automatically begins to integrate itself.

The division of economic development has the job of formulating specific programs and recommending municipal policies which will advance Milwaukee toward the overall goal of economic development.

To succeed, the division must look to the universities which in cooperation with civic and labor groups must produce an economic base analysis which will show the strengths and weaknesses of our local economy, reveal the interrelationships of our basic industries so that future programs can be aimed at those industries which have a potential in our city, provide a basis for a realistic decision for city capital investment designed to strengthen our economic base and give us a general insight into where our economy is likely to go.

NEED FINANCIAL PLAN

Still another decision must be made after the previous operations—economic, social, and physical—are fully planned and programed. This pertains to a long-term financial plan.

There must be injected into the decisionmaking processes an increasing awareness of the effect of the State and Federal Government upon the financial resources of the local government. Our local resources are seriously affected by the manner in which the State government taxes and distributes these taxes.

These organizations and programs—physical, economic, social, and financial—will involve the total community: Public bodies, private agencies, universities, social agencies, all citizens.

This plan for progress, this Milwaukee idea, will be criticized at first for moving slowly. In reality, it is the only shortcut to total development.

By using this plan for progress, Milwaukee will have in readiness the means to meet the challenges of the future.

FRANK HEWLETT—REPORTER

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, almost every day for the last 14 years my staff and I have heard the Salt Lake Tribune's Frank Hewlett ask "Got any news for me today?"

Of course, Washington, serving as ex-officio capital of the world, has thousands of newspaper reporters listed in its directories. However, few have the background and the experiences of Frank Hewlett, who has covered everything from World War II in the Pacific to the smallest of reclamation projects in the West.

Sandor S. Klein, editor of the Boise Statesman, has written an excellent column on Mr. Hewlett, and has related some of those war experiences. Because of his modesty, few in the Capital know of them. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this well-earned tribute be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Boise (Idaho) Statesman, Jan. 17, 1965]

REPORTER'S NOTEBOOK

(By Sandor S. Klein)

One of my good friends in Washington is a reporter named Frank Hewlett. He is correspondent for several western newspapers. If you see a blur and flying coattails, you can pretty well bet it's Hewlett because he's always in a hurry.

Under ordinary circumstances, Hewlett is a pretty gentle fellow. But he can scrap, if he must, to get the news.

He was a correspondent for the United Press International in Manila when the Japanese attacked in World War II. With the Japanese threatening to cut off Manila, Hewlett said his farewells to his wife and in a borrowed car raced to beat the Japanese to the last road open to the Bataan Peninsula. He just made it, too, the last American correspondent out of Manila.

During the next 3½ months he lived with the heroic last-ditch defenders on Bataan and Corregidor. Joe Alex Morris, who was United Press foreign editor at the time, later recounted Hewlett's experiences in a book about the UP called "Deadline Every Minute."

During his stay with the isolated troops, Hewlett filed stories day after day about the heroic but doomed Americans. But he complained to his colleagues that he was getting no guidance from the UP's New York headquarters on coverage. The fact was that none of New York's messages had got through to him but one. It was a message from the accounting department asking:

"What shall we do with your paycheck?"

This irked Hewlett no end and he finally sent this reply, intended to be sarcastic:

"Hell, why don't you buy Liberty Bonds?"

As the end approached at Corregidor, Hewlett learned that a badly damaged trainer plane was being patched up. Under orders from the military command, Hewlett was ordered to leave on the plane and to carry out a sackful of Army intelligence records. The plane managed to escape Japanese gunfire on the takeoff but when it landed on the Philippine Island of Panay it collapsed gently after touching down. It looked for a while as though he might be trapped there but fortunately an American bombing plane from Mindanao was forced to make a refueling stop at Panay and Hewlett hitched a ride south. There he got another ride to Australia.

Hewlett remained with Gen. Douglas MacArthur's forces for the 3 years or so it took him to fight his way back into Manila. So, when on February 4, 1945, Hewlett heard that the 1st Cavalary was about to enter the city with a rescue column of 16 tanks and jeeps and trucks, he joined it. He had a personal reason. His wife, whom he thought at first would have diplomatic immunity because she was employed by the American High Commissioner to the Philippines, was in the notorious Santo Tomas internment camp in Manila.

As a tank broke through the prison fence, Hewlett's jeep was right behind it. A Japanese soldier fired at him from close range but fortunately missed. While fighting continued around the camp, Hewlett and several others made their way into the old auditorium.

Hewlett had a chance to greet Robert Crabb, one of his UP colleagues who had been interned by the Japanese, and Mrs. Franz Weissblatt, wife of another UP correspondent who had been captured on Bataan. But Hewlett could not find his wife. Desperately he searched out someone he had previously known in Manila and he was told to try the hospital building.

When there was a lull in the firing, Hewlett streaked across to the hospital. He started up a dimly lit stairway. He noticed a thin figure of a girl, who apparently weighed no more than 80 pounds, trying to make her way down the stairs. Hewlett stared. Then he took the remaining stairs in a few strides and his arms enfolded her. Hewlett and his wife, Virginia, were reunited again after 3 years.

I saw them when they returned to the United States. It was at the San Francisco organizational meeting of the United Nations. Mrs. Hewlett, though she had received medical attention and rest at a military hospital, was still thin. But her face was aglow. So was Hewlett's.

And I couldn't help but think of the line by Milton:

"They also serve who stand and wait."

GOLD OUTFLOW SHOWS LACK OF JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION DISCIPLINE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, because of the emotional impact that our gold reserve can have, I hope that those who testify, beginning tomorrow, at the hearing by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will avoid intemperate statements of panic and crisis. Already we have heard more emotional remarks and impassioned speeches than were necessary. Although such speeches make good headline material for newspapers, they do not assist with the problem at hand.

NO CRISIS

We must let it be known to all that we are not legislating on the gold reserve in an atmosphere of crisis. There is no reason for alarm. We do not need to be unduly concerned about what has been referred to as the international money ring. We do not need to spread distrust of our currency by announcing that it can not now be redeemed. That has been the case for the last 30 years. We do not need to frighten individuals with threats of poverty and unemployment as results of Federal Reserve action. We do not need to antagonize foreign countries whose cooperation is necessary if our present international monetary stability is to be maintained.

We do need, and we welcome, responsible statements of fact and philosophy; and I hope that all who testify on the bill will limit themselves to statements of that type.

ADMINISTRATION BILL NEEDED

The administration's request for action on the gold reserve currently being held behind our Federal Reserve notes and deposit liabilities is a timely one. A brief review of our monetary statistics over the postwar period gives a clear picture of the present situation and its causes. In 1949, our monetary stock of gold reached a high of nearly $25 billion. Since that time, our gold supply has decreased continually, with the exception of 3 years, 1952, 1956, and 1957. The outflow in the 15-year period has been about $10 billion. Now we have a total of just over $15 billion.

The gold outflow has not been entirely undesirable. During the years after the war, our European neighbors had a dollar shortage; and since they desperately needed assistance in rebuilding their economies from the rubble of the war, our deficit balance and resulting outflow of gold served a useful purpose. The international monetary system of the free world was strengthened; the European nations and Japan were assisted in the task of rebuilding. The shortage of dollars, however, was gradually overcome; and since 1958, according to the Joint Economic Committee, our deficit in the balance of payments has been a problem.

TRADE BALANCE IN OUR FAVOR

Interestingly, this problem has not been the result of importing more than we export in goods and services. The United States has exported more goods and services than it has imported, each year. The problem, interestingly, has arisen from our overwillingness to bear the burdens of the world. Earnings from the export surplus and other credit items have not been large enough to offset our defense expenditures, our economic assistance, and our capital investments in foreign countries.

As our payments continued to exceed our receipts, dollar balances began to build up in foreign countries. A new term, "Eurodollars" was coined, because of the importance of the U.S. dollars as a reserve currency and as a medium of exchange in Europe. These dollars represented a significant proportion of the total reserves of most of the free countries of the world.

Many countries have been, and apparently still are, content to have their reserves in U.S. dollars, because our dollars have been convertible at any time for gold, at a price of $35 an ounce. So long as this commitment exists and so long as there is no fear that it will not continue in the future, U.S. dollars literally are as "good as gold." In addition, dollar balances provide income to the holder, through interest payments, rather than being sterile, as gold might be.

PLEDGE STABLE PRICE OF GOLD

The United States has made plain the assurance that it is committed to holding the price of gold at $35 an ounce, and that dollars will be exchanged for gold at that price, if requested by foreign central bankers. We must stand by that commitment for the present and for the foreseeable future. If, for any reason, foreign monetary authorities thought the dollar was about to be devalued in terms of gold, of course they would seek to exchange dollars for gold before the devaluation. This we cannot afford; and thus it is imperative that we have sufficient gold to meet the requests made.

It is my opinion that recent conversions of dollars for gold have perhaps been overemphasized. It has been claimed that the $150 million purchase by France during January may be part of an effort to embarrass the United States. It could also be an effort to exert the national image of that country, and to break free somewhat from the influence of dollars as a large part of that nation's reserve, and thus to increase the prestige of France's own money. It should be remembered, however, that during 1964, French conversions of dollars to gold amounted to about $100 million a quarter. Therefore, the recent conversion need not be the basis for rash action or the foundation for unwarranted rumor. Rather, it should be considered as part of a continuing effort to maintain a certain proportion of the French monetary reserves in gold.

Spain, too, has quietly been converting its dollars into gold. A reported $40 million exchange was carried out in December; and a similar amount may have been exchanged during the past month. Further conversions may be expected until Spain's gold stocks are up to 50

to 75 percent of her total foreign exchange reserves, which are relatively small.

Whatever the reason for these conversions, they do cause an outflow of gold. It is presently estimated that the gold outflow in 1965 will be between $500 million and $1 billion. Some are predicting an even greater outflow.

ECONOMY EXPANSION

In addition to the gold outflow as a demand for our gold, our currency will, with a normal expansion, require additional backing. It is likely that an expansion of Federal Reserve notes and deposit liabilities would, in the absence of any such legislation, require an additional $400 to $500 million in gold.

The proposed new subscription to the International Monetary Fund will require about another $351 million.

Combining these, we come up with a possible total of about $1.75 billion in gold needed during 1965.

Latest Treasury statistics indicate that we have about $1.5 billion in what might be called free gold. This is gold that we possess above the 25-percent legal requirement behind Federal Reserve notes and deposit liabilities. Theoretically, this means that we only have $1.5 billion with which to meet foreign and domestic demands; and the unsophisticated could construe this to mean that our ability to redeem dollars for gold is limited to that amount. Foreign central bankers, however, are not unsophisticated; and they realize that the Federal Reserve Act makes provisions for emergencies, in a section giving the Federal Reserve authorities the power to suspend the 25-percent requirement for temporary—though possibly indefinite—periods, if necessary. They also are aware that in order to maintain the standing of the U.S. dollar, we must be committed to dollar conversion to the last ounce of gold.

GOLD BACKING FOR CURRENCY REMAINS

I mention this provision allowing conversion without any congressional or presidential action only to illustrate that we are not considering the removal of the gold backing from our currency out of necessity or weakness. Nations are not clamoring for our gold reserves. Our commitments could be met without any legislative action. It is desirable, however, that we do take legislative action to assure all who might be concerned that we do intend to keep the dollar strong.

Several proposals have been introduced. Many more, based on minor technical differences, could also be introduced. However, the three major alternatives are:

First. To eliminate all gold backing from both our Federal Reserve notes and our deposit liabilities. This proposal would completely eliminate any tie of our domestic currency to gold.

Second. To eliminate all the backing from the deposit liabilities of Federal Reserve banks, but to continue full 25-percent backing of Federal Reserve notes in circulation.

Third. To decrease the percentage of gold backing behind both Federal Reserve notes and our deposit liabilities from the present 25 percent to a lower percentage.

My research and analysis indicate that the second of these proposals is to be preferred. It would make available about $5 billion in gold with which to meet demands by foreign banks and to back the expected normal increase in our Federal Reserve notes as our economy expands. The Treasury proposal meets the need equally as well as do the other proposals, and at the same time it should cause the least concern which could develop into a crisis situation.

It has been suggested by some that the gold backing of our currency does not perform any useful function. This point of view is based on the claim that we have a managed money supply, that it is not limited by the gold; and that U.S. citizens cannot exchange U.S. currency for gold, and therefore it is useless to keep the backing.

It is true that we have a managed currency. The gold backing does not determine the quantity of money in circulation, nor does it act as a first line defense against inflation.

INDEPENDENT FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

The responsibility and authority to maintain a stable currency and an appropriate money supply have been delegated by Congress to the Federal Reserve System. Congress has taken this action because money management requires daily action and analysis which Congress is not in a position to perform. The Federal Reserve is an independent agency of the Federal Government, and, as such, is completely responsible to Congress. The independence of the system does not mean that it is not responsive to the overall goals and policy of the administration. It does mean that the action of the Board is not directly dictated by the administration, and thus it is one step removed from political pressure. The fact that the Federal Reserve is independent is the genius of the whole system. It precludes administrative politically inspired tinkering. Election-time politics has little to do with monetary action, and thus confidence can be placed in responsible monetary authorities. It may be true that there have been some errors in judgment that appear through hindsight; but there is every reason to trust the action of the Reserve Board so long as it remains independent of the administrative branch of the Federal Government.

It is interesting to realize that the chief sponsors of legislation to completely repeal the gold-cover requirement and thus release the money supply from any tie with gold are, for the most part, the same individuals who have attempted to destroy confidence in the independent Federal Reserve System. They are the same individuals who desire that Board members be, in effect, completely subject to political pressure. What a transfer of power that would provide for the Federal Government.

As a matter of fact, it is not desirable to end the independence of the Federal Reserve System. Neither is there a need at this time to completely remove all gold from our domestic system. Contrary to some allegations, the gold reserve does perform necessary and important functions. These hearings are a good example of one such valuable function. The fact that arbitrary gold-backing levels have been set has made it necessary to propose the action now being considered. This brings clearly to the attention of Congress and the American people the fact that we are losing gold, and that this is a result of our monetary and fiscal policies which can be altered to overcome the continual outflow. If this were the only value in the backing, I would consider it to be justifiable. Second, whether based on valid monetary theory or not, some individuals feel more confidence in our monetary system if it is backed by, or in some way is tied to, something with intrinsic value.

Many would like to go back to a full gold standard and make it possible to convert our currency into gold. Certainly that is not feasible with the present world supply of gold; and, thus, it cannot be considered a possible alternative. It is possible, however, to have some gold backing; and though our currency is not convertible by United States citizens, nor has it been since 1933, the gold backing does lend some confidence. Furthermore, a legal requirement that there be a gold reserve does provide ultimate limits on the inflationary potential in our currency.

The Treasury proposal will make it necessary again to bring this matter before the public in a few short years, if during the interim the basic causes of our gold outflow have not been solved.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION FAILS

Although I concur in the request of the Treasury, I wish it to be clear that I cannot concur in the monetary and fiscal policies that have made this action necessary.

During the last 4 years, the administration has developed several measures postponing the inevitable necessity of balancing international spending and income receipts. These measures have in some respects been ingenius and not altogether undesirable; but they have only been delaying tactics, and have not removed the source of the imbalance. Regardless of the hopes expressed by administration authorities and the assurances given that the imbalance would exist for only a few months, the months have turned into years, and it appears that during the fourth quarter of last year the deficit may have been at the astronomical rate of about $5 billion a year.

TEMPORARY EXPEDIENT

It should be stressed that the action now contemplated is also only a temporary expedient. The administration proposal will make about $5 billion in gold available to meet foreign and domestic demands without affecting the discipline of balancing our international expenses and receipts. This does not require that our fiscal policies be changed in order to avert additional deficit spending. It does nothing to change the inflationary forces present in our economy, which, if they break through the surface, could make our goods and services less competitive in a world market, and thus could increase our deficit balance.

This measure will only buy time during which the administration may, if it is willing to do so, take action which will strike at the real problems.

FISCAL AND MONETARY DISCIPLINE NEEDED

There is no doubt in my mind that there is a direct connection between fiscal and monetary discipline and the gold drain. There is no doubt that it is the result of overspending in the public sector, rather than the inability of the private sector to perform its responsibilities. On this basis, I think it is not a good long-range policy, as a possible solution, to penalize the private sector with direct controls on its activity.

I will support a measure to make gold available, because I feel that it is desirable that we not tie the hands of the administration. We must give it another chance to prove its dedication to fiscal responsibility both at home and abroad, despite the failures of the past. I shall do this only in the hope that appropriate action will be supported. We must do something positive; but we cannot afford to stifle the private sector, which even now is not only providing through taxes, much of the money for public spending, but also is providing in our international balance of trade a surplus to help in offsetting much of the Federal spending.

PLAN OF ACTION

The following is a list of positive steps that could be taken:

First. Exports should be encouraged, through Federal policies.

Second. Reduction of both tariff and nontariff barriers to the sale of U.S. goods should be encouraged.

Third. If other nations do not reduce their restrictions, it may be necessary to impose balancing or equalizing restrictions or quotas on imports.

Fourth. Wage increases must remain within the increase in productivity.

Fifth. Profit potential in the United States must be made equally as attractive as it is in other countries, so that capital will remain in this country.

Sixth. Other countries, particularly those that are developed and now showing a surplus in their international accounts must accept a greater part of the free world defense burden.

Seventh. Measures should be taken to encourage foreign investment in U.S. securities.

Eighth. Foreign-aid programs need overhaul and reduction.

Ninth. The price level of American goods and services must remain constant, so as to retain or increase the competitiveness of American products in the world markets.

Tenth. Tourist travel in the United States, by both U.S. citizens and foreigners, should be encouraged.

Only with appropriate action in these areas will our gold outflow problem be solved; and only if the administration takes that action will it be able to avoid the necessity of coming to Congress and the American people again, in a relatively short time, to admit its failure to manage our international business with prudence, by asking for final elimination of all gold behind our currency.

THE EISENHOWER TRIBUTE TO WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, most of us, I am sure, were impressed by the inspiring remarks of General Eisenhower in tribute to Winston Churchill, made over the facilities of the British Broadcasting Co. during the dramatic ceremonies the past weekend. I ask unanimous consent that his historic statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE TEXT OF EISENHOWER'S TRIBUTE ON TV

Upon the mighty Thames, a great avenue of history, move at this moment to their final resting place the mortal remains of Sir Winston Churchill. He was a great maker of history, but his work done, the record closed, we can almost hear him, with the poet (Tennyson) say:

"Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me,
Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark.
And may there be no sadness of farewell
When I embark."

As I, like all other freemen, pause to pay a personal tribute to the giant who now passes from among us, I have no charter to speak for my countrymen—only for myself. But, if in memory, we journey back two decades to the time when America and Britain stood shoulder to shoulder in global conflict against tyranny, then I can presume—with propriety, I think—to act as spokesman for the millions of Americans who served with me and with their British comrades during those 3 years of war on this sector of the earth.

HE WAS BRITAIN

To those men Winston Church was Britain—he was the embodiment of British defiance to threat, her courage in adversity, her calmness in danger, her moderation in success. Among the allies his name was spoken with respect, admiration, and affection. Although they loved to chuckle at his foibles, they knew he was a stanch friend. They felt his inspirational leadership. They counted him a fighter in their ranks.

The loyalty that the fighting forces of many nations here serving gave to him during the war was no less strong, nor less freely given, than he had, in such full measure, from his own countrymen.

An American, I was one of those allies. During those dramatic months I was privileged to meet, to talk, to plan, and to work with him for common goals.

Out of that association an abiding—and to me precious—friendship was forged; it withstood the trials and friction inescapable among men of strong convictions, living in the atmosphere of war.

FRIENDSHIP GREW

The war ended, our friendship flowered in the later and more subtle tests imposed by international politics. Then, each of us, holding high official posts in his own nation, strove together so to concert the strength of our two peoples that liberty might be preserved among men and the security of the free world wholly sustained.

Through a career during which personal victories alternated with defeats, glittering praise with bitter criticism, intense public activity with periods of semiretirement, Winston Churchill lived out his 4 score and 10 years.

With no thought of the length of the time he might be permitted on earth, he was concerned only with the quality of the service he could render to his nation and to humanity. Though he had no fear of death, he coveted always the opportunity to continue that service.

At this moment, as our hearts stand at attention, we say our affectionate, though sad, goodby to the leader to whom the entire body of freemen owes so much.

CHAMPION OF FREEDOM

In the coming years, many in countless words will strive to interpret the motives, describe the accomplishments and extoll the virtues of Winston Churchill—soldier, statesman, and citizen that two great countries were proud to claim as their own. Among all the things so written or spoken, there will ring out through all the centuries one incontestable refain:

He was a champion of freedom.

May God grant that we—and the generations who will remember him—heed the lessons he taught us; in his deeds; in his words; in his life.

May we carry on his work until no nation lies in captivity; no man is denied opportunity for fulfillment.

And now to you, Sir Winston—my old friend—farewell.

THE MUSIC MAN FROM NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I call attention to the 500th performance of Lawrence Welk and his "Champagne Music Show" on the ABC television network on Saturday, January 23, 1965.

The Lawrence Welk Band is the first in television history to be signed for a full-hour program on a week-to-week basis. Its leader, a native of North Dakota, once expressed his feelings by saying, "You have to always be happy and play what the people want." Because of this attitude, this band continues to provide one of our most wholesome and popular television programs.

Lawrence Welk was born on March 11, 1903, in the south central community of Strasburg, south of North Dakota's capital city of Bismarck. He was one of eight children born to the German family of Ludwig Welk.

As was the case with so many of the farm children of that day, young Lawrence had to leave school at an early age, to work in the fields. But although his other education may have stopped, Lawrence's father taught him to play the accordion; and by the time he was 13, he was invited to play at weddings and other community affairs, and sometimes took in as much as $150 when he passed the hat at these gatherings.

At the age of 17, Lawrence's father gave him a $400 accordion; and soon he was playing with several small bands in the area.

Although hampered by his lack of education, inability to read a note of music, and German accent, young Welk rose fast; and it was not long before he had his own six-piece band, known as the "Hotsy Totsy Boys."

He enlarged his band, and was soon playing in top ballrooms in several major eastern cities. When, at Pittsburgh's William Penn Hotel, in 1938, he received several fan letters calling his music "sparkly and bubbly," he began to call it "Champagne Music"; and that theme has stayed with him to this day.

The band's first engagement at the Aragon Ballroom, in Ocean Park, Calif.,

in 1946, marked the beginning of Welk's success on the west coast.

In 1951, the manager of the Aragon Ballroom offered the band a 4-week contract to perform over KTLA, a local Los Angeles station. The show was so popular that it stayed on; and 4 years later it was among the top 10 of all programs in southern California.

In 1955, the "Lawrence Welk Show" joined the ABC television network; and soon "Champagne Music," with its unique ability to make people just sit back and be happy, was flowing into the living rooms of millions of weekly viewers.

Mr. President, as one musical writer once said, there is indeed "a touch of America in this genial, wholesome maestro's lilting, danceable music."

His story is one cf dedication to the highest ideals of showmanship; and his popularity is ample proof that good taste and sound judgment are still part of the American community.

I salute this son of North Dakota, and ask unanimous consent that a character sketch of Mr. Welk, from Celebrity Register, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LAWRENCE WELK

The Welk vintage of "champagne" music has made him one of the richest maestros in the ballroom music business and one of the most popular. His gaiety and smiling friendliness have won over countless women, men, and children, who dig the smooth, simple sounds that bubble like froth out of the television set for 2 hours each week (an unprecedented time span for a musical program). Welk has said that his music may not be "sophisticated, or new, or clever, or smart." (Variety has called him a genius in schmaltz), but he wants it that way so that everyone can understand. "You have also to show a little friendliness, let's say it that way, and you do the things you know you can do." To promote this sense of contentment and well-being he pays his band members some of the highest salaries around and gives them pep talks when spirits are sagging.

Born into a farming family in North Dakota, March 11, 1903, young Lawrence restrained his musical ambitions until he was 21 because his family feared he would learn "worldly ways." But once out, he toured with his Lawrence Welk Novelty Orchestra which featured a Hawaiian guitar player as well as Lawrence himself on the accordion (the one he owns today cost $5,000). Later, he formed the Hotsy Totsy Orchestra and broadcast from his home State to farm audiences. About 1934, to sponsor a show, Welk promoted a Honolulu fruit chewing gum. Shipped in from San Francisco it was sold in his own wrappers until Wrigley wrote him that it wasn't such a good idea since both their names began with a "W." Lawrence dropped the chicle line but has had few troubles with sponsors since. Married in 1930 to a former nurse, Fern Renner (children: Shirley, Donna, Lawrence, Jr.), he lives quietly in California.

His high standing with Coral Records is due to his perennially big selling albums with such titles as "Bubble in Wine" and "Sparkling Strings." "Basically I'm a musician," he has said and has given strict orders to his producer and arranger to "watch the lyrics. When children are listening, I don't want to give them a smutty thought." For this wholesomeness Welk was voted in 1956 as the father of the year and as the man with the best musical show of the year by the National Ballroom Operators of America. His television shows, "Lawrence Welk's Top Tunes and New Talent" and "The Lawrence Welk Show," have prime time on ABC's television channel. Over his 25 years in show business, there has been little change in his musical formula: muted horns and strings pouring out simple arrangements with a light foot-tapping beat. Welk is content with that. "As long as I stay with my own audience," he once told his wife, "I'm a winner."

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the strong nationwide support for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore is well shown by the fact that 33 Senators now sponsor Senate bill 360, to establish the lakeshore, which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] introduced on January 8, and which the Senate passed last year.

The widespread support of the bill is also indicated by the favorable comment, in newspapers throughout the country, by editors and conservation writers and editors. The able conservation editor for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, Edward J. Meeman, recently wrote a very encouraging personal call for the rescue of the Dunes in the proposed National Lakeshore Park. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Meeman's editorial, as published in the Cincinnati Post and Times Star of January 23, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRESERVING INDIANA'S DUNES—PARK BILL SET FOR PASSAGE IN 1965

(By Edward J. Meeman)

The 88th Congress earned the name of "the conservation Congress" because of its achievements in the historic Wilderness Preservation Act, the land and water conservation fund, the Fire Island National Seashore, the Ozark National Rivers, and other measures.

It also left to its successor, the 89th Congress, a rich heritage of legislation in process.

High on this list is the bill to create the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore which has just been reintroduced by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman of the Interior Committee, and cosponsored by Senators VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana, and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois. DOUGLAS has championed the measure because the dunes lie just east of Chicago where live millions of his summer-sweltering constituents who like to escape to this stretch of Lake Michigan beach, overlooked by ancient heaps of wind-blown sand anchored by rare vegetation.

The bill is in the exact form in which it passed the Senate in the last session. It has been endorsed by President Johnson, as a similar bill had been endorsed by President Kennedy. It is backed by the national conservation organizations. It will pass if the industrial and real estate interests which oppose it recognize that this administration bill is the final compromise, that so many thousands of acres have already been eliminated from the project that future compromise is out of the question. It will, if conservationists recognize that this is the best that we can do.

The bill sets aside forever as a permanent possession of the American people about 11,300 acres of land. This includes the 2,182 acres of the existing Indiana Dunes State Park, which will remain separately managed. The State park will become part of the national lakeshore only when the State of Indiana is willing to give it up. The proposed national park has a shoreline of 10.8 miles.

More generous terms than are usually provided to existing residents of a natural area about to be taken over, are in this bill. Senator DOUGLAS states them as follows:

"Owners of an improved property, which is within the lakeshore boundaries, defined as a detached, one-family dwelling construction which was begun before October 21, 1963, may forever retain their home in ownership and use, together with land on which it is located, or they may lease it, sell it or will it to their heirs. They may also sell it to the Government under a lease agreement for a period up to 25 years."

Not long ago I walked this beautiful shore and looked up with awe at these irreplaceable dunes. May they always be there for future generations to enjoy. This is the hour to assure that destruction of these dunes shall be halted, and this invaluable treasure in the heart of the Nation shall be forever inviolate.

GENERAL LEMAY—"MR. AIR FORCE"

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, today one of America's foremost airmen and one of its foremost generals steps down. I speak, of course, of Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, who is retiring this afternoon.

General LeMay—who has been "Mr. Air Force" for so long—is perhaps the most feared American in the eyes of the Soviet Union and Red China.

He was asked to keep America safe through the cold war; and he did his job well.

Murray Moler, of the Ogden Standard Examiner, one of Utah's leading newspapers, has penned an excellent tribute to General LeMay which deserves wide distribution. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD this appropriate editorial comment, which was published in the Standard Examiner on January 24, 1965. The editorial is entitled "U.S. Air Force Won't Seem the Same After Gen. Curtis LeMay Retires."

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

U.S. AIR FORCE WON'T SEEM THE SAME AFTER GEN. CURTIS LEMAY RETIRES

February 1 is an historic date in the history of the U.S. Air Force.

On February 1, 1930, a 23-year-old Ohioan named Curtis Emerson LeMay received a commission in the Army Air Corps as a second lieutenant. He'd just received his wings at Kelly Field in Texas.

On February 1, 1965, this same Curtis LeMay—long a four-star general—retires from the Air Force which he has headed as Chief of Staff since July 1, 1961.

These 35 years span one of the most turbulent periods in the history of the world.

The growth of U.S. military aviation has been a major factor—in war and in peace—during these last two generations.

And "Curt" LeMay, to his thousands of admirers, has personified the Air Force—its development from a fledgling service to maturity as the top deterrent arm in the American arsenal.

Younger officers in the Air Force refer to General LeMay as simply "The Chief."

Veterans in the military aviation—and many of the correspondents who've also come

to know and admire this husky, cigar-chewing man—fondly call him "The Bomber."

He earned this nickname by his long fight for superiority of the American bombing force and his constant insistence, even as long-range missiles were introduced, that the manned aircraft retain a significant role.

The Air Force just won't seem the same without General LeMay up there on top.

His successor as Chief of Staff, Gen. John P. McConnell, is an able, experienced flier, commander, and administrator.

But General McConnell doesn't have the color, the flair, that General LeMay has. No one else in the Air Force does, for that matter.

Stories about General LeMay can—and have—fill a book.

We've known him since World War II days, when, after helping direct the B-17 raids on Germany, he came out to the Pacific Theater of Operations to direct the B-29 attacks on Japan.

When Japan surrendered, we were with the 20th Air Force commander when he surveyed the damage done by his fire bombers on the key cities of Japan.

It was a sober General LeMay who looked over the ruins and read the lists of the civilian casualties.

He wasn't a killer by nature and his sorrow at the suffering showed it.

But, as he expressed his feelings, it was obvious to accompanying newsmen that he believed that the heavy bombardments from the air had actually reduced casualties—both Japanese and American—because they forced the enemy to its knees without the blood bath of an actual invasion.

We saw General LeMay again during the Bikini atomic bomb tests of 1946. He was reflective then, too, as he calculated the changes that would be made in the world's fighting machines with perfection of nuclear weapons.

That's when he pushed construction of the six-engined B-36 superheavy bomber—a plane that could fly long distances and carry tremendous loads of atomic weapons. The B-36 never dropped a bomb in anger—but, with General LeMay directing its deployment, it played a major role in keeping the peace.

After organizing air operations for the Berlin air lift, General LeMay really came into his element when he was ordered to set up the Strategic Air Command, whose headquarters he placed in the heart of America near Omaha.

From "the cave," SAC's underground operations control center dug into the banks of the Missouri River, Curt LeMay ranged far and wide.

He helped select SAC's motto—"Peace Is Our Profession"—to show that the bomber forces were there to keep U.S. strength so mighty that no enemy dare attack us.

He was a "nut"—and we use this in a favorable sense—about security.

"The Bomber" instilled in his officers and men a constant fear that subversive elements would infiltrate a SAC base—or put a destructive grenade aboard key aircraft.

He made spot checks, day and night, on patrols assigned to guard parked aircraft.

He ordered that everything brought aboard a plane be closely checked.

In March 1956 we were aboard a SAC B-29 weather plane on a 19-hour flight from Eilsen Air Force Base, near Fairbanks, up over the North Pole country.

Well along on the course over the Arctic Sea, a major who was serving as aircraft commander reached under his seat for his lunch box.

As he opened the lid, his face blanched.

Instead of the expected ham sandwich, there was a red-painted beer can. On its side was inscribed "The Bomb."

It wasn't a bomb, of course. But it could have been.

When we returned to base, that major had some explaining to do to get off the hook for not following all security regulations that General LeMay had ordered.

He was also a "ham" radio operator. When at SAC headquarters he and his deputy commander, Lt. Gen. Francis V. (Butch) Griswold, also a radio hobbyist, worked out a system of communications second to none in the world.

They placed aboard B-52's, B-47's and KC-135 tankers gear called "single sideband" radio. Its clarity was tremendous. So was its range.

Its objective was to guarantee that all weapons-carrying aircraft, including those on "aerial alert," were in close touch with SAC headquarters at Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha. It was part of the "positive control" program to preclude "war by accident."

In the fall of 1957, General LeMay was at the controls of a KC-135 that flew nonstop, without refueling, for 6,322 miles in 13 hours and 2 minutes from Westover Air Force Base, Mass., to Buenos Aires, Argentina.

During the flight, we talked with the general as he was over the jungles of Brazil. We'd called from the UPI desk in Omaha over the single sideband system.

General LeMay's voice came back over the miles loud and clear. You could, despite the distance, feel his pride of accomplishment.

That was his long suit—pride. He had it all the way.

He was equally proud of the missiles, when they came into cervice. But he always insisted that it would take a flexible "mixed" force of manned planes and unmanned rockets to keep America safe.

And keep America safe is what Gen. Curtis LeMay, who retires early next week, has helped accomplish so well for so many years.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of S. 3, and as a member of the Senate committee which will be requested, over a period, to appropriate not to exceed $1,092,400,000 for implementation of its provisions, I have made a section-by-section analysis of the act as it passed the Senate earlier today. Feeling that such an analysis may be informative and useful, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MEMORANDUM IN EXPLANATION OF THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of the act is to assist the States in the Appalachian region in meeting their special problems, to promote their economic development, and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts toward attacking problems common to Appalachia. Public investments made under the act shall be concentrated in areas where there is a significant potential for future growth and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be the greatest. The States will be responsible for recommending local and State projects, within their borders, which will receive assistance under the act.

TITLE I—THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Membership and voting

Under section 101, an Appalachian Regional Commission is established. It shall be composed of one Federal member, referred to as the "Federal Cochairman," and one member from each participating State in the Appalachian region. Each State member may be the Governor, or his designee, or such other person as may be provided by the law of the State represented. The State members of the Commission shall elect a cochairman of the Commission from among their number.

Decisions by the Commission shall require the affirmative vote of the Federal Cochairman and of a majority of the State members. Each State member shall have an alternate, appointed by the Governor or as otherwise provided by his State's law. The alternate shall vote in the event of the absence, death, disability, or resignation of the primary representative. Each State member and his alternate shall be compensated by the State represented, but the Federal Cochairman shall be compensated by the Federal Government.

Functions of the Commission

Under Section 102, the Commission shall, among other things:

1. Develop comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs and establish priorities thereunder, giving due consideration to other Federal, State and local planning in the region.
2. Conduct and sponsor investigations, research, and studies, including an inventory and analysis, of the resources of Appalachia, and cooperate with Federal, State and local agencies in sponsoring demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth.
3. Review and, where appropriate to increase the effectiveness thereof, recommend modifications or additions to Federal, State and local public and private programs.
4. Work with State and local agencies in formulating and recommending, where appropriate, interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation, and in developing appropriate model legislation.
5. Encourage the formation of local development districts.
6. Encourage private investment in industrial, commercial and recreational projects.
7. Serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Appalachian programs.
8. Establish and utilize citizens advisory councils and conferences provide a forum for public consideration of problems and proposed solutions thereto of the region.
9. Advise the Secretary of Commerce on applications for grants for administrative expenses to local development districts.

Recommendations

Under section 103, the Commission may make recommendations to the President and to the State Governors and appropriate local officials regarding the expenditure of funds by Federal, State, and local agencies throughout Appalachia in the fields of natural resources, agriculture, education, training, health and welfare, and other fields related to the purposes of the act; the Commission may also make recommendations to the President and State Governors and appropriate local officials with respect to such additional Federal, State, and local legislation or administrative actions as the Commission deems necessary to further the purposes of the act.

Liaison between Federal Government and the Commission

Section 104 provides for the effective and continuing liaison between the Federal Government and the Commission, and a coordinated review within the Federal Government of the plans and recommendations submitted by the Commission pursuant to sections 102 and 103.

Administrative expenses of the Commission

Section 105(a) provides that the administrative expenses of the Commission shall be

paid by the Federal Government for the period ending on June 30 of the second full Federal fiscal year following the date of enactment of the act. Thereafter such expenses shall be paid equally by the Federal Government and the States in the region. No assistance may be furnished to any State delinquent in payment of its share of such expenses.

Section 105(b) authorizes not to exceed $2,200,000 to defray the administrative expenses of the Commission as provided in this section.

Administrative powers of the Commission

Section 106 provides the Commission with the standard powers of administration in order to conduct its business, fulfill its functions and achieve its objectives under the act. The Commission is authorized, among other things, to accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property, real, personal or mixed, tangible or intangible. The Commission is also authorized to enter into such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation. The Commission is also authorized to maintain a temporary office in the District of Columbia and establish a permanent office at such a central and appropriate location as it may select and field offices at such other places as it may deem appropriate.

Information

Section 107 authorizes the Commission, in order to obtain information needed to carry out its duties, to hold hearings, sit and act, at such times and places, take such testimony and receive such evidence as it may deem advisable. The Commission is also authorized to secure such pertinent information as may be available from appropriate Federal, State and local agencies.

Personal financial interests

Section 108 provides that no State member and no officer or employee of the Commission shall participate personally in any proceeding, application or other particular matter in which he, his spouse, minor child, partner, or organization in which he is serving as an officer, director, trustee, etc., has a financial interest except when such interest is fully disclosed and the Commission expressly determines that the provision may be waived. Violators are to be punished by fine and/or imprisonment, and the Commission is given discretion to void and rescind any contract or other transaction in relation to which the violation occurred.

TITLE II. SPECIAL APPALACHIAN PROGRAMS

Part A—New programs

Appalachian Development Highway System

Section 201(a) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to assist in the construction of an Appalachian development highway system to serve the Appalachian region. The system is not to exceed a total of 2,350 miles in length. Additionally, not to exceed 1,000 miles shall be local access roads that will serve specific recreational, residential, commercial, industrial or other like facilities or will facilitate a school consolidation program. The system, in conjunction with the Interstate System and other Federal-aid highways in the region, will open areas with development potential where commerce and communication have been inhibited by lack of adequate access. The provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to Federal-aid primary highways, shall also apply to the Appalachian development highway system and the local access roads, unless the Secretary of Commerce affirmatively waives such provisions as being inconsistent with this act.

These highways will not be constructed with the particular objective in mind of easing traffic congestion. Rather, they will be built as instruments of economic development. They will do so by opening up areas to development which have not heretofore been developed because of their remoteness and isolation. They will provide the means to insure that the industrial, recreational, and tourism potential is realized.

The funds for this program shall be provided from the general fund rather than from the highway trust fund.

Section 201(b) provides that the Appalachian Regional Commission shall submit to the Secretary of Commerce its recommendations with respect to (1) the general corridor location and termini of the development highways; (2) the designation of local access roads to be constructed; (3) priorities for construction of local access roads and of the major segments of the development highways; and (4) other criteria for the program authorized by this section. Before any State member of the Commission participates in or votes on such recommendations, he shall have obtained the recommendations of the State highway department of the State which he represents.

Section 201(c) gives the Secretary of Commerce authority to approve in whole or in part such recommendations or to require modifications or revisions thereof. The Secretary may not, however, approve any recommendation for construction which would require the expenditure of Federal funds (other than funds available under title 23 of the United States Code) in excess of the appropriation authorization in subsection 201(g). On its completion, each development highway not already on the Federal-aid primary system shall be added to that system and must be maintained by the State.

Section 201(d) allows the States to give special preference, in the construction of highways and roads authorized under this section, to the use of mineral resource materials indigenous to the Appalachian region.

Section 201(e) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, for the purposes of research and development in the use of coal and coal products in highway construction and maintenance, to require each participating State, to the maximum extent possible, to use coal derivatives in the construction of not to exceed 10 percent of the roads authorized under this act.

Section 201(f) provides that Federal assistance to any construction project under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the costs of such project, unless the Secretary of Commerce determines, pursuant to the recommendation of the Appalachian Regional Commission, that assistance in excess of 50 percent is required in furtherance of the purposes of this act. In no event, however, shall such Federal assistance exceed 70 percent of the costs of such project.

Section 201(g) authorizes an appropriation of $840 million to implement this section.

Demonstration Health Facilities

Section 202(a) authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for the construction, equipment, and operation of multicounty demonstration health facilities, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers, and other facilities necessary to health. Grants shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated under this act and shall not be taken into account in the computation of State allotments made pursuant to any other provision of law.

Construction grants shall be made in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Hill-Burton Act, as amended, and the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963.

Section 202(b) provides that no grant for construction (including initial equipment) shall exceed 80 percent of the cost of the project. Moreover, not to exceed $41 million of the funds authorized in section 401 shall be available for construction grants under this section.

Section 202(c) provides that grants under this section for operation, including equipment other than initial equipment, of a project may be made up to 100 percent of the costs thereof for the 2-year period beginning on the first day such project becomes operational as a health facility. For the next 3 years of operations such grants shall not exceed 50 percent of the operational costs. No operational grants shall be made after 5 years following the commencement of operations. Not to exceed $28 million of the funds authorized in section 401 shall be available for operating grants.

The committee report defines the operating cost as the cost of operation of such facilities after deduction of any contributions by States, local governments, private organizations or individuals, and after deducting appropriate charges made for services rendered to individuals at such facilities.

Operational grants shall be available only for those hospitals which are constructed under sections 202 (a) and (b). They will not be available to hospitals already in existence or to those that will be constructed under other public or private programs.

Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control

Section 203(a) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to provide for the control and prevention of erosion and to promote conservation and development of soil and water resources in Appalachia, to enter into agreements up to 10 years with landowners and operators providing for land stabilization, erosion, and sediment control; and reclamation through changes in land use, establishment of conservation measures and practices.

Section 203(b) requires the landowner or operator to furnish to the Secretary a conservation and development plan enumerating the land uses and conservation measures mutually agreed upon between the parties.

Section 203(c) requires that such plan be incorporated in an agreement under which the landowner or operator shall promise to implement the planned land uses and conservation measures.

Section 203(d) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, in return for such agreement by the landowner or operator, to furnish such financial and other assistance to the landowner or operator as appropriate and in the public interest for implementing the measures agreed upon. Such grants shall not exceed 80 percent of the cost of implementing the measures, and such cost sharing is limited to 50 acres occupied by such owner or operator.

Section 203(e) permits termination of the agreement by the Secretary if he determines that such termination would be in the public interest. Modification of agreements is also permitted under this section.

Section 203(f) permits the Secretary of Agriculture to provide in any such agreement for preservation, for a period not to exceed twice the duration of the period covered by the agreement, of the cropland, crop acreage and allotment history applicable to land covered by the agreement for the purpose of any Federal program under which such history is used as a basis for crop production allotments, etc.

Section 203(g) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue such rules and regulations as are necessary to implement this section.

Section 203(h) provides that the Secretary of Agriculture, in carrying out the provisions of this section, shall utilize the services of the Soil Conservation Service and State and local committees.

Section 203(i), for the implementation of this section, provides an expenditure of not to exceed $17 million of the funds authorized under Section 401.

Timber Development Organizations

Section 204(a). In order that small individual timber stands may, through good timber management, more fully benefit the Appalachian region, this subsection authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide technical assistance in the organization and operation, under State law, of private timber development organizations having as their objective the carrying out of timber development programs to improve timber productivity and quality, and increase returns to landowners through establishment of private, nonprofit corporations, which on a self-supporting basis may provide (i) continuity of management, good cutting practices and marketing services; (ii) physical consolidation of small holdings or administrative consolidation for efficient management under long-term agreement; (iii) management of forest lands donated to the timber development organizations for demonstrating good forest management, on a profitable and taxpaying basis; and (iv) establishment of a permanent fund for perpetuation of the work of the corporations, to be composed of donations, real or personal, for educational purposes.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide not more than one-half of the initial capital requirements of such timber development organizations through loans under the applicable provisions of the 1961 Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act, but such loans shall not be used for the construction or acquisition of facilities for manufacturing, processing, or marketing forest products, or for physical consolidation of small timber holdings authorized by this subsection.

Section 204(b) provides that not to exceed $5 million of the funds authorized in Section 401 shall be available to carry out this section.

Mining Area Restoration

Section 205(a)(1) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make financial contributions to States in Appalachia to seal and fill voids in abandoned coal mines. This, in effect, extends the scope of the act of July 15, 1955, regarding the sealing and filling of voids in abandoned coal mines, from the anthracite region of Pennsylvania to the entire Appalachian region.

The Secretary is also authorized to make financial contributions to States to reclaim and rehabilitate existing strip and surface mining areas.

Section 205(a)(2) authorizes the Secretary to plan and execute projects for extinguishing underground and outcrop mine fires in the region. The $500,000 limit on annual expenditures for control of fires as contained in the act of August 31, 1954, is removed insofar as fires in inactive coal mines in Appalachia are concerned.

Section 205(a)(3) authorizes the Secretary to expand and accelerate fish and wildlife restoration projects in the region under the provisions of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act of 1937 and the 1950 Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act.

Section 205(b) provides that for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 the Federal share of mining area restoration projects carried out under subsection (a) and conducted on lands not federally owned shall not exceed 75 percent of the total cost thereof.

Section 205(c) provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture and appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, and with the Appalachian Regional Commission, make a survey and study of strip and surface mining operations and their effects in the United States. The study will consider, among other things, the nature and extent of surface and strip mining operations and the conditions resulting therefrom; the effectiveness of State and local control over strip mining activity and requirements for appropriate State legislation to provide for proper reclamation and rehabilitation of strip and surface mined areas; the public benefits which may result from reclamation and appropriate development of strip and surface mined areas; the appropriate cost-sharing roles of Federal and State governments and private interests in, and the objectives and total overall costs of a program for, accomplishing the reclamation and rehabilitation of existing strip and surface mining areas in the United States. The Secretary of the Interior shall then submit to the President recommendations for a long-range comprehensive program for reclamation and rehabilitation of strip and surface mining areas in the United States. The President shall submit these recommendations, together with his own, to the Congress not later than July 1, 1967.

Section 205(d) provides that not to exceed $36.5 million of the funds authorized in section 401 shall be available to carry out this section.

No moneys may be expended for the purposes of reclaiming, improving, grading, seeding, or reforestation of strip mined areas, except on lands owned by Federal, State, or local governmental bodies, until authorized by law after completion of the study and report to the President as provided in subsection (c).

Water Resource Survey

Section 206(a) authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Army to prepare a comprehensive plan for developing and efficiently utilizing the water and related resources of the Appalachian region. Special attention shall be given to the need for an increase in the production of economic goods and services within the region as a means of expanding economic opportunities. The plan shall constitute an integral component of the regional economic development program authorized by this act.

Section 206(b) provides that the plan may recommend measures for the control of floods, the regulation of rivers to provide better water supply for industrial and municipal development, the generation of hydroelectric power, prevention of water pollution, development of the recreational potentials of the region, and such other measures as may be necessary to achieve the objectives of this section.

Section 206(c) provides that the Secretary of the Army, acting through the U.S. Army Engineers, shall consult with the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Power Commission, and the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare, to insure that the plan prepared shall constitute a harmonious component of the regional program.

Section 206(d) provides that the plan shall be submitted to the Appalachian Regional Commission, after which the Commission shall submit the plan to the President with a statement of its views. The President shall then submit the prepared plan to the Congress with his recommendations not later than December 31, 1968.

Section 206(e) authorizes the Secretary of the Army to enter into contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, etc., with any departments, agencies or instrumentalities of the United States or with any State, political subdivision, agency or instrumentality thereof or with any person, firm, association, or corporation in the preparation of the plan authorized by this section. Moreover, the Federal agencies referred to in subsection (c) are authorized to assist the Secretary of the Army in preparing the plan.

Section 206(f) provides that the plan shall be coordinated with all Federal comprehensive river basin plans heretofore or hereafter developed for river systems draining the Appalachian region.

Section 206(g) provides an expenditure of not to exceed $5 million of the funds authorized in section 401.

Part B. Supplementations and modifications of existing programs

Vocational Education Facilities

Section 211 (a) authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for construction of school facilities needed for vocational education in areas of Appalachia where such education is not now adequately available. The grants will be made in accordance with provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, but without regard to any provision therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings, or to State allotments.

Section 211 (b) provides for an expenditure not to exceed $16 million of funds authorized in section 401 for construction of such school facilities.

Sewage Treatment Works

Section 212 (a) authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for the construction of sewage treatment works in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, but without regard to appropriation authorization ceilings or allotments therein among the States of Appalachia.

Section 212 (b) provides an expenditure not to exceed $6 million of the funds authorized in section 401 for construction of such sewage treatment works.

Amendments to Housing Act of 1954

Section 213 makes the Appalachian Regional Commission an eligible agency to receive comprehensive planning grants under the Housing Act of 1954.

Supplements to Federal Grant-in-Aid Programs

Section 214(a) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, pursuant to specific recommendations of the Appalachian Regional Commission approved by him and after consultation with appropriate Federal officials, to allocate funds to the heads of Federal agencies responsible for the administration of existing Federal grant-in-aid programs. Such funds shall be used only for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to projects under such programs above the fixed maximum portion of the cost otherwise authorized by the applicable law. This will enable the States and local communities of the region to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs for which they are eligible but for which they have been unable heretofore to supply the required matching share.

Section 214(b) applies an 80 percent ceiling to the Federal share of the total cost of projects under subsection (a).

Section 214(c) defines the term "Federal Grant-in-Aid Programs" as used in this section. It has reference to Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by this act for the construction or equipment of facilities. It includes all other Federal grant-in-aid programs in existence on the effective date of this act for the acquisition of land and the construction or equipment of facilities including, but not limited to, programs authorized by the Library Services Act, the Federal Airport Act, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The term shall not include, however, any program related to highway or road construction, nor would it include any program except a grant-in-aid

program. Federal loan programs are to be excluded.

Section 214(d) provides, for implementation of this section, an expenditure of $90 million of the funds authorized in section 401.

Part C—General provisions

Maintenance of Effort

Section 221 provides that no State or political subdivision thereof shall be eligible to receive benefits under this act unless the aggregate expenditures of State funds for the benefit of the area affected, exclusive of Federal funds—and not including a State's expenditure for participation in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways—are maintained at a level at least equal to the average level of such expenditures for the last 2 full fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this act. However, the Commission shall recommend to the President or the President's designee a lesser requirement when a substantial population decrease in the area affected would not justify a State expenditure equal to the average heretofore alluded to or when a State's average level of expenditure, within an individual program, has been disproportionate to the present need for the affected area.

Consent of States

Section 222 provides that no State shall be required to engage in or accept any program under the act without its consent.

Program Implementation

Section 223 provides that no program or project authorized under any section of title II shall be implemented until the Commission has consulted with and obtained the recommendations of the appropriate State official involved and until plans with regard to such program or project have been recommended by the Commission and approved or modified by the President or such Federal officer as the President may designate.

Program Development Criteria

Section 224(a) provides criteria to be followed by the Appalachian Regional Commission in developing recommendations for programs and projects under the act. Among these are (1) the relationship of the project to overall regional development and the inclusion of its location in an area having a significant potential for growth; (2) the relative per capita income and the unemployment rates in the area served; (3) the relative financial resources available to the State or political subdivisions or instrumentalities which seek to undertake the project; (4) the importance of the project as compared with other projects in competition for the same funds; (5) the prospects that the project will improve, on a continuing rather than on a temporary basis, the opportunities for employment, the average level of income, or the economic and social development of the area served.

Section 224(b) precludes any assistance from being given to the relocation of establishments from one area to another, or to finance the cost of facilities for generation or production, transmission or distribution of electric energy or gas (natural, manufactured, or mixed). No assistance may be given to finance the cost of industrial plants, commercial facilities, machinery, working capital, or other industrial facilities or to enable plant subcontractors to undertake work theretofore performed in another area by other subcontractors or contractors.

TITLE III.—ADMINISTRATION

Local development districts—certification

Section 301 defines the term "local development district" as an entity certified to the Appalachian Regional Commission either by the Governor of the State or States in which such entity is located or by the State officer designated, as having a charter or authority that includes the economic development of counties or parts of counties or other political subdivisions within the region. No entity shall be certified as a local development district unless it is (1) a nonprofit incorporated body organized or chartered under State law; (2) a nonprofit State or local government agency or instrumentality; (3) a nonprofit agency or instrumentality created by interstate compact; or (4) a nonprofit association or combination of such bodies, agencies, and instrumentalities.

Grants for administrative expenses of local development districts and for research and demonstration projects

Section 302(a) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to make grants, either directly or through arrangements with the Commission, for administrative expenses to local development districts, the amount of any such grant not to exceed 75 percent of the administrative expenses in any one fiscal year. No such grants shall be made for a period in excess of 3 years beginning on the date the initial grant is made to such development district. Local contributions for administrative expenses may be in cash or in kind, including but not limited to space, equipment and services. The Secretary is also authorized, either directly or through arrangements with appropriate public or private organizations (including the Commission), to provide funds for investigation, research, studies, and demonstration projects, but not for construction purposes, which will further the purposes of the act.

Section 302(b). Recipients of Federal assistance under this section shall maintain accurate and complete records of activities financed with Federal funds and report thereon to the Secretary, such records to be available for audit respecting such grants by the Secretary of Commerce and the Comptroller General.

Section 302(c) provides an expenditure not to exceed $5.5 million of the funds authorized in section 401 for implementation of this section.

No part of any appropriated funds may be expended involving scientific or technological research or development activities unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions effective to insure that all information, copyrights, patents, etc., resulting from that activity will be made freely available to the general public.

Project approval

Section 303 provides that an application for a grant or for any other assistance under this act shall be made only by a State, a political subdivision of a State, or a local development district. It is required that the application be made through the State member of the Commission representing such applicant and that such State member shall evaluate the application for approval. The Commission can approve only those applications which are first approved by such State member.

Annual report

Section 304 requires that not later than 6 months after the close of each fiscal year, the Commission shall submit to the Governor of each State in the region and to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report on the activities carried out under this act during such year.

TITLE IV—APPROPRIATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Authorization of appropriations

Section 401 authorizes not to exceed $252,400,000 to be appropriated for the period ending June 30, 1967, to be available until expended. This amount is in addition to the appropriations authorized in section 201 for the Appalachian development highway system.

Applicable labor standards

Section 402 provides that wage rates in connection with activities under this act shall be no less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended.

Definition of Appalachian region

Section 403 delineates the area embraced in the term "Appalachian Region." Of the 12 States included in Appalachia, West Virginia is the one State in which all counties are eligible for assistance under the act.

Severability

Section 404 contains the usual severability clause.

Termination

Section 405 provides that the act shall cease to be in effect on July 1, 1971.

THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON NAZI WAR CRIMINALS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, several Senators, including myself, have previously called to the attention of the Senate the situation which now obtains in Germany with respect to the prosecution of Nazi war criminals.

The German criminal code contains a 20-year statute of limitations on murder, which has been interpreted by the West German Government to bar the initiation of prosecutions for Nazi crimes after May 8, 1965—20 years after the end of the Hitler regime. The Federal Republic Government claims that even though the period of limitations is scheduled to run its course on that date, prosecutions of Nazi criminals will not cease, but that many cases now being prepared for trial will be heard over the next few years.

The German Government also has declared that it has initiated extensive investigations of all other known Nazi war criminals. It is a feature of German law that a period of limitation may be interrupted, thereby automatically starting the period to run again for another 20 years, by official initiation of an investigation. This will make it possible for the German Government to prosecute every Nazi criminal known to it on May 8, 1965. For this purpose it appealed, on November 20, 1964, to "all governments, organizations, and individual persons, both in Germany and abroad," to make available all documents in their possession relating to the offenses of Nazi criminals still unknown to the Federal Republic.

Despite the efforts of the Federal Republic, however, a number of war criminals may escape justice unless some way is found to avoid the application of the statute of limitations to their crimes on May 8. As an example of how this might occur, the East German Government has refused to give the Federal Republic free access to files in its possession which may contain information concerning war crimes. There is some fear that East Germany may be withholding information for release after May 8, when Nazi criminals known to it, but not to the Federal Republic, would be able to walk the streets of Germany freely, unafraid of official retribution for their acts. The propaganda value of such a situation for East Germany and other Communist countries is obvious: West Germany

would then be held up to the world as "fundamentally unrepentant and, thus, a continuing danger to mankind." Phony as this would be under the circumstances, it would still be effective propaganda.

Recognizing these implications of the statute-of-limitations issue, the West German Bundestag, on December 9, 1964, called on the Federal Government to report to the Bundestag by March 1, 1965, whether in all identifiable cases the statute has been interrupted, and further, to report whether the Government is prepared, if necessary, to discuss with the Bundestag the question of extending the statute.

Mr. President, it is apparent from the facts I have just related that the West German Government and Bundestag will soon be making a historic decision—a decision which concerns all humanity. That decision may foreclose prosecution of the last remnants of the most infamous and brutal band of killers in modern history; or it may again demonstrate to all the determination of the German Federal Republic to insure that no one who committed mass murder—genocide—will go free to mock the world.

The power to choose is West Germany's alone. But no man can be indifferent to the choice. The resolution I am now introducing, on behalf of myself and of the Senator from Connecticut, calls upon the President to request the West German Government "to take whatever action it deems necessary in providing for an extension of the statute of limitations affecting Nazi war criminals so that there will exist no possibility that any war criminals will escape justice through the operation of that statute."

I send the concurrent resolution to the desk for the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and myself, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

I also ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the desk for 1 week from today, for the addition of cosponsors, and that the text of the resolution may be printed, together with the text of my remarks, at this point in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 16

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

Whereas the West German Bundestag is currently considering whether to extend a 20-year period of limitation on the institution of criminal actions, otherwise barred by statute after May 1965, against Nazi war criminals charged with genocide or murder; and

Whereas under the law of the German Federal Republic such statute of limitations may be tolled by the institution of a judicially sanctioned investigation of any person suspected of a crime; and

Whereas as a result of the efforts of the Government of the German Federal Republic prosecutions or investigations of presently known war criminals have been instituted to the end that these felons will not escape justice; and

Whereas despite such efforts there is the distinct chance that some war criminals will escape justice through the operation of the statute of limitations and this is a question for the world and for morality; and

Whereas the chance that some war criminals will escape is enhanced by the possibility that certain files pertaining to their wartime activities are being withheld by the East German Government (Communist) for propaganda advantage in the event prosecution is no longer possible under the laws of the German Federal Republic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should request the Government of the German Federal Republic to take whatever action it deems necessary in providing for an extension of the statute of limitations affecting Nazi war criminals so that there will exist no possibility that any war criminal will escape justice through the operation of that statute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in all our history there has never been a more immoral act than the Nazi genocide. Murder has no statute of limitations, and it should have none under the German law.

We must make clear where we stand on this dreadful issue; there can be no silence. I hope very much that the West German Government and Bundestag will hear the call made here, and will pay attention to how deeply we feel about it. I hope too that the President of the United States, upon the adoption of such a resolution as the one I have introduced, or sooner—and I hope very much sooner—will exercise the great influence of his Office to see that there shall not be what would constitute one of the gravest miscarriages of justice in the history of man: The escape of any Nazi war criminal because of the operation of the statute of limitations.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and other Senators who would urge the West German Republic to act before May 8, 1965, in order that those individuals responsible for vicious war crimes under Hitler can be brought before the bar of justice.

At common law, Mr. President, which forms the basis of this Nation's criminal laws, there is no statute of limitations for murder. Justice demands that this principle be applied to the mass murders of millions of Europeans during World War II. Those responsible—from the top to the bottom—should be brought to justice and should not be given a ticket to freedom.

I am encouraged that our own Government is aiding the West Germans in the apprehension of war criminals. In a note sent by the Department of State to the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany the United States assured the German nation that "the Government of the United States of America will continue to assist the Federal Republic in every appropriate way in its search for evidence of Nazi crimes and criminals." I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the note be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TEXT OF NOTE SENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO THE EMBASSY OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY CONCERNING COLLECTION OF EVIDENCE ON NAZI MURDERS

On January 8, 1965, the Department of State transmitted the following note to the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in response to the Embassy's request, as part of a worldwide appeal, for assistance in collecting evidence concerning murders, perpetrated during the Hitler regime which are not yet known to the Government of the Federal Republic:

The Department of State acknowledges the receipt of the note from the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany dated December 22, 1964, requesting, as part of a worldwide appeal, the assistance of the Government of the United States in collecting evidence concerning Nazi murders not yet known in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The two principal repositories of German documents which might be of value to the Federal Republic are the Berlin Document Center and the National Archives and Records Service of Alexandria, Va. The archives of the Library of Congress also contain some German documents.

The Federal Republic has of course for a number of years frequently consulted the Berlin Document Center, and the center continues to give all possible assistance to appropriate German authorities. German investigators have also in the past searched the documents at the Library of Congress and may, if they wish, again investigate these files.

The Government of the United States has returned to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany over 80 percent of the German documents originally stored in the National Archives at Alexandria. In 1960, officials designated by the German Federal Government searched these Archives for material which could be of use in the prosecution of Nazi war criminals. In order to be certain, however, that no useful document which might still be in the Archives has been overlooked, the Government of the United States invites the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany again to search the German documents still remaining in the National Archives at Alexandria. Upon notification by the German Government of its desire to send competent and qualified authorities to visit the Archives, the Department of State will be pleased to make appropriate arrangements with the National Archives.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is aware that the Government of the United States of America has long had a deep interest in the efforts of the Federal Republic to find, prosecute, and convict Nazi criminals not yet brought to justice. The Federal Republic is also undoubtedly aware of the concern of many American citizens that the scheduled expiration in May 1965 of the 20-year period under the German statute of limitations for murder might permit presently unknown Nazi criminals to escape prosecution. In light of these considerations, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is assured that the Government of the United States of America will continue to assist the Federal Republic in every appropriate way in its search for evidence of Nazi crimes and criminals.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr.

SCOTT] with respect to the resolution introduced earlier today by Senator RIBICOFF and me regarding the extension of the statute of limitations affecting the Nazi war criminals.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

I urge the Senate to support the resolution introduced by Senators JAVITS and RIBICOFF which requests the President to ask the Government of the German Federal Republic to extend its statute of limitations affecting Nazi war criminals.

As you know, on May 8, 1965, the 20-year statute of limitations runs out under West German law on the murders and genocide perpetrated before and during World War II.

I join with many people throughout the free world who shudder at the thought of any Nazi criminal coming out of hiding and being free of persecution because of such a circumstance.

But under West German law there are important exceptions to this situation. I am informed that a statutory limitation can be interrupted by an action on the part of a West German judge. In other words, if a judge makes a notation on the papers of a suspect that, "the investigation is to be continued," the statutory limit is set aside and the case stays open for another 20 years.

The West German Government is to be commended for its recent worldwide appeal for information on all Nazi crimes so that every possible suspect could be so designated.

However, as German Ambassador to the United States Heinrich Knappstein pointed out recently, it is entirely possible that some people with such information, such as those behind the Iron Curtain, might intentionally withhold data which they alone possess. That would allow the statute of limitations to run on some Nazi criminals. And Ambassador Knappstein added, "This possibility should also be blocked." Such a view is shared by many people throughout the free world.

Therefore, I commend the West German Government for what it has done up until now to prosecute Nazi criminals and for its actions to keep open the statute of limitations on specific suspects of which it is aware.

But I join the many others who have spoken from the floor of this Senate to urge that the German Government take whatever further action is necessary prior to May 8, 1965, to be certain that not one criminal, however carefully he is hidden, can possibly escape prosecution.

EXCISE TAXES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the distinguished minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL] pointed with pride to the efforts of the distinguished minority leader last spring to reduce excise taxes amounting to some $550 million and said that the proposal of the President was merely copying Republican policy.

I think it should be noted that last spring the administration had cut taxes by approximately $11½ billion through reductions in personal income tax and in the corporate profit tax and that it was reluctant to take up a decrease in excise taxes on top of those reductions in the income tax. But since my good friends from the other side of the aisle have introduced the historical record of their efforts to reduce excise taxes, I think it would be appropriate if I introduced into the RECORD my previous efforts in 1958 to reduce excise taxes. On June 20, 1958, I proposed an amendment to the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1958 proposing wide reductions in excise taxes which would have amounted to approximately $1,350 million. We were then in a recession, and a reduction in excise taxes was very appropriate.

I ask unanimous consent that a description of this amendment be inserted in the RECORD, with the voting record of the two parties in the matter.

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

VOTING RECORD

(Vote No. 117, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 9, page 11866)

Congress: 85th, 2d session.
File reference: Finance, commerce, industry.
Subject: H.R. 12695. Tax Rate Extension Act of 1958 (Douglas amendment).

DIGEST OF VOTE

H.R. 12695, an act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, and to repeal the taxes on transportation of property.

Vote on Douglas amendment to reduce or repeal the following excise taxes: (Estimated revenue loss, $1,347 million).

1. Retailer's excises: Repeals the 10-percent excise tax on jewelry selling at retail for $25 or less; the first $100 of the retail selling price of watches and clocks, toilet preparations, luggage, handbags, and wallets.

2. Manufacturer's excises: Repeals the 10-percent excise tax on air conditioners, light bulbs, radios, TV sets, phonographs, musical instruments, sporting goods (except fishing equipment), business machines, mechanical lighters, pencils, fountain and ballpoint pens, cameras, and film; repeals the 5-percent excise tax on household-type refrigeration equipment, electrical-gas-oil appliances, household-type projectors; repeals the 2 cents per 1,000 but not more than 10-percent excise tax on plain matches and the 5½ cents per 1,000 on fancy matches.

3. Facilities and services: Repeals the various rates of excise taxes on admissions of all kinds, including musicians; reduces from 10 percent to 5 percent excise taxes on telephone and telegraph leased wires; repeals the 10-percent excise tax on local telephone service; and reduces from 8 percent to 4 percent the excise tax on wire and equipment service.

RESULT OF VOTE: AMENDMENT REJECTED

Yeas (20): Democrats, 18, or 49 percent; Republicans, 2, or 5 percent.

Nays (55): Democrats, 19, or 51 percent; Republicans, 36, or 95 percent.

Not voting (21)—Democrats (12): Absent, 6; announced against, 4; paired for, 1; paired against, 1. Republicans (9): Absent, 2; announced against, 3; paired for, 2; paired against, 2.

Yeas (20)—Democrats (18): Carroll, Douglas, Fulbright, Hennings, Hill, Humphrey, Johnston of South Carolina, Kennedy, Long, Magnuson, Mansfield, McNamara, Morse, Murray, Pastore, Proxmire, Sparkman, Symington. Republicans (2): Langer, Malone.

Nays (55)—Democrats (19): Anderson, Bible, Byrd, Chavez, Church, Eastland, Ervin, Frear, Green, Holland, Jordan, Kerr, Lausche, Monroney, Neuberger, Robertson, Stennis, Talmadge, Thurmond. Republicans (36): Aiken, Allott, Barrett, Beall, Bennett, Bridges, Bush, Butler, Carlson, Case of New Jersey, Case of South Dakota, Cooper, Cotton, Curtis, Dirksen, Dworshak, Flanders, Hickenlooper, Hoblitzell, Hruska, Ives, Javits, Kuchel, Morton, Mundt, Potter, Revercomb, Saltonstall, Schoeppel, Smith of Maine, Smith of New Jersey, Thye, Watkins, Wiley, Williams, Young.

Not voting (21)—Democrats (12): Clark, announced against; Ellender, announced against; Gore, absent; Hayden, absent; Jackson, paired for; Johnson of Texas, absent; Kefauver, announced against; McClellan, paired against; O'Mahoney, absent; Russell, announced against; Smathers, absent; Yarborough, absent. Republicans (9): Bricker, paired against; Capehart, paired for; Goldwater, paired for; Jenner, absent; Knowland, paired against; Martin of Iowa, announced against; Martin of Pennsylvania, announced against; Payne, announced against; Purtell, absent.

ANALYSIS OF ISSUE VOTED ON

A Presidential recommendation? H.R. 12695—Yes.

Administration's position: Against amendment.

Administration's position—Supported: Democrats, 19, or 51 percent; Republicans, 36, or 95 percent. Opposed: Democrats, 18, or 49 percent; Republicans, 2, or 5 percent.

Party cohesion: Democrats, 51 percent; Republicans, 95 percent.

Measure of party support on issue as voted on—For (20): Democrats, 18, or 90 percent; Republicans, 2, or 10 percent. Against (55): Democrats, 19, or 35 percent; Republicans, 36, or 65 percent.

Senator DOUGLAS, in urging adoption of the amendment, stated: "It will be seen that most of these excises are durable goods excises. We all know that the present recession has been largely in the durable goods industry. This industry has been in trouble for some time. It has been in trouble for many months preceding the beginning of the recession last August * * * there is every reason why the manufacturers' excise—a wartime excise—should be repealed at this time, when our purpose should be to stimulate sales, and thereby employment and production in this industry."

Opponents' concern was in the loss of revenue at a time of increased Government spending.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, an analysis will show that there were 20 votes cast in favor of the reduction in excise taxes and 55 against. Of the 20 votes cast in favor of the reduction, 18 were Democrats; namely, Senators Carroll, DOUGLAS, FULBRIGHT, Hennings, HILL, HUMPHREY, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Kennedy, LONG, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCNAMARA, MORSE, Murray, PASTORE, PROXMIRE, SPARKMAN, and SYMINGTON.

I regret that there were only two Republicans who voted in favor; namely, Senators Langer and Malone.

In other words, approximately 50 percent of the Democrats who voted, voted for the reduction, but only 5 percent of the Republicans voted to reduce the excise tax, and 95 percent of the Republicans voted against the reduction.

Among the Republicans who voted against the reduction I find the name of the distinguished minority leader, my colleague [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL], the chairman of the Republican policy committee [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who occupies a very leading position in the Republican hierarchy.

So perhaps it was the movement of the progressive Democrats which I had the honor to propound which stimulated the

Republicans last spring, and which may have laid the basis for the action of the administration this winter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The junior Senator from Louisiana is pleased to note that his name was among those who voted for the Douglas amendment to reduce excise taxes by $1.3 billion. The Senator from Louisiana did not feel he could vote for the Dirksen amendment when it was offered some time ago because he feared it could be the beginning of an avalanche of reductions in addition to what had been planned. This Senator from Louisiana was in charge of a bill which provided for a $11.5 billion tax reduction, which the second year would amount to a reduction of $14 billion.

So the Senator from Louisiana is somewhat in the position of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He has voted for and against reduction of excise taxes. But, so far as I can recall, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has been consistent, whether it was a Democrat who managed the bill or a Republican who did. He has voted to reduce excise taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not sure I have had a record of perfect consistency, but I have had one of relative consistency.

At any rate, there were only two Republicans who in 1958 voted with those who started the movement to reduce excise taxes, and this fact should be added to the historical record which the two distinguished leaders on the other side of the aisle placed in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has been one of my teachers and leaders in the matter of excise taxes in recent years. In 1947, however, the Senator from Oregon introduced a bill that would have eliminated most of the excise taxes and reduced the others recommended by the Committee for Economic Development in its great report of 1947.

The Senator from Oregon, year after year, has offered amendments, or revised amendments, containing proposals of the Committee for Economic Development, because I think the Committee for Economic Development was unanswerably right in 1947, and I think it has been unanswerably right since.

I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], great economist that he is, has been unanswerably right every time he has taken the floor and given his expert knowledge of the tax problems of the country on all phases of taxation, but particularly on the matter of excise taxes. I congratulate him for that record.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Oregon. Apparently I followed in the footsteps of the Senator from Oregon in this matter, as in so many other matters. But the record is clear that it was the progressive and liberal forces in the Senate that have led the move for reduction of excise taxes, and this fact should be noted and recorded. We are very grateful to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] for following in our footsteps. We are pleased that it has become administration policy. I have noted a general lag of 7 years between the time when the senior Senator from Illinois proposes measures and the time they are adopted. This is a cultural and political lag which I hope to reduce in the future.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite correct when he says it was the liberal forces, for I urge that we keep faith with the pledges made at the time the excise taxes were imposed in the first place. In many of my speeches on excise taxes over the years, I have cited the position taken by Senator after Senator and Representative after Representative that these excise taxes were imposed as a war measure. They made an unequivocal pledge that when the war was over, they would be removed. They received votes on the basis of that promise. I believe when a politician makes a promise, he ought to live up to it, or if he does not, he ought to admit that he is reneging on a pledge.

Congress has not kept faith with the commitments it made at the time excise taxes were imposed. They were imposed, as shown by the speeches made at the time, including those of both leaders of both Houses of Congress—as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show—to discourage civilian production; and rightly so. We were saying that we were trying to win a war, and any unnecessary civilian production interfered with the prosecution of the war. In fact, a reading of those speeches will lead one to reach no other conclusion than that it was that which was given major emphasis.

The second reason advanced was that they were easy to collect, simple to impose and would raise a great deal of money quickly. They were imposed as a war measure for quick revenue and they were justified in that kind of imposition. There has been no justification for Congress to "renege" on the promise it made to the American people year after year since the war ended. The penetrating report of the Committee for Economic Development in 1947, stands unanswerable. I have listened to the debate in the Senate, and I have not heard one Senator come anywhere near presenting a rationalization which would justify a verdict in favor of continuing excise taxes.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUTER RAILROADS URGED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a lead editorial in the New York Daily News. The Daily News usually has a fairly conservative view on questions of subsidies.

It points today to the high necessity in the public interest of the Federal Government backing commuter roads, like the New York, New Haven, and Hartford.

This excellent editorial advises that this is a much wiser line of action than spending what is proposed to be spent at a future date on the experimental high-speed rail systems.

I hope that we can effectively and prudently afford to do both. But I think it is very interesting that this editorial should feel that this is a case which so richly deserves governmental financial backing, as I have urged together with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], my colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and other Senators and Representatives so that the commuter lines can continue to operate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in this morning's New York Daily News, entitled "One Track; One Road," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ONE TRACK; ONE ROAD

The financial troubles of the New Haven and Long Island railroads have been making a lot of headlines recently, but these are not the only local lines whose commuter operations are sick, sick, sick.

A few days ago, Erie Lackawanna Chairman William White issued a worried and worrisome warning that his road soon may have to ask the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit the dropping of all Erie commuter service in northern New Jersey.

This road carries about 35,000 commuters every business day. The service is operated at a loss of more than $8 million a year. The State of New Jersey meets a $2.2 million worth of this loss while the railroad pays the State about $4.3 million in property taxes.

White says that "if the service is deemed essential, it can no longer be considered a private business; it is a public service that must be paid for by someone other than bondholders and shareowners of the railroad."

Would it be an injustice to taxpayers who don't use the railroad to allow States served by the local commuter railroads to set up a costly commission or authority which would take over operation of all commuter lines?

The Erie Lackawanna makes this meaty comment:

"Ironically, the millions of dollars being spent every year to build more and more highways only means more and more congestion in the already crowded metropolitan areas. Highway construction puts the emphasis on moving vehicles, not people. Conversely, one railroad track can move as many people as can autos on 10 to 20 lanes of highways. Why let this great asset go to waste? The commissioner of the New Jersey Highway Department has pointed out that assumption of the Erie Lackawanna's annual suburban service deficit would cost less than constructing 1 mile of superhighway."

On the strength of that statement, if taxpayers should be called on to subsidize a lot of commuter service until a big regional transit authority could get such service on a paying or break-even basis, the taxpayers would be getting their money's worth in more ways than one—less highway construction needed, less city traffic and parking congestion, etc.

But for the short haul in attacking the metropolitan area's commuter troubles, why doesn't the Johnson administration postpone those dreamy experiments with 200-mile-per hour Washington-to-Boston trains, and just make a wise distribution of a lot of that money among the New York and Boston metropolitan area commuter railroads?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination of Mr. W. J. Driver, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination to the Veterans' Administration will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, I have had some things to say in the past weeks about the announced closing of the Miles City Veterans Hospital. In my judgment—and I have spoken it repeatedly as a Senator from Montana—the closure is ill-advised, as well may be other closings which were announced at the same time. It is ill-advised because of the geography of the situation in the northern plains region. It is ill-advised because of the very adequate patient-load which the Miles City hospital has consistently carried. It is ill-advised because of the favorable cost-per-patient record of that hospital. It is ill-advised because of the great extra burden of travel which it places on both patient and family in the essentially rural and sparsely settled region which the hospital serves. It is ill-advised because the Miles City hospital is not only not obsolete but, on the contrary, is capable of useful expansion at least to twice its present size as a modern veterans' facility. It is ill-advised because the closing of Miles City will weaken a basic legal principle in veterans' legislation—that veterans are entitled to hospitalization at a location reasonably proximate to their place of domicile. It is ill-advised because veterans have been obtaining at Miles City first-class general medical service which, for more than a decade, has been entirely satisfactory to patients.

Those are the reasons, Mr. President, which have prompted me to speak out repeatedly on this situation. Those are the reasons which are involved in my vehement objections to the action which has been announced; and, together with my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF], I intend to continue to press them.

As for Mr. Driver, from all reports he is an able and conscientious man who has had long experience and dedication in veterans' affairs, which makes the closure at Miles City even more difficult to fathom. I can only assume—and I am inclined to believe and have so stated—that the responsibility for these closures is to be laid at the doorstep of the Bureau of the Budget with its false economy drive in the Veterans' Administration, which in this instance has been pushed at the expense of the fully earned and legally authorized rights of veterans to first-class, considerate, proximate, and humane treatment.

Because Mr. Driver is an able and conscientious public servant, I would expect that he will have the determination to resist the erosion of these earned and legal rights of veterans against those who may have yielded their human perspectives to the computers in the name of economy. I would hope, too, that as an able and conscientious public servant that he will be prepared to stand against an ill-advised economy and to dedicate himself to the redress of grievances which stem from it, especially when, as in the case of Miles City, the ill-advice is so transparent. It is with that expectation and hope and without reservation that I shall vote for the confirmation of his nomination. I urge all Senators to do so.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, shortly I shall move to postpone until March 1, 1965, consideration of the nomination of Mr. W. J. Driver by the President of the United States to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

I ask for the yeas and nays on that vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will have to make the motion first, before he can ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move to postpone until March 1, 1965, consideration of the nomination of W. J. Driver by the President of the United States for the office of Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request for the yeas and nays is in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, there is more than an executive nomination at stake here today.

There should be under consideration as well the far-reaching and unwarranted closing of 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliaries and either a closing or a reduction in personnel at 17 regional offices, including the one at White River Junction, Vt., which were announced by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on January 13, 1965.

It is becoming more and more apparent that the White House and the Bureau of the Budget, not Mr. Driver, are the ones truly responsible for this coming and harmful curtailment of service to veterans. Yet, in the face of this fact, I think it is appropriate to say that ratification of Mr. Driver's nomination could very easily be considered as a ratification of the policies he so recently announced.

When it comes to executive nominations, Mr. President, the Constitution speaks of the power of the Senate to give its "advice" as well as its "consent."

Is the advice provision in the Constitution pure sham or do we indeed have just cause for giving counsel to the administration of which the Acting Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is a spokesman?

True it may be that Mr. Driver is a qualified man. True it may be that the decision to eviscerate the Veterans' Administration was not his.

But true it is also that if Mr. Driver is confirmed now the Senate will be saying to the veterans of this country:

> We are afraid to protest. We tremble at the thought of exercising the power of advice which the Constitution intended. In a word, we break faith with you.

How curious it is, Mr. President, that in the name of economy the administration recommends that we oppose aiding those who fought for this country in order to aid dictators abroad who now work against it.

How ironic it is that the veteran in Alaska must by reason of the proposed order travel a thousand miles to get hospital care and the veteran in Vermont some 250 or 300 miles to obtain aid on his claim.

And why are these inconveniences supposed to be necessary? When we ask, "economy," is the answer we receive.

Justice and health care can be made so inaccessible that there is neither justice nor care. The consequences of it all is that a man with a valid claim abandons it and the man who is ill wearies of the endeavor to get attention, grows worse and sometimes dies.

I say to my colleagues with complete sincerity that the Senate is not yet ready to act on the nomination of W. J. Driver as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

I say that the Senate has a right to know whether the curtailment of these Veterans' Administration activities will deteriorate or improve service to veterans of armed conflict.

The Senate also has the duty to find out whether the Federal Government should continue its practice of taking from rural States facilities that are much in need in order to crowd them into cities already overburdened with housing and transportation problems.

This is not yet a Senate of sheep, Mr. President. It still retains the power to advise as well as consent, to counsel as well as ratify.

If through unwisdom or folly we are forced to act now before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare completes its investigation of the proposed closing of veterans' installations, then the Senate has lost its best opportunity to speak out for the men who served with distinction in time of war.

I propose now that we avoid such a senseless loss.

I had intended, Mr. President, to propose to the Senate, without prejudice to the nominee, that action on his nomination be delayed until such time as the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reaches a determination, expressed in a written report, as to whether the proposed installation closings will increase or improve service to honorably discharged veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

I was advised, however, by the Parliamentarian that to be in order a postponement motion must specify a day certain.

Mr. President, that is the reason why I have offered the proposal. The purpose is to allow the Veterans Subcommittee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to complete their investigation.

I hope very much that the motion will be approved.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished friend, the Senator from Vermont, for the wisdom of his action today, and for his lucid explanation of his motion to postpone.

It is always a difficult matter to pass on an individual, particularly when, from

all accounts, that individual is of the very highest type, and one whose character, integrity, capacity, and ability are not likely to be challenged by us.

It is also true that we must recognize that any man entrusted with the responsibility of leadership and control over a great bureau or division of our Government must of necessity, to a degree at least, follow the wishes of the administration and play on the team, in backing up the policies of the President.

When I say "President," I must say that I mean the President. The Bureau of the Budget is only a euphemistic way of referring to the President's policy. Therefore, perhaps we should not expect Mr. Driver to stand out against the fixed and considered policy of the administration that he does and presumably will later continue to represent. But, when we are dealing with the veterans of this country, and especially veterans who are disabled and have qualified for care and for hospitalization, we are dealing with a subject that transcends party. It transcends executive policies.

The head of the Veterans' Administration, I submit, should feel a deeper and more profound sense of duty to the service-connected disabled veterans and the aged veterans in this country than to any administration or to any policy.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont that we should wait. In the first place, if we were to vote on this confirmation today, I would be compelled to vote no. And, if we are compelled to vote on the nomination today, I shall vote no without any personal reflection upon the nominee. I shall do so because we cannot afford to place the hallmark of our approval upon the nominee, until we see how he stands up on these vital questions and the appropriate committees of Congress have had opportunity to report.

Therefore, if we can wait until the actions of that department emerge, and the lines are laid down more clearly, we may perhaps be able to exercise our constitutional duty more intelligently because of the knowledge we shall then have. We shall perhaps be able to act more fairly to Mr. Driver, to the veterans, and to the people of the country.

I think it would be a sad mistake to vote today, when that vote would stand for something that very few of us wish to stand for.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont for offering this motion. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I certainly agree with him completely.

I think it should be pointed out that this motion is in no way intended to cast a reflection upon Mr. Driver as an individual, or upon his ability as an administrator.

It does seem, as the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire has pointed out so ably, that if we approve his nomination at this time, we are, in fact, saying that we approve the action which has been proposed by the Veterans' Administration.

I am sure this is not something which is in the interest of veterans. Every veterans' organization in the country, so far as I know, is militantly opposed to this action. The purpose of my motion is merely to give the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, more particularly the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, an opportunity to consider all the evidence and make a report to the Senate.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I am grateful to the Senator from Vermont for offering this proposal to postpone consideration of the nomination. I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire. If the vote is forced today, and the vote on confirmation comes up this afternoon, I shall be constrained to vote against confirmation.

On January 22, when the hearings began in the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, I was prepared to vote for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I was prepared to vote for it in spite of the fact that, as my colleague [Mr. MANSFIELD] has pointed out, he had advised the ill-conceived proposal to close the veterans hospital. I was prepared to vote for confirmation in spite of the fact that he had written to Senators who came from States where hospitals or domiciliary facilities to be closed were located.

There were developments in those hearings that I shall go into, if I am forced to vote, that raise questions that are unanswered. There are several volumes of testimony which resulted from the hearings of the subcommittee that should be printed and made available to every Member of the Senate. Many questions were asked that were not answered, but material was to be supplied for the record.

Many inconclusive statements were made by Mr. Driver and especially by Dr. McNinch. I participated in those hearings.

So I believe we should delay action on the confirmation of the nomination. We should not permit the closing of hospitals. We should not permit the new policies by Mr. Driver and Dr. McNinch as the policies of the Veterans' Administration to be endorsed. We should not endorse this new program of depriving veterans in isolated and remote areas of hospitals and other facilities adjacent to their communities. We should not adopt the idea that we should move those facilities closer to the large populations and major facilities and close hospitals in other areas.

If forced to vote on the nomination this afternoon, I hope I shall be able to say more.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for giving me this opportunity to go into the matter and for giving Mr. Driver an opportunity to explain his position, so it will not cause any reflection on Mr. Driver. Perhaps if the vote came later, I would be able to vote for confirmation.

Mr. PROUTY. I am grateful to the Senator from Montana. During the committee hearings he interrogated at great length members of the Veterans' Administration. Quite frankly, he could not be satisfied with the answers given to him and other members of the committee who were present.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding to me. I compliment him on his most appropriate motion to delay the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs at this time. There are many angles to this so-called cutback, and the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has taken the time of its members and staff and of the witnesses to go into the subject so that we may have a full understanding of what is taking place. That would be done without prejudice to Mr. Driver. I cannot understand why the nomination should be pressed at this time until the committee makes its recommendations.

There are many other reasons, of course, why the confirmation should be delayed at least until March 1, or until the committee has an opportunity to report. Obviously, every day is bringing forth further information as to the aspects of the so-called cutback and economy effort against the veterans of this country, their widows, and their orphans.

In my own State of Delaware this past weekend, I attended a meeting of about 150 veterans, including the Governor of the State of Delaware, the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Jenkins, and members of the State legislature. They were all concerned by the so-called cutback or economy move against veterans, which places additional costs on veterans across the country, including veterans who cannot afford these costs.

In the State of Delaware, the legislature unanimously adopted a resolution last Friday against the cutback as it affects our State. The Governor has signed it. As I understand, this resolution is to be forwarded not only to the President of the United States and Mr. Driver, but to both Houses of Congress.

It seems to me, without further extending my remarks, that the motion to delay, without prejudice, a vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver, whom I recognize as a very able public servant of the country, and who is held in the highest regard—would be in his best interest. It would be in his interest to delay action on the confirmation until the committee has an opportunity to report to Congress on the issue we are considering today.

Mr. PROUTY. I am grateful to my distinguished colleague. He made a powerful presentation when he appeared before the committee. He has pointed out the harms which would accrue to the veterans in the States if this proposal were carried through.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I commend the Senator on the motion he has made. I appreciate the fine work he has done in behalf

of the veterans in committee and in the Senate.

Mr. Driver called at my office early in January and advised me that he was the nominee to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. We had a very pleasant visit. I could see no reason why I should not support him. I so advised him. It was not disclosed to me that the order was about to be issued. The order was issued in a matter of hours that veterans hospitals were to be closed.

Mr. President, we have no assurance that there is any economy in this move. Abraham Lincoln once put this conundrum. He said:

> If I call a calf's tail a leg, how many legs does it have? The reply was, "Five." Lincoln said, "No. Calling his tail a leg does not make it so."

Getting up and asserting that this is an economy movement does not make it so. We have a sizable program in operation for building new veterans hospitals. We have a sizable program for enlarging hospitals. The taxpayers of the United States are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to build hospitals of various kinds. Hospitals that have existed for some time carry the advantage of a lower per capita cost than the new ones.

(At this point Mr. TYDINGS took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if we are to give an individual veteran adequate care, it will require personnel, regardless of where the hospital is located.

If there is a surplus of veterans hospitals, why this program of enlargement? That does not prove that any economy is involved.

Furthermore, it has been stated by the Veterans' Administration that the need for hospital beds for veterans of World War II will increase each year for the next 15 years. The peak will be reached in 1980. That is not my statement. That is a statement made by the Veterans' Administration.

Why close hospitals at a time when the need is going up?

I do not believe that Mr. Driver should be confirmed until we find out what weight he will give to the findings of the committees now considering this situation.

The Senate is entitled to cooperation from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. It is a two-way street. Soon after the announcement came, the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives started to hold hearings. They began to gather information. They began to study the issue.

Did the Veterans' Administration hold everything in abeyance while Congress was looking into the subject?

Not at all. They are taking those steps in defiance of the act of Congress. Patients are being refused admission because of plans to close hospitals. Patients are being advised that they will have to move because of the plan to close hospitals.

The debt this Nation owes our veterans is so great that the least that can be done is to hold everything in abeyance until all the facts are in. The idea of going ahead and refusing patients and making plans for transferring them, is not only an act in defiance of the Congress, but also lacking in due regard for the needs of the veteran.

If their ground is so well taken, if they have such great proof that these hospitals are not needed, if they have indisputable proof that there is economy involved, why all the hurry?

Why not let the Senate committee and the House committee look into the facts? If, when the facts are all in, they prove their point, why do they wish to hurry?

The only plausible answer is that they do not wish the facts presented. They do not wish Congress to take time to study the matter before they proceed with the steps they have set in motion.

I shall not only support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], but also, I dare express the hope that perhaps this issue could be held in abeyance and not forced to a vote today.

I can see it no other way than an endorsement of what the Veterans' Administration is attempting to do. It is attempting to close hospitals while the matter is being studied by Congress. It is attempting to close hospitals on claims of economy that it has not established. It is attempting to close hospitals while it is opening and enlarging other hospitals.

It does not make sense.

I hope that we shall not be forced into the uncomfortable situation of having to vote against the nomination at this time.

If I am forced to do so, I shall oppose the nomination.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding to me.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator from Nebraska has made a valuable contribution. I am indeed grateful to him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to ask one question.

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My analysis of the problem is that there are two issues. One is the right of Mr. Driver to be approved. Two is the propriety and justice of what is contemplated with respect to the closing of certain hospitals.

How does the Senator from Vermont tie in these seemingly two separate issues into one, indicating that in order to properly solve the second question of the right to close the hospitals, we should delay approval or disapproval of Mr. Driver?

Mr. PROUTY. My answer to the Senator is this: Mr. Driver issued the order, I believe on January 13—I am not certain of the date—but it seems to me that if we approve his nomination at the present time, in effect we shall be saying that we approve the closing of these installations. A great many Senators feel that they are very much opposed to the closing of these installations at the present time, until proper examination has been made and justification has been given for such closings.

Thus far, we have not received that information. I am sure that anyone who attended the hearings when the representatives of the Veterans' Adminstration were present, would agree that their answers were far from conclusive. In many instances, they did not have the answers.

I have the highest respect for Mr. Driver as an individual. I hope, at some time in the future, that I can vote for confirmation of his nomination. I believe that he is a good administrator and has done a great job through the years for the Veterans' Administration, but I strongly feel that if we confirm his nomination now, we shall be saying to the veterans in our States that we approve of the orders sent out from the Veterans' Administration by Mr. Driver.

I am sure that the veterans in the 50 States are almost unanimous in opposition to the proposed closing of these hospitals, at least until the facts are made known more clearly than they are known at the present time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What answer can we give to those who might charge us with using the power of nonapproval of an appointment as a coercion upon him to adopt a judgment which he believes to be wrong and inconsistent with what should be done?

Mr. PROUTY. All we are trying to do, in this instance, is to give the committee an opportunity to ascertain the facts. We are delaying it. As I suggested earlier, I have the highest respect for Mr. Driver, but he has not made a strong case, in my judgment—and I believe in the judgment of those who attended the hearings—in support of his position.

Perhaps Mr. Driver is not the one at fault. Perhaps higher authority has suggested that he take this action; but, irrespective of that, I believe that in justice to the veterans we represent in the States throughout the country, we have no alternative other than to take this position at the present time.

I wish it could be avoided but, unfortunately, the nomination was called up.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In replying to the communications which I have been receiving in opposition to the closing of the hospitals, I have stated that I will do nothing to impede the proper treatment which the Federal Government should give its veterans. I have further stated that inquiries are being made by the appropriate committees of the Senate and House to pass on the merits of what is being done, and that I would await the findings of those committees. I should like to get the judgment of the committees. I shall make no findings of my own until I have heard all that the committees have to say. I am of the belief that probably to get this matter on an even keel, without force being applied one way or another, it ought to be held in abeyance until the committees make their reports.

Mr. PROUTY. That was my original point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to say, in response to what the Senator from Ohio has said, that I have made, and will continue to make findings on my own, because I know the situation at Miles City. I think it is outrageous.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am a member of the Labor and Public Wel-

fare Committee, which has looked into this matter, and am its ranking minority member. I have heard a good deal of the testimony—not all of it, but a good deal of it—and I would like to answer the statement of the Senator from Ohio, because I believe he has asked some very pertinent questions.

Mr. President, nothing will happen to Mr. Driver. He will probably eventually be confirmed as VA Administrator. I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination when it comes before the Senate. He is a fine public servant with a long record of service. We all understand that.

Mr. President, we all know that this is a decision which was made, not by him—and probably would not have been made by him even if he had been on the job for a year—because he came to the job on December 29 and the decision was announced on January 13th. It was undoubtedly significantly influenced by the Bureau of the Budget and by others in the administration.

Mr. Driver may have been a party to the consultation, but this was not his decision.

If that is the case, why should we postpone consideration of his nomination? In the first place, it does not change his position at all, because he is the Administrator, and will continue to be throughout this session of Congress. He has been testifying before us as Administrator, and he would perform his duties even if his nomination went over until the 1st of March.

I am not concerned about the fact that the world will take this as Senator MANSFIELD's agreement, even if he votes against the decision that the facility ought to be closed. I have never heard him express himself more strongly on any issue since I first came to the Senate.

What can we do in the circumstances? People say we have a great deal of power. If the decision to close these facilities is not modified, and an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration is pressed upon, we cannot, under the rule, move to add to that appropriation. All we can do is move to cut it, which we will not do under the circumstances, of course. We will find that our courses of action are somewhat limited no matter what the committee finally decides is the most prudent course. The best alternative we can adopt, I believe, is to adopt a resolution expressing our disagreement with the decision.

The President might make up his mind about this and say, "I am sorry that you have adopted this resolution." That is all we could do.

Our only opportunity is to postpone consideration of the nomination. This is not a terrible thing. After all, we are not living in a vacuum. Everyone will understand that this is the only opportunity the Senate has to protest against these arbitrary closings, whether the closing takes place in my State, in the State of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], or in other States. No matter where it takes place, the feeling is very deep against it.

We have heard the testimony in committee. The proponents of this action have not made out a case in their favor. Those who propose to close these facilities, which are important to our veterans must bear the burden of proof that these facilities should be closed. The Veterans' Administration and the Administrator, himself, must bear the burden of proof.

I cite, for example, the standard which was announced by the Administrator in connection with these closings. For example, he has said that the closings have been made because they will contribute to the maximum amount of operational economy and efficiency in maintenance. As shown by the cross-examination of the witnesses by the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], in which I participated and in which others also participated—I refer to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and other Senators—it appeared clear that the facility at Sunmount, N.Y., was in good operating condition, and maintained high operating efficiency, and there was no reason for closing it.

The effect of the closing of the Bath, N.Y., hospital on medical services in that area is a cause of deep concern to me. The Bath hospital is located in south-central New York State and serves a seven-county area which includes 33,000 veterans. The ratio of hospital bed to population in this area is 8 to 3 as compared with the national average of 2 to 7. This hospital has been operating, moreover, at a 90-to-990 capacity for the past 5 years.

With respect to its economic impact, the closing of the Veterans' Administration Center in Bath would leave some 2,200 people in and around a community of 6,166 people without income support. The area would be losing a payroll of approximately $3 million to $3,500,000 per year, an extremely serious blow. The village of Bath has a population as specialized in the case of the aged and infirmed as Detroit has for the manufacture of automobiles. The loss of these funds to an area as dependent as the village of Bath is, would be a major calamity.

The Bath hospital is staffed with many certified specialists in fields such as pathology, surgery, urology, gastrointestinal, cardiology, radiology, and physical medicine. This hospital has more board specialists than any hospital within a surrounding area of approximately 90 miles. Bath has the only domiciliary in the area and serves approximately 9 million veterans in a 10-State area. The hospital has trainee programs with surrounding colleges—a nursing program with Keuka College, and affiliations with Cortland State University, the University of Rochester, the University of Syracuse, and the University of Buffalo. It has consultants who visit the hospital from Strong Memorial in Rochester, and Sayre Hospital, Sayre, Pa.

With respect to the Veterans Hospital at Sunmount, N.Y., this important medical facility provides medical services for 70,055 veterans in the area. The payroll there involves $3,075,000 which represents 45 percent of the income from wages in this community. In addition, the Veterans' Administration has spent over $2.5 million on this hospital in the last 10 years to improve its physical capabilities. In addition, over $70,000 was spent just to make the ceilings fireproof. This type of expenditure is not made on an obsolete and unnecessary facility.

The Castle Point VA Hospital closing will result in a drastic loss of medical services, movement of 250 patients, the loss of 340 jobs and $2,400,000 annual payroll to the community.

VA Administrator Driver stated to me in his letter of notice on the closings that they would contribute to "maximum operational efficiency and economy" and "maintenance of high standards of service." I question whether the record of hearings of the Veterans Subcommittee bears this out. I hope that the subcommittee will recommend that the VA reconsider its proposed closings and that in this event Administrator Driver would abide by that recommendation.

We ought to make it very clear that Mr. Driver is a fine gentleman; his nomination is expected to be confirmed; but that this is the only opportunity we have in the Senate to deal with these closings, considering the ways of the Senate. This is our first full opportunity to express our displeasure with this decision.

The Senator from Vermont has shown us a mild way to do it. After all, this proposal involves a deferral for only 30 days. It would not affect Mr. Driver, or his future, or his job. However, it would show the temper of the Senate. I shall vote to support the motion, and I hope the Senate will do likewise.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise to support the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. I commend him for submitting his motion to the Senate.

Speaking along the lines mentioned by the Senator from New York, this morning I was in receipt of a letter from the Director of the Department of Veterans' Affairs of the State of Nebraska, Mr. Leo J. Beck, Sr. He had received a letter addressed to him by Mr. Driver only a few days before he wrote his letter of January 29.

In Mr. Driver's letter concerning the Lincoln Veterans' Hospital to Mr. Beck this language is used:

> The current capacity of this hospital is 280 beds, 30 of which are out of use because of the limited demand for care in the area. There are also 40 beds out of use for the same reason at our nearby hospital in Omaha.

What is the truth about this situation? According to the information available to Mr. Beck, the following is what actually has happened. He states in his letter to Mr. Driver:

> The truth is that there have only been 250 beds in the Lincoln facility for the past 10 years and that the 30 beds you mentioned (Ward 1) has been used as office space for the psychiatric, social services, and dietetric schools. Also, in Omaha the 40 beds you mentioned are not in use for lack of money from the Bureau of the Budget.

I suppose that the lack of funds can be taken care of by a very generous appropriation through the Appropriations Committee. That has been done before.

Mr. Beck continues:

> We have sent men to Omaha this past year and they have been put on a 10-day waiting list. Outpatient care is being neglected here in Lincoln, mental patients are being sent home or to Knoxville.

Knoxville is more than 150 miles from Lincoln, Nebr.

It seems to me that it would be wise to follow the course suggested by the Senator from Vermont. He is not asking for any prejudice against the nomination of Mr. Driver. By voting for the Senator's motion we have the only way open to us to express our dissatisfaction with the policy adopted by Mr. Driver. He has freely stated this policy is the creature of the Bureau of the Budget and is recommended by and has the support of higher authority. The higher authority in this case can only mean the occupant of the White House. That is where the responsibility resides.

I believe it should be recorded in an official way that we are not taking this matter lightly and that we would like a report from the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee before we are called upon to confirm the nomination of Mr. Driver.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has brought out an important point in connection with the letter from which he has read. He emphasized one point. Is my understanding correct that Mr. Driver in his communication about the Lincoln, Nebr., hospital used a figure of the number of available beds or places for beds that was 10 years old?

Mr. HRUSKA. He did so; that was the language of Mr. Beck. The space for 30 beds has not been used in the past 10 years for beds because it has been used for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. And those other purposes are for services to veterans.

Mr. HRUSKA. Exactly.

Mr. CURTIS. I am fully aware that the order which we have been discussing is not the personal order of Mr. Driver, and that others have imposed it upon him. But still we are asked to make Mr. Driver the Administrator. We are asked to advise and consent to his nomination as head of the Veterans' Administration. If the head of the Veterans' Administration has no power and authority, the country should know it and the Congress should rewrite the organic law and see that this great agency, which operates hospitals, carries on insurance programs, adjusts claims, administers a compensation program, and so on, is accorded the services of an Administrator who can operate the agency.

I commend the Senator from Nebraska for his remarks on this subject. The very fact that the Veterans' Administration makes such a statement, going back to a 10-year-old figure on the size of a hospital, indicates the great need for the study, the inquiry and the gathering of facts now being carried on by the committees of the two Houses of Congress.

I believe that not only should the confirmation of the nomination wait, but also that the Veterans' Administration should have the courtesy and the sense of cooperation to hold in abeyance all steps toward closing these hospitals while the studies are going on.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his contribution and his remarks. One further point, it cannot be contended that the Lincoln Veterans' Administration hospital is obsolete and unfit for the purpose at hand, because only 3½ short years ago an almost $1 million modernization program was completed there. That point ought to be placed in the RECORD, and I state it for that purpose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter from Mr. Leo J. Beck, Sr., director of the Department of Veterans' Affairs for the State of Nebraska, to William J. Driver as Director of the Veterans' Administration, dated January 29, printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

JANUARY 29, 1965.

Re Lincoln Veterans Hospital.

WILLIAM J. DRIVER,
Director, U.S. Veterans' Administration, Veterans' Administration Central Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DRIVER: Thank you for your letter of January 26 and I believe that you are sincere in your reasons for including the Lincoln Veterans Hospital in the list of those to be closed.

It is quite apparent, however, that you have been and are still incorrectly informed as to the true situation.

You mention and I quote, "The current capacity of this hospital is 280 beds, 30 of which are out of use because of the limited demand for care in the area. There are also 40 beds out of use for the same reason at our nearby hospital in Omaha." The truth is, that there have only been 250 beds in the Lincoln facility for the past 10 years and that the 30 beds you mention (ward 1) has been used as office space for the psychiatric, social services, and dietetic schools. Also, in Omaha, the 40 beds you mention are not in use for lack of money from the Bureau of the Budget.

We have sent men to Omaha this past week and they have been put on a 10-day waiting list. Outpatient care is being neglected here in Lincoln, mental patients are being sent home or to Knoxville.

Grand Island is not properly staffed medically and the Lincoln and Omaha doctors will not go there. Your statement of better services to veterans cannot hold water. It is true that Grand Island is a newer building but cannot compare, even in a small degree, to the abilities and staffing of the Lincoln Hospital.

Some of your employees are being offered the high salary of $1.25 per hour in other hospitals so it is quite clear that you are taking good care of them. But my main concern is the veterans of Nebraska who you are definitely rejecting at a time when they are aging, finding it difficult to travel, and who, in many cases, will die before they can get into a hospital. These deaths, Mr. Driver, can definitely be laid at your door.

I am not so much concerned as to the economic impact on Lincoln since I am sure we are competent here to handle this, but with the greatest veteran hospital demand still to be reached, why not send someone to Lincoln who will find out the true situation. The word economy is certainly a false nomenclature for the hospital closing.

Cordially,

LEO J. BECK, Sr.,
Director, Department of Veterans' Affairs, State of Nebraska.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Through the courtesy of the Senator from Vermont, I had the opportunity to say a few words on the pending question. I had not intended to seek recognition in my own right, but I am impelled to do so because of the points made and the general tenor of the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Incidentally, I have served with the senior Senator from New York for many years in the House and in the Senate. There is no Member of this body whose ability, skill, knowledge of the law, and capacity to analyze issues and questions I admire more. I have seen him when he was fighting for the State of New York. When he fought for the State of New York, he never once proclaimed the complete impotency of the U.S. Senate. He has not suggested on those occasions that there was nothing we could do about the situation except to register a general protest so the world would know that we did not like what was going on. My admiration for the Senator from New York has been unbounded, because when the interests of the people of New York were affected he has invariably found that there was something he could do about it. But this afternoon he was in another mood. He was in a "cast-oil-on-the-water" mood. I could not let pass unnoticed—although what I say is not antagonistic to the Senator's position and certainly not to him—the rather smooth and suave way in which he said, "Now, it is not a question of letting the world know that we protest. There is nothing we can really do about it. We cannot stop an appropriation."

He suggests that this proposal is a gentle little way, which everyone recognizes, of waiting 30 days so that people will know that we are unhappy and are not pleased.

Mr. President, I for one do not want anyone to go away with the idea, nor do I wish the public to read the proceedings in the RECORD and have the conception that in delaying confirmation of the nomination we, today, are merely going through the motions of mild protest. In the first place, it is not an insignificant act for the Senate to hold up the confirmation of the nomination of a man against whom not one word has been spoken on the floor of the Senate. Something very real must be involved, because the Senate does not act to hold up the confirmation of the nomination of a worthy public servant—and I have every reason to believe that the nominee is a worthy public servant—for 30 days, for 20 days, for 10 days, or for 1 day, unless Senators really feel that something vital is involved.

As far as I am concerned, I wish it distinctly understood that I do not agree to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Driver after 30 days. I wish to wait and see how he lines up. I wish to wait and satisfy myself as to whether his first allegiance and loyalty is to a political administration or whether his first allegiance and loyalty is to the veterans who need care in veterans' hospitals.

I wish to comment for a moment on the suggestion that there is nothing that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate can do, and that we cannot stop appropriations. We can stop them. We can increase them. We can earmark them. However, what has troubled some

of us is not the fact that notice has been served that veterans' facilities will be closed. It is the fact that the closing of facilities has seemed to us very plainly to be aimed at and to militate against the sparsely populated rural sections of the country. With the load of veterans care increasing—and it is estimated that it will continue to increase until 1980—there is grave doubt as to whether any facility should be closed. But if they are closed, let all sections be treated alike. Yet, the program as outlined seems to be directed only toward the rural sections of the country, such as that represented by the distinguished Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. METCALF], who have spoken out so well, and toward the section represented by us in rural New England.

Mr. President, in all friendliness, I shall be glad to lay one wager with my good friend from New York. If word had gone out that there would be a sweeping closing of veterans care facilities in the State of New York, we would not be talking about a gentle protest or an idle gesture.

I cannot refrain from saying that it is highly appropriate that we should be discussing this problem today, because this afternoon by a significant vote the Senate followed a course laid down in the 88th Congress and in the 87th Congress. With the best motives and the best intentions in the world, the Congress has been following a course of procedure that makes Federal favoritism—and I repeat the term, "Federal favoritism"—inevitable.

The area redevelopment legislation inaugurated by Congress some years ago has all the earmarks of a beautiful, altruistic, idealistic project, whereby the Federal Government will use its vast influence and resources to help those who are underprivileged and in distressed areas of the country. But some of us voted against that bill, and we were held up to scorn as being coldblooded, cynical, and out of date.

The reason why we voted against it was that no matter how many provisions were written into it against pirating, so-called—against using the Federal Government's influence to lure industry from one State into another State, in the belief that that should not be done—the fact remains that no matter who administers that legislation, no matter whether it is a Democratic administration or a Republican administration, no matter how sincere is the desire to be fair and just, Uncle Sam cannot be expected to decide as between the rights and needs of his 50 children without falling into error. I do not refer to Federal rescue work in an area that is devastated or where some great calamity takes place. I refer to the proposition that the Federal Government in Washington will put its finger on one region this year, and another region next year, and say, "We are going to pour money in for you, and that will be all right; but the rest of you will have to wait. Next year we will take care of you; the following year we will take care of someone else." It is a long, long road; and King Solomon, in all his wisdom, could never administer that kind of Federal Government, with that kind of theory, and do it in fairness and with justice to all.

We are speaking within a very few minutes after the debate has been finished and the vote taken on Appalachia, which is the region to be favored today. Someone said there would be six more regions to follow, and I guarantee that my region will be the sixth. Anyway, Appalachia is the region that has been favored today. Immediately following the passage of that bill, we have begun the consideration of veterans' business.

It is not that facilities are being closed. Some of us have been crying for years for Government economy. If just and fair economies were being put into effect, we would be arrant hypocrites if we stood up and protested. That is the reason why I have not been shouting too loudly about the regional offices and administrative offices of veterans' facilities. Even there, however, there has been injustice, as I pointed out forcibly in my statement to the Veterans' Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

But I can see the handwriting on the wall. I can name some of the hospitals that will be closed next. They are hospitals in the more remote regions of the country. That is why this is a very real issue.

I, for one, wish to give due notice that this is not an idle gesture. This is not a 30-day moratorium to allow everybody to fall into line. I do not intend to sit on the Committee on Appropriations and be walked on by anybody who decides that my region, my sparsely populated State, and, above all, the veterans of that locality can be made to suffer because, presumably, there are fewer votes to protest such action. I do not intend to let that happen; and we are not powerless.

I have had such views rammed down my throat in this body for 10 long years. I believed them the first 2 years. I almost believed them for the first 5 years. Why? When we were voting on a foreign aid bill that was loaded to the gunwales with every kind of extravagance for countries that should not have been aided, people said to us, "Oh, no; you cannot vote against that bill on final passage. You must not."

"Why?"

"Because you will be cutting off the vital aid which we all agree must go to certain nations for the safety of this country."

I swallowed that reasoning and voted for foreign aid bills 5 years longer than I ought to have done. It never once occurred to me that that kind of argument sounded good but was not practical. If we had defeated a foreign aid bill 5 years ago, another one would have been before us within the next 3 weeks, reduced to proper size, merely because Congress would have stood up for once and said, "No." It would not have meant that the program concerning which we had said "No" was ended forever and that we would have been charged with its execution. The money bag and the purse strings are the only controls left in the legislative branch of our Government. We should not hesitate to use them.

All we need to do if we see injustice and favoritism, whether it be toward my State or the State of some other Senator, if we see the Federal Government getting beyond its proper sphere and picking and choosing—I almost said "bribing," but I would not use that word—among different sections of the land, is to stand up someday and refuse to report an appropriation bill until its provisions have been changed.

We need not think that the administration would allow the veterans hospitals of the country to be closed. Oh, no. We do not have to swallow that kind of talk. That is why I took exception, first, to the idea that the 30-day moratorium would be a nice little gesture on the part of the Senate to make the people back home feel good. It would not. It would be a highly significant act. It would involve a grave responsibility, to start with.

Second, it is a mistake to say that during those 30 days, no matter what reports came from committees, and if in the wisdom of the Veterans' Administration and the Federal administration veterans facilities in small States and in sparsely populated areas closed their doors and our veterans made to suffer, there was nothing that the Senate and its Committee on Appropriations could do about it. I say there is. I should like to see the Senate stand up on its hind legs someday and let the world know, when we are talking about giving notice to the world, that there is something else besides the executive branch of the Government and the Supreme Court. The legislative branch has become eroded to the point that Senators themselves say, "We have to take it. We can wait, but the ax is going to fall, so we might as well accept it."

That was what I wished to say. I do not say it in criticism of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, characterization is, I think, always a difficult thing when one man rises to try to define what is in the heart of another man in the way of characterizing his determination or his views as to how constant he wishes to be in that determination.

There are 100 strong-minded, strong-willed Senators in this Chamber. I yield to no one in my fidelity to my convictions. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire yields to no one in his fidelity to his convictions.

I shall express mine for myself. I do not agree with the description of them by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I say that with all respect and with a very deep and warm feeling toward him.

The argument was very potent and very effective. But, be that as it may, and I shall yield in a moment, the fact is that I said that by voting to defer the confirmation of the nomination of a worthy public servant—these are the words of the Senator from New Hampshire—we start the process of seeing what the things are that we can do to reverse the VA closing order. This is one of them.

I am not closing the door to what we can do in the future, to what the Committee on Appropriations can do—upon which committee the Senator from New

Hampshire so ably serves—or to what anyone else can do.

I shall join fully in every honorable effort toward that end with just as much conviction and just as much determination as the Senator from New Hampshire.

I am not engaging in an exercise to lay this question over for 30 days with a slap on the wrist for the administration, and the expectation that everything will be all right hereafter.

But, I shall not sacrifice, and I never have sacrificed any man like Mr. Driver in this Chamber in terms of his being a worthy public servant, which is the situation as it stands now. That is why I said what I did.

I shall vote "aye" on the pending motion. But, it is only fair to him, a man who has served 20 years in the Veterans' Administration, that I make clear that what I do is not directed against him.

We have complete interest in common in this matter. I join with my colleague from New Hampshire in every conceivable thing which any of us can do, he or I, or both of us together, in effecting the determination of the Senate, once expressed, that it disapproves thoroughly of this pennywise, pound-foolish, penny-pinching policy of VA hospital closings.

I know what men endure. It burned into my soul during my service in World War II.

I feel this very deeply. I admire and deeply respect the Senator from New Hampshire. But, I felt it important to state that my determination is just as unflagging as his, to see that what I consider to be a very serious wrong is corrected.

I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

I have reviewed in my mind what was said. I do not think that one word was said in criticism of the Senator from New York. What I said was in disagreement with his presentation.

We can disagree on issues and disagree on facts. We can disagree on alleged facts without being personal.

If I was personal in the slightest degree, I am indeed sorry. I hold the Senator in the very highest regard. I was not speaking in anger. I merely wished to make clear that I felt that perhaps inadvertently he had conveyed the idea that this afternoon's debate was a gesture. I wanted to nail that to the mast. I do not consider it to be a gesture.

I am sure that if anything were to happen to Mr. Driver, I would regret it as much as anyone. But, if we are put to the test, if we are to see something happen to Mr. Driver, rather than see something happen to thousands of veterans in this country, I would vote in favor of the thousands of veterans.

If I said anything that is offensive to the Senator from New York, I certainly withdraw it. I would not want to do that.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is very kind. Apparently some of my statement did not convey what I had intended to convey to the Senator.

I am glad that with his customary frankness, he has enabled both of us to make that very clear.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I regret very much that I must rise today and speak on the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

I hope that the motion of the Senator from Vermont is adopted so that I shall not have to analyze the hearing record, so that I shall not have to say some of the things about Mr. Driver as a result of his appearance before the committee that might be derogatory of his character.

I am not in accord with the statement that he is a fine man who has been abused because of the budget. His appearance before the committee indicates that he approves of the abandonment of congressional authority. He wants to move away from policies adopted by his predecessors in the Veterans' Administration. I want to give Mr. Driver the opportunity to put his defense in the RECORD. I want to have the Members of this body advised, so that all 100 Senators will have an opportunity to read the RECORD, especially to read the testimony he presents and to read his rebuttal when it comes.

Therefore, I think that the motion of the Senator from Vermont should be adopted. But, if it is not adopted, I say here and now that I am going to talk about some of my reasons for not voting on the present record for him to be the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I withhold that. But I want to have an opportunity to take the floor in the event that this motion fails, so that I can point out some of the points that were brought out in the hearings.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, while the nomination of the future Administrator of the Veterans' Administration is under discussion, I think it is altogether appropriate to point out that the impact which the proposed closings of VA facilities will have will be not only on the veterans of the various States involved but also on the States themselves.

In New Hampshire, the cutback in services at both the regional office in Manchester and the office in White River Junction will mean that many veterans, some of them in poor financial condition as well as poor physical condition, will have to travel up to 250 miles to go to Boston to find out whether they will or will not be eligible for assistance. I see no reason why New Hampshire veterans should thus be discriminated against in favor of those living in States which will have their own facilities.

The State of New Hampshire has taken official notice of this proposal. The House of Representatives of the New Hampshire General Court has, by resolution, protested the plans of the Veterans' Administration.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the clerk of the house containing the resolution be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, inasmuch as my duties as a Senator from New Hampshire require that any attempt to thus discriminate against my State be thoroughly opposed, I intend to support the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

EXHIBIT 1

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Concord, January 27, 1965.

Hon. THOMAS J. McINTYRE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McINTYRE: On Wednesday, January 20, the members of the house of representatives passed the following resolutions offered by Messrs. Coutermarsh of Lebanon and Vachon of Manchester:

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has ordered a cutback in the regional offices of veterans' affairs at both Manchester, N.H., and White River Junction, Vt.; and

"Whereas this action might cause a cutback in veterans services and the loss of employment at these facilities; and

"Whereas although the Federal Government has justified the cutback of the offices on the grounds that it would reflect economy without affecting the services to veterans: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the members of the House of Representatives of the 1965 session of the General Court of New Hampshire, strongly protest this cutback in the offices at Manchester, N.H., and White River Junction, Vt., because of the result in poorer services to veterans and hardship to people employed at these facilities; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the Veterans' Administration and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress."

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS W. TOLMAN,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to postpone consideration of the nomination until March 1, 1965. The yeas and nays have been ordered——

CLOSURE OF WHITE CITY, OREG., DOMICILIARY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the recent announcement of the Veterans' Administration to close certain hospitals, domiciles, and regional offices has been of great concern to me, particularly with respect to the domiciliary in White City, Oreg. The Camp White facility was established early in 1949 as a domicile for veterans of World War I and II. The conversion of this former military base to a veterans' domiciliary was of particular interest to me because it was my bill, S. 1035, of the 80th Congress, to provide for the acquisition of the Camp White facilities for use as a veterans' domiciliary, that became Public Law 577 of the 80th Congress.

It is a very interesting case from the standpoint of legislative history. Here is a domiciliary that was established by statute. I am concerned about the fact that the Veterans' Administration takes upon itself the power of repeal of a statute. That is what this action amounts to. It raises some very interesting legal questions as to whether or not that power in fact vests in the Veterans' Administration.

I was very pleased when Senator YARBOROUGH promptly scheduled hearings in the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs on the closure of these Veterans' Administration facilities. I certainly want to thank and extend my appreciation for my colleague's action on this important

matter and his continued interest in the welfare of our veterans who have sacrificed so much on behalf of our country.

Due to a long-standing engagement which required my presence in Oregon, I did not appear personally to testify before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs regarding the proposed closure of the White City domiciliary. However, I requested Chairman YARBOROUGH to include, in the hearing record, my comments and several questions which I posed to the principal witness appearing on behalf of the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration responded to the questions I posed regarding the relocation of the 1,000 veterans at the White City domiciliary, the assimilation of these veterans into other domiciliary facilities, the alleged savings to the Government resulting from the closure of four domiciliaries, including Camp White, and the additional cost to the Government for transportation and care of these veterans at other Veterans' Administration facilities.

However, what concerns me most, Mr. President, is the Veterans' Administration's contention that there is a progressive decrease in the need for domiciliary care. It supplied a table on domiciliary facilities and the demand for the use of these facilities. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this table be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

7a. The need for domiciliary care as requested in average yearly waiting lists on a national basis is as follows:

Fiscal year	Average yearly waiting list	Workload as manifested by ADML
1959	872	16,374
1960	567	16,339
1961	567	16,237
1962	398	15,760
1963	393	15,589
1964	619	15,229

Domiciliary facilities and demand, Nov. 30, 1964

Domiciliary location	Available beds	Operating beds	Waiting list	Workload ADML fiscal year 1964
Bath, N.Y.	830	830	9	747
Bay Pines, Fla.	400	400	33	371
Biloxi, Miss.	818	818	20	720
Bonham, Tex.	327	327	141	324
Clinton, Iowa	565	565	23	574
Dayton, Ohio	1,600	1,600	34	1,535
Dublin, Ga.	483	483		462
Hot Springs, S. Dak.	548	548	4	499
Kecoughtan, Va.	1,250	1,203		1,099
Los Angeles, Calif.	2,550	2,550		2,419
Martinsburg, W. Va.	500	500	69	479
Mountain Home, Tenn.	1,771	1,771	2	1,604
Temple, Tex.	392	392	55	381
Thomasville, Ga.	800	800		772
Wadsworth, Kans.	1,000	1,000		927
Whipple, Ariz.	159	159	161	160
White City, Oreg.	1,025	1,025	113	955
Wood, Wis.	1,661	1,275		1,201
Total	16,679	16,246	664	15,229

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is very difficult for me to believe that there is a decline in the need for domiciliary care in view of the figures supplied in this table. I wish to point out to my colleagues that the average yearly waiting list of veterans in need of care in domiciliaries across the Nation has increased from 393 in fiscal 1963 to 619 in fiscal 1964. These figures do not show a decrease in the need for domiciliary care. The average daily member load shows a slight decrease from 15,589 in fiscal 1963 to 15,229 in fiscal 1964. These figures do not appear to me to show a substantial enough decrease to warrant the closure of these domiciliary facilities.

The Veterans' Administration has also advised me that the 1,000 veterans at the White City domiciliary will be transferred to the domiciliaries at Los Angeles, Calif.; Whipple, Ariz.; Temple and Bonham, Tex.; and Hot Springs, S. Dak. However, upon the basis of the table provided by the Veterans' Administration, only the domiciliaries at Los Angeles, Calif., and Hot Springs, S. Dak., are in a position, with current beds available, to absorb the veterans from White City. But it would be impossible for these two facilities to absorb the 1,000 veterans.

According to the information provided by the Veterans' Administration, no expansion of facilities, in the way of construction, will be required to assimilate these veterans; however, the number of existing beds will be expanded to assimilate these veterans. If this is the case, do these other domiciliaries have the space available to make room for the additional beds and other facilities which will be required to take care of these veterans?

According to the figures provided in the budget for fiscal 1966, the Veterans' Administration intends to decrease the number of operating beds for use in domiciliaries for fiscal 1966 from 16,440 to 14,053. It is expected that the average daily member load will decrease from 15,241 to 13,993. Now the figures provided me in the table do not indicate that such a substantial decrease is going to occur in the need for domiciliary care by our veterans. Just how does the Veterans' Administration plan to assimilate the veterans from the closed domiciliaries with such an estimated decrease in beds? There are approximately 3,000 veterans who will be left without a domicile if the VA continues with its proposed action to close the domiciliaries. It is possible that some of these veterans will request discharge; however, I do not believe that the number who take this course of action will warrant such a decrease in the number of operating beds.

Are we going to make living conditions so unbearable that our veterans will be forced out without the means and ability to care for themselves? This appears to be what is happening in this instance. This is certainly a sad commentary on the carrying out of our obligations to our veterans.

During the war the hospital facilities were there. The structures are still there, and with equipment an excellent hospital could be provided.

Let me, in this digression, answer the alibi that the Veterans' Administration tries to put out—that they do not have the medical personnel with which to staff such a hospital. They argued that some years ago, and the result was that the Jackson County Medical Society of Jackson County, Oreg., met that one head on and worked out a cooperative program to which they offered their services to the Veterans' Administration to provide medical assistance.

Mr. President, we are dealing with some pretty precious human values. We are dealing with veterans who have been in these domiciliaries for some time. We are dealing with veterans most of whom come from this region of the country. It is very easy for a bureaucrat here in Washington in the Veterans' Administration to decide, "We are going to ship them wherever we want to ship them." To many of these men this has become home. These men are not bedridden. They are ambulatory. These men move from the domiciliary into the community. They have a great many friendships in the community. There are a great many associations in the community. They should not be treated as prisoners, to be moved from penitentiary to penitentiary as though they were closing a prison. These domiciliaries have become the homes of the present inhabitants, which carries with it a great many subjective values, as well as many human values. I stand aghast at what I consider to be the lack of appreciation on the part of the Veterans' Administration in regard to human values. I stand aghast that in this instance such a high value is being placed upon the dollar sign as against the human values involved in what I consider should be generous and kindly treatment on the part of the Government of the United States toward the men who fought for this Republic in time of war.

Mr. President, I wish the Senate—before it takes action on what I consider to be unsound economy on the part of the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration—could have an opportunity to commingle with the veterans themselves. I would like to see Senators get on an airplane and visit each one of these domiciliaries and give the veterans an opportunity to talk with them. Apparently, unless we can bring the politicians to the problems in this country, there is little hope of action in the Senate which will protect the kind of values I am talking about.

I have heard no evidence, I have read no argument presented by the Veterans' Administration, or by the Bureau of the Budget, or through them by the White House, to justify what I consider to be the inhumane action that really is behind the so-called economy drive on the homes called domiciliaries of the veterans of this country.

I know the kind of argument that will be used against those of us who speak as I am speaking this afternoon, that we are politicians caught in a squeeze involving our State or local districts which will take Federal funds out of those districts, so we cry to high heaven in protest.

That kind of ad hominem argument has never deterred me from making the plea for human values that I am making this afternoon. For I am pleading for the veterans in every domiciliary in this country who will be victimized by what

I consider to be unconscionable conduct on the part of the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration, and apparently approved by the President of the United States.

From the outset of the establishment of Camp White as a domiciliary, I urged the Veterans' Administration to include hospital faciilties at Camp White. Despite the demonstrated need for a hospital at this installation, the Veterans' Administration remained adamant in its opposition to the hospital through Democratic and Republican administrations. I am more convinced than ever that it was a mistake not to include hospital facilities at Camp White. Instead of seeking closure action at present, the Veterans' Administration should be working to the best of its ability to construct a new hospital for the use of these veterans at Camp White.

It is obvious to me, Mr. President, that the Veterans' Administration is engaged in a squeeze play which will make life so difficult for these veterans that they will seek any place other than a veterans' domiciliary to wait out their retirement years. The end result will be that they will be compelled, against their wishes, to seek largess from friends and relatives. This is a cruel hoax to perpetrate on veterans who have served their country so well. This is a fine reward for loyal service to the Nation.

I hope that veterans' organization after veterans' organization will take stock of one of the early actions of the administration in regard to doing what I consider to be an unconscionable injustice to the veterans of America.

To add insult to injury, the Veterans' Administration is taking its domiciliary closure action under the guise of economy. If an increase in the burdens of the veterans can be called economy, I wish to dissociate myself from that kind of false economy, because it is purchased at the cost of the health and comfort of our veterans.

Any dollar that is saved at the cost of creating unhappiness and suffering and the disjointure of the lives of our veterans is shockingly false economy and will go down in the history of Congress and this administration to its everlasting discredit, if it is not stopped.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement that I made to the Yarborough Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

JANUARY 21, 1965.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your courtesy in scheduling prompt hearings on the proposed closure of certain Veterans' Administration facilities, including the Camp White, Oreg., domiciliary, is greatly appreciated, not only by me but by the people of Oregon and particularly those residing in Oregon's Fourth Congressional District.

I am thoroughly familiar with the purposes for which the Camp White facility was established early in 1949 as a domiciliary for veterans of World War I and II. I have firsthand knowledge concerning this project because I was instrumental in obtaining the use of this former military base as a veterans domiciliary. In fact, it was my bill, S. 1035, of the 80th Congress, to provide for the acquisition of the Camp White facilities for use as a veterans domiciliary, that became Public Law 577 of the 80th Congress. For many years thereafter, I sought to bring about the establishment of a veterans hospital in connection with the domiciliary. I was convinced then, as I am convinced now, that it was a great mistake for the Veterans' Administration to continue its adamant opposition to the inclusion of urgently needed hospital facilities at Camp White. The requirements for the hospital are great and the location is ideal.

Rumors of the proposed closure of the Camp White domiciliary came to my attention considerably in advance of the official notice of the closure, but I regarded these rumors as being without any substance because the thought of closing the domiciliary seemed to me to be utterly absurd.

Camp White is located in the vicinity of Medford, Oreg., in an area that is blessed with almost ideal weather conditions the year around. I can state without hesitation that no geographic location in the entire United States is better suited as the site of a domiciliary for veterans of the higher age brackets than this particular installation. Approximately 1,000 veterans live at the domiciliary and many have lived there for almost 15 years. There is every indication that the domiciliary is well managed, is comfortable, and has been accepted as a completely satisfactory home for the vast majority of the veterans living there. Undoubtedly, the veterans were as shocked and dismayed as I was when the news came that their domiciliary home would be closed down and that they would be transferred to distant domiciliaries with far different surroundings and climates. We all know that older people become deeply rooted, so to speak, at the place they call home, and it is difficult for most of us to imagine the distress caused by complete separation of these older men from the place they have known as home for so many years.

The Veterans' Administration is very matter-of-fact in indicating that this phasing out of the domiciliary is being taken for economy reasons. Administrator Driver's letter refers to the fact that the nationwide action being taken by the Veterans' Administration closures of facilities will effect "a savings to taxpayers in administrative or overhead costs amounting to $23,500,000 in fiscal year 1966." My only observation on this is that the savings is a mere pittance when compared to the vast amounts we throw away by way of wasteful expenditures under our foreign aid program each year. Our veterans, who are not only human beings, but who have served their country well, deserve far better consideration than to be made the victims of a program of alleged Federal savings which is microscopic in comparison to our foreign aid program. For once we should begin to think of our own folks at home when expenditures of Federal funds are involved.

I am not at all sure that Federal savings would be involved by the closure of Camp White and I am convinced that the closure would not be in the best interests of the veterans. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate your presenting to the principal witness appearing at tomorrow's hearing on behalf of the Veterans' Administration the following questions:

1. To what new locations will the 1,000 veterans at White City be transferred? (The nearest domiciliary facilities in the West, I am told, are located at Los Angeles, Calif., and Whipple, Ariz. There is not one other veterans domiciliary in the Pacific Northwest and most are located in the South. I am deeply concerned over the fact that these veterans will be transferred to facilities which are not close to the homes of their friends and relatives, and that members of their families will not be able to visit them readily. These visits are oftentimes an important part of their rehabilitation and care.)

2. Will other domiciliaries be able to assimilate the 1,000 veterans at White City and the additional 2,000 of other domiciliaries, which are also being closed?

3. Will the domiciliaries to which the White City veterans are scheduled to be transferred be able to assimilate these veterans without expansion of facilities? If expansion is required, what will be the cost of such expansion and the increased annual cost of operation?

4. How much will the closure of White City save the Federal Government?

5. How much will the closure of the total of four domiciliaries save the Federal Government?

6. What will be the additional cost to the Government by way of transportation and care for approximately 3,000 veterans at other VA domiciliaries?

7. Has the need for domiciliary care decreased and will it continue to decrease in the next 25 years? (I would like to have specific figures in this connection, including the number of beds available, the number of beds now in use, and the number of veterans on the waiting list at various domiciliaries if any.)

The report of the Veterans' Administration suggests that the domiciliary program was established initially to care for veterans who could not sustain themselves in the communities. The VA adds that the social security program, together with increased veterans' benefits, is providing more and more veterans with assurance of freedom from financial want. This does not impress me as being entirely logical because it overlooks the fact that costs of living and private nursing home costs have increased vastly in recent year. It is my hope that the subcommittee will explore this aspect of the case in depth with the officials of the Veterans' Administration participating in tomorrow's hearing.

The Veterans' Administration contends also that domiciliary care must be integrated with hospitals. However, in the case of Camp White, the VA fought vigorously my efforts and those of other Members of the Oregon congressional delegation to establish hospital facilities in connection with the Camp White domiciliary. Thus, the argument concerning the lack of a hospital appears to be a self-serving declaration created by the VA for its own benefit in this case. It is my firm opinion, and I would appreciate your so advising the VA, that we should now be considering the installation of hospital facilities at Camp White rather than talking about closing the domiciliary.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should reiterate that the climate in the area of Medford, Oreg., at which Camp White is situated is very mild and healthful and is conducive to the general well-being of these veterans. There is no domiciliary located in a more ideal area from the standpoint of health and climate factors. This domiciliary has had enthusiastic support and fine cooperation from the local people. This has been of immeasurable benefit to the veterans. The welfare of the veterans should bear far greater weight than the meager savings which are proposed for the Federal Treasury through the closure of Camp White.

Your consideration of my views in opposition to the closure of the Camp White domiciliary will be greatly appreciated; it is my hope that the subcommittee will agree that the closure is unwise and express in strong

terms to the Veterans' Administration the desire of the subcommittee that this domiciliary should continue to serve in the years ahead the best interests of our veterans.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall vote for the Prouty motion because I believe that we need further time to go into the facts in regard to this nomination, and into the policies of the Veterans' Administration.

I am told, "all this nominee is doing is carrying out orders."

That is some basis for asking approval of a nomination, that the nominee is carrying out orders.

Now is the time to take a look at the orders. Now is the time to make clear to the administration that if it is appointing a man to carry out these orders, it is better that he not be appointed. We had better take the position of looking at the orders and the policies. I believe that a month is a short time, indeed, to ask for the postponement of action on this nomination until the appropriate committees of Congress can take a long, hard look at what I believe to be an unfortunate veterans policy announced by the administration through the Veterans' Administration, apparently with complete approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the White House.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I join Senators who have spoken so forcefully in behalf of the motion now pending before the Senate.

I must confess that when the motion to postpone was first made by the Senator from Vermont, I had some question as to whether that was the proper way to approach this subject. However, considering everything, I have decided that I shall vote for the motion to postpone, and I urge all other Senators to do so.

Perhaps this is a little ancient history now, and not all of it, if any, is attributable to Mr. Driver; but I have been less than satisfied with the presentations made by the Veterans' Administration to the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations during the last 2 years. In fact, it is my feeling—and I would be prepared to document it—that the former Administrator of the Veterans' Administration purposely deceived and misled both Senators from Colorado with respect to certain actions he took within that State. I do not believe that this necessarily can be attributed to Mr. Driver, and I do not do so.

But we are all in a very critical situation. The Veterans' Administration hospital at Grand Junction, Colo., is about to be closed. It was built in 1949, only 15 years ago, at a cost to the Government of $17 million. The personnel employed at that hospital, in a town of 20,000 population, is 168. That means that 168 families in that small town will be uprooted and thrown into movement that is unjustified by the economics of the situation and unjustified by the humanitarianism that we owe to veterans.

What will this mean to the people of western Colorado and the veterans of Colorado? I speak primarily with respect to the veterans. It means that when the facility at Grand Junction is closed—if it is closed—no facility will be available to veterans in Colorado, that great mountainous area between Salt Lake City and Denver, and between Cheyenne, Wyo., and Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Mr. President, I think we must ask ourselves why these veterans facilities were scattered around the country in the first place.

They were not put around the country in any logrolling deal. And they were not put around the country as a pork barrel. They were placed in various portions of the country so that we could adequately take care of the veterans in a region which was reasonably accessible to their homes, their families, and their friends.

Applying this reason to the State of Colorado alone—and I speak about the Grand Junction facility only because it is the only one that I know about personally—this means that some persons in Colorado would have to drive 350 or 400 miles, either to Denver or to Salt Lake City, to visit veterans who are in that hospital.

When one considers that in some months of the year in Colorado one must drive over 12,000-foot passes which are covered with ice and snow—and even on the best occasions it is a 7- to a 9-hour drive—it is an unconscionable burden upon the veterans, their families, and friends which they should not be required to bear.

It has been stated that the Grand Junction facility is an expensive facility. The figures that have been given to me by the Veterans' Administration are that it costs approximately $34 a day at that facility, and that some facilities cost as little as $28.

Mr. President, they will not save $34. They will not save $28. If they move these veterans from Grand Junction to Cheyenne, to Albuquerque, to Denver, or to Salt Lake City, they still have to be maintained. They still have to be taken care of. I, for one, am not going to abandon my obligation and sense of duty which I feel to these veterans wholly aside from the office which I hold.

Mr. President, I realize that deferring this decision does not hit at the main question. It does not hit it squarely. It is the only effective means of objection that we have available to us today. I do not question Mr. Driver's ability, honesty, or integrity. I do not do this as a personal thing against him. This was a move of the Bureau of the Budget. That means that it was a Presidential move.

And as I stated before, I do not intend to deprive our veterans in order to finance a part of the Great Society and some of the social concepts that the present occupant of the White House seems to entertain.

I hope that other Senators will join us in deferring this nomination. This would let them know that we in the Senate are serious about maintaining our position that these hospitals should not be closed to our veterans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], to postpone action on the nomination of W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, until a certain date.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BENNETT (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator for Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 12 Ex.]

YEAS—23

Aiken	Dirksen	Lausche
Allott	Fannin	McIntyre
Boggs	Fong	Metcalf
Cannon	Hruska	Morse
Cotton	Javits	Mundt
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Murphy

Prouty	Tower	Young, N. Dak.
Saltonstall	Williams, Del.	

NAYS—58

Anderson	Hartke	Morton
Bartlett	Hayden	Nelson
Bass	Hill	Neuberger
Bayh	Holland	Pastore
Bible	Inouye	Pell
Brewster	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Robertson
Carlson	Long, La.	Russell
Case	Magnuson	Smith
Church	Mansfield	Sparkman
Clark	McClellan	Stennis
Cooper	McGee	Symington
Douglas	McGovern	Thurmond
Eastland	McNamara	Tydings
Ellender	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Harris	Monroney	
Hart	Montoya	

NOT VOTING—19

Bennett	Jackson	Scott
Dodd	Johnston	Simpson
Dominick	Kuchel	Smathers
Fulbright	McCarthy	Talmadge
Gore	Moss	Yarborough
Gruening	Muskie	
Hickenlooper	Pearson	

So Mr. PROUTY's motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of William J. Driver to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I served notice during the debate on the previous motion that I should like to discuss the nomination in greater detail.

On January 22, when hearings started in the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I was convinced that I was going to vote for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. METCALF. I was convinced——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order. The Senator from Montana is entitled to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. METCALF. I was convinced, in spite of the fact that on January 13 Mr. Driver sent various Senators a letter announcing the closure of several veterans' installations. I read the letter. I did not feel that he was justified in the conclusions that he reached. I did not feel that the statements that he made were correct. But I believed that he probably made them in all honesty. That he had been forced to make them, as has been suggested here, by the Bureau of the Budget.

But after 2 days of hearings before the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], I am convinced that this man has not been frank with the Congress. He has told us half truths. He has insinuated things that cannot be justified. He is personally embarking upon a policy that is contrary to the traditions of the Veterans' Administration and contrary to the policies adopted by his predecessors.

A good deal of the debate has turned on economy. The letter of January 13 stated that if those 11 hospitals were closed, $23.5 million would be saved. After considerable interrogation Mr. Driver admitted that this policy he had embarked upon would not save money, but instead it would cost more money. Not a dollar would be saved. The appropriation for next year would be increased. The reason why he wanted to close the 11 hospitals was that back in 1958 or 1959 a ceiling of 125,000 hospital beds had been established by Presidential directive, and he needed the beds in the 11 closed hospitals so he could build hospitals in some other places.

On further interrogation we learn that the Veterans' Administration has adopted a policy of building hospitals of 400 or 500 beds in, near, or adjacent to medical education facilities. So that means that while today a hospital of 196 beds at Miles City, Mont., and a hospital at Grand Junction, Colo., will be closed, tomorrow the Veterans' Administration will close some of the other 100-, 150-, and 200-bed hospitals in remote or isolated areas.

So we said, "What do you mean by 'remote and isolated areas'?"

Then Dr. McNinch, Mr. Driver's deputy, testified. He testified from a prepared statement. He said that marginal hospitals had to go, that we had to have better quality of medical care and better quality of medical attention, and that the quality that the veterans were entitled to have could not be reached and could not be realized at hospitals having 100 or 200 beds.

I have a letter from a doctor in Miles City who says:

> There is not a VA hospital in the United States that is better than the Miles City hospital. The cases that require more specialty training have immediately been referred to Minneapolis or Denver for treatment. If their argument about medical care is true, then every doctor in Montana should leave and go to the city. I personally challenge any medical board of inquiry to attest in court, if necessary, to anything that even suggests that the quality of medical care in this hospital is anything but of the highest standard.

Nevertheless, the Veterans' Administration is committed to a policy of locating hospitals in metropolitan areas adjacent to medical centers. I asked Mr. Driver:

> Can you point to a new hospital that is proposed to be built next year that is located in some other area?

He cited an example of Tampa, Fla. He said that the Tampa hospital would not be located near a medical school. Subsequently, I learned that a medical school is proposed to be built at Tampa, Fla. I am glad there will be a hospital at Tampa. It is needed there. A shift in population has occurred, and because of an increase in the number of retired veterans, a hospital is needed there.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Last year, I obtained the exact figures on this situation in Florida from the State veterans' service office. Also, the figures were verified by the Veterans' Administration. At that time, more than 1,000 veterans in Florida suffering from mental ailments were being hospitalized outside Florida, some of them as many as 1,000 or 1,200 miles from their homes. This indicates something of the nature of the extreme need in our State, about which the Senator from Montana likewise knows.

Mr. METCALF. I concur completely with the need for a new veterans installation in Florida. I concur in the need for increased hospitalization in many other retirement areas.

President Johnson said to the newly elected Senators and Representatives, "Think in terms of 1980 and 2000 instead of in terms of 1933." Still, when our veterans are growing older, we continue to think in terms of the veto of the bonus bill and the running of the bonus army out of Washington in 1933.

Mr. Driver's letter to various Senators—I am reading from the one which my senior colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] placed in the RECORD—consistently pointed out that so far as regional officers were concerned, higher quality service was needed. Then during the testimony, he insisted that he had said throughout the entire letter that they would use new criteria and that they had planned to eliminate marginal hospitals in remote and isolated areas, because those hospitals were unable to provide quality service.

If the Veterans' Administration cannot provide service to 82 or 85 percent of the veterans who need merely general hospitalization in or near their homes, it is time we examined into some of our other hospitalization programs. It is time we looked into the Hill-Burton Act, the purpose of which is to encourage the development of hospitals in remote and isolated areas.

The Veterans' Administration says it intends to close the Miles City, Mont., hospital and the hospital at Grand Junction, Colo., because the quality of medical service rendered in them is not adequate for the veterans.

Where is it proposed to send the veterans? They would be moved to adjacent remote and isolated hospitals, where they would receive the same quality of medical service as they now get at Grand Junction, Colo., or Miles City, Mont. They would be moved to Minot, S. Dak., to Bismarck, N. Dak., and to other areas where the quality of service is no better and no different; to hospitals which have none of the specialized diagnostic services that are said to exist in Minneapolis, Denver, Salt Lake City, and Spokane.

So if this program of closure continues, as the first two closures indicate it will, there will be an area of the United States that stretches from Minneapolis to Spokane and from the Canadian border to Denver and Salt Lake City that will not have a single veterans hospital.

I say to Senators from States having hospitals with 200 or 300 beds:

"Send not to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for your States. It tolls for the veterans hospitals in your States."

The Veterans' Administration admits that with the approval of Mr. Driver it

has embarked on a program of eliminating so-called marginal hospitals in remote and isolated areas.

The second item that was brought out, by coincidence, is that the Veterans' Administration plans to begin using the health services of the military branches and the Public Health Service. It proposes to have those services take care of veterans. That program has been opposed by the military authorities and the Public Health Service and also by veterans organizations in America since the inception of the veterans hospital program. These programs were not pushed upon Mr. Driver. He defended them. His deputy defended them. He told them that this was the way he intended to administer the Veterans' Administration. He has defied Congress to do anything about it. He insisted that he should have an opportunity to submit answers to the questions that many Senators propounded during the course of the hearing. He said, with respect to questions that were left unanswered, that answers would be supplied for the record. The Senate should have an opportunity to read the record of hearings that were conducted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and his committee. The Senate should not confirm the nomination of Mr. Driver, who on the record to date has been less than frank, less than forthright, and less than truthful to Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

It is very difficult for me, as my record in the Senate shows, to vote against the confirmation of a Presidential appointee. In 1945, it will be recalled by some of the oldsters here, I presented a 5-hour dissertation as the result of a long research study that I conducted into every confirmation fight in the history of the Senate. I laid out the four historic criteria that have been followed by the Senate in every confirmation fight.

I shall vote against this nomination tomorrow. In my judgment, the nominee does not meet the criterion of competency. The testimony that he gave before the subcommittee demonstrates that over and over again.

Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] used language that I think indicated that one of the conclusions that he reached was a question as to whether this man was dealing with the Senate in an openhanded way, or whether he was engaged in a misrepresentation that occurs when one does not tell all the facts.

The feeling the Senator from Montana had, as I understood him, was that he did not believe he got the full story from the witness.

I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Oregon raised that question. During the debate on the previous motion, the Senator from Oregon himself was talking about economy. He mentioned that this was false economy and that we should look at the humanitarian grounds, which demonstrates that Mr. Driver sold the idea to the Senators that this is an economy move. But Mr. Driver had to admit that there was not any economy involved at all. He had to admit that all he wanted was to have some additional hospital beds and hospital rooms, so that he could go forward with his construction program.

That was not frank. That was not forthright. That was a half-truth in an effort to deceive the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I completely agree with the Senator from Montana. Whenever I must come to a conclusion that a nominee is not engaging in a full-faith presentation of facts, he simply falls short of the competency that qualifies him for the job.

Mr. President, in my judgment, this man is not sufficiently competent to be placed in the position of trust that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs occupies.

Mr. President, I have stated that tomorrow I would vote against the nomination, on the ground that the nominee, in my judgment, does not meet the criterion of competence.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] has made my case, although I shall enlarge upon it.

We cannot take the record of the testimony of this nominee before the Yarborough Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs and reach any other conclusion but that he was a witness who did not act in good faith in his testimony. He concealed. Therefore, I lost confidence in his intellectual honesty. I shall never vote for a nominee in whose intellectual honesty I do not have confidence, because such a nominee does not meet the criterion of competence.

Mr. President, some comments were made in discussion this afternoon by the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], as to what we will be doing to individual veterans in moving them about the country as though they were pawns. In my earlier remarks, I stated that we should take the example of the Camp White domiciliary, because most of those men come from that part of the country.

Do we wish to put a dollar sign on the human values involved in the kind of transfer of those men into a strange environment at their advanced age? These are veterans of wars to whom we are all greatly obligated morally.

Does it mean nothing?

Does it mean nothing to the Bureau of the Budget or to this nominee—or, apparently, to the White House?

Does it mean nothing to pull these men out of an environment to which they have learned to adjust, an environment that provides them the only happiness they know in their last years, and thrust them into a new environment in Florida, Arizona, or in XYZ State?

I happen to believe that we cannot put a dollar sign on an action of that kind. Even though they have been able to substantiate economy—and the Senator from Montana has pointed out that the nominee failed completely, under examination, to uphold the claim of the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration on economy—even if one could show some dollar economy, we cannot erase the human hardship that this action will cause.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against the nominee because I do not believe that he has demonstrated the competency which justifies his confirmation.

There is another phase of this situation I wish briefly to mention. It is interesting to hear the rationalizations advanced by some Senators and to read the news stories in the press in support of the nominee, that he is a bureaucrat who has climbed the ladder within the Veterans' Administration, that he was a deputy, and that this is desirable because it is promotion within the bureaucracy.

I am one who would have the Senate never forget that is dangerous administrative policy. Watch out for an administrative policy in connection with the various administrative agencies, in which we are going to fill top posts with bureaucrats from below.

I have been in the executive branch of the Government and I wish to tell the Senate that the cheap politics that reigns in many a bureau in this country puts major political party politics to shame.

It is not in the interest of efficient administration of administrative agencies to adopt the policy of giving the head position to a man who has previously served in lower positions. For the head position happens to be a policymaking position that calls for independent review.

As an old teacher of administrative law, let me point out to the Senate that we must watch out for bureaucratic inbreeding, that the nominee's career is an example of bureaucratic inbreeding.

Under our system of government checks, in promoting the efficiency of government, it is highly desirable to bring in independent minds that were never on the payroll of the agency to administer, review, and survey the policies of the administration.

Let me warn the Senate what this policy will result in if we do not stop it: It will result in the entrenched evils of bureaucracy spreading even wider.

I spoke about this danger briefly 1 or 2 years ago, when a nomination was before the Senate for one of our quasi-judicial tribunals, where one of the deputies to fill the commission post was picked. I warned at that time that it was going to result in bureaucratic inbreeding; and in that case, it has. In my opinion, that particular commissioner has been a complete "flop" from the standpoint of the public interest.

What we need is an independent check from the country. We need an independent check, not to promote someone within the bureau who has played bureaucratic politics for some years and secured for himself a position where he thinks he is qualified to be made the head man. In the Veterans' Administration we should put in charge a person who has not held a position in the Veterans' Administration before, but who we know is highly competent, able, and qualified to come into that agency and make an independent review of the policies which have been developed in past years under the previous Administrator. If they are good

policies, he will sustain them. If they are bad policies, he will change them.

The difficulty in this kind of bureaucratic inbreeding that the Senate will sanction, if it confirms this nomination, is that we will have more of the same.

What we need in order to carry out our system of government checks is to check bureaucracy by seeing to it that an independent mind is placed in the top position to review the policies—in this instance, of the Veterans' Administration—and to weed out the policies that the former Administrator has been carrying on that may prove to be wanting. The odds are in favor of the fact that this bureaucrat will just give us more of the same, and will not give us the independent check for which I am pleading.

I close by saying that I shall vote against the confirmation of the nomination because I do not believe the nominee meets the test of competence, because I do not have faith in his intellectual honesty, and because I think his promotion within the bureaucracy to the head position in the agency is not in keeping with the desirable carrying out of our system of checks, and therefore is not in the public interest.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO VOTE ON NOMINATION OF MR. W. J. DRIVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a vote on the nomination of Mr. Driver at 1 p.m. tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, that the Senate proceed to vote at 1 p.m., Tuesday, February 2, 1965, on the nomination of W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, in executive session, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 2, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 1 (legislative day of January 29), 1965:

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Andrew F. Brimmer, of Pennsylvania to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Buford Ellington, of Tennessee, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

William H. Brubeck, of California, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

John Hay, of Connecticut.
Joseph J. Montllor, of New Jersey.
Charles P. Nolan, of Massachusetts.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

Richard W. Aherne, of Pennsylvania.
George E. Brown, of Texas.
Miss Ann P. Campbell, of Connecticut.
David Meredith Evans, of Pennsylvania.
John H. Fincher, of Illinois.
Miss Susan M. Klingaman, of New York.
Miss Claretta L. Krueger, of Illinois.
Alfred L. Padula, Jr., of New York.
Thomas R. Shaver, of Illinois.
Erwin W. von den Steinen, of California.
Stephen B. Watkins, of Connecticut.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

Miss Janet M. Ansorge, of Wisconsin.
John P. Banning, Jr., of New York.
William A. Bell, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Lynn Darrell Bender, of California.
Richard W. Bogosian, of Massachusetts.
William J. Boudreau, of Massachusetts.
James R. Bullington, of Tennessee.
Walter M. Cadette, of New York.
Miss Ellen Rose Delate, of New Jersey.
Guy Feliz Erb, of California.
Harrell Kennan Fuller, of New Mexico.
Arthur M. Giese, of Mississippi.
Marvin Groeneweg, of Iowa.
Miss Jean Marianne Haeske, of Washington.
Richard J. Harrington, of California.
David Bruce Jackson, of California.
Vernard A. Lanphier, of Utah.
Warren A. Lavorel, of California.
David E. Long, of Florida.
Peter J. Lydon, of Massachusetts.
Lewis R. Macfarlane, of Washington.
James B. MacRae, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
George R. Martens, of New York.
Michael A. G. Michaud, of California.
Charles T. Owens, of California.
Vernon D. Penner, Jr., of New York.
Miss Charlotte W. Peters, of Indiana.
Joseph A. Presel, of Rhode Island.
Jonathan B. Rickert, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph L. Romanelli, of New York.
Leonard G. Shurtleff, of Massachusetts.
Thomas W. Simons, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Rufus Grant Smith, of New Jersey.
James H. Taylor, of California.
Michael Acton Taylor, of Indiana.
Patrick N. Theros, of the District of Columbia.
John N. Thomas, of California.
Miss Susan L. Travis, of Pennsylvania.
James W. Wheatley, of Tennessee.
James C. Whitlock, Jr., of North Carolina.
Leonard F. Willems, of Wyoming.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Samuel B. Bartlett, of Massachusetts.
Don E. Bean, of Tennessee.
Robert J. Blais, of Maryland.
Marion V. Creekmore, Jr., of Tennessee.
William H. Gussman, of New York.
Edwin Ho, of Hawaii.
Leon M. Johnson, Jr., of Colorado.
D. Lowell Jones, of Mississippi.
Norman C. LaBrie, of Massachusetts.
James W. Lamont, of Maryland.
Mark Lore, of New Jersey.
Donald K. Parsons, of California.
Hal W. Pattison, of New Jersey.
Harry W. Quillian, of Virginia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

G. Gardiner Brown, of Ohio.
Miss Cornelia Anne Bryant, of South Carolina.
Gordon J. DuGan, of the District of Columbia.
Walter J. Kearns, of Montana.
Thomas E. Macklin, Jr., of California.
Miss Elizabeth F. O'Brien, of the District of Columbia.
James E. Thyden, of California.
Miss Judy Anne Uhle, of Illinois.
Anthony H. Wallace, of New York.
Miss Carol A. Westenhoefer, of Michigan.
Paul R. Wisgerhof, of Colorado.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Stephen F. Creane, of Virginia.
Robert F. Grealy, of Massachusetts.
James D. Keegan, of the District of Columbia.
Harry Keith, of Maryland.
John J. Reagan, of Florida.
Jaroslav J. Verner, of Minnesota.
Miss Carol Ann Lucas, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a vice consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Grover C. Chappell, of Illinois.
John R. Friar, of Maryland.
Henry D. Hecksher, of Virginia.
Edward S. Juchniewicz, of New Jersey.
Myron M. Kline, of Minnesota.
John C. Murray, of New Hampshire.
Michael C. Sednaoui, of Colorado.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Helen F. Foose, of California.
Miss Margaret M. Herrick, of Minnesota.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code:

In the grade of general

Lt. Gen. William H. Blanchard, 1455A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

In the grade of Lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. James V. Edmundson, 1863A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert J. Friedman, 1397A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William K. Martin, 1697A, Regular Air Force.

Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, 1530A (major general, Regular Air Force), to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, under the provisions of section 711, title 10 of the United States Code.

ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert Rigby Glass, O19765, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Henry Kreitzer Benson, Jr., O20331, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Chrysostom David Scherrer, O20690, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Roland Bennett Anderson, O21108, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Andrew Enemark, O20879, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Allen Beall, Jr., O19907, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Jarvis Tolson III, O20826, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Clare Dunn, O20245, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Clarence Carl Haug, O19736, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ben Sternberg, O21286, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Alexander Osmanski, O19745, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Michael Shannon Davison, O22051, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Allen Thomas Stanwix-Hay, O51759, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Melville Brown Coburn, O19973, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kelsie Loomis Reaves, O20777, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Jay Hayes III, O20134, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Arthur Goshorn, O31465, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Charles Fremont Tillson III, O21196, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Stuart O'Malley, Jr., O20682, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Edward Schlanser, O19886, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Benjamin Otto Turnage, Jr., O20360, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Donald Vivian Bennett, O23001, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Milton Finn, O21252, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Peter Stone, O21376, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. William Arthur McKee, O31867, U.S. Army.

Col. William Herbert Price, Jr., O21903, U.S. Army.

Col. Lloyd Hilary Gomes, O21353, U.S. Army.

Col. Omer Sigmund Dews, O40079, U.S. Army.

Col. Samuel McClure Goodwin, O23177, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Emmett Ekman, O21190, U.S. Army.

Col. Wilson Maxwell Hawkins, O22737, U.S. Army.

Col. Michael Jesse Reichel, O40087, U.S. Army.

Col. James Lawton Collins, Jr., O21788, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Charles Forbes, O24511, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles McNeal Mount, Jr., O21849, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Riis Ploger, O21760, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Martin Gettys, O44181, U.S. Army.

Col. Edward Harleston DeSaussure, Jr., O23790, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank Dickson Miller, O21270, U.S. Army.

Col. Clarence Clinton Harvey, Jr., O21076, U.S. Army.

Col. John Scarborough Hughes, O34271, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Eugene Kelsey, O21061, U.S. Army.

Col. Michael Paulick, O23060, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Marion Seignious II, O47226, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Philip Seneff, Jr., O23738, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thurston Tyler Paul, Jr., O32243, U.S. Army.

Col. John Frederick Freund, O23334, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Roland Merrill Gleszer, O23278, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas Henderson Scott, Jr., O23030, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Russell Deane, Jr., O24835, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Jerry Spears Addington, O23041, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edward Alfred Bailey, O21083, U.S. Army.

Col. David Stuart Parker, O22907, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Samuel William Koster, O24873, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Walter MacRae Vann, O21812, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Alvin Ethelbert Cowan, O24171, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Jack Emerson Babcock, O21413, U.S. Army.

Col. Donald Harry Cowles, O35735, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Campbell Cassibry, O23058, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edwin Fahey Black, O23012, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Andrew Peach Rollins, Jr., O24237, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank Meszar, O23211, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Charles T. Booth II, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert B. Bell.

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles T. Hagan, Jr.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the life and character of Sir Winston Churchill has been the subject of countless sincere and eloquent encomiums in recent days, and I would not presume to undertake an inclusive eulogy. I cannot let his passing, and the impressive funeral ceremonies, retreat into history, however, without a brief and heartfelt comment.

Sir Winston Churchill was the best of everything British. He was a man who could bring to the modern world the finest traditions of the past. Yet for all his achievements that would make him a legend in his lifetime, we saw in him, particularly, the greatness of human spirit. In many ways, he captured the spirit of Kipling's "If," and shining through a brillant career we cannot help but see the greatness of an individual that would be translated into magnificent accomplishments in the realm of public service.

Sir Winston Churchill was the embodiment of the British spirit. He represented the greatness of the British past and British traditions. Yet for all of his achievements in the field of politics, in military affairs, in art and letters, he shall be marked by the indomitable spirit in a man whose pole star for greatness was courage. This was a personal courage that would be translated into the courage of a nation, an empire, and a cause. It was physical, and it was moral. One cannot look at him without a sure conviction that here was a man who, without hesitation or fear, would undertake any task, perform any duty, make any sacrifice which he might demand of others.

His stature will grow in history, and the posterity which owes him so much will study again and again the character of this man who not only inspired the free world by the leadership of his country in Britain's darkest hour but who had the vision, the courage, and the foresight after the end of World War II to direct

the world's attention to the tyranny of communism and the aggressive aims of the Soviet Union. It could well be that the greatest debt the free world shall owe to this man who towered above others in our tumultuous 20th century shall be found centered in his leadership in the postwar years to prevent the enslavement of mankind by the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Flags Again Flying in Front of Union Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, several of our colleagues, including GEORGE FALLON, SAMUEL FRIEDEL, CLARENCE LONG, and I, commute daily from our homes in Baltimore. Leaving Union Station for the House Office Building, we never failed to be thrilled by the sight of the flags flying in Columbus Circle Plaza, with the dome of the Capitol in the background.

Then one day we noticed that the flags and the poles were gone. A week or more passed and they had not been put back in place and we inquired about them. We were informed that after more than 50 years there, their condition was such that they had to be taken down. After expressing concern at their removal, action was taken.

The chill January wind reddened the faces of the group assembled on the Columbus Circle Plaza at the base of the flagpoles in front of one of Washington's landmarks—Union Station. They were gathered to officially observe the restoration of the three poles which had been removed because they had deteriorated beyond the point of repair, after standing proudly in their original positions for better than half a century.

Since the three flagpoles are on Government property, their restoration was under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Regional Director T. Sutton Jett inaugurated the action which culminated in flags once again being raised to fly in front of Union Station, as they had for so many years before.

When it was announced in July 1964 that new poles would be erected to replace those which had been removed, many persons, in many walks of life, evidenced great interest because of their feeling that these three poles had added greatly to the beauty and impressiveness of the plaza. Work on the project was started early in August and carried on to completion during the next 5 months.

In brief ceremonies on Friday, January 15, 1965, those who had shared such a great interest in seeing the poles restored, stood silently while an honor guard from the Military District of Washington solemnly raised the flags to the strains of the national anthem played by members of the Metropolitan Police Band.

In addition to Mr. Jett there were Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia; Congressman GEORGE H. FALLON, of Maryland; Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, District of Columbia Commissioner; Mr. C. R. Van Horn and Mr. B. J. Viviano, of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and Pennsylvania Railroad, respectively; Mr. C. W. Shaw, Jr., manager of the Washington Terminal Co., which operates Union Station, and his immediate predecessor, Mr. A. W. Johnston, now regional manager, eastern region, B. & O. Railroad; Col. George Webb and Mr. Whitney Irons, representing the District of Columbia Society of the Order of Founders and Patriots of America; members of the Metropolitan Police Department; and a number of railroad and Union Station representatives. It was my privilege also to be present.

Not only these, but travelers and passers-by, who stood under the Union Station portico once again enjoyed an unsurpassed view of the Capitol dome beyond the gleaming white poles from which flew the flags of the United States of America and the District of Columbia.

They said it was the cold north wind that reddened faces and hands of those who stood in quiet reverence. But none said it was the wind, only the wind, that caused eyes to fill and glisten as the glorious colors rose toward the gray and wintry sky. Not a word was spoken, nor was there any need.

Wool Act Extension Introduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill calling for permanent extension of the National Wool Act of 1954. The National Wool Growers Association, at its 100th anniversary convention, held in Phoenix last month, adopted the following resolution:

> The National Wool Act throughout its existence has been a program that has proven a step toward establishing our industry on a sound basis. It provides additional income for growers and at the same time leaves wool in a position to compete freely in the open market. We urge early extension of the act by the Congress. In view of the long-term requirements of sheep and wool production, such extension should be for as long a period as feasible but in no event for less than 5 years.

The National Wool Act is unusual in that since its inception it has worked to the satisfaction of the entire wool industry, from producer through manufacturer. All major organizations in the industry have supported its extension each time it has been up for renewal.

The wool producers would now, after 10 years of experience with the act, like to have it made permanent. In any event, they feel that they are entitled to an extension of sufficient duration to encourage producers to expand their flocks. The average life of a breeding ewe is 7 years and an extension for at least that period of time would provide producers with the economic stability necessary to persuade them that increased investment in their operations is a prudent business move.

My bill calls for a permanent extension. Recognizing that the Congress can modify any statute at any time, I share the feeling of the wool growers that a permanent law would be of most benefit to them. If this is not possible of attainment, I feel strongly that an extension of 7 or at least 5 years would provide the sheep industry with the minimum necessary stability.

I therefore am happy to sponsor this measure in behalf of one of our important agricultural industries, and I am hopeful the Committee on Agriculture will give this measure early and favorable consideration.

Tragic Sacrifices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the ratio of workers deciding to retire before reaching 65 years of age has increased each year since the opportunity to do so first became available to women in 1956. The percentage of women choosing reduced retirement benefits each year has risen from 12 percent in 1956 to 66 percent in 1964.

The opportunity for early retirement became available to men in 1961. Thirty percent of those retiring accepted lower benefits that year, 47 percent in 1962, 48 percent in 1963, and 49 percent in 1964.

The Advisory Council on Social Security points out in its recent report that reduced benefits represent great sacrifices for many who accept them. On the whole recipients of reduced benefits get $78 in monthly payments compared to $103 paid full beneficiaries. In many cases this cut is more than the retiree can afford to give up if he is to avoid accepting welfare aid.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the reduced benefits represent actuarial determinations of what can be paid per month for more months without exceeding the total expected payments to a worker who waits until 65.

But the end result seems unfortunate to me. It demonstrates the great desire of many people to retire earlier than 65, certainly. But I wonder to what extent it demonstrates compulsion as well. How many workers electing reduced retirements feel they cannot go on, that their employers will not let them, that automation has taken their jobs, that their health cannot stand it, and so forth?

The Advisory Council on Social Security has called for an inquiry into this aspect of early retirement and the sacrifices the present law compels. I hope

the Social Security Administration makes the inquiry promptly and makes the information readily available. In the face of the demonstrably great desire and need of Americans to retire before 65, I feel that a system which penalizes so many persons so severely cannot claim to be operating satisfactorily. Changes will have to come.

The following is a press release on this subject which I issued:

TRAGIC SACRIFICES

WASHINGTON.—Has 65 become too old to retire?

Is the strain of earning a living getting to be too great for men reaching their early sixties?

Almost half the men who retired last year took cuts in their social security benefits in order to quit before they reached 65, Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan's 16th District, said today.

These cuts went too deep, many fear.

The average early retiree gets only $75 in benefits for each $103 paid someone in similar circumstances who works until he is 65 years old.

The Advisory Council on Social Security warns that lower benefits now being accepted in many cases won't keep them off welfare in future years.

"These are tragic penalties," Representative DINGELL, said. "A basic aim of social security always has been to pay benefits which would keep retirees off welfare."

To give early retirees a better break the Council urges Congress to modify the method of computing each individual's benefit "base." But this won't help all, the Council warns.

"I was one of the original advocates of permitting men to retire at the age of 62," Representative DINGELL said. "This change became law only 4 years ago, in 1961.

"Acceptance was immediate; 30 percent the first year, 47 percent the second year. Of the 2,500,000 men who went on social security benefit rolls during the first 3 years of this program, more than 1 million retired early in spite of the sacrifices the present law demands.

"The prompt change reflects almost universal feeling that any man who has worked steadily ought to be able to quit at about age 60 if he wants to.

"The United States is certainly rich enough to afford this.

"But the sacrifice many are making is tragic. The pressures on some men to retire must be very great.

"Some early retirees are being displaced by automation, I suppose; some doubtless feel they can't meet competition from younger men; and I expect some are being forced to retire by their employers. I have heard of cases in which employers have made up benefit losses, but these have been exceptions.

"Many men retire early to save their health.

"I think the first thing we must do is to find out more of the reasons behind early retirement, and how great these sacrifices really are. Social security benefits for man and wife replace 71 percent of a $150 a month income, only 52 percent of a $350 a month income, and just 31 percent of a $600 a month income. Is this fair? Or necessary?

"We need to know how many retirees are getting out voluntarily, how many feel forced to quit, how many of these men actually have worked only occasionally in recent years. Desire for earlier retirement is too great for Congress to ignore.

"The proportion of women accepting reduced benefits in order to retire early is even greater than men, 64 percent. Their reasons vary. Some are retiring from jobs, some accepting dependents' allowances, some are widows, etc. Nearly all men retiring on reduced benefits are former workers."

Death of Dr. Virgil M. Hancher, Former President of the University of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I read this morning in the Washington Post of the death of Dr. Virgil M. Hancher, who was for 24 years president of the University of Iowa at Iowa City. Dr. Hancher was widely known as an educator, and he contributed much to the State of Iowa during the time he served as president of the University of Iowa. In addition to his long and successful career as an educator, he served his country well several years ago as an alternate delegate to the United Nations.

His death yesterday in New Delhi, India, where he was acting as an educational consultant for the Ford Foundation, comes as a shock to me, as I am sure it does to the many persons who are familiar with Dr. Hancher's contributions to higher education in Iowa and throughout the rest of the Nation.

I would like to extend my sincere condolences to Dr. Hancher's daughter and son-in-law, Dr. and Mrs. Richard Hockmuth of Marshalltown, Iowa. I am sure those who have known and worked with Dr. Hancher join with me in expressing sympathy and regret upon his death.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1965

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

The Rev. Harry W. Campbell, pastor, Epworth Memorial Methodist Church, South Bend, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, gather within Thy care all these who serve our land. Increase our wisdom by gifts of Thy truth; make steadfast our courage by revealing to us Thine own purposes; make real our best hopes for our Nation by quickening within us a sense of destiny; and enable us to walk proudly in our tasks by showing us that we are enlisted in a noble cause. Keep us hard-headed, but capable of being soft-hearted. In the blessed name of Jesus we pray. Amen.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 1, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 71)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on the District of Columbia home rule, which has been read in the House. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD, and, without being read, it will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The restoration of home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia must no longer be delayed.

Our Federal, State, and local governments rest on the principle of democratic representation—the people elect those who govern them. We cherish the credo declared by our forefathers: No taxation without representation. We know full well that men and women give the most of themselves when they are permitted to attack problems which directly affect them.

Yet the citizens of the District of Columbia, at the very seat of the Government created by our Constitution, have no vote in the government of their city. They are taxed without representation. They are asked to assume the responsibilities of citizenship while denied one of its basic rights. No major capital in the free world is in a comparable condition of disenfranchisement.

The denial of home rule to the District creates serious practical difficulties. The District is the ninth largest city in the United States—more populous than 11 of the States. Its government must handle the same problems which press with increasing urgency on the legislative, executive, and judicial arms of city governments throughout the Nation, and it must perform as well many of the functions of State and county governments. Under the present system these duties fall upon busy Members of the Senate and the House who—in addition to their congressional responsibilities—must serve as State representatives, county supervisors, and city councilmen for Washington.