By Mr. HARRIS:
H.R. 4319. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey certain lands in Saline County, Ark., to the Dierks Forests, Inc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. IRWIN:
H.R. 4320. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Mistica Adornetti and Sister Elena Brogno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:
H.R. 4321. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Boscarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By. Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:
H.R. 4322. A bill for the relief of Harry Nicolas Vakalopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:
H.R. 4323. A bill for the relief of Gorgonio B. Policar, Jr., M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:
H.R. 4324. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John W. Cassell, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:
H.R. 4325. A bill to authorize the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to rent certain property in the District of Columbia for certain office purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MADDEN:
H.R. 4326. A bill for the relief of Borivoj Divcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:
H.R. 4327. A bill for the relief of Brenda Patricia Fawkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:
H.R. 4328. A bill for the relief of Lawerence C. Fincher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 4329. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isabel Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:
H.R. 4330. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Spataro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:
H.R. 4331. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of the Algonac Manufacturing Co. and John A. Maxwell against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE:
H.R. 4332. A bill for the relief of the Students' Association of the University of Texas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:
H.R. 4333. A bill to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late William F. Valters a commission as second lieutenant, Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.
H.R. 4334. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ofra Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 4335. A bill for the relief of Dr. Isabelo Remedio Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 4336. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hotica Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 4337. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Pichon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:
H.R. 4338. A bill to authorize the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to rent certain property in the District of Columbia for certain office purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RYAN:
H.R. 4339. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Kirousi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:
H.R. 4340. A bill for the relief of Virginia Clemente Coelho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:
H.R. 4341. A bill for the relief of Primo Meconi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:
H.R. 4342. A bill for the relief of Guido Aquilini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 4343. A bill for the relief of Farida Hanna Hazbon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:
H.R. 4344. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kodungallore Janaki Warner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1965

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

Dr. James P. Wesberry, pastor, the Morningside Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Once again, our Heavenly Father, we are grateful for the privilege of being in our Nation's Capitol, with its giant dome of architectural beauty, its crowning statue of freedom, and this sacred Chamber where a just and adequate edifice of law is built upon the heritage of our fathers.

We come humbly to unite our prayer, with those of multiplied millions of our fellow citizens, on behalf of each Member of the U.S. Senate, the Vice President, the Chaplain, the clerks, and all others who share and bear with them the heaviest governmental responsibility on earth.

Grant, we beseech Thee, most gracious God, unto these, Thy servants, in whose hands rest the welfare and virtue of the people to make or mar, divine wisdom, that their decisions may be righteous; divine guidance, that no ill will shall befall them or us; divine sympathy, that they may serve the best interests of all the people; and the counsel of Thy Holy Spirit, that they may know themselves to be Thy ministers.

Give Thou strength and health and Thy special providential care to the President of the United States.

Fill each of our hearts, we pray, with the love of God and the daring of Thy kingdom in the perennial and holy warfare for the freedom, justice, and rights of people everywhere. Renew our vision, O God, of the possible future of our country, and set our hearts on fire with new determination to do Thy will and to speed the coming of Thy kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 2, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 203. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases; and
H.R. 214. An act to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and, effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 203. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.
H.R. 214. An act to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and, effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read routine nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to make an announcement, that pursuant to Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] to be a member of the fifth meeting of the Mexico-United States interparliamentary group in lieu of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] who is excused.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to make uniform for all commodities, for which a marketing quota program is in effect, provisions for reducing farm acreage and producer allotments for falsely identifying, failing to account for disposition, filing a false acreage report, and for harvesting two crops of the same commodity produced on the same acreage in a calendar year; and to provide in the case of peanuts and tobacco for credit for penalties paid on marketings against penalties incurred for false identification or failure to account (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INCREASED FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION IN MEETING COSTS OF MAINTAINING THE NATION'S CAPITAL CITY

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 374 OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to measurement of farms (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that an appropriation to the White House Office for salaries and expenses, for the fiscal year 1965, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of that Board on the District of Columbia National Guard Armory and the District of Columbia Stadium, including financial statements, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Farm Credit Administration, fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on supply support deficiencies contributing to high deadline rate of air defense equipment at an oversea location, Department of the Army (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 confidential report on inadequate maintenance and supply support of aviation units of the 8th U.S. Army, Korea, Department of the Army (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 accumulation and retention of excess missile spare parts due to inadequate supply management practices of the U.S. Army, Europe, Department of the Army, 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 weaknesses involving primarily the disposition of surplus nonfat dry milk, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, 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 increased costs due to failure to obtain competition in procurement of electronic parts on qualified products lists at the Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio, Defense Supply Agency, Department of Defense, 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 confidential report on inadequate maintenance and supply support of aircraft of the 7th U.S. Army, Europe, Department of the Army (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 resulting from the use of stateside personnel in civilian positions at naval installations on Guam, Marianas Islands, Department of the Navy, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on activities exercised through the Geological Survey to areas outside the national domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

GENERAL REVISION OF THE COPYRIGHT LAW, TITLE 17 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and for reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

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

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

COST-OF-LIVING ALLOWANCES FOR CERTAIN JUDICIAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide cost-of-living allowances for judicial employees stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska or Hawaii (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF LOSSES OR COSTS INCURRED BY THE POSTAL SERVICE

A letter from the Postmaster General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the estimated amount of the losses or costs (or percentage of costs) incurred by the postal service in the performance of public services, during the current fiscal year, ending June 30, 1965; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MANPOWER ACT OF 1965

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON MEASURES BEING TAKEN TO CONTROL THE EMISSION OF AIR POLLUTANTS FROM FEDERAL FACILITIES

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on measures being taken to control the emission of air pollutants from Federal facilities, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO PREVENT THE CLOSING OF THE U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL IN THE BRIGHTON DISTRICT OF BOSTON

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Massachusetts House of Representatives that the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital in the Brighton district of Boston will be closed; and

"Whereas more than 60,000 outpatients, many of whom are fishermen engaged in New England's oldest industry, are treated annually in this facility; and

"Whereas if the Rutland Heights Hospital of the Veterans' Administration is closed, the load on remaining U.S. hospitals for inpatient service will be increased: 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 U.S. Public Health Service Hospital in the Brighton district of Boston; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States rescind the order providing for the closing of said hospital; 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 Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, January 20, 1965.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by District 50, United Mine Workers of America, State of Michigan, relating to medicare; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by District 50, United Mine Workers of America, State of Michigan, relating to the war on poverty; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JORDAN of Idaho:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"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 the act of Congress of June 29, 1956, entitled 'the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956,' (70 Stat. 374), and subsequent revisions thereto, have provided for a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways of not to exceed 41,000 miles of such highway system; and

"Whereas since the enactment of the aforesaid Federal Aid Highway Acts, the construction of the Interstate Highway System is nearing the halfway point in its completion; and

"Whereas the 50 States, in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, are now in the process of preparing a comprehensive study and analysis of overall highway needs, and the financing thereof, after completion in 1972 of the Interstate Highway System; and

"Whereas the aforementioned study will include an evaluation of all Federal aid highway programs, including the possibility of extending the mileage of the Interstate Highway System; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 is presently on the Federal aid primary highway system in the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 is the only north-south route between north Idaho and southwest Idaho and serves an area with a population of 300,000 people, which is 45 percent of the total population of the State of Idaho and would also serve the inland empire area of eastern Washington, including the Spokane, Wash., metropolitan area; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 is one of the most important arterial highways in the State of Idaho; presently the only all-weather, all-year route between north Idaho and south Idaho; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway 95 provides the only north-south connection in Idaho between Interstate Highway No. 90 and Interstate Highway No. 80 North; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 if improved to expressway or interstate highway standards would provide a highway facility having high standards of service and access control and lying approximately midway between Interstate Highway No. 5 to the west and Interstate Highway No. 15 to the east of the currently designated Interstate Highway System; and

"Whereas an improved U.S. Highway No. 95 would provide an excellent highway service tie with transcontinental routes in Canada and with the Alcan Highway to the State of Alaska; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 offers excellent opportunity for extension to the south and west from the Idaho-Oregon State line through Oregon and Nevada to a connection with Interstate No. 80 in the vicinity of Winnemucca, Nev., and this in turn, would provide a most important service connection from California to Idaho and Canada; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 serves the following population centers in Idaho; Bonners Ferry, Sandpoint, Coeur d'Alene, Moscow, Lewiston-Clarkston, Grangeville, Council, Cambridge, Payette-Ontario-Weiser, and Boise-Nampa-Caldwell; in addition to servicing Calgary and Edmonton, Canada; Winnemucca, Reno and Carson City, Nev.; and Sacramento, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, Calif., through connecting interstate highways, as well as numerous historical, recreational, and scenic areas together with the agriculture, mining, and lumbering industries; and

"Whereas U.S. Highway No. 95 would also serve the important water transportation terminal planned for development at the Port of Lewiston: 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 that when priority selection is made for the next most important highways in the United States, after the present Interstate Highway System is completed, that the Congress of the United States of America direct the Secretary of Commerce to include U.S. Highway No. 95 from the Idaho-Oregon State line in the south to the Idaho-Canadian border in the north in the mileage of expressway or interstate highway extensions as may be determined for Federal aid highway programs upon completion of the presently designated Interstate Highway System; 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 Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house on the 18th day of January 1965.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate on the 20th day of January 1965.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"DRYDEN M. HILER,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"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 Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PREVENT THE CLOSING OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AT RUTLAND

"Whereas the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has proposed that the medical-surgical facilities of the Veterans' Administration located at Rutland be closed on June 30, 1965; and

"Whereas the closing of these facilities appears to be contrary to the philosophy of rendering maximum benefits to the veterans of the country whose timeless efforts and unselfish sacrifices should always be remembered: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to instruct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to rescind his directive ordering the closing of the veterans' facilities at Rutland; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted 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 the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate, January 27, 1965,

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

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. 76. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Commerce to make certain studies (Rept. No. 54).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. RES. 63. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel (Rept. No. 55).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S. 969. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to give 6 months' advance public notice of the planned closing or relocation of any veterans' facility, and to provide for at least one veterans' service center in each State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

S. 970. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to expand and improve services under the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, to provide special funds for training professional personnel for providing health services for crippled children, to provide for a program of medical assistance for children and other persons whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical care and services, to enable States to implement and follow up their planning and other activities leading to comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 971. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elena B. Guira; and

S. 972. A bill for the relief of Manuel S. Pablo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 973. A bill to prohibit the use of mail covers to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. PELL):

S. 974. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 975. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 976. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 977. A bill to provide for the adoption of a perpetual calendar; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 978. A bill for the relief of Ethel Hudson Morrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 979. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John J. Bailey of Orlando, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 980. A bill establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 981. A bill for the relief of Steven Ho, Tsou Chang Mao Ho, and their children, Samuel and Anita; and

S. 982. A bill for the relief of Maj. Robert G. Smith, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 983. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. PELL:

S. 984. A bill to provide for an Administrative Counsel of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CLOSING OF VETERANS HOSPITALS

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 79); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, Whereas on January 13, 1965, the Acting Administrator of the Veterans' Administration announced the proposed closing of 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliaries and 17 regional offices operated by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas said announcement was made without notice or consultation with Representatives in Congress or Senators or with the appropriate committees of the Congress having jurisdiction over veterans affairs; and

Whereas the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has, since said announcement, begun hearings and studies concerning the need for said hospitals and other facilities and the advisability for said closings; and

Whereas the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has announced its intention to have similar studies and hearings; and

Whereas notwithstanding the interest of these committees of Congress and the hearings and studies already underway, the Veterans' Administration has proceeded to refuse admission to worthy veterans to said hospitals covered by the closure order, and has proceeded to move toward transfer of patients elsewhere, and to take other steps toward closing hospitals to the detriment of veterans needing hospitalization: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that none of the hospitals or other Veterans' Administration facilities mentioned in the order of January 13, 1965, be closed without the approval of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate and the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, and that until those committees have completed their studies and hearings the Veterans' Administration and all of its officers and employees cease and desist from refusing admission of patients or transferring patients or taking steps leading to the closing of said facilities until final action has been taken by the committees.

VETERANS' SERVICE CENTERS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Delaware may proceed.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], I introduce, for appropriate reference, amendments to title 38 of the United States Code, dealing with veterans' benefits.

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

The bill (S. 969) to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to give 6 months' advance public notice of the planned closing or relocation of any veterans' facility, and to provide for at least one veterans' service center in each State, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BOGGS (for himself and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced would do two things: First, it would call for the location in each State of at least one veterans' service center, a VA field office which would serve as the center for administration in that State of VA programs to its veterans. Second, the bill I have proposed would require that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs give 6 months' notice before closing or materially reducing the services available at any VA hospital, domiciliary or outpatient dispensary.

I have hesitated to take this step, because I am reluctant to impose any restrictions on an agency of the executive branch, but I think that recent experience bears out my thinking that these two small changes in the law are called for.

The first of these proposals, the one relating to veterans' service centers, will not result in a very great change in the administration of our many excellent programs for veterans; but it will, I think, guarantee our former servicemen a measure of sensitive, close-to-home handling of their affairs.

As some Senators are all too painfully aware, the recent move by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to consolidate a number of regional offices will, if it is allowed to proceed, have the effect of removing far from the homes of many of our veterans all but the slightest office contact with the VA. This sort of consolidation may, as the Administrator claims, result in a saving—at least on the books—but my investigation into the matter has convinced me that any savings thus effected will be more than offset by inconvenience and added expense to the veterans served by the so-called remote offices.

Now, the measure which I have proposed would not require that there be a VA office in every hamlet, however sparsely populated or far from a regional center. It would require only that every veteran be able to transact his affairs with the VA within his own State. There is now, in every State and in the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, at least one VA office, either a regional office or VA center. The recent unfortunate cutback decision will leave eight States without such an office. All that this measure would require is that there be at least one such office sufficiently staffed and equipped so that it could handle the affairs of the veterans in the State, rather than having to send to Philadelphia, or Boston, or Los Angeles or Washington for a man's file, for instance, before the office could even begin to consider his case.

This is not simply a matter of State pride—although I for one have noticed with some alarm the increasing tendency of Federal agencies to disregard the States as entities in making up regions for administrative purposes. There is a very compelling practical reason for administration of VA programs at the State level. It is not generally recognized, or fully appreciated, but an astounding amount of the burden of keeping our veterans apprised of their rights and obligations under law is borne by the service organizations such as the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to name only three of these helpful groups. These veterans organizations have assumed and carried out a tremendous responsibility in the vital task of maintaining a working relationship between the veteran and his Government. All of these fine organizations are organized and function on a State-by-State basis. The American Legion, for example, is made up of 58 departments, 1 for each State and the District of Columbia, and 7 outside the country.

It is obvious that if each of these State veterans service units can maintain a working contact with a corresponding State-level VA service center, that will help tremendously in providing service to the State's veterans. And it is equally clear that removal of State contact, or reduction of it to a point where it is substantially lost, would mean a very real breakdown in effective administration of the programs designed to aid those men who have served this Nation so well. Let us look for efficiency and economy in Government by all means, but let us by no means be unduly conscious of cost, when dealing with those who did not count the cost in serving their country. And let us be sure we are talking about real savings, and not merely transferred expense.

The second change in present law which the bill would bring about is quite a simple one, and one to which I should think there could be little objection. Under this change, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs would be required to publish, in the Federal Register, notice of his intention to close any VA medical facility at least 6 months before acting on his proposal to close it; and, if requested, he would have to hold hearings in the congressional district in which the affected facility was located.

There is a human side to every administrative problem. And the 6 months' notice provision which is called for in this bill will allow that human side to make itself known.

The issue in any case of a proposed closing is whether the needs of the area's veterans will be met after the change. A hearing of interested veterans will shed a great deal of light on that issue. The criteria of efficiency and economy remain essential, but no less essential is the reason for the Veterans' Administration itself; namely, service to veterans and their families.

This provision for notice of intention to close any veterans medical facility would prevent any sudden announcement of a decision to take such action before the Congress and others had an opportunity to explore the matter thoroughly. Our recent experience underlines the need to have some prior notification, in my opinion.

To conclude, I simply say that while these two changes are far from earthshaking so far as the Veterans' Administration is concerned, in my opinion they will, if written into the law, provide some very real and needed safeguards for those whom that law, and the agency which administers it, are intended to serve.

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

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

S. 969

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 230(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "The Administrator shall establish in each State not less than one veterans' service center, which shall be the center in such State for the administration of programs and services provided by law for veterans and their dependents and beneficiaries; and the Administrator may establish such regional offices and such other field offices within the United States, its territories, Commonwealths, and possessions as he deems necessary. As used in this subsection the term 'State' means the several States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. Section 5001 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and (2) by inserting after subsection (e) a new subsection (f) as follows:

"(f) No hospital, domiciliary, or outpatient facility owned or operated by the Veterans' Administration shall be closed or relocated, nor shall the services provided at any such hospital, domiciliary, or outpatient facility be materially expanded or reduced, unless notice of such proposed action has been published in the Federal Register at least one hundred and eighty days prior to the date any action in furtherance of such proposed closing, relocation, expansion or reduction is taken, and opportunity has been afforded, if requested, for a hearing in the congressional district wherein such facility is located on such proposed action by any interested veteran or group of veterans."

CHILD HEALTH AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference the Child Health and Medical Assistance Act of 1965.

The bill amends the Social Security Act to expand and improve services under the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs; to provide special funds for training professional

personnel for providing health services for crippled children; to provide for a program of medical assistance for children and other persons whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical care and services, and to enable States to implement and follow up their planning and other activities leading to comprehensive action to combat mental retardation.

This is a bill broad in scope, designed to carry out many of the major health proposals suggested to the Congress by the President in his message of last month. It is identical to the measure introduced last week in the other body by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. President, medical and research technology has advanced the art and science of medicine further in the past 25 years than in all of the previous medical advances in the history of mankind. Already the surgeon's knife enters where it never could before. Entire organs are removed and transplanted; segments of blood vessels replaced. The body temperature is lowered—cooled—while the heart surgeon explores the vital pump. Drugs have conquered once deadly bacterial enemies, others relax the grip of hypertension and even mental disorders. Hormones ease the pain of arthritis and other chronic ailments. Vaccines shield the body against certain viruses. Cancer researchers explore the exciting possibility that a virus may cause that dread disease—and logically, that there may then be a vaccine to protect us from it. Less spectacular but no less important, simple procedures have been devised to detect hidden diseases before outward signs appear, while they can still be treated and still be cured.

We are thrilled and encouraged by these developments but let us never lose sight of the essential question: How vigorously can we put our carefully built scientific capability to the service of those who need it? How swiftly and equitably can we deliver these services to the society of the sixties, the seventies, and the eighties? While we congratulate ourselves on success in sophisticated open-heart surgery successes, let us not forget the child in the slum, who right now is falling victim to a disease for which we long ago discovered preventive vaccines.

Let us not forget especially the health needs of the 15 million children of families who live in poverty.

As President Johnson stated in his message on the Nation's health:

> Our first concern must be to assure that the advance of medical knowledge leaves none behind.

And as the President further stated:

> We must not allow the modern miracles of medicine to mesmerize us. The work most needed to advance the Nation's health will not be done for us by miracles. We must undertake that work ourselves through practical, prudent, and patient programs.

The bill I am introducing today will provide for just such practical, prudent, and patient programs. It builds upon our sizable body of experience with health measures in the fields of maternal and child health services, of crippled children's services and services to the mentally retarded, of school health services, and of health services available through our public assistance programs including medical assistance for the aged.

This bill is designed to help meet many of the urgent health needs pointed out in the President's message. Its provisions for increased authorizations will help the States to extend their maternal and child health services, crippled children's services, and programs to combat mental retardation. Included in these programs are provisions for grants to aid in the training of professional personnel, such as physicians, psychologists, nurses, dentists, and social workers, for work with crippled children, particularly those who are mentally retarded and those with multiple handicaps. We now have severe shortages of professional personnel in these fields.

The bill provides for a 5-year program of special project grants to help the States provide comprehensive health care and services for children of school age and for preschool children, particularly in areas with concentrations of low-income families. Such projects would provide screening, diagnosis, preventive services, treatment, correction of defects, and aftercare for children in low-income families. These measures are of crucial importance because our children represent the future of our Nation, and they must have good health while they are young in order to be able to prepare themselves for full adult participation in our society and to be able to help our Nation meet the challenges of the future.

In addition, the bill provides for greatly needed improvements in the health care available under our public assistance programs. By applying to all of the federally aided public assistance categories the experience we have gained in the program of medical assistance for the aged, we will take a major step toward providing for improvements in the health of children and other needy persons. This bill would establish a program of medical assistance under a new title XVIII of the Social Security Act and would include, under the federally aided public assistance programs administered by the States, a program of medical assistance for all persons now receiving public assistance in the categories of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to families with dependent children.

In addition, it would permit States to include, as is presently done under the program of medical assistance for the aged, medical assistance for needy persons who are able to provide their own maintenance but whose income and resources are not sufficient to meet their medical costs.

The bill would also assure for our needy senior citizens that the federally aided, State-administered programs of medical assistance for the aged would make provision for paying, in the case of eligible individuals, any deductible imposed with respect to individuals under the program established by the Hospital Insurance Act of 1965.

Mr. President, the provisions of the bill will help the States achieve greatly needed advances in making adequate medical care available to children in low-income families and other needy persons and will thereby assure not only a better state of health for these needy families and individuals, but a better state of health for our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a summary of the provisions of the bill prepared by Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur J. Cohen. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 5 days in order that Senators who wish to cosponsor it may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 970) to amend the Social Security Act to expand and improve services under the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, to provide special funds for training professional personnel for providing health services for crippled children, to provide for a program of medical assistance for children and other persons whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical care and services, to enable States to implement and follow up their planning and other activities leading to comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The summary to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE CHILD HEALTH AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE ACT FOR 1965

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

TITLE I—AMENDMENT OF CHILD HEALTH PROGRAMS UNDER TITLE V OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The bill would increase the amounts authorized for maternal and child health services by $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and by additional sums to be determined by the Congress in succeeding fiscal years. Such increases would assist the States to move toward the goal of extending maternal and child health services with a view to making such services reasonably available to children in all parts of the State by July 1, 1975.

Extension of the maternal and child health program to additional parts of the State will provide preventive health services for more mothers and children and contribute to further reduction of infant and maternal mortality through greater availability of services.

The bill would increase the amount authorized for crippled children's services by $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and by additional sums to be determined by the Congress in succeeding fiscal years. Such increases would assist the States to move toward the goal of extending crippled children's services with a view to making such services reasonably available to children in all parts of the State by July 1, 1975.

Extension of services for crippled children to areas of a State not now served will increase the number of children helped by the

program, and make services more accessible in all parts of a State. The increased funds will also help States to extend their programs to urban areas and further broaden their definitions of "crippling" until all State programs would serve children with any kind of handicapping condition or long-term illness.

The bill would increase the amount authorized by the Social Security Act for crippled children's services by such amounts as appropriated by the Congress for fiscal year 1967 and for ensuing fiscal years, such funds to be used for the training of personnel.

Grants would be made to institutions of higher learning for training professional personnel such as physicians, psychologists, nurses, dentists, and social workers for work with crippled children, particularly mentally retarded children, and those with multiple handicaps. Training of such scarce personnel, especially in clinics and university centers, now provided to a limited extent from funds available through the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, would be greatly accelerated.

The program would help to reduce the severe shortage of professional personnel to serve mentally retarded children and children with multiple handicaps.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to carry out a 5-year program of special project grants to provide comprehensive health care and services for children of school age, or for preschool children, particularly in areas with concentrations of low-income families. Projects would provide screening, diagnosis, preventive services, treatment, correction of defects and aftercare for children in low-income families.

An appropriation of $15 million would be authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and necessary amounts for the next 4 fiscal years.

The grants would be available to the State health agency or with its consent to the health agency of any political subdivision of the State, to the State agency administering or supervising the crippled children's program, to schools of medicine, and to teaching hospitals affiliated with schools of medicine.

A full report on the program, including evaluation and recommendations, would be made to the Congress prior to July 1, 1969.

This program would enable State or local health agencies, crippled children's agencies, and medical schools and teaching hospitals to provide comprehensive health care to children in need of such care in areas where low-income families are concentrated and to improve the amount and quality of care available to children of low-income families by the organization of the necessary services to provide care. It would reduce the numbers of children of preschool and school age who are hampered by remediable handicaps and provide necessary medical care for children of low-income families who would otherwise not receive care.

Project applications must show how services will be coordinated with State health, education, and welfare departments.

TITLE II—MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

In order to provide a more effective program of medical care for children and other needy persons, the bill would establish a program of medical assistance under a new title XVIII of the Social Security Act. This single and separate medical assistance program would provide an emphasis now lacking under the separate medical care provisions of the present law as well as extend coverage to include additional children and others in need of help in meeting the cost of medical care.

The proposed title would replace medical assistance for the aged and the provisions for direct payments to suppliers of medical care and services under old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to families with dependent children, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and the consolidated program for the aged, blind, and disabled. The program would be administered by the States (and by the same State agency that administers old-age assistance) and would include all persons now receiving assistance for basic maintenance under the public assistance titles enumerated above. In addition, States may include, as presently done under medical assistance for the aged, persons who are able to provide their maintenance, but whose income and resources are not sufficient to meet their medical care costs. Services offered the former group may be no less in amount or scope than for the latter group. If the medically needy are to be included, comparable eligibility provisions would apply so that all persons similarly situated among the aged, blind, dependent children, and the disabled would be included in the program. No age requirement may be imposed that would exclude any person under 21, or over 65 years. A flexible income test taking medical expenses into account would be used.

The Federal share of medical assistance expenditures under the new program would vary in relation to a State's per capita income with no maximum on the amount of such expenditures in which there would be sharing. The bill also provides that no less than one-half of the non-Federal share shall be met through State rather than local funds and after July 1, 1970, all the non-Federal share would be from State funds. In order to receive any additional Federal funds as a result of expenditures under the program, the States would need to continue their expenditures at their present rate. For a specified period, no State would, however, receive less in Federal funds than under current provisions of law. The bill provides that a State plan will not be approved if the operation of the proposed State program would result in a reduction of assistance under the basic maintenance assistance programs.

In order to continue to receive Federal funds under the new title, the State would need to show progress toward a goal of comprehensive care and services to substantially all needy individuals under its program.

The new title would prohibit the imposition of durational residence requirements. No liens would be imposed against the property of a receipient during his lifetime for assistance correctly paid. Also, no recovery can be made of any medical assistance correctly paid except from the estate of a person over the age of 65 at the time he received medical assistance, and then only after the death of surviving spouse and minor children. Only income which is actually available may be considered in determining need and any resources of the individual must be reasonably evaluated. States may not take into account the financial responsibility of any individual for anyone who is not a spouse or child under the age of 21.

As a minimum, the medical services which must be offered under the plan are to include inpatient hospital services, outpatient hospital services, other laboratory and X-ray services, skilled nursing home services, and physician's services whether furnished in the office, the patient's home, a hospital, or a skilled nursing home. Other items of medical service are enumerated and are optional with the States. Provision would be made for a State authority or authorities to establish, maintain, and improve standards for public and private institutions if the State plan provides for services to be available therein. Included would be standards applicable to arrangements between facilities and institutions that provide care or services.

The States would need to have professional medical personnel to participate in the administration of the program, and the cost of such personnel, whether on the State or local staff, would be shared in by the Federal Government at a rate higher than for normal administrative costs. States may also provide social services with the Federal share of the cost at the same higher rate. The State agency administering the program would need to work out cooperative arrangements with health and vocational rehabilitation agencies looking toward effective coordination of available services. In developing its plan for medical services under the title, States would need to show that in their plans eligibility for care and services will be determined in a manner consistent with simplicity of administration and the best interests of the recipient. The State in determining eligibility and the medical assistance to be provided, would need to make provision for paying, in the case of eligible individuals, any deductible imposed with respect to individuals under the program established by the Hospital Insurance Act of 1965.

If the State plan includes provision for making medical assistance available to persons in mental or tuberculosis hospitals, the State would need to show that appropriate steps are being taken to provide, for such persons, the medical and related services they need, and the States are working toward a comprehensive mental health program in the State. The availability of Federal funds for the cost of medical assistance paid in behalf of such persons is contingent upon a corresponding increase in total expenditures in the State for mental health services.

Under existing law direct payments to suppliers of medical care, i.e., physicians, hospitals, nursing homes, druggist, etc., may be considered as assistance under all of the federally aided programs. In the case of medical assistance for the aged, a single formula applies and all payments under the program are by vendor payment. In old-age assistance there are special provisions for matching vendor payments up to an average of $15 per month and any excess above this average may be matched as regular assistance within the limitations that exist. In the programs of aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to families with dependent children there is no special matching provision for vendor payments but such payments may be counted along with all other payments in determining Federal participation.

Even among these three programs the basic formula is different for aid to families with dependent children than for aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. In the combined adult programs under title XVI the arrangement is essentially the same as that for old-age assistance. Under the medical assistance for the aged program there is no limitation on the amount of expenditures that is matchable while under each of the other programs there is a limitation imposed by an average maximum. Thus, there are wide variations in the extent to which Federal participation is available depending on the individual program, amount of assistance provided in a particular State, and other factors.

The bill would enable the States to establish a program of medical assistance that would afford a uniform basis of Federal participation in expenditures for medical care without regard to any of these other factors. It would assure that some medical care is made available to needy children as well as to adults receiving public assistance and should minimize differences in the services available to them. The bill would also afford a basis for dealing with medically indigent children and adults who would be eligible for federally aided assistance if their needs were sufficiently great. In this respect, it would follow the precedent estab-

lished by the medical assistance for the aged program.

Since medical assistance would be provided under the program without regard to whether the individuals were or were not receiving money payments, problems of transfer from one program to another would be avoided. Thus there would be no basis for such transfers as have taken place between the OAA and MAA programs. The separate medical care program would provide a solid basis for needed medical assistance to all needy and medically needy people within the scope of the federally aided categories and would result in substantial administrative and program simplification.

TITLE III—IMPLEMENTATION OF MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENT OF TITLE XVII OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

This title would authorize grants totalling $2,750,000 for each of fiscal years—the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. The grants would be available during the year for which the appropriation is authorized and during the succeeding fiscal year. They are for the purpose of assisting States to implement and followup on plans and other steps to combat mental retardation authorized under section 1701 of the Social Security Act.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF MAIL COVERS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, some 2 years ago, there was brought to my attention a method of surveillance practiced by the Post Office Department known as a "mail cover." This technique involves the systematic recording of all mail received by a person or firm as well as the recording of all information obtainable from the mail without opening it.

Under postal regulations, any postmaster in the country is authorized to place a mail watch on a person or firm at the request of any law enforcement official. The regulations authorize such mail covers only for the purpose of locating fugitives from justice. But apparently the postmaster is required to take without question the law enforcement officer's assertion as to purpose. The thought that every policeman, constable, and deputy sheriff in the country has the authority to learn what mail any person is receiving causes me grave concern. But this regulation is only the beginning. Under another regulation, postal inspectors may order mail covers. Evidence which I have collected over the past 2 years indicates that watches will be instituted through the Postal Inspection Service at the request of any Federal agency and practically for any reason.

The Postal Inspection Service claims that agency requests for covers are honored only if they are to be placed on the mail of persons apt to receive communication from a fugitive from justice or on the mail of persons known to have committed or strongly suspected of having committed a serious criminal violation. However, this claim is not substantiated by the information received from other agencies. The Internal Revenue Service last summer told me that the Post Office Department has instituted mail covers at its request as part of employee and tax practitioner integrity investigations. Such investigations are certainly a long way from criminal matters.

My inquiries into the use of mail covers has convinced me of one thing despite protestations of the Post Office Department to the contrary. There is wide open use of this surveillance technique with absolutely no effort at control. During the past 2 years, I have called on the Department on several occasions to discontinue the use of mail covers or at least to establish some system of control. On each occasion, I have been assured they are used sparingly and only where necessary. The evidence does not support this contention.

As a result, I introduced in the last Congress a bill to prohibit mail covers. Since the situation has not improved, I am again introducing a bill for this purpose. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit the use of mail covers.

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

The bill (S. 973) to prohibit the use of mail covers, introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MANPOWER ACT OF 1965

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended.

This bill, I hope, will become law. In that event, it will be called the Manpower Act of 1965. I assume that, as in former years, it will be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment of that committee will hold hearings on this bill on February 9 and 10.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD. I further ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section description of the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 974) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. PELL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 102(5) of the Manpower Development and Training Act, as amended (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), is amended by adding a comma after the word "arrange" and inserting "through grants or contracts," immediately following the comma.

(b) Section 102 of the Act is further amended by adding new paragraphs (6) and (7) at the end thereof to read as follows:

"(6) establish a program of experimental, developmental, demonstration, and pilot projects, through grants or contracts, with public or private nonprofit agencies, for the purpose of improving techniques and demonstrating the effectiveness of specialized methods in meeting the manpower, employment, and training problems of worker groups such as the long-term unemployed, disadvantaged youth, displaced older workers, the handicapped, members of minority groups, and other similar groups. In carrying out this subsection the Secretary of Labor shall, where appropriate, consult with the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Commerce, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Where programs under this section require institutional training, appropriate arrangements for such training shall be agreed to by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He shall also seek the advice of consultants with respect to the standards governing the adequacy and design of proposals, the ability of applicants, and the priority of projects in meeting the objectives of the Act;

"(7) stimulate and assist, in cooperation with interested agencies both public and private, job development programs, through on-the-job training and other suitable methods, that will serve to expand employment by the filling of those service and related needs which are not now being met because of lack of trained workers or other reasons affecting employment or opportunities for employment."

SEC. 3. Sections 103 and 104 are renumbered 105 and 106 and new sections 103 and 104 are added to read as follows:

"LABOR MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 103. (a) During the period ending June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out, in a limited number of geographical areas, pilot projects designed to assess or demonstrate the effectiveness in reducing unemployment of programs to increase the mobility of unemployed workers by providing assistance to meet their relocation expenses. In carrying out such projects the Secretary may provide such assistance, in the form of grants or loans, or both, only to involuntarily unemployed individuals who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside, have bona fide offers of employment (other than temporary or seasonal employment), and are deemed qualified to perform the work for which they are being employed.

"(b) Loans or grants provided under this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, with loans subject to the following limitations:

"(1) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

"(2) the credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

"(3) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

"(4) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (A) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (B) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Secretary may determine to be consistent with its purposes; and

"(5) the loan is repayable within not more than ten years.

"(c) Of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this Act, not more than $5,000,000 may be used for the purposes of this section.

"TRAINEE BONDING DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 104. During the period ending June 30, 1967, the Secretary shall develop and

carry out experimental and demonstration projects to assist in the placement of persons seeking employment through a public employment office who have successfully completed or participated in a federally assisted or financed training, counseling, work training, or work experience program and who, after appropriate counseling, have been found by the Secretary to be qualified and suitable for the employment in question, but to whom employment is or may be denied for reasons other than ability to perform, including difficulty in securing bonds for indemnifying their employers against loss from the infidelity, dishonesty, or default of such persons. In carrying out these projects the Secretary may make payments to or contracts with employers or institutions authorized to indemnify employers against such losses. Of the funds appropriated for fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, not more than $200,000 and $300,000, respectively, may be used for the purpose of carrying out this section."

SEC. 4. Section 202(1) of the Act is amended by striking the words "and such persons shall be eligible for training allowances for not to exceed an additional twenty weeks.", and by changing the comma after the word "Act" to a period.

SEC. 5. (a) Section 203(a) of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) Amend the second sentence thereof to read as follows: "Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding one hundred and four weeks, and the basic amount of any such payment in any week for persons undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed $10 more than the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available: *Provided,* That the basic amount of such payments may be increased by $5 a week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of four additional dependents: *Provided further,* That in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of his total allowance, including payments for dependents, shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess.";

(2) Amend the second paragraph thereof to read as follows: "With respect to any week for which a person receives unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law which is less than the total training allowance, including payments for dependents, provided for by the preceding paragraph, a supplemental training allowance may be paid to a person eligible for a training allowance under this Act. The supplemental training allowance shall not exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation and the training allowance provided by the preceding paragraph.";

(3) Insert the words "under the training program" after "compensated hours per week" in the third paragraph of such subsection;

(4) In lieu of the fourth paragraph of such subsection insert the following:

"The training allowance of a person engaged in training under sections 204 or 231 shall not be reduced on account of employment (other than employment under an on-the-job training program under section 204) which does not exceed twenty hours per week, but shall be reduced in an amount equal to his full earnings for hours worked in excess of twenty hours per week."

(b) Section 203(b) of the Act is amended by inserting a comma after the word "transportation" where it first occurs, striking out the language after that word and before the word *"Provided"* and inserting the following in lieu thereof: "and when such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of the trainee's regular place of residence, subsistence expenses for separate maintenance of the trainee:".

(c) Section 203(c) of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) Strike the words "not less than" and insert "at least" in lieu thereof;

(2) Insert a colon after the words "gainful employment", strike everything in the first sentence after the words "gainful employment", and insert the following in lieu thereof: *"Provided,* That they are not members of a family or a household in which the head of the family or the head of the household as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is employed.";

(3) Amend the last sentence to read as follows: "The number of youths under the age of twenty-two who are receiving training allowances shall, except for such adjustments as may be necessary for effective management of programs under this section, not exceed 25 per centum of all persons receiving such allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for the receipt of unemployment compensation)."

(d) Section 203(d) is amended to read as follows:

"For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter, Federal payments for training allowance under this section, or as reimbursement for unemployment compensation under subsection (h), shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 241."

(e) Section 203(h)(2) of the Act is amended by striking everything in the first sentence after the term "1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "and for 90 per centum of the amount of such benefits paid thereafter."

SEC. 6. Section 208 is repealed.

SEC. 7. Section 231 of the Act is amended by striking the third sentence and inserting the following in lieu thereof: "For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, Federal payments under this Part shall be 100 per centum of the cost of carrying out the agreement, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter, Federal payments under this Part shall be made in accordance with the provisions of section 241."

SEC. 8. Title II of the Act is amended by adding part C to the end thereof to read as follows:

"PART C—FEDERAL PAYMENTS FOR TRAINING AND TRAINING ALLOWANCES

"SEC. 241. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter, Federal payments for training allowances and for reimbursements for unemployment compensation under section 203 and for training programs under section 231 shall be limited to 90 per centum of the total of all such costs. Expenditures from non-Federal sources may be made in cash or kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services."

SEC. 9. Title II of the Act is amended by adding part D to the end thereof to read as follows:

"PART D—REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

"SEC. 251. (a) Notwithstanding any limitation in the other provisions of this Act, the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, in accordance with their respective responsibilities under parts A and B of this title, are authorized to provide a supplementary program of training and training allowances, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, for unemployed and underemployed persons residing in areas designated as redevelopment areas under the Area Redevelopment Act. Such program shall, insofar as practicable, be carried out by the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare in accordance with the provisions otherwise applicable to programs under this Act and with their respective functions under those provisions, except that—

(1) the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall determine the needs and the eligibility of persons for training under this section;

(2) the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, each with respect to his functions under this section, prescribe jointly with the Secretary of Commerce such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section; and

(3) no funds available under this section shall be generally allocated to any State pursuant to any agreement entered into under this Act, nor shall any State or local matching funds be generally required, nor shall any apportionment of funds be made among the several States, except as the Secretary of Labor or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as the case may be, jointly with the Secretary of Commerce, may deem appropriate, giving adequate consideration to the relative needs of the eligible areas.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out this section.

"(c) The expiration or termination of any other part of this Act shall not terminate the authority conferred by this section unless an Act of Congress explicitly so provides."

SEC. 10. Section 302 of the Act is amended by striking the word "and" following "the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act," inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and inserting "and the Vocational Education Act of 1963," following "the Vocational Education Act of 1946."

SEC. 11. Section 304 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. For the purpose of carrying out this Act there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter such amounts as may be necessary."

SEC. 12. The following subsection is added to section 305 of the Act to read as follows:

"(e) The costs of all training programs approved in any fiscal year, including the total cost of training allowances for such programs, may be paid from funds appropriated for such purposes for that fiscal year; and the amount of the Federal payment shall be computed on the basis of the per centum requirement in effect at the time such programs are approved: *Provided,* That funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, may be expended for training programs approved under this Act prior to July 1, 1965, and expenditures for such purposes shall be subject to the matching requirements in effect at the time such programs were approved."

SEC. 13. Sections 309(a) and 309(b) are both amended by striking "Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to April 1, 1964, April 1, 1965, and April 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof: "Prior to April 1 in each year."

SEC. 14. Title III is amended by repealing section 310.

The section-by-section description presented by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

OUTLINE OF PROVISIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR MANPOWER ACT OF 1965

1. Termination date: Removes the June 30, 1966 termination date of the title II provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

2. Job development programs: Directs the Secretary to stimulate and assist job development programs to fill service needs which are not being met because of a lack of trained workers or other reasons affecting employment.

3. Experimental and demonstration programs: Expands the Secretary's research authority under title I of the MDTA so that he may undertake experimentation and

demonstration projects, and make grants to or contract with appropriate organizations for such purposes.

4. Labor mobility demonstration projects: Extends authority to conduct such projects for 2 more years, increases appropriations for such projects from $4 million to $5 million a year, removes the language which restricts the type of relocation expenses covered by the section to transportation costs and grants to 50 percent of such costs, adds provisions dealing with loans, and makes the provisions a part of title I, repealing section 208 accordingly.

5. Trainee bonding demonstration projects: Further amends title I to provide for demonstration projects to assist in the placement of trainees who have difficulty in securing bonds required for employment. Not more than $200,000 for fiscal 1966 and $300,000 for fiscal 1967 is authorized for such projects.

6. Training allowances: (a) Extends period of training allowance support from 1 to 2 years; (b) Changes eligibility requirements to permit single persons without dependents to receive training allowance; (c) Increases training allowances by $5 a week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of six.

7. Revision of limitation on number of youths who may receive training allowances: The act presently provides that not more than 25 percent of those receiving training allowances may be under the age of 22. This provision is amended to enable the Secretary of Labor to make such adjustments as administrative necessity may require.

8. Transportation allowances: Permits the payment of transportation allowances for daily commuting between the residence and the place of training.

9. Outside work for on-the-job trainees: Permits on-the-job trainees to engage in up to 20 hours of outside work without a reduction in their training allowance.

10. Matching funds: Matching for training allowances and HEW training programs may be combined and is put on a 90–10 basis. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or kind.

11. Appropriations: (a) The present monetary limitations in section 304 of the Manpower Act on authorizations authorized for each title are replaced by an open-end authorization for the whole act; (b) makes it clear that costs of training allowances as well as institutional costs approved in any fiscal year may be paid out of funds appropriated for that fiscal year. Also permits the non-Federal contribution to be based on the matching requirement in existence at the time the training program is approved. (Thus, training programs approved before June 30, 1965, will not require matching by the States, even though payments to States are made after that date.)

12. Area Redevelopment Act: Authorizes special funds under the Manpower Act for training programs in areas designated as redevelopment areas under the Area Redevelopment Act to be carried out by the Secretaries of Labor and HEW pursuant to the Manpower Development and Training Act, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce and with full Federal financing. The need for the separate training provisions now in the Area Redevelopment Act is thus eliminated and the training requirements in all areas can be conformed to the maximum extent practicable.

13. Miscellaneous: Technical changes are made in the method of computing the average weekly unemployment compensation payment in the States, upon which weekly training allowances are based.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill broadens the Manpower Development and Training Act by making the act permanent.

It directs the Secretary of Labor to embark on a news program to train unemployed workers for jobs in the expanding service sector of the economy.

It increases funds for research in new training techniques for the unemployed and those displaced by automation.

It increases from $4 to $5 million the amount available for helping working families to move to where new jobs are located.

The bill increases both the duration and the amount of the retraining allowances and eliminates the limitations on the number of young people who can be retrained under the act.

Most important, the bill recognizes the great financial strains upon the various State treasuries and recommends that the Federal Government fund 90 percent of the cost of the program on a permanent basis, in lieu of the original 50–50 cost-sharing plan originally envisioned when the Manpower Development and Training Act was first passed in 1962.

ADOPTION OF A PERPETUAL CALENDAR

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the adoption of a perpetual calendar, effective January 1, 1967.

This calendar was devised by a fellow Hawaiian, Dr. Willard E. Edwards, in 1919. Dr. Edwards makes a convincing case for the adoption of the perpetual calendar. I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Dr. Edwards entitled, "A Systematic Calendar Recommended," be printed in the RECORD together with the perpetual calendar.

I also ask unanimous consent that an article written by Sylvia Porter, a noted financial and business columnist, entitled, "Revised Calendar Proposed in Bill," and which appears in today's Washington Star be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 977) to provide for the adoption of a perpetual calendar, introduced by Mr. FONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The articles and calendar presented by Mr. FONG are as follows:

A SYSTEMATIC CALENDAR RECOMMENDED

(By Willard E. Edwards)

A calendar is defined as a system of determining the beginning, length, and divisions of a year. And the word "system" implies a regular, orderly, or logical way of doing something. However, our present calendar is neither systematic nor logical. It has two serious faults; it lacks fixity, and its divisions are unequal.

It is not logical to have irregular and unequal lengths of months, quarters, and half years. Nor is it necessary to have each year begin and end on a different day of the week.

To print just one size of all calendar months, a printer requires 28 plates. He needs seven for starting 28-day months on each day of the week; seven each for 29-, 30-, and 31-day months. To print just one size of our complete calendar years, he needs 14 plates. Seven are required for starting a 365-day year on each day of the week; and seven more for a 366-day year.

February now has 4 Sundays plus 24 workdays, not counting holidays. January and March can have 27 workdays plus 4 Sundays. When compared with February, these 2 months can have three-twenty-fourths or 12½ percent more workdays.

This is very costly in all comparison, statistical, and accounting work. Many workmen paid by the hour earn considerably less in February. But they may have the same monthly rent and other fixed monthly bills to pay. Employers paying employees a fixed monthly salary get less work from them in February. This short month is thus unfair, impractical, and costly, almost any way you look at it.

Some sources say February used to have 29 days but had one day removed and added to a 30-day August to make August a "lucky-number" month. The 6th month of the Roman year, Sextilis, was renamed August in honor of Augustus Caesar. At that time, Romans thought months with an odd number of days were lucky, and that months with an even number of days were unlucky.

February was then at the end of the year and mattered least. The other months of the Roman calendar originally had alternate months of 31 and 30 days, beginning with March.

The first 3 months of our calendar year now have 90 days, the second quarter has 91, and the third and fourth have 92 each. The first half year therefore has 181 days, and the second half 184. This is far from being systematic, logical, or practical.

Since each year starts and ends on a different day of the week, no 2 years are now alike in succession. Our present calendar is simply an awkward arrangement and an expensive heritage from the past. There is little to be gained by cherishing or defending it, and no progress is ever made without change. We have but one clock in international use. Isn't it time we changed to one fixed international standard civil calendar? The clock and the calendar simply record the passing of time, and it would be of great economic and social advantage to have them both as international civil standards.

Regularity and fixity are demanded in all of our other international standards. Why then should we not have fixity and regularity in the calendar? Time is a measurement of the earth's rotation on its axis and of its revolution around the sun. The laws of nature determine the length of our solar year. At noon on January 1, 1965, it was 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, and 45:66 seconds in length. When reduced to a decimal, this period becomes 365.242195 days.

However, the calendar year, when averaged over a period of 400 years, is 365.242500 days in length. Our calendar is thus slow by the small difference of 0.000305 day, or an average of about 26 seconds each year. It will take 3,280 years for the calendar to get behind the solar year by one whole day, providing the annual difference remains constant.

Our calendar was considered corrected in 1582 by Pope Gregory when 10 days were dropped and a new leap-year rule was formulated. Adding 3280 to 1582 we get 4862, and the year 4860 can be counted as a 365-day year instead of a leap year. The calendar will then be corrected for another 32 centuries, and this should be accurate enough for most of us.

There is thus no fault with the length of our calendar year; astronomy does not enter into present calendar revision problems in any way. The great expense and inconvenience in using our present calendar lies entirely in its lack of fixity and in its unequal divisions. When learning of these two faults of our calendar in 1919, I was challenged to devise a better one. "The perpetual calendar" is the result.

By dividing 365 by 4, we get 91¼ days in each 3-month period. By setting aside the quarter day, 91 days may be divided into 30-, 30-, and 31-day months. This allows 13 full weeks in each quarter. Since this would give us a calendar year of only 364 days, or 52 weeks, we must account for 1 day more.

It is most logical to choose New Year's Day and have it become a day apart. It is already an international holiday and can be used like the day we gain when crossing the 180th meridian eastward. We then have an "extra day" as a calendar correction, often called meridian day. It is also called a second Sunday, or any other day of the week, depending on what day the dateline is crossed in an easterly direction. Such an extra day at the dateline has been readily accepted ever since 1884.

In the perpetual calendar, this first day of each year may also be called January 0 for accounting or statistical purposes. Zero is the first cardinal numeral, a perfectly good number, 1 less than 1. In mathematics, it is a real number. It should be shown preceding the figure 1 on our telephone dials and in our dictionaries.

The prime meridian of longitude through Greenwich is "the zero meridian," and the first hour of the day is "the zero hour." We don't say it is 1 o'clock, or 0100, until 1 hour past midnight, the beginning of the second hour of each day.

In the perpetual calendar, the second day of each new year becomes Monday, January 1, a working day. But we will always have a 3-day New Year's weekend. The first day of the year, the New Year's Day holiday, follows a Saturday and Sunday, December 30 and 31. Each quarter and each week starts on a Monday. Saturday and Sunday then become the weekend on the calendar as well as in fact. They are often shown this way on European calendars.

In leap years, a second "day apart" follows June 31 and precedes July 1. It is called leap-year day, a holiday and the first day of the second half year. These 2 days apart may be abbreviated as NYD and LYD. Unless they are used, any other proposed change in the calendar becomes impractical.

By the use of these yeardays or days apart, the calendar becomes fixed and perpetual, and that is their only purpose. With equal quarterly divisions, only three plates are then required to print the months. And only one plate is then required to print the whole year. People born on the annual day apart can say "I was born on New Year's day." Those born in leap years on the 184th yearday can say "I was born on leap-year day."

No one will lose a birthday in the perpetual calendar, but many will gain one. Those born on February 29 in the present calendar can observe that same date every year in the new calendar. To find your birthday in the perpetual calendar, simply count the days in the present calendar from January 1 to your birthdate. Then count the same number of yeardays in the new calendar, starting with "New Year's day." The birthdate yearday will always be in the same month, with a difference of no more than 1 or 2 days.

Easter is suggested on April 14 to conform with the original date and a provisional bill enacted by the British Parliament in 1928. Good Friday will then never fall on a Friday the 13th, there being no such date in the perpetual calendar. Easter Monday, as a holiday on April 15, could always be the third day of a 3-day weekend.

Christmas would also fall always on a Monday, making Christmas Sunday a more meaningful day. And New Year's eve, on Sunday, December 31, would not interfere with regular church services.

There is much to commend the adoption of the perpetual calendar. It has been officially endorsed by the Legislatures of the States of Hawaii and Massachusetts. It is the only calendar proposal which has received any official U.S. endorsement. It has been endorsed by thousands as the simplest, most practical, and most logical plan for a new fixed equal-quarter international standard civil calendar. Its use in the business, banking, industrial, and insurance worlds will save thousands of hours now spent in needless annual bookkeeping, accounting, and tax figuring. A bill is before the U.S. Congress asking for adoption of the perpetual calendar beginning with 1967.

To remember its arrangement, the following rhyme is offered:

"With a day apart, the year's begun,
Followed by thirty, thirty, thirty-one.
Months always start a certain way,
On Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.
Each quarter and each year the same,
Is the perpetual calendar's aim."

On October 25, 1963, the Vatican Ecumenical Council voted 2,057 to 4 not to oppose adoption of a perpetual calendar. It also voted 2,058 to 9 in favor of a fixed Easter. In the perpetual calendar, Easter can be easily fixed, and on the original historic date at that. The perpetual calendar is an efficient, logical, timesaving, and scientific plan, entirely suitable for this day and age, and for the years to come.

Revised perpetual calendar

New Year's Day (occurs between December 31 and January 1 each year)

JANUARY							FEBRUARY							MARCH						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

APRIL							MAY							JUNE						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Leap-year Day (occurs between June 31 and July 1 in leap years)

JULY							AUGUST							SEPTEMBER						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

OCTOBER							NOVEMBER							DECEMBER						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	29	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

REVISED CALENDAR PROPOSED IN BILL

(By Sylvia Porter)

Imagine a calendar in which:

This month had 30 days instead of 28 and leap year fell not in February but between the last day of June and the 1st of July.

Your birthday and all holidays fell on the same day of the week each year and each year began on a Monday.

Friday the 13th was abolished, the calendar year had only 364 days and you always could look forward to a 3-day holiday weekend at Christmas and New Year's.

A bill on a calendar with all these radical changes—starting in 1967 or 1968—is due to be introduced in the Senate this week by Hawaii's Republican Senator HIRAM FONG. Designed to correct the many gross irregularities and confusions in today's calendar, it has strong support in business, government, and international circles.

Of course, the "perpetual calendar" is not going to become law this year or in the foreseeable future; habits of centuries are formidable obstacles.

Nevertheless, the Commerce Department backs the calendar—on condition that other leading nations also would go along. The changes have been endorsed by two State governments, many large companies and chambers of commerce, college presidents and chiefs of major foreign governments. And when you ponder what we've been putting up with for 2,000 years, you well may conclude that the calendar proposal makes a lot of sense.

For instance, for centuries February has been a short month because of the superstitions of two Roman emperors. Julius and Augustus Caesar renamed July and August after themselves—from the original Quintilis and Sextilis. Julius declared July a 31-day month because the Romans considered even-numbered months unlucky. Augustus simply took a day from February to make August another "lucky" 31-day month.

As a result of such unscientific juggling with the calendar, we are wasting hundreds of thousands of working hours and countless millions of dollars each year in needless figuring and accounting. For the precision-minded statistician, there actually is no such thing as a "comparable period last year."

In addition, today's calendar imposes tangible financial burdens on workers and employers. As another illustration, this February has only 24 working days (including Saturdays) while March has 27—12.5 percent more than February. Millions of workers who are paid by the hour thus earn much less in February, yet have the same monthly bills to pay. If they pay workers by the month, employers will get far less work for their pay in February 1965, than in any other month this year.

With the days redistributed in an equal pattern, each calendar quarter would have an even sequence of 30-, 30- and 31-day months—and by reducing the calendar year by 1 day, each quarter would have exactly 91 days.

The "extra day" would be New Year's Day, not shown on the calendar. This day would fall between the last day of December and January 1 and would be called January zero. It would become an international holiday—as would leap year's day, another "extra day" every 4 years.

The "elimination" of New Year's Day and leap year's day would move forward everybody's birthday by 1 or 2 days and everybody's birthday would fall on the same day of the week each year. If you were born on February 29, you would also be able to celebrate your birthday each year instead of each 4 years.

If the changes sound crazy, it is because we have been living by a "crazy" calendar for so many centuries. There really is little

"to be gained by defending our present calendar," as Senator FONG says. "It is just an awkward and expensive heritage from the past."

QUALIFICATIONS OF PERSONS APPOINTED TO THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to establish certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The proposed bill provides that no person shall be appointed as a member of the Supreme Court unless at the time of the appointment he shall have had at least 5 years of judicial experience as a judge of the district court of the United States, the U.S. Court of Appeals, or a judge of any State court of general jurisdiction, or as an appellate State judge having jurisdiction over courts of general jurisdiction.

Mr. President, the Constitution has little to say with respect to the qualifications of members to be appointed to the Supreme Court. It refers to Justices of the Court in only two instances. Section 2 of article II states that Justices shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Section 1 of article III provides that Justices shall hold their offices during good behavior and "Shall at stated times, receive for their services, a compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office."

The members of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 were determined, above all things, to establish a government of laws and not of men. To accomplish this objective they inserted in that document the doctrine of separation of governmental powers.

They utilized this doctrine in a twofold way. First, they delegated to the Federal Government the powers necessary to enable it to discharge its limited functions as a central government. They then left to each State the power to regulate its own internal affairs. It was this use of the doctrine of separation of powers which prompted Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase to make these memorable remarks in his opinion, in *Texas* v. *White*, 74 U.S. 700 (1868):

> Not only, therefore, can there be no loss of separate and independent autonomy to the States through their union under the Constitution, but it may be not unreasonably said that the preservation of the States, and the maintenance of their governments, are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National Government. The Constitution, in all its provision, looks to an indissoluble Union, composed of indestructible States.

In their other utilization of this doctrine, the members of the Convention of 1787 vested the power to make laws in the Congress, the power to execute laws in the President, and the power to interpret laws in the Supreme Court of the United States and such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time establish. Moreover, they declared in essence that the legislative, the executive, and the judicial powers of the Federal Government should forever remain separate and distinct from each other. Each is sovereign within its own sphere. One cannot encroach upon the other.

Some of the members of the Convention of 1787 expressed fear that the Supreme Court, having no rules by which to govern or to limit the execution of its judicial power, would usurp the powers vested in the other two branches of the Federal system and thereby destroy the concept of separation of powers upon which the entire system was expected to endure.

Alexander Hamilton rejected these arguments. He argued that the men selected to sit on the Supreme Court of the United States would "be chosen with a view to those qualifications which fit men for the stations of judges," and that they would give "that inflexible and uniform adherence" to legal rules "which we perceive to be indispensable in the courts of justice."

By these remarks, Hamilton assured the several States that men selected to sit upon the Supreme Court of the United States would be able and willing to subject themselves to the restraint inherent in the judicial process. History has led some eminent legal scholars to question the accuracy of Hamilton's prediction.

The late Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson, for example, said of the Supreme Court:

> Rightly or wrongly, the belief is widely held by the practicing profession that this Court no longer respects impersonal rules of law but is guided in these matters by personal impressions which from time to time may be shared by a majority of Justices. There is no doubt that if there were a super-Supreme Court a substantial proportion of our reversals of State courts would also be reversed. We are not final because we are infallible, but we are infallible only because we are final. (*Brown* v. *Allen*, 344, U.S. 433, 535, 540 (1953).)

In 1958, the conference of chief justices of State courts, appointed 10 of its members to study the impact of Supreme Court decisions on Federal-State relationships. While recognizing that the "ultimate judicial power" of the country must abide in the U.S. Supreme Court, this special committee said, however, and I quote:

> We do not believe that this goes so far as to impose upon us an obligation of silence when we find ourselves unable to agree with pronouncements of the Supreme Court (even though we are bound by them), or when we see trends in decisions of that Court which we think will lead to unfortunate results.

The principal recommendation of this eminent committee was that the Justices should exercise more fully the concept of "judicial restraint."

I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of August 29, 1958, commenting upon the findings of this committee be inserted in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

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

SUPREME COURT: A CRITICAL LOOK BY STATE JUSTICES

(NOTE.—The U.S. Supreme Court needs more "judicial self-restraint," in the opinion of the chief justices of 10 States.

(The justices had been appointed to a special committee by the conference of chief justices to study recent decisions.)

The U.S. Supreme Court is taken to task by a committee of State chief justices for going too far and too fast in expanding Federal power. The chief justices urge Justices on the highest Federal court to use a bit more "judicial restraint."

That's the main conclusion submitted last week to the Conference of Chief Justices by a special committee appointed last year to look into decisions affecting Federal-State relationships.

The committee headed by Chief Judge Frederick W. Brune, of the Maryland Court of Appeals, included top judges from seven Northern States and three Southern States. The Northern States represented were New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Oregon, and Massachusetts, besides Maryland. The Southern States were Texas, Georgia, and South Carolina.

The report, at the outset, recognizes that "by almost universal common consent" the ultimate judicial power of the country rests with the U.S. Supreme Court. It goes on to say: "Any other allocation of such power would seem to lead to complete chaos." The report adds: "It is a part of our obligation to seek to uphold respect for law." But then this comment is made:

"We do not believe that this goes so far as to impose upon us an obligation of silence when we find ourselves unable to agree with pronouncements of the Supreme Court (even though we are bound by them), or when we see trends in decisions of that Court which we think will lead to unfortunate results."

WHEN LAWS CONFLICT

The report deals mainly with decisions involving the supremacy of Federal laws over State laws, and with decisions rendered under the 14th amendment. However, recent decisions on racial segregation, which were rendered under the 14th amendment, are not mentioned.

In the field of labor relations, the justices noted that the theory of supremacy, "coupled with only partial express regulation by Congress, has produced a state of considerable confusion." Decisions are cited that prevented a State from acting to bar strikes in public utilities and that seemed to give Federal courts exclusive jurisdiction in suits between employers and unions. The report also notes that, in two decisions last year, the Supreme Court upheld the right of an employee to sue a labor union in a State court. In labor regulation, the report suggests that Congress might clear up the confusion.

The justices also note that, under the supremacy doctrine, the Supreme Court has "practically eliminated" any antisubversive laws by States.

When it comes to cases under the 14th amendment, the State justices take particular exception to decisions which limited the authority of States to make their own rules for the admission of lawyers to the bar. Their report quotes with approval a dissent by Justice John M. Harlan that "this case involves an area of Federal-State relations—the right of States to establish and administer standards for admission to their bars—into which this Court should be especially reluctant and slow to enter."

The justices direct their sharpest criticism at Supreme Court decisions relating to State enforcement of criminal laws. They object to a decision that freed a confessed murderer because he pleaded guilty without having a lawyer; decisions that require States to provide free transcripts of trials so that convicted felons can appeal; and a decision that struck down a city ordinance aimed at supervising ex-convicts.

At one point, the report observes: "Appellate courts generally will give great weight to the findings of fact by trial courts which

had the opportunity to see and hear the witnesses, and they are reluctant to disturb such findings. The Supreme Court at times seems to read the records in criminal cases with a somewhat different point of view."

The justices appear especially disturbed at the decisions governing appeals from criminal convictions under State laws. There is a possibility, the committee fears, that State appellate courts may bog down under the weight of appeals from criminal convictions. "The danger of an almost complete breakdown in the work of State appellate courts under the flood of appeals which may be loosed * * * is not a reassuring prospect," the committee said.

The committee, however, acquits the Supreme Court of invading some State powers. The justices note that, in Federal trials of suits between citizens of different States, the laws of States rather than of the Federal Government are to prevail. Supreme Court decisions also have upheld suits in State courts against corporations from other States. And on taxes, the report observes that: "On the whole, the Supreme Court seems perhaps to have taken a more liberal view in recent years toward the validity of State taxation than it formerly took."

COURT-MADE LAW

Overall, however, the committee finds a Supreme Court majority often too eager to make policy decisions and to assume legislative power. In questioning this trend, the report notes that Supreme Court Justices themselves frequently disagree. Hence the suggestion for "judicial self-restraint."

Besides Judge Brune, the chief justices who signed the report are: Albert Conway of New York, John R. Dethmers of Michigan, William H. Duckworth of Georgia, John E. Hickman of Texas, John E. Martin of Wisconsin, William C. Perry of Oregon, Taylor H. Stukes of South Carolina and Raymond S. Wilkins of Massachusetts, plus Associate Justice Martin A. Nelson of Minnesota, who signed the report for the chief justice of his State.

IMMENSE AND DOMINANT POWER

(Following is the text of conclusions reached by the Committee on Federal-State Relationships as Affected by Judicial Decisions, in a report submitted to the Conference of Chief Justices in Pasadena, Calif., August 20, 1958)

This long review, though far from exhaustive, shows some of the uncertainties as to the distribution of power which are probably inevitable in a Federal system of government. It also shows, on the whole, a continuing and, we think, an accelerating trend toward increasing power of the National Government and correspondingly contracted power of the State governments.

Much of this is doubtless due to the fact that many matters which were once mainly of local concern are now parts of larger matters which are of national concern. Much of this stems from the doctrine of a strong Central Government and of the plenitude of national power within broad limits of what may be necessary and proper in the exercise of the granted powers of the National Government which was expounded and established by Chief Justice Marshall and his colleagues, though some of the modern extensions may and do seem to us to go to extremes. Much, however, comes from the extent of the control over the action of the States which the Supreme Court exercises under its views of the 14th amendment.

We believe that strong State and local governments are essential to the effective functioning of the American system of Federal government; that they should not be sacrificed needlessly to leveling, and sometimes deadening, uniformity; and that, in the interest of active citizen participation in self-government—the foundation of our democracy—they should be sustained and strengthened.

As long as this country continues to be a developing country and as long as the conditions under which we live continue to change, there will always be problems of the allocation of power depending upon whether certain matters should be regarded as primarily of national concern or as primarily of local concern. These adjustments can hardly be effected without some friction. How much friction will develop depends in part upon the wisdom of those empowered to alter the boundaries and in part upon the speed with which such changes are effected. Of course, the question of speed really involves the exercise of judgment and the use of wisdom, so that the two things are really the same in substance.

We are now concerned specifically with the effect of judicial decisions upon the relations between the Federal Government and the State governments. Here we think that the overall tendency of decisions of the Supreme Court over the last 25 years or more has been to press the extension of Federal power and to press it rapidly.

There have been, of course, and still are very considerable differences within the Court on these matters, and there has been quite recently a growing recognition of the fact that our Government is still a Federal Government and that the historic line which experience seems to justify between matters primarily of national concern and matters primarily of local concern should not be hastily or lightly obliterated. A number of Justices have repeatedly demonstrated their awareness of problems of federalism and their recognition that federalism is still a living part of our system of government.

The extent to which the Supreme Court assumes the function of policymaker is also of concern to us in the conduct of our judicial business. We realize that, in the course of American history, the Supreme Court has frequently—one might, indeed, say customarily—exercised policymaking powers going far beyond those involved, say, in making a selection between competing rules of law.

We believe that, in the fields with which we are concerned and as to which we feel entitled to speak, the Supreme Court too often has tended to adopt the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint. We feel this is particularly the case in both of the great fields we have discussed—namely, the extent and extension of the Federal power, and the supervision of State action by the Supreme Court by virtue of the 14th amendment. In the light of the immense power of the Supreme Court and its practical nonreviewability in most instances no more important obligation rests upon it, in our view, than that of careful moderation in the exercise of its policymaking role.

We are not alone in our view that the Court, in many cases arising under the 14th amendment, has assumed what seem to us primarily legislative powers. See Judge Learned Hand on the Bill of Rights. We do not believe that either the framers of the original Constitution or the possibly somewhat less gifted draftsmen of the 14th amendment ever contemplated that the Supreme Court would, or should, have the almost unlimited policymaking powers which it now exercises.

It is strange, indeed, to reflect that, under a Constitution which provides for a system of checks and balances and of distribution of power between National and State Governments, one branch of one government—the Supreme Court—should attain the immense and, in many respects, dominant power which it now wields.

When we read the Lincoln Mills case in connection with the regulation of labor relations, we find language which reads to us very much as if the Supreme Court found in a somewhat obscurely worded section of the Labor-Management Relations Act a grant by Congress to the Federal courts of a power closely approximating legislative power. Perhaps no more is meant by the term "to fashion a body of Federal law" than to interpret and apply a statute whose meaning is rather vague, but the possible implications of this phrase may be considerably broader.

We believe that the great principle of distribution of powers among the various branches of government and between levels of government has vitality today and is the crucial base of our democracy.

We further believe that, in construing and applying the Constitution and laws made in pursuance thereof, this principle of the division of power based upon whether a matter is primarily of national or of local concern should not be lost sight of or ignored, especially in fields which bear upon the meaning of a constitutional or statutory provision, or the validity of State action presented for review. For, with due allowance for the changed conditions under which it may or must operate, the principle is as worthy of our consideration today as it was of the consideration of the great men who met in 1787 to establish our Nation as a nation.

It has long been an American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast. We find first that, in constitutional cases, unanimous decisions are comparative rarities and that multiple opinions, concurring or dissenting, are common occurrences.

DIVERGENT VIEWS OF JUSTICES

We find next that divisions in result on a 5-to-4 basis are quite frequent. We find further that, on some occasions, a majority of the Court cannot be mustered in support of any one opinion and that the result of a given case may come from the divergent views of individual Justices who happen to unite on one outcome or the other of the case before the Court.

We further find that the Court does not accord finality to its own determinations of constitutional questions or, for that matter, of others. We concede that a slavish adherence to stare decisis [standing by previous decisions] could at times have unfortunate consequences; but it seems strange that, under a constitutional doctrine which requires all others to recognize the Supreme Court's rulings on constitutional questions as binding adjudications of the meaning and application of the Constitution, the Court itself has so frequently overturned its own decisions thereon, after the lapse of periods varying from 1 year to 75, or even 95 years. See the tables appended to Mr. Justice Douglas' address on "Stare Decisis," 49 Columbia Law Review 735, 756–758.

The Constitution expressly sets up its own procedures for amendment, slow or cumbersome though they may be. If reasonable certainty and stability do not attach to a written constitution, is it a constitution or is it a sham?

GRAVE CONCERN OVER SOME RULINGS

These frequent differences and occasional overrulings of prior decisions in constitutional cases cause us grave concern as to whether individual views as to what is wise or desirable do not unconsciously override a more dispassionate consideration of what is or is not constitutionally warranted. We believe that the latter is the correct approach, and we have no doubt that every member of the Supreme Court intends to adhere to that approach, and believes that he does so. But to err is human, and even the Supreme Court is not divine.

It is our earnest hope, which we respectfully express, that that great Court exercise

to the full its power of judicial self-restraint by adhering firmly to its tremendous, strictly judicial powers and by eschewing, so far as possible, the exercise of essentially legislative powers when it is called upon to decide questions involving the validity of State action, whether it deems such action wise or unwise. The value of our system of federalism, and of local self-government in local matters which it embodies, should be kept firmly in mind, as we believe it was by those who framed our Constitution.

At times the Supreme Court manifests, or seems to manifest, an impatience with the slow workings of our Federal system. That impatience may extend to an unwillingness to wait for Congress to make clear its intention to exercise the powers conferred upon it under the Constitution, or the extent to which it undertakes to exercise them, and it may extend to the slow processes of amending the Constitution which that instrument provides.

The words of Elihu Root on the opposite side of the problem, asserted at a time when demands were current for recall of judges and judicial decisions, bear repeating: "If the people of our country yield to impatience which would destroy the system that alone makes effective these great impersonal rules and preserves our constitutional government, rather than endure the temporary inconvenience of pursuing regulated methods of changing the law, we shall not be reforming. We shall not be making progress, but shall be exhibiting that lack of self-control which enables great bodies of men to abide the slow process of orderly government rather than to break down the barriers of order when they are struck by the impulse of the moment." Quoted in 31 Boston University Law Review 43.

We believe that what Mr. Root said is sound doctrine to be followed toward the Constitution, the Supreme Court and its interpretation of the Constitution. Surely, it is no less incumbent upon the Supreme Court, on its part, to be equally restrained and to be as sure as is humanly possible that it is adhering to the fundamentals of the Constitution with regard to the distribution of powers and the separation of powers, and with regard to the limitations of judical power which are implicit in such separation and distribution, and that it is not merely giving effect to what it may deem desirable.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, more recently, Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of the Harvard University Law School said in his annual report of 1964 that there is a "widespread and strong" feeling among lawyers that judges "cannot be relied upon to be judicious and wise." Dean Griswold said that he and the lawyers who complained to him recognize that there are many judges of outstanding character and ability. He said, however, that the "departures from that high standard are encountered frequently enough to make this a fundamental concern to the legal profession and also to all citizens."

Mr. President, there is a growing consensus in the legal profession that the quality of our judiciary could be improved if we begin by requiring that all future appointees to the Supreme Court have prior judicial experience.

The late great Justice Benjamin Cardozo once gave a series of lectures on this subject at Yale University. His lectures subsequently appeared in a book entitled, "The Nature of the Judicial Process." The entire book is a plea for judicial experience as a prerequisite for anyone appointed to the Supreme Court.

Justice Cardozo, in studying the process of judging, said:

> What is it that I do when I decide a case? To what sources of information do I appeal for guidance? In what proportion do I permit them to contribute to the result? In what proportion ought they to contribute? If a precedent is applicable, when do I refuse to follow it? If no precedent is applicable, how do I reach the rule that will make a precedent for the future? If I am seeking logical consistency, the symmetry of the legal structure, how far shall I seek it? At what point shall the quest be halted by some discrepant custom, by some consideration of the social welfare, by my own or the common standards of justice and morals?

This is a picture of a great legal mind in action. It is a picture of the thinking of one of the greatest judges this country has produced. It is also an implicit plea for judicial experience before any man is appointed to the Nation's highest court.

No one would consider being operated on by a man not trained as a doctor. No one would consider being represented in court by a man who was not an able and competent lawyer, skilled in the art of his profession.

An equally strong case can be made against forcing the American public to be judged, in the highest judicial tribunal in the land, by men who lack the basic ingredient of "experience" in the task to which many have been so prematurely assigned.

Yet it is unfortunately true that many men have been selected to sit upon the Supreme Court with no prior judicial experience whatsoever. In fact, some had never even engaged in the practice of law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, a compilation by the Library of Congress entitled "Prior Judicial Experience of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices from 1789 to 1963."

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this table shows that of the 14 Chief Justices who have served since our country's founding, 8 had no prior judicial experience. It shows, furthermore, that of the 84 Justices who have served on the highest Court, 29 were appointed without prior judicial experience.

Even today, there are six men who sit upon the Supreme Court of the United States who had, prior to their appointment, no judicial experience whatsoever, with the exception of one who served 1 year as a police judge 27 years prior to his appointment on the Court.

Nevertheless, learning to think judicially is a skill which should have been mastered before a man becomes a Supreme Court Justice. It is a skill which equips a man with the discipline necessary to discard personal notions and to decide the issues upon the basis of the Constitution, the statutes, and legal precedent.

One of the most eminently qualified judges in the entire country, my distinguished colleague Senator ERVIN, had this to say about the importance of legal precedent:

> Practicing lawyers and judges of courts of general jurisdiction perform their functions in the workaday world where men and women live, move and have their being. To them, law is destitute of social value unless it has sufficient stability to afford reliable rules to govern the conduct of people, and unless it can be found with reasonable certainty in established legal precedents.

Mr. President, I offer the proposed legislation not to impugn the Supreme Court, nor to in any way question—or bring into question any person now sitting on the Supreme Court. My purpose is to strengthen our constitutional system by strengthening the Court in the future. As a lawyer I know from academic training and considerable experience that a strong and highly respected U.S. Supreme Court is indispensable to our system of government. I want to see the Court strengthened. I want to see its members and its decisions respected by lawyers, by jurists, and by the American people.

I know of no more sound nor, at the same time, more considered step toward restoring that confidence than by requiring that the men whose function it is to dispense "equal justice under the law" be men of experience in the arduous task of the judicial process.

I therefore urge that the Senate take prompt and favorable action on the proposed measure.

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

The bill (S. 980) establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXHIBIT 1

Prior judicial experience of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices from 1789 to 1963

	Supreme Court service	Judicial service prior to appointment
CHIEF JUSTICES		
John Jay	1790–96	Chief justice, New York Supreme Court, 1776–79.
John Rutledge	1795 (4 months)	Chief justice, Supreme Court, South Carolina, 1791–95.
CHIEF JUSTICES—continued		
Oliver Ellsworth	1796–1800	Judge, Governor's Council, Connecticut (Supreme Court of Errors), Colonial, 1780–85. Judge, superior court, Connecticut 1785–89.

EXHIBIT 1—Continued

Prior judicial experience of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices from 1789 to 1965—Continued

	Supreme Court service	Judicial service prior to appointment
CHIEF JUSTICES—continued		
John Marshall	1801–35	None found.
Roger Brooke Taney	1836–64	Do.
Salmon Portland Chase	1864–73	Do.
Morrison Remick Waite	1874–88	Do.
Melville Weston Fuller	1888–1910	Do.
Edward Douglas White	1910–21	Justice, Louisiana Supreme Court, 1879–80.
William Howard Taft	1921–30	Judge, Supreme Court, Ohio, 1887–93. Judge, Federal Circuit Court, 6th Circuit, 1892–1900.
Charles Evans Hughes	1930–41	None found.
Harlan Fiske Stone	1941–46	Do.
Frederick Moore Vinson	1946–53	Associate Justice, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, 1938–43.
Earl Warren	1953 to present	None found.
ASSOCIATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES		
John Rutledge	1790–91	Chief Justice, Supreme Court, South Carolina, 1791–95.
William Cushing	1790–1810	Probate judge, Lincoln County, Maine (Colonial), 1760–72. Judge, Superior Court, Massachusetts. (Colonial) 1772–75. Judge, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1775–77. Chief Justice, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1777–89.
James Wilson	1789–98	None found.
John Blair	1789–96	General Court, Virginia (Colonial), 1778–80. Judge, High Court of Chancery, Virginia (Colonial), 1780. Judge, Virginia 1st Court of Appeals, 1780–89.
James Iredell	1790–99	Superior Court judge, North Carolina (Colonial), 1777–78.
Thomas Johnson	1792–93	Chief judge, General Court, Maryland (Colonial), 1790–91.
William Paterson	1793–1806	None found.
Samuel Chase	1796–1811	Chief judge, Criminal Court, Baltimore, Md. (Colonial), 1788. Chief judge, General Court, Maryland, 1791.
Bushrod Washington	1799–1829	None found.
Alfred Moore	1800–1804	Judge, superior court, North Carolina, 1798–99.
William Johnson	1804–34	Judge, Court of Common Pleas, 1798–1804.
Henry Brockholst Livingston	1807–23	Judge, Supreme Court, New York, 1802–6.
Thomas Todd	1807–26	Judge, Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1801–6. Chief justice, Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1806–7.
Gabriel Duvall	1811–35	None found.
Joseph Story	1811–45	Do.
Smith Thompson	1823–43	Associate justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1802–14. Chief justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1814–19.
Robert Trimble	1826–28	Judge, Court of Appeals, Kentucky 1807–9. Federal district judge, ship, Kentucky, 1817–26.
John McLean	1830–61	Judge, Supreme Court, Ohio, 1816 22.
Henry Baldwin	1830–44	None found.
James Moore Wayne	1835–67	Judge, superior court, Georgia, 1824–29.
Philip Pendleton Barbour	1836–41	Judge, General Court, Virginia, 1825–27. Judge, U.S. District Court, Eastern, Virginia, 1830–36.
John Catron	1837–65	Judge, Supreme Court of Errors and Appeals (then Court of Last Resort), Tennessee, 1824–31.
John McKinley	1837–52	None found.
Peter Vivian Daniel	1842–60	Judge, U.S. District Court, Virginia, 1836–41.
Samuel Nelson	1845–72	Judge, 6th Circuit, New York, 1823–31. Associate justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1831–45.
Levi Woodbury	1845–51	Judge, New Hampshire superior court, 1817–23 (6 years).
Robert Cooper Crier	1846–70	Presiding judge, District Court, Allegheny County, Pa., 1833–46.
Benjamin Robbins Curtis	1851–57	None found.
John Archibald Campbell	1853–61	Do.
Nathan Clifford	1858–81	Do.
Noah Haynes Swayne	1862–81	Do.
Samuel Freeman Miller	1862–90	Justice of the peace, Barbourville, Ky., date unknown.
David Davis	1862–77	Judge, 8th judiciary district, Illinois, 1848–62.
Stephen Johnson Field	1863–97	Justice, Supreme Court, California, 1857–63.
William Strong	1870–80	Judge, Supreme Court, Pennsylvania, 1857–68.
Joseph P. Bradley	1870–92	None found.
Ward Hunt	1873–82	New York Court of Appeals, 1865–73;
ASSOCIATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES—con.		
John Marshall Harlan	1877–1911	Judge, county court, Franklin County, Ky., 1858–59.
William Burnham Woods	1880–87	Judge, U.S. Circuit Court, 5th Circuit, 1869–8 .
Stanley Matthews	1881–89	Judge, court of common pleas, Hamilton County, Ohio, 1851–(?). Judge, superior court, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1863–65.
Horace Gray	1881–1902	Justice, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1864–81.
Samuel Blatchford	1882–93	District judge, New York, Southern District, 1867–73. Circuit judge, 2d Judicial District, 1873–82.
Lucius Quintas C. Lamar	1888–93	None found.
David Josiah Brewer	1889–1910	Commissioner, Federal Circuit Court, District of Kansas, 1861–62. Judge, probate and criminal courts, Leavenworth County, Kans., 1862–65. Judge 1st Judicial District, Kansas, 1865–69. Supreme Court, Kansas, 1870–84. Federal Circuit Court, 8th District, 1884–89.
Henry Billings Brown	1891–1906	Circuit judge, Wayne County Mich., 1868 to (unknown). U.S. judge, eastern district, Michigan, 1875–90.
George Shiras, Jr	1892–1903	None found.
Howell Edmunds Jackson	1893–95	Circuit Court, 6th Circuit, 1886–91. Presiding judge, Circuit Court of Appeals, 6th Circuit, 1891–93.
Edward Douglas White	1894–1910	Justice, Louisiana Supreme Court, 1879–80.
Rufus Wheeler Peckham	1896–1909	Justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1883–86. Court of Appeals, New York, 1886–96.
Joseph McKenna	1898–1925	Judge, Circuit Court, 9th Circuit, 1892–97.
Oliver Wendell Holmes	1902–32	Associate judge, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachussetts, 1883–89. Chief justice, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachussetts, 1889–1902.
Rufus William Day	1903–22	Judge, court of common pleas, 1886–89. U.S. Court of Appeals, 6th circuit, 1899–1903.
William Henry Moody	1906–10	None found.
Horace Harmon Lurton	1910–14	Justice, Supreme Court, Tennessee, 1886–93. Judge, U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, 6th circuit, 1893–1909.
Charles Evans Hughes	1910–16	None found.
Willis Van Devanter	1910–37	Chief justice, Supreme Court, Wyoming, 1889–90. U.S. circuit judge, 8th circuit, 1903–10.
Joseph Rucker Lamar	1911–16	Associate justice, Supreme Court, Georgia, 1906–08.
Mahlon Pitney	1912–22	Associate justice, New Jersey Supreme Court, 1901–08.
James Clark McReynolds	1914–41	None found.
Louis Dembitz Brandeis	1916–39	Do.
John Hessin Clarke	1916–22	U.S. district judge, northern district of Ohio, 1914–16.
George Sutherland	1922–38	None found.
Pierce Butler	1923–39	Do.
Edward Terry Sanford	1923–30	Judge, U.S. District Court, Middle and Eastern District, Tennessee, 1908–23.
Harlan Fiske Stone	1925–41	None found.
Owen Josephus Roberts	1930–45	Do.
Benjamin Nathan Cardozo	1932–38	Judge, Supreme Court, New York, 1914. Associate judge, Court of Appeals, New York, 1914–32.
Hugo Lafayette Black	1937 to present	Police judge, Birmingham, Ala., 1910–11.
Stanley Forman Reed	1938–57	None found.
Felix Frankfurter	1939–62	Do.
William Orville Douglas	1939 to present	Do.
Frank Murphy	1940–49	Judge, recorders court, Detroit, Mich., 1923–30.
James Francis Byrnes	1941–42	None found.
Robert Houghwout Jackson	1941–54	Do.
Wiley Blount Rutledge	1943–49	U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia. 1939–43.
Harold Hitz Burton	1945–58	None found.
Thomas Campbell Clark	1949 to present	Do.
Sherman Minton	1949–56	Circuit Court of Appeals, 7th Circuit, 1941–49.
John Marshall Harlan	1955 to present	U.S. Court of Appeals, 2d Circuit, 1954–55.
William J. Brennan, Jr	1956 to present	Superior court judge, New Jersey, 1949–50. Appellate division judge, 1950–52. Justice, Supreme Court, New Jersey, 1952–56.
Charles E. Whittaker	1957–62	U.S. District Court, Western District of Missouri, 1954–56; Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit, 1956–57.
Potter Stewart	1959 to present	Court of Appeals, 6th Circuit, 1954–58.
Byron R. White	1962 to present	None found.
Arthur J. Goldberg	——do——	Do.

DISCONTINUANCE OF POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to discontinue the Postal Savings System.

POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM OUTMODED

The Postal Savings System was established by act of Congress on June 25, 1910. When enacted in the first decade of this century, the Postal Savings System was designed to attract the savings of small depositors who lacked confidence in the private banking system and to provide savings deposits facilities in communities where no banks existed. With the growth in recent years of the private banking system, credit unions, and the savings and loan associations, there are few communities in the United States without ready access to banking services. In those few isolated places which do not have banking services, the "bank by mail" system has met the need. The formation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation has also provided the necessary guarantees and security of deposits on savings in commercial banks which were not available when the Postal Savings System was established.

DECLINE STEADY SINCE 1947

From its establishment in 1910 up until 1947, the Postal Savings System experienced a continued growth in deposits. The System grew from 12,000 depositors with desposits totaling $677,000 in 1911, to a high of 4.2 million depositors with deposits totaling $3.4 billion in 1947. Since 1947, however, the System's activities have been on the decline. Annual deposits have decreased consistently every year from 1947, and withdrawals have exceeded deposits annually since 1948. By the close of fiscal year 1964, the number of depositors had shrunk to 1,076,225 and the principal to the credit of these depositors to $415,965,295.

It is easy to understand the rapid decline in the Postal Savings System. First, the convenience of commercial banking facilities. Second, the insured protection which deposits under $10,000 now carry in banks and savings and loan companies. Third, postal savings deposits by law provides for the payment of interest on deposits at a rate of only 2 percent per annum. While the first two reasons are very important, the third factor is probably most controlling. Any knowledgable investor is not going to leave his money on deposit at 2 percent interest in postal savings, when commercial banks and savings institutions will pay him from 4 to 4½ on money deposited in savings accounts. In fact, if all of the money on deposit last year in postal savings had been reinvested by depositors in commercial banks, the depositors would have received an additional $8,290,779 in interest.

THOUSANDS OF INACTIVE ACCOUNTS

Many of the postal savings accounts have been inactive for years which indictates a lack of information or ignorance on the part of depositors or their families in the existence of these accounts. In fact, as of June 30, 1964, there were 155,718 unclaimed accounts, which had been inactive for 20 years or more.

By liquidating the Postal Savings System we would be getting the Federal Government out of a commercial type business operation which is no longer needed or justified. We would also perform a service to the depositors, by forcing the transfer of these funds to other investments where they could earn the higher going rate of interest which, in most instances, is more than double the 2 percent rate paid on postal savings deposits. The abolishment of the System would also result in a savings of manpower and operating expenses in the Post Office Department, which is already overburdened with other nonpostal duties such as selling duck stamps, issuance of savings bonds, and registration of aliens.

ABOLISHMENT RECOMMENDED BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

The Hoover Commission recommended the abolishment of the Postal Savings System many years ago. The Comptroller General as early as 1952 recommended that Congress take the necessary action to liquidate this system. When I became a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the 82d Congress, I introduced my first such bill S. 3312 to discontinue the Postal Savings System. In the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses I again introduced similar bills. Time and events have certainly proved that there is no justifiable reason for continuing this outmoded system. Therefore, I urge my colleagues in the 89th Congress to take immediate action to repeal the Postal Savings Act.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed at the end of my remarks, a table which shows a summary by fiscal year of postal savings business since the establishment of the system.

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

The bill (S. 983) to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The table presented by Mr. BENNETT is, as follows:

Summary of postal-savings business since the establishment of the system, by fiscal years

Fiscal year [1]	In operation			Deposits	Withdrawals	Balance to credit of depositors [2]	Increase or decrease (−)		Number of depositors [3]	Average principal per depositor	Balance on deposit in banks	Excess of income before operating expenses	Operating expenses [4]	Net income or loss (−)
	Offices	Branches and stations	Total depositories				Amount	Percent						
1911	400		400	$778,129	$100,984	$677,145			11,918	$57	$571,671	$3,168	$20,282	−$17,114
1912	9,907	263	10,170	30,732,357	11,172,418	20,237,084	$19,559,939	2,888.6	243,801	83	18,586,042	233,266	359,572	−126,306
1913	12,158	662	12,820	41,701,383	28,119,597	33,818,870	13,581,786	67.1	331,006	102	31,512,337	312,840	431,035	−118,195
1914	9,639	708	10,347	47,815,249	38,189,848	43,444,271	9,625,401	28.5	388,511	112	40,919,673	416,483	336,604	79,879
1915	8,832	714	9,546	70,314,858	48,074,421	65,684,708	22,240,437	51.2	525,414	125	60,086,319	675,950	332,768	343,182
1916	7,701	720	8,421	76,775,868	56,440,691	86,019,885	20,335,177	31.0	602,937	143	80,775,586	660,185	347,988	312,197
1917	6,423	738	7,161	132,112,217	86,177,406	131,954,696	45,934,811	53.4	674,728	196	126,840,820	1,308,341	469,786	838,555
1918	5,926	730	6,656	116,893,259	100,376,456	148,471,499	16,516,803	12.5	612,188	242	140,658,608	1,243,483	411,710	831,773
1919	5,715	724	6,439	136,690,122	117,838,361	167,323,260	18,851,761	12.7	565,509	296	135,942,981	1,814,490	405,988	1,408,502
1920	5,583	731	6,314	139,208,954	149,255,892	157,276,322	−10,046,938	−6.0	508,508	309	126,426,019	2,165,509	461,250	1,704,259
1921	5,554	746	6,300	133,574,840	138,461,259	152,389,903	−4,886,419	−3.1	466,109	327	48,668,108	3,291,187	779,660	2,511,527
1922	6,020	754	6,774	96,507,746	111,161,210	137,736,439	−14,653,464	−9.6	420,242	328	44,160,417	3,924,745	755,109	3,169,636
1923	6,047	755	6,802	88,008,160	94,073,299	131,671,300	−6,065,139	−4.4	417,902	315	61,844,062	5,478,741	751,394	4,727,347
1924	5,995	763	6,758	94,932,846	93,790,011	132,814,135	1,142,835	.9	412,584	322	96,369,774	7,272,563	777,036	6,495,527
1925	5,896	759	6,655	89,707,991	90,348,915	132,173,211	−640,924	−.5	402,325	328	97,898,486	2,075,387	815,365	1,260,022
1926	5,853	770	6,623	90,751,051	88,745,704	134,178,558	2,005,347	1.5	399,305	336	101,175,541	1,437,814	892,828	544,986
1927	5,896	776	6,672	103,606,868	90,426,172	147,359,254	13,180,696	9.8	411,394	358	114,597,400	1,533,904	930,374	603,530
1928	5,897	786	6,683	96,386,499	91,602,404	152,143,349	4,784,095	3.2	412,250	369	118,714,519	1,569,950	951,348	618,602
1929	5 976	794	6,770	112,446,412	110,945,232	153,644,529	1,501,180	1.0	416,584	369	127,639,413	2,876,795	1,110,102	1,766,693
1930	5,998	797	6,795	159,959,071	138,331,914	175,271,686	21,627,157	14.1	466,401	376	148,255,213	1,562,107	1,426,244	135,863
1931	6,665	794	7,459	366,900,908	195,755,724	347,416,870	172,145,184	98.2	770,859	451	306,119,698	2,239,153	1,898,262	340,891
1932	6,743	806	7,549	860,195,852	422,792,099	784,820,623	437,403,753	125.9	1,545,190	508	681,726,891	4,255,327	3,231,425	1,023,902
1933	7,071	817	7,888	1,166,326,647	763,961,062	1,187,186,208	402,365,585	51.3	2,342,133	507	976,377,147	6,558,753	4,440,629	2,118,124
1934	7,247	812	8,059	966,650,799	955,916,819	1,197,920,188	10,733,980	.9	2,562,082	468	694,575,369	8,102,625	4,116,790	3,985,835
1935	7,301	810	8,111	944,959,559	938,016,807	1,204,862,940	6,942,752	.6	2,598,391	464	384,510,210	11,828,955	4,494,512	7,334,443
1936	7,299	804	8,103	933,071,216	906,261,000	1,231,673,156	26,810,216	2.2	2,705,152	455	203,010,277	9,508,164	4,594,494	4,913,670
1937	7,266	802	8,068	972,743,476	936,742,892	1,267,673,740	36,000,584	2.9	2,791,371	454	136,094,899	9,938,040	4,767,075	5,170,965
1938	7,245	805	8,050	929,480,177	945,354,737	1,251,799,180	−15,874,560	−1.3	2,741,569	457	114,654,887	11,133,169	4,719,599	6,413,570
1939	7,162	802	7,964	897,339,074	886,846,425	1,262,291,829	10,492,649	.8	2,767,417	456	68,266,768	13,033,715	4,688,347	8,345,368
1940	7,172	808	7,980	923,266,363	892,149,457	1,293,408,735	31,116,906	2.5	2,816,408	459	43,131,865	10,817,131	4,802,895	6,014,236
1941	7,203	835	8,038	923,660,091	912,915,552	1,304,153,274	10,744,539	.8	2,882,886	452	29,969,506	9,246,565	5,004,417	4,242,148
1942	7,211	852	8,063	895,079,877	883,709,846	1,315,523,305	11,370,031	.9	2,812,806	468	23,918,756	9,451,495	5,119,656	4,331,839
1943	7,199	861	8,060	1,033,549,955	771,547,650	1,577,525,610	262,002,305	19.9	3,064,054	515	11,875,204	15,888,515	5,324,068	10,564,447
1944	7,183	874	8,057	1,363,027,587	906,416,690	2,034,136,507	456,610,897	28.9	3,493,079	582	8,685,412	18,126,143	5,406,937	12,719,206
1945	7,162	888	8,050	1,739,340,729	1,113,902,275	2,659,574,961	625,438,454	30.7	3,921,937	678	7,904,432	20,791,630	6,369,274	14,422,356
1946	7,187	902	8,089	2,127,037,514	1,666,956,179	3,119,656,296	460,081,335	17.3	4,135,565	754	5,279,425	14,934,883	8,530,337	6,404,546

See footnotes at end of table.

Summary of postal-savings business since the establishment of the system, by fiscal years—Continued

Fiscal year [1]	In operation			Deposits	Withdrawals	Balance to credit of depositors [2]	Increase or decrease (−)		Number of depositors [3]	Average principal per depositor	Balance on deposit in banks	Excess of income before operating expenses	Operating expenses [4]	Net income or loss (−)
	Offices	Branches and stations	Total depositories				Amount	Percent						
1947	7,225	916	8,141	2,163,618,842	1,890,501,677	3,392,773,461	273,117,165	8.8	4,196,517	808	5,561,323	34,870,656	9,076,920	25,793,736
1948	7,234	949	8,183	2,055,651,215	2,069,294,693	3,379,129,983	−13,643,478	−.4	4,111,373	822	6,472,055	27,381,460	8,339,027	19,042,433
1949	7,213	982	8,195	1,947,237,723	2,048,965,436	3,277,402,270	−101,727,713	−3.0	3,964,509	827	6,680,390	11,710,576	9,297,594	2,412,982
1950	7,215	1,020	8,235	1,827,912,752	2,007,998,573	3,097,316,449	−180,085,821	−5.5	3,779,784	819	9,507,181	8,130,584	8,457,033	−326,449
1951	7,208	1,039	8,247	1,603,326,721	1,912,444,160	2,788,199,010	−309,117,439	−10.0	3,529,527	790	22,508,797	14,317,639	7,981,997	6,335,642
1952	7,200	1,061	8,261	1,460,414,712	1,631,049,586	2,617,564,136	−170,634,874	−6.1	3,339,378	784	33,378,638	16,190,595	9,473,026	6,717,569
1953	7,181	1,066	8,247	1,342,674,724	1,502,690,672	2,457,548,188	−160,015,948	−6.1	3,162,176	77	33,046,504	15,468,475	8,588,482	6,879,993
1954	6,816	1,056	7,872	1,197,325,333	1,403,454,284	2,251,419,237	−206,128,951	−8.4	2,934,795	767	30,664,075	15,210,666	7,828,865	7,381,801
1955	6,708	1,042	7,750	1,140,503,005	1,383,925,784	2,007,996,458	−243,422,779	−10.8	2,711,110	741	30,831,056	18,392,739	7,842,080	10,550,659
1956	6,623	999	7,622	605,100,315	848,626,927	1,765,469,846	−242,526,612	−12.1	2,482,026	711	29,650,979	12,973,376	6,447,914	6,525,462
1957	6,483	886	7,369	353,628,378	656,829,920	1,462,268,304	−303,201,542	−17.2	2,200,508	665	27,214,262	12,530,732	5,167,746	7,362,986
1958	6,037	834	6,871	241,239,105	489,899,563	1,213,607,846	−248,660,458	−17.0	1,925,852	630	24,339,541	10,110,805	4,876,580	5,234,225
1959	5,537	787	6,324	192,886,980	363,042,165	1,043,452,661	−170,155,185	−14.0	1,740,052	600	21,760,490	8,083,855	4,180,294	3,903,561
1960	5,189	734	5,923	145,081,905	350,474,905	838,059,661	−205,393,000	−19.7	1,550,930	540	19,137,686	7,009,716	3,974,420	3,035,296
1961	4,848	636	5,484	114,884,340	251,248,335	701,695,666	−136,363,995	−16.3	1,397,538	502	17,846,397	5,492,107	3,823,721	1,668,386
1962	4,601	604	5,205	93,674,620	212,303,325	583,066,961	−118,628,705	−16.9	1,271,858	458	18,620,747	4,444,526	3,458,287	986,239
1963	3,696	554	4,250	76,441,625	174,752,436	484,756,150	−98,310,811	−16.9	1,164,634	416	17,394,771	3,801,458	3,314,352	487,106
1964	2,993	473	3,466	63,154,600	131,945,455	415,965,295	−68,790,855	−14.2	1,076,225	387	17,372,425	3,157,989	3,103,545	54,444
Total												444,989,125	205,507,043	239,482,082

[1] Figures based on fiscal year which ended June 30 of each year except June 28, 1957, June 27, 1958, June 26, 1959, June 24, 1960, June 23, 1961, June 22, 1962, June 21, 1963, and June 19, 1964, except last 4 columns which are based on fiscal year ended June 30.

[2] Balance to credit of depositors includes item shown on balance sheet as unclaimed.

[3] Includes depositors whose accounts are reflected on balance sheet as unclaimed.

[4] Expense of the Post Office Department incident to the operation of the system.

Source: "Report of Operations of the Postal Savings System, 1964," letter from Postmaster General dated Jan. 4, 1965.

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE COUNSEL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to create in Congress an Office of Administrative Counsel, staffed with experts. This proposed legislation is the outgrowth of the standout efforts of Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, to have the Scandinavian "Ombudsman" concept adopted in this country.

I introduce this companion bill for several substantial reasons. First, it would relieve Members of Congress of some of the inordinate burden they are compelled to carry in acting on behalf of their constituents, in connection with problems these people have with the Federal Government. Second, an Administrative Counsel's office would employ persons who would be experts in every field of Government, something no Member of Congress can hope to duplicate on his own staff.

Much has been said of the action of Members of Congress in contacting various Federal agencies and departments on behalf of their constituents. It has been suggested that all such contacts be made a matter of record and be available to public scrutiny. I endorse this proposal and hope it will be adopted. But, if this legislation was adopted, there would be less of a need in this regard.

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

The bill (S. 984) to provide for an Administrative Counsel of the Congress, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF S. 256

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 256) to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, at the next printing.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of January 22, 1965, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

S. 646. A bill to implement further the constitutional right to bail by authorizing in appropriate cases the release on a personal recognizance of persons otherwise eligible for bail: Senators BARTLETT, BURDICK, DIRKSEN, DODD, INOUYE, METCALF, SCOTT, and TYDINGS.

S. 647. A bill to assure that convicted persons will receive credit toward service of their sentences for time spent in custody for lack of bail: Senators BARTLETT, BURDICK, DIRKSEN, DODD, INOUYE, METCALF, SCOTT, and TYDINGS.

S. 648. A bill to further implement the constitutional right to bail by permitting persons admitted to bail to make a cash deposit with the court in lieu of providing securities or other collateral security: Senators BARTLETT, BURDICK, DIRKSEN, DODD, INOUYE, METCALF, SCOTT, and TYDINGS.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce that a hearing will be held on the nomination of John Doar, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice.

The hearing will begin on Thursday, February 25, 1965, at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to appear and testify or submit a statement pertaining to this nomination should send the request or prepared statement to the subcommittee no later than 1 week prior to the hearing date.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that yesterday the Senate received the nomination of Donald W. Hoagland, of Colorado, to be Assistant Administratrator for Development Finance and Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

THE DANGEROUS ONES—HELP FOR CHILDREN WITH TWISTED MINDS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, early last month I introduced S. 488, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to assist States and communities to establish programs for the identification, care, and treatment of children who are in danger of becoming emotionally disturbed. The current issue of Harper's magazine carries an article I have written about the proposed legislation and the urgent need for it. There has been a great deal of interest in this article, entitled "The Dangerous Ones: Help for Children With Twisted Minds." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE DANGEROUS ONES: HELP FOR CHILDREN WITH TWISTED MINDS

(By Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF [1])

He has suffered serious personality damage but if he can receive help quickly this

[1] As Governor of Connecticut; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and now a U.S. Senator, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF has been able to translate into action new ideas in the field of mental health and mental retardation.

might be repaired to some extent. So wrote a social worker who interviewed 13-year-old Lee Harvey Oswald in 1953.

"Oswald never received that help," the Warren Commission tersely reported in 1964.

Oswald is dead and so is the beloved President he murdered. But there are—according to expert estimates—close to a half-million American children as desperately sick as young Oswald was, who, like him, are not getting the help they need today. Nor will their plight be eased greatly by the $150 million Congress appropriated last year for the construction of new community mental-health centers. Indeed, the Joint Commission on Mental Health and Illness—whose studies laid the groundwork for that legislation—lacked the funds even to study the problem of emotionally disturbed children.

Yet this is a problem of peculiar urgency—as a matter both of humanity and of public safety. Week after week, our newspapers report senseless killings, rapes, and acts of sadism. For those who read beyond the headlines there emerges a repetitive chronicle of neglect and inaction by a society that turned its back on deeply troubled children until it was too late to save them or to protect the community.

Such, for example, was the story of Anthony, a 17-year-old New York boy who confessed last September that he had raped and strangled several elderly women. Anthony had an IQ of 62 and was always a strange and violent child. When he was 13 his mother took him to Bellevue Hospital. The doctors there sent him to a State school for mental defectives where he became one of 4,100 patients in the care of 20 psychiatrists. Two years later he was released and told to report to another sadly understaffed institution—a mental-health clinic in the Bronx. They discharged him last April, and in June he was arrested for rape. The judge, who knew nothing of his past psychiatric record, released him on $500 bond. Three months later he was in a Brooklyn police station confessing to a horrendous catalog of sex crimes.

"You wonder who let him go," Lt. Harold Norton, one of the interrogating officers, said afterward to reporter Jimmy Breslin. "His background alone—arson, raping a 5-year-old child—that should have been enough to hold him. Talk to the boy for a couple of hours and you'd know he never should be on the streets. The psychiatrists—they get busy, too many patients, no room in the hospital."

Too few psychiatrists, too many patients—this is a familiar refrain as one studies the records of potentially dangerous children who later turn up in criminal court. And there is still another recurring theme: no one is in charge. The troubled child seems to drift haphazardly, with little if any communication among courts, mental-health clinics, social workers, with no one responsible for getting at the root of the trouble and following through and treatment.

Consider, for instance, Michael who was born to a 15-year-old mother who had a record of sexual delinquency. Michael was admitted to his first institution—a county hospital—when he was 6 months old because of malnutrition and neglect. For the next 3 years he was shunted from foster homes to his mother, to a great-aunt, and then back to his mother and a new stepfather. By the age of 9 he was a very disturbed child, and social agencies made plans to have him placed in an adoptive home. But they were never carried out.

In the next 3 years Michael lived in nine different foster homes, became sick with rheumatic fever and then ileitis, and finally was placed in a children's home where he stayed for 3 troubled years. In his teens, a record of crime begins, and he comes before the juvenile court because of his dangerous cruelty to younger children. He is accepted by a home for boys and, 6 months later, runs away. Shortly afterward he is picked up for stealing, confesses that he had attacked and almost killed a small boy, and is sent off to a school for delinquents.

There an examining psychiatrist finds in Michael "a spine-chilling coolness as he describes his misadventures and I feel he is quite capable of a repeat performance. The boy seems to be guarding against forming a relationship with anyone. * * * The origin of this, of course, seems to lie in the disturbed relationship with his mother."

But Michael is paroled after 6 months to one of his stepfathers; within a few months he kills a woman customer in a holdup attempt. Now he is under life sentence in the State penitentiary.

Such cases could be multiplied by the thousands out of court records. None probably illustrates the problem more vividly than that of Lee Oswald. And we can find some clues to what should be done if we reexamine his now familiar story. Here are the salient facts which are, I think, worth restating and pondering:

An unhappy, bitter child in a badly deranged home, Oswald found it almost impossible to establish the most elemental give-and-take with other people. Sometimes his inner anguish poured out, and gave foreboding signs. This was especially true during his brief stay in New York—a city with many helping agencies. Taunted while he was at junior high school, the 13-year-old preferred to sit in the apartment he shared with his mother and watch television. His persistent truancy finally brought him to Youth House—an institution in which children are kept for psychiatric observation or for detention pending court appearance or commitment to a child-caring or custodial institution like a training school.

Here he stayed for a month in 1953 and was examined by experts. The diagnosis: "Personality pattern disturbance with schizoid features and passive-aggressive tendencies." At 13, Lee Oswald was found to be a child of more than average intelligence, detached and withdrawn, with serious environmental problems. The experts recommended that Oswald be placed on probation on condition that he attend a child-guidance clinic. They also suggested psychotherapy for his mother. But this probation plan did not work out.

"Few social agencies even in New York were equipped to provide the kind of intensive treatment that he needed," the Warren Commission observes, "and when one of the city's clinics did find room to handle him, for some reason the record does not show, advantage was never taken of the chance afforded to Oswald."

WHO'S IN CHARGE?

How many other potential Oswalds fail to take advantage of the chance afforded? Recent studies conducted by the National Institute of Mental Health suggest an appalling answer. Of 60 children studied in the District of Columbia, 58 had persistent emotional problems which were first noted when they were in preschool, kindergarten, or first grade. Nationwide, 208,000 children under 18 years of age were seen in psychiatric outpatient clinics in 1959; of these 86,000 were under 9 years of age. This is the picture we get from reporting clinics alone. Yet, two-thirds of the children diagnosed as needing help left the clinics before treatment was started, and less than half of their parents went to the guidance clinics to which they were referred. Only about one-third of those who went to the clinic returned for help after the first contact.

So the statistics accumulate and the tragedies mount. What is needed, it seems to me, is an all-out effort to make sure that potentially dangerous youngsters are identified early, effectively brought into treatment, and continuously treated as long as necessary to assure decent lives for themselves and safety for society.

Professional people have indeed told us this time and time again in recent years. Last year, for example, a conference of all the leading child psychiatrists in the country, held by the American Academy of Child Psychiatry and the American Psychiatric Association, urged that a national survey be conducted under the leadership of representatives of the entire spectrum of child-care professions in the field of mental illness and health "looking to the formulation of a national program to combat childhood mental illness and to secure the wherewithal to carry out such a plan."

TO MAKE SOMEONE RESPONSIBLE

I have offered a bill in the U.S. Senate to take the first step in this direction. Briefly, this bill would set up a program of Federal grants, administered by the Government agency most concerned—the Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These grants would make it possible for qualified local agencies—be they social agencies or universities—to develop community therapeutic centers for emotionally disturbed children, or children in danger of becoming disturbed. Up to 75 percent of the cost would be borne by the Federal Government.

These centers, cooperating with the schools and courts, would offer a variety of services to children, all aimed at giving them accessible, comprehensive, and continuing care. A child might come to a center via a school, or a court, or a social agency, or a parent, or even a concerned neighbor. It would then be up to the center to use all the means at its disposal to make sure that the child does not slip haphazardly through its fingers into the never-never land of neglect and remorse. The child would not be referred from one office to another—guided only by a slip of paper bearing the address of an agency in a distant part of the city. The center would provide one-stop service, with a counselor taking responsibility for the case, even though different therapists would be involved at different times. With grant funds, the center itself could treat the child, or counsel his parents, or refer him to a foster family or a residential treatment center, as it saw best. But it would retain responsibility for that child, for making a comprehensive plan for him and seeing that it is carried out.

My bill is designed to help communities find and treat children with severe emotional problems. It is, of course, only the beginning of an attack on this problem. The cost in Federal funds will be $1 million for the first year, $3 million in 1966 and 1967, and $5 million annually thereafter. These are modest sums compared not only to the need, but to amounts appropriated for other major health and welfare problems. But they will permit us to make a start in some communities toward providing the full range of services to children who desperately need them. Once the projects have proved their worth, and as we train adequate professionals to staff them, I predict that they will—like similar good beginnings—gradually multiply.

At the outset, the bill would set up an expert panel of advisers to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to make recommendations and advise him on a nationwide plan to provide preventive, diagnostic treatment and protective services for children who are, or are in danger of becoming, emotionally disturbed. This would be done from the standpoint of the best interests of the child, the parents, and the community.

I know many people are tired of panels and reports and proliferating committees and studies. And there are those, too, who doubt that we can do much to cure the ills of the mind and emotions. Certainly it is true that psychiatry is still an infant discipline. And although Freudian jargon has filtered down

into country-club conversation, we still have much to learn about the workings of the human mind. But certain things we do know—for instance, that the signs of emotional instability manifest themselves when children are very young and that cure is more likely if treatment is begun at an early age and is carried through without interruption.

Though we do not often read about them in the papers, many children can be—and have been—helped. To cite just two examples, there was Paul who first came to the attention of a social agency at 6. Now at 19, after many years of continuous treatment, he is a self-supporting university student. In the case of James, tuberculosis proved to be his salvation, because his physical ills put him under the wing of doctors, who observed and treated his emotional ills also.

In contrast, the tragedies of Anthony and Michael which I have cited earlier, and the grim record of Lee Oswald, are not stories of treatment failures but of society's failure to treat those who needed it. Today, out of an estimated half-million emotionally disturbed children, only 10,000 are known to be getting any sort of treatment. In other words, we are letting 98 percent of this group slip through our fingers, condemning them to lives of futility and anguish, and society to nameless perils. The risk is, I submit, one we cannot afford to take. No one can guarantee that they can all be helped or cured. But so far, we have scarcely even begun to try.

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL GRONOUSKI BEFORE OKLAHOMA PRESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], to have printed in the RECORD the text of the address delivered by Postmaster General John A. Gronouski before the Oklahoma Press Association at Oklahoma City on January 29, 1965.

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

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, POSTMASTER GENERAL, BEFORE THE OKLAHOMA PRESS ASSOCIATION, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., JANUARY 29, 1965

I am happy to be here with you today. I take great pleasure in the opportunity to speak to this distinguished group of newspaper editors and publishers. And I am honored that your invitation should have come through two men I have long admired: Senator MIKE MONRONEY and Congressman CARL ALBERT.

My respect for Senator MONRONEY and Congressman ALBERT is so great that I could easily devote the entire time I have allotted to me this morning in a tribute to them.

As you know, MIKE MONRONEY is chairman of our Postal Operations Subcommittee and he's one of the acknowledged experts in the United States on the postal service. As such, he's a pretty tough taskmaster on all of us in the Department. He keeps a sharp eye on us. But he's a fair taskmaster, too, and I'm proud to call him my friend and trusted adviser.

Of course, anything I could say about CARL ALBERT was expressed far better by his own colleagues in selecting him as their majority leader. And having selected him, they can tell you that there is no harder worker in Washington today—or a more brilliant one.

It was my honor to share the platform with him at a senior citizens rally in Atlantic City last summer with a group of other government officials, and I must say that I had reservations about ever doing it again. The fact is, he upstaged us all. But here I am again—not a glutton for punishment, but a victim of his persuasiveness. The fact of the matter is, it's an honor to be upstaged by CARL ALBERT.

I read an item in Editor & Publisher the other day which reported that one of your newspaper engravers here in Oklahoma City—Raymond Frazier by name—has collected enough postage stamps to start a small post office of his own.

I hope he thinks it over before doing anything drastic.

In the first place, I don't think the public is quite ready for a whole new set of ZIP code numbers.

And then, too, I'm not at all sure he knows what he'd be letting himself in for. "Postmaster General" is a nice sounding title, but there are a lot of headaches that go with it. In fact, I've been putting in a 15-hour day ever since I took the job, more than a year ago, and I'm just beginning to identify some of the problems. You know, the President talks about the Great Society as "a place where leisure is a welcome chance to build and reflect * * * and a place where man can renew contact with nature," but at the rate he's been working us, I'm beginning to get the idea that the Great Society doesn't include the Cabinet. Secretary Udall may have a chance to renew contact with nature once in a while, but you can bet he's spending more of his time renewing contact with the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

So my advice to our friend is to stay with engraving. It's a quieter life all the way around. In addition to that, he's a lot better off on that side of the newspaper than the other side. As Postmaster General, I often find myself looking right into the editorial barrel, so to speak, and it gets a bit nerve-racking. It's a lot safer on the firing end.

The most recent editorial fad seems to be writing open letters to the Postmaster General, wondering aloud why he can't run the Post Office Department like a business and show a profit for a change.

Of course, under law, we're prohibited from making a profit, but we do try to operate under sound business procedures. I was beginning to convince some people of this, too, until the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. came along last month and announced rate reductions on long distance calls. I don't know whether it was deliberate or not, but they made the announcement the same day I hinted at the possibility of increases in second- and third-class postal rates.

The open letters really had fun with that one. In fact, they're still coming in.

"Why is it, Mr. Postmaster General," they ask with undisguised sarcasm, "that private enterprise can reduce rates while the Government is preparing to raise them?" Of course, there's seldom an attempt at understanding the differences between the two operations—such as the fact that the telephone company installed phones in remote areas only when it became economically feasible to do so, while we established rural routes whether they made money or not, simply because we're a public service organization. Or that it's easier to transport a voice than a letter. Or that it's still a whole lot cheaper to send a 3-ounce letter from coast to coast for a nickel than it is to make a 3-minute call for a dollar. These things are not considered because it's automatically assumed that if the Government operates a service, it's bound to be inefficient. Grey-flannel-suit socialism is the way one columnist referred to the postal service.

The whole thing bewilders me at times. A businessman would have to pay a private message delivery service $3.25 to pick up a letter and deliver it 3 miles away in the city of Washington, while we will charge him 8 cents to fly it across a continent.

And so we have different requirements and different problems, and we should recognize them.

But that does not mean that we should become bemused by them. There are certain areas of similarity that we would ignore at our own peril. When we can learn from private enterprise, we intend to do so.

Actually our rate structure is based in large part on our present method of operation. If we can modernize that operation, we can modernize the rate structure as well. Last week, I appointed an advisory panel of distinguished business, economic, and labor leaders from all over the Nation to study this whole question and to assist me in my recommendations to the President. This is part of President Johnson's policy of consulting with outstanding experts in private industry in formulating and carrying out Government programs and services.

Frankly, I cannot say at this time what their recommendations will be. But I can say that whatever the decision is, it will be based on the soundest advice available in this Nation.

Basically, our challenge is this:

Our mail volume, now running at an annual rate of 72 billion pieces a year, is increasing at an explosive rate. No one is complaining about it, because it is part and parcel of our national prosperity. Nevertheless, it has increased by about 166 percent since 1940 and continues to increase at the rate of 2 billion pieces a year.

The trick, of course, is to find a better way of sorting the mail so we can keep it moving—and that is just what we are doing. through ZIP code. And the most important aspect of ZIP code is the one which deals with our large-volume mailers.

Many people do not realize it, but 75 percent of our total mail volume is business mail. We spend a lot of our time and effort keeping up with it. One program which we have recently initiated in this regard is called VIM—vertical improved mail—which speeds the delivery of business mail in highrise office buildings. Replacing the time-consuming operation of walking from office to office, from floor to floor to deliver the mail, we can now handle the entire operation from a single mailroom in the basement by the use of a vertical conveyor system. This means that every tenant gets his mail as soon as it is sorted, and continues to get it throughout the day.

But the most significant breakthrough has come at the sending end of our operation. We now have discovered a way to keep a large proportion of our business mail out of the post office entirely until it reaches its destination area—to send it directly to one of our 566 new sectional centers without once unbagging or sorting it. And that is the real key to ZIP code. When we do that, we have gone a long way toward meeting the challenge of growth in the postal service.

How do we propose to do it? By asking large-volume mailers to use their automatic data processing equipment to sequence their address lists by ZIP code numbers and then presort their mail before they give it to us.

This is a lot to ask of a mailer, but I assure you it is not a one-way street. In the long run, his cooperation will save him money by helping us hold down rates, and will assure his mail much speedier delivery.

This program of presorting is more than just desirable, however; it is vital.

And so, with this in mind, I am, by administrative action, planning to require all large volume second- and third-class mailers to presort.

Further, I plan to ask Congress for legislation to require the same of large volume first-class mailers. We are now far enough

along on our ZIP code program for this to have an immediate effect on our overall postal operation—and frankly, I do not see any other way out.

I am not so naive, however, to think that we will escape criticism entirely.

But I do not believe we are asking anything unreasonable of our mailers. In fact, a major reason A.T. & T. has been able to save money—and pass that savings along to the public—is that each year they are asking their customers to do more and more of their work for them. Long-distance dialing is a case in point. Several years ago, when you wanted to call long distance, you asked the operator to place it for you. Today, you dial it yourself.

That's exactly the type of cooperation we are now asking of our customers—and we believe the results will be just as meaningful.

The other vital area of cooperation, of course, lies with the average mailer's use of ZIP code. Obviously, the program will not reach its full potential if people fail to address by ZIP code—or fail to include ZIP code in their return address.

To help speed this program along, I announced, earlier this week, a new program to imprint ZIP codes right on the postmarks of the more than 30,000 post offices that individually serve one ZIP code area. They will carry the ZIP code number in the lower portion of the familiar circular postmark. This, I believe, will speed the use of ZIP code by years and will be a tremendous boon to the volume mailer in ZIP coding his lists.

As you probably know, we have been working for some time on an optical scanner which will be able to "read" ZIP code numerals on envelopes and sort the mail. We have now made the big breakthrough in this area. In about a year, we expect to begin installing these sophisticated new machines in large post offices throughout the United States. When you realize that each machine will be able to "read" and sort at the rate of 35,000 letters an hour, you begin to understand why I call this the icing on the ZIP code cake.

Presorting by ZIP code is, of course, the major postal achievement of our era—and because of it, we would still need ZIP code if we never had an optical scanner. But the scanners, themselves, will help us move the mountains of individual mail that will continue to pour into our large post offices, will speed delivery and will keep our workforce at a manageable size—which, in turn, will allow us to hold rates down to a reasonable level.

This is not a pie-in-the-sky dream. This is a goal that can be reached in a few short years.

It's not going to be easy, but we intend to strive for it—and we intend to succeed.

Thank you.

JOHN CARVER SPEAKS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on Monday of last week it was my pleasure and privilege to be at San Francisco when John A. Carver, Jr., recently elevated to the position of Under Secretary of the Interior, after having served so admirably as Assistant Secretary during the last 4 years, spoke at the annual convention of the National Canners Association. His was an excellent speech. It has a message of interest to all Americans; and therefore I consider myself particularly fortunate in gaining for Under Secretary Carver's remarks an even wider audience than the one present at San Francisco. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF JOHN A. CARVER, JR., UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE GENERAL SESSION OF THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION IN SAN FRANCISCO, ON JANUARY 25, 1965

I have, as your chairman has announced, recently moved from what I have often called the dry-land part of the Department of the Interior, into a much more varied assignment as the chief lieutenant of the Cabinet officer responsible for the entire Department.

Naturally, I haven't been unaware that there was in the Department a Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, or a U.S. Geological Survey. But as I have grappled with the problems of Indian and territorial administration, with public land administration, and with parks and recreation and a railroad in Alaska, I have not been as fully aware as I might have been of relationships and comparisons which are capable of being made when these other programs are related to the conservation movement generally.

So I hope you will forgive me as I try to adjust my thinking to include the harvesting of the products of the ocean with the harvest of crops on the lands in the context of conservation consciousness.

I think it particularly appropriate to start with this particular group—you as canners see quite clearly that the food from the sea, particularly the coastal sea, and the food from the land must be produced with a consciousness of conservation principles, if supplies are to be maintained, and if we are to meet the demands of a population which will double in a period of time shorter than the age of most of us here.

Today I want to take a few minutes to talk about the American conservation movement in this transitional period.

In my dryland phase, I came to know Wesley Powell, John Muir, Gifford Pinchot, and Harold Ickes as the intellectual giants of the conservation movement. I am sure that when the history is written about efforts to achieve conservation of resources of the sea, heading the list will be found a man who shares the platform with me today, the Honorable E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, Senator from Alaska. He has devoted his life to this and continues to lead the effort.

In my dryland phase, my laundry list of the resources which are essential to the continued growth and prosperity of our modern society emphasized petroleum and coal, metalliferous minerals and timber, potable water and animal forage. Now I must add many products of the sea. Citing known supplies, rates of use and needed reserves, to a large extent, misses the point of the national resource picture. The critical resources of one generation tend to be outrun by technology, so that the following generation faces a whole new pattern of resource issues.

I can make the point by citing only two examples, and the history of each are well known, making it unnecessary to give details. One is the uranium boom and the other is the present vastly expanded demand for silver after a long period of decline.

I do not choose to consume our valuable time with either historical review or statistical evaluation of our present resource situation. I would rather talk about the methods of public policy formulation. I think you might find it profitable to examine for a few minutes into the ways that resource conservation issues are posed in this complicated decade.

For this purpose, let me state a fairly simple thesis—one that may seem grossly oversimplified until you have pondered it awhile. I am persuaded that national conservation emphasis, now and for the future, must be concentrated on certain basic, fundamental subjects: land to live on and potable water for survival. Whether development and wise use of the seas and their resources should be included is the new idea I'm adjusting to.

Our land economists point out that the process of urbanization alone—for housing, commercial, and industrial development—is consuming the countryside of this Nation at the rate of 1 million acres per year. This has obvious implications for the long-range future—the prospect of simply running out of living space. But we needn't look that far ahead to see its impact. There is already ample evidence that real estate values—raw land values—have increased more than any other commodity since the end of World War II.

The literature of our youth used the expansive words—"boundless," "inexhaustible," "endless," "numberless," "unlimited"—to describe our prairies, forests, flight of birds, runs of salmon, herds of buffalo. The land which was beyond the blue ridge was the jumpoff for the land beyond the Cumberland Gap, up the Missouri, beyond the Rockies, and finally the arid desert itself.

It is only recently that we have come to the realization that the supply was finite.

Science and technology only stretch the limits of resources from the land necessary to man's existence. Chemical fertilizers multiply our food and fiber potentials. Energy can be captured from the fundamental atom, and soon from the sun itself. Technology cannot make the earth itself bigger. The supply of land is a closed vessel.

The adjacent seas, I now see, offer great possibilities for expansion of our activities. We are rapidly becoming vitally interested in the world ocean—all seas. Instead of thinking only or first of our defense interest in the sea, our vision must include the great opportunities for increasing commerce, for producing fresh water, for utilizing energy from the sea, or for utilizing the resources within the sea of minerals and food.

Our science and technology are progressing to a point where we can look forward to farming the shallow expanses of the seas, producing more shellfish and inshore varieties of valuable species of market fish.

These developing uses of adjacent seas, coupled with the multiple-use concept of the land, offer possibilities for expansion of our conservation horizons.

It is gratifying that conservation, as an attitude or pattern of thinking, has become an umbrella spacious enough for all—those who enjoy our lands and parks in a recreation sense, as well as those who derive their sustenance from it, whether from the timber, the forage, the minerals, or the resources of the sea.

But although multiple use and a consciousness of conservation, represent sound public policy and good sense, as concepts they do not eliminate the necessity for making hard choices. As competition for land use increases, the feasibility of multiple uses is reduced. The hard choices become more and more frequent—and more and more difficult.

When we turn from the national land base to the question of fresh water, the situation is not much different. The fastest growing areas of the United States are to be found on either side of the lower Colorado River—south central Arizona and southern California. Neither of these areas is self-sufficient in water resources. Both have looked to the Colorado as the key to their growth for nearly 60 years. For 30 years, they resorted to both litigation and legislation to assure adequate water for agriculture and for municipal uses.

Through the whole history of the Boulder Canyon legislation and judicial consideration

of the issues in *Arizona* v. *California*, it was taken as fact that the lower Colorado would furnish 7.5 million acre-feet of water to the Southwest annually. Now we are reasonably certain that this is not so. After almost three generations of controversy, finally resolved by the Supreme Court in 1963, we face the unpleasant prospect of having to allocate a net shortage. Unless, that is, our conservation statesmanship is bold enough and imaginative enough to save water now being wasted and augment supplies from other sources.

These, you say, are relatively simple decisions to make. It takes only application of basic economic and engineering principles to determine whether and how much we can afford to do. True, except that this view ignores the simple fact that the very issues at stake will undoubtedly constitute one of the principal political battlegrounds of our generation and the next. And the resulting contest will be heavily colored by the slogans and epithets of past conservation crusades.

Even experienced and sophisticated veterans of public resource management react in a conditioned way to verbal stimuli which are a part of our political tradition. Take the word "exploit" in reference to economic development needs. This is ordinarily a bad word in the conservation lexicon—not for any etymological or philological reason, for words are neutral. But this one exudes the colorful symbolism of our political environment. "Exploit" means "spoil"; "conserve" means "save." In this context, one doesn't even need to write down the moral propositions that create the differences. Generations of holy crusade have produced the glandular reaction—"exploiter," evil; "conservationist," virtuous.

This Pavlovian reference illustrates how deeply conservation issues have cut into national thinking.

Some will say: "Isn't this good? Shouldn't people react righteously without having to ponder? Let's not equivocate with evil." This begs the question, for it assumes that the labels and catch phrases, the campaign slogans, have been correctly assigned; that there is some divine guidance, some intuitive gift, that permits ready identification of an infidel or heathen cause. For the purist, there are no gradations of virtue—no compromises between ideal and reality.

Recently, an experienced and seemingly sophisticated government servant said to me, "Why doesn't the Department create a special board for the sole purpose of identifying the public interest?"

A good question. Yet in the 4 years I've been in the Department, I can't recall anyone of the innumerable controversies where each side of the issue wasn't framed plausibly in terms of the public interest. I've known no decision made by Secretary Udall which hasn't been made in the public interest. Yet the controversies have been deep and vigorous, and many have reverberated in the halls of Congress or the columns of the press long after they were made. In all of them both sides of the controversy are stated in terms of the public interest, and in most of them both sides are in the public interest, in greater or lesser degree. But choices have to be made and the job of making choices cannot be delegated by the Secretary to a board.

Conservation issues are public issues. Success in the task of conservation requires mastery of the workings of politics, both internal and external. I have found that the word "external" includes, in a special way, international politics. Conservation presents elemental conflicts of values.

If the politics of conservation are to be worthy, if it is to be recognized that resource managers must communicate to the public and to the legislatures a sense of ethical urgency rooted in a felt philosophy, then history must be studied, our society comprehended, our governmental system mastered.

It helps to recognize that these are the current manifestations of a long tradition. Resource issues have been political issues since the earliest days of the Republic. Jefferson and Hamilton's ideological struggle had as one of its ingredients the policies which should govern in settling western lands. In the last decade, Al Sarena held center stage while the pressure for more open space, better recreation facilities, more and purer water piled up. This accumulation is our political inheritance, the unfinished agenda of our generation.

The techniques of achieving political goals for conservation were never more effectively exhibited than they were at the hands of the first Roosevelt and his chief lieutenant, Gifford Pinchot. Roosevelt made his name synonymous with conservation, as he met both the interests and their legislative spokesmen headon.

By a pen's stroke, he set aside public lands for forest purposes while enrolled enactments of Congress prohibiting such executive action sat out the constitutional waiting period on his desk. Forestry, reclamation and wildlife protection became main functions of the Federal Government under his tutelage.

Teddy Roosevelt took the conservation movement out of the polite conversation of drawing rooms and off the platforms of the lecture circuit. An ideal, clothed with Victorian respectability, became an objective of public policy—of government activity. Conservation was made an object of political contest—where it has been ever since, not only at the Federal level but in the States as well.

Theodore Roosevelt's task in establishing the conservation deal ran across the grain of traditional thinking. He had to first establish waste as something close to immoral—and then worked on the public conscience to see that it reacted accordingly. The substantive issues of his day were, however, relatively uncomplicated. Techniques of forest protection were direct, elementary, and easily comprehended; power generation and transmission had potential for the future, but comparatively little current relevance; demands upon land and water resources were confined to single uses, uncomplicated by competing needs incompatible with each other.

Now our population has almost doubled and its mobility multiplied fivefold or tenfold.

Hetch Hetchy was the ancestor of today's truism: That one man's conservation ideal can be another's desecration, that recriminations among allies under stress can draw as much blood as contests between ideological enemies.

Any number of parallel situations may be cited to demonstrate the increasing conflict between and among interests within the conservation family in its broad expanse. The Steamboat Springs project, dear to the hearts of the reclamation branch of the family, foundered upon the unavoidable consequence of flooding a part of Dinosaur National Monument. The filling of Glen Canyon Reservoir is already underway, but the bitterness over failure to protect Rainbow Bridge against water intrusion will not be easily forgotten. Issues such as these find their outlet in the exercise of highly developed techniques of political pressure.

The issues upon which the conservation community finds itself divided will increase as demands for scarce land increases. The political dimension of conservation has expanded in ever-widening circles as our society and our technology have become increasingly complex. The simple "for" or "against" issue of 1900 now assumes overtones of the bureaucratic contest for policy supremacy. "Multiple use" becomes a slogan to block the preservation of critically needed recreation values, freedom to locate mineral claims argues against inclusion of a public domain tract in either a forest or a park. Parks supporters are accused of "locking up" resources because they regard public hunting incompatible with park objectives. The pluralism of modern life makes extremely complicated the simple faith which motivated Thoreau, Muir, Powell, and the other prophets of the good life.

I have spent perhaps more time than I should on the general nature of modern conservation issues and the environmental context in which they must be decided. But I think it is more important that these concepts be understood than that we compile a catalog of specific problems and the programs designed to meet them.

Yet I do not wish to leave any impression that the problems are insurmountable—or that they are not being attacked most vigorously. Neither is the case.

The 88th Congress has justly deserved the title of "Conservation Congress." In its short 2-year span, more basic conservation laws were passed than in any comparable period—even the Roosevelt years were less productive. In 1964 alone the following expressions of national policy were enacted into law:

A Land and Water Conservation Act sets aside certain Federal revenues for a program of land acquisition and assistance to the States in meeting our burgeoning outdoor recreation demands.

A Public Land Law Review Commission was created to study and recommend a comprehensive overhaul of the laws and policies governing the management and disposal of the public domain.

The Wilderness Act established a system of primitive areas to be preserved for future enjoyment and study, but with appropriate recognition of the need to develop certain resources, principally minerals, within such areas.

Fourteen new units were added to the national park system, including Fire Island National Seashore and Canyonlands National Park.

Appropriations were made to start construction on a giant intertie of power systems in the Far West, designed to balance the power resources, public and private of a region spreading from Canada to the lower Colorado.

A Water Resources Research Act provides authority for an expanded and coordinated program of water research, with emphasis on Federal-State cooperation and use of land-grant college facilities.

"New starts" were authorized for Federal reclamation projects in Utah, Idaho, Colorado, Wyoming, and Washington State.

And last, but not least, for those of you engaged in the fishing industry, several very important pieces of legislation were passed which strengthened the research programs of the individual States and give promise of upgrading at long last the domestic commercial fishing fleet.

Now all of you are experienced enough in the ways of government to know that this kind of legislative production did not spring into being, full-blown, in the course of 1 year. Most of it is the culmination of long deliberation and hard bargaining going back over a 2-, 4-, or 8-year period. It represents, however, a high-water mark in executive-legislative cooperation, because Federal land and water policies are uniquely within the congressional prerogative.

If, as I predict, these conservation questions are to be central public issues in this and the next decades, then we can profitably spend our time considering how public issues are resolved in this country.

The ultimate arbiter is the consensus of the people, but this consensus is acceptable to those adversely affected only as the interested groups like your association and others are satisfied that the processes or resolution

of disputes are fair and equitable and in accordance with our constitutional system.

So we must keep in mind that it is to the Congress, as our representative form of government, that land managers—resource managers—must look for the articulation of the rules. This is the philosophy behind the Public Land Law Review Commission. Only rules derived in legal fashion will be fully honored as decisions inevitably become harder and harder.

Perhaps your interest—perhaps you in the business world who are seemingly remote from some of these issues will see that your role is central, too. Perhaps those of you whose crop is from the sea might see these issues as still a decade or two away. But history as I read it does illuminate. I hope you will agree.

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

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

PRESIDENT JOHNSON INITIATES PHOTOGRAPHIC HISTORY OF THE 1960'S

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, last summer I visited the photograph collection in the Library of Congress to review pictures taken thoughout the country during the New Deal period. I was amazed at the number of excellent photographs on file, and the history of our country that was captured so dramatically by brilliant photographers of this period. Miss Dorothea Lange played a key role in the photographic record of the 1930's, and she has continued to press for greater public recognition of the need to maintain a photographic history of our times.

I have considered introducing legislation providing for a photographic history of the 1960's.

On January 13, President Johnson issued a memorandum to his department and agency heads asking that they submit to him each month three photographs which they feel most powerfully portray American life in their area of responsibility. From this group the President will select one photo each month to be designated "The President's Choice."

I wish to commend the President for initiating this most valuable effort. With a minimum of expense, we shall have a visual history of the United States which will be of immeasurable benefit to generations to come.

I ask unanimous consent that a White House press release dated January 13, 1965, describing the President's directive be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 13, 1965.

President Johnson today announced a White House program of photography.

In a memorandum to the heads of departments and agencies, he stated: "The history of our times and the efforts of this administration to meet the challenges of today are graphically expressed in photographs now being made. Photography can show with peculiar power that government is personal, that we are concerned with human beings, not statistics."

The President asked the heads of departments and agencies to submit by the 20th of January, and on the first of each month thereafter, the three photographs taken in their division of the Government which most powerfully portray the problems of America and the efforts to meet them. These photographs will be screened by a group of outstanding photographers consisting of Ansel Adams, Walker Evans, W. Eugene Smith, and John Szarkowski; with Mr. Szarkowski, director of photography of the Museum of Modern Art in New York City, serving as executive director of the group.

From the photographs recommended by this group, the President will select one each month and it will be released as "The President's Choice." It is the President's hope that in time these photographs will be placed in exhibitions and gathered in a book which will capture the spirit of our times.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered

THE VOTING CRISIS IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, to the dismay of the whole country the racial crisis in Selma, Ala., is daily becoming more serious, with hundreds of arrests Monday and hundreds more yesterday. What is most shocking about it is that it is a crisis over Selma's Negro citizens' right to vote, a right which all Americans, Southerners as well as Northerners, seem to agree is fundamental and inalienable, whatever their feelings on other subjects. This is probably why Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., chose Selma as the site of a major voter registration drive last month. Up to that time it was one of the most intransigent holdouts from the general pattern of compliance in the South with the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Since the voter registration drive in Selma began, the statistics demonstrate the extent to which the pattern is one of seemingly flagrant disregard for the law and for the most basic right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. Close to 2,000 Negroes have sought to register to vote in Selma since the opening of the drive. In January, 280 were arrested while waiting at the courthouse; on Monday, 264 more were arrested along with some 600 students who demonstrated in sympathy with those waiting to register; and yesterday some 500 more were arrested, including 120 adults. With all this, 36 have had their applications processed in 1 week, 57 the week following that, and Monday another 70. Not a single Negro has been actually registered to vote yet, since none of the processed applications have been acted upon. The usual period before notification in Selma is about 6 weeks. When the whole laborious effort has been completed, it may only result in increasing the number of rejected applications—rejections based upon Alabama's difficult and arbitrary literacy test for voting.

Added to all this frustration, and arising from it, is the danger of physical violence which hangs like a pall over the long line of registrants in Selma. It has exploded on several occasions already in the past few weeks, and it could again if something is not done soon to remedy the situation.

Dr. King has outlined the hurdles faced by Negroes in Selma who want to do no more than exercise the right to vote: A city ordinance against parading without a license is used to discourage applicants from coming to the courthouse in groups, when a Negro in Selma cannot be expected, after decades of intimidation, to try to do so in any other way; the county sheriff James Clark, is apparently dedicated to making the process of registering as dangerous for Negroes as possible; the registration officials are seemingly engaged in a slowdown, since despite a court order requiring 100 applicants to be processed each day, Monday's total of 70 was the highest to date actually to be processed; finally, even if these hurdles could be cleared, there remains Alabama's literacy test. Selma's pattern of resistance is clear enough now. In one Alabama county, where a Federal referee has finally been appointed under the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts, the only result has been an increased rate of flunking the literacy test.

All these facts are befor the Federal courts in a half dozen pending lawsuits, four of them brought by the Justice Department. The arrests Monday and yesterday and the summary contempt penalties meted out Monday against some of the picketers should be added to the suits still pending before the three-judge Federal district court, and I have asked the Justice Department to go into this question. I have every reason to believe that the Department is alert to the events in Selma and will move rapidly to obtain relief under the law where it can be obtained.

However, there are apparently limits to the effectiveness of the Federal law to protect voting rights, and the Selma situation should also be watched closely to see whether additional law is now necessary. For, this crisis again underscores the need for legislative proposals to resolve this kind of seeming paralysis in the voting system of a State. It may well show that Federal legislation is required authorizing the appointment of Federal registrars who would themselves be empowered to register citizens to vote.

The crucial point here is that this dangerous confrontation is avoidable. The people of Selma have every reason to implement now what all America knows: that the right to vote is the very heart of the democratic system and will not be denied on grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin. To endeavor to do otherwise is to play King Canute with the sea and jeopardizes domestic

tranquillity and security. I deeply believe the people of Selma can find the way if they determine in their minds to do so.

My main reason for making this statement on the floor of the Senate is that I do not believe that situations in the country as serious as this one, which is widely discussed and commented upon, should be merely swept under the rug and not noted in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "On Winning the Right To Vote," from last night's New York Post.

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

ON WINNING THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The arrest of Martin Luther King and 700 Selma Negroes should serve to highlight the single most dramatic statistic about the voter registration drive in Selma. Despite all the long hours of waiting, of demonstrations and jailings, not a single Negro is known to have succeeded in registering.

Those Negroes who, by patient persistence, have managed to get into the office of the board of registrars were confronted with questions such as: "If no national candidate for Vice President receives a majority of the electoral vote, how is a Vice President chosen? In such cases how many votes must a person receive to become Vice President?" [1]

How many New Yorkers would qualify to vote if they were obliged to answer such questions?

There is only one way to cut through the massive barriers of force, procedure, and subterfuge erected to keep the Negro from voting. That is to enact legislation in Congress establishing a system of Federal voting registrars.

Such a law would authorize a Federal registrar to move into a community like Selma, set up shop in the local post office and begin to register the disenfranchised Negro voters.

The right to vote will remain a slogan, not a reality, in too many places until such a law is enacted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I feel, with other members of the bipartisan group which traditionally sponsors civil rights legislation, that this crisis may very well show that we still have not gotten abreast of the situation, and that the only way to accomplish the purpose is to give power to Federal registrars to register voters to finally break the iniquitous system that, somehow or other, keeps people from exercising one, single, unquestionably cherished American right—the right to vote.

POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday I had occasion to speak on the floor of the Senate about the enormous growth of public sentiment in support of voluntary measures of population control, both inside, and outside the United States.

This morning's Wall Street Journal carries on its front page a most enlightening article, entitled "Birth-Control Push: Federal, Local Agencies Begin To Move Deeper Into Controversial Field—Cities, Counties Open Over 680 Clinics—United States Is Making Poverty Funds Available—Raising a Storm in Milwaukee."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article which appeared in today's Wall Street Journal may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

BIRTH-CONTROL PUSH: FEDERAL, LOCAL AGENCIES BEGIN TO MOVE DEEPER INTO CONTROVERSIAL FIELD—CITIES, COUNTIES OPEN OVER 680 CLINICS—UNITED STATES IS MAKING POVERTY FUNDS AVAILABLE—RAISING A STORM IN MILWAUKEE

(By Richard D. James)

CHICAGO.—State and local governments are rapidly invading an area they once regarded as strictly off limits and loaded with political dynamite—birth control.

This week the Baltimore City Health Department began operating five birth-control clinics, providing both advice and contraceptives, with $10,000 in city funds allocated to carry the program through 1965. It's estimated the program will serve about 3,600 women this year.

Last year the California Board of Public Health began urging county health departments to set up public birth-control programs. As a result, a dozen counties opened such clinics in 1964, and another dozen are expected to open them in the next 6 months, says Dr. Leslie Corsa of the State health department.

These two efforts are typical of hundreds scattered across the country. It's estimated that cities and counties in 21 States now are running more than 680 public birth-control clinics, up from 470 clinics in only 11 States a year ago. The number of mothers receiving help through these facilities jumped sharply to 175,000 last year from 75,000 in 1963 and about 50,000 in 1960, says the Planned Parenthood-World Population Council.

FEDERAL EFFORT GROWS

Moving into the field, too, though at a more cautious pace, is the Federal Government. As part of the antipoverty war, it is offering to pick up the tab for birth control for the first time. Already one project has been approved, and applications from three other cities are pending. Corpus Christi, Tex., last month was granted $8,500 in Federal funds to run birth-control clinics for married women in poverty-stricken areas inhabited by Negro and Spanish-speaking citizens.

The growing role of governments in birth control generally represents a major change in policy. Though the dissemination of birth-control information and devices has not been legally barred in most communities, the usual custom in government medical programs has been either to ignore the matter completely or to refer patients to private birth-control clinics. As a practical matter, contraceptive aid was available in the main only to women who could afford the services of a private physician. It generally was denied to women whose poverty and high reproductive rate made them the most likely candidates for birth-control assistance.

The present effort by public agencies is aimed mostly at promoting birth control among welfare recipients and low-income families. By spending tax money to run clinics, buy and distribute contraceptives, and supply information and counsel on family planning for these people, public health and welfare workers hope to save much greater sums now going to provide expensive medical care for expectant mothers and to support unwanted children who wind up on relief rolls.

A FACTOR IN WELFARE RISE?

Public health and welfare authorities contend the lack of access to modern, effective child-spacing methods is an important reason why more than half of the 7,800,000 persons on relief in this country are mothers and their dependent children. The lack of birth-control information, it's argued, also helps explain why this aid to dependent children (ADC) relief group has soared to more than 4 million persons from 2.2 million in 1955. Total ADC payments now run over $1.5 billion a year, compared with $639 million in 1955.

Partly because authorities see it as a way to reduce this huge burden, tax-supported family planning is bound to continue growing, perhaps even more rapidly than to date. "There is a lot of interest that hasn't yet been put into action, so I'm sure this will be a burgeoning affair," forecasts Dr. Johan W. Eliot, assistant professor of maternal and child health at the University of Michigan.

Another reason Dr. Eliot and others see increased activity ahead is what a high U.S. Public Health official in Washington calls a change in attitude on a very broad base toward recognizing that family planning is a problem.

A PRESIDENTIAL STEP

Evidence of such a change cropped up just a few weeks ago when President Johnson in his state of the Union message warned of the seriousness of the population explosion and said the Federal Government had a responsibility to do something about it. This is the furthest any President has ever gone in publicly throwing Federal support behind family planning. Some have interpreted the President's comment as foreshadowing further steps by the Government into the birth-control field.

The moves, if they come, are certain to be slow and deliberate in hopes that major opposition from the Nation's 45 million Catholics could thus be avoided. The Catholic Church condemns the use of artificial birth-control methods, including pills, as immoral. The only legitimate natural means, in the view of the church, is the rhythm technique, which requires periodic continence.

Even here, however, signs of a changing attitude on family planning are to be found. A commission of Catholic bishops and cardinals is studying the church's birth-control stand and will report its recommendations to the full session of the Vatican Council II when it resumes in Rome this September.

The growth of public birth-control programs has been particularly vigorous of late. Besides the new programs in Baltimore, California, and elsewhere, activity is climbing sharply in seven southern States which have long-standing policies encouraging counties to operate public birth-control clinics.

Alabama, for one, has sponsored a birth-control program at public expense for the past 20 years, and 63 of the State's 67 counties operate clinics. However, their major growth has come in just the past 4 years. During this period the number of mothers receiving family-planning assistance "has at least doubled to 10,000 a year," says Dr. Harold H. Klingler of the State health department.

Florida, which has favored publicly financed birth control for 15 years, spent $25,000 last year to supply contraceptives to county projects, compared with an outlay of only $1,000 in 1961, reports Dr. David L. Crane, a State health official. The number of Florida counties operating clinics now totals 61, compared with only 13 in 1962.

There's plenty of evidence to show that the number and size of family planning programs operated by public agencies will continue to expand. At a February 17 meeting of the Chicago Board of Health, Dr. Eric Oldberg, board president, will introduce a resolution which, if adopted, will pave the way for the city to run birth-control clinics for the first time. Dr. Oldberg is optimistic that the pro-

[1] By 51 votes in the Senate.

gram will be approved and that Mayor Richard Daley will support it. If so, Dr. Oldberg expects to have the clinics operating in the city's 34-maternal-child health centers in second quarter of this year.

Several State legislatures are weighing requests for funds to expand new birth-control programs. Oregon lawmakers are debating a request for $135,000 by the State welfare department for the 2 years beginning July 1 so it can buy contraceptives for up to 4,000 welfare recipients. The State's first county birth-control clinic opened in November, and several others are expected to open soon, says Dr. Carl Ashley of the State health department.

TENNESSEE EFFORT EXPANDS

Tennessee Gov. Frank G. Clement has asked his State's legislature to vote added funds to finance a State health department program calling for outlays of up to $35,000 in the coming 2 years for drugs and supplies for county family-planning clinics. The number of county programs in the State has increased to 19 from just 1 a year ago, and 5 more will begin shortly, says Dr. R. H. Hutcheson, State health commissioner.

Perhaps more important because of the national precedent involved, President Johnson has asked Congress to appropriate $85,000 for the Washington, D.C., Public Health Department's birth-control program, more than double the $25,000 Congress allotted to get the program going last April.

One reason public officials are encouraged to seek more birth-control money is the generally widespread support shown so far for the Government projects. "The support has been spectacular," says Detroit Health Commissioner Dr. John J. Hanlon in discussing the city's month-old birth-control program. "We have a Catholic mayor, and I discussed the program with him and he publicly took a stand in favor of it."

Before Dr. Page Seekford, county medical director in Charleston, W. Va., started a birth-control clinic last July—the first in the State—he sent questionnaires to the local politicians and the medical society. "The response was in favor of going ahead, and we got editorial support from both local newspapers too," he says.

ILLINOIS FUROR SUBSIDES

In other areas, once fierce opposition is now crumbling. It appears, for instance, that an Illinois legislative birth-control commission will recommend next month an extension of the State's birth-control program to all of the 52,000 woman, wed or unwed, on the State's welfare rolls who request help. In 1963 Catholic criticism and controversy over the morality of aiding the unwed forced Gov. Otto Kerner to limit the program to 12,000 married women on relief.

"Personally, I still dislike the idea of giving contraceptives to unmarried women," says State Senator Morgan Finley, who led the anti-birth-control fight in the last legislative session and who heads the commission. "But after the hearings I find it actually boils down to the lesser of two evils—giving birth-control information to the unwed or face the continuing explosion of ADC rolls."

But in at least one instance, a proposed birth-control program has not been warmly received. A Milwaukee request for $45,000 in Federal antipoverty money to run five birth-control clinics has evoked a storm of protest and created doubts as to whether the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity will approve the request. The agency has indicated that local agreement on a program would be needed before a project would be approved.

The Milwaukee Common Council, the city's governing body, is objecting to the plan. So is a group of citizens called the Civic Awareness Committee, which is distributing a statement urging opposition on medical grounds, and so is another citizens' group which is circulating petitions requesting Gov. Warren P. Knowles, who has the final word, to veto the plan. Catholic Archbishop William E. Cousins of the Milwaukee archdiocese, whose orginal statement was widely interpreted as favoring the plan, has amended that stand lately and now questions whether there is either local consensus or need for the program.

The expansion of public birth-control programs has provided a major new market for drug companies selling contraceptives. It's estimated that the industry this year will sell $4 million worth of oral contraceptives, measured at retail prices, to Government birth-control programs, up from only $1.8 million last year. "This year the public programs will be the fastest growing segment of the whole oral contraceptive market," says William L. Searle, marketing vice president of G. D. Searle, which manufactures the contraceptive Enovid.

Though it's too early to tell definitely, there are indications that public birth-control programs do effectively lower birth rates among low-income families and thereby reduce relief spending. A State-run clinic near Nashville, Tenn., figures it has prevented at least 130 pregnancies among the 200 women served since the clinic opened 15 months ago. "We've had only 8 pregnancies, and the normal rate in this group would have been 140 to 160," says Dr. Hutcheson, State health commissioner.

Mr. CLARK. I hope very much, as a result of the breakthrough which has occurred in the field of population control since the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and I began to speak in the Senate with reference to this problem, we shall be able to take necessary action both at home and abroad to bring to every citizen of the world information necessary to enable parents to regulate the size of their families in accordance with their own choice; and thus make progress in preventing economic distress which is already occurring, and which is sure to increase as time goes on, resulting from the fact that hundreds of thousands—indeed, millions—of unwanted children are being born every year because their parents do not have the type of information to enable them to engage in the type of family planning they would like to engage in.

LAW-ENFORCEMENT WIRETAPPING

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently the Christian Century published articles by two law school professors advancing arguments for and against law-enforcement wiretapping.

Being opposed to law-enforcement wiretapping, I found the article by Prof. Herman Schwartz most impressive. Professor Schwartz was a member of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee staff before he joined the faculty of the law school at the State University of New York at Buffalo.

Professor Schwartz points out with clarity the grave dangers of law-enforcement wiretapping. I believe all who read the article will find it interesting and enlightening.

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

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

REFLECTIONS IN OPPOSITION

(By Herman Schwartz, associate professor of law at the State University of New York at Buffalo)

Wiretapping seems to raise one of the sharpest conflicts between individual liberty and effective law enforcement; specifically, how can one fight organized crime without unnecessarily invading the citizen's privacy? Put this way, the problem seems resolvable only by a compromise or "balanced" solution such as that currently being supported by a few articulate prosecutors, a solution which would permit a limited amount of wiretapping, restricted to the investigation of a few major crimes and closely supervised and controlled by the courts in all but national security cases. Such a narrowly restricted invasion of privacy seems a small price to pay for smashing organized crime, especially since, as is often noted, we are dealing only with the privacy of criminals.

Unfortunately, this reasonable compromise is no compromise at all. Physical and other inherent factors virtually preclude any meaningful limitations; as a matter of fact, the invasion of privacy is far greater than at first appears. The same factors preclude effective supervision by the courts; indeed, experience has shown that many courts do not even try to exercise any control. Moreover, there are indications that the so-called dilemma is more apparent than real, and that wiretapping may not be quite as indispensable as is often claimed.

I

The bedrock assumption on which the case for court-authorized wiretapping rests is that the invasion of privacy by means of a wiretap is no different in quality or degree from that produced by a conventional search. Since judicial supervision is considered effective protection for the latter, why treat wiretapping differently? This assumption is completely unwarranted, for a tap represents an immeasurably greater intrusion into the privacy of not one but many people.

Moreover, unlike the conventional search, wiretapping is inherently unlimitable. The invasion of a home under a search warrant must and can be narrowly limited to a specific place armed or occupied by a specific person, and to specified items therein. A policeman is not authorized to enter any suspicious area simply in the hope of finding something that may turn out to be useful. Limitation and specificity are essential to a valid search under a warrant, and there is no inherent reason why these restrictions cannot be observed and enforced. A wiretap, however, cannot possibly be kept within such bounds. Whereas a conventional search is limited to a specified place and item, a wiretap catches not only all the telephone conversations of the suspect at the place where he is calling or is called, but also of many other persons and conversations.

As to the suspect, all of his calls are overheard, no matter how intimate, irrelevant or even legally or constitutionally privileged they may be. Thus, in the Coplon case in 1950, the Government tapped conversations between the defendant and her attorney during the trial, thereby violating her constitutional right to counsel. And a Queens County, N.Y., district attorney has wiretapped in abortion cases, thereby eavesdropping on the statutorily privileged physician-patient conversations.

A wiretap's intrusion does not stop with the suspect and any other persons using his phone. It also catches all persons who are called by the suspect and by others using the tapped phone as well as all those who call

any of these people on that phone, regardless of the total irrelevance of any of these conversations to a valid police purpose. It has been reported that in the course of tapping a single telephone a police agent recorded conversations involving at the other end the Julliard School of Music, the Brooklyn Law School, Consolidated Radio Artists, Western Union, the Mercantile National Bank, several restaurants, a drug store, a real estate company, many lawyers, a stationary store, a dry cleaner, numerous bars, a garage, the Prudential Insurance Co., a health club, the Medical Bureau To Aid Spanish Democracy, dentists, brokers, engineers, and a New York police station.

Wiretapping's broad sweep is most apparent where public telephones are tapped. Of 3,588 telephones tapped by New York City police 1953–54, for example, 1,617—almost half—were public telephones. It is inevitable that in these cases only an infinitesimal number of the intercepted calls were made by the suspect or by anyone remotely connected with him. The same holds true for taps on the phones of hotel switchboards, law firms and large corporations. All such taps invade the privacy of thousands of people—and once the tap is in, nothing can be done to curb its operation. The inherently dragnet nature of any tap thus precludes any meaningful limitation.

Because of the inherently unlimited scope of electronic eavesdropping, a court cannot control wiretapping in the way it controls more traditional searches. Its power is also weakened because of the fact that the tap must necessarily remain secret and because of certain other realities of practical jurisprudence.

The traditional search and seizure for tangible items cannot be kept hidden, whereas almost all wiretaps are likely to remain secret. As New York District Attorney Frank S. Hogan has pointed out, most taps are installed not to obtain material for use in court, where they might be subject to challenge, but solely as leads to other evidence. The defendant must find out and prove whether any of the evidence introduced against him is in fact derived from wiretapping. According to a Yale Law Journal study some years ago, Federal judges have been very reluctant to permit such an inquiry, and the rule excluding wiretap evidence from Federal courts has proved an illusory safeguard. There is no reason to think that defendants have been more successful in tracing wiretap evidence in State courts.

The small probability of a challenge to the propriety of a wiretap order invariably makes for lax judicial scrutiny of the application, especially where judges are overworked or otherwise unable to make a close study of papers. Some judges are, of course, more prosecution-minded than others, and practicing lawyers know that careful judge shopping is one of the most important and widely practiced skills of any successful law practice. This may be one reason why New York district attorneys assert that although they have occasionally been required to modify their supporting papers, they have never been denied a wiretap order.

Nor does experience with a court order system provide any basis for faith. For several years such systems have been in effect in New York and a few other States. An extensive 2-year study concluded that "the experience of the statutes throughout the country providing for judicial supervision has been very bad. Law enforcement officers have had no difficulty obtaining a court order when they wanted it. Judges who are "tough" are just bypassed. In addition, police officers have shown complete impatience with the court order system and more often have engaged in wiretapping without a court order than with a court order."

II

But what of organized crime? Surely the urgent need for wiretapping as an investigative technique overrides the unavoidable danger to individual liberty. After all, when criminals can avail themselves of the most modern devices, how can one restrict the police to horse-and-buggy methods?

Such an argument has first-blush appeal but little more. In the first place, many law enforcement officials do not agree that wiretapping is indispensable. Among such officials are the present and former attorneys general of California, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Delaware, and New Mexico, as well as district attorneys from Philadelphia and from Cook County, Ill. In a recent congressional survey only 13 out of 45 State attorneys general called for wiretapping authority; most expressed no opinion and 6 were flatly opposed.

On the Federal level enthusiasm for wiretapping is relatively new. Although FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover now appears converted to the ranks of its champions, at various times in the past he has called it archaic, inefficient, and "a handicap to the development of sound investigational techniques." And in March 1961, early in his term, former Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy in an interview published in Look expressed a strong aversion to wiretapping.

State legislative committees in California and New Jersey have concluded, after hearings and study, that the value of wiretapping is far outweighed by the dangers to privacy. Several State judges with years of experience have come to the same conclusion; for example, New York State Justice Samuel Hofstadter has declared that his record of wiretapping results "showed some arrests and fewer convictions and then rarely, if ever, for a heinous offense."

There is much evidence that Federal law enforcement is quite effective without wiretapping. The Attorney General's report for the past few years show great success in the fight against organized crime, narcotics, and gambling, even without this power. Indeed, wiretapping is rarely mentioned in any Federal statements on law enforcement except in testimony in support of wiretapping authority.

Even in internal security matters it has never been shown that wiretapping is necessary or even useful. As Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., told the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1962: "We can be sure that if this wiretapping which has been going on since 1939 had produced effective results, they would have been presented to the public in support of this request for further wiretapping authority."

An even weaker case is made for State wiretapping. Although many of the arguments for its use are couched in States rights terms (each State should be able to protect itself against crime), the inextricably interstate nature of a telephone system precludes such insularity. If the State of Illinois attempts to safeguard the privacy of her residents by banning wiretapping, her efforts will be frustrated by New York's lesser concern for the privacy of her residents. Each time a conversation takes place between Chicago and New York, regardless of who initiates it, what its purpose is, or how intimate and confidential its nature, that conversation will be subject to eavesdropping by New York police.

The primary justification for local wiretapping authority is again the need to fight gambling and organized crime, especially traffic in narcotics. There is no evidence, however, that where it has been used wiretapping has been particularly effective in combating those evils. New York has permitted its officers to tap for years, yet there is no evidence that it has coped with illegal gambling any better than has Philadelphia or Chicago, where all wiretapping is forbidden. Indeed, it is generally acknowledged that the difficulty in fighting gambling and organized vice—the other area where wiretapping is widely resorted to—is not that the investigative techniques are inadequate; it is, rather, that the public is indifferent and that the police have a tendency to be lax, inept, and not infrequently corrupt.

Hardly a year goes by without some startling revelations of police tieups with gamblers. The most recent revelations concern the New York police, where corruption in connection with gambling may well have gone very high indeed and may have involved a telephone company employee. There were similar revelations in 1950, and there have been others in numerous other cities since then. Before risking our privacy to hands so readily tempted, must we not insist that law enforcement authorities make better use of such weapons as they already have?

This is not to say that wiretapping is not useful. But it is to say that a case for indispensability has not been made—and in a free society one does not give the police drastic powers unless a need is conclusively shown.

III

So far most of the discussion has focused on telephone communication. This, however, is only a small part of the problem. Wiretapping in itself is but one of many investigative techniques made possible by the electronic revolution. We now have detectaphones which when placed next to a wall pick up all the conversations in the adjacent room; spike microphones that can be put in contact with a pipe and so turn an entire heating or plumbing system into one vast microphone to pick up all conversations throughout a house, from bedroom to basement; parabolic microphones which require no contact whatsoever in order to pick up conversations hundreds of feet away.

Recent history has demonstrated that legitimation of wiretapping leads to acceptance of such other devices as well. The New York, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Nevada statutes, originally limited to wiretapping, now permit eavesdropping by all methods. In 1961 Senator Kenneth Keating, of New York, introduced a bill to permit States to legalize not only wiretapping but all types of electronic eavesdropping.

So far law enforcement offiicals have not been too reluctant to use these devices. Among decisions of the past 10 years permitting its use were a California case where police installed a listening device in a suspects' bedroom; a New York case in which a jail-visiting room was "bugged" and conversations between a prisoner and his lawyer were overheard; and a District of Columbia case where a hotel room was similarly "bugged." There are of course many other instances which did not reach the courts, for the reasons earlier set forth.

Our society has much more sympathy for the policeman trying to catch criminals than for the individual trying to maintain an enclave of privacy. Wiretapping and other forms of electronic eavesdropping would constrict this enclave almost to the vanishing point. As Senator PHILIP HART said in 1962: "Let's be sure that we don't make a move which ultimately will produce a people that never knew what privacy was [that] isn't aware that they have lost anything."

ROA LISTS 30 REASONS AGAINST LIQUIDATING RESERVES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Secretary McNamara's decision to eliminate the Army Reserve raises serious questions about our national defense posture which must be thoroughly explored by Congress. Any proposal as far reaching as this one cannot be ac-

cepted by Congress without thorough investigation and establishment of the facts.

Many of the arguments which can be raised against the Secretary's decision are contained in an article appearing at page 12, in the February 1965 issue of the Reserve Officers Association magazine, the Officer. The charges made by the ROA are weighty indeed, and merit Congress' close attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Thirty Reasons (There Are More) Give Basis for Grassroots Revolt Against Plan," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THIRTY REASONS (THERE ARE MORE) GIVE BASIS FOR GRASSROOTS REVOLT AGAINST PLAN

ROA has sparked a grassroots drive to defeat the McNamara plan to destroy the Reserves with a brief citing 30 principal arguments.

The paper went to ROA leaders throughout the Nation, who were supplied the ammunition for developing local understanding of the issues raised about national security.

For the benefit of all readers of the Officer, this ROA staff paper is presented herewith in full:

1. The proposal will weaken the United States militarily, reducing the mobilization base by 21 divisions and discarding 150,000 trained, able-bodied reservists.

2. The plan, based on a directed decision, was conceived in secret, studied furtively in a limited circle which knows little about the Reserve components, and was adopted without the advice or knowledge of the Army's responsible professional military staff, the Army Committee on Reserve Policy, or the Congress of the United States and its committees.

3. The plan was presented after the fact to the Reserve Forces Policy Board, established by law as "principal policy adviser to the Secretary of Defense" on Reserve matters, and was rejected by this Board.

4. Only the Congress of the United States can make major changes in the statutory structure and policy of the military. Yet this decision was made before the national election and the decision was announced after the election and while Congress was not in session.

5. Historically, it has been proved that control and command of all military forces committed to the defense of the Nation must rest with the armed services. To propose the fragmentation of this authority among the 52 National Guard jurisdictions will result in organizational chaos, deterioration of combat readiness, and the erosion of every purpose of these men and weapons.

6. This so-called realinement places the responsibility for military training upon the Governors of the several States. Organization of the National Guard does not place authority where responsibility rests. None of the States and territorial Governors has any direct responsibility for national security; none is answerable to the National Government. Can anyone honestly believe that the Governors of the States, through their political appointees, can do a better job of training military forces than the professionals of the Regular Forces?

7. The State militia, as now constituted, provides ample force for the Governors to deal with disasters and riots in their States; to add to the size of these forces at the present time defies logic. What possible justification is there for State Governors to command units equipped with high-powered atomic cannons, high-performance and long-range aircraft, and the heavy armor with which our modern divisions are equipped?

TWO RESERVE ELEMENTS REQUIRED

8. There is historic and practical legal basis for two separate elements in the Reserve Forces. Congress established the National Guard with two functions, State and Federal, but the State function—action on strikes, insurrections, and emergencies—is primary; its Federal function secondary. Reserves have the exclusive function of augmenting the Regular Forces in emergencies. A Federal Reserve supported, trained, and controlled by the service concerned is vital to national survival.

9. Reserve units are inherently more flexible and responsive than Guard units. Transfer of units and transfer of individuals, weapons, and equipment between units in different States presents no problem in the Reserve. Nor do activations and inactivations among Reserve units as requirements change. All of these actions run into almost insurmountable obstacles in the National Guard.

10. There is a great problem in connection with the obligated Reservists who comprise 50 percent of the strength of many Reserve units, if their units are transferred to the State guard. Since a State oath or enlistment is required, this would provide an excellent opportunity for all of them to abrogate their obligation and escape service. Even though they might be required to train with the guard unit, they will not belong to the unit and cannot be called up by the Governor for State functions. The unit, in reality, would be at half-strength.

11. The decision does not take into account the personnel composition of the component involved. The facts are that the Reserve is manned with a hard core of active-duty-experienced noncommissioned officers and ROTC-trained company officers. On the other hand, the National Guard is predominantly manned with superficially trained enlisted personnel, with no previous active-duty military experience, who cannot possibly be effective without extensive post-mobilization training.

12. Any decision to transfer all units to the National Guard reduces the entire Reserve to a stagnant pool. This means that highly trained active-duty-experienced officers and men will be denied continuing training, but will be subject to callup in a mobilization emergency and condemned to slaughter in early combat. Such a system turns the clock back 40 years, actually destroys the military services' most valuable backup asset and reverts to a system inferior even to that of pre-World War II.

13. The 1961 callup provided an eloquent example. Three divisions were called up; one Reserve division and two National Guard divisions. The Reserve division mobilized quickly, relieved a Regular Army division for combat availability and performed quietly and competently with high morale during the entire period.

The National Guard divisions were not self-sufficient and had to be reinforced by Army Reserve "fillers" who had not been drilling. They had been left dormant in a pool. This element of the Army Reserve was integrated into the National Guard divisions under the leadership of the National Guard officers. They found conditions so intolerable as to cause them to reach a point of near rebellion; some actually picketed while on active duty.

The Secretary of Defense's proposal will destroy the element of the Army Reserve that performed so well and turn the entire Army Reserve into a dormant pool of the type found to be so unready.

LAW REQUIRES RESERVE TRAINING

14. The law of the land says:

"Whenever units or members of the Reserve components are ordered to active duty (other than for training) during a period of partial mobilization, the Secretary concerned shall continue to maintain mobilization forces by planning and budgeting for the continued organization and training of the Reserve components not mobilized, and make the fullest practicable use of the Federal facilities vacated by mobilized units, consistent with approved joint mobilization plans" (title 10, United States Code, sec. 276(a)).

15. The Reserves themselves were not granted their "day in court" on this matter, although leaders of the National Guard actually helped to draft the decision and to join in the campaign to "sell it" to the public.

16. The Reserve components represent a prudent and wise investment by the American taxpayers, with hundreds of thousands of officers and men organized in a modern system, carefully worked out under laws enacted on the basis of long experience. This system of laws keeps modern the Reserves of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with qualifications the same as for the active services. The operation of these laws—not dicta from the Pentagon—is the basis of our system of national security.

17. Service in the Reserve forces is a requirement for national defense, not some sort of picnic. The philosophy cited as the basis for this decision to abolish the Reserves is fallacious, and reflects a failure to recognize what Congress found to be true subsequent to World War II and Korea, that men and women must be persuaded that their services in the citizen-reservist forces are needed, and are appreciated by the Nation's leadership. Denunciation of their records does great harm to the cause of national defense.

18. During World War II, the victorious U.S. Army was composed of: 95 percent citizen-soldiers, 2 percent Regular Army, and 3 percent National Guard. This is our future reliance. The experienced elements must not be discarded.

19. The late President Kennedy warned the people of this Nation (as has every other enlightened leader in modern times) that free and open debate on all issues is essential to maintenance of freedom in this free republic. Dissent in the Pentagon already has ended. This must not be extended throughout the citizenry.

20. While it is obvious that, if the Pentagon spends the $150 million to be saved on Reserve personnel to equip the National Guard, the claim that the taxpayers will save $150 million annually is not true. On the other hand, if the Defense Department's aim is to save money—it can lop off three Active Army divisions and put a billion dollars on the Reserves, or it can save $50 billion by simply disbanding.

21. How do you "increase the combat readiness of our Ready Reserve Forces" by eliminating the 150,000 trained men and 21 divisions? The Secretary of Defense himself testified to the Nation's specific need for them earlier this year, and very recently the Chief of the Army Reserve components claimed they represent minimal needs.

"WHAT'S THE HURRY?"

22. The rarely seen haste to put this decision into effect in itself should suggest caution. Careful investigation should be made of the entire Reserve structure to avoid adoption of this hasty and radical decision which has only one goal, destruction of the Army Reserve.

23. The American people have a right to know what political considerations entered into this decision.

24. If another general war should occur, we all know who would be ordered into uniform first. To repeat an ageless slogan, "The Reserves ask only the right to be ready."

25. This decision not only reflects unjustifiably upon the Reserves, it sets aside the

basic philosophy of this Nation that every citizen has a responsibility for national defense, and must be encouraged in every way to make this commitment.

26. This proposed abolishment of the Army Reserve has been interpreted in many places as the first step toward complete elimination of our Armed Forces Reserve. Throughout all history civilizations which have abandoned the citizenship responsibility for defense and depended solely on professional forces (mercenaries) completely divorced from the mainstream of society, have been destroyed by their enemies.

27. President Lyndon B. Johnson stated in a letter dated October 24, 1964, addressed to all members of the Army Reserve:

"Defense of our great Nation is every American's business. We rely heavily on the Army Reserve as a significant part of our country's defense team. * * *

"I am confident that the Nation can rely upon the Army Reserve today and in the future as it has so often in the past." (From the Army Reserve magazine.)

(The decision to abolish the Reserve was forwarded to the Army Secretary on October 6.)

28. Deputy Secretary of Defense Vance said recently:

"Under the concept of flexible response, the Nation's Reserve components assume a degree of importance unsurpassed at any time in our history * * *. It is opposite from the truth to say that America's Reserve components have lost their usefulness in this era of nuclear deterrence." (Address to ROA Fort Monroe chapter, July 1964.)

PERSHING'S WARNING

29. General of the Armies John J. Pershing, before the 1st ROA convention in 1922 said:

"Of special importance is a stimulus in the organization of Reserve units throughout the Nation. Before the war, there was no conception of such a society. But the war brought home to us in a striking manner the advisability of * * * precaution. The experience has awakened the country so that a resolve has gone forth embodied in the law of 1920 (National Defense Act of 1920 setting up an organized Reserve) that never again shall our untrained boys be compelled to serve their country on the battlefield under leadership of new officers with practically no conception of their duties and responsibilities."

30. Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, stated:

"During the buildup of the Cuba crisis, the argument was frequently heard throughout the Pentagon that we should call up the Reserves, so that they would have time to really get themselves ready. I expressed the opinion that the Air Reserve Forces were ready, and that they should not be called until they were actually needed. On the night of Saturday, October 27, 1962, the order went out from the Pentagon at 2100 hours to selected Air Force Reserve units. At 0900 hours the next morning, these units were reported 93 percent manned, with an optimum in-commission rate on aircraft at 75 percent. At the 30-hour mark, the Secretary of Defense declared them 'operational and deployable.'

"At a press conference in December (1962) Defense Secretary McNamara called it a 'fantastic prformance.' This is the standard of performance that has been built into the Air Force Reserve * * *." (In special article, the Officer, September 1964.)

STATE OF THE STATE ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR DEMPSEY OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on February 2, Connecticut's great Governor, John N. Dempsey, gave his state of the State address before the Connecticut General Assembly.

Governor Dempsey presented a very forward looking program to meet the needs of the people of the State of Connecticut. This address will serve as a good model for constructive State legislation for all our States, and I commend it to my colleagues for their careful consideration.

I am sure that the program outlined by Governor Dempsey will have the support of the general assembly and the people of the State of Connecticut.

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

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

TEXT OF GOVERNOR DEMPSEY'S STATE OF THE STATE ADDRESS

We begin today a new chapter in the record of a general assembly destined to serve a longer term than any other in the history of Connecticut.

This general assembly—the last to be elected under a system which our highest court has said must be changed—has the valuable asset of experience.

It knows how to resolve differences. And this, of course, is the first lesson that must be learned by any legislative body with divided political control.

I am convinced that the people of our State view their government as a creative instrument in shaping the scope and quality of today's Connecticut and the Connecticut of tomorrow.

The people want a government which:

Is keenly aware of its human obligations.

Accepts reasonably and responsibly its economic stewardship.

Constantly seeks improvements in its own structure and operations.

Welcomes all challenges of today as an opportunity for fulfillment of the promise of tomorrow.

Assuring such a government calls for a wide and unlimited view of the mandate now resting upon us.

That mandate is to do all that we can to give our children and their children the kind of Connecticut we want them to have as we enter the 21st century.

Because Connecticut is so good a place to live, its population is growing faster than that of most States.

By the year 2000 there will be twice as many people living in Connecticut as there are today.

The problems that arise when a family doubles in size—the need for more living space, for more income, for more services—are multiplied many times when the population of a State increases so dramatically.

These problems are of crucial significance in shaping any program of governmental action.

I propose, therefore, to outline steps we can take now to assure a Connecticut of tomorrow in which:

Every natural resource is conserved.

Every material resource is developed.

Every human resource is fostered and encouraged to reach its fullest potential.

Education is the key to this effort.

Our goal is to provide every Connecticut child and young person with the fullest and finest education to the limit of his capabilities.

To that end, we must increase the support of public education in our towns and cities.

And, in so doing, we must pay special attention to areas of special need.

Every child whose environment leaves him unprepared to profit from formal education represents a waste of priceless human resources.

We must make it possible for these children to bridge the educational gap they face through no fault of their own.

State assistance must be provided for preschool, remedial education, and guidance programs designed to give every child in our public schools full and equal access to the benefits of a first-rate education.

There is also an imperative need to accelerate the pace of growth we have maintained for the past several years in our institutions of higher learning.

The executive budget will, therefore, make renewed provision for 700 additional students each year at the university and its branches and 300 additional students at the technical institutes.

At our State colleges, provision will be made for 800 additional students—300 more than the annual increase that has prevailed for the past several years.

Furthermore, I recommend the establishment of a new postsecondary program, confined to academic subjects, to be conducted at the State colleges during afternoon and evening hours when these valuable facilities should be better utilized.

This new program will provide for the enrollment of 1,400 students the first year, and an increase to 1,800 the second year.

Two years ago this general assembly approved my recommendations to establish a State scholarship program and a commission on higher education.

I urge your continuing support of the vitally needed work of the scholarship commission in helping deserving Connecticut young people attend college in this State. You will also, I am sure, give long and serious consideration to the forthcoming report of the commission on higher education.

Technical education both at the secondary and postsecondary levels is vitally important. I propose accelerated expansion of our vocational and technical education programs in both scope and quality.

I strongly recommend the establishment of a center for education and research in the field of metallurgy and materials science at our great State university.

Adoption of my budget recommendations for this center will insure a significant advance in the creative partnership between industry and our State university for the development of new skills, new products and new jobs for our people.

Educational opportunities for all of our people are incomplete without good library service.

I commend to your thoughtful consideration the proposals of the special committee on libraries which I appointed in December of 1963 in accordance with the intent of this general assembly.

Education enriching the mind and spirit must include a broad range of cultural opportunities. The report of the State commission on the arts points the way toward fuller enjoyment of our cultural resources.

We must remember, too, that the finest educational facilities fail of their purpose unless staffed by good teachers. The teacher is the one absolutely essential element in any educational program.

Therefore, let us make sure that we do everything possible to prepare teachers and to compensate them adequately for the heavy responsibilities they carry.

Our concern for education reflects our great concern for our richest resource—our young people.

We must assure continuing expansion of opportunities for youth outside the field of formal education.

In full partnership with the Federal Government, we should take maximum advantage of the provisions of the national economic opportunity program. In this way we will help idle youth return to education, do useful work, acquire valuable occupa-

tional skills, and develop excellence of performance in every possible field.

In creating these broader opportunities, you will have the benefit of the recommendations of the Commission on Youth Services which you established in 1963.

Wisdom and foresight dictate that we must also plan and act for the fullest conservation and development of our human resources in the broad field of health and humane services.

The physically and mentally ill, the disabled, the handicapped, the blind, the deaf, the mentally retarded, the helpless and the needy are, even as we, children of Almighty God. The kind of Connecticut we have created, and which we want to maintain and improve, will not permit them to suffer neglect.

What greater reward can we know than the light which our help brings to the eyes of a crippled child?

Will we measure these deeds in the terms of cold budget figures?

Or will we acknowledge that the enrichment which they bring to our lives far outweighs their cost?

We must increase and expand facilities for the care and treatment of the chronically ill and the mentally ill.

Services of the highest caliber for the blind, the deaf, and the physically disabled must be provided.

Connecticut's deep concern for the mentally retarded has found expression in a nationally acclaimed program of care, treatment, and research which has made this State an acknowledged leader in this all-important humane endeavor.

We are aware that few afflictions bring more distress to more people than the heartbreak of mental retardation. That is why Connecticut's already excellent program must not only be continued but expanded.

The guidance of the State committee on mental retardation planning will be of great assistance in this effort.

We must prepare for the staffing and operation of the regional center under construction in New Haven and the center soon to be under construction in Newington and for the planned growth of the newly opened center in Putnam.

To meet a demonstrated need in Fairfield County, I am recommending that a care and treatment center be established in conjunction with the Kennedy Center in Bridgeport.

Mental illness, another national health problem of the first magnitude, also has long been of deep concern to Connecticut.

Connecticut's position of leadership in this field will be maintained. The new mental health center in New Haven, a joint venture uniting the resources of the Yale University School of Medicine, Grace-New Haven Hospital, and the State of Connecticut, will open next year. It will provide our people with the newest and finest combined facilities for teaching, research, and treatment.

Our continuing emphasis on community based mental health care calls for the establishment of a community mental health center and branch hospital in Fairfield County.

Pioneer programs meriting your continuing support are the mental health service corps and summer camping project which serve as models for the Nation.

The growing menace of narcotics addiction requires the expansion of research and treatment facilities at the Blue Hills Clinic.

We are fortunate in all these endeavors to have the assistance of the dedicated citizens serving on the State advisory council on mental health planning.

One of the greatest programs that the State of Connecticut has ever undertaken is housing for the elderly.

Men and women retiring after a lifetime of useful work have earned the right to live in decency and dignity.

It is our duty, therefore, to go forward with the housing program that brings new hope and security to our older men and women.

To increase the range of other opportunities for older people, the commission on services for elderly persons needs additional resources. The report of the committee to study tax burdens of elderly citizens will also merit your thoughtful consideration.

Another report bearing on our social and humane obligations comes to you from the commission to study the welfare laws.

The welfare department is required by law to furnish the basic needs of food, clothing, shelter, and medical care to those who cannot provide for themselves.

It has the further responsibility of helping the dependent to become self-supporting.

The commission's report gives detailed consideration to these responsibilities.

Connecticut must be a State where every citizen has full access to all the rights of citizenship.

I therefore urge this general assembly to reconsider measures giving the civil rights commission power to secure compliance with laws forbidding discrimination in housing.

The commission must have the authority to obtain injunctions against the sale or rental of housing units where discrimination is charged, until a court of law has ruled on the charge. The full intent of the fair housing legislation you already have adopted cannot be carried out until the commission has this enforcement resource.

I will recommend in the budget that we substantially reinforce the staff and field capability of the civil rights commission and its top level executive direction. In particular, we should make full-time legal assistance directly available to this commission.

Two years ago, I made three major proposals for highway safety. Two were enacted—the absolute maximum speed limit and the chemical test law.

Nothing was done about the problems that arise, on the highway and elsewhere, when young people consume liquor. Those problems have not diminished.

I ask you, therefore, to help in their solution by adopting the bill that will make illegal the possession of liquor by persons under 21 years of age.

Connecticut will continue its fight for recognition by the State of New York of the perils to which its liquor laws expose teenagers.

One of the most important aspects of highway safety is the training of our young drivers. My budget will substantially increase assistance to the driver education program.

Again I call attention to the urgent need for a department of correction.

Our adult correctional institutions must be coordinated so that they can operate more efficiently and economically and be truly effective as an instrument of rehabilitation.

I stand ready to work with the legislative leaders of both parties in eliminating any obstacles to prompt enactment of this long needed reform.

We must assure for the Connecticut of tomorrow the preservation of those blessings of nature which have so enriched the quality of Connecticut life in the past.

To this general assembly which adopted it originally, I know that I can confidently recommend a continuation of the open spaces conservation and development program.

A closely allied problem, and one that presents major difficulties in a densely populated industrial State, is eliminating pollution in our streams, rivers, and coastal waters.

We must step up the cooperative effort to assure clean, pure water for the health, recreation, and prosperity of our people. The increasing menace of air pollution also requires our intensified concern.

A prime objective of the research advisory committee will be accelerated investigation of pollution control methods.

A safe, modern, and effective transportation system is indispensable to the convenience of our people and the health of our economy.

The highway construction program which I will recommend will provide for completion of Connecticut's share of the basic interstate system and for substantial expansion in the interior road network.

Our economy cannot, however, continue to grow and prosper unless it is assured a sound and efficient rail transportation service.

And the convenience of our citizens also requires that this service be maintained. I have long stressed the obvious fact that Connecticut action alone cannot insure the survival and the prosperity of all services of the New Haven Railroad.

But in the area of passenger transportation, we have recognized a State obligation to act, and this recognition must be extended.

An important step in this direction is the joint Connecticut-New York program, announced last month, to provide both new equipment and new cash income for essential commuter operations.

Additional legslative action is required to assure Connecticut's full participation in this program.

Our program to replace urban blight with healthy urban growth has brought dramatic changes to the skylines of our cities. I recommend continued State participation in the urban renewal program.

Our population increase is matched, of course, by an increase in the need for jobs.

The Connecticut Development Commission and the Industrial Building Commission are performing outstanding service in this area. We must give them the vigorous support they need to meet the added demands of an expanding economy.

An advanced program of scientific and industrial research is the key to Connecticut's future as an important center of space age technology.

I recommend that the research advisory committee, established by executive action in 1961, now be made a permanent agency of the State government.

Our State, which 4 years ago set an example for the Nation with its job retraining program, now has a greater opportunity than ever before to develop the occupational skills of its people.

Our continuing emphasis on the creation of new job opportunities must take into account labor legislation. The effects of automation and changing patterns of defense production must be studied and anticipated.

Connecticut will take maximum advantage of the programs established under the Federal Economic Opportunity Act.

Another partnership effort with the Federal Government which will yield far-reaching benefits is the interregional planning program.

In the years of growth which we are certain to experience, the success of this program will mean the difference between orderly, planned development * * * or haphazard, disorderly growth.

Connecticut's leadership in this task is demonstrated by the fact that our grant from the Federal Government for interregional planning is the largest received by any of the 50 States.

I have outlined for you some of the challenges confronting our State government. The quality of our response depends on the skill and dedication of the men and women who do the State's work.

I will, therefore, recommend an upgrading in the rewards of State service.

I make this recommendation in recognition of the devotion and talents of the thousands of men and women who have given Connecticut the finest State government in the Nation.

We must protect our State employees and the public whom they serve by the adoption of a code of ethics. The recommendations of the legislative council, based on the report of the special committee which I appointed, should provide valuable guidance in this endeavor.

This general assembly also has an unprecedented opportunity to provide a prompt, fair and effective solution to the troubling question of the use of the party lever on our voting machines.

Many who share my opposition to the mandatory party lever have resisted efforts to make its use optional because of their sincere conviction that this would be a first step toward its complete abolition.

These sincere doubts can be overcome by adopting now a bill making the use of the party lever optional, but containing the further proviso that the bill will become effective only upon adoption of a constitutional revision giving the optional lever permanent constitutional status.

Important proposals for improvement in our judicial system will be brought to your attention by the reports of the judicial council and of the special commission which you established to study the judicial systems of other States.

The recommendations I have presented represent a program wholly consistent with continued prudent fiscal management.

The fiscal aspects of this program will be presented in detail to you in the budget message.

I have served in this Chamber; I have participated in the legislative process in Connecticut for a long time, and I know that we will be united in our basic purpose—to serve the State we love and of which we are so proud.

Your effort and sacrifice will be amply rewarded if, because of what you do here, one of our children earns a hard-won diploma, a crippled child walks again, a despondent and idle worker regains a job, learning a simple skill brings a smile of happiness to the face of a mentally retarded youngster.

I feel sure that John F. Kennedy, the President so tragically taken from us, had these rewards in mind when, in accepting the leadership of our country 4 years ago, he spoke these words:

"With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

THE IMPORTANCE TO CONNECTICUT OF THE PROPOSED STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT OF 1965

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] introduced a significant bill—S. 949—to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science in the hands of American industry.

I am pleased to join him as a cosponsor of this bill, which is important to the continued growth of our Nation's economy and the growth of the economies of every State, including my own State of Connecticut.

Science and technology have historically been the main source of Connecticut's economic development and affluence. The inventive genius of men of the caliber of Eli Whitney, Seth Thomas, and Linus Yale provided the early impetus for our transition from an agricultural to an industrial economy, during the early 19th century. Science and technology, as the modern catalyst for economic expansion, have led to the development of many of Connecticut's leading industrial and business enterprises.

But we cannot rest upon past accomplishments. If Connecticut is to continue to capitalize upon the dynamic opportunities offered by modern science and technology, we must push forward toward four major economic goals:

To promote Connecticut's economic growth;

To improve Connecticut's competitive position in national and international trade;

To encourage regional economic growth so that Connecticut can achieve its share of the benefits of an expanding economy; and

To achieve and maintain a high level of employment throughout the State.

Mr. President, the need for action is greater now than ever before. For, paradoxically, in the process of developing our present economic gains, problems have been created that could restrict our future economic growth. Connecticut, like many other States with an industrial and urban economy, is confronted with problems of mass transit, air and water pollution, effective use of land and natural resources, and a host of other problems associated with urban growth and automation. To combat these problems, we must undertake programs which assure the development and spread of new technology. The proposed State Technical Services Act provides a weapon for the battle. It would permit Connecticut, in conjunction with its universities and local industries, to join with the Federal Government in bringing the latest technology, wherever it exists, into the production lines and plants of Connecticut industry.

The proposed act would enable Connecticut to receive Federal grants, on a matching basis, in support of programs to make better commercial use of the latest findings of science and technology. The programs, planned and carried out by the State, would place these important findings in the hands of business and industry at the local level. The technical services provided would include: Identifying new opportunities to apply technology to the advancement of specific areas and industries; preparing and disseminating scientific or engineering information; and facilitating its use by business and commerce.

Connecticut is already making significant strides in this general area. Governor Dempsey presented a proposal to the Connecticut General Assembly yesterday to establish a permanent State research advisory commission. Also, the Governor has requested authority to establish an institute of materials science and engineering at the University of Connecticut, to assist in the dissemination of materials and metallurgical technology to the industry of the State. The Federal support which the State Technical Services Act would give, would greatly strengthen and accelerate the efforts already underway.

Through this joint Federal-State program, we will respond to the President's challenge to apply the Nation's growing scientific and engineering resources to new socially profitable uses.

CONSUMERS SEEK LIFTING OF CONTROLS ON RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a matter of great importance to my State and to other States on the eastern seaboard; namely, the residual fuel oil import problem. My colleagues and I have over the years protested the continuation of controls over the importation of this vital fuel which is so costly for our schools, hospitals, powerplants, and apartment dwellers.

In this connection I call attention to an advertisement which appeared in today's Washington Post calling this vitally important problem to the attention of the President. This appeal is timely, for two reasons: First, the announced intention of the Department of the Interior to hold hearings on this problem early next month; and second, because a task force under the direction of Secretary McNamara is looking at this problem from the point of view of its impact on Appalachia.

I sincerely hope that the President will give this appeal the fullest consideration and let us have his decision before the start of the next fuel oil import year—April 1, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement that appeared in this morning's Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

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

[An advertisement in the Washington Post, Feb. 3, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your state of the Union message you declared all-out war on waste in Government, and with justifiable pride, cited your administration's past accomplishments. We enlist in your war, Mr. President, which we know you will pursue with your customary determination.

You can take action right now, Mr. President, to move ahead in this war by eliminating at least $80 million of waste annually—waste to our Federal Government; waste to our State governments; waste to our entire national economy.

You can do this by removing senseless and needless controls on residual fuel oil imposed in 1959.

These controls, which restrict a free and certain supply of a vital raw material, produced in this country in insufficient quantity to supply our own domestic needs, have created shortages and have artificially inflated fuel prices.

Residual controls, Mr. President, are unnecessary, in fact they are harmful to our Nation's well being because:

They have deprived 50 million east coast consumers of the economic benefits of free and open competition.

They have impaired our international relations, particularly with our good friends of Latin America in a life or death struggle with Castro's communism, and are in direct contradiction to the principles of the Alliance for Progress.

They have impeded economic development in areas such as New England, New York, and Florida, whose people ask only the opportunity to help themselves to move ahead in the march toward the Great Society.

They have added millions of dollars each year to the Federal budget by forcing the Defense Department and other Federal agencies to pay premium prices for fuel supplies.

You can act now to remove these controls, Mr. President, with the certain knowledge that you will:

Act in the interest of our national security. The Director of the OEP, acting on Cabinet recommendation, found residual controls were not necessary for national security and there should be a meaningful relaxation.

Restore competition among all fuels without injuring any domestic industry—the petroleum industry is constantly seeking to reduce domestic residual production. Other domestic fuels, particularly those supplying the energy market where the growth potential is tremendous, do not need this subsidy.

Improve U.S. trade relations throughout the world.

Stop the annual waste of millions of consumer dollars by ending premium fuel prices.

We are in sympathy with your plans and desires to eliminate poverty and to cure regional economic distress whether it be in Appalachia or elsewhere. One important factor to help alleviate economic distress along the east coast would be to eliminate this unnecessary economic burden. Let us have our vital fuel supplies with the benefits of free and open competition.

We join with you, Mr. President, in the belief that there is no place in our society for waste and inefficiency. Eliminate this needless program now and all Americans will benefit.

SPONSORS

The New England Governors' Conference.
Massachusetts Association of Nonprofit Schools and Colleges.
Associated Industries of Maine.
Florida Electric Cooperatives Association.
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority.
St. Croix Paper (a subsidiary of Georgia-Pacific Corp.)
St. Joe Paper Co., Port St. Joe, Fla.
Lee County Electric Cooperative, Inc.
Mecaw Industries, Portland, Maine.
City of Cambridge, Mass. John H. Cochrane, purchasing agent.
Town of Arlington, Mass. Edward C. Monahan, town manager.
Town of Danvers, Mass. Robert E. Curtis, town manager.
Gardner A. Caverly, Executive Vice President, the New England Council.
Committee for a National Trade Policy.
American Public Power Association, Alexander Radin, general manager.
Gas and Electric Department, Holyoke, Mass. Francis King, manager.
Florida State Chamber of Commerce.
Utility Board of City of Key West, Fla., M. E. Rosam, II, manager.
City of Ocala, Fla.
Central Maine Power Co.
Keyes Fibre Co., Waterville, Maine.
Brown Co., Berlin, N.H.
St. Regis Paper Co.
Florida Power Corp.
Orlando Utilities Commission.
The Great Northern Paper Co.
City of Quincy, Mass., Thomas V. Morrissey, purchasing agent.
City of Bangor, Maine, V. E. Kane, purchasing agent.
State of New Hampshire, Richard N. Peale, division of purchase and property.
Ashland Paper Mills, Inc., Ashland, N.H.
APW Products Co., Hinsdale, N.H.
Monadnock Paper Mills, Inc., Bennington, N.H.
Oil Users Association.
Greater Boston Hospital Council, Inc.
Florida Municipal Utilities Association.
City of Bartow, Fla.
Penobscot Co., Boston, Mass.
Tileston & Hollingsworth Co., Boston, Mass.
City Electric & Water Utilities Department, Jacksonville, Fla., by its city commission.
Stauffer Chemical Co.
Spaulding Fibre Co., North Rochester, N.H.
Byron Weston Co., Dalton, Mass.
Town of Brookline, Mass., Henry Saumsiegle, purchasing agent.
Town of Westwood, Mass., Richard J. Hart, purchasing agent.
City of Newton, Mass., Harold T. Pillsbury, purchasing agent.
State of Vermont, Richard C. Raymond, purchasing director.
Crompton & Knowles Corp., Worcester, Mass.
The Foxboro Co., Foxboro, Mass.
S. D. Warren Co.
Florida Power & Light Co.

(Entire cost of this advertisement borne by oil consumers.)

FEDERAL POWER PRODUCTION—ADDRESS BY CLYDE T. ELLIS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, for many years the production of electric power at generation plants owned by the Federal Government has provided vast benefits to the people of America. Combined with the distribution of the electricity to the ultimate users, through consumer-owned systems such as cooperatives, power districts, and municipal systems, Federal power has served as a yardstick against which the service provided by the investor-owned utility monopoly could be measured.

In areas where Federal power is produced, not only do the members and customers of the consumer-owned systems enjoy low electric rates, but the customers of the utility companies benefit, as well. In the strong light of comparison, the companies have been forced to keep their rates in line with those of the public and cooperative systems; and, by doing so, their sales of electricity have increased tremendously, and their profits have grown correspondingly.

This electric-power yardstick has, therefore, served the country and the people well. It has been of inestimable value, and it needs to be continued as a national policy.

However, Mr. President, many of us who try to protect the interests of the American consumer are becoming concerned over a trend that is taking place. With the Nation's use of power doubling about every 10 years, and with a slowdown in recent years in the construction of new Federal power generation plants, the effect of the yardstick is diminishing. If the trend is not halted, the usefulness of the yardstick in the years ahead could become so limited that its benefits could almost disappear.

No one is more aware of this grave danger than Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. In an address which he delivered before more than 8,700 members of NRECA, at its 23d annual meeting, in Miami Beach, last week, Mr. Ellis analyzed the problem in considerable depth, and proposed some solutions. I earnestly commend to the Congress the text of Mr. Ellis' address; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

IN TODAY ALREADY WALKS TOMORROW

(Address by Clyde T. Ellis)

We come together this week for the 23d time in a great national meeting which is part review and part revival; part reunion and part renewal; and, according to some, perhaps, part riddle and part religion.

And, as you may have discovered, the people of Miami Beach may remember this meeting as part rural and part revenue.

For my part, I'm glad we're meeting in this beautiful setting, in a shoreline city built on what could hardly have been called even an island of shifting sand where nothing was before. This is a great State with an important rural electrification program. Florida is a sort of cross section of the rest of the Nation, and most of the problems and challenges that confront any of you can be found somewhere in this State.

We all have plenty of problems and challenges—the problems of today, and the challenges of tomorrow. In many respects the most trying and difficult years for our program will be those just ahead. We must deal with problems and opportunities that are vastly complex and for which there are no easy answers. Many of them are already with us. You'll hear them discussed and debated in the next few days as our program participants speak to the theme of the meeting: "Rural Electrification, Today and Tomorrow."

I'm reminded of these great lines from Coleridge:

"Often do the spirits of great events stride on before the events, and in today already walks tomorrow."

We would be making a foolish mistake if we did not try to read our future course in the signs that are everywhere around us today. We must seek out and take advantage of our opportunities, and we must deal with our problems. Some of them are of such magnitude that if we try to ignore them they can engulf us and sweep us into the backwash of history. This has happened to other worthwhile programs which bloomed in their first hour of need but withered in the march of time.

This might already have been the fate of our program if you had considered electricity as an end in itself, rather than a means to an end. You did not allow your organizations to stop and stagnate when the first lights were turned on. Instead, you have had a vision of the dynamic role the rural electric systems must play in building a thriving, prosperous rural America. As the leading corporate organizations in the rural areas, you have recognized your responsibilities to your communities, the Nation and the world.

These things and more have elevated you and your program to new heights of public esteem and respect.

Through your accomplishments you have spread your influence across the whole spectrum of our economic and political life—from the kitchen of the sharecropper to the offices of the mighty.

We've come a long way over these years, and we still have a long way to go. But we approach our problems and opportunities today from a position of strength.

We must use this strength wisely yet boldly. This morning, I want to suggest steps that we of the staff believe must be taken in several areas. The time for action is now, for, "In today already walks tomorrow."

RURAL ELECTRIC PROGRAM NEEDS ARE MANY

Our major problems continue to center around (I) financing, particularly for the generation and transmission program, which is under constant attack; (II) territorial protection; (III) Federal Power Commission jurisdiction; (IV) low-cost wholesale power supply, including the modernization of the electric power yardstick through new projects, interconnections and pooling; (V) our concern about the people in the rural areas generally; and (VI) our concern about our political role in achieving all of these objectives.

I. OUR FINANCING PROBLEM

We had hoped to have the results of our study of possible private sources of financing, which you authorized last year at Dallas, available at this meeting. The scope and complexity of the study, together with the early date of this year's meeting, made this impossible. This independent study, now in progress by a New York investment banking firm, will be completed in the next few months. We plan to have it completed in time for its consideration by the NRECA board this summer and your consideration of it during the regional meetings this fall. Meanwhile, after the summer board meeting we will probably present parts of it to committees of the Congress.

We know there is tremendous pressure within the administration and in the Congress to raise the interest rate, cut back on the amount of loan funds authorized, and to stop all loans for the generation and transmission of power.

We understand that at least one high official in this administration—not the President—is urging that tight new restrictions be placed on generation and transmission loans, and even that the REA loan program be abandoned—to be replaced by some scheme of guaranteed private loans.

Let me remind anyone with such ideas that the winner of last fall's election was not Barry Goldwater—and that the man who did win ran on a pledge of strong support for the rural electrification program.

We are watching these developments closely, and we are strong believers in the old admonition that "by their deeds ye shall know them."

Some who are genuine and proven friends of this program feel that we should take the initiative now and recommend changes in the loan program to Congress. They argue that as a result of the elections last fall we have a friendly administration and a more favorable Congress. Their reasoning is that, if changes must come eventually, it is better to make them while our friends are in control.

There is logic in this approach, but the plain fact is that nobody can be sure at this point just what kinds of changes might safely be made without jeopardizing the program.

In the light of all these developments your national board voted yesterday to broaden our study to now include REA and/or other Government sources of capital.

During the summer we will have an opportunity to thoroughly analyze our own study and any concrete recommendations the administration may have. This fall we can discuss the alternatives and our recommendations with you at the regionals. You will then be in position to make an informed decision at our annual meeting in Las Vegas early next year.

This administration will still be in office next year, and so will this Congress. I believe we can persuade Congress not to take any drastic action this year. My suggestion is that for the time being you retain your policy of support for the present REA loan program.

Need for loan fund account and revolving fund now

The one exception for this year is that we badly need to establish a true revolving fund for REA loans. Under such a plan your repayments on your loans would go into a special account and be available for relending. You have supported this concept in the past. The administration will probably recommend again this year that Congress establish an REA loan fund account under which our Government would change its bookkeeping to show that our loans are investments and not Government operating expense. This is good, but it does not go far enough. We need a true revolving fund under which your loan repayments could be held in a special fund for relending.

Need for adequate REA loan funds this year

We will have our usual difficult problem this year of securing adequate REA loan funds without restrictions on their use. Our annual need for loan funds increases as our use of power continues to double every 6 or 7 years.

We must seek, also, to ease the crippling restrictions that recent Appropriations Committee reports have placed on the Administrator's ability to make loans. Every year lately power companies—but not all of them—fight us in the appropriations committees in greater numbers and with greater force. Their prime objective is to destroy the feature of our program which they dislike the most—our right to generate our own power and transmit it to our own load centers. If they can knock out our G–T program, they can accomplish two things: first, destroy the only alternative of hundreds of our systems which are buying power from them, thus rendering these cooperatives completely dependent on the companies for power supply on the companies' terms; and second, eliminate the growing importance of the yardstick factor which our G–T's provide in the industry. I'll have more to say about yardsticks in a moment.

II. NEED FOR TERRITORIAL PROTECTION

Since our systems are all incorporated under our respective State statutes, and depend upon State statutes for their right to operate in given areas, territorial protection is a State problem. It is key, nevertheless, to the elimination of other major power company campaigns against us.

Our only real protection in the long run is law, State law. If you will achieve territorial protection in your State, and this year may be our last best year to try, you will go a long way toward stopping the other attacks upon us as well.

Let us make clear to both the power companies and the legislatures that we have no quarrel with the power comapnies—but only they with us—that they have nothing we want, that we want peace with them as to territory and all other matters.

You in several States have achieved your fair play legislation after hard fights. Others of you are achieving it by negotiations and then both you and the power companies going to the legislatures together and getting the laws passed. I urge all of you who have not achieved it to try—now.

III. NEED FOR GETTING FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION OFF OUR BACKS

Our major national legislative effort this year must be dircted toward a satisfactory solution of the Federal Power Commission encroachment problem. The consumers and owners of rural electric systems are one and the same and they don't need the FPC to protect them from themselves.

The results of this senseless self-assertion of jurisdiciton over us by FPC would be enormous additional expense for the rural electrics—it already is to some—in complying with or resisting all the red tape requirements and endless delay in obtaining REA loans—and since Commission decisions can be appealed to and through the courts, power companies would thus achieve their long-sought desire to haul us into court for endless litigation over all REA loans they would not like. They know we cannot survive such long wars of attrition.

Over the years the Federal Power Commission has demonstrated that it has much more than it can do in discharging the responsibilities it already possesses. The FPC needs to devote more time to its job of regulating the monopolies under its jurisdiction, and less to empire building.

In line with the policy you have established, we shall spare no effort in this session of Congress to pass a bill specifically exempting rural electric cooperatives from FPC jurisdiction. And I think we will win. FPC reminds me of a story of a friend of mine who said his doctor treated him for 6 months for yellow jaundice before he found out he was Chinese. And he said he almost cured him, too.

The matter of getting our wholesale power contracts with the companies exempted, too, must await your further study and policy formulation.

IV. NEED TO IMPROVE OUR WHOLESALE SUPPLY

Any business that cannot purchase its wholesale supply in a competitive market or produce its own is in trouble. We are in trouble. And with our wholesale requirements doubling about every 7 years we are in double trouble. Let me speak first about the need for modernizing the electric power yardstick.

Need for modernizing the electric power yardstick

I want to compliment the Federal Power Commission upon its National Power Survey released last month. This is in many respects an admirable piece of work. Although it has serious limitations, it is nevertheless an impressive research document that should serve as a basis for achieving the technical revolution that it suggests in the electric power industry.

Significant technical breakthroughs in our industry have already been achieved, in large part through the experimentation of Federal agencies, notably TVA and Bonneville and their consumer-owned distributors and by the giant facilities of the huge European and Russian power pools. Once the breakthroughs are put to general use in the years just ahead, great benefits will flow from them.

But a major question is: Who will benefit, the consumer or the commercial power companies or both? The FPC speaks of savings in terms of price, implying that the consumer's power bill will be less.

If the past is any guide to the future, most commercial companies will not pass these benefits on to the rural electric co-ops which they serve and to their other customers, unless forced to do so. The record is clear that regulation, either by Federal or State commissions, will not get the job done. We've had regulation for decades, and this is not preventing power companies from overcharging customers, including us, of hundreds of millions of dollars a year.[1]

There has never been but one really effective influence on the commercial companies, and that has been the electric power yardstick. The electric power yardstick, as you know, is created by the combination of the Federal wholesale power and the consumer-owned, nonprofit power distributors, including our co-ops and power districts which buy that power and distribute it—and, in some areas, by the power generated by our own generation and transmission co-ops and the

[1] A report on overcharges of 106 major electric utilities, NRECA, 1965.

distribution co-ops. It takes the nonprofit generation and the nonprofit distribution to create a measure (or yardstick) of the costs of generation, transmission, and distribution.

While there is no direct competition in the retail sale of electricity (except when the companies invade our territory), the mere fact that the Federal Government and the rural electric G–T's[2] can and do generate and sell some power at wholesale (none at retail), and that some people do join with their neighbors and serve themselves with electricity on a nonprofit, yardstick basis, is a healthy influence upon what is basically a monopolistic industry. The one thing that strikes fear in the heart of a monopoly is the prospect of competition—even competition by yardstick example, as in this case.

This concept of the value of an electric power yardstick, by which both the consumers and public officials can measure the real cost of service, has long been a matter of national policy. TVA could not be a yardstick, standing alone, but the combinatin of TVA and the electric co-ops and municipal systems to which it sells its power is a yardstick. The same is true of the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers projects through their sales to these nonprofit groups. And the same is true of our G–T's and their member distribution systems.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, like Teddy Roosevelt before him, often spoke of the necessity of this electric power measuring stick, or yardstick. The 20th Century Fund has said that while F.D.R. did not propose the elimination of the commercial companies, he advocated sufficient public operation to provide a yardstick for measuring the cost of electric service.[3] This is an opinion I believe most reasonable people still share.

Value of the yardstick

There is just no question about the benefits of the electric power measuring stick, or yardstick, to the consumers, including those served by the commercial companies. Companies serving areas near such major Federal projects as TVA and Bonneville tend to set lower rates to both their retail and wholesale customers, including us, and the farther away from such projects a company is, the higher its rates. The companies' rates around the periphery of TVA are lower than the average. The companies of New England have long and successfully opposed any Federal development which would generate power. Take the example of two comparable cities served by two power companies. The consumer in the city of Boston, Mass., far removed from the yardstick influence, pays $9.91 for 250 kilowatt-hours; but the consumer in the city of Portland, Oreg., where the influence of the Bonneville Power Administration is strong, pays only $5.35 for 250 kilowatt-hours—a little more than half as much. And some companies in New England charge our co-ops there two and three times as much as do companies near the TVA and Bonneville areas. There are almost as many examples, one way or the other, as there are companies.

High rates are more important than many people realize. Most consumers do not understand that the power costs they pay are many times the amount of their monthly power bills—that there is a factor for power costs in everything they eat, drink, and wear—in everything they buy.

There is also no question about our Nation's policy concerning some Federal generation and sale of wholesale power. This policy has been reaffirmed time and again in legislation dating back to 1906. At least in the yardstick sense, the Federal Government is and has been in the wholesale electric power business to a limited degree for over half a century, not to the extent of dominating the industry, but just enough to exert a healthy and effective influence on behalf of the consumer.

But as the Nation's use of power continues to double about every 10 years, this yardstick is shrinking rapidly, relatively, and in any effective sense could almost disappear in the years ahead. In the past decade there has been a rapid decline in the construction of new Federal generating plants. Between 1956 and 1962 the Federal Government's percentage of total installed generating capacity in the Nation fell from 15.2 percent to 12.7 percent.

We believe there is a direct relationship between the decline in this percentage of Federal generation and power company rate increases or failures to decrease rates and in the growth of power company overcharges. We have long believed that in order to be effective nationally the Federal wholesale part of the yardstick should approach 20 percent, and never be lower than 15 percent, of total installed capacity.

It is essential, too, for our own security and to help strengthen the yardstick, that we increase our own generating capacity as the total industry grows. The FPC survey notes that our cooperatives as a group generate a smaller percentage of the power they sell than any other major segment of the industry. We generate only 18 percent of our own needs, and less than 1 percent of the industry total though we serve about one-tenth of the population.

But even if our own generation were sharply increased, say to 25 percent of our own requirements, this still would be only a drop in the bucket. The major responsibility for maintaining an effective yardstick must be carried by the Government.

If the Government is going to achieve and maintain at least a 15-percent level, then by 1980 the Federal projects must have a generating capability of 79 million kilowatts. At present they have a capability of about 26 million kilowatts. This means that if the yardstick is to be preserved, some additional 53 million kilowatts of Federal capacity must be added in the next 15 years. In this same period the commercial companies will be adding many times this amount.

In other words the yardstick must be modernized as to generating capacity and as to major transmission line pooling, not to give the Government a major share of the industry, but just to hold its own in the total picture in the public interest.

Need for new power sources and some new policy

But where and how should this additional 53 million kilowatts of Federal capacity be achieved? The country is running out of the better hydroelectric sites. The FPC survey indicates the limit of total hydro additions by 1980 at about 40 million kilowatts, and predicts that only half of this potential will be developed by Federal agencies. So let's be optimistic and assume that all the projects needed to add 20 million kilowatts to the Federal hydro systems will be approved and built. This will still leave a deficit of about 33 million kilowatts if the 15-percent minimal yardstick is to be maintained.

This means that in one way or another the Government will have to utilize steam generation on a much greater scale than in the past.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is the only Federal agency now authorized to construct steamplants. By 1980, TVA will need to add about 20 million kilowatts of steam generation. Subtracting this from the 33 million needed means the Federal Government must develop on the order of 13 million kilowatts of steam capacity outside the TVA area.

Even if this must be done within the framework of the traditional Federal policy that the development and sale of electric power should be related to other purposes, such as the reclamation of arid lands or multiple-purpose river development, still it can be done.

There are many human needs in our modern society that an extension of this related-purpose concept could help us meet. Let me mention three of them:

First, the desalinization of water: It would be inexcusably wasteful if the huge desalinization plants of the future were not designed to produce electric power as a related purpose. The generation of electricity requires high-pressure, high-temperature steam which, when exhausted after use, still contains appropriate heat for water distillation. This is true regardless of whether coal or gas or atomic heat is used to produce the steam. Under classical reclamation theory, the revenue from the sale of the power could also be used in part to subsidize the cost of producing the fresh water and delivering it to the places of need. Your policy in this area needs to be updated.

Second, there is every justification for the large-scale generation of steam power in the coal fields of the poverty-stricken Appalachian area. Or to say it another way, can our Federal Government longer tolerate the economic, social, and political joke of trying to treat only the symptoms of poverty in the 11-State Appalachian region when the real disease, or at least a major one, is the lack of development for the region's own benefits of its greatest natural asset: the Nation's prime storehouse of low-cost coal?

Both TVA and commercial companies have proved that the larger the generation and transmission facilities, the lower the cost of generation and transmission per kilowatt-hour of power. The national power survey forecasts single units of from 1,500 to 2,000 megawatts by 1980. This presupposes large-scale pooling as in TVA. The Appalachian area should be the center of low-cost, coal-fired electric power generation for almost the entire eastern United States. Our studies indicate that giant publicly financed plants in Appalachia could deliver wholesale electricity almost anywhere in the eastern half of the country at lower cost than power is now being generated in those areas, except the Tennessee Valley.

But there is more. These low-cost calculations include the payment into some kind of an "Appalachian development fund" of one-half mill per kilowatt-hour sold. This fund would be used for the overall economic development of the region. Considering the projected power demand in eastern United States by 1980, it is conceivable that under such a plan $5.7 billion could be poured into this overall area development fund, from this one-half mill, during this 15-year period, and that 184,000 new coal mining jobs could be created.

And this would be but the beginning of benefits. The benefits of low-cost power would be a tremendous stimulant to the total economy of the entire region, even of the Nation. The Appalachia problem cannot be solved without converting its vast storehouse of fossil fuel energy into low-cost energy for its own and the country's use through mine-mouth million kilowatt, or more, generators and farflung power pooling in the public interest.

Leadership for such a program, and its administration, could be provided by an Appalachian Federal Resource Development Corporation with self-financing authority, and with the power generated being sold to all types of distributors: commercial, cooperative, and municipal.

---

[2] Generation and transmission cooperatives composed of and owned by the distribution co-ops they serve.

[3] "Electric Power and Government Policy," a survey of the relations between the Government and the electric power industry, the 20th Century Fund, 1948.

I hope you will develop a solid policy in this direction at this meeting.

A third area of possibility for the needed Federal steam generation in the future lies in the Bureau of Reclamation program. Since the generation and sale of hydroelectric power now are used as a means of subsidizing reclamation, why shouldn't steam-power revenues be used in the same manner? Certainly the result would improve the efficiency of the Government's wholesale power system since the hydropower could then be put to its most valuable use, as peaking power.

Our Government came close to getting into the dual purpose steam generation business at Hanford, Wash. The President recommended and the Senate passed such a bill in 1961, but the House killed it. You took a strong position for, and fought for, this Hanford atomic steam project but, except by implication, you have no stated position generally on supplemental steam generation. And TVA's steam generators are not supplemental. I hope you will have a position on Federal steam generation outside of TVA before this meeting ends.

Need for pooling and interconnections

As important as it is for the Federal Government to continue to own an effective portion of total power generation, this in itself will not modernize the yardstick. The FPC National Power Survey reaffirms and supports our longstanding position that throughout the United States there must be intelligent pooling and interconnection of the Nation's power resources. The potential benefits—to the electric industry and to the consumer—of national power pooling on a giant scale are almost beyond comprehension.

Several company spokesmen have also expressed specific opposition to the FPC survey recommendation that high voltage interconnections should be built between the different areas of the country, yet this is a key concept in the entire national plan.

The FPC survey estimates that time zone diversity alone between east and west, thus shifting the peaks, would be worth 6 million kilowatts of installed capacity by 1980—and that this could be increased to 12 or 13 million kilowatts by reserve savings, seasonal peak load diversity and coordination between hydroelectric plants.

These are fantastic potential benefits, valued by FPC at $2 billion by 1980 in terms of generating investment saved.

The survey concludes that overall efficiencies, including pooling, would make possible a 27-percent decrease in the price of electricity throughout the United States by 1980. This saving would amount to $11 billion per year. Properly applied, it could help all Americans to live better, could help all business, and could help U.S. industries compete in both the domestic and world markets.

There are strong indications that most power companies will resist polling and interconnections on a national scale—except where they do them themselves. In the weeks before the FPC survey was to be released, combinations of power companies in several areas of the country, knowing it was coming, hurriedly announced plans for their own regional pooling, while still publicly belittling general pooling. The newspaper stories carried the companies' claims of great benefits and savings for their plans, but in none that I saw did they support pooling of all power in an area and in none was any saving cited as an objective either for their consumer customers or for us, their wholesale customers. Several of the companies in the proposed pools also made it clear that they were going to operate very exclusive clubs and did not want the rural electrics and other nonprofit distributors to participate.

This is stone age thinking that has no place in our modern economy. The great promise of power pooling will never be realized if it is founded on narrow self-interest, age-old prejudices and on monopoly charge-the-customer-all-he-can-bear practices. The public interest requires not only national power pooling but that our systems participate, and we intend to see that you are given the opportunity to participate.

New EHV interconnections needed

Without taking a position on the ownership of the lines, the FPC survey recommends several extra high voltage, east-west interconnections. It is significant that in all cases the suggested lines either begin or terminate at major Federal power systems, or at terminals of transmission facilities which are under contract to Federal agencies.

We do not have to look very far into the future to see that if the yardstick provided by the Federal wholesale power program and the nonprofit producers and distributors is to avoid extinction, the parts that compose it must grow as the total power industry grows.

To preserve and modernize the yardstick, I urge that in addition to maintaining at least the 15-percent ratio of Federal generation, serious consideration be given immediately to the authorization and construction of the following elements of a Federal transmission system:

1. An extra high voltage, common carrier, Federal tieline between the Federal facilities of the Columbia Basin and the Missouri Basin. This line would utilize time zone diversity and coordinate two major adjacent Federal hydroelectric wholesale systems.

2. A similar major line between the Missouri Basin System and the Federal Southwestern Power Administration. This line would carry a portion of the 3-million-kilowatt seasonal diversity forecast by FPC as existing by 1980 between the Northwest and the SPA area.

3. Extra-high-voltage, Federal, common carrier lines to link SPA with TVA and TVA with the Federal Southeastern Power Administration facilities, and with the southern terminal of a Passamaquoddy-St. John Federal transmission system in the Boston area. This network would carry part of the load needed to realize the benefits of a 3.3-million-kilowatt diversity the FPC forecasts between the Northeast and SPA areas by 1980. These lines would interconnect the proposed giant steamplants in Appalachia with the other major Federal projects. They would extend the Federal part of the yardstick into the high-power cost areas of the Eastern States, including Florida and New England.

Most of these Federal systems or projects are already built, from the Columbia to the Savannah, from the Colorado to the now promised Passamaquoddy-St. Johns. They must all be tied together—and very soon—and tied with the Canadian pools and beyond to the Alaskan projects, including Rampart Dam on the Yukon.

These recommendations require no basic adjustments in national power policy. They are merely an extension and modernization of the policy which developed in this country over the years. If everything I have called for this morning were in full operation in 1980, the proportion of Federal participation in the total power picture still would be no greater than it was in 1956.

So we aren't discussing revolutionary ratios; we're discussing the preservation of the small competitive factor provided by the participation of the nonprofit segments of the power industry.

Our direct self-interest is clear. We now purchase 37 percent of our wholesale power supply from Federal agencies and 38 percent from the commercial companies. The modernized yardstick would produce efficiencies which would increase—and thus maintain the ratio of—our supply of Federal power and decrease the rates per kilowatt-hour we pay the companies. Full participation in the pools by our generation and transmission cooperatives would result in great savings for them and would prevent many of our relatively small plants from becoming obsolete.

Modernization of the yardstick including national power pooling is going to be achieved. And I think you are going to lead that fight in the public interest, and win it, just as you have led and won many other fights, including the west coast intertie battle last summer.

V. NEEDS OF RURAL AREAS IN THE GREAT SOCIETY

Another area of the consumer interest in which you have long played a major role, and which I believe must be of even greater concern to you in the future, is the broad area of human need. Probably because our own program deals so intimately with people, you have long supported progressive efforts to increase the opportunities of people to lead fuller and more rewarding lives. While you have focused your efforts on the needs of rural people, the results of your work benefit the entire Nation.

The recognition of these efforts by the President, by Members of Congress, by the press and others, benefits you tremendously in the raising of our program's prestige. It has given all of us a more responsible position in the minds of many of this country's most influential people. Many who have no particular interest in our bread-and-butter rural electrification issues respect and support us because of the broader, humanitarian aspects of our program. This is an attitude that has taken on new importance in recent years, and in my opinion, our participation in the various community development programs, and our willingness to share our experience with our fellow rural peoples of other nations on a nonprofit basis, plus our TNT (tell the nation the truth) about what we are doing have been chiefly responsible.

As you know so well, new Federal programs are now being developed to help the less fortunate people in both our rural and urban areas. These programs, their benefits are a part of what President Johnson calls the Great Society. Some think little of this vision the President has for our Nation, and some think it is too idealistic to ever be accomplished. I am convinced most of it is going to be accomplished and we can either keep hands off and probably see most of the benefits flow to the cities, or we can increase our efforts and help shape it to make all of rural America bloom again.

Let us not forget that this country never had a more idealistic undertaking than the rural electrification program. The cynics and scoffers and prophets of doom and men of little faith once had a field day with the idea that all rural people could, or should, have electricity. Now they are in full bay at the heels of the antipoverty program and the other elements of the Great Society.

Let me tell you something: I have a feeling that Lyndon Johnson just may be able to do it. I'd like to help him, and I think most of you would, too. Whatever we can do to help, we'll be repaying in small measure the great debt we owe all the people of this country for their help and support of our own program. If everyone in America were blind to everything except his own narrow self-interest, the country would be in sad shape, and, among other things, most of rural America would be in darkness tonight.

And let me tell our great President something, too, and the Congress: Your Great Society is not going to work efficiently, in my opinion, unless and until the Federal Government, which in recent years has been abdicating its necessary role in the power field, reasserts itself in the consumer and public interest to bring all the known effi-

ciencies of giant electric power into being with the built-in controls and influences of a modernized yardstick.

We will continue to help you, Mr. President, with rural areas development—we have already done much—and we will help you with your war on poverty—and this for us will be in its finest sense "bread cast upon the waters," but please, Mr. President, in these areas you must help us to help you.

VI. NEED FOR MORE POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY

Finally this morning, I want to compliment and congratulate all of you on the magnificent job you did in saving your program at the polls in the elections last fall.

Certainly the spirit of that great event strode on before the event, and it lingers long after the event.

I don't have to detail for you now the stake this program had in the presidential election, what all of us did, or what the results were. You know that on the basis of the record, the election of Senator Goldwater would have meant the end of the rural electrification program we have known. You know that we all mobilized as never before in our history in grim determination that this would not happen. And you know that largely as a result of these efforts President Johnson piled up the largest rural vote of all time.

While you were about it, you also decided to do something about a number of Congressmen with long and clear records against us, and to do more in support of many Congressmen and Senators who had long supported us. Partly as a result is a Congress that as a whole seems more favorable to us than any in the past decade.

In a political sense, you came of age last fall. You developed a political maturity that you never had before, and it carries with it both responsibilities and opportunities. Whether we like it or not, our entire political posture has changed, and we can never go backward.

The men we helped elect cannot be abandoned. If they are to fight for us, we must support them. Another day, in another year, they will have to run again. We hope they will run on their support of our programs. Where will you—all of us—be on that day?

Because our program was established by public action and exists by public consent and support, it has always been in politics, though not partisan politics. There have always been in both parties those who supported us and those who opposed us, and whom, in varying degrees, we either supported or opposed.

The difference now is that we have learned to be effective in politics, and we must be even more effective in the future—even to the point of seeing to it that the candidates nominated by both parties be friendly toward us.

We know how to mobilize our own program—and we must learn how to work effectively with others whose overall best interests coincide with ours.

We are strong in rural areas where others are weak. They are strong in mushrooming urban areas where we are weak. Surely simple commonsense dictates that we seek each other out, find whatever areas of agreement we can, and then work together. Our electric consumers information committee, through which two dozen organizations work together in the power area—cooperative, power groups, trade unions, farm organizations—is proof positive that this can be done.

I strongly urge that in every State you take the initiative now to find the groups with whom you can work effectively, and form your alliances.

During these next few days you are going to be hearing a lot more about the future. I know you'll do some hard thinking and participate in the discussions. The program needs your ideas and your help.

Through your accomplishments in several areas, you are now in a strong position to deal with the future more on your own terms. You have the strength and know-how to make your own program secure, to help shape the future of the whole power industry, and to help make the world a better place for all of us.

IN CONCLUSION

Yes, Coleridge wrote, "In today already walks tomorrow"; and I hope that on this day all of us can have the vision to see the needs of tomorrow, the wisdom to find the solutions to those needs, and the courage to do whatever must be done.

Vision, wisdom, courage—these are hallmarks of the great; and this is a program touched with greatness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, Calendar No. 51, House Joint Resolution 234, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A 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 VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution.

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

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have some brief preliminary remarks to make on the pending joint resolution, however, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] also has some brief remarks; and since he must leave soon for another important appointment, I waive making my opening remarks at this time in order that he may be heard.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida.

As we consider supplemental funds for the Department of Agriculture to carry out of its price-support commitments, we do so in the light of the disturbing fact that the farm parity index as of mid-January declined to 74 percent, down from 75 percent since 1939.

If we look more closely into the reasons for this decline in the parity index, we discover it is not due to a reduction in farm prices—which in fact increased 1 percent between mid-December and mid-January. Rather it is due to the steady, almost relentless, increase in prices paid by farmers, which are up 1¼ percent in January compared with December.

This is the continuation of a long-term upward trend in farm costs. In 1947, farm costs were $17 billion, less than 50 percent of gross farm income of $34.4 billion.

Since 1947, gross farm income has been increasing steadily. But farm production costs have been going up much faster. In 1964, gross farm income was $42 billion, but farm costs had increased to $29 billion—70 percent of gross farm income.

Thus, between 1947 and 1964, production costs have increased from less than 50 percent of gross income in 1947 to 70 percent of gross income in 1965.

This is the well-known cost-price squeeze in agriculture. The crucial factor adversely affecting farmers is not so much prices or gross incomes. The crucial factor is costs. January figures indicate that the situation is not improving—but is getting more critical. Costs are still going up.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing gross farm income, production expenses, net farm income, the ratio of costs to gross income and the parity ratio for each of the years 1947 to 1964, inclusive.

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

Year	Gross income	Production expenses	Net income	Ratio, expenses to gross	Parity ratio
	Billions of dollars			Percent	
1947	34.4	17.0	17.3	49.4	115
1948	34.9	18.9	16.0	54.1	110
1949	31.8	18.0	13.8	56.6	100
1950	32.5	19.3	13.2	59.4	101
1951	37.3	22.2	15.2	59.5	107
1952	37.0	22.6	14.4	61.1	100
1953	35.3	21.4	13.9	60.6	92
1954	33.9	21.7	12.2	64.0	89
1955	33.3	21.9	11.5	65.7	84
1956	34.6	22.6	12.0	65.3	83
1957	34.4	23.4	11.0	68.0	82
1958	37.9	25.3	12.6	66.8	85
1959	37.5	26.2	11.3	69.9	81
1960	37.9	26.2	11.7	69.1	80
1961	39.6	27.0	12.6	68.1	80
1962	41.0	28.3	12.6	69.0	79
1963	41.7	29.2	12.5	70.0	78
1964	42.0	29.4	12.6	70.0	75

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I do not know of any reason to suppose that it is necessary for farm costs to go up every year. There is no immutable law of nature that dictates this upward trend. Farm costs are manmade. The reasons that farm costs go up, at least many of them, are clear.

Whenever wage rates go up faster than productivity, the result is inevitable. Higher prices and costs.

The past five Presidents of the United States have been compelled to call on labor unions to be moderate in their wage demands. But it is unrealistic to suppose that labor union leaders can accept this counsel. Their responsibility is to their members, and their members expect them to get at least as much as other labor leaders. No, this is our responsibility—to so arrange the economic climate that labor unions can effectively represent and promote the interests of their members, but without excessive and inflationary wage increases.

Wage rates are also pushed up by other factors. Wage rates are pushed up by Government. Whenever we increase the minimum wage level, or extend minimum wage legislation to new groups, this pushes up not only the wage levels of those directly affected, but also the whole wage structure.

The maintenance of proper differentials between different categories of skills is in fact an essential public objective, since we must maintain proper incentives for people to increase their skills. Much evidence is available to indicate that when wage levels are pushed up at the bottom, the push extends to the whole wage pattern.

An increase in required overtime payments, or a reduction in the workweek would have the same inflationary effect on the cost-price situation.

We are also inclined to forget that the benefits bestowed on people by law for more generous retirement programs or benefits, or improved unemployment insurance benefits, do not come free. The cost of such benefits is not paid by Government or by employers. The costs are reflected primarily in prices.

Since farmers purchase not only the same items used for consumption as do other segments of the population, but also expend 70 percent of their gross income for production items, they are particularly affected by rising prices.

One of the most recent examples of Government action to increase farm costs has been the requirements imposed by the Secretary of Labor which must be met by farmers who wish to establish eligibility to employ farmworkers from Mexico, the British West Indies, Canada or other foreign origins.

Farmers who wish to establish such eligibility must offer continuously, whenever they are recruiting domestic workers, to enter into a written contract with each such domestic worker, under the terms of which the farmer promises to pay transportation, housing and occupational insurance for such workers, without charge to such workers—plus a wage fixed by the Secretary of Labor on an hourly basis, which must be paid to workers on a price rate basis no matter how little they produce.

The required hourly minimum wage which must be paid varies by State from $1.15 in Texas to $1.40 in California. This represents an increase of from 20 cents to 55 cents per hour. In addition to this minimum wage, farmers are required to provide without charge to the worker, transportation, both local and long distance, housing and occupational insurance.

I do not recall that the Congress has ever enacted legislation providing for a minimum wage for farmworkers. Yet the Secretary of Labor appears to have established by executive decree what the Congress has refused to provide by statutory enactment.

It can, of course, be argued that what the Secretary of Labor has required is not a minimum wage, because no penalty is imposed on those who do not pay the prescribed amounts. The only sanction is that the farmer is not eligible to employ foreign workers. But those farmers in those areas who grow high-labor-requirement crops commonly have no alternative. The practical effect of the Secretary's ruling is exactly the same as though imposed by statute.

Fortunately, producers of some crops have made great strides during the past 2 or 3 years toward mechanizing their operations. Such reduction in numbers of workers employed have been made in anticipation that the Labor Department and the Congress were taking actions to tighten the farm labor supply situation.

But many producers of many other crops have not been fortunate in having comparable new technology available to them.

In the case of many high-labor-requirement crops, the increased wage requirement will be farreaching.

For example, I doubt that U.S. producers of such crops as pickles and strawberries can compete with the growing pickle and strawberry industries of Mexico when they have to pay more for 1 hour of work than Mexican employers pay for a day. The production of such crops as lettuce and tomatoes, will certainly be expanded in Mexico and the Caribbean area.

We must, of course, enact the pending measure. We have no alternative but to provide funds for commitments that have been made, no matter how ill-advised they may have been. That is not the point I would make. The point I would make is that the Congress, and the executive branch, too, should recognize that there are many factors, and factors within our control, which bear on the economic status of farmers. We are often inclined to overlook these factors. Many legislative enactments that do not appear to be directly related to the interest of farmers have a greater impact on the economic position of farmers than farm program legislation.

As Congress progresses with its work in the year ahead, we will deal with a number of measures which, whatever else may be said for such measures, do involve cost increases for farmers. This is one of the possible adverse consequences that should not be lost sight of in the exercise of our legislative responsibility.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida once more for giving me the opportunity to make these remarks at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the pending joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234), as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Appropriations, recommends supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture amounting to $1,600 million.

The committee considered supplemental estimates proposed in House Document No. 59 totaling $1,742,209,000. The $1.6 billion recommended is $142,209,000 under the supplemental estimates, and is the same amount as approved by the House.

I wish to make a further statement in regard to some of the items carried in the joint resolution.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET LOSSES TO THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The joint resolution provides an additional appropriation of $1.1 billion to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for unreimbursed net losses sustained during fiscal 1963, and $100 million of unreimbursed loss sustained in fiscal 1962.

I wish I could advise the Senate that the reductions in the supplemental estimates totaling $142 million were a saving, but such is not the case. All of these reductions in the estimates will have to be reconsidered in some future appropriation bill. That is due in part to the fact that we are dealing with appropriations that are required under law to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation by appropriation for realized losses, already sustained in prior years, in the conduct of mandatory price support programs. We are also dealing with appropriations to meet the costs and expenses under Public Law 480.

Both the Congress and the executive branch have failed to act responsibly in making the necessary appropriations as required under various laws.

PROVISIONS AUTHORIZING REIMBURSEMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a summary furnished to the committee by the Department of Agriculture citing the various provisions of law authorizing or requiring appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for costs or losses sustained in carrying out various authorized programs.

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

APPROPRIATIONS FOR REIMBURSEMENT TO CCC FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES AND RESTORATION OF CCC CAPITAL IMPAIRMENT (PRIOR TO JULY 1, 1960) AND FOR REIMBURSING CCC FOR PROGRAMS FINANCED FROM CAPITAL FUNDS

I. PROVISIONS OF LAW AUTHORIZING OR REQUIRING APPROPRIATIONS

Restoration of CCC capital impairment

Act of March 8, 1938 (15 U.S.C. 713a-1), provided for annual appraisal of assets and liabilities of the CCC by the Secretary of the Treasury and further provided: "there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually * * * an amount equal to any capi-

tal impairment found to exist by virtue of an appraisal as provided herein."

This act, as amended by Public Law 312, approved March 20, 1954, carried the Williams amendments which provided for future restorations of capital impairment on the basis of realized losses and also that: "Such capital impairment shall be restored with appropriated funds as provided herein rather than through the cancellation of notes."

(NOTE.—Superseded by Public Law 87–155 authorizing appropriations to reimburse CCC for net realized losses sustained after June 30, 1960 (next under).)

Reimbursement to CCC for net realized losses

Public Law 87–155 (75 Stat. 391), August 17, 1961: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, * * * an amount sufficient to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for its net realized loss incurred during such fiscal year, as reflected in the accounts and shown in its report of its financial condition as of the close of such fiscal year. Reimbursement of net realized loss shall be with appropriated funds * * * rather than through the cancellation of notes."

The act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 783), increased CCC's borrowing authority from $12 billion to $14.5 billion.

Special milk

Public Law 86–446, April 29, 1960, amending Public Law 85–478 (7 U.S.C. 1446 note): "There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, separate from any other appropriation of funds for Commodity Credit Corporation, such amounts as may be deemed to be necessary to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for amounts advanced by it."

(NOTE.—The Agricultural Act of 1961, Public Law 87–128, title IV, authorized appropriations for fiscal years 1963 through 1967. Under this authority the 1963 appropriation was made to the Agricultural Marketing Service.)

Sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies and commodities disposed of for emergency famine relief to friendly peoples, titles I and II of Public Law 480

Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act—Public Law 480, title I (7 U.S.C. 1703(a)), July 10, 1954: "For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation * * * for commodities disposed of and costs incurred under titles I and II of this act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums," etc.

Long-term supply contracts, title IV of Public Law 480

Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, Public Law 480, title IV, as amended by Public Law 86–341 (7 U.S.C. 1736), September 21, 1959: "In carrying out this title, the provisions of sections * * * 103(a) * * * shall be applicable to the extent not inconsistent with this title."

Public Law 480, title I (7 U.S.C. 1703(a)), July 10, 1954 (sec. 103a): "For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation * * * for commodities disposed of and costs incurred under titles I and II of this act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums."

(NOTE.—Activity under this program started in December 1961.)

International Wheat Agreement

Public Law 421 (7 U.S.C. 1641), October 27, 1949, as amended: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation of its estimated or actual net costs."

Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile

Agricultural Act of 1956, Public Law 540, title II (70 Stat. 200 7 U.S.C. 1856), May 28, 1956: "In order to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for materials transferred to the supplemental stockpile there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts equal to the value of any such materials so transferred. The value of any such materials for the purpose of this subsection, shall be the lower of the domestic market price or the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of such transfer, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture."

National Wool Act

Agricultural Act of 1954, Public Law 690, title VII, National Wool Act (7 U.S.C. 1784), August 28, 1954: "For the purpose of reimbursing the Commodity Credit Corporation for any expenditures made by it in connection with payments to producers under this title, there is hereby appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, an amount equal to the total of expenditures made by the Corporation during the preceding fiscal year and to any amounts expended in prior fiscal years not previously reimbursed: *Provided, however*, That such amounts appropriated for any fiscal year shall not exceed 70 per centum of the gross receipts from duties collected during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceding the beginning of such fiscal year on all articles subject to duty under schedule 11 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended."

Grain for migratory waterfowl feed

Public Law 654 (7 U.S.C. 445), July 3, 1956: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its investment in the grain transferred."

(NOTE.—This appropriation item is now included under the Department of the Interior.)

Surplus grain for game birds

Public Law 87–152 (75 Stat. 389), August 17, 1961: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its investment in grain transferred."

(NOTE.—Appropriations to cover costs of grain transferred to States will be requested in a later budget. Appropriations to cover costs of grain transferred to the Department of the Interior will be requested by that Department.)

Cotton classing and tobacco grading

The 1952 Agricultural Appropriation Act (7 U.S.C. 414a), August 31, 1951: "Hereafter there may be transferred to appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof such sums from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation as may be necessary * * * such transfers to be reimbursed from subsequent appropriations therefor."

(NOTE.—This appropriation item is now included under Agricultural Marketing Service.)

Soil Bank Act

Agricultural Act of 1956, Public Law 540 (7 U.S.C. 1808(a)), May 28, 1956: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, including such amounts as may be required to make payments to the Corporation for its actual costs incurred under this section."

(NOTE.—Program completed. Direct appropriations made beginning in fiscal year 1958.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that corrective action should be promptly undertaken by the executive department to request the Congress to appropriate the amounts necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for all outstanding prior year losses, as well as to estimate carefully the costs of Public Law 480, the International Wheat Agreement, and any other related items for which mandatory appropriations are requested. In recent years, both the executive and the legislative branches have sought to make funds available only as needed to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to finance all authorized programs.

The committee believes that this pending supplemental would not be required if both branches had acted more responsibly in recent years in regard to the appropriations needed for this general purpose.

EXCERPTS FROM COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. President, in view of the importance of the pending joint resolution and the need to emphasize that the Commodity Credit Corporation appropriations should be considered on a more current basis, I request unanimous consent that portions of the committee report, accompanying the resolution, and dealing with the various appropriation items, including the language amendments dealing with Public Law 480, be included in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that the request of the Senator from Florida is that only the report be included in the RECORD, and that it does not involve acceptance of any recommendation in the report or any amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. I merely wish to have it placed in the RECORD in order to show those portions of the committee report which show the fiscal situation of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the failure to meet it in accordance with the law, and the amendments which we are recommending. I am not asking for action on the resolution at this time.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

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

EXCERPTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEE REPORT

The committee recommends an appropriation of $1,100 million to complete the restoration of unreimbursed losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal 1962 of $100 million, and to provide an additional $1 billion of reimbursement appropriation for unreimbursed losses sustained in fiscal 1963. The total net realized losses sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the conduct of mandatory price support and related farm programs for fiscal 1963 amounted to $2,654,853,000 and of this amount $1,574 million was appropriated to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in the regular Agricultural Appropriation Act for 1965. That amount, together with the $1 billion recommended in this resolution, restores all of the capital impairment for fiscal 1963, except for $80,853,000.

The need for this supplemental appropriation of $1,100 million results in part from the failure of the executive branch to request full restoration of net realized losses pursuant to Public Law 85–155, approved August 17, 1961, which authorizes appropriations to reimburse for such realized net losses as reflected on the accounts of the Corporation, as shown in its financial statement at the close

of each fiscal year. In addition, the Congress has not always provided the full amount of partial restoration estimates submitted by the Department; and this procedure of attempting to provide sufficient funds on an estimated basis to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to discharge all its mandatory operations has led to the need for this supplemental appropriation in the middle of fiscal year 1965. The committee strongly urges the Department to amend the budget for fiscal 1966 to request the full losses sustained in fiscal year 1964, and expects that in future budgets, the full amount of all unreimbursed losses for prior fiscal years, as finally determined, will be requested, including the $1,057 million of unreimbursed losses sustained in fiscal 1961 as a result of revaluation of the inventory.

The committee has included in the resolution under this appropriation head two provisions dealing with agricultural research. The first proviso will preclude the Department of Agriculture from proceeding to eliminate certain lines of research and to close out research stations which were listed in the announcement by the Secretary of Agriculture in his press release of last December 31. The committee believes that no formal action to close out the research announced by the Secretary should be taken until the committees of both Houses of Congress have acted upon these proposals to eliminate research in conjunction with the consideration of the regular agricultural appropriation bill for 1966. The second provision would authorize the use of available funds to provide for the installation of urgently needed temperature and humidity control equipment for the metabolism and radiation laboratory recently constructed at Fargo, N. Dak. The provision increases the limitation in the regular Agricultural Appropriation Act for renovation and alteration of research facilities and does not provide any additional appropriation since funds already made available will be used to carry out this urgently needed alteration in connection with the new facility.

PUBLIC LAW 480

The committee has considered the supplemental estimates transmitted in House Document No. 59 for Public Law 480, and recommends an additional appropriation of $250 million, for sales of commodities for foreign currencies authorized by title I of Public Law 480. This is a reduction of $23 million under the amount of the supplemental estimate and is the same amount as approved by the House. The Department did not request restoration of the House reduction. The supplemental appropriation recommended, together with $1,612 million appropriated in the regular appropriation act, will make a total of $1,862 million available in fiscal 1965 for financing expenses and costs incurred in the sale of agricultural commodities for foreign currencies.

A supplemental appropriation of $233,400,000 was proposed for financing the expenses under title IV, which authorizes long-term supply contracts for the sale of commodities. The House reduced the supplemental estimate to $200 million, a reduction of $33,400,000, and no restoration of the budget estimate was requested by the Department. The committee concurs in the amount approved by the House, which together with the $35 million already appropriated, makes a total available in fiscal 1965 of $235 million.

The supplemental appropriation is recommended to provide for increased expenses in the current year and to enable the Department to move in the direction of placing this program on a pay-as-you-go basis, and thereby further relieve the obligations against the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation for conduct of its mandatory farm program operations. Future appropriation requests for expenses of this program will be estimated on a more current basis, and as repayments of outstanding contracts are received, they will be applied against the yearly costs, and future appropriation estimates will be based upon gross annual program costs less the receipts from repayments under outstanding contracts.

As the resolution passed the House, it carried a limitation in regard to the export of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic. The committee recommends that the provision inserted in the House be stricken from the resolution. The text of the language stricken reads as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act".

In lieu of the language stricken, the committee recommends the inclusion in the resolution of the following provision:

": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act, except when such exports are necessary to carry out the Sales Agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest".

It is further the policy of Congress that most careful consideration should be given by the responsible agencies of our Government concerning the continued provision of assistance under this act to countries that are, directly or indirectly, hostile to the United States or that are providing assistance to groups or countries that are acting against the best interests of the United States.

In exercising said provisions of assistance, the Congress emphasizes that said assistance is contributed by the people of the United States of America out of taxes paid by them; it is not reasonable to expect them to want to renew said assistance to countries which permit the property of the United States of America to be destroyed and whose leaders make statements derogatory to our country.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

The committee recommends an additional appropriation for expenses of the International Wheat Agreement in the amount of $50 million. This amount, together with the sum of $31,838,000 carried in the regular Agricultural Appropriation Act, makes the total available during this fiscal year of $81,838,000. The amount recommended is $4,956,000 under the supplemental estimate and is the same amount as carried in the House bill. The additional appropriation is necessary to meet the expenses resulting from increased volume in wheat support payments for 1965 and to cover additional unrecovered expenses for 1964 program costs.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to continue briefly.

COMMENTS ON ELIMINATION OF RESEARCH

The committee adopted the provision inserted in the bill dealing with the closing out of research activities because it believes that due to the long-term nature of research activities and due to the outstanding contribution that agricultural research in particular has made to the efficiency of American agriculture, that the committee should be furnished with specific details affecting the proposed elimination of research. The committee has an opportunity to consider and pass upon the funds required for the establishment of research facilities and lines of research annually when it considers the appropriation requests for this purpose. The committee believes that more detailed information should be furnished to it and considered by it, and in my opinion, whenever and wherever research is no longer making a sound contribution in light of overall research expenditures and other expenditures, it should be phased out, or eliminated.

In other words, I completely approve the general philosophy of the Secretary, that items found to be no longer needed should be discontinued. However, I believe the responsibility is not wholly a matter for the Secretary to determine, as to what items are not now serving a useful purpose in research.

The announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture, as issued in a press release, is not in conformity with the usual approach to decreases in research activity. I expect to ask the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish more specific details in regard to the lines of research and locations of research which he proposes to eliminate. In his press release of December 31, 1964, he merely announced some general criteria which were used by the Department in arriving at the decision to eliminate research activities.

I believe the committee should be advised more fully in regard to how these criteria are specifically applied to stations to be closed and lines of research to be discontinued in accordance with the announcement made by the Secretary. In addition, the committee should be promptly advised as to the original purpose for the establishment of these lines of research and research stations; the accomplishments of such research activity if any; the problems which need further investigation; a summary description of current investigations and their objectives; the economic importance of the research investigations by activities or by commodity; whether the research is directed to and results in research findings of regional or local significance; and in cases of local significance, whether the State or States involved plan to continue their research activity. Finally, any other additional pertinent data, such as the economic importance of the affected commodity, should be promptly assembled and furnished to the committee.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I would suggest that upon receipt of such data from the Department, the subcommittee be furnished with copies and give early consideration to the additional justification material supplied by the Department, and then advise the Secretary of Agriculture as promptly as possible in regard to stations and lines of research in which the committee would concur in the proposed action by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Speaking only for myself, I do not want the Secretary of Agriculture to regard the action taken today, if it be taken, as a deterrent or to discourage him from making proposals for economy in reducing the cost of administration of any agricultural activity. I am sure that a number of these research activities which are proposed to be discontinued have possibly fulfilled their original objective and may warrant closing.

Since the Congress originally supported their establishment and has approved the funds for their operation over the years, it should have an opportunity to review any proposed action by the Department to close them out—and should have the opportunity to make this review prior to actual elimination of the project or activity. The normal procedure should be followed as is the case in connection with the budgetary proposal in this year's budget for fiscal 1966 to eliminate beginning next July 1 the Federal share of financing in connection with the cooperative eradication program to control the fire ant.

I commend the Secretary in that case, for following the normal and sound approach, although I may not agree with him in his recommendation. I wish that he had followed the same type of approach in connection with the large group of closings of research activities which he has suggested on his own judgment.

Another amendment is proposed by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking member of the subcommittee which is headed by me. It is an important amendment, requested by the Department of Agriculture. An explanation of the justification for it has been given by the Department of Agriculture in a written statement. Acting for the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, I ask unanimous consent that the explanation of the Department of Agriculture be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EXPLANATION SUBMITTED FOR THE COMMITTEE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ON BUILDING LIMITATION

This amendment would authorize the use of available funds to provide for urgently needed temperature and humidity control at the U.S. Metabolism and Radiation Research Laboratory, Fargo, N. Dak.

The new Laboratory at Fargo is a major link in research to develop ways to control insects effectively without hazard to man, animals, and plants from residues. Research at the Fargo Laboratory includes basic studies on the metabolism of agricultural chemicals in insects, plants, and livestock, and the development of sterility techniques for the control of insects.

In designing the Fargo Laboratory, it was recognized that critical control of temperature and humidity would be required in the radiological and quarantine wings. However, based primarily on the geographic location of the Laboratory, the Department and the project architect were of the opinion that a mechanical ventilating system would be satisfactory in maintaining desired summer temperatures in the remainder of the Laboratory facility.

Operation of the installation during the past summer months has definitely proven that the mechanical ventilating system, as designed and installed, will not provide the required critical control of temperature and humidity in the remainder of the Laboratory.

Plant and animal life respond directly to changes in temperature and humidity in research, and if an experiment is to be consistent these changes must be controllable throughout the entire year. Fluctuations in temperature and humidity influence the speed and rate of absorption of test insecticides into the insect and also influence the rate of metabolism of the insecticides within the insect. A similar problem exists in studies on the relative effect of various herbicides on plants or pesticides in animals. Therefore, in order for this facility to meet the requirements of the research, it will be necessary to convert the existing mechanical ventilating systems to a system properly designed to effectively control temperatures and humidity.

It is estimated that the cost of providing the required additional facilities will be $220,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the amendment relates to the use of funds already appropriated in an amount exceeding $200,000, to furnish humidity and temperature control facilities for the research facility at Fargo, N. Dak., which proved during the hot days of last summer to be unable to perform to advantage some of its functions due to the absence of those facilities at the station.

SALES AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. President, the pending joint resolution provides urgently needed funds for the conduct of mandatory agricultural programs. As passed in the other body, the resolution carried a provision that none of the appropriation under the head of "Public Law 480" shall be used to finance during the balance of the fiscal year the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such act.

In placing that provision in the resolution, the other body expressed by its action the sentiments of most Americans and many Members of Congress. Personally, I am sympathetic to the objective sought by the House. Following action by the House, the committee, on request of the Secretary of State, delayed further consideration of the resolution until such time as officials of the Department of State could be scheduled to present the views of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, had asked to be heard personally before the committee, but due to the delay incidental to his attendance at the Churchill funeral and his subsequent illness, our committee did not meet until February 1, when it heard Mr. George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, speaking for himself and the Secretary of State.

Following a complete hearing before the full committee, the committee met later on February 1 and considered whether it should eliminate the provision inserted in the House or to amend it.

After thorough consideration, the committee voted to adopt the amendment which appears on page 3 of the resolution, and which has already been placed in the RECORD for the information of Senators.

It will be noted that the committee struck out the language inserted in the House and in lieu of it inserted the same language that had been stricken and added the words "except when such exports are necessary to carry out the Sales Agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest". The amendment reported by the committee thus provides that any action under title I of Public Law 480 be limited to the fulfillment of the existing agreement between our country and Egypt, and that such action be taken only if the President first finds it is in the national interest to do so.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask a question in relation to the language which the Senator has read. Is it possible that the appropriation which is now being considered might carry over into a period following the fiscal year 1965?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not if the wording of the committee amendment is adopted. It is the purpose of the committee that funds be available only until the completion of the present fiscal year and only for the purpose of carrying out the terms of the existing contract, which has existed for nearly 3 years. Only then would the President determine whether the carrying out of that contract, or the partial carrying out of it, would be in the national interest of the United States.

Mr. MILLER. I understand the latter point, but I am wondering about the significance of putting into the amendment the language "during the fiscal year 1965" to which the Senator has just referred.

Mr. HOLLAND. The joint resolution is a supplemental appropriation measure. Therefore it should properly relate only to expenditures to be made in the fiscal year 1965. Our committee was very anxious to limit the wording placed in the joint resolution by the House amendment in two additional ways. The House limited it to no expenditures under title I. We limited it further to no expenditures under title I unless they were in fulfillment of that contract and unless they were made in the fiscal year 1965. So we think we have further limited it except for the possibility of partial or total expenditure of that balance, which the record shows is about $37 million. Only in the event that the President determines that it is in the national interest shall that expenditure be made.

Mr. MILLER. That was the point which the Senator from Iowa was trying to bring out. I have seen two different interpretations of that language appearing in the press. One interpretation was that the language "and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest" relates only to the carrying out of the agreement entered into October 8, 1962. That is one interpretation.

The other interpretation is that it not only covers that agreement, but also covers any further agreement from which these funds might flow, either during the balance of the fiscal year 1965 or after the end of the fiscal year 1965.

Mr. HOLLAND. I can say for the Senator's information that I believe it was the understanding of the whole committee—and the committee was not a unit in reporting the amendment—that we were limiting it entirely to the carrying out of the existing agreement within its allotted time period. The agreement expires June 30, 1965. Therefore, we

made this appropriation entirely a supplemental appropriation, and provided for the carrying out of it only in case the President made the determination that it was in the interest of this Nation to carry it out within that time and to the degree, of up to $37 million—if he should find it was to the interest of the United States.

Mr. MILLER. So that with respect to lines 13 and 14, which read:

And if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest—

That really means, within the intention of the committee, the same as saying—

and if the President determines that the financing of such exports under such agreement entered into October 8, 1962, is in the national interest.

That is implied.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is implied and, I believe, stated by the wording of the committee amendment, that we are discussing only the balance due upon an existing contract that we do not want to see welched upon, and only in the amount still due upon that contract, which is $37 million. That would be the maximum which could be spent; it could only be spent up to June 30 of this year, and only then in the event such a finding should be made by the President as is stated in the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry that I did not have the opportunity personally to discuss the subject with the Senator from Oregon but I understand that he and other Senators very much desire to proceed quickly to the third committee amendment, which is the amendment that deals with Public Law 480, the contract with Egypt, and the expenditure of any Federal funds in fulfillment of that contract. For that reason I am not going to make the customary request for the adoption of all amendments, but I hope that if the Senate feels it appropriate to do so it will, adopt the two preceding committee amendments. If there is any objection to them, at least the Senator from Florida has not heard it. The Senate could adopt the amendment relating to the closing of research stations, and the explanation of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. I have already placed in the RECORD an explanation of the second amendment, which was furnished by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will be in accord with the adoption of these two amendments at this time en bloc.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for his usual courtesy and cooperation. I know of no objections to the first two amendments. I suggest that the Senate adopt the first two amendments en bloc, which would leave the third amendment for debate, and then we can get on with the business. I think that there will be a relatively short debate on the subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would be very happy if that course were followed. There is one additional comment I should like to make. If the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] wishes to speak briefly on his amendment, I would desire to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President the record has been made by the insertions into the RECORD made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. So we have no further need to discuss the amendment, unless some questions are raised.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The President, I am strongly in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], which would postpone the closing of agricultural research stations such as the one at Newell, S. Dak. These facilities are urgently needed to strengthen our agricultural economy. The Newell station should certainly not be closed. If it needs modification and improvement, those changes should be made.

I hope that the Senate will approve the committee amendment so that we can carefully consider the future role of our agricultural research stations.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the supplemental appropriations bill we are today considering has gained importance with last Monday's action by the Senate Appropriations Committee in amending it to preclude the use of Public Law 88–573 funds in the elimination of agricultural research stations.

I am gratified that Senators of the Appropriations Committee voted without dissent to attach to House Joint Resolution 234 the language:

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 appropriations estimates for fiscal 1966.

For this reason, if no other, I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 234.

I am firmly convinced, Mr. President, that the Secretary of Agriculture in his decision of last December 31 to close horticultural research stations in a number of States, including Wyoming, acted arbitrarily and without statutory authority. I take this opportunity to publicly thank and applaud the Appropriations Committee Senators for their attention to this question by bringing to this floor language providing that this order will not be carried out "until after the Congress has considered and acted upon such plans for the elimination of research" in the course of debate on the agricultural appropriations bill.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed the text of a letter I prepared January 29 and mailed February 1 to Senators of the Appropriations Committee.

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

U. S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
February 1, 1965.

On December 31 last, the Secretary of Agriculture announced that for reasons of economy he had ordered the closing of a number of agricultural research stations, including the one at Cheyenne, Wyo. The Secretary stated that he hoped to effect savings of $8 million and an extensive reduction in USDA personnel, both of which objectives I wholeheartedly applaud. However, a study of the Cheyenne-based research station, as well as a study of the prerogatives under law enjoyed by the Secretary, leaves me firmly convinced that Mr. Freeman, in seeking to close the research station, has acted outside the context of the law and with total reliance upon the naked power of the Presidency.

The station is the only one of its kind in the Great Plains area conducting research on shrubs, trees, windbreaks, and ornamental horticultural products and vegetable crops.

I am writing, therefore, to ask your help in maintaining this research station and to offer a brief explanation of my reasons for believing the station should not be closed.

The Cheyenne station was created March 19, 1928, by Public Law 178 of the 70th Congress. This law provides in part that: "The Secretary of Agriculture be and he is thereby authorized and directed to cause * * * an experiment station of the Department of Agriculture to be established at or near Cheyenne, Wyo."

The act further provides: "It is hereby authorized to be appropriated each fiscal year necessary appropriations to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry on the experiments contemplated by this act."

Public Law 178–70 is codified (7 U.S.C. 387, 387–A) and is not amended. The Secretary is not empowered under Public Law 178–70 or under any general or unique powers given him by the Conrgess to close the Cheyenne station.

In a document on this question prepared at my request by the Library of Congress, the conclusion is reached that: "Since the Secretary does not appear to have been accorded any express statutory authority to close any one of these (agricultural research) stations on the ground of obsolescence or for any other specific purpose * * * [this] would appear to represent another attempted exercise by the President of a power to impound appropriated funds and thereby prevent their disbursement."

The Library of Congress report further states (in quoting 7 U.S.C. 361a to 361e, 387–390k) that Congress "has made it abundantly clear that these research stations were designed as permanent installations the continued operation of which was to be suspended for any appreciable duration only by warrant of statutory authority."

The importance of the agricultural research station to Wyoming is evidenced by press dispatches from my State's capital city, as well as by letters from scores of individuals and organizations all of whom, like myself, applaud true economy in government but cannot see justification in the closing of this important research facility.

It should be pointed out here that the research station is responsible for the most part in developing shelter-belt trees and shrubs over an area which includes about 150,000 square miles in sections of Wyoming, South Dakota, Colorado, Nebraska, and Kansas. The station is credited with developing the first strawberry plant hardy enough to survive the rugged Western and Great Plains

weather, and it is currently testing new potato crosses from the Greeley, Colo., area.

It is impossible to estimate the savings to ranchers and farmers realized as a direct result of this station's 38 years of operation, but it has certainly been many times more than the facility's modest $206,000 annual budget.

In an editorial from the January 4 Cheyenne, Wyo., State Tribune, the Secretary's economy argument is directly challenged. Says the newspaper: "We challenge the fact that any saving will be achieved at all * * * it merely produces the total disappearance or a function that has existed for nearly four decades in this region, working for the betterment of plant production." Copies of the Tribune editorial and a Wyoming Agriculture Department news release are enclosed with this letter.

Another point I should raise is that this dilemma facing the people of the Rocky Mountain West is not analogous to similar action by the Secretary of Defense, who does have the statutory authority to close certain facilities under his Department. Such specific authority has not been granted the Secretary of Agriculture by the Congress.

As I said at the outset, Senator, I need your help. It is my belief, based upon careful research, that the horticultural plant breeding station at Cheyenne is irreplaceable within the context of its expenditures. The information gleaned from research at this facility is of vital importance to farmers and ranchers throughout the West, and I am convinced further that the station does not constitute a financial liability but that it is, in fact, a most worthwhile and economical facility. Unless the Congress acts, however, it will be closed some time between April 1 and June 30 of this calendar year.

I ask that you use your influence and position on the Senate Committee on Appropriations in an effort to restore funds for this project when the appropriate legislation comes before your committee.

If the 89th Congress appropriates funds to provide for the facility at its present level of operation, I believe the station can be perpetuated despite the Secretary's wish that it be closed.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss this with you, and I thank you for your attention to this lengthy correspondence.

Sincerely yours,

MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have also written Secretary Freeman directing his attention to the points of law propounded in my letter to Senators. I have yet to receive the Secretary's reply.

Mr. President, the agricultural research station at Cheyenne is the only one of its kind in the Great Plains area conducting research on shrubs, vegetable crops, and windbreaks—areas of research vitally important to farmers and ranchers courageous enough to stake their future on the fickleness of nature in the Great Plains and Rocky Mountain area. This station was established by an act of Congress—the 70th Congress—on March 19, 1928.

I am unalterably opposed to this station's termination through Executive fiat or bureaucratic caprice. If the language of the Senate Appropriations Committee amendment to House Joint Resolution 234 is adopted, this station will have a new lease on life, and the Congress will have ample opportunity to perpetuate or terminate that which it created more than a quarter century ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the first two committee amendments may be considered en bloc. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 3, after the figures "$1,100,000,000", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following provisos:

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: *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.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, it is proposed to strike the language——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the legislative clerk read both of the preceding amendments together.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. They were considered en bloc.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The third committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 3, after the figures "$200,000,000", it is proposed to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act" and insert ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act, except when such exports are necessary to carry out the Sales Agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest".

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I understand, the amendment just read is the one about which the Senator from Oregon had some questions, and perhaps other Senators have similar questions. I ask, therefore, for the immediate consideration of that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, after line 3.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the parliamentary situation is perfectly clear; but I want to leave no room for doubt about it. So I shall raise a parliamentary inquiry or two, and then suggest the absence of a quorum. The call need not be for a full quorum. However, I promised certain Senators that when this particular amendment was reached, I would see to it that there was a quorum call.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. As I understand, the amendment now pending is the amendment to the appropriation bill that proposes to modify the action taken by the House in regard to the so-called Nasser issue, involving the shipment of Public Law 480 food to Egypt.

It seems to me that we are indebted to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for bringing this amendment to us in the most simple form, a form that calls for either the acceptance or the rejection of the Senate committee's amendment.

Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that if the Senate should reject the amendment offered by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, that would then leave the bill in the same form in which it came to the Senate from the House; namely, that it would contain the House action which seeks to deny the administration the authority to ship some $37 million more of Public Law 480 food to Egypt?

The VICE PRESIDENT. As the Chair understands the inquiry of the Senator from Oregon, if the amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations were rejected, the situation would be that the language that came to the Senate committee from the House would remain in the text of the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Chair means on this one point, does he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; the so-called third amendment in the joint resolution.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I commend the Senator from Florida for handling the problem procedurally in the way he has. It provides the Senate with a clear-cut issue to vote up or down. I should not think the debate need be long. I shall make a short speech if I am recognized after the quorum call.

Unless the Senator from Florida wishes to make some comment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is perfectly acceptable to me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the majority leader has suggested that I might wish to protect my right to the floor, if I can obtain unanimous consent to proceed with my speech immediately after the quorum; so with that understanding I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest that the quorum be live and that Senators be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

[No. 15 Leg.]

Aiken	Harris	Morton
Allott	Hart	Mundt
Anderson	Hayden	Murphy
Bartlett	Hill	Nelson
Bass	Holland	Neuberger
Bayh	Hruska	Pearson
Bennett	Inouye	Pell
Bible	Javits	Prouty
Boggs	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Brewster	Jordan, Idaho	Randolph
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Cannon	Lausche	Simpson
Carlson	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Case	Long, La.	Smith
Church	Magnuson	Sparkman
Clark	Mansfield	Stennis
Cooper	McClellan	Symington
Cotton	McGee	Thurmond
Curtis	McGovern	Tower
Dirksen	McIntyre	Tydings
Douglas	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Miller	Yarborough
Ervin	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Fong	Montoya	
Gore	Morse	

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], 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 Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I proceed with my statement, with many Senators present in the Chamber, I believe I should state the parliamentary situation. With the cooperation and unfailing courtesy of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], we are in a situation in which the pending amendment is the Appropriations Committee's amendment dealing with the issue of whether or not $37 million worth of Public Law 480 food should go to Nasser if the President, in his discretion, should decide it is in our national interest to send it to Nasser.

That is the way it ought to be done. We ought to vote it up or down. The issue before us now is whether to support the committee amendment, which would permit the food to go to Nasser if the President should decide it is in the national interest, or follow the House position of not sending it to Nasser.

The senior Senator from Oregon takes the position that the Senate should take the position taken by the House, for reasons that I shall set forth, I may say for the relief of all Senators, in a relatively brief manuscript.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator clear up one question? Apparently there are contracts covering certain amounts of food aid which are not covered in the $37 million, and the $37 million is an uncommitted fund. I ask the Senator whether or not it is clear that the House language deals only with the $37 million and does not affect any agreement, though there may have been no deliveries under it yet, which relates to specific items of food.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As briefly as I can, I shall explain the situation. This contract, soon to be 3 years old, expires June 30, 1965, and approximately $37 million of commodities, distributed between three of the commodities covered by the agreement, have not yet been committed in any way to Egypt for delivery.

There is an additional amount, which I think has caused the question by the Senator from New York, of some $30 million, which was asked for by Egypt, and, with respect to which commitment was given. About half of it has been actually contracted for by distributing firms in this Nation, since the distributions are handled that way.

It is my understanding that this amendment not only does not cover that half which is being handled, and some of it may be on the water; it does not cover the other substantially $15 million worth, because that has been completely committed to Egypt and it is presently being farmed out to the various distribution agencies and businesses of this Nation, and through similar businesses in Egypt. No contention has been made—in our committee, at least, or otherwise; and I do not make any such contention—that any part of the $30 million is involved in this issue.

It is my belief, from all the evidence presented and from every statement I have been able to obtain, that the only thing involved is whether or not the $37 million shall be left in the joint resolution, and to allow the President to determine in his discretion, that it is in the national interest to deliver any part of that $37 million commitment.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from Florida that that is my understanding.

Mr. JAVITS. Am I to understand that in the Senator's effort to persuade the Senate to accept the House language, which would have the net effect of rejecting the Senate committee amendment, the Senator makes no contention that the House language would inhibit action as to any other commitment, but only as to the $37 million? Of course, that strips of validity the argument that we are going back on a contract or contracts which may be in channels of distribution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD from page 89 of the printed hearings the list furnished by the Department of Agriculture showing the commodities still undelivered, amounting to $36,972,000, broken down into four different groups. The largest is for wheat and there is a smaller amount for vegetable oils. There is a small amount for NFD milk, and a small amount for tobacco.

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

Funds remaining available for new PA's
(Jan. 28, 1965)

Commodity:	*Millions*
Wheat	$22.432
Corn	-------
Vegetable oils	5.59
Tallow	-------
NFD milk	0.1
Poultry	-------
Tobacco	8.85
Dry beans	-------
Butter-butter oil-ghee	-------
Cheese	-------
Beef	-------
Total	36.972

Mr. HOLLAND. I make the statement again for the RECORD. I understand that my learned friends from New York and Oregon agree that this is what is involved in the language of the House, and therefore in the amendment of the Senate committee.

Mr. JAVITS. The important thing that we are seeking to do is to show our disapproval of Nasser's policy. It should not be complicated with any other questions of contracts, or food which people expect—and have the right to expect—or anything else. It is a straightforward issue: how to show how thoroughly we disapprove.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because I believe that continuity of presentation is important to an understanding of my position in connection with this amendment, I shall not yield until I finish my brief speech, and then I shall be happy to yield for any questions Senators may wish to ask.

Mr. President, the committee amendment to the House amendment on food sales to the United Arab Republic should be rejected. It simply restores the sale of food to that country through June 30, 1965, and nullifies the House amendment.

The committee amendment states that funds appropriated may be used to carry out exports to the United Arab Republic under the sales agreement entered into in October of 1962 if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest.

Since the administration has been continuing sales under that agreement, we know that it has already made the determination mentioned. We also know that despite what Under Secretary Ball has told the Appropriations Committee, that the President is not necessarily going to carry it out, our Ambassador in Cairo has been working hard to assure Nasser and his officials that the administration is doing everything it can to carry it out.

The New York Times of February 2 carries the story. It says:

But Mr. Ball made clear that it was by no means certain the President would so decide. "I'm not saying the President is necessarily going to carry it out," he said.

Two columns over is its special report from Cairo, dated February 1. It says in part:

Ambassador Battle met with President Nasser tonight to outline the administration's effort to continue American food shipments to Egypt, and to discuss the future of the aid program.

Later in the same story:

In the last few days Mr. Battle is understood to have given high Egyptian officials reassurances of the administration's intention to continue aid to the United Arab Republic.

Experience has taught me that what the U.S. State Department tells foreign governments is far more reliable than what it tells the American Congress.

I would even go so far as to say that the Department would tell Congress almost anything to get past this potential legal limitation on food sales to Egypt. It, too, has learned by experience that Congress is too timid to exercise its own powers in these matters. It knows that we are, indeed, the sapless branch because we are afraid to exercise our constitutional powers where they have an effect upon international issues or problems. So we delegate one more congressional function to the executive branch, and thereby bleed a little more of the sap from our veins.

We hear from the administration that it needs flexibility, although it never flexes but only bends before any demands made upon it by a foreign government.

We hear it said that "the stakes are high in the Middle East," which is the euphemism for American oil interests. We hear that if the United States does not meet Nasser's price the Russians would be glad to, because it would give them additional influence upon our oil interests.

In fact, I understand that the Under Secretary of State never even so much as whispered the word "oil" during his testimony before the Appropriations Committee. However, the American people can be sure that oil is always uppermost in the minds of the top officials of the State Department when they are trying to sell a program to the Congress in getting along with the dictators of the Middle East and, for that matter, dictators in other parts of the world, such as Sukarno in Indonesia.

Although it may be said that Egypt does not have oil, the fact is that Nasser is the chief political leader of the Arab world, and his political power in the Arab world stands as a constant threat to American oil interests. Any time he wants to make trouble for us, he can use his political power in the Arab world to start a diplomatic squeeze play on oil.

It needs to be pointed out to the American people that American foreign policy in many parts of the world oozes with oil. Prick that foreign policy in many places, and oil diplomacy oozes out.

What does the oil-oriented State Department suggest to the Congress in response to Dictator Nasser's vicious anti-American campaign after a USIS library of thousands of volumes is sacked and burned and the building destroyed, after uncontrolled mobs are allowed to destroy American property and deface American symbols, after Nasser makes not one but several speeches insulting the United States and in effect, uses an Arab figure of speech which in American vernacular means, "Go jump in the lake"?

The oil-oriented State Department oozes forth with the proposal that we must try to get along with Nasser by sending him $37 million more of Public Law 480 food that belongs to the taxpayers of the United States.

In Indonesia, another dictator, Sukarno, does not tell the United States to go jump in the lake, he actually tells us to take our aid and go to hell.

What does the oil-oriented State Department do in response? It engineers the White House into continuing the full delivery of foreign aid to Sukarno in spite of the fact that Congress, in the last session, notified the White House by an amendment to the foreign aid bill that it was opposed to sending more foreign aid to Indonesia. It is true that the so-called Presidential escape clause was attached by the Congress to the restriction on aid to Indonesia. This escape clause permitted the President to send aid to Sukarno if he, the President, found and reported to the Congress that, in his opinion, it was vital to the interests of the United States to continue the aid.

Congress cannot justify giving any such unchecked power to the President of the United States. Under our system of checks and balances, Congress has the legislative authority to determine what countries shall get aid, in what amount, and under what conditions. It should not delegate that authority to the President. We are dealing here not with any inherent power of the President. We are dealing with the statutory power of Congress. Foreign aid rests upon the statutory power of Congress exercising its legislative power over the expenditure of hard-earned taxpayers' dollars, which constitutes no interference with any right of the President.

Any time the President believes that it would be in the vital interest of the United States to supply foreign aid to any dictator who is threatening to drive American interests out of his country, and who insultingly tells the United States to take its aid and go to hell, he can either appear before the Congress or send a message to the Congress requesting legislative action by way of passing a special bill granting such aid. Of course, we all know that if Congress would stop abdicating its legislative power in the field of foreign aid by delegating it to the President and started requiring the President to get specific legislative approval covering such shocking fact situations as exist in Indonesia, the President would never be able to get the legislation passed. He would not be able to get it passed, because American public opinion would rise up in opposition to it. Then Congress would recognize the force of that public opinion.

The behind-the-scenes maneuvering of the State Department which it has been doing in connection with Nasser and Sukarno is a good example of what I mean when I say that the American people are having concealed from them time and time again the background facts and motivating causes that are producing the many unsound recommendations of the State Department to the White House in the field of foreign policy.

I am satisfied that one of the major reasons for our State Department's appeasement policies toward Sukarno is spelled out in a three-letter word—oil. Most Americans do not know that there is a billion to a billion and a quarter dollars worth of American oil investments in Indonesia, in addition to which other governments, such as the British and the Dutch have extensive investments in Indonesia. The most reliable information I have been able to find is that oil production in Indonesia amounts to at least 444,000 barrels a day. Esso has a refinery in Indonesia with a run of 65,000 a day. The Shell Refinery has a run of 85,000 barrels. Pan-American Oil Co. entered Indonesia in 1963. The Union Oil Co. has engaged in talking negotiations at least with the Indonesian Government. Caltex Pacific Oil Co., California & Texas Oil Cos., Standard Oil of New Jersey, Shell Indonesia owned by British and Dutch interests are the major oil companies operating in Indonesia. The oil export from Indonesia is estimated to be a minimum of $250 million a year. All these oil companies have had a great deal of trouble with Sukarno, because from time to time, he has threatened to nationalize them and take them over.

American oil companies are rushing as fast as they can to build a huge refinery in South Vietnam. That will not be the last one, if we continue our policy in South Vietnam. I am one Senator who will not sacrifice American boys for oil anywhere. The American people will not be either when they get the facts.

In 1963, Sukarno went to Tokyo, and representatives of the American Government carried on long negotiations with him, resulting in a so-called oil contract agreement.

I am discussing the Indonesian situation, long with the Egyptian situation, because we are dealing with two tyrants of the same stripe, and we are dealing with two tyrants who are following the same tactics. Thus far they have been able to have their way with our State Department, which in my judgment, is following a shameful program of appeasement of dictators in many facets of American foreign policy.

How long this will last in Indonesia, is, of course, up to Sukarno. With his cuddling up to the Chinese Communist leaders, as evidenced by the recent trade and economic and military aid agreement, announced as a result of the negotiations with the Chinese leader and Sukarno's foreign minister, Subandrio, in Peiping, I am willing to make judicial notice that it is only a matter of time before the oil-oriented diplomacy of the State Department in Indonesia will be in more trouble.

In a very real sense, the economic aid that our Government has been supplying Sukarno to the expense of the American taxpayers constitutes a form of economic subsidy to American and foreign oil interests in Indonesia. To put it more bluntly, it is protection money; it is payoff money; it is bribe money.

When are we going to learn that these international crooks, such as Nasser and Sukarno, will not stay bought? We only stultify our own country by engaging in such corrupt oil-oriented diplomacy. Sooner or later, Communist-oriented Sukarno is going to throw us out of Indonesia anyway.

The American taxpayers are entitled to have our Government stop throwing away their money in such places as Egypt and Indonesia. The American people are also entitled to have their Congress exercise its checking power upon the executive branch of Government by refusing to pass foreign aid legislation in such form as permits the State Department and the Pentagon Building and the White House to implement with American taxpayers' dollars such unsound foreign aid programs as the State Department and the White House propose to continue to implement in Egypt and Indonesia.

I ask unanimous consent that certain articles on this subject be inserted in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment before the Senate places squarely before the Senate both an opportunity and a duty to stop the State Department and the White House from continuing an unsound aid program in Egypt. Nasser, by his anti-American course of action, has abrogated any claim on his part to a continuation of American foreign aid. That is an elementary tenet of contract law. The U.S. Government owes it to the American taxpayers to stop sending to Nasser $37 million worth of Public Law 480 food which is what we would be sending if the Senate Appropriations Committee action should stand. In my judgment, if the State Department has its way, that is what we will be sending. Not only that, but if the Senate folds in regard to this item of foreign aid, I am satisfied, judging from past experience with the State Department, that we will have in the not too distant future some more oil-oriented foreign policy proposals made to us for a continuation of another round of economic aid to Nasser.

The coating of oil slick should be removed from the cloak of American foreign policy, and the issue raised by this amendment offers the Senate an opportunity to back up the House in the foreign aid drycleaning job it started. I would have the Senate take a further look at Nasser's policies as an aggressor and a dangerous threat to peace in the world.

Nasser invades Yemen at a very high human and financial cost; he aids the Congo rebels and we offset it by raising our own aid to Tshombe; he maintains a costly military establishment reinforced by a nuclear and missile research program; he enables Egyptian students to attack and burn the property of the U.S. Government. But still and all, so long as he does not move against our oil interests there are those who still believe he is deserving of the largess of the American taxpayers.

Humanitarian aid? No, Mr. President, we are not talking about humanitarian aid under Public Law 480. That is not involved here. The House amendment did not in any way touch the food the President may give away under title II to meet the food needs of people stricken by famine or other natural disaster.

Nor did the House language stop the sale of food under Public Law 480 for hard currency. That involves some contracts, to which the Senator from New York has referred. We can still sell it to Nasser for hard currency. He would not want much under those conditions. Only soft currency sales are affected by the House amendment. This is another concealment of cause and effect from the American people with respect to foreign aid and foreign policy.

People talk about sales for soft currency. They say to the American people that the soft currency piles up. To a large extent it is no sale at all, because only a small part of the soft currency ever benefits the American people. Under international arrangements, we cannot even spend that soft currency unless we obtain the consent of the country in which the currency is stored. We have great stacks of it around the world, and we are not able to spend it, because before we can spend it we must obtain the consent of the country involved, and it must first make a finding that its use will not cause any monetary or economic problem within that country.

That is why Senators have not found me enthusiastic about so-called soft sales. It is much better to make loans and to have them paid back in the course of time in hard money at interest rates which cover the cost of the use of the money for the protection of the American taxpayer, thus giving us a very interesting check, which results in a remarkably practical assurance that they will not be asking for loans except for projects that are feasible, for projects that will pay out, for projects that are economically sound, culturally desirable, and will help raise the standard of living of the people. That is what we are interested in.

Mr. President, we shall win this great contest between totalitarianism—the most vicious form of which is communism—on the one hand, and freedom on the other. We must follow a foreign policy that will bring the benefits of economic freedom to the masses of the people in the countries which we seek to help.

I shall continue to do everything I can to help support programs that will help the people of Egypt and the people of any Arab State. We shall not help them if we turn the control over to their dictators, for their dictators have demonstrated time and time again that it is not people that constitute their primary concern. That is why we must try to devise loan programs invested in given projects that will give definite benefits to the people in order to raise their standard of living.

So, Mr. President, I say that there is no humanitarian aid involved in the subject matter of the amendment.

It is only the soft currency sales that are affected by the House amendment. It is only the soft currency sales that permit Nasser to import American foodstuffs, sell them within the United Arab Republic, and use the proceeds for the purposes of government specified in the agreement. American food on those terms permits the United Arab Republic to finance its foreign aggressions and intrigues out of income it would otherwise have to spend to feed its people.

What we are in fact doing to a remarkable degree in regard to the sale of food to Nasser is helping Nasser to invade Yemen. We are helping Nasser to carry on his support of the rebels in the Congo. We are helping Nasser to build up a foreign policy pattern in the Middle East that jeopardizes the best interests of the United States. It may not jeopardize the present immediate best interests of the oil companies. But, Mr. President, it does not advance the cause of human freedom around the world; it sets it back. We must follow through on these sales. We must analyze what the benefit of this food is to Nasser as a dictator in carrying out a foreign policy that shocks the free world, a foreign policy of aggression, a foreign policy that, if we do not stop it, will fan the flames of a great war in that part of the world.

Mr. President, we cannot put our stamp of approval upon Nasser's foreign policy. We cannot escape the hard, cold, financial fact that we are helping him financially by this program; and when we help him financially, we in fact indirectly help finance his shocking foreign policy program.

I tell Members of Congress that once this bill is enacted without the House amendment in it, the State Department will furnish the remainder of the $30 million under the existing agreement, the $37 million more that Nasser was expecting to receive under the agreement, and it will negotiate a new agreement to replace the one that expires on June 30 of this year.

Senators can talk all they like about what promises were made about "consultation" with Congress or a committee of the Congress. But no committee can speak for the Congress. In order to avoid floor action in the two Houses of the Congress, one of the gimmicks of the State Department in recent years, by way of retreat—and they do not even like to make this retreat—is to try to offer to the Congress some arrangement whereby they will "consult" with some committee. Committees are not the Congress. If we are to carry out our responsibilities under the checking system of the Constitution, we must insist that those questions be determined by both Houses of the Congress. The "gimmick" of a consultation with the committee, in my judgment, is nothing but an evasive, digressive strategy.

The only consultation that will take place will be that which informs us as to

why a certain thing was done. That is the conception of "consultation" that is practiced with Congress on the administration of foreign policy legislation.

We have put ourselves in this position by accepting time after time, year after year, the same excuses and arguments for "executive flexibility." Our constituents know, of course, that the Constitution gives to Congress the powers that are being exercised under this bill. It does not give them to the executive branch. Every insult, every intrigue against American friends in Africa and the Middle East which Nasser undertakes with American subsidy is the fault and the responsibility, in the last analysis, of the Congress, not the President, because we authorized it and we allow it to continue, unless we start stopping it here this afternoon. By continuing aid under these circumstances, we invite others to imitate and improve upon Nasser's blackmail technique of getting aid from the United States.

We cannot really evade this responsibility by turning the decision over to the executive branch to make. I think most of our constituents have already seen through that.

The committee amendment means that Nasser's United Arab Republic is to continue receiving American food, and I believe it should be rejected.

Mr. President, as I said at the beginning, the parliamentary situation gives us a clear choice—the choice of voting again to delegate to the President more power that belongs under the Constitution of the United States to the Congress, or to exercise our legislative responsibility for foreign aid. If extraordinary circumstances develop during the life of administering a foreign aid program, and the President would like to do something with a program which the Congress has not legislatively authorized him to do, let him send up a message. Let him, in keeping with our system of checks and balances and in keeping with that great program of a three-branch system of government, coordinated and coequal, carry out his function as President. He can respect that system by saying to Congress, "I send you this message and request legislative action to carry out the following suggestions. I think X country, in spite of a course of action that it has followed, ought to receive Y dollars of aid."

Then let us debate that aid proposal. Then we shall be carrying out our system of three coordinate and coequal branches of the government. That is not what the committee amendment says. The committee amendment says, "Let the President decide it for us."

I close by saying that this amendment by the committee is really another proposal to surrender more legislative power to the executive branch of Government.

This proposal is to enlarge the power of the President. I respectfully submit, because I am a supporter of the President—and I yield to no one in my support of the President—that I have a duty and a trust to disagree with him when I am satisfied that he proposes something that is not in the public interest. The President's attempt to obtain this enlarged delegation of power this afternoon is not in the interest of the people of this country, and the President should be stopped in his attempt to obtain such authority.

I close by urging the Senate to reject the amendment of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which has become known in this debate as amendment No. 3. By rejecting it, the bill will be left with the House language in it; and when the House language is left in it, Nasser will not get the $37 million worth of food. But he will get something else. He will get an answer from an America that is finally awakened to the responsibility of making clear to tyrants such as Nasser, Sukarno, and the others that we cannot be blackmailed and will not continue a program which, if we continue it, will be interpreted by many as a foreign aid program based upon the false notion that we can buy tyrants and that they will stay bought.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1965]

SENATE UNIT EASES BAN ON CAIRO FOOD: APPROPRIATIONS PANEL HEEDS WHITE HOUSE PLEA FOR FREE HAND IN AFRICA

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, February 1.—The Senate Appropriations Committee voted today to let President Johnson complete a surplus food sales agreement with the United Arab Republic if he finds it in the national interest.

Last Tuesday the House of Representatives, by a vote of 204 to 177, declared that no part of the $1.6 billion supplemental appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation could be used to finance food exports to the United Arab Republic.

The House action would have meant that $37 million worth of commodities—all that remains of $431.8 million worth that the United States agreed 3 years ago to sell to the United Arab Republic for local currency—would not have been delivered.

[In Cairo, President Gamal Abdel Nasser conferred with Ambassador Lucius D. Battle in their first meeting this year. West Germany's Ambassador to Cairo was called home to report on the worsening relations between Cairo and Bonn.]

Today the Senate Appropriations Committee, by a vote of 17 to 6, agreed to retain the House ban, but then added the following language: "Except when such exports are necessary to carry out the sales agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest." Thus did the committee accede to the administration argument that Congress should not limit the President's constitutional responsibility in foreign affairs, while registering at the same time its disapproval of continued aid to President Nasser as long as he persisted in anti-American acts and speeches.

The administration was not only agreeable to the action of the Senate committee but also welcomed it. A nose count had indicated that the Senate might well go along with the House unless the President himself took responsibility for carrying out the remainder of the agreement.

In fact, the committee did exactly what Under Secretary of State George W. Ball requested it to do during testimony this morning.

Mr. Ball said that relations between Washington and Cairo in recent weeks "have been anything but satisfactory." He candidly admitted that it was impossible to say "whether it will be possible to bring about the kind of understanding between the United States and the United Arab Republic that can contribute to peace and stability in the Near East and in Africa."

EFFORT NEEDED

If relations are to be improved, he went on, "it will take a substantial effort by the United Arab Republic and not merely by the United States."

The State Department is not advocating "a policy of weakness," Mr. Ball said. He said U.S. relations with the United Arab Republic involved a "highly moving situation," and it was necessary to proceed "with coolness and great caution."

"All I'm saying is that the President should have power to complete it (the agreement) if he decides it is to the advantage of the United States," Mr. Ball said.

But Mr. Ball made clear that it was by no means certain the President would so decide.

"I'm not saying the President is necessarily going to carry it out," he said.

Meanwhile, it was learned that the President was considering sending letters to Senators MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana and EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the Democratic and Republican leaders, which would set forth the administration's policy toward Egypt.

URGED BY SENATORS

Several Senators have urged the President either to send such letters or to make a White House statement of policy in order to reassure some Members and give others a defensible explanation to their constituents for not supporting the House action.

Nevertheless, some officials said today that the President was resisting either a statement or a letter to the Senate leadership.

In a brief floor speech today, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, said he wanted to give the President a free hand in foreign policy. But he said that unless there was some assurance that the United Arab Republic "will not torpedo U.S. foreign policy, then I think we have no alternative but to go along with the House."

State Department officials emphasized today that the administration was as angry as Congress over the supplying of arms to the Congolese rebels by the United Arab Republic, the burning of the U.S. Information Library in Cairo and President Nasser's telling the United States to take its aid and "jump in the Mediterranean."

Mr. Ball assured the committee today that the administration would consult Congress before undertaking new aid agreements with the United Arab Republic.

For its part the committee added two paragraphs to its report on the bill that were a warning both to the administration and President Nasser. It said:

"It is further the policy of Congress that most careful consideration should be given by the responsible agencies of our Government concerning the continued provision of assistance under this act to countries that are, directly or indirectly, hostile to the United States, or that are providing assistance to groups or to countries that are acting against the best interests of the United States.

"In exercising said provisions of assistance, the Congress emphasized that said assistance is contributed by the people of the United States of America out of taxes paid by them; and it is not conducive for them to want to continue said assistance to countries which permit the property of the United States of America to be destroyed and whose leaders make statements derogatory of our country."

NASSER MEETS WITH ENVOY

CAIRO, February 1.—Ambassador Battle met with President Nasser tonight to outline the administration's efforts to continue American food shipments to Egypt, and to discuss the future of the aid program.

Qualified sources said Mr. Battle also talked with the Egyptian President about the

Congo situation where previously Washington's and Cairo's policies have clashed.

It was their first meeting since December 19 and since President Nasser had publicly accused the Ambassador of arrogance and rudeness toward Egypt in a pre-Christmas speech.

TENSION RELAXES

Despite the congressional battle over Egyptian aid, the atmosphere of American-Egyptian relations has relaxed considerably here. Constant Egyptian speculation that Ambassador Battle would be replaced has ceased and a number of high Egyptian officials have privately complimented the Ambassador.

Although neither side would go into specifics of the discussion today, diplomatic sources disclosed that recently the United States has been sounding out a number of African governments on the possibilities of working out a compromise government in the Congo with Moise Tshombe removed from the scene.

It was presumed that this was touched upon tonight.

On the aid question Mr. Battle took with him late reports of the administration's campaign to beat off House restrictions on surplus food shipments in return for local currency.

In the last few days Mr. Battle is understood to have given high Egyptian officials assurances of the administration's intention to continue aid to the United Arab Republic.

[From the New York Times, May 21, 1963]

OIL FIRMS BOW TO INDONESIAN CONTRACT TERMS

(By Ronald Stead)

DJAKARTA, INDONESIA.—Three major foreign oil companies in Indonesia have just agreed to the Government's new conditions to turn over to it 60 percent of their proceeds from oil extraction.

The companies involved are Standard Vacuum of California, American Caltex, and British-Dutch-owned Shell.

This is the shape of things to come for all foreign companies allowed to work Indonesia's rich oil resources. One company, Pan-American Oil of Chicago, is already implementing the first such new-style accord.

SURVEY COMPLETED

It recently completed an aerial magnetometer survey over 13,000 square miles of Sumatra. Pan-American's next development is a seismograph study which will pinpoint oil location so that rigs for drilling can be brought in early next year.

Pan-American Oil paid a nonrefundable bonus of $5 million to the Indonesian Government in order to become contractor to the state-owned oil company named "Pertamin," and it has undertaken to pay another $5 million bonus after oil production has reached exploitable quantities.

THE 30-YEAR PACT

The area available to Pan-American is 25,000 square kilometers in central Sumatra adjacent to the Caltex workings.

The agreement to share the crude oil value in the ratio of 60-to-40 percent is valid for 30 years, the first 10 being utilized for exploration and the remaining 20 for exploitation.

An authoritative official of the company who furnished this correspondent these details says that about 500 Indonesians are employed so far and there has been no labor trouble worth mentioning.

Indonesia's Communists, who dominate the labor unions, object to the new system for foreign participation in the country's oil potential and urge nationalization.

MAJOR REVENUE SOURCE

Indonesia supplies only 2 percent of the world's oil but this contributes 40 percent to Indonesia's total income from exports.

Under the new plan which the Government is imposing, foreigners become contractors not lessees. In other words, Indonesia's mineral rights are not going to be leased to non-Indonesians any more. Contractors furnish all the technical and financial outlay.

The three big companies—Stanvac, Caltex, and Shell—that have been installed in Indonesia many years do not look favorably on the terms they were told they must accept by June 15 if they desired to continue production in this country.

Under an Indonesian law passed 3 years ago, all previous concession rights were abolished. But the companies were allowed to continue working under the old plan until a new agreement was reached.

CONCESSIONS ENDED

Talks have been in progress more than 2 years, with the companies holding out for something better than 40- to 60-percent division of the financial yield from crude oil production.

The regulation containing the June 15 ultimatum became effective April 26.

TIME LIMIT IMPOSED

It said that the foreign companies had been given enough time to accommodate themselves to Indonesia's new oil policy and had failed to carry out the requirements of a Presidential decree issued in 1962. The resultant situation required imposition of a time limit, the order declared—hence the deadline.

Had any company decided to terminate operations in Indonesia, it would have been given 5 months in which to do so—under conditions to be announced.

Indonesia's take-it-or-leave-it attitude concerning oil emphasizes President Sukarno's goal of independence at any price.

So far as the national economy is concerned, the price now is higher than ever before—with the foreign exchange reserve exhausted, inflation chronic, and few permanent results discernible from the 8-year development plan which the President (recently installed in that office for life) has ordered be put into execution without fail.

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1963]

WESTERN OIL MEN REACH AN ACCORD WITH INDONESIANS: UNITED STATES AND BRITISH CONCERNS BECOMING CONTRACTORS IN NATIONALIZATION STEP—LONG DEADLOCK BROKEN—CRISIS BETWEEN WASHINGTON AND DJAKARTA AVERTED AND BOTH SEEM SATISFIED

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

TOKYO, June 1.—Indonesia and three Western petroleum companies signed an agreement today that will put the country's oil industry under a combination of private foreign enterprise and gradual, compensated nationalization.

The agreement, reached after urgent political intervention by the U.S. Government, broke a long deadlock between the companies and Indonesia and averted a crisis in relations between Washington and Djakarta.

All parties seemed satisfied by the results of the days and nights of hard bargaining in Tokyo, where President Sukarno is vacationing.

Indonesia was able to stick to its principle that oil belonged to the nation. Mr. Sukarno was also able to keep the foreign oil companies operating in his country. Their knowledge and market channels are vital to Indonesia.

President Kennedy sent Lt. Gov. Wilson Wyatt, of Kentucky, to Tokyo as his personal representative in the negotiations. Assisting Mr. Wyatt were Abram Chayes, State Department legal adviser, and Walter James Levy, an oil specialist who is acting as consultant to the State Department.

THE COMPANIES INVOLVED

The oil companies are Caltex Pacific Oil Co., owned by Standard Oil Co., California, and Texaco, Inc.; Stanvac Indonesia, owned by Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), and Shell Indonesia, owned by British interests.

As a result of the negotiations here, the oil companies' status has shifted from owners to contractors. But they remain in control and management of the $250 million a year export production for at least 20 years.

Also they won acceptable selling terms for that part of the industry—refining and internal distribution and marketing—that they had agreed long before would be taken over by the Indonesians.

Western oil specialists here said that "pragmatically" the foreign companies had lost little and gained much. They said the chief gains were the prospect of orderly operations in Indonesia and the long-range possibility that the companies and the Government would benefit enough to want to renew the contract after 20 years.

Washington, which had been so worried about a breakdown in the talks that it dispatched Mr. Wyatt and his experts, avoided a showdown. That might have meant an end to U.S. aid to Indonesia and a greater Indonesian drift to the Communists.

The agreement was signed by President Sukarno's aids and officials of the companies. It ended a dispute that had been going on for more than 2 years.

The oil companies had believed they were being forced to work under conditions, and under threats, that made long-term operations impossible. Washington was afraid that an Indonesian move toward nationalization without the companies' agreement might be interpreted by Congress as an act of expropriation barring Indonesia from U.S. aid.

The agreement runs along these lines:

The oil companies will continue to produce and export crude oil for 20 years, after which the contract will be renegotiated. The companies, by paying a bonus, will also get the rights to explore and exploit new oil deposits.

During the 20 years the companies will give the Government 60 percent of the profits. That is the rate they have been paying for the last 2 years, ever since a 50–50 arrangement ended.

Within 5 years the Indonesian Government can take over facilities for domestic distribution of oil products. U.S. sources said the companies had agreed some time ago that these facilities would be nationalized.

During the Tokyo talks the negotiators agreed on terms for the takeover: An agreed price, payment in hard currency within 5 years and interest on the unpaid balance. The amount to be paid was not disclosed.

The refining facilities of the companies may be taken over in 10 to 15 years. If Indonesia waits the full 15 years, the agreed rate of depreciation will mean she will pay almost nothing for the refining facilities.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1963]

POLITICS COMPLICATES OPERATIONS OF PETROLEUM COMPANIES IN ASIA

(By Richard Rutter)

Petroleum companies have had more than their share of trouble in southeast Asia. If anything, the situation may deteriorate further.

In the Eastern Hemisphere, as a whole, oil business continued to expand and international companies were able to post a gain in earnings while other segments of the industry had harder going. But the bulk of the gains came from operations in the oil-rich Middle East rather than from Asia.

In three southeastern Asian countries in particular—Indonesia, Burma, and Ceylon—operating conditions ranged from difficult to almost impossible and the cessation of all activity in those nations now looms as a definite possibility.

Indonesia is a case in point, with its trend toward increased state regulation and nationalization of industry.

More than 500 enterprises are now run by the Government, 300 of them Dutch companies taken over in 1957. The Western-owned oil companies, however, worked out a "hands off" agreement with the Sukarno government. Caltex, Stanvac, and Shell were allowed to restore war-damaged facilities, import equipment, and export products free of foreign exchange controls and other restrictions.

CONCERNS DO WELL

Constituting a sort of oasis of free enterprise in a largely state-run economy, the oil industry has done well. Output has risen so that shipments now account for almost 40 percent of the nation's total export earnings.

But more recently the Indonesian Government has "gotten tough" with the oil companies and has insisted on altered working arrangements. The three foreign operators have agreed to higher royalty payments and a long-term timetable has been set up under which they will eventually turn over to the Government all their facilities—without compensation.

These companies have a combined investment in Indonesia of almost $1 billion, and understandably, they have balked at investing more capital in further expansion instead of using retained earnings. As a result, the Government now threatens nationalization in the near future.

At that, the companies in Indonesia have so far escaped the fate of the Western operators that have been in Ceylon for the last 40 years or more. Last summer Ceylon, through the Government-owned Ceylon Petroleum Corp., expropriated about 20 percent of the operating facilities of three foreign companies—Caltex, Esso Standard Eastern, Inc., and British Shell. Taken over were gasoline filling stations, storage depots, kerosene outlets, and bunkering facilities.

Caltex valued its seized properties at about $1,500,000 and Esso put its at $2,500,000. At the same time, the state oil company began to import Soviet petroleum products through a barter agreement and to market them through the expropriated facilities. Ceylon has no known petroleum deposits of its own.

UNITED STATES RETALIATES

The Government promised compensation for the appropriated properties, but so far none has been forthcoming. As a result, the U.S. Government early this year suspended various forms of assistance to the island country, totaling about $15 million.

In retaliation, the Ceylon authorities have imposed a ceiling price on imported crude oil and stipulated that no foreign exchange will be released for the import of oil above that price. That quotation, incidentally, is what the state-owned company is paying for Soviet crude oil, or 20 percent less than the Persian Gulf price that the Western companies adhere to.

Ceylon has also indicated that if the private oil companies do not import oil at the cutrate price, their remaining facilities will be taken over.

In Burma a military junta took over last year and promptly stated an official goal of "nationalization of such vital means of production as agriculture, industry, distribution, transportation, communications, and external trade."

The already scheduled nationalization of the British-owned Burma Oil Co. was pressed. Negotiations are now proceeding to acquire the British shares in that company and related trading companies. The Government has announced that all commerce and industry will be completely nationalized though new private enterprises may be established in exceptional circumstances.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I share the concern of the Senator from Oregon relative to the history and responsibility of Congress in the field of foreign affairs. I might disagree with some of the Senator's contentions about the involvement of the oil industry in this matter. Whether it is or is not involved is quite beside the question.

The question is, How long are we going to let petty dictators tweak Uncle Sam's nose with impunity and pluck off his beard and blow it in his face? The time has come for the United States to assert to those who thumb their noses at us while receiving handouts from us, while they try to increase their prestige in the world, that we have a responsibility in the field of foreign relations, one that we are too often prone to abdicate to the executive branch.

I fervently hope that we will reassert that responsibility today. I hope we will not retreat from the correct position taken by the House of Representatives. I fervently hope that the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I speak with mixed feelings concerning the action the Senate is now considering. I jotted down some thoughts as I listened to the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] on this troublesome question. I say "with mixed feelings" because I have long been a student in this body of the Senator from Oregon in particular, in regard to the complicated, complex questions that trouble me at this moment.

The principal reason of my obtaining the floor is to take issue with some of the questions that have been submitted until now and to suggest that perhaps there are other priorities that might well prevail in our judgment on this question.

I think it well to remember that this is a Department of Agriculture appropriations supplemental measure; that it was designed only for fulfilling obligations already on record. It is not a projection of a new program or a new position of policy. In my opinion there should have been no consideration of a compromise of the House action. It seems to me, in the interest of being forthright on this question, that the language should have been stricken completely from the record. It is my understanding that no hearings were held on it by the House. It popped up on the floor of the House. It did not receive the deliberation that we ordinarily accord to this kind of proposal. But that is water over the dam.

We are considering this afternoon a compromise proposal that the committee has carefully considered for very good reasons. I hasten to add that I think the most unfortunate thing this body could do would be to try to shape American foreign policy from a sense of anger against some dictator like Mr. Nasser or Mr. Sukarno. We have no business shaping the foreign policy of the United States merely because someone has pulled our beard in a spirit of aggravation. In the role we are called upon by history to fill at this time we must be bigger than that; we must be more firm than that; we must be more farseeing than that. If every 10-cent dictator who came along could get us off the track and deliberately incite us by remarks that were intemperate, it would be difficult indeed to live up to the responsibilities placed upon our shoulders.

It seems to me that Senators should remember, as we search our souls for a decision on this question today, that this is not a question of satisfying our own ego concerning Mr. Nasser. He gets under my hide, as do Sukarno and other dictators on the international scene. But the fact that he irritates me should not be the source of the foreign policy of our country. Foreign policy should be laid out on the basis of its principles, concepts, goals, targets, and priorities, not on a basis of personal venom or of "revenge" because we are out of patience at the moment.

I would be the last to carry any brief for Mr. Nasser or Mr. Sukarno, or any of their ilk. I only say that the world is round; that Nasser is not in a political vacuum; that the world is not going to revolve around an axis between Washington and Cairo. What happens in Eastern Europe, Latin America, or Africa affects us all. Our responsibility is to a world that is round, not a world that is shrunken to the axis of Cairo and Washington, in the midst of which we are sitting today. For those reasons, it seems to me we ought to think twice before we act precipitately on a matter such as this.

If I may speculate for a moment, I believe much can be said to the effect that Israel will be in a slightly better position if we have more to do in Cairo than if we break off with Cairo. For whatever our connections there are worth, some restraints can be imposed, some cautions can be invoked, that our absence from Egypt or our breaking away from there would not permit. Even from the standpoint of our interest in the neighbors of Egypt, there is some obligation, it seems to me, on our part to keep them within our sights.

So the question is not merely, How do we get even with Nasser? How do we tell him off? How do we get the message through to him? The whole world will not rise or fall because of something dictated by Nasser. I question the real substance of a nation's foreign policy if that policy is to reflect, at the whim of Congress, every bit of intemperance or outspokenness on the part of dictators. In our country, our task is not and cannot be to punish, bad as Nasser may be, bad as Sukarno may be. What kind of national purpose would that be? What kind of national policy would that project? Our task, if I may respectfully suggest it, is that of being as good and strong and wise as the times demand.

If I may draw a parallel, what would have happened to the image of British life in the two or three centuries when they took on the chores of trying to balance the delicate political powers of the world, if whenever someone on the sidelines tweaked the nose or pulled the tail the British had digressed from their long-range purpose of trying to preserve the balance of the world?

The world would have been in a shambles many a time as the result of losing

sight of the high road along which they alone were in a position to maintain a course toward a slightly better world in their time.

As Members of the Senate—and we are all very jealous of the prerogatives and responsibilities of the Senate—we ought to be ready to face up to the facts of our time as to where the responsibility rests.

I never want to forfeit the responsibility of the Senate in a projection of foreign policy. We live now, though, in a world of dictators for a large part, not in a world of democracies as such. What we do with this $37 million, or do not do with it will not make one iota of difference to the chances of democracy in Egypt.

This is a matter that concerns another of these disturbances, should this issue not be followed through by this body, that can well ruffle the only troubled waters in the Middle East, at a time when there are still higher priorities, in a way that would not bring any attendant consequences of advantage to us, as I see it.

There is only one place where the buck cannot be passed any longer. I think well of a remark made by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] this week in my presence. The Senator reminded us all that we can sound off here, as we should, and air this issue in the open. We can be wrong, as we sometimes are. And the consequences of our making a mistake are not always earth-shaking, fortunately.

We have a second chance. We can make a second guess and indulge in a second try in an effort to find the right answer. But, when this decision is arrived at by the President, he must be right the first time. He has no second chance.

It behooves us under the circumstances at this moment to abide by the compromise language that the Committee on Appropriations has drafted. That action would leave it to the discretion of the President to assert his judgment in a small way on a matter that has accumulated from the past. It is not a policy that is being written here today. It has no business being written here today. It merely concerns language that was tacked on an agricultural supplemental measure in a short period of time. Therefore, we ought to leave the President of the country the latitude of judgment in the national interest in this particular instance as he sees it.

I am sure that by June, July, or midsummer, the question of what we shall do with the Public Law 480 program, what will happen to some of our foreign aid programs, and what our real policy direction ought to be will be before us again. That is the time for us to have a great debate along these lines. That is when we can exert collectively the kind of influence on or guidelines of wisdom that the times require.

In conclusion, I am always sobered in these moments by recalling a conversation that I once had the privilege of having with the senior Senator from Tennessee when he and I were in New Delhi. It was a rather philosophical session with Prime Minister Nehru. We were talking about the relative injustice of the criticism that is heaped upon the United States by other countries and the double standard that is applied to measure whether a country is doing the right thing or the wrong thing.

We always catch a lot of the "flak," but we are not in the position of trying to lead the world in order to be patted on the head, nor perhaps even to be thanked. We must stick to this business, because if we do not, and if we are not willing to take this "flak," we forfeit the leadership to those to whom we do not care to entrust the world.

As we mused on that occasion over the criticisms we received in those days from Indians—and today from Nasser, Sukarno, and others—Mr. Nehru made a very astute observation. He said:

> You know, the injustice of all this must be obvious to all of you. We understand the effect it has in your own political arena. But what would happen to me, Nehru, in India if I were to make a mistake? I may be defeated in the next election. My party may be thrown out. My party may suffer as a consequence. And that is about all. But, you Americans are like Atlas, with the world on your shoulders. If you make a mistake, stumble, and fall, the world falls with you. That, in some measure is one of the reasons for the anxious criticisms that are occasionally levied at you. We know that you make the difference, that what you do makes the difference.

It seems to me that we should do all within our capabilities to live up to the responsibilities, the frightening, costly, and yet exciting possibility that the history of our times has placed upon us.

In doing so, we had better have an opportunity to meet those obligations and those responsibilities in a way that will stand the test of history, and will enable us, as we stand before the bar of history, to hold our heads high in the knowledge that we did what we thought the times required.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to reply briefly to the Senator from Wyoming.

I disagree with every major premise of the speech. I shall try to recollect the major points made by the Senator from Wyoming and give my point of view on each.

The Senator from Wyoming speaks of our taking a precipitate action of intemperance in the Senate today. But that is an old debating technique, seeking to color the opposition with a name rather than facing up to the facts of the issue.

There is nothing precipitate about what is proposed here. The issue as to what we should do is a matter of foreign policy in respect to aiding dictators around the world who follow courses of action that are not in the best interests of the United States.

The issue has been before the Senate year after year for many years. It has been before the Committee on Foreign Relations time and time again. We have taken some actions in regard to it. Let me name a few. We took some action, as I said in my earlier speech today, in respect to Indonesia last year. We included a presidential escape clause in that one. The fact is, however, that Sukarno has not lost a dollar of aid. The fact is that the administration has proceeded, following the inadequate congressional action of last year, to continue to give Sukarno aid.

We had a long debate 2 years ago on the aggressor amendment. The Senate took a petition on that issue. I do not know of a foreign policy issue that has been more openly debated than the issue raised by the committee amendment this afternoon—How far should Congress go in delegating its legislative powers?

Yet the Senator from Wyoming calls this precipitate action. This has been an issue that has been before Congress and the people of this country for quite some time. There is growing public support that Congress should exercise its authority.

It is suggested by the Senator from Wyoming that we who support the House language and oppose the Senate amendment are somehow, in some way, engaged in intemperate action. That is pure nonsense. Is it intemperate to say we must take a look at our foreign policy with regard to Nasser and decide what the relationship of that foreign policy is to the best interests of the United States? Is it intemperate to place a congregational check upon our aid program in Egypt because it goes to a man who has knowingly been an aggressor against Yemen? That has been a matter of great protest in the Congress and in the country for many months. If we continue to supply Nasser the kind of aid that is proposed to be supplied to him in the Senate amendment to the joint resolution, his aggressor potentialities will be strengthened.

Those of us who disagree with the Senator from Wyoming and the majority of the Senate Appropriations Committee agree that we have had a thorough debate on the merits of the issue and the time has come to take action this afternoon.

Let me mention one of the actions we have taken by way of exercising checks by the Congress by way of legislation. In 1955 we adopted the Lehman-Morse sense-of-Congress resolution with regard to policies in the Middle East. At that time one policy which we protested relates to Norway, which was quickly rectified by Norway. We made clear in that action that the State Department should understand that the Senate looks askance at grants-to-aid countries that engage in the kind of shocking and deplorable action we were protesting.

In 1959 we made the Lehman-Morse resolution of 1955 an amendment to the foreign aid bill. It became the Javits-Morse amendment to the foreign aid bill. It was an amendment stating the policy of the Congress. Of course, that statement of policy is in line with the House language.

"Precipitate," says the Senator from Wyoming. "Intemperate," says the Senator from Wyoming. The fact is that this is another link in the chain forged in recent years by the Senate, seeking to exercise its responsibilities and act to check such powers as these.

The Senator from Wyoming says it will be a deplorable thing if Congress makes a mistake; that the President should not be put in a position where he

can be checked by the Congress, because he cannot afford to make a mistake; that he must not be put in a position where he can make mistakes.

Mr. President, this President and previous Presidents have been making mistakes in foreign aid. They have been making mistakes in foreign aid because Congress has not imposed the type of restriction that we are arguing this afternoon should be imposed, and which it is not only our constitutional right to impose, but our clear duty.

I strongly oppose delegating the kind of discretionary power to the President that the Senator from Wyoming would leave him. We cannot afford to continue the kind of mistakes Presidents have been making in the field of foreign policy, because we have been delegating this kind of discretion to the President, rather than passing on the merits and sending it to the President, who can return it with a veto message, which is his checking power.

The argument of the Senator from Wyoming really adds up to a proposal to give more and more power to the President, to abdicate more and more of our constitutional duty to determine standards so far as foreign aid and agricultural legislation are concerned.

This issue does not involve a question of inherent Presidential power. It is a question of power to be exercised by the President only to the limit he is permitted to exercise it under a statute passed by the Congress.

For some years, some of us have been bringing this issue to the floor of the Senate time and time again, and have been urging that standards and limitations be placed upon that delegation of power to the President of the United States.

The Senator of Wyoming raises what I respectfully submit is an entirely irrelevant question about what position the British lion would have been in in history, if, every time its tail was tweaked or there was any opposition, it had followed the course of action to which the Senator from Wyoming referred.

I know that the British lion bled nearly to death trying to placate and manipulate and maintain its own version of peace and empire all over the globe.

That argument has nothing to do with the issue before us, but let me say that the world would be in a better position today, and freedom would not be suffering as much today, if the British lion had stopped its growling decades ago and had begun establishing freedom in British territories around the world. That issue is irrelevant to this debate, but if it is to be dragged in, let me point out there is no basis for setting up Great Britain as a model for the United States to follow in policies involving millions of people who are not free.

The Senator from Wyoming says we shall have a chance next June, or whenever a foreign aid bill is brought up, to have a great debate. I am accustomed to that argument—"Not now, but some other time." That is the argument made—"Do not face up to your responsibilities now, but some other time."

The legislative framework that has delivered this issue to the floor of the Senate happens to be that of an appropriation measure. It is within the authority of the Congress to face up to the issue in an appropriation measure. But let me say most respectfully that if the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses bring it in, there is no merit in the argument of the Senator from Wyoming that we should not face up to it now, but face up to it next June, because he does not like the legislative format that brings the issue to the Senate.

It happens to be within the rules of the Senate to bring it in in this way. I am interested in the issue, and I am interested in the merits of the issue. We have before us this afternoon the merits of the issue as to whether or not we are going to countenance giving this arbitrary power to the President in an area where, in my judgment, it is not in the interest of the United States to extend aid.

We have the legislative authority to follow the course of action which the House has followed. This raises the simple and basic question: Is that policy of the House sounder foreign policy for this Republic to follow than the foreign policy proposed by a majority of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate?

My answer is decidedly "yes."

It is decidedly in the best interests of the foreign policy of this country to stop aiding a man who is aiding the rebels in the Congo ever so little or ever so much.

We do not know where the Congo issue will lead, but the Congo issue can take on awful and frightening proportions. There is no doubt that Nasser is a conduit to the rebels in the Congo. Nasser provides a training center for the rebels in the Congo. Nasser provides a corridor for Communist forces by various devices, some by subterfuge and some with not so much subterfuge, to aid what is going on in the Congo.

Neither the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] nor any other Senator can stand up in the Chamber this afternoon and show that it is in the interests of the United States to have Nasser—or the head of any other country—giving aid to the rebels.

Is it in the interests of the foreign policy of the United States to give countenance, support, and aid to a dictator that has been carrying on an aggressive policy which he has been carrying on in Yemen? Of course it is not.

Mr. President, we did not draw the issue. Nasser did. If the Senate adopts the House language, it is not my position that it will be taking action this afternoon out of pique, out of intemperance, or out of any motivation to discipline Nasser. It is my position that if we are to protect the best foreign policy interests of the American people, we should stop subsidizing Nasser. That is the issue.

I do not care what language is used by those who wish to rationalize the insistence of the State Department that it should be allowed to do what it wishes to do in the Middle East concerning Nasser. The fact remains that it has already demonstrated what it wishes to do, and what it has been doing—under the kind of policy which the House seeks to prevent—which has not been in the best interest of the United States.

What should we do? Fold our arms? Surrender? Admit we are making a mistake, and that if we keep on making the mistake we will not be checked but go ahead and continue making it?

The Senate has a duty to the American people to exercise whatever legislative authority it has to change a foreign policy which, I believe, is not in the interests of our country.

It is interesting that some Senators have come to me and told me they are going to vote for the Senate language, but, they say, "We believe it is a mistake to continue the policy, but we do not like to be placed in the position of seeming to vote against what we believe the President wishes in foreign policy."

Let me say respectfully to those Senators that it is their duty to vote for the House language, if they actually believe that the President is following a foreign policy which is not in the best interests of the country.

I rest my case on that major premise. We cannot analyze the foreign policy of Nasser and find any basis for arguing that his foreign policy is in the interest of the people of the United States.

The authority over American aid to a foreign government lies with the Congress, not with the President. The only powers he can legally exercise in connection with sending food or money or military aid abroad is what we give him. But he is only our agent, and we continue to be responsible for the results.

Senators represent the people of the United States. Every Senator who believes that Nasser's policy is not in the best interests of the people of the United States, in my judgment, has a clear duty to vote for the House language and against the language of the Senate committee. In my judgment, the Senate has to vote to stop a foreign policy that is being practiced by the President and the Secretary of State—and, yes, by the Pentagon—which, if it is continued, will cause serious crises in this country.

I believe that the way to stop a war is to stop it before it begins. I believe that we should make it perfectly clear to the dictators of this world—and make it clear to them now—that we are not going to give them aid in any way, shape, or manner which can strengthen their warmaking plans, their aggressive plans, the plans which some of them have publicly announced, that they intend to attack certain countries whenever they consider themselves strong enough to do so.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I do not intend to prolong the debate. I regret that I did not take the opportunity to prepare a written text which could have been used as a basic reference.

Let me say for the record that the real point in this discussion is that the Senate has before it a supplemental agricultural appropriation measure; that this is a policy already laid down; that

this is an extension of a policy of trying to fill the gap with $37 million already authorized and contracted for; that we are not considering the extension of a policy; and that we are not opening up the consideration of a new policy.

Therefore, in that context, we must weigh the consequences of this move now in regard to what it means in its gains and in its risks to our basic foreign policy decisions.

I submit, with all due respect, that this matter of $37 million, while it is bound to offer some psychological advantage on the other side, will have no real message which it can convey in meaningful ways to moderate, restrain, hold back, or in any other way strengthen our hand with Nasser. That problem must be dealt with at some other time and on some other basis in terms of a policy projection.

As the Senator from Oregon seems to imply, if we are really out to have no truck with any dictator, let me say that we shall not have anything left in the way of any international relationships, with the exception of a small part of Western Europe and one or two scattered republics here and there.

We are dealing with a dictator, and we must be realistic about it.

Are we going on a great crusade, beginning with Nasser and Sukarno, and make little Americas and little democrats out of these people?

We shall be better off in the long run, if that were possible, but we are dealing with the world as it is, not with a dream that might be.

The same thing obtains in regard to Nasser. He is hardly a proper object on which to focus American foreign policy. For long after Nasser has gone, the people of Egypt will be there. The political vacuum in the Middle East will be there. The great tensions will still prevail.

If we really wish to bring down Nasser—which I gather from the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] should be basically our long-range policy, to get rid of him because he is a rascal—then we should impose a blockade on Egypt right now.

We should cut off all economic intercourse with the United Arab Republic and really put the squeeze on Nasser. Most people, I am sure, fully appreciate the fact that this is not a rational approach in the times in which we live.

Therefore, let us get down to brass tacks. To cut off this $37 million, which has been already laid out, already projected, already authorized, and already contracted for, will do nothing except increase tensions and increase strain—and heaven knows, there are enough tension and strain areas—does not offer us the alternative of clearing it up, or strengthening our hand, if we take this retaliatory action.

In my judgment, the issue is as simple as that.

For that reason, I again urge Senators to consider the consequences of this action with the almost nonexistent, beneficial gain which might be realized from this small sum of money applied in this way.

I conclude by reminding my colleagues that I oppose Mr. Nasser in principle and in substance in every way I know how. But there is one thing that takes precedence over my personal bitter opposition to Nasser, and that is that we try to strive to keep a strong position in all the areas of the world, at the same time without jeopardizing the tensions in certain areas with a proposal which would not offer us the prospect of a great gain; and that prospect of a great gain is not present in the particular decision now pending.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall reply briefly to the rejoinder by saying that most of it is based upon an attempt on the part of the Senator from Wyoming to put words in my mouth.

The Senator from Oregon has not taken the position this afternoon that we should have no communion with dictators. The blanket suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming, that I am proposing this afternoon that we have no dealings with totalitarian government, is not based on any fact in connection with anything that I have said. I referred to dictators who plan and carry out aggressions against their neighbors.

Certain courses of conduct have been followed by Nasser which I have set forth in support of my major premise. We must ask ourselves this question: Is his conduct in the interest of the public policy interests of the people of the United States?

Let me quickly review them again, because I say to my friend from Wyoming that the issue was raised by the appropriation measure, quite appropriately, and that we now must review the question of whether we wish to continue aid to a man who in my judgment has abrogated all right to further aid by the course of conduct he has taken against the United States, and a course of conduct that he has taken elsewhere in the world that is in the worst interest of the United States—Yemen and the Congo and, in fact, his whole attitude in the Middle East.

What has he done? We know that he has permitted in his country the anti-American action that we have protested. We know that he has summarized his position, as far as his caring as to what we think about it, in the language that I used in my earlier remarks which, in the American vernacular, is that we can take our aid and go jump in the lake. We are being asked to aid a man who has pointed out very clearly that we can count on him not to agree with us in diplomatic channels, but to oppose us and to do what he wants to do, and that we can like it or else. That is what has developed since there has developed the lack of funds to supply him with more goods under soft currency sales to the tune of $37 million.

Of course, Congress has the right—and I happen to believe the duty also—to review that action on the part of this individual. My speech goes to this individual and to his conduct. I say, on the basis of his anti-American record, on the basis of his conduct, which threatens our interest in that part of the world, which may very well create a situation in the Congo that might embroil us, as well as a good many other nations, that we cannot justify giving him further aid.

I talked about Sukarno as the second horrible example that I believe confronts us. The President of the United States has made a serious mistake every time he has sent further aid to Sukarno after the action taken by Congress last year. He did it under the law. He did it in the exercise of Presidential escape clause. But on the merits he has been aiding a man whom he should not aid, because he is a man who has shown his disrespect and his evaluation of American aid by making the statement, which he has reiterated, that we can take our aid and go to hell.

If we in Congress proceed to pass legislative controls and restrictions in the administration of foreign policy that meets the challenge raised by such foreign policies as are being practiced by Nasser and Sukarno, are we precipitate, are we intemperate, are we affecting the decision of whether we will aid anyone?

The Senator from Oregon has made perfectly clear in vote after vote that he is willing to grant aid to people that we can count on to keep their word, that we can count on not to be aggressors, and to people who, although their ideology may be different from ours, demonstrate that they are not warmakers. We are dealing with a man who in my judgment is a serious threat to the peace in the Middle East.

Senators will remember that a few years ago Congress added to the foreign aid bill the provision terminating aid to any country that seized the property of American investors without due compensation.

It is remarkable to recall that there was no Presidential escape clause in it. Yet we heard no outcry about tying the President's hands, or denying him flexibility. It has proved to be one of the most useful and successful provisions in the aid program.

We tried to follow the same pattern in the aggressor amendment. But that provision requires a Presidential finding and hence it has proved inoperative.

I believe we should adopt the House language in the interest of protecting the best interests of the American people and deny Nasser the $37 million in aid.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I sincerely regret that the Senate Appropriations Committee has changed the wording of the Agricultural Supplemental Appropriations Act and has thereby weakened the prohibition against Public Law 480 agricultural commodities being sent to the United Arab Republic. The House of Representatives wrote into this act a very strict prohibition against the use of any funds appropriated by this act to finance the export of food to the United Arab Republic. It is my belief that the wording as it has been changed by the Senate committee has no meaning in fact. The President could now prevent the use of these funds for exports to Nasser if he determines that it is necessary. Obviously the administration has determined that furnishing Nasser with this food, is, somehow, in the interest of the United States.

Mr. President, I feel kindly toward the Egyptian people, and I believe that if they were given full information a majority of them would stand with the United States in the defense of freedom. However, President Nasser has been treating the United States in a most highhanded manner which cannot go unnoticed by the Congress and by the American people. Nasser, in conjunction with the Red Chinese and others, has been sending military supplies to the Congolese rebels. He joined in bitter protests against the United States-Belgian rescue of white hostages from the Congo. On November 26, 1964, the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library in Cairo was sacked and burned by a mob that the Government of the United Arab Republic was either unable or unwilling to control. On December 19, 1964, the Russian-built planes of Nasser's air force shot down an unarmed commercial plane belonging to the Mecom Oil Co. of Texas. On December 23, 1964, in a long speech in Port Said, Nasser added insult to injury by telling the U.S. Ambassador the Egyptian equivalent of "go jump in the lake."

It is apparent to any observer, Mr. President, that our furnishing of food to Nasser enables him to divert his attention from the production of this basic commodity to the building up of a vast arms industry. I wonder how long the American people will be content to have their Government stand idly by in the face of such insults and aggressive actions and continue to subsidize the man who is responsible.

Under the terms of the 1963 Foreign Assistance Act, the President was directed by Congress to withhold all foreign economic aid, as well as food-for-peace aid, from any nation committing aggressive actions against any other country receiving our aid. Nasser has publicly admitted supplying arms and munitions to the Congolese rebels whose avowed intention is to overthrow the Central Government of the Congo. The U.S. Government recognizes and supports the Central Congolese Government. I believe that this constitutes a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of this provision of the 1963 Foreign Assistance Act. Obviously it is time for Congress to take firm action; and the provision adopted by the House of Representatives represents a good step in the right direction.

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois with the understanding that I do not prejudice my rights to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suppose that I could probably indulge in remarks not unlike those that have been offered on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. But at the risk of being slightly partisan, it seems to me that some of the "bread" cast upon the waters 5 years ago is beginning to come back. There run in my mind many statements and principles that were uttered in 1960 about the prestige and the preeminence of the United States of America. My own party was certainly scolded in no uncertain terms for allegedly having permitted our prestige and preeminence to sink to an all-time low.

Late one night this week I found time to go back and reread a few of those speeches. Then I began to think about the prestige and the preeminence that are manifested and reflected by the incident that has somehow triggered the proposal that is before the Senate today.

It is rather interesting to go back and read the language uttered at that time, and then find myself in the position of supporting the committee and the administration in this matter. And that, of course, I intend to do, because I believe it is the right thing to do.

But if one were to read the record on the subject of our prestige at the present moment, a gentleman by the name of Castro—and I must assume that he is a gentleman—although he is still 90 miles away, is still there, and he still carries on his nefarious schemes in Latin America to subvert, if he can, freedom and free government. That certainly does not comport with the restoration of prestige that was promised in most eloquent terms by the administration then in power.

I think of Sukarno. I remember him best when he appeared before a joint meeting of the House and Senate. I know what my feelings were at the time, because some of his language was ornamented to the point where it was very testy to Members attending the joint meeting.

So, as I see him now, and the attitude that he expresses toward this country, whose largess he has experienced in abundant measure, I wonder where this prestige is that we supposedly lost and which was then to be restored by those who succeeded him.

I think of a gentleman by the name of Ben Bella, who called upon the Chief Executive, and evidently, from all that I could learn, secured a pledge of assistance and then promptly left our country to go to Havana. When he had stayed his leave in Havana, he went to Moscow. It was quite evident that after he got a pledge of assistance from us, he did not share our feelings at all so far as the liberty of people and their freedom from tyranny are concerned.

Then I think of Mr. Nasser, who has ignored our admonitions with respect to his troops that are still in Yemen, and who admittedly, of course, has sent weapons to the Congo, which has been such an uneasy scene for such a long time. And parenthetically, Mr. President, the record evidently does not show the exact circumstances under which Mr. Nasser made the statement that has caused so much fulmination in the newspapers and elsewhere. A hint has come to me that our own Ambassador was quite firm with him in discussing Public Law 480 aid, and because of the firmness of our Ambassador in stating what we would and would not do, probably that statement was regarded as some provocation for the statement that was ultimately made.

I do not know. I picked up a little here and a little there. But the record itself is not clear on that point. It may have been adduced in the form of off-the-record testimony. But how can we pass judgment unless we know whether or not there was provocation at the time the statement was made?

Any lawyer knows full well that those things that excite the spirit and suddenly find articulation in some vengeful act register with a judge and with a jury when the time comes for a judgment of those situations.

But no one has undertaken to tell under exactly what circumstances the statement was made. I am not inclined to believe that the little smatterings of information that have come to my attention may very well have been correct.

We get up our bile a good deal about what is going on in Vietnam. I assume they are going to throw at us—and I assume on occasion that we will pay our respect to their leaders, and perhaps it will not be very complimentary. But it certainly does not add to the conduct of foreign policy of this country, and it is not the road to settlement, to understanding, and to ultimate peace.

I do not want to be embroiled 12,000 miles from here in Asia and then be embroiled in another place in the Middle East. My friend the Senator from Oregon has talked about being embroiled. The easy way to become embroiled is to take a good strong bludgeon—and it can be a verbal bludgeon—and strike a leader in some far off country over the head, when we do not know all the circumstances that might have provoked the expression that found currency in every newspaper and on every television and radio station in our land. That is a pretty thin basis upon which to render judgment and to indulge in name calling, no matter how polite, in what we are pleased to refer to as the world's greatest deliberative free body.

We had better mind our language a little. We had a situation in Mozambique, when our own diplomatic representative, at the end of a bayonet, was hustled down to the dock and told to get out. It looked like capricious treatment of our representative. But after a while, it was swallowed up by the waters of time, and we have not heard much about it.

We had a similar experience closer at hand when our flag was taken down in the Republic of Panama, and when the snipers were shooting into the Canal Zone. What a weird admixture of feeling that engendered everywhere in the country. But after a while, it subsided before any real damage was done.

It is true that our libraries have been burned, our flag has been hauled down, and our teachers, so far as I know, have been run out of a university in Ghana. Of course, we have protested, although we have given the leader of that country an abundant measure of our resources in machinery and food and money in order to let him carry on and undertake to industrialize his country, if he can.

In many areas of the world, it appears that respect for us has vanished. I am not so naive as to believe that some far-off country will love us particularly and

lavish affection on us for what we may do for it. I concluded long ago that probably the only thing we can get is respect; and that respect we will gain through strength. But we must be very sure that we are on good ground; that our facts are straight; and that we either know or do not know whether there was an element of provocation that can so easily call forth an equivalent expression, and use that as a basis for an interdiction by Congress in a piece of legislation that will have its repercussions in the chancelleries of the world, particularly in the United Arab Republic and in the Middle East.

This could be something of a pattern. Who shall say? But arbitrary, capricious, and precipitate action will not further the cause of the United States as the leader of the free world. That leadership has been thrust upon us, and we could not avoid that responsibility, even if we wanted to do so.

So how do we carry on in the pursuit of the idealism we have flaunted to the world? Do we do it by striking back? No. There is some Christian virtue in the old biblical admonition to turn the other cheek.

Also, in the admonition that has come rolling down the corridor of time: "Let not the sun set upon your anger."

Nobody could sit in this Chamber this afternoon and hear some of the utterances that have been made without knowing that there was some bile and some anger behind them. One does not negotiate in a spirit of anger and ever expect the negotiations to be durable and to solve the problems of this country. How easy it would be for the leaders in all parts of the world, on the basis of what we might contrive here this afternoon, if we failed to support the committee, to conclude that Congress had taken out of the hands of the Chief Executive the responsibility for conducting the foreign policy of the country. Congress is not adequate to it unless it has all the facts, unless it knows as much about the situation as the President does—and the President has the facilities for obtaining the last word upon the subject. The Central Intelligence Agency might have investigated it, or the State Department or another instrumentality of the executive branch might have done so.

Who shall say what the feeling was like? I cannot say because, frankly, I do not know. On that tenuous basis, I shall not let it be manifested to the world that I am taking away from the President his responsibility in the conduct of the foreign policy of the country.

There is still another factor. Who shall say whether whole or partial restitution has been made? I understand that restitution has been made, certainly in part. I received two reports. One was that a palace was turned over to us in lieu of the library that was burned. The other report was that a thousand books have been made available. So evidently there was a spirit of restitution that quickly asserted itself. It is a consideration that must be kept in mind.

It was said here this afternoon that there are oil interests abroad, and that we are trying, somehow, to crucify American foreign policy upon the altar of oozing oil. Is not oil a legitimate interest in the world? How is one to get into the oil business unless he knows where oil is? When I was a boy, we organized a group around the corner in the little town where I lived, and someone suggested that we raid an apple orchard. Then, of course, the discussion began. "Whose orchard?" Usually I won, because I said I wanted to go to an orchard where apples were on the trees; otherwise there would be no fun.

So one goes where the oil is. The economy of this country is driven forward dynamically every second by this energy-creating fuel. What would we do without it?

So our people rightly go forward into the earth to explore and to find oil, and to enrich us and enrich other countries at the same time. Is there something illegal or illegitimate about the touch of oil when our enterprisers and explorers should go forward into the Middle East or into Indonesia, where there are extensive and productive oil interests? What is wrong with that, so long as the business is legitimate? Those people, as corporate citizens and as individual citizens, are entitled also to the consideration of their country when they go abroad for exploratory purposes to enrich mankind and to help to carry our civilization forward.

Is there something wrong with that? If the day ever comes when we must apologize for our people who go abroad to exploit, but who leave some of the profit there for the enrichment of other people, then we might as well tell them to come back home and say to them, "The protection of the flag is no longer with you." I do not want to put it on that thin ground. I want to see the whole subject in proper perspective, including the possibility that some provocative words might have coaxed forth the sentiment so suddenly uttered about getting a gulp of sea water, which supposedly has its equivalent in the idiom of our world. I merely want to get back and put things together.

I have to scold our friends a little, because they have charged us with letting our prestige go to the very bottom, under a great President—Eisenhower.

All these incidents arise. So, I must ask in all humility where to use that prestige and where to use that influence.

It has not been restored. But I shall be the good Samaritan type. He went all the way. We jump off in that great story before we get to the full meat of it.

The good Samaritan went down this road. Who was this victim? He was dumped off to one side. The robbers had taken his valuables, his clothes. The Levite came on one side and left him there. The priest came on the other side and left him there. Then the Good Samaritan did what? He bound up his wounds after putting oil on them. He put him on his beast. He took him to the inn down the road. He went in with him. Then what did he do?

He did not call it quits there. He went up to the man at the desk, where one signs his name on the hotel register. He said, "I picked my friend out of the ditch. He is hurt. He needs ministration. He needs succor. Look after him and wait until I get out my wallet. I will give you a little money now, and then I will come back this way and pay you the rest of what will be owed, while you take care of him."

That is the real nub of the story—to go the second mile, to go all the way.

I shall not be deflected by bile. I know what it is. My desk is as littered with correspondence as that of any other Senator, and perhaps more so. As to what we ought to do, should we clench our fist, set our teeth tight, and talk through our teeth in language that even Nasser can understand? That is the spirit in which we somehow restated the policy of our country. Ought we to sit down in sweetness and light in the hope that that is the way to get peace—peace with a baseball bat? No. We had better leave this matter where it is, with the President of the United States.

We had better accept the committee's language. It does not always satisfy me entirely. I tried to write alternative language for the committee. But I shall ride along with what the committee has done, and what the committee has written in the report. That is what I was interested in. The report states that we want to put them on notice that it is not the Senate of the United States that is sending this aid; it is not the House of Representatives. It is the taxpaying people of this country who are supplying that aid, and their patience could wear thin. But let us not let it wear thin in a single afternoon of discussion in this hallowed Chamber, saying "this is what the American people have mandated us to do, to cut you off, talk tough and let you know who we are in the scheme of things."

That is a great diplomatic manifestation, is it not? Not in my book. While I am not entirely satisfied with it, I urge the Senate to go along with the committee and to make no precipitate blunder that can cause us trouble in one end of the earth when we already have enough trouble 12,000 miles from here, in Vietnam. More than 53,000 young Americans have either been in or out of Vietnam since we have been engaged, and $1.5 million of our money is expended there every 24 hours.

We are talking here about an amount of $37 million. That is big in my book. If one comes from a country town, that is not hay. Put those values beside each other, the $1.5 million a day in Vietnam compared with $36 million or $37 million. Let us be pretty careful in dealing with that amount in order to make it plain to a man who said an unkind thing and so expressed his ingratitude, his lack of appreciation. He will be punished, and the sense of the punitive has been uttered on this floor. Let us not do it. There is too much fever in the world.

I do not want to see my country get into difficulty that may at long last cost us some sweat and anguish before we are through.

I say to the committee that I hope the Senate will sustain the position that the committee has presented to us.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me briefly.

I express my very deep appreciation to the distinguished minority leader. I expected nothing else from him but a nonpartisan patriotic, American, constitutional position such as the one that he has taken. I say that speaking for our entire committee.

That was the kind of position that was taken there. That was the kind of position that brought out the amendment of the committee, and the excellent wording in the report to which the Senator has referred. Using that, the committee, as a whole, voted for this amendment 17 to 6. Two of the six voted in the negative thinking that we ought not to say anything in derogation of the President's view. So, really one might say that the vote was 19 to 4. It was animated somewhat by the same principles of devotion and dedication which the Senator has shown so clearly.

The position that we shall be in if the committee report is not adopted has been stated for the RECORD. In the first place, this is not a question of our power. Of course, we can undo what we have done before, even though we leave some fine people high and dry, and leave the policy of our country in the air, which I hope we shall not do.

Notwithstanding what we have done in the past, notwithstanding that we have delegated power to certain fine officials to enter into a contract under Public Law 480—which I helped to draft, on another committee than Appropriations—notwithstanding the fact that that contract is there, and there is not any doubt about it, it is now proposed that we put it off before its terminal date, and without leaving it to the officials to whom we have entrusted the negotiation of that contract and its administration. It is proposed that we pull the rug out from under the officials and leave the world with the feeling that we do not propose to stand behind the officials whom we have confirmed and the law which we have enacted and entrusted to them to administer.

It is not a question of power. It is a question of wisdom. I remind the Senator that the Senate confirmed the nomination of the Secretary of State without a dissenting word. The warmest expressions of confidence in the Secretary of State which came from the Senate at that time came from the lips of my beloved friend, the senior Senator from Oregon. There was not a dissenting voice in the Senate. There was not a dissenting voice to be heard when we confirmed the nomination of Mr. Ball as Under Secretary. There was not a dissenting voice to be heard when we confirmed the nomination of Mr. Battle as Ambassador.

The people of the United States spoke rather clearly last November when they spoke of their confidence in the President of the United States.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield at this time. I have only 10 minutes. Then I shall be glad to let the Senator speak on his own time.

We heard Mr. Rusk. We heard Mr. Ball. We read the words of the Ambassador. We know what transpired. If Senators care to read various parts of the record, they will find, on pages 95, 96, and 104, excerpts from what the Ambassador did when he terminated the discussion of any renewal or extension of this contract under Public Law 480 because of the rude treatment—which is the least one could say of it—which we had received. He was willing to stand up in foreign capitals and say, "As long as this is the climate you create, we will not negotiate for an extension of these benefits to you."

At the same time, he knew, and it was stated to us in the hearings, that with respect to 25 percent of their requirements in certain foods and up to 50 percent of their requirements in certain other foods, we have been helping to feed the poor people of Egypt. It is proposed to take this authority away from the power of the Ambassador, the Secretary of State, and the President, to use that which they describe as their "ace in the hole" in the negotiations, not merely with Egypt, but all through the world, in places I am not at liberty to mention for the record. This shows the influence they were able to exercise, due to our representatives there, in keeping down tragedies in other places I am not free to mention. The information is in the record, and any Senator who wishes to read it can do so, but I am not free to mention it on the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I had declined to yield to the Senator from Oregon. If I yield to the Senator from North Dakota, I shall have to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is it not true that when we consider the regular agricultural appropriation bill which will be before us in July, probably, we can again go into the matter of foreclosing or stopping any assistance to Egypt? That bill will deal with funds for surplus foods for various nations such as Egypt. In the meantime, the President will be given time to work out some satisfactory understanding with Egypt.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. And let me say on the floor of the Senate, where it cannot be denied by any Senator, that Senators who were against foreign aid in any form, in an overwhelming and bipartisan expression of their feeling of what we should do, voted for this program. They felt that we should not tear up our contract, violate it, or do anything that would pull the rug out from under our duly selected officials whose nominations the Senate had confirmed. It was not a part of sound judgment to tolerate such conduct—and I will not use an adjective I might like to—in a situation of this kind. It was felt that this matter should be left to those with full knowledge of the facts.

As the Senator from North Dakota has stated, we will consider the entire question when we have before us the annual foreign assistance bill, in 6 weeks or 2 months, when these questions can be gone into with greater care and detail.

The Senator from Florida has felt as keenly as anyone has on this matter. He has not failed to stand up against the President in matters such as the sale of wheat to Russia, which the Senator from Florida thought was wrong. There was a difference of opinion. But in the present instance—and I might say I have not heard from the President—there is involved only a matter of giving decent support to the President, the Secretary of State, and our Ambassador in Egypt.

I could not give my consent to pulling the rug out from under the feet of those good people just because we had the power to cut the heart out of this contract 5 months before it was to expire, when the contract was perfectly legal and made under a provision of law which we ourselves had enacted, and under which we gave those officials power to negotiate the contract.

I yield now to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Florida is quite correct when he says I voted for the confirmation of the nomination of the Secretary of State and others. I am only saddened because they did not live up to my expectations. They have been following a course of action in regard to foreign aid which, in my judgment, is not in the interest of the American people. This is an example.

My good friend from North Dakota talks about our taking this matter up later. We have an opportunity now to act on it. We are about to set a precedent. I know how this body works. Once a precedent is set, there will be a hard time getting away from that precedent later.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

COMMUNIST FORCES BEHIND NEGRO REVOLUTION IN THIS COUNTRY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Communist forces both inside and outside the United States are pressing for a Negro revolution in this country.

This Communist position is not unique. Support for the cause of Negro revolution is coming also from non-Communist organizations and individuals both inside and outside the United States.

From inside the United States, aid and incitement for the Negro revolution is not coming entirely from Communist and pro-Communist sources, it is being provided also by others, including both persons and organizations which are demonstrably not Communist, and which may not even know that they are serving the purposes of world communism and helping toward the achievement of a Communist objective.

For example, Communist support for and participation in the so-called Freedom Party and its activities is both direct and diffused. Communist infiltration of

the so-called Freedom Party can be traced clearly and demonstrated readily.

But support for the so-called Freedom Party has come also from groups and individuals that are not Communist, and from others in which the Communist influence, if it exists, is not clearly evident or easily exposed.

The State of Mississippi has been subjected to an invasion which the Communists regard as only the opening maneuver in the coming Negro revolution.

In discussing the background and origins of this project for the invasion of Mississippi, and those who have participated, I have found it is hardly possible to avoid referring to persons or organizations in these different categories I have just mentioned.

I propose to call attention to some of the evidence respecting Communist infiltration of the so-called Freedom Party, the degree of Communist control or guidance of its activities, and the nature, sources, and channels of Communist support being provided.

Mr. President, I recognize that there will be a tendency on the part of some to discount what I say here today because of my origin. It will be charged that I am attempting to smear the civil rights movement by associating it in the public mind with communism. There will be cries of "guilt by association," but for the sake of the young men and women from different parts of this country who have come into Mississippi to associate with the individuals I am talking about today, and with others of this stripe, I ask that they give me as fair a hearing as they would want for themselves. I challenge these young people to check up on what I say, to get the facts for themselves, and then to decide for themselves whether they wish to be associated with people of this kind, whether they wish to lend themselves to an effort which is serving the objectives of the Communist conspiracy, which is helping to foment disorder and racial strife and which already has destroyed the gains of many years in the field of racial relations in this country.

(At this point Mr. FANNIN took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. EASTLAND. For an understanding of how the State of Mississippi is being made a battleground by forces from outside the State, one fact which needs to be made very clear is this: the so-called Freedom Democratic Party—now often called the Freedom Party since it was commanded by court injunction not to use the word "Democratic" or claim to be a "Democratic Party"—this organization, by whatever name, is in no way representative of the State of Mississippi.

On the contrary, the so-called Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party was sponsored by nonresidents of the State of Mississippi, organized by nonresidents of the State of Mississippi, and chiefly developed by nonresidents of the State of Mississippi. Its principal support and impetus come today from outside the State of Mississippi. It gets most of its financing from outside the State of Mississippi. This is a carpetbag outfit if there ever was one.

The so-called State convention of the so-called Freedom Democratic Party was attended by only some 400 representatives and these 400 came from only 40 of the 82 counties of Mississippi. More than half the counties of the State had no representation at all in this rump meeting.

The idea of a Freedom Democratic Party popped up after a planned meeting, scheduled to be held in Jackson, Miss., in early May of last year for the purpose of arranging participation, by stooges of out-State groups, in precinct meetings of the regular Democratic Party of Mississippi on June 16, 1964, turned out to be a complete fizzle. That meeting was arranged under the directions of David Dennis, Mississippi Director of CORE. When only 55 persons showed up at the meeting, representing only 4 Mississippi counties, it was decided to try to develop a new party. Dummy conventions were held in precincts in 40 counties, and then county conventions were held on August 1 and the statewide convention of the so-called Freedom Democratic Party came along on August 6.

This group never has been, at any time, free of control by nonresidents of the State of Mississippi. A circular distributed in Mississippi, and even outside the State, showing support for the so-called Mississippi Freedom Party by the Council of Federated Organizations—COFO—gives the same address for both the Freedom Party and the Mississippi State headquarters of the COFO, at 1017 Lynch Street, Jackson, Miss.

On January 11, 1965, the New York Times published an article, on page 26, referring to 21 lawyers who were, according to Mr. Peter Kihss of the Times, "pledged to go to Mississippi to take depositions in efforts to oust Mississippi's 5 present Members from the U.S. House of Representatives."

At least some of the New York and New Jersey lawyers planning to go to Mississippi talked to the press at a private session set up by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party according to the New York Times story.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of this New York Times story, to which I have referred, and which I now send forward, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

TWENTY-ONE LAWYERS BEGIN MISSISSIPPI DRIVE—GROUP WILL SEEK DEPOSITIONS TO OUST CONGRESSMEN

(By Peter Kihss)

Twenty-one lawyers pledged here yesterday to go to Mississippi starting this week to take depositions in efforts to oust Mississippi's five present Members from the U.S. House of Representatives.

"We go down with hearts open and eyes closed," jested George Nims Raybin, assistant counsel to the city's rent and rehabilitation administration, when questions were raised over whether any of the legal volunteers might have qualms about personal safety.

One silver-haired volunteer was Ephraim Cross, professor emeritus of romance languages at City College, who started teaching there in 1911 and who preferred not to reveal how much older he might be than pretty women might think.

Professor Cross said he had been a member of the New York bar for many years and had decided to invoke his legal training for this deposition caravan—after having hired lawyers in similar cases of his own in the past.

A 40-DAY DEADLINE

Snow swirled outside the Broadway Congregational Church, 211 West 56th Street, where the fifth-floor private session had been set up by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. The Mississippi group is acting under a law permitting contestants to take depositions against newly elected Members during the first 40 days of a new session of Congress.

Morton Stavis, a Newark lawyer who is national coordinator of the caravan, told the group that Mississippi was readmitted to representation in Congress in 1870 after the Civil War on a compact that its State constitution would never be changed to deprive any citizens of the right to vote if they were entitled to vote under its 1869 constitution.

The only qualifications then set were that the voters be male citizens at least 21 years old, who had lived 6 months in the State and 1 month in a county. But in 1890, he asserted, Mississippi repudiated this compact with a new constitution requiring voters to be able to give "a reasonable interpretation" of any section.

The current challenges, served December 4 on the four Democratic Representatives and one Republican elected last November, charge that Negroes have been "systematically excluded" from voting in Mississippi.

STATEWIDE EFFORT

William M. Kustler and Arthur M. Kinov, who with Benjamin E. Smith, of New Orleans, are general attorneys for the Freedom Democratic Party, said the effort would seek subpenas for depositions throughout Mississippi's 22 counties.

Among those to be served are Gov. Paul B. Johnson, Jr., Attorney General Joe T. Patterson, and Secretary of State Heber Ladner, as members of the State board of education. The procedure under title 2, chapter 7, of the United States Code, provides for subpenas that may be issued by officials living within each congressional district ranging from judges and mayors down to public notaries.

Among the volunteers here, Ernst Rosenberger, of 80 William Street, who is 33 years old, said he was born in Germany and had to leave there as a Jew when he was 4 years old. "I've been down this road," he said.

Alan H. Levine, of 61 Broadway, is 26 years old but his blond appearance make people think he's just about entering college. He spent 2 months in the South last summer as a volunteer lawyer on voter registration projects after he decided he wanted to help in "a practical meaningful way" more than paying dues to civil rights groups.

Barney Rosenstein, of 500 Fifth Avenue, has been a lawyer particularly in housing cases, for some 30 years. He explained his motive by saying:

"We who have good fortune because we're in New York ought to be willing to share some of it."

More lawyers will be sought in another New York briefing to be held next Saturday, Mr. Stavis said. Ten were briefed in Detroit last Saturday. Other briefings are scheduled for next Saturday in Chicago and either in San Francisco or Los Angeles.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, spokesmen for the Freedom Democratic Party called a news conference in New York City last December 6 to announce that the party would challenge the seating of all five Members of Mississippi's

delegation to the House of Representatives, according to the New York Times of December 5, 1964.

The Times story said that "spokesmen" for the Freedom Democratic Party stated that "a legal peace corps" of more than 100 lawyers would go to Mississippi to gather evidence in the case.

The Times story said William M. Kunstler, of New York, whom the Congress described as "counsel for the predominantly Negro party" had explained the legal grounds for the challenge. This same story said:

The Freedom Democratic Party was founded in Jackson, Miss., last April 24, by a coalition of civil rights groups in an attempt to organize prointegration forces loyal to the National Democratic Party and its candidates.

I mention that paragaph because it indicates the Times recognizes the conspiratorial nature and non-Mississippi emphasis of the organization.

Whether anyone besides William Kunstler appeared at the New York press conference as a spokesman for the so-called Freedom Democratic Party was not stated by the Times story from which I have quoted.

That news story, nearly 2 months ago, did not name any of the lawyers who would be in the legal task force from the New York area joining the invasion of Mississippi. But now we are beginning to learn who they are.

A news story which moved on the Associated Press wire from New York and was published in the Washington Post & Times Herald on January 12, 1965, set forth that a group of 21 lawyers planned efforts in Mississippi to seek the ouster of that State's five Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. Stating this had been announced at a press conference in New York, the AP story went on to say this group of lawyers is headed by one Morton Stavis who calls himself the national coordinator of deposition caravan. Morton told the Associated Press his group would seek depositions from citizens of Mississippi in an effort to prove that Mississippi has violated the conditions under which it was readmitted to representation in Congress in 1870.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this Associated Press news story, and also the text of a story from the Worker of January 17, 1965, which I now send forward, may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 12, 1965]

SLAYING OF TWO NEGROES

A group of 21 lawyers yesterday planned efforts in Mississippi to help seek the ouster of that State's five Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. The move was announced at a New York news conference.

They said they would go there to take depositions, starting this week, claiming that Negroes have been systematically excluded from voting in elections there.

The project is called deposition caravan.

Morton Stavis, a Newark, N.J., lawyer who is national coordinator of the caravan, said the ouster effort was based on the contention that Mississippi had repudiated a pact for its representation.

Mississippi was readmitted to representation in Congress in 1870 after the Civil War, he said, on a compact that its State constitution would not be changed to deprive any citizen of the right to vote.

The only qualifications then set were that voters be male citizens who had lived 6 months in the State and 1 month in a county, he said. However, in 1890, he added, the State repudiated this compact with a new constitution requiring voters to be able to give a reasonable interpretation of any section.

Plans were to seek depositions chiefly from Negro citizens but also from a number of State officials.

[From the Worker, Jan. 17, 1965]

THIRTY-ONE LAWYERS TO GET PROOF OF MISSISSIPPI VOTE CURBS

(By T. R. Bassett)

Thirty-one lawyers, 21 in New York City and 10 in New Orleans, last week signed up with depositions caravan and volunteered to go to Mississippi to assist the interracial Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party in its campaign to unseat that State's 5 Congressmen.

The lawyers held legal seminars and a briefing session over the weekend. They are expected in Mississippi January 20, and are to be joined by other volunteers to be recruited at meetings scheduled for January 16 in California.

They will take depositions to present to the Elections Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee to back the charge that Negroes are systematically excluded from the franchise in Mississippi.

Under title 2, United States Code, section 201, such depositions can be taken within 40 days of a new session of Congress. In New York, William M. Kunstler, attorney for the Freedom Party, said subpenas will be served throughout Mississippi's 82 counties.

Most witnesses to back the charges are expected to be Negroes, but State officials will also be subpenaed, including Gov. Paul B. Johnson, Attorney General Joe Patterson and Secretary of State Heber Ladner, as well as officials of the State subsidized Mississippi Sovereignty Commission it was learned.

At the New York briefing session at the Broadway Congregational Church, Morton Stavis, national coordinator of the caravan, pointed out that Mississippi was warned by the Congress when readmitted to the Union in 1870 that she would lose her representation in that body in case of wholesale denial of the vote to Negro citizens.

Community, civic and labor groups and individuals are urged to press for Congress action after the evidence is presented.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this man Stavis, who is heading up this caravan of New York area lawyers invading Mississippi, was born Moses Isaac Stavisky on May 26, 1915, in New York, N.Y. He changed his name legally to Morton Stavis in 1939. Stavis resides at 203 Ketes Street, Elizabeth, N.J., and maintains a law office at 744 Broad Street, Newark, N.J.

Morton Stavis' public record goes back a long way. For instance, the Communist Daily Worker of September 4, 1940, at page 3, named Stavis as one of 63 lawyers then meeting at the Emergency Peace Mobilization in Chicago who joined in a telegram to the House Military Affairs Committee opposing the Burke-Wadsworth military peacetime conscription bill as unconstitutional and un-American. The Emergency Peace Mobilization has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

This same Stavis was a member of the Communist Party in 1945 and 1946 in New York and New Jersey. Presumably he stayed in the party after 1946, because in 1950 he was a member of the Communist Party unit in Union County, N.J. In 1952, he was considered within party circles as a lawyer who was a real leader and a good speaker, and was considered a member of the Lawyers Club of the New Jersey Communist Party.

Stavis has served as counsel for Communist Party members in court and at hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He had been active in the affairs of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee from 1955 through 1964, during which time he has been a member of that organization's national council.

In 1950, Morton Stavis was attorney for two men charged with distributing pro-Communist literature at the General Motors plant in Linden, N.J. These men refused, on advice of counsel, to state whether they were members of the Communist Party. Morton Stavis, as counsel for these two men, objected to the question about Communist Party membership on the ground that the question involved the political beliefs of his clients. The case was reported in the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., the issue of August 9, 1950.

Morton Stavis was defense attorney for Mrs. Sylvia Neff, who was convicted in May 1952, for swearing falsely to a Federal grand jury that she had no Communist connections. She was found guilty on three separate perjury counts. Federal Judge Madden of Camden, N.J., who tried this case, charged Stavis with "throwing sand and legal gravel in the eyes of the jury" and was seeking to "cast a shadow of doubt to create confusion." Speaking directly to Stavis, Judge Madden declared:

I have never had my patience tried so much before. You tried me so thoroughly that I had to go to a doctor so I could stay on the bench to conclude the trial. Both you and your client have no idea what it means when you take an oath such as you took when you became a member of the bar. You followed the obvious line of the Communist Party to such an extent that it was open and obvious to the jury what your methods were.

Judge Madden's charge was reported in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of May 29, 1952.

Morton Stavis was attorney for James B. McLeish, president of district 4 of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, when McLeish on December 22, 1952, refused to state to a Federal grand jury whether he had been a member of the Communist Party, USA, and was cited for contempt of court as a result. The circumstances were fully reported in the Newark Star Ledger of December 23, 1952. The United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America had been expelled from the CIO in May of 1950 because of Communist domination of the UE.

From 1954 through 1962 Morton Stavis has been listed as a member of the executive board of the National Lawyers Guild.

The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and the National Lawyers Guild have been cited as Communist fronts by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Stavis and his wife both invoked the fifth amendment before the House Committee on February 28, 1956, in refusing to answer all questions put to them regarding past or present Communist Party membership.

In May of 1956 a witness named William A. Wallace testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which was then engaged in investigating the unauthorized use of the U.S. passports. In the course of his examination under oath, Mr. Wallace testified:

> Morty Stavis directed me to Forer. When I came to Washington I came to Forer and discussed my whole case with Joe Forer, and he told me that in order to keep myself off the limb that we would arrange that if he touched me once on the knee—we were sitting like this—if he touched me once on the knee that I could go ahead and answer the questions; if he touched me twice on the knee then that I should use the fifth amendment or call for consultation.

The Morty Stavis mentioned in that testimony, and the Morton Stavis referred to in the other incident I have recounted here, is the same Morton Stavis who announced in New York that he was head of a group of lawyers who were going to move into Mississippi to aid the so-called Freedom Party in its effort to unseat duly-elected Representatives of the State of Mississippi in the Congress of the United States.

What this means, Mr. President, is that it is an attempt by the Communist Party to influence the Congress of the United States.

The New York Times article of January 11, 1965, by Peter Kihss, which I have just offered for the RECORD, mentioned one Ephraim Cross as among the group of lawyers planning to go to Mississippi, to participate in the Freedom Party's drive to oust Mississippi's delegation to the House of Representatives. The article described this man as a "silver-haired volunteer" and as "professor emeritus of romance languages at City College."

This is the same Ephraim Cross who put himself on record in favor of abolishing the House Committee on Un-American Activities; who was a member of the New York Council to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities; who was a member of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. Ephraim Cross was a member of the National Lawyers Guild, and, I believe, still a member of that organization. He was a sponsor of the National Assembly for Democratic Rights. He was a signer of a petition for executive clemency for Carl Braden and Frank Wilkinson, both identified Communists.

This is the same professor Ephraim Cross who, in the spring of 1953, addressed a conference of some 100 delegates who had met in Philadelphia to map out "an intensive drive to win clemency for Ethel and Julius Rosenberg," the convicted atom spies. A story about this conference and Professor Cross' association with it was carried in the Daily Worker of March 3, 1953, on page 4. This same Ephraim Cross also had been one of the signers, in 1953, of a statement defending the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, which is one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States.

According to the Daily Worker of October 1, 1953, Prof. Ephraim Cross was one of 99 so-called notables who sponsored a call for repeal of the McCarran-Walter Act.

According to the Worker of December 18, 1962, Ephraim Cross had at that time just attacked the House Un-American Activities Committee for its investigation of Communist penetration of certain so-called peace groups.

On January 16 of this year the Peoples World, the Communist newspaper for the Pacific coast, carried a story naming three San Francisco lawyers who had announced that they were going to Mississippi on behalf of the Freedom Party. The attorneys named were Terry A. Francois, George Moscone, and Ed Stern.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of the news story to which I have referred, and which I now send forward, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may yield to me for a brief statement by way of a preface to my question.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, my colleague and I have discussed these facts. I know the major points in his speech. I have heard part of it, and I am familiar with all of it through him.

First, I wish to highly commend him for bringing out these well-documented facts. I know my colleague knows what he is talking about and I commend him for bringing this matter up not only for the benefit of the Senate but also for the benefit of the American people.

I believe the people of the Nation will have a growing concern and interest, as they learn more and more about the activities of this group, particularly of those with Communist connections, who are members of the party or are affiliated with it in some way.

This morning, as over the past several weeks, I gained special information about the activities of the Communists in Vietnam, on the other side of the world, where we have sent many thousands of our armed services personnel. Many of our servicemen have been killed trying to stem the tide of this very influence that the Senator from Mississippi is describing in such detail is going on in one of the States of the United States on the racial question. The same type activity is also going on in other States.

During the latter part of 1964, while in Mississippi, I went into several of the communities in which activities of freedom schools—the schools operated by COFO—were being operated. I went to police officers and mayors and other citizens whom I personally knew and I talked to them about the modus operandi of the workers and how the operation was conducted. Without exception I found the same general pattern. These groups came into various counties in Mississippi last spring or early summer. Included within the groups were some very fine clean-living young people of intelligence, high purpose, and good but perhaps misguided intentions. Along with them came a kind of middle group. Then there was another group of beatniks and below that group was very low-class common trash.

They were cunning, vigorous, and persistent.

Without exception and within a short time the better group I have described would recognize the kind of associates they had and they would move on to some other place where the condition was not so rank. The better ones left after a few days or certainly within a few weeks. But the agitators, the common crowd and the crumbs, would stay there. They were the ones who would make the trouble.

Did not my colleague find a similar pattern of operation?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The crowd that remained was the group of trained and paid agitators. Included in the group were some of those which the Senator is now describing as Communist affiliated. They were the ones who flouted all the customs and traditions of a social order to which people had been accustomed and had lived under for almost two centuries.

The white boys and white girls would live in Negro homes. They would sit in the courthouse square on park benches, and they would love and hug and go down the streets holding hands. I am speaking of the white girls and white boys in the groups that came in.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know of several instances in which members of the group were syphilitic and the Public Health Service had to take charge.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, I heard of that, too. The mores, customs, and traditions that the people there were taught in their youth were flouted daily in the faces of both races.

Those activities naturally provoked our people. They provoked the ladies, the men, the youth, and everyone else, over and over again. The fact that those activities were deliberate and planned is clear as crystal and beyond doubt.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know of an instance in my hometown in which a Negro woman cut her husband up because of his attention to one of those white girls.

I shall say that those people did not realize that they were part and parcel of the Communist conspiracy. Those activities were directed by the Communist conspiracy in an attempt to take over the State of Mississippi by the Communist Party. That is all it can mean. Its leadership is Communist. They are trying to influence the House of Representatives against five duly elected Members

of that body. It is a Communist plan to influence the Congress of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. The pattern of operation is certainly the same.

I found that the more understanding and better type of colored people neither liked nor appreciated that conduct on the part of the white and colored people who came in there. They shied away from those who came. They stayed away from them and used their influence to keep them from making any headway.

Did the Senator find that pattern of conduct in his area?

Mr. EASTLAND. From my observation—and my area was right in the center of it—40 of the agitators reported in the area at one time. I would say that 95 percent of the Negroes in the area spurned any association with them and condemned their coming. They condemned everything that the groups stood for.

Mr. STENNIS. I found the same pattern of operations in the area in which I live. What we have discussed has been confirmed by the police and other responsible people in the community. They saw those incidents as they happened.

Is it not true, too, that all of the conduct which we have discussed has a tendency to array race against race, even though members of a race did not take any part in the activity, and neighbor against neighbor? When the agitation came and split the races, did it not cause understanding to be spread further and further apart? Is that not true in these instances in which the groups were able to remain and carry on an aggressive campaign over and over and week after week? Was that not the effect of the activity?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, that was the effect of it. But I know that members of the groups would go to town after town and try to obtain quarters in a Negro home, and there was not a Negro home in the town that would let the members of the groups remain there.

Mr. STENNIS. I was referring to the places in which they did stay or in which they were permitted to remain.

Mr. EASTLAND. What my colleague has said is exactly correct.

Mr. STENNIS. In many places they were not able to make any headway at all. They were spurned by the colored people, and everyone else. Then they would get out, and they would not be seen any more in those areas.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know of town after town in which that happened.

Mr. STENNIS. In areas in which those people were able to stay, their activities would disrupt the business life, the social, and the spiritual life of both races and generally disrupt the peace and harmony of the people. Is that not what the Senator found?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Now, after all this has occurred, to that the most active participants and some of the most effective of the leaders are either Communists themselves or have a documented Communist connection, makes the pill even more bitter to swallow. It becomes an insult on top of an insult, and it should be a subject of the gravest concern to every Senator, every Representative, the administration, and the people of the United States. The people should know those things are being carried on in various places under the guise—the damnable claim—that "it is something we are going to do to help the races."

Mr. EASTLAND. I have referred to Stavis, who is down in Mississippi now taking depositions. He is a Communist, and it is a Communist attempt to influence Congress. It is a Communist attempt to deprive five legally elected representatives of their seats in the House of Representatives.

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly agree with my colleague. The Members of this body do not realize the extent to which this activity is being carried on in order to try to scrape up some kind of proof that might possibly be used to unseat the Members of the House of Representatives elected from our State.

Mr. EASTLAND. My colleague knows that they come back with lurid stories such as that of a citizen of my town named Fannie Lou Hamer. I saw the story in the Washington Post. She made a speech here a few days ago and said that 6 out of 10 Negro women who were taken to the Sunflower City Hospital were sterilized.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is a joke and a lie on its face because, to begin with, there is no hospital in Sunflower City. There is no hospital within miles of Sunflower City. Yet absolute lies, that are put out for propaganda purposes, are printed in the newspapers and hurled at the people of Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Do not the facts disclosed by the Senator fully underscore and bring out the correctness of the repeated warnings that have been made by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, about the efforts of the Communist Party to infiltrate any part or element it can in regard to the racial struggle? I should like to quote something that Mr. Hoover recently said, as late as January 1965, as set forth in an FBI release:

> The Communist Party is making every effort to increase its influence in the racial struggle and continues to promote the false impression that it is a legitimate political party.

Those are not idle words; they do not come from an idle source, a questionable source, or a biased source.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator says is absolutely correct. That statement comes from a man who has thoroughly infiltrated the Communist Party and knows whereof he speaks.

This is an attempt by the Communist Party to use the responsible news media for propaganda purposes in order to take over one of the 50 States of the Union.

Mr. STENNIS. As we stand here and discuss the subject, it is natural that we shall be charged with some bias, partisanship, or prejudice on the subject. But I have another quotation from Mr. Hoover. I shall read it and let the Senator or anyone else who hears it decide whether it does not bear out what we are saying. Mr. Hoover, in December 1964, speaking in New York City before the Society of Pennsylvania Women, said:

> Nowhere have the devious tactics of the Communist Party been more forcefully demonstrated than in the party's efforts to drive a wide breach of racial misunderstanding in this country to capitalize upon areas of dissension and unrest.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct. It applies absolutely to conditions in Mississippi today.

Mr. STENNIS. It fits exactly like a hand in a glove. One more thing about the effect of these activities: Does not the Senator believe that in an area where large numbers of white and colored people live together, and who have been living together peacefully, that if this activity continues for any appreciable time, it will tear down business, tear down the economy, and disrupt the spiritual life as well as the social life of the areas in which it is operating? That there will no longer be a normal economy; there will no longer be a market in which to buy automobiles, farm machinery, or anything else? That Mississippi will no longer be a place to produce agricultural or any other products? That the economy of the area will be destroyed wherever such activity takes place?

Mr. EASTLAND. It will hurt both races and will hurt our national economy.

Mr. STENNIS. Of course it will, and not only in our State, but in any other State where conditions like these exist.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not believe that any Member of the Senate or anyone else has any sympathy with this activity. I do not believe they approve it. Still, much more pressure will have to be put on the very people whom the Senator is describing in his speech, if their activity is to be stopped and if they are to be prevented from traveling under the guise of political freedom or of improving racial relations or the social structure of our country. If they are left to freely pursue that course, they will leave the country in shambles.

Mr. EASTLAND. It means that Congress will have to take action to curb the Communist Party. After all, this is a Communist conspiracy. Why should the Communist Party be permitted to take over a State of the Union? That is the plan.

Mr. STENNIS. The Nation is in serious trouble in Vietnam. Day by day, we are expecting things to become more serious there. It is a part of the Communist conspiracy to move in on soft spots wherever they occur in the world and cause as much trouble as they can under whatever guise fits their purpose, even to the extent of guerilla warfare and similar tactics.

Such activities are occurring not only in other countries; they are beginning to take place rapidly in our home States. This is a challenge to the Government; it is a challenge to the best thought and the best spiritual relations we can possibly bring about in the whole Nation.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is not the big challenge to control the Communist Party at home?

Mr. STENNIS. Of course it is. It is a challenge to do something effective about the Communist Party. Instead, the Communists are being encouraged in many ways to continue their activities, and large sums of money are being sent in to finance them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator believe that the connotation of race—that it is necessary to get people wrought up—is merely the pretext for the Communist Party to march in, and is not that what is happening in Mississippi?

Mr. STENNIS. Instead of the situation becoming better, it will probably become worse than it was last year, unless something effective is done to control it.

I thank the Senator for yielding. I commend him for his statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. I appreciate the statement of my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. President, the San Francisco Examiner of Januray 19, 1965, published an article reciting that several attorneys from the San Francisco area were proceeding, in separate groups of five or more, to the First Congressional District of Mississippi to "perfect the challenge to the Mississippi congressional delegation." The Examiner article indicated that Representative PHILLIP BURTON, a freshman Member of Congress from San Francisco, had written a letter to the Attorney General asking that U.S. marshals and FBI agents protect this group of lawyers while it was in Mississippi.

One group of five California lawyers, which reportedly left for Mississippi on January 19, was alleged to include Alvin H. Goldstein, a former special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, and Benjamin Dreyfus, a former member of the professional section of the Communist Party USA, in San Francisco. Dreyfus was a member of the Communist Party at least until 1945 and national president of the National Lawyers Guild, 1962–64. The other three members of this group of five lawyers reportedly headed for Mississippi as a part of the Freedom Party invasion were reported as Edward Stern—presumably the same person as the Ed Stern mentioned in the People's World article on January 16; Jack Berman; and Harry Lohstroh.

Who are some of these lawyers coming into the State of Mississippi to make more trouble? I cannot give complete answers, but I can furnish some facts.

Edward Stern is a member of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers Guild.

Jack Berman was born in 1922 and admitted to practice in 1946, after graduation from the University of California with an LL.B. degree. He has an office on Market Street in San Francisco. In 1960 he was counsel of record for some of those who had participated in riots at the city hall in San Francisco. According to the 1961 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, at page 112, he was a sponsor of the Los Angeles Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born. That organization was an affiliate of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, which has been cited by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive and Communist.

Benjamin Ballinger Dreyfus was born in 1910, admitted to practice in 1938, after getting his LL.B. from Stanford University. He is a native of San Francisco, has his law office there, and lives in Mill Valley, Calif. He was identified on June 19, 1957, by Dr. Jack Beverly Patten, in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as a former member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Patten testified under oath, and identified Dreyfus as a fellow member of the professional section of the Communist Party in San Francisco in the early 1940's.

Dreyfus himself testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on June 21, 1956, and invoked the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution in refusing to answer questions regarding Communist Party membership. He admitted membership in the National Lawyers Guild and the holding of official posts in that organization.

Dreyfus is a former president of the National Lawyers Guild. He was elected a member of the National Executive Board of the National Lawyers Guild at its 1956 convention.

Benjamin Dreyfus was a sponsor of the California Statewide Legislative Conference held in February of 1947 in Sacramento. This conference was cited as subversive in the 1947 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, at pages 240–242. Benjamin Dreyfus turned up the next year as a member of the expanded executive board of the California Legislative Conference, according to a report in the Daily People's World of September 13, 1948. The California Legislative Conference was cited as subversive by the fifth report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities for 1949, at pages 436 and 437.

The Daily People's World of October 24, 1949, in an article captioned "Five Thousand Dollars for Defense Fight Against Medina Edict Started at CRC Dinner," reported that Benjamin Dreyfus, referred to as secretary of the National Lawyers Guild, had been toastmaster at a testimonial banquet sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress and held at 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco.

According to a news story in the Santa Rosa Press Democrat of October 30, 1950, Benjamin Dreyfus spoke on October 29, 1950, at a meeting sponsored by the California Legislative Conference, and held at the Labor Temple at Santa Rosa. This is the same California Legislative Conference that I mentioned earlier as having been cited as subversive by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

The 1955 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, at page 329, listed Benjamin Dreyfus as a speaker on October 5, 1953, at a meeting of the Los Angeles Committee To Get Justice for the Rosenbergs, convicted atom spies.

Benjamin Dreyfus was counsel for William Schneiderman, identified Communist leader, in 1956, according to a report appearing in the Daily Worker of September 11, 1956, at page 3.

Benjamin Dreyfus, listed as "president of the National Lawyers Guild in Los Angeles," was scheduled to speak on November 11, 1960 at a meeting of the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms at St. Nicholas Greek Church in Los Angeles. The Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms was cited as subversive by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in its 1963 report, at page 13.

In February 1961, Benjamin Dreyfus signed a petition for executive clemency for Carl Braden and Frank Wilkinson, whose appeal after conviction had been denied by the U.S. Supreme Court. In June of 1961, Benjamin Dreyfus was a sponsor of an East Bay community forum in honor of Bertram Edises, an identified Communist.

The 1961 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, at page 117, lists Benjamin Dreyfus as a member of the Southern California Executive Committee of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee has been cited as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Benjamin Dreyfus has signed several petitions for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. One instance of this was reported in a circular accompanying a letter dated March 27, 1963 and signed by Clarence E. Pickett, appealing for support for a campaign to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities. Another more recent instance, was reported in the Worker of December 8, 1964.

Terry A. Francois was born in 1921, admitted to practice in 1950 after graduation from Stanford University. He has an office in uptown San Francisco. The 1961 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, at page 110, listed Terry A. Francois as president of the San Francisco chapter of the NAACP.

All I know about George Moscone, at the moment, beyond his inclusion in the group of San Francisco lawyers announced as working for the Freedom Party, is that he was referred to in an article in the October 26, 1963, issue of the People's World, Pacific coast organ of the Communist Party USA, as a candidate for supervisor, San Francisco, having labor endorsement.

According to an article in the Reporter magazine for August 13, 1964, the groundwork for the so-called Freedom Party was "accomplished in a series of conferences that included Aaron Henry and two other Negro leaders, Robert Moses, field secretary of SNCC, and David Dennis, field secretary of the Congress for Racial Equality." Moses, who, the article declares, "appears to be the key figure in all civil rights undertakings in Mississippi" was described as "program director for COFO."

Robert Parris Moses is a 27-year-old New York Negro—last known address 17 West 139th Street—who has been ex-

tremely active in Mississippi and other States in encouraging Negroes to register and vote. He is affiliated with the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee in New York. He has been the initiator of numerous complaints of alleged civil rights violations, and in many instances his charges have not been substantiated.

For instance, Moses was tried in police court in McComb, Miss., on October 31, 1961, on charges of disturbing the peace. At the time, Moses had been conducting voter registration schools in the McComb area. But he was not arrested for that. His arrest was the result of his participation in a mass demonstration to protest the action of local officials in not allowing sit-in demonstrators to reenter a Negro school. On October 31, 1961, he was found guilty on the charge of disturbing the peace and sentenced to a fine of $200, with 4 months imprisonment in the county jail. He filed notice of appeal and was released on $1,000 bond.

On May 21, 1962, Moses was tried before a county court jury, was again found guilty, and was sentenced to 6 months in jail and a payment of a $500 fine. He again filed notice of appeal and was released on $1,000 bond.

In 1962, Moses appealed as a conscientious objector from the decision of his local draft board with respect to his classification. At that time Moses was working for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee. His claim did not appear based on specific religious beliefs, or adherence to the tenets of any particular church creed, but was supported mainly by his allegation that he did not believe in violence and killing. It was reported that Moses had expressed a desire to be arrested in connection with his alleged civil rights activities so that he would not be taken into military service. However, the U.S. Attorney General closed the file on this case without taking action against Moses.

In January 1963, Moses and others filed suit against the Attorney General of the United States and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation seeking to compel them to take action against local authorities and other individuals alleged to have violated or to be violating the rights of Moses and others. U.S. District Judge Youngdahl, in the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia, indicated disbelief that he had authority to take the action Moses' suit requested, and the suit was dismissed in July 1963.

Let me name some of the other well-known nonresidents of the State of Mississippi who have been publicly identified with the organization of the so-called Freedom Democratic Party, and tell something about them.

One of these individuals is George William Crockett, Jr., a Negro, long active in the Detroit chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, and who has been on its advisory board. Crockett was designated as cochairman of a committee of lawyers who would spend a period of 12 weeks in Mississippi, after the Guild in 1964 inaugurated a lawyers peace call program involving the recruiting of attorneys to devote their time for defense of individuals involved in Mississippi civil rights cases.

George William Crockett, Jr., is a partner in the law firm of Goodman, Crockett, Robb, & Philo, of Detroit, Mich. He has defended Communists in various Smith Act cases. For instance, he represented the chairman of the Michigan Communist Party in the New York Smith Act trial. In that famous trial of first-string Communists in 1949 before Judge Medina, Crockett so comported himself that at the end of the trial Judge Medina held him in contempt of court and sentenced him to 4 months' imprisonment on each of nine specific contempt charges. Crockett sought relief from a higher court, but the U.S. Supreme Court denied his petition for certiorari, and Crockett and other attorneys similarly sentenced in the same proceeding served their sentences in 1952.

In 1962 Crockett went to Mexico, where he associated with individuals known as among the more active members of the American Communist group there. In 1964 Crockett was registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as an agent of the Cuban Communist Government of Fidel Castro.

A man who has been particularly active in voter registration matters in Mississippi, and who is known as a supporter of the so-called Freedom Party, is James Foreman, spelled F-o-r-e-m-a-n, also known as Forman, without the e, who has been active in connection with racial demonstrations in other portions of the South, also. This man Foreman has been involved in various civil rights investigations either as subject or alleged victim. In 1936 he was alleged to have represented himself improperly as a member of the Domestic Peace Corps in Mississippi, but was not prosecuted because there was no evidence that those to whom he misrepresented himself were in fact misled into believing that he was a Government employee. This matter arose through Foreman's activities as a member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

On August 28, 1961, the Memphis Press Scimitar referred to Foreman as having claimed to be the president of the National Freedom Council. This was in connection with a story about Foreman's involvement in the incident at Monroe, La., wherein a man and woman were held hostage in the home of Robert Williams, Monroe Negro integration leader, during racial demonstrations on August 27, 1961. According to the Memphis Commercial Appeal, which also referred to Forman as president of the National Freedom Council, Forman claimed he had been clubbed during the incident at Monroe. It should be made clear that Forman was not a party to the kidnapping by Williams, but defended Williams thereafter.

Foreman was arrested at Albany, Ga., in 1961, in connection with activities testing the use of intrastate trains. At that time newspapers referred to him as heading a subcommittee of the Congress of Racial Equality—CORE.

Like many of the backers of the so-called Freedom Party, Foreman has had various affiliations in connection with the fomentation of racial discord and strife and the organization of racial demonstrations, all under the banner of civil rights.

Another backer of the so-called Freedom Party is Jesse Williard Gray. Gray is a Negro, born in the South, in Louisiana, not in Mississippi; and he has been a resident of the New York area for many years and rose to notoriety and power among racial agitators in that area. He is presently a resident of New York City, and director of the so-called Harlem Community Council on Housing. Gray has been a major agitator in organizing tenants in the Harlem area since late 1958. Gray's various interlocking interests call to mind the essay on Communist aims and tactics written in 1928 by Joseph Pogany, a representative of the Communist International, using the name of "John Pepper," and titled "Platform of the Workers—Communist—Party of America." In this essay, "John Pepper" wrote that "one of the biggest tasks" of the party was "to extend its activities to the solid South," and in explaining tactics to be used in this effort, pointed out that "the Negro Miner's Relief Committee and the Harlem Tenants League are examples of united front organizations which may be set up as a means of drawing the Negro masses into the struggle." Incidentally, it may be worth noting that this essay on Communist tactics, written 37 years ago, declared that "Communists must not forget for a moment that the struggle—of the Communist Party—for the national liberation of the Negroes includes the relentless struggle against the Negro bourgeoisie and the struggle against the influence of the petit-bourgeoisie over the Negro proletariat." That translates into plain English as warning that in order to exploit the Negro race in this country the Communists would deliberately seek to defeat and supplant old-line Negro leaders and discredit or destroy Negroes who had gained influence in their community by attaining a measure of education or material success, or both. That still is Communist policy and practice today, as numbers of those who have been real leaders of the Negro race down through the years, until recent date, have been learning to their sorrow.

Now, let us get back to the subject of backers of the Freedom Party.

Jesse Williard Gray openly admitted Communist Party membership in the 1950's. He was a Communist Party organizer from 1950 to 1958. In November 1958 he was relieved by the party of his duties as regional director of the Harlem section of the Communist Party, but apparently did not resign from the party.

This is the same Jesse Gray to whom I referred to in an earlier address, who was very active in the recent riots in Harlem, and who has been well known for some time by the New York City Police Department as a troublemaker.

There is no direct evidence available to show present membership by Jesse Gray in the Communist Party, but he has recently obtained contributions for the party, including a contribution of $2,500 or more from the trust fund of a

married daughter of Samuel Rubin of New York City, always a generous contributor to the Communist Party, and who for many years was president of Faberge, Inc., engaged in the perfume business.

Last July the New York Journal-American carried an article reporting that Malcolm X, who had formerly been a member of the so-called nation of Islam, had announced the formation of the organization for Afro-American Unity—OAAU. This organization was described as a group dedicated to "fomenting a black revolution in this country by any means necessary, including arming Negroes." The article stated that Malcolm X, in an interview, had indicated that he and other militant Negro groups had established a brain trust which was engaged in mapping out a program for the OAAU. Jesse Gray was named by Malcolm X as one of the members of this brain trust.

Another operator in behalf of the Freedom Party is Bayard Rustin, quondam close associate of Martin Luther King.

When the Freedom Party moved on Atlantic City at convention time last year, Bayard Rustin was announced as having been placed in charge of arranging for demonstrations.

I referred to Bayard Rustin on an earlier occasion in more detail than I shall attempt today. He served some 28 months during World War II as a conscientious objector. In January of 1953, he was convicted in Pasadena, Calif., for sex perversion and lewdness. In 1956, he attended the Young Communist League meeting in New York as an observer. In 1958, he went to Soviet Russia and there participated in Communist propaganda shows. More recently, he was concerned with organizing Martin Luther King's march on Washington, D.C., which the Communist newspaper, the Worker, called a Communist project.

(At this point, Mr. KENNEDY of New York took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, another supporter of the so-called Freedom Democratic Party and its program is one Jack Minnis, former research director of the Southern Regional Council's voter education project. In 1964 Minnis was reported as doing research on southern politics and economics in association with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Minnis gave a lecture at the State University of New York in Buffalo, N.Y., in February of 1964, and the February 28, 1964, edition of Spectrum, the weekly student newspaper at that university, published an article about the lecture. This article indicated that Minnis had stressed what he called the complete absence of Federal authority in Mississippi, and had further claimed that he had personally seen FBI agents "remain dormant" while Negroes were harassed and prevented from registering to vote. The article indicated Minnis had also asserted that all Federal authority was locally influenced.

From this, it is obvious that Minnis either has a complete lack of understanding and knowledge concerning the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the matters he mentioned in his lecture, or else he was deliberately misrepresenting the situation.

According to the student newspaper article, Minnis testified in Federal court in the case of the United States against Joni Rabinowitz to the effect that racial prejudice of southern juries placed the defendant in the case in serious jeopardy of a miscarriage of justice. Joni Rabinowitz, a student at Antioch College in Ohio, was field secretary of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and had been indicted for perjury by a Macon, Ga., Federal grand jury in connection with civil rights activities. The student news story to which I have referred pointed out that her father was or had been an attorney for Fidel Castro. The fact is that Joni Rabinowitz is the daughter of Victor Rabinowitz, of the New York law firm of Rabinowitz & Boudin, registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as agents for Fidel Castro and associated in that connection with Benjamin E. Smith, of New Orleans, counsel for the Freedom Party.

After the assassination of President Kennedy, Jack Minnis and one Staughton Lynd prepared a long article entitled "Seeds of Doubt," recounting alleged discrepancies in reports respecting the assassination and claiming that the Dallas Police Department and the FBI should "account for their own activities" in connection with the matter. Questions raised in this article were not new, having been previously raised by the press, and were shown to have been based on erroneous information or speculation.

The Worker of December 20, 1964, on its front page, hailed "a massive organizational effort" to get New York City Congressmen to support "the Mississippi Democratic Freedom Party's challenge of the Mississippi congressional delegation."

The article went on to describe an all-day conference of representatives of some 45 organizations associated with the Metropolitan Conference of Civil Rights Action, and said the conference was largely devoted to discussing ways and means of mobilizing New Yorkers in this fight.

The Worker article identified as chairman of the Metropolitan Conference one Rev. Edler G. Hawkins, also referred to as this year's moderator of the United Presbyterian Church.

Edler G. Hawkins was a candidate for the New York State Assembly on the American Labor Party ticket in 1948, participated in a conference of the American Labor Party in March of 1949, and was a member of the State executive committee of the American Labor Party in April of 1949.

According to a report on the Communist peace offensive, made by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Edler G. Hawkins was a member of the American Sponsoring Committee of the World Congress for Peace, which met in Paris in April of 1949. This was one of the long series of Communist-inspired and manipulated peace meetings intended to produce, and which did produce, propaganda useful to the Communist conspiracy on a worldwide scale.

In 1943, Edler G. Hawkins was a sponsor of the Citizens' Emergency Conference for Interracial Unity. A statement sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, opposing renewal of the Dies Committee, was signed by Edler G. Hawkins in 1943.

In August of 1945, a booklet issued by the Committee for Equal Justice for Mrs. Recy Taylor, which was an auxiliary of the International Labor Defense, listed Edler G. Hawkins as a sponsor.

The 1946 fall term calendar of the Tremont Annex of the Jefferson School of Social Science, in Bronx, N.Y., listed Edler G. Hawkins as a sponsor.

On page 28 of a review by the House Committee on Un-American Activities of the 1949 Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, Edler G. Hawkins is listed as affiliated with the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

Edler G. Hawkins was a sponsor of the Waldorf Conference of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions in March 1949, according to one of the conference's own leaflets.

In April of 1947, Edler G. Hawkins was publicly announced as one of the signers of a statement called "The Negro Leaders' Defense of the Communist Party."

Mr. President, the Worker of December 8, 1964, identified William Kunstler and Arthur Kinoy, of New York, and Benjamin E. Smith, of New Orleans, as "legal counsel for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party."

The Peter Kihes article in the New York Times of January 11, 1965, which I have offered for the RECORD, stated that:

> William M. Kustler and Arthur M. Kinor, who with Benjamin E. Smith of New Orleans are general attorneys for the Freedom Democratic Party, said the effort would seek subpenas for depositions throughout Mississippi's 22 counties.

The name "William M. Kustler" is an obvious typographical error. The individual referred to is William M. Kunstler.

This is the same William Kunstler of whom Representative WILLIAM M. TUCK, of Virginia, said, in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives on February 1, 1964:

> This Kunstler has been doing all he could to impede the processes of justice in Danville, Va., but impeding justice is not new for him. He has taken a lead in the movement for the pardon and the release of the notorious conspirator and enemy of America, Norton Sobell, who is currently serving a 30-year prison sentence for conspiracy to commit espionage in 1951 in connection with the Rosenberg case. This same Kunstler was sponsor of the rally to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, held in New York City on April 21, 1961. Carl Braden and Frank Wilkinson were among the contemptible speakers at this rally. Both of them were then about to begin serving sentences in prison for contempt of the Congress of the United States, extending from their refusal to answer whether or not they were or had been members of the Communist Party.
>
> Another speaker at the meeting was Pete Seeger, who had just been sentenced to a

year in prison for the same reason. This same Kunstler, who, posing as a respectable professor of law, plagued the people of the city of Danville, has been shown to be one of the signers of a petition which urged Presidential clemency for Carl Braden. I have evidence also that in March 1962, after having failed in his efforts to secure a pardon for Braden, he attended a reception in New York in honor of this convicted scoundrel.

Kunstler was one of the 25 of the signers of the endorsement of Justice Black's dissent from the 5 to 4 Supreme Court decision of June 5, 1961, requiring the Communist Party to register with the Government of the United States. These signatures were sponsored by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

From that background one is led to suspect that Kunstler, who along with Carl Braden, Carl Braden's wife, and others of their ilk, was prominent in the strife which occurred in Danville, is less interested in the plight of the Negro race than he is in the Communists and their causes, and that he is more interested in creating a stage for civil disobedience which will further the cause of lawlessness in this country.

Representative TUCK was eloquent, but he did not claim to discuss the entire record of this man Kunstler, nor did he do so. Neither do I make such a claim; but I can add a few more facts to what Representative TUCK said.

Kunstler was trial counsel for Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

William Kunstler was special counsel for CORE. He was special counsel for the NAACP. He was special counsel for the ACLU. He was counsel for the Southern Conference Educational Fund. With Henry Winston, an identified spokesman for the Communist Party, he was a speaker for the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, according to a report of the National Guardian of May 30, 1964, at page 4.

The Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties was a Communist front, and the purpose of the rally at which Kunstler spoke was to whip up sentiment and action against the Internal Security Act.

With identified Communists Frank Wilkinson and Harvey O'Connor, and leftwing attorney Mark Lane, Kunstler was a scheduled speaker in October 1962, at a rally to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This rally was held at Manhattan Center in New York City. The Mark Lane who spoke with Kunstler at that rally is the same Lane who later became notorious as a leading exponent of the theory that Lee Harvey Oswald was framed for the assassination of President Kennedy and did not actually commit the crime.

Preceding the New York Times story of January 11, but following the Worker story of December 8, 1964, the Washington Post of January 5, 1965, named Arthur Kinoy as attorney for the Freedom Party. This was in connection with reporting that Kinoy had addressed a meeting of this organization at Lincoln Memorial Congregational Temple on January 14, 1965.

Arthur Kinoy is a lawyer, a member of the firm of Kunstler & Kunstler at 511 Fifth Avenue, New York City. He is 44 years old, having been born in the Bronx, N.Y., in September of 1920.

In his student days at Harvard, Arthur Kinoy was a member of the national executive committee of the American Student Union, an organization cited as Communist by five different investigating committees. In 1945, he was registered as a member of the American Labor Party.

Later, Kinoy was a representative of the International Workers Order. He was attorney for the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers Union of America, a Communist-controlled union. He has been connected with various other front groups.

During the investigation by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of Communist infiltration among American citizens employed by the United Nations, Mr. Kinoy appeared as counsel for one Alfred J. Van Tassel who claimed his fifth amendment privilege in refusing to testify about his Communist Party affiliations.

Arthur Kinoy took an active part in the defense of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, who were executed on June 19, 1953, after conviction of atomic espionage. Kinoy made two last-minute efforts to save the Rosenbergs from execution. A motion brought by Mr. Kinoy for Emanuel Bloch on June 18 was referred to Judge Kaufman by Judge Ryan; and the following day, a motion for a stay of execution pending determination of the motion brought by Mr. Kinoy the previous day was referred to Judge Kaufman by Judge Dimmock. This motion was denied, and another motion to stay the execution pending appeal of the decision was likewise denied.

Arthur Kinoy was honored by the New York Committee for Protection of Foreign Born at a banquet advertised as salute to attorneys. The New York Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is an affiliate of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

In the New York Times of October 3, 1946, at page 21, Arthur Kinoy is listed, together with Frank J. Donner and Marshall Perlin, as attorney for Steve Nelson before the U.S. Supreme Court. Steve Nelson was a notorious American Communist who was also an international Communist leader.

In 1958, Arthur Kinoy was associated with the law firm of Donner, Kinoy & Perlin, a firm which received payments from various Communist groups in the 1950's including the Committee for Justice for Morton Sobell and the Labor Youth League.

According to testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in April 1959, which has been publicly printed and made public, Arthur Kinoy was at that time listed by Harry Sacher as a member of the law firm of Harry Sacher, Frank Donner, Marshall Perlin, & Milton Friedman, with offices at 342 Madison Avenue, New York City. Both Harry Sacher and Frank Donner have been frequently listed as defending Communist cases.

Kinoy has been associated with the National Lawyers Guild for a long time. He was national vice president of that organization in 1954. Ten years later, he was still active in the work of the National Lawyers Guild. He recently served as vice president at the National Lawyers Guild Convention in Detroit. The June 13, 1964, issue of the Michigan Chronicle, a weekly Detroit newspaper in the Negro community, reported Kinoy as having participated in a conference sponsored by the National Lawyers Guild Committee for Legal Assistance in the South, the purpose of the conference being to brief attorneys on legal problems confronting civil rights demonstrators in Mississippi. The news story to which I have referred indicated that those who attended the conference volunteered to go to Mississippi to defend any demonstrators who might encounter legal difficulties.

Along with Kinoy and Kunstler, Benjamin E. Smith was named as one of the three who guide the legal affairs of the Freedom Party. Whether or not because of his position as legal counsel, this Benjamin Smith is indeed a very strong supporter of the Mississippi Freedom Party and its objectives. He was at one time, and may still be, one of two men in charge of the activities of a special task force sent into Mississippi by the National Lawyers Guild to aid in registration of Negroes to vote.

Benjamin E. Smith is a member of the firm of Smith & Waltzer in New Orleans, La.

Smith is a member of the National Lawyers Guild and has served on its executive board. He is a politically minded man, and was active in leftwing politics before he could vote. In 1948, at the age of 21, he was named a presidential elector on the Henry Wallace ticket.

Benjamin Smith had an early association—more than 10 years ago—with Hunter Pitts Odell, then a Communist Party district organizer, who subsequently, and much more recently, became an assistant to Martin Luther King.

In October 1954, Benjamin E. Smith was one of 175 signers of a letter to President Eisenhower urging him to grant amnesty to "political prisoners convicted under the Smith Act."

In 1956, in sworn testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee at a hearing in New Orleans, La., Smith denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party.

In the spring of 1958, Benjamin E. Smith was appointed assistant district attorney of the parish of New Orleans. This came about in an interesting way. The newly elected district attorney was one Richard A. Dowling, who had been identified in the July 1938 issue of Equal Justice as an attorney for the International Labor Defense in New Orleans, who had been a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association in 1942, and who was listed in 1938 as a member of the Lawyers' Committee on American Relations With Spain. District Attorney Dowling appointed one J. David McNeil as his executive assistant. Mr. McNeil had been a member of the International Labor Defense and had been identified with the National Lawyers' Guild and with the

Southern Council, Southern Conference for Human Welfare. At the same time that he appointed Mr. McNeil as his executive assistant, Dowling named Benjamin E. Smith as assistant district attorney.

Benjamin E. Smith went to Cuba near the end of December 1960, and stayed about 2 weeks, reportedly as a guest of the National Lawyers' College of Cuba, to attend events commemorating the second anniversary of the Cuban revolution. Smith reportedly has claimed that Fidel Castro has done a great deal to help the Cuban people and that the American press has given a distorted picture of the Castro regime.

In October of 1961 or prior thereto, Smith was employed by the Republic of Cuba; and in 1964 both Benjamin E. Smith and his partner, Bruce C. Waltzer, were registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as agents of the Republic of Cuba.

Smith was elected a vice president of the National Lawyers Guild at its national convention in Detroit, Mich., in February of last year.

Prior to last October, A. Phillip Randolph of the Negro-American Labor Council, who was a prime mover behind the so-called march on Washington, called for a state of the race meeting of leading Negroes from throughout the country to be held in Washington, D.C., in October 1964. This meeting later was postponed until after the national elections, and was scheduled for December 11 to 13, 1964, at Howard University. Still later the meeting was again postponed, and rescheduled somewhat indefinitely to be held during January 1965 in New York City. In an announcement with regard to this meeting, reported in the Washington Evening Star of November 9, 1964, at page C–20, Walter E. Fauntroy, pastor of the New Bethel Baptist Church in the District of Columbia and director of the Washington office of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, said the purpose of the meeting "will be to discuss what future activities will encase the civil rights organizations and what new directions the movement will take."

While there has been no overt evidence that the Communist Party has had anything to do with the planning of this gathering, the party has been greatly interested in taking advantage of it. Claude Lightfoot, chairman of the Communist Party's National Negro Commission, instructed a number of party members to attend the state of the race gathering. The party's obvious purpose in having its people from various parts of the country attend this meeting was to make possible its hope of controlling or at least influencing actions taken.

It was interesting to note that on January 30 of this year, a meeting called by A. Phillip Randolph was held at the office of the National Council of Churches at 425 Riverside Drive, New York City. This was announced as a meeting of the Negro-American Labor Council. Whether this is all that came of Randolph's call for a state of the race meeting, or whether that meeting is still to come, I do not know.

Mr. President, the efforts multiply, and intensify. The fronts proliferate, and interlock. Bad men are enlisted, venal men are bought, stupid men are duped; some good men are misled, some honest men are fooled, even some very brainy men are led astray by their own logic, for a man is like a computer in this: feed in the wrong facts, or not enough facts, and the right answer will not come out.

So, Mr. President, the cast of characters swells and alters, some put on new disguises, some play new parts, but the theme of the play is no different. The tactics change, but the objective remains the same. And all the while, the pressure mounts.

The whole worldwide effort of the Communist conspiracy and its apparatus, its fellow travelers, its hirelings, its dupes, and its unwitting helpers, to achieve a black revolution in this country, stands oriented to focus on a State which is particularly vulnerable because it has a million blacks and a million whites. The focus is Mississippi, the State where I was born, the State to which I owe allegiance.

As late as 1955, the FBI could not report a single Communist in Mississippi. Undoubtedly it could report a good many now. Few of them are local products. Some of them may be recent converts by Communist missionary activities. Most of them will be found to have been imported into Mississippi from the North.

Only last year FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover told the House Appropriations Subcommittee, in executive session, that Negroes in the United States "today constitute the largest and most important racial target of the Communist Party." The Communists, Mr. Hoover said, magnify and dramatize racial tensions. They use such campaigns, Mr. Hoover explained, as steppingstones to extend Communist influence among Negroes.

We do know—

Mr. Hoover told the committee—

that Communist influence does exist in the Negro movement and it is this influence which is vitally important. It can be the means through which large masses are caused to lose perspective on the issues involved and, without realizing it, succumb to the party's propaganda lures.

Last July Communist leader Gus Hall made a speech at the Riverside Plaza Hotel in New York City in which he declared that "Mississippi is now the critical testing ground for all the democratic victories won by our people," and asserted that Mississippi "has now become a front line in the struggle against the rising danger of fascism in America." Remember, when Gus Hall says "democratic victories" he means victories for communism; when he talks about "fascism" he means anticommunism.

When Gus Hall declared last year that the Communist Party "lives and grows, it is again attracting the best, the young fighters from the trade unions, from the civil rights front, the best of the fighters for peace and democracy"; he was saying, in Aesopian language, that the Communists are gaining power, prestige, and desirable new recruits through exploitation of racial strife. When Gus Hall called Mississippi "the critical testing ground for all the democratic victories won by our people" and "a front line in the struggle against the rising danger of fascism in America," he was saying that if the Communists can win a clear victory in Mississippi, under the so-called civil rights banner, ultimate Communist control of the entire country will be brought much closer; but if they lose, all the Communist gains in the past 16 years will stand in danger of being wiped out.

Last August James E. Jackson, Negro boss of the Communist Worker, wrote in the World Marxist Review that Negroes "have become the new American proletariat."

The presence of so large a proportion of Negroes in the American working class, so especially motivated to militancy, can be likened to the addition of manganese to iron ore—

Jackson wrote—

When the two elements are fused in the furnace of class struggle, the metal of the American working class acquires * * * a quality vastly superior to either of its components—the quality of pure steel.

Translated from Communist jargon into plain English that means the Communist Party, U.S.A., has high hopes of using Negro discontent as a basis for fomenting both industrial and civil strife, and concurrently promoting Communist political causes.

Communist plans and hopes for a Negro revolution in the United States go back a long way. They were on paper as early as 1928. And in the winter of 1953, the National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., issued a statement saying:

The next period ahead will witness momentous struggles of the Negroes. Given the vanguard leadership of the Communist Party, we may be confident that the Negro liberation movement will ally itself more fully with the camp of decent democracy.

In plain English, that meant that more than 10 years ago the Communist leadership in this country had confidence in their ability to fan the fires of racial hatred, to use and pervert the racial and individual aspirations of Negroes and Negro groups, to manipulate Negro and racial organizations so as to bring them into the Communist camp.

This is the issue, Mr. President. It is an issue which vitally affects all the people of this Nation. I pray they may come to understand it, and to translate their new understanding into action in time to help the people of the South to beat back this attack, in time to halt this invasion of Mississippi, in time to end Communist-directed perversion of political processes in this country, before the Communists can derive from the rising strife the full potentialities which it holds of benefits for them and for their plans to take over our country. Whether all the people come to this understanding in time, the people of the South understand now. The people of Mississippi understand. They know what they face; they know what they are fighting for—not only to protect their own way of life and their own freedoms, but to turn back the concentrated and focused power of the world Communist conspiracy and

all its helpers, witting or unwitting, on what the Communists themselves have termed a critical testing ground. The people of Mississippi did not ask for this critical struggle. They did not want it or seek it. But they will not shirk it; they will not run from it; they will not compromise with the enemy. They have asked for the understanding and the help of their fellow countrymen. But they will stand their ground alone if they must. They will not give up. There is too much at stake.

Mr. President, there is no compromise with death.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the People's World, Jan. 16, 1965]

SAN FRANCISCO LAWYERS PLAN TRIP TO MISSISSIPPI

SAN FRANCISCO.—Three well-known local attorneys have announced plans to go to Mississippi on behalf of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP) as part of a national effort to collect evidence on denial of Negro voting rights in that State.

Attorneys Terry A. Francois, George Moscone, and Ed Stern plan to join other lawyers from across the Nation as part of the MFDP challenge to the seating of Mississippi's five Congressmen. Both Francois and Moscone are members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

The challenge is separate from Representative WILLIAM F. RYAN'S fairness resolution, defeated at the time Congress opened. The new challenge is provided under title 2, sections 201–226 of the United States Code.

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 401(a), Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 6968(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRIEDEL, of Maryland, Mr. MINSHALL, of Ohio, and Mr. KING of New York as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 4355(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. NATCHER, of Kentucky, Mr. LIPSCOMB, of California, and Mr. PIRNIE, of New York as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 9355(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. FLYNT, of Georgia, Mr. LAIRD, of Wisconsin, and Mr. TALCOTT, of California as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 14 United States Code 194(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. ST. ONGE, of Connecticut; and Mr. WYATT, of Oregon as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 46 United States Code 1126c, the Speaker had appointed Mr. CAREY, of New York, and Mr. MAILLIARD, of California, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a), Public Law 87–758, the Speaker had appointed Mr. KIRWAN of Ohio, and Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama as members of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 6, Public Law 754, 81st Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. STAGGERS, of West Virginia, and Mr. GROVER, of New York, as members of the Federal Records Council, on the part of the House.

The message further notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(a), Public Law 474, 81st Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. HALEY, of Florida; Mr. MORRIS, of New Mexico; and Mr. BERRY, of South Dakota, as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 105(c), Public Law 624, 84th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. STEED of Oklahoma, and Mr. DEVINE of Ohio as members of the Committee on the House Recording Studio.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I withhold my request for a moment so that I may explain what I am doing. I shall suggest the absence of a quorum only so that Senators may know that we are resuming the debate on the pending motion on the committee amendment to the joint resolution which is before the Senate.

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. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have heard with the greatest interest the debate with respect to the provision inserted by the House, to which an amendment has been proposed by the Senate committee and I have listened with the greatest respect to the contentions of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and to the contentions of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], exactly opposite to each other in their implication.

It seems to me that the issue is not what the Senator described; and it is for that reason that I have taken the floor in an effort to clarify it.

It seems to me that the issue is not one of anger at Mr. Nasser, however justified that would be, nor is it one of untying the hands of the President of the United States, a position with which I thoroughly agree. Indeed I voted against the prohibiton of aid to Indonesia. I believe I was one of approximately 20 Senators who voted against the proposed prohibition in order to keep the hands of the President free.

The issue is whether or not an honest and spontaneous expression of indignation by the American people should be permitted to continue to sound out across the world, or whether it should be stillborn, stopped in the Senate. I think that is the issue, and none other.

There is no issue of oil politics, in my judgment. Our oil people have every right and every reason to explore for oil and produce and sell oil throughout the world. Nor do I think that it is a question involving Israel particularly. There are two schools of opinion on that score. Some believe that the American presence in the United Arab Republic is generally a good thing as part of our endeavor to keep some sanity in the dreadful and continuing intransigence of the Arab States with respect to Isreal. Others believe it is time to declare to the Arab States that the world will no longer stand for such irresponsibility.

But I do not believe that is really and directly involved in this particular issue. What is involved is whether the honest indignation of the American people, as expressed in the House of Representatives, is to be sustained and, therefore, allowed to express itself here, or not.

In order to understand clearly that that is the issue, and the only issue, it is also necessary to understand what has happened with respect to the fulfillment of any existing contracts or commitments to Mr. Nasser or, indeed, any likelihood of giving him any aid in the future. As to this, the record is clear. We have been very generous with Mr. Nasser. As recently as 1964—and I am reading from page 93 of the hearings—we sold or gave to Egypt $143.1 million in agricultural commodities under Public Law 480. We also gave Egypt an AID loan of $1.4 million, making the total aid to the United Arab Republic $144.5 million in 1964.

Since the beginning of Public Law 480, we have sold to Egypt, for local currency, the astounding aggregate of $705,800,000 worth of farm commodities. Mr. Ball sums up the total answer by saying:

Through 1964, the total value of Public Law 480 sales was about $825 million.

Mr. President, it seems to me that with that kind of record there can be no argument about any nation being short or sharp with any leader like President Nasser. Also, I point out that this very contract itself, of which $37 million is left for completion, originally called for $394,800,000 worth of commodities. The overwhelming bulk of the original contract has now been completed.

One other point, which is very important: We have heard arguments about pulling the rug out from under a contract made by the authorities of the United States with the United Arab Republic. When one cancels a contract or cancels any part of it, based upon the terms of the contract, he is not pulling the rug out from under anybody. The terms of this contract are found on page 81 of the hearings.

Those terms are as follows, in paragraph 5 of the contract itself:

> The financing, sale, and delivery of commodities under this agreement may be terminated by either Government if that Government determines that because of changed conditions the continuation of such financing, sale, or delivery is unnecessary or undesirable.

In addition, there has not even been a commitment under this contract, as it is generally and euphemistically called, because the contract itself provides that the amounts which are to be delivered under it are to be determined on the basis of an annual review made by the Government prior to the beginning of each fiscal year; and it has already been testified that the $37 million affected by this amendment does not come within the purview of that kind of agreement.

Finally, there is discussion about whether we are going to offend Mr. Nasser by doing what we are talking about in this amendment. If Mr. Nasser wants to be offended, he has plenty of reason to be offended other than by this amendment. If Senators will refer to page 100 of the hearings, they will find that Mr. Ball testified to the following effect:

> Senator ELLENDER. You are now telling the committee, then, that our only obligation to Nasser is contained in the particular agreement under discussion and that no promises have been made to renew or extend more aid to Nasser after the termination of this agreement.
>
> Secretary BALL. That is right, sir.

I take the word of Under Secretary Ball for this; I am not questioning his good faith, and I am not charging any double dealing on the part of the State Department of the United States.

In addition, Mr. Ball made it very clear in his testimony, which appears on the same page, that we intended no further agreements with the United Arab Republic. As I say, if Nasser wants to be insulted, he has plenty of basis for it right in the record. This will not compound or worsen or better the situation we are talking about here. Mr. Ball said:

> Let me say with respect to this that whether there would be any further agreements with regard to Public Law 480 assistance is a matter which would have to be fully reviewed with this committee and with the Congress when we come up for appropriations for the following fiscal year. Certainly, there will be nothing more in this fiscal year, and that question is one which will be fully reviewed with you in the light of the circumstances at that time. So there is nothing intended now.

In short, anyone looking for a reason to be offended can be very much offended by the fact, which is now public testimony, that we shall do no further business with Nasser under Public Law 480 unless Congress says we should.

Why is this cry of indignation which has been made in the House of Representatives so important, and why, in my judgment, should it be sustained? The reason is this: A time comes in the life of any person and in the life of a nation when wrenched out of it by a succession of events which become intolerable is that amazing human emotion of indignation. Somehow or other, indignation often has a way of reaching people in a way that nothing else has. We have been tried sorely by many nations. I agree with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] about that. We have been tried sorely by Indonesia and by many other countries. I shall not specify them, because to do so might be invidious. But when events occur in succession, one upon the other, like hammer blows, to make people feel that they have come to the point where they will take them no more, then an expression of indignation can be most effective in this world. It is for that reason that I shall vote against the committee amendment.

To those who would say that we must work along, we must play along, with Mr. Nasser; that it is very important to our position in the Arab world; and that we do not want to antagonize him, I say that that was what we said in 1956, when we caused the forces of the United Kingdom, of France, and of Israel to be pulled out of Sinai, and the result was that Mr. Nasser talked softly until they were pulled out, but then talked very harshly to the world.

We have had a succession of incidents with Nasser in which exactly the same thing has taken place.

First, we have been talked to kindly and graciously, to gain our confidence and dispose us favorably toward the United Arab Republic; then the very confidence we have vested has been abused. This has not happened once; it has happened time and time again. Now it is compounded by the fact that, I think it is fair to say, the hopes and efforts of anti-American activity and propaganda in the whole of Africa, very much tantamount to what is being preached in Communist China, is centered in the United Arab Republic.

We do not know—only the Lord knows—what is being prepared in the way of rockets and missiles there, with the help of ex-Nazi scientists who are employed there. We do not know exactly what Nasser is fomenting in the Congo and in other areas of Africa. We know he brags that he has armed the Congolese rebels, who have been guilty of some of the most barbarous acts that have ever taken place in the civilized world.

We know he has urged the Government of Libya to throw us out of the Libyan bases, and has urged the government of any other African country where he has any influence to be anti-American in its policy and to throw out the United States.

Mr. President, this was not a calculated exercise of foreign policy discretion on the part of the House of Representatives. It was an honest cry of indignation. An honest cry of indignation was well deserved in the case of President Nasser.

I doubt that any adult person believes that we will win with blandishments or with $37 million in additional commodity aid to President Nasser. He is following a very hard, considered policy on his own. But Egypt is not a country that is distant from us in terms of orientation. It is a country within the compass of the free world. This cry of indignation from the House of Representatives, if sustained in the Senate, may do what nothing else has yet done: it may reach into Egypt and make the people of Egypt feel how very deeply we are offended by what has occurred in their country with respect to us.

I think our action will have, if anything, an influence to tone down Mr. Nasser if we sustain the House, rather than reject the action of the House.

I deeply believe that the President should have freedom of action and that his hands should not be tied. For over a week I have urged the President to give us some declaration of policy which would at least show the displeasure of the United States with President Nasser.

If we should sustain the committee, we would be giving a clean bill of health to the whole operation. We would not even be protesting. We would not even be expressing displeasure. We would be scurrying around in the back rooms and telling Mr. Nasser, "Do not worry about this. The President of the United States will get the Senate to reverse the House." This pandering is equivalent to saying, "They have no backbone. You can use them any way you want. You can play one against the other. They will always come back for more punishment."

Is it not true that the only way in which we can indicate our displeasure is by a protest, and the most vigorous kind of protest, by the President of the United States? The President could have protested the day before yesterday, or the day before that, or the day before that. I would have been delighted to vote the other way if the President had taken that kind of action. But the President leaves us helpless if, acting under the advice of the State Department, he does not do it. We cannot even express our displeasure unless we express our sentiment against the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, has the President of the United States given the Senator from New York any good reason for not sustaining the House amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. Not at all. I must say this with the deepest of humility and respect—I have asked directly, and other Members have asked the President directly. I am sure that, under the advice of the State Department, the President acted in the greatest of good faith.

Nonetheless, we are entitled to believe that if he does not express our displeasure with Mr. Nasser under the terrible provocation that we have already suffered, then we must, or somebody must. It cannot be permitted to go by unchallenged.

Consider the vote in the House of Representatives. One hundred twenty-eight Republicans, every single Republican, voted "aye." Thirty-one Democrats from the southern part of the United States and 45 Democrats from the northern part of the United States voted "aye." This vote was leaderless. The majority leadership in the House was not looking for this vote. It was an honest exclamation of displeasure over Mr. Nasser. Certainly, $37 million is not going to make or break Mr. Nasser. It will not make or break us. In my judgment, it will not result in rupturing the diplomatic relations between us unless Mr. Nasser wants to rupture the diplomatic relations. If he does, he has plenty of reason for doing so, as a result of the testimony of Mr. Ball and the testimony of others.

One thing that our action would do would be to tell Mr. Nasser and the people of Egypt, "At long last, we are deeply displeased with what you are doing."

We can take the one method which is open to us to let them know in unmistakable terms that they are not to tempt the United States any farther than they already have.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I make this statement to the Senator from New York, whose opinion I respect. I sat as a member of this committee. I heard the Secretary of State testify in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I heard Mr. Ball and others testify in the Appropriations Committee.

The point that appeals to me the most in the whole problem which faces us in connection with their appropriation measure is that the President, and the Department of State under the President, have responsibility for initiating foreign policy and for carrying out that policy with respect to other countries.

If Congress flatfootedly refuses to permit the President to exercise the initiative he thinks he ought to exercise, we have taken all opportunities to negotiate away from the President and from the Department of State.

I invite the attention of the Senator from New York to two paragraphs on page 3 of the committee report. This was considered by the committee with very great care.

I shall read the two paragraphs, because I would like to have them in the RECORD. They read as follows:

> It is further the policy of Congress that most careful consideration should be given by the responsible agencies of our Government concerning the continued provision of assistance under this act to countries that are, directly or indirectly, hostile to the United States or that are providing assistance to groups or countries that are acting against the best interests of the United States.
>
> In exercising said provisions of assistance, the Congress emphasizes that said assistance is contributed by the people of the United States of America out of taxes paid by them; it is not reasonable to expect them to want to renew said assistance to countries which permit the property of the United States of America to be destroyed and whose leaders make statements derogatory to our country.

That is a statement that the committee unanimously agreed to in adopting the recommendations of the committee. That is in the joint resolution. We feel that it is the initiative of the President of the United States. We expressed our opinion. We still gave him the initiative that he should have. But we made it perfectly clear that we did not like what was going on.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have given precatory notice to the State Department in the committee report. Suppose that the State Department does not act upon it? Do we make another request, and another request, and another request? At what time do we exercise our power if our requests are not honored? I point out to the Senator that we have been making this same kind of request for years and incorporating it in foreign aid bill after foreign aid bill. There have been recitals that the country involved should respect the peace and other people, respect transit through the Suez Canal, and respect the property of the United States.

Mr. Nasser has treated such recitals like pieces of paper. And so has the State Department.

Nonetheless, I would not have initiated this proposal. I doubt if I would have voted for the measure if it had come up as an original measure in the Senate. I voted against the Indonesia measure, as I stated earlier.

This action seems to be so spontaneous, and would represent so little in the way of substantive breach, or break, or stoppage, that it would not be like showing all of our authority.

One does not get a decision when these precatory recitals are not honored; and they have not been honored, to my personal knowledge, for 10 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, when the security of our country is involved, and we have an equal responsibility with the President to maintain that security, certainly we should act. But, when the security of our country is not directly involved, I believe that we have to leave the initiative of the foreign policy of our country in the hands of the President, the State Department, and the Chief Executive's special advisers.

In this instance, I did not believe, and I do not think our committee believed, that the security of the United States was involved, but rather that diplomatic relations with other nations of the world—which we cannot discuss in detail here in the Senate—are involved. If we take the initiative away from the President and from the State Department we may be interfering with other sections of the world with which we are concerned. It is very important that we leave the initiative to the administration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my point is, if I may finish on this note, that sometimes an honest cry of indignation cuts through all the niceties, unties the hands of the bureaucracies, and expresses the heart of the people. This voice having sounded, it should not be stilled. That is exactly how I feel about it. I do not feel that this is a precedent for me, or anyone else. Tomorrow I can vote the other way. But the voice of honest indignation has been sounded; and it should not be silenced in the Senate. It is long overdue.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the committee amendment at the desk which I ask to have stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to obtain the floor in my own right, if I may.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, so would I.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is an unusual way to bring up an amendment—by having a Senator yield.

Mr. MILLER. I am willing to yield. I would like to have my amendment put before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I understand the rules of the Senate. I have no right to yield for the purpose of a Senator's making an original speech, except by unanimous consent, whether that unanimous consent is asked for or not. If the Senator from Iowa desires to make a unanimous-consent request, I will yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I will not object.

Mr. MILLER. I do not want to have unanimous consent. I would like to yield to the majority leader. But I want to make it clear that I would like to have my amendment put before the Senate. I have been here all afternoon. I want to get my amendment up as rapidly as possible.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I understand that no Senator has any objection to having the amendment to the amendment submitted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no unanimous-consent request pending.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Iowa for the purpose of presenting his amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I must say that this is a highly unusual way to conduct the business of the Senate. The Senate has rules. Senators know of my interest in orderly procedure. This is no way for the Senate to conduct its business. Unanimous consent should not have been given. The majority leader should be given the right to the floor, and the Senate should proceed in an orderly manner.

I shall not object.

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Chair had made the announcement that the unanimous-consent request was agreed to, and on that basis the Senator from Iowa is recognized. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

AMENDMENT NO. 22

Mr. MILLER. I call up my amendment (No. 22) to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3 . is proposed to strike out lines 13 and 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or are necessary to carry out any other agreement with the United Arab Republic which has been approved by the Congress."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in view of my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] earlier this afternoon, which has clarified the situation, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified to read as follows:

Strike lines 13 and 14 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and are approved by the Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment will be so modified.

Mr. President, my amendment being before the Senate, I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I shall be brief. I have listened with interest all afternoon to the debate on the amendment which was reported overwhelmingly by the Appropriations Committee. I can sympathize with much of what has been said. I am quite certain that every Member in this Chamber, on either side of the aisle, could make that same statement.

In executive session I asked Under Secretary of State, Mr. Ball, some questions that I would just as soon have asked in open session had I been able to leave the Senate floor that morning.

I pointed out to him that there were certain matters in the field of foreign policy vis-a-vis the United Arab Republic which I thought were open to question; for example, our recognition of the so-called republican regime in the Yemen, which brought about the dispatch of 30,000 to 40,000 Egyptian troops into that unhappy little country.

I pointed out also that we were aware of the fact that certain statements had been made pertaining to the Red Sea by the President of the United Arab Republic; one of our libraries had been burned; not so many weeks ago, Egypt, among other countries, dispatched arms, material, and munitions, by way of the Sudan, into the Congo.

I pointed out also that, so far as I was concerned, our Government did the right thing in carrying out the Belgian-American paratroop drop into Stanleyville and beyond. I think it had to be done. I approved of it. But I certainly did not approve of Egypt and other countries sending arms to the Congo to assist in the overthrow of the constituted government and making an already tense situation more difficult so far as the Congolese and Africans are concerned. It is known that Nasser has designs on large parts of Africa, as do other African leaders.

I call attention to the fact that some days ago the joint leadership from both Houses were called to the White House, for a meeting and discussion of the foreign situation with the President of the United States. Many personal opinions were expressed. The President made one statement to which I wish to refer, and this can be corroborated, because there were present the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the dean of the Republicans in this body, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and others at the White House. The President has feelings, too, but the President has a responsibility which transcends all of our responsibilities because of the particular position which he holds. He said at that meeting that "I have to ask myself one question in the final analysis, and that question is, 'What is in our national interest?' "

I asked Mr. Ball the other day if what he was saying represented the feelings and the thinking and the attitude of not only his immediate superior, Mr. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, but of the President of the United States; and, if it did, whether it fitted in with what is in our national interest. He said, "I would not be down here if it were not on that basis"—or words to that effect.

So perhaps the Senator from New York has not received direct word from the President of the United States, but certainly, from the statement made by the Secretary of State and Under Secretary of State, who speak for the President, I think we have received word concerning the President's attitude in this matter, how he sums up this particular situation, and what he thinks should be done for the next 5 months—and that is all this supplemental appropriation covers. The committee amendment gives the President the flexibility to decide whether or not the remaining $37 million, the last part of the contract formulated in 1962, is or is not to be carried into effect.

So I would hope that the vote would be in favor of the position taken by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which considered this supplemental appropriation, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who has such a well-deserved reputation for soundness and patriotism, and that the Senate would support him on this occasion.

Remember that in the report issued by the committee, certain strong statements were made which were read to this body by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. PELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, when it comes to the exercise of the weapons of tactical diplomacy, many of us believed that the executive branch of our Government should be permitted the maximum flexibility. It is for this reason that I intend to join those supporting the committee's language in granting the administration's wish to retain freedom of decision as to whether or not to continue extending 480 wheat to Egypt. I would add, however, that I am disappointed at the very few times the administration has exerted negatively in the past its much vaunted weapons of tactical diplomacy.

Specifically, only in Indonesia in 1964, the Dominican Republic in 1963, Peru in 1962, and Egypt in 1956 do we see actions taken in the past decade by our various administrations using Public Law 480 wheat as a means of expressing our disapproval of actions taken by foreign governments. It will be seen that while there are these four instances of such action, these are far too few, considering the provocations that we have suffered during this 10-year period, the times we have been insulted, kicked around and spat upon by various foreign nations.

This compilation of the past 10 years may not be complete, but it is as complete as I have been able to ascertain.

I believe that the administration should be encouraged to use more frequently the weapons of tactical diplomacy at hand, such as the withholding of Public Law 480 wheat, the clamping down of aid, the holding up of consular invoices, or the withdrawal of various amenities that foreign nations have come to take for granted.

In this case, what I, for one, should like to see is what I understand the administration will do; that is, that the administration itself will exert a tight rein on Public Law 480 wheat being sent to Egypt and will do so only on a very short-term basis indeed.

I believe, too, that we should leave our administration this flexibility. In spite of recent difficulties, there still are areas of common interest that Egypt shares with the United States. We should not, for our part, force Egypt to the bottom of the well. For this reason, I favor preserving the widest possible flexibility for those entrusted with the tactical exercise of responsibility for our foreign policy, but I urge the administration to exercise its backbone and use more steel in its withholding of Public Law 480 wheat as a weapon of tactical diplomacy in the future.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for nearly 10 years I have been voicing apprehension with respect to the political maneuvering of President Nasser, along with his obvious disagreement with the policies of the United States, which he recently reemphasized in sharp language.

I would hope that it would be possible for us to terminate any assistance to him, especially as we now know of his extensive activities in promoting the cause of the rebels in the Congo.

There are certain reasons for not voting now for a cutoff of food shipments to Egypt, however, even though no American would approve the calculated laxness which allowed a student mob to burn a library, nor should anyone withhold his contempt for Nasser's previously

referred to language when he talked about American assistance.

Despite these occurrences, the Senate now has to consider what is in the national interest. In that connection, I note that the food shipments which are now underway are part of a signed agreement; and that there is nothing in this agreement which calls for its suspension on account of episodes and language like that of recent weeks, however offensive they may be. Should we not ask ourselves if this is the time for the United States to put itself in the position of breaking its word, by breaking this contract.

As chairman of the Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, I believe it fair to say that our relations in the Middle East are becoming increasingly complex. It is clear that 1965 may well be a year of danger, danger arising from tension over the Congo, tension over Jordan waters, tension both within and among the Arab States.

In recent years, American Presidents have conducted our delicate relations with these countries in an effort to defend the interests of the United States—and, incidentally, to assist in the maintenance of the security of our friends in the State of Israel.

There is no substitute, in such a situation as this, for the discretion and authority of the President, acting under the Constitution, to carry out his responsibility for the conduct of our foreign relations.

Therefore, I believe that the Congress, if the President so decides, should approve his having the right to make the shipments under this existing contract.

We of this body know this President. We know that he will decide to continue such shipments only on the basis of what is best for the country.

I would honestly hope, however, that this is the last aid the President requests for this leader of a totalitarian state who continues to talk and act against the best interests of the United States, and continues to promote unrest in his part, and other parts, of the world.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the hour is late. Senators are anxious to vote and go home or to their many engagements. I shall detain the Senate for less than 5 minutes.

To lapse into the vernacular, Nasser, the dictator of Egypt, is a "pain in the neck," which none will deny.

His activities are utterly without excuse. He has committed grave affronts to the United States. I am just as disappointed with the Egyptian dictator as any one of the "small band of angry men" across the aisle. I am concerned over his activities in stirring up revolution in Yemen. I am deeply disappointed at the way he fuels the arms race by using German scientists to develop a rocket-striking force aimed against Israel. I have no sympathy with the trouble he has stirred up in the Congo by aiding Chinese-backed rebels. I am concerned over his rude, anti-American statements, and the fact that he stood idly by while the USIA library was being burned.

Nevertheless, I shall support the committee amendment because I believe that the President should have the power to send aid to Nasser, if he takes a more responsible "tack," and that the President should not be without power to influence Nasser to end the menace in the Middle East and his quite unjustifiable intervention in the Congo. The result would ge greater insecurity for Israel, and a greater danger in sparking and touching off world war III.

Because the hour is late, I shall curtail my remarks and expect to speak more extensively on this subject tomorrow.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I rise to support the committee amendment.

In view of the opinions which I have expressed on the floor of the Senate in the past, I know that this statement will come as a great surprise to many Senators listening to me.

I realize the feelings that influence not only a great many Members of this body, but also the feelings which prevailed in the other House when it attached to the joint resolution the language which it did, before it was sent to the Senate.

First of all, I recall that for many years I have advocated a firmer and tougher line in all our foreign relations. This has been a consistent act, not only through committee work, but also in my votes in the Senate.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who spoke so very well this afternoon, can testify—as other Senators can—to the fact that in the past year I have supported most of his amendments which I thought would add a tougher and more realistic position to our foreign policy.

In the year before last six of us on this side of the aisle took the floor, over a series of weeks, and offered a series of proposals with respect to what could be done in the Cuban situation. Except for one brief reply from the senior Senator from Oregon, we were met by cold silence from Senators, from the State Department, and from the President himself.

We have offered many amendments for the purpose of taking a firmer and tougher line with our allies.

I believe we must ask ourselves, What is the primary and first purpose of the foreign policy of the United States? I was asked this question by members of the Peace Corps, and I gave them this answer, and received snickering laughter in reply. I said that the primary purpose of the United States is to preserve the peace and freedom of the people in this country—not the peace and freedom of anyone else, but the peace and freedom of the people of this country.

I believe that the freedom of other people throughout the world contributes to that peace, but the primary order is the preservation of our safety and our own peace and our own freedom.

The minority leader spoke at some length this afternoon on this subject, and made a very brilliant speech. I agree with his conclusion, but I do not agree with his reasons. I am through, personally, with presenting the other cheek to anyone regardless of who he is. There is no use going through the list of provocations which Nasser has incited, which Sukarno has incited, which Castro has incited, which other people have incited, and which we continue to ignore.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming also said that we should not speak from pique. I do not speak from pique this afternoon. Only last week I made a very strong statement against any aid to Nasser and the United Arab Republic in any manner, shape, or form.

Something has occurred which has changed my mind. I wish to read two or three significant sentences from the hearings. I read from page 96, from the testimony of Under Secretary Ball:

> Secretary BALL. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have an opportunity to amplify this to the committee, but I really feel that this is the kind of testimony which probably should be heard in executive session.

Again, at page 99 of the hearings, I read:

> Secretary BALL. I would like to discuss this in executive session. We are quite flexible in our approach to this problem. What we want to do is to save the President's ability to deal with a critical situation.

The Secretary repeated that same statement in two or three other places, I believe, in the hearings. This is the key to the reason why the Senator from Colorado has changed his general opinion about this subject and supports the President today. What was said in the executive session, off the record, we are not able to repeat here. I cannot tell my constituents. I cannot tell the reasons. I do say that they were hard facts. These facts caused the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, to appear before the committees of Congress, and caused Under Secretary Ball to appear for Secretary Rusk, in his illness, just 2 days ago before the Appropriations Committee, and to make the appeal that he made to Senators there. I am sure that many Senators felt in their hearts an indignation and a feeling of outrage, as I felt; and many Senators voted for the amendment which the committee has reported.

When do we face up to our responsibility? Let me answer a part of the question which the Senator from Oregon posed. I say that we face up to our responsibility when we consider things in a long-term range, in an atmosphere of study and calm. I cannot go along with my friend from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in his argument that a cry of indignation will be effective throughout the world. A cry of indignation is like a boy stepping on a thorn. It is instinctive and involuntary, and reflects about the same high mental philosophy.

What we want and what we need in the Senate and in Congress in general is a calm, judicial determination of how we wish to influence the foreign policy of this country through legislation. Every one of us will have an opportunity to do that when the foreign aid bill comes before us later in the session. We shall have another opportunity to do that when the appropriation bill on foreign aid comes before us. Therefore, in this year, every Senator will have an opportunity, at least twice, to consider this

matter calmly, with a judicial aspect, and then vote in a way which will best reflect his ideas and concept of the foreign policy of the United States.

I told the committee the other day, when it was considering this subject, that, as I felt now, even though I vote for and support the committee amendment, I have no intention of voting for any aid to the Arab Republic later in this year unless the action today, if it should occur, produces an amelioration of the situation in the Near East.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for the very forceful and sound statement he is making with reference to the testimony before the Appropriations Committee. I heard it before the Foreign Relations Committee, too. I heard the sound reasons that were given. We are not now free to disclose those points. I believe the Senator is making a wonderful summary of the situation in which we now find ourselves. For that reason I voted as I did in favor of the amendment in the committee and shall vote for it on the floor. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I always value his judgment in all these matters.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I wish to commend the Senator from Colorado on his excellent persuasive statement. I, too, deeply resent Mr. Nasser's statement about the United States. I believe his position and mine were about the same before we had the hearings on this subject before the Appropriations Committee. Had I been a Member of the House, with the information most Members of the House had, and the only choice open to me between what they voted for and nothing at all, I would have voted with the majority for their amendment. However, I believe that the pending amendment offers an alternative that most Members of the House who voted for the House amendment could accept.

As the Senator from Colorado has said, we shall have another chance to review this matter and to write foreign policy of the United States on an appropriations bill, if we must, and in connection with the foreign aid authorization bill and the agricultural appropriation bill, when we will be appropriating further funds for the food-for-peace program.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. He is entirely correct. We shall have an opportunity to do that.

I wish to conclude my remarks very shortly. However, I wish to make my position clear for my constituents and for the Senate.

Having constantly proposed a harder and more realistic line in international affairs, it is indeed a change of climate to be voting as I shall, particularly in view of the way we have been attacked by Nasser and the things he is doing, which it would serve no purpose to repeat now.

As we now stand, I would agree with the Senator from Oregon in all that he has said about the vacillation, the weakness, and the deviation of the State Department. They have caused all of us worry. The concern of the Senator from Oregon is mine, too. When we authorize the money requested, regardless of what we insert in the joint resolution, the State Department will continue blithely down the same primrose path that it has pursued too often in the past.

Yet I have changed my basic position in relation to the one amendment proposed. When the Under Secretary of State comes to that committee and in executive session says to the committee, "This is in the national interest"—and I refer specifically to the statement of the distinguished majority leader a few moments ago when he stated that Mr. Ball was asked if this was the position of the President and he told him in substance, "Yes"—I would not be in this room if the President did not so regard it.

As an American, knowing the volatile situation in the Near East and knowing that it is at the boiling point and that it can boil over any time; knowing what the situation is in Africa; knowing the significance of Egypt to the situation in the Congo; knowing the significance of Egypt to the relationships of Yemen and other places in the Near East, I could not avoid supporting the President in the present instance. As I look at it today, if I did not support the President in the present instance, in effect, I would have to say, in my own mind, "I do not believe Ball and I would not believe Dean Rusk if he were here, either, and if the President were here, I would not believe him, either."

But, Mr. President, I cannot say that. I cannot say that, because the President is the shaper and the implementer of our foreign policy. When those men come to us and in an executive session tell us facts which justify their position that it is in the national interest, and that if the President finds it in the national interest, we might utilize this, then in all conscience I must, in this instance, support the President. I can see no other course if I am to keep faith with the oath of my office.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Colorado is making a very sound and sensible statement. I find myself virtually in the same position in which he finds himself. I for one would like to congratulate the Members of the House who voted in the manner in which they did with the information that they then had, so that this subject could be brought over to us for more serious consideration.

We have now had several meetings in executive session. We have been provided with reasons which are rather persuasive, but which cannot be discussed publicly.

The thing that impels me to vote to sustain the committee position, as I did in the committee, is the fact that this proposal is now our only opportunity to improve our relationships with Nasser to get him to improve his activities vis-a-vis the Congo and some of his neighbors in that area. It is an opportunity we should not fumble by rapid actions or by apologetic bargaining. By tough bargaining we can improve the relationships. By accepting the action of the House and summarily cutting off the aid, it is true we would reprimand Nasser. But we would also close the door on any opportunity for negotiation or improvements. I would like to keep open any opportunity that we have for progress in this troubled and explosive area of the world.

After the conference adopts the proposed language, I intend in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to interrogate Mr. Rusk, Mr. Ball, or whoever shows up in due course. I shall ask, "What did you do about that $20 million? What would you do about the remaining amount of money which is available—$37 million, I believe, in toto? What kind of deal did you drive? What kind of bargain did you make? What beneficial results have you won for America?"

If they come to us and say that they fell on their faces and received no concessions, but they still made available these grains, it will be exceedingly difficult for them again to induce the Congress to go along with what seems to me a reasonable proposal in the present troublesome instance.

This is not the end of the ball game. This issue will be coming up time and time again. The House will pass similar reservations. If it does not, I am sure the Senate will, if in fact we continue to give aid to people who repudiate us, reject us, insult us, and undermine us. The proposal is a good laboratory for us. How good are our bargainers in the State Department? What will they do now that they have been given this opportunity? Will they come through and insist upon some concessions from Nasser or will they deny Nasser any further aid? Or—worst of all—will they continue the aid and win no concessions from Nasser?

It is not a very expensive venture insofar as our international expenditures are concerned. It is a rather easy way to find out in the laboratory of life whether or not the State Department and the President follow through with the assurances that they have made to us.

I shall vote to give them the opportunity, and I devoutly hope that they will be successful.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. His observations are very timely and helpful. My position is exactly the same as his. Had I been voting at the time the House did with the information that they had, I would have voted the way they did. If I had had to vote before Secretary Ball appeared before the committee the other day in executive session, I would have voted again with the House position. But, as I have explained, I cannot in conscience and as I see my own duty—and I do not cast any reflection upon the position or the views that any other Senator has—after listening to that, and after listening to those repre-

sentations, I can do nothing else but support the committee amendment, for which I voted in committee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote to sustain the committee amendment. I have one chief reason for doing so. The question is, whether in this first test in the first full term of President Johnson, the Congress shall deny him the authority to negotiate and to exert all the authority of the President with respect to the sensitive situation in Egypt. I believe that he should have that opportunity. Therefore, I shall vote for the committee amendment.

Nevertheless, I doubt very much that our action today will settle very much. We have voted upon similar situations in past years. I am afraid that when the foreign aid bill comes to the floor of the Senate this year, we will be voting again upon aid to Egypt, Indonesia, and similar situations. I believe a much deeper question is involved. We are in this sorry situation today, because succeeding administrations, and the Congress of the United States have failed to establish any consistent aid policies, and we have lost control of the foreign aid program.

I have no simple remedy. Our concept of foreign aid has changed. At its beginning, foreign aid was designed to help countries establish industrial and agricultural strength which would in time, raise the living standards of their peoples. We know that much of our foreign aid has been wasted, and that it has not contributed greatly to solid economic development. We know also, as in this situation, our aid is provided to countries which devote their needed resources to aggressive purposes. Our basic purpose is to help independent countries remain free and sovereign, that they may contribute to freedom and security, including that of the United States. But our aid has been turned against our basic interests by some countries.

I do not believe, as some have testified, that it is in the best interests of our country to continue to make it possible for countries to offend our basic purposes, by providing aid to them.

This afternoon, it has been said that when we work upon the foreign aid bill, we shall be able to evolve a new program, or correct the mistakes of the present program. I doubt it very much. I think it likely that we will be voting again whether to give aid to Egypt or Indonesia, and upon the same issues before us today. But I hope very much that we shall maintain today the authority of the President. I have come to believe that the only way we can recapture control of our own foreign aid program, or the chief way, is by the initiative and action of the Executive. The President, as he starts on a new term, has now a better opportunity to correct our foreign aid program and make it effective, than he will ever have. Countries over the world are looking toward him. They wonder what his policies will be. He has unusual authority and power to correct the foreign aid program, and I believe that he will do so. I would hope that our programs would be reviewed and assessed in every country, as I have urged for years, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said for years, and as the Congress voted 2 years ago on my amendment to the foreign aid bill.

I would hope that the President would establish policies that would be applicable to every country; that our economic aid would not be continued unless used effectively; and that we should not give economic aid to countries which used it to supplement their resources for aggression.

I propose a way to reestablish consistent policies, and recapture control of our foreign aid. I would like for the President to announce, with the approval of the Congress, that for the year 1965, or any part of it, that the United States does not intend to make available any economic aid to any country except for humanitarian reasons, until he had reviewed and assessed our program and until policies were laid down applicable to all countries.

I have written the President and suggested that he do this.

The reasons why I think it would be an effective plan are as follows: It would give the executive an opportunity, in consultation with Members of Congress and committees charged with the responsibility, to develop a program and policies which would carry out the purposes we want carried out, beneficial to the countries we help, and to the United States, and fair to our taxpayers.

Also, if it were to deny aid to all countries for a time, it could not be said that we were punishing or favoring a specific country.

Third, if aid were discontinued for a time, countries wanting aid would have to come to us, openly and fairly, on the terms of our policies.

Today, after having received aid for years, if it is suggested to some countries that it should be made more effective, they answer by saying, "You are putting strings on our aid." If we suggest to Mr. Nasser "You should stop certain actions; otherwise we cannot give you aid," he replies, "you are interfering with the policies of our country."

Some others give the impression that if we do not give them aid, they will go to Russia. I would say, "Go to Russia." In effect, the program has become their aid program, not ours, used by them for their purposes.

I have voted for foreign aid since I have been a Member of the Senate; but since I had the opportunity to observe its application in one country—India—when I was there as Ambassador for more than a year, I knew that the program ought to be strengthened and its defects corrected.

In all those years, I have urged that certain steps be taken to make the aid program more effective. I have not been wholly successful. Today we have come to a climax, to the point where we know that something must be done. The most important thing to understand is that we have lost control of the foreign aid program—the program of the United States.

I shall vote to give the President this authority, which I think he deserves; but I hope with all my heart that he will use this time to review and reassess the entire program and place it in its original concept. I believe he should discontinue the program for a time—for a year, if necessary—to develop the proper policies consistent with the interests and good purposes of the United States—that it may again become an effective foreign aid program of the United States and its people, and that it will be genuinely helpful to recipients. It is the program of the United States, and not of other countries, and it must not be the program of countries which turn our aid against the interests of the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield briefly?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed with the distinguished minority leader the schedule for the remainder of the evening. The minority leader is momentarily absent from the Chamber, but I feel that I should make an announcement, and I do so with his approval and, I believe, with the approval of most Senators now in the Chamber.

The Senate will be in session for some time yet this evening. I hope it can dispose of this amendment shortly, one way or the other, and then take up the Mundt proposal and, if possible, come to a final vote on the joint resolution itself.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I assume that the distinguished leader, in referring to "this amendment," meant both the Miller amendment and the United Arab Republic amendment, to which it is addressed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I give deep faith to the arguments that have been made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and other Senators, urging that we accept the proposal made by the Committee on Appropriations.

For the past several years, I have been hoping that better treatment of our country would come from those who have been the recipients of our generosity.

I have subscribed to the policy of turning the right cheek after I have been smitten upon the left. I have done so with a great deal of contentment within my own conscience. But, as time passes, I have concluded that this submission to attacks by those whom we have helped has not contributed to our character or our security. Suffering abuses has not helped our image among the nations of the world.

When we have allowed our enemies and our friends to expropriate property without protest, we have witnessed an advance of expropriation by other countries. When we have continued to give aid to those who have spat upon our flag, burned our embassies, torn down our libraries, attacked us with the epithet we were an imperialistic nation, and sought to create disturbances in countries where we were attempting to bring tranquillity, we found that instead of our position growing better, it grew worse.

I do not want to approach the issue of Nasser on any basis except what I believe is in the best interest of our country. And, approaching it from that standpoint, I know that when Nasser went into Yemen, he followed a course that was inimical to the security of our Nation. I know that when he granted that his nation should be the vehicle and the corridor for creating disturbances in the Congo, he was not helping the security of the United States. I know that when, at the Belgrade conference of the nonalined neutral nations of the world, word was received by those in attendance—which included Nasser—that Red Russia had broken its agreement about the nonuse of nuclear tests, no word of protest came from Nasser, or any of the other so-called neutral nations in attendance.

The principal objective of our course should be the establishment of an image of the character of our country. We cannot be exhibited around the world as being spineless and absolutely devoid of what the ordinary individual would claim to be character. By the use of the word "character," I mean that we should say, "We shall give you help with respect to your need for food. We will not oppose you in your efforts to develop your nation in conformity with what you think is right. We will tolerate your attacks and your abuses up to a certain point. But, when that point has been reached, our character demands that we discontinue the sufferance of the attacks which you have made upon us."

The senior Senator from Oregon spoke today about a forfeiture or an abdication of the powers of Congress, as contained in the language which states that if the President determines that it is in the interest of the country, he may grant this aid. I subscribe to what he said. But, I point out that that principle should not be applied only to Nasser. It should be applied to the Communist countries of the world. It is not being applied to them.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall yield in a moment.

I hope I shall not be boring to my associates, but there has developed a new philosophy in the foreign relations of our country.

I want my colleagues to listen to what I say. We shall be hearing more and more of the theory that there is no Communist country in the world. I repeat that. We shall be hearing more and more from persons in high, responsible positions that there is no Communist country in the world. That will be said to us in spite of the fact that we have statutes on the books which identify certain countries as Communist countries.

I want to adopt a uniform principle that will apply to Nasser and to the Communist countries, concerning this dispensation and exculpation of abuses which they have perpetrated upon us, through the President saying, "It is in the interest of our country to grant aid." If we are to do that, let the program be uniform.

I yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio is laboring under the misapprehension that it is the belief of the senior Senator from Oregon that the principle he argued for today in respect to uniform application should not be applied, let me disabuse him of that impression.

Let me say also that when we aid Nasser, we are aiding communism. Let us not deceive ourselves about that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have not yet stated what my position on the bill is.

I shall vote against the committee recommendation. I shall do so because I believe the time has come when we must establish the image among the people of the world that our flag shall not be torn down, that our property shall not be burned, that we shall not suffer under the claim that we are an imperialistic nation which wants to exploit the people of the world, that we shall not allow our enemies to be aided and our good purposes to be ignored.

The past 15 years have demonstrated that that policy does not work. We are growing weaker and weaker everywhere around the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about my amendment. What we have been talking about for the past 2 hours is what is in the national interest.

The committee amendment provides:

> That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such act, except when such exports are necessary to carry out the sales agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest.

The action of the House of Representatives makes it very clear that a majority of the Members of the House, in a bipartisan vote, do not believe that it is in the national interest at all; and they do not want anybody else to decide that question, either, except the Congress of the United States.

That is a pretty severe position to take, but it is warranted by what has taken place. First of all, I would be shocked if any Member of the Senate would say that it is in the national interest, as of now, to go forward with $37 million more of foreign aid to the United Arab Republic. It is about time for us to show some self-respect as a nation. The intemperate language that has been used by the leader of the United Arab Republic, the anti-U.S. propaganda which has been delivered over various means of communication in the Middle East controlled by the government, and the burning of our library are only a few of the instances which have impinged upon the respect of the United States.

Our security is involved, and I say this with all respect to my friend from Massachusetts, because the confidence of other nations of the world is involved, or their respect, not only for the strength of the United States, but for the willingness of the United States to use its strength.

I do not need to point out that we are reading all too frequently statements made by Communist leaders, particularly Mao Tse-tung, to the effect that the United States is a paper tiger. Smaller nations, particularly to the south of us, are very perceptive. Many of them are worried about whether or not we are indeed a paper tiger. If we are not willing to stand up against a situation which exists in the Middle East with respect to our foreign aid, then how, they will wonder, can we possibly stand up to situations which are much worse, including the one in South Vietnam.

There is more involved than merely the self-respect and security of the United States. The United Nations is very much involved. We say, as a matter of national policy and national interest, that we are for the United Nations and that we support the United Nations. Yet we are giving aid to a country which has gone contrary to United Nations policies through its aggression in Yemen, through its support of the rebels in the Congo, and through its persistent delinquency in the payment of dues and assessments to the United Nations.

As of December 31, 1964, the United Arab Republic was delinquent to the extent of $374,322 in dues and assessments to the United Nations.

This, Mr. President, after $700 million of foreign aid from the United States, which, as the Senator from New York has pointed out, has been what we have contributed since our foreign aid program began.

It is about time for us to face up to the fact that, in determining the national interest, the Congress has a responsibility. It is not for us to slough off that responsibility to the executive branch of the Government. There are certain areas where the executive branch probably has more of a responsibility in determining the national interest than does the Congress. This should be done on a partnership basis, if at all possible.

During the past few years, Congress has gone far more than half way in allowing the executive branch to determine what is and what is not in the national interest. I do not believe we should have gone as far as we have gone. The people of the United States look to their representatives in the Congress to declare what is and what is not in the national interest, especially when our self-respect and national security are involved.

I point out that we are not involved in reneging on any agreement. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], made an excellent statement on this point. I should like to amplify to some extent what he had to say about it.

On page 89 of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations on the supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, 1965, it is indicated that there are $37 million in purchase authorizations which have not been issued.

On page 81 of that same document there is set forth the agreement itself. The very first paragraph of the agree-

ment reads that subject to the issuance by the Government of the United States of purchase authorizations, certain things will be done. Since these purchase authorizations have not yet been issued, they are subject to issuance, and the contracts are based upon their issuance. If they are not issued, there is no contract, or at least the contract is terminated in line with the very terms of the contract.

Also on page 89 of the same hearings, it is indicated that some $30 million more is involved, namely, purchase authorizations of $30 million which have been issued.

The committee amendment is not clear on this point. I understand that the State Department thinks the $30 million for which purchase authorizations have already been issued would not be affected by the committee amendment, and that only the $37 million for which purchase authorizations have not been issued would be affected.

I am willing to abide by that interpretation. So what we are really talking about is $37 million, for which clearly no purchase authorizations have been issued, which would be within the express terms of the contract.

A further item should be brought to the attention of the Senate in connection with the alleged "reneging" of our agreement.

On page 88 of the hearings, in a letter to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Department of Agriculture set forth a memorandum regarding the current status of the agreement with the United Arab Republic. On page 89 it is stated:

> All purchase authorizations which have been issued are by their terms expressly made subject to the provision of the regulations under which they are issued. These regulations reserve the right "at any time" and "for any reason or cause whatsoever" to revoke any purchase authorization and terminate deliveries thereunder.

I suggest that the argument of anyone who would impute to the Senate a reneging of an agreement or the embarrassment of our officials who may have negotiated this agreement is not well placed at all.

It is said, also, that the committee amendment represents the only chance for any leverage or bargaining power with the United Arab Republic. I submit my amendment gives us another chance, because my amendment does this. It states, in effect:

Go ahead and negotiate with the United Arab Republic, but let it be clearly understood that the negotiations are subject to final aproval by Congress. We have not slammed the door shut, as is now the case with the action taken by the House. There is still a card left in the deck, so to speak, for negotiating and bargaining purposes. But, when and if a negotiation takes place with the $37 million, then Congress will take a look at it and will have to approve it.

We shall have 2, 3, or possibly 4 months to see how things go, with respect to the attitudes and actions of the United Arab Republic. It would be hoped that 2 or 3 months from now, if an agreement is negotiated regarding the $37 million, Congress could wholeheartedly support the agreement; because, in the meantime, the United Arab Republic will have shown itself to be a good, upright citizen—in fact, a free nation, and a good member of the United Nations. But, if it has not, then Congress, naturally, would not be expected to approve the agreement.

One final argument. On several occasions I have heard mentioned the importance of comity between the two Houses. This is a perfect time to preserve comity between the two Houses. The 204 Members of the House of Representatives who voted for the House amendment did not do so lightly. They did not do so on the spur of the moment. Those Members of the House have seen what has happened. They have done their homework. It will be difficult, I believe, for any of them to change their minds on the subject. If the Senate comes along and destroys that amendment completely, I believe that the comity between the two Houses will be threatened.

My amendment offers a middle way. It still keeps a string on the $37 million. I would be hopeful that the House would go along with that amendment, but I would be pessimistic that the House would acquiesce in the amendment by the Appropriations Committee if that prevails.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield. I understand that my friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] wishes to respond, and I am happy to yield to him at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have had little to say today, although I have been assigned by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to handle the bill.

This particular amendment, which we have been arguing about for more than 6 hours, relates to only 2 percent of the total amount of the joint resolution. The joint resolution relates to the important and vital functioning of the Department of Agriculture in three fields—which I am not going to discuss at this time because everyone should know about them; but they relate to the very bones and sinews of the agricultural program of the Nation.

Therefore, I have had little to say, after 6 hours or more of debate spent on the subject, and after we approved the amount which is involved—and it is a big amount, $1,600 million—after we adopted the other two amendments and got down to the discussion of this little amendment which relates to Egypt.

With all due respect and much affection for the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], let me say that I believe that his amendment would leave us in a very unfortunate position. It would make it look as though the Senate thought that the Constitution permitted Congress to have the last word on a matter such as foreign policy. The Congress does not have that authority under the Constitution. That is a policy so well settled, and a philosophy so well fixed, that there is no way in the world for the Senate to change it.

I am sure that this amendment was drawn rather impulsively on the floor of the Senate. I so regard it.

The amendment as drawn retains the wording of the House provision, and then adds these words, which were in the committee amendments—

> Except when such exports are necessary to carry out the sales agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended.

Then it completes the amendment with these words offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]—

> And are approved by the Congress.

This means that he would provide, if his amendment were adopted, that regardless of negotiations, regardless of the Constitution and the laws under it, Congress would undertake the responsibility of asserting the last word in the matter of international policy and administration.

I rarely move to lay a motion on the table and am not going to do so in this instance if it is possible to obtain an immediate vote. I know that Senators wish to go home. I would hope that Senators will permit a vote to be taken on this particular amendment. If that can be done, I shall be glad not to make a motion to lay on the table.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to respond briefly to my friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and emphasize that the amendment was not impulsively drawn.

The substance of the amendment was discussed with the Secretary of State when he was in the Senate committee last week. I regret that his illness apparently prevented following up on his assurance that he would have to look into it.

Second, with respect to the constitutional argument, I believe that if the Senator would push his argument to its logical conclusion, we might say that Congress is not even permitted to act on the appropriations bill. I believe that Congress has that permission. I believe that Congress has the last word with respect to foreign relations insofar as Public Law 480 is concerned, and insofar as the appropriations thereunder are concerned. Congress itself enacted Public Law 480. If Congress can extend authority under Public Law 480, it can also withdraw authority in whole or in part. That is all my amendment does. It would withdraw authority with respect to only a very small but a very important part.

Therefore, I hope that this debate will not go off into a constitutional argument. I respect my very dear friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] but I do not believe that his argument would stand up, if he would carry it to its logical conclusion.

In any event, I do not wish to delay the Senate any longer. I hope that we may vote on the amendment.

NEED TO PRESERVE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN POLICY POWER IN EGYPT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I support the language that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has

approved to give the President discretion in carrying out the agreement to sell surplus agricultural commodities to Egypt.

Mr. President, I am concerned, as I know all the American people are concerned, over the recent actions of Egypt's President Nasser. The shipping of arms to the Congo to inflame a murderous civil war, as well as such prior activities as shipping weapons to Cyprus and maintaining a military force in Yemen, are clearly not in the interests of the United States, or of peace, in the critical areas of the Middle East and Africa. Nevertheless, I believe that we must be realistic about this matter. Is it conceivable to anyone that the cutting off of $37 million of foodstuffs sales is going to cause a shift in Nasser's attitudes? Can we seriously expect that by cutting off these sales for the next 6 months we would convince Nasser to reverse his policies in these areas, throw his arms around the American Ambassador and promise never to threaten American interests again?

Mr. President, these very questions are ridiculous, for it must be quite clear that the actions we take today will not have any constructive effect on Nasser's policies. On the contrary, if it has any effect at all, it will tempt Nasser to undertake still more destructive policies which in the long run will help neither the United States nor the United Arab Republic. It is hardly becoming for a great power like the United States to act from sheer spite, without any hope of accomplishing what we seek to accomplish, and with a real danger of deliberately worsening relations with an important foreign country merely out of anger or intemperance.

Mr. President, an article written by John S. Badeau, former American Ambassador to Egypt, in the latest issue of Foreign Affairs puts the whole question of American-Egyptian relations in a rational perspective. There is, indeed, a "crisis of confidence" between the United States and Egypt. There are real differences in the policies of both countries, yet by and large both the United States and President Nasser's government have a number of common interests and both have far more to gain than to lose by maintaining moderately good relations. Ambassador Badeau points out very cogently that from the Egyptian point of view American policy in the Middle East has been inconsistent. In his words:

> American foreign policy toward Egypt has been so erratic largely because Americans—like Egyptians—react rather than act. They do not recognize that it is possible for two countries to oppose each other on specific issues while maintaining a continuing and mutually profitable relation. It is too often an "all or nothing" policy. Either American wheat buys Egyptian compliance to an American viewpoint, or there will be no American wheat. This assumes that the object of American aid is to "bring Egypt to heel," and that when this fails the only alternative is pressure totally to stop the aid program. This seldom works, and particularly it does not work with President Nasser. If the United States desires to protect such national interests as involve the United Arab Republic, it must be prepared steadily and quietly to pursue a policy that does not fluctuate like the stock market with every political crisis. American policy must be aimed at maintaining a relationship with Egypt, not on seeking pretexts to sever it.

Mr. President, we must keep our eyes open and our wits about us in dealing with President Nasser. The aid we are supplying him is not tanks and machineguns but wheat, dairy products, and beef. These are not implements of war, but products designed to help the people of Egypt to achieve a higher standard of living. These products are shipped under title I of Public Law 480 which enables the Government of Egypt to sell these goods for Egyptian currency which then remains under the control of the United States. President Nasser cannot take this money and go out and buy weapons with it. It has been implied that, indirectly, some of these funds have been misused to support Nasser's military ventures in Yemen. Responsible Government agencies deny these charges, but if there is still concern in the minds of Members of Congress that U.S. aid to Nasser may have gone astray or been misused in any way, then the proper course is to authorize an investigation and audit, perhaps by the General Accounting Office. Certainly, if any other agency of Government were accused of misuse of funds, our reaction would not be to abolish that particular agency of Government or program but to investigate the situation and determine what actually has happened. I do not believe that the charges of a single defector who may have ulterior motives of his own should be the basis for abruptly terminating a commitment of this nature without any effort to get further facts.

Finally, Mr. President, we must not forget what happened in 1955, when Secretary of State Dulles abruptly canceled U.S. promises to help with the Aswan Dam project. That was done as a strong expression of disapproval of Nasser's policies. It was a clear effort to tie foreign aid assistance to acquiescence with the broad political policies of another government. The results were not at all what we had sought and, in fact, created grave problems in the Middle East for many years thereafter. It is, of course, one of the common lessons of history that men do not learn from history, but surely that example less than a decade ago should be fresh enough in our minds and should discourage any desire on anyone's part for a repetition.

Mr. President, in short, there is nothing to be gained by an action taken from spite, carried out with great fanfare, and designed not seriously to weaken President Nasser but merely to antagonize him. There is nothing to be gained in the eyes of the rest of the world by depriving the people of Egypt, and the children of Egypt of foodstuffs which we have virtually promised to make available to them. One does not starve a nation into friendship. I strongly believe that the President must have the discretion provided by the language approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee in order to conduct any kind of rational and meaningful relations with President Nasser. We would be cutting off our nose to spite our face, as the saying goes, to deny Egypt surplus U.S. food. We would not be enhancing the security of Israel by this act, or encouraging Nasser to cooperate more closely with the United States. We would only be aggravating an already dangerous climate of distrust and antagonism in the Middle East.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I believe that it would be an extremely dangerous precedent to establish the requirement that Congress must approve Public Law 480 food-for-peace agreements. Congress is not and should not be an administrative body. It does not have the staff or the facilities to investigate and act on executive agreements. The amendment offered by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] appears to be clear and straightforward. In actual fact, it is a back-door approach, overturning the constitutional responsibilities of the executive branch of the Government and placing Congress in a position where it does not belong and where it cannot act properly and responsibly. If the Senator feels that such a far-reaching change is necessary, then his proposal should be introduced in the form of a straightforward amendment to Public Law 480 on which hearings can be held, officials connected with the program can be heard, and a thoughtful investigation made. The increasing tendency toward what I call back-door legislation—to alter the nature or operation of a program by an amendment offered at the last minute on the floor of the House or Senate without going through the front door of committee hearings and study—is, in my judgment, unwise. It bypasses competent committees and does not permit careful responsible legislating. I am deeply opposed to the amendment offered and urge that it be defeated.

Mr. President, I strongly urge that no changes be made in the language which the committee recommends.

I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Badeau's article to which I referred earlier be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC: A CRISIS IN CONFIDENCE

(By John S. Badeau)

During recent congressional debates on aid legislation many harsh things were said about the United Arab Republic and its President. One Senator stated that "Col. Abdel Nasser * * * has been responsible more than any other single individual for keeping the political cauldron boiling in the arid, strifetorn Middle East * * * pouring oil on whatever brush fires break out." President Nasser has been equally sharp and critical. Early in 1964 he publicly described American foreign policy toward the Arab world as "not based on justice but on the support and consolidation of the base of aggression, Israel, and we cannot, under any circumstances, accept it."

To be sure, much of this may be dismissed as political talk for the public ear. Nasser, no less than American Senators, has a constituency which periodically must be stirred up and marshaled for support. There is thus little new in the current skirmishing between Arab and American spokesmen—but those who follow United States-United Arab Republic relations closely feel there ought to be. For this increased tempo in verbal attacks comes during a period of nota-

ble improvement in relations, when both the United States and the United Arab Republic, as a matter of basic policy have been trying to get along with each other.

For both parties the change began in the aftermath of the Suez affair. By its prompt support of the United Nations and its refusal to back the Israel-Anglo-French invasion, the United States gave practical proof of its impartiality in Middle East quarrels which threatened the peace of the area and the world. This was followed by a quiet mending of relations in the closing days of the Eisenhower administration. Economic aid to Egypt was cautiously reinstituted and a franker exchange of views took place. President Kennedy supported and expanded this policy, identifying the Middle East as an area vital to American interests. He sought to develop relations with Egypt around points of mutual interest, while recognizing that the United States had, and would continue to have, sharp differences with Nasser.

In making this approach, the United States paid particular attention to economic assistance. Whatever else the revolution in Egypt stands for, it is the most vigorous attack on the perennial problems of poverty, disease, ignorance and privilege ever seen in the ancient valley of the Nile. With a burgeoning population (doubled since 1936), severe limitation of arable land (3½ percent of the country's total area), and limited foreign exchange earnings (chiefly the cotton crop, Suez Canal tolls and tourism), it is obvious that the United Arab Republic cannot forge ahead with desperately needed modernization and social advance without substantial foreign assistance.

Here was a point of mutual concern on which closer American-Egyptian relations could be built. On its part, the United Arab Republic needed to develop a healthy and progressive society without being captured in the process by the Soviet bloc. But a socially stable and progressive Egypt was also in the interests of the United States, one of whose basic Middle East policies is to contribute wherever possible to tranquillity through social progress in this vital region. Political and economic chaos in the Valley of the Nile would have repercussions in the surrounding area. Both in its own right, and as a major influence in the Arab world, the sound economic progress of Egypt is a desirable American objective. American economic assistance, chiefly through the Public Law 480 food program, was therefore increased.

Egypt's response to this approach opened a new era in United States of America-United Arab Republic relations. A cultural agreement was signed in 1962. In 1963, after 11 years of negotiation, Egypt entered into an investment guarantee agreement with the United States, aimed at stimulating and protecting American business interests. On several occasions, notably at the Economic Conference in Cairo in the summer of 1962, the United Arab Republic played a moderating role in containing African and Asian extremists. Nasser opposed the Soviet resumption of nuclear testing and shifted his policy away from supporting Gizenga in the Congo. While maintaining diplomatic relations with Cuba, the United Arab Republic displayed little enthusiasm for Castro and took a reasonably sympathetic attitude toward President Kennedy's showdown with Khrushchev. And for the first time in some years, the controlled press in Egypt gave a fairly objective, often sympathetic, account of American actions.

Against this background of cooperation, the shrill crescendo of bitter accusation between American and Egyptian leaders strikes an ominous discord. A popular Egyptian proverb says, "One day it's honey—the next onions." After the good diet of the past 3 years, are American-Egyptian relations in for a ration of onions? Under the present administration, the United States made its most determined effort to protect its interests in the Near East through a reasonable rapprochement with the United Arab Republic. Are all such efforts bound to be fleeting? What is it that interrupts them just when everything seems to be going well?

The answer is not to be found so much in specific policies of the two countries as in the atmosphere within which these take place. At the end of the First World War, an American observer reported that "Before all else (the nations of the Near East) need renewed confidence in each other and in us, and in our honest purposes of good." That is as true today as it was 40 years ago. The day of honey in Arab-American relations so easily changes into a day of onions because there is a mutual distrust of each other's honest purposes of good. Actions in themselves relatively minor become objects of deep suspicion because they are seen as cloaks for imperialism, neo-colonialism, pan-Arabism, or the personal ambitions of some Arab ruler. The crisis is often a crisis of confidence, generating a fog of suspicion which chokes good relations and makes it difficult to negotiate a lasting solution to differences.

It is a crisis in confidence which currently threatens American relations with the United Arab Republic. Although the mutuality of interests continues, the United States is wondering whether in the light of recent events it can trust the United Arab Republic to follow a reasonably consistent course of cooperation—or will it undercut vital American interests in the Arab world at its own whim? And can the United Arab Republic trust the United States to pursue its present course with continuity—or will the erratic winds of changing administrations and election pressures continually blow American foreign policy off course? It is doubt about these fundamentals of the American-Egyptian relationship which has created a crisis between the two nations.

One reason for such doubts is the very success of recent policy. Each party now finds itself playing an important role in the national interests of the other, a role in which the capacity to hurt is large. American food makes a massive contribution to the well-being of Egypt and is a resource on which the United Arab Republic national budget is currently based. While the country could get along without it (as the aftermath of Suez shows), the withdrawal of our food sales would create a serious economic problem. Moreover, the attitude of the United States influences both government and private credit resources in Western countries upon which the United Arab Republic now depends for its badly needed foreign currency assistance. Thus the United Arab Republic is nervous about anything which might suggest a sudden shift in American policy and scrutinizes carefully and suspiciously every American statement, fearing the worst.

But the United States also is nervous about Egypt. The United Arab Republic and its President are the single most powerful force in the Arab world. With the largest and most modernly equipped Arab army, the most powerful and sophisticated propaganda system and wide appeal among the Arab masses, President Nasser has a potential which cannot be neglected by any nation having interests in the Near East. He has the power to harm American interests to a considerable degree, as the response to his call for liquidating the American airbase in Libya shows. It is not simply a matter of power and ambition; Nasser typifies the socially revolutionary and politically self-determining forces which are at work in most countries of the Near East. If these forces, under the spell of Nasser's leadership, are aroused against American interests in Libya, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia, they can cause much trouble, even if they might not in the end totally destroy the U.S. position.

But this mutual fear is more than a current mood, bred by recent experience. There are, in fact, good reasons for the United States and Egypt to suspect each other—reasons which have a long history. Each Nation has a bill of particulars against the other, drawn from the experiences of the last decade. It is this which forms the reservoir of suspicion from which a crisis of confidence is so easily drawn.

On Egypt's part, the first count against the United States is the unpredictibility of its policy. American-Egyptian relations since the revolution in 1952 amply illustrate this. In the opening stages of the new regime, America was closely and hopefully identified with it, believing that a change in social and political conditions was long overdue in the Valley of the Nile. This led to a "honeymoon" policy, when sympathy and identity of interests seemed high.

In 1955 this cordial relation abruptly changed, due to Egyptian arms purchases from the Soviets. Failing to secure military equipment from the West on acceptable terms, Nasser turned to the Soviet bloc. The American reaction was a reversal of policy, which now set itself to contain and separate Egypt from its Arab neighbors. This was the policy of "isolation"—a long cry from the "honeymoon" which preceded it.

This policy failed. The United States was unable to isolate Egypt, the Israel-Anglo-French invasion of Egypt brought Nasser to the summit of his influence in the area, and it became clear that some new approach was needed. In the aftermath of Suez, America therefore shifted to a line that was "cautious but correct," gradually reinstituting aid and seeking at least minimal normal relations.

Under President Kennedy, this was reinforced and expanded to become a policy of "selective cooperation" built on mutual interests. In no sense was this a return to the "honeymoon," with uncritical support of all United Arab Republic policies. Rather it was based upon a sense of mutual needs and a willingness to concentrate on these instead of on the many disputes which had soured past relations.

Thus in less than a decade the United States has followed four different policies toward Egypt. While each is defensible in terms of the conditions which produced it, the effect on the Egyptian is to create the impression that American actions are unpredictable, not built upon clear principles—indeed, not even built upon a consistent view of America's own interests. It is this penchant for change in the American course which makes the Egyptian reserved and suspicious of us, especially during a period when relations are good.

A second cause of Egyptian suspicion is the rapid rise of American power, particularly in and near the Middle East. Prior to the Second World War, the American presence in the Arab world consisted chiefly of missionaries, educators, archeologists, and a limited number of businesses, petroleum being the largest. The United States was a threat to no one; it had no bases, no troops, no fleets, and it displayed none of the panoply of power Arabs expected from a great nation.

This changed after the war. Beginning with President Truman's commitment to the defense of Turkey and Greece in 1947, the United States played an increasing role in the area. Military bases in Morocco, Libya, Turkey and Arabia, the powerful 6th Fleet always just across the horizon, support for the military establishments of Iran, Turkey and Greece, the landing of Marines in Lebanon—these were disturbing proofs to the Arab that the United States had become a military presence which could interfere with

actions of the Arab States whenever it chose. What Great Britain once was, the United States has now become—the policeman of the world. Therefore the spectre of American might in the Middle East always lurks just offstage and Egyptians are convinced that at some unexpected point it will step from the wings to play the dominant role in their affairs.

This fear is fed by a third suspicion—that the United States is too often in league with the forces of "imperialism and neocolonialism." What the Egyptians mean by this is not (despite the paragraph above) that America will deliberately seek to create a Middle East empire. It is that we are damned by our association with the British and the "reactionary" Arab regimes. As to Britain, many Arabs believe that the present remnants of its historic position in the Middle East are supported by the United States. While at the time of the Suez invasion in 1956 the United States joined in condemning (and thus terminating) the Anglo-French invasion, within a few days we froze Egyptian assets in America, refused to sell food and drugs to Egypt, and ended the CARE program. Obviously, it is argued, America was prepared to support Britain as far as it dared.

This identification with "imperialism" is given more substance by our interests in and association with Arab regimes which the Egyptian considers "reactionary." By this he means the monarchies of the area and their governments which he claims do not represent popular consent or the interests of the people. The Egyptian argument is that these regimes are based upon an economic and political elite who keep power against the best interests of the common masses by cooperating with the foreign power having a stake in the country. He believes that the very character of the regimes in Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Libya (to name the current lot) drive them into subservience to Western, therefore American, power. This is the "neocolonialism" against which the nonalined world so frequently agitates as a threat to its untrammeled independence.

These three causes for distrust are brought to a focus in the problem that most continuously and deeply besets our relations with the Arab world—the question of Israel. There are many aspects of this tangled affair, but as regards American foreign policy the heart of the matter is that the Egyptian (and most of his fellow Arabs) believes that Israel exercises a veto power on American policy toward the Arab world. Whatever understanding of the realities of Arab life there may be in American circles, and however logically American interests can be served by at least an even-handed policy toward the Arabs, the Egyptian is convinced that when the cards are down Israel and its supporters can force the United States to make their interests paramount. Thus the Egyptian believes that no balanced American policy toward the Arab world can be permanent. Sooner or later it will run counter to Israeli interests, and when that happens, the U.S. Government is powerless to hold to its course.

So runs the Egyptian indictment. But Americans have equally deep suspicions of the United Arab Republic. Most basic is the conviction that Egypt and its President are compulsive meddlers in the affairs of their neighbors. Both openly and secretly they stir up strife, support dissident movements and seek the overthrow of regimes of which they disapprove. Even Egyptians recognize this and express themselves in one of Cairo's many jokes about the regime. According to the story, when President Nasser went to Algeria last spring, he took with him a number of movie films, one of his favorite forms of relaxation. Among these was "Mutiny on the *Bounty*." After seeing the picture, the President sent a cable to the Foreign Office saying, "Contact the mutineers on the *Bounty* immediately. Tell them we support their cause and any attack on them will be considered an attack on the United Arab Republic."

During the past 2 years there have been five instances of United Arab Republic meddling which particularly disturbed Americans. The first was Egypt's support for the coup d'etat which overthrew the Imam of Yemen. What began as modest help to Republican forces against the Royalists ended with full-scale military occupation of the country. Egypt eventually had nearly 40,000 troops in the Yemen. A second instance was the dispatch of United Arab Republic arms and technicians in support of Algeria in its border dispute with Morocco—and this at a time when Cuba was also getting into the act.

The third incident was the supply of small arms to the Government of Cyprus during the current civil war on that unfortunate island. While any government has the legal right to sell arms to another government, it seemed that Greek Cypriots had ample quantities of weapons on hand, both for their regular and irregular forces. What reason had the United Arab Republic to contribute to an already overabundant supply except the desire to fan the fires of conflict between Greek and Turkish Cypriots? And why did Nasser welcome Makarios so warmly to Cairo this summer, unless the United Arab Republic is more interested in perpetuating than in calming the Cyprus disorders?

The fourth instance is perhaps the most serious. In February 1964, President Nasser, in a public speech heard throughout the Arab world, called for the ending of British and American base rights in Libya. The response was an immediate public furor in Libya which came dangerously near to ending in the abdication of the king. Once again Egypt was interfering in the affairs of its neighbors, and in a form directly challenging an American interest.

Finally, there is the current Egyptian campaign against the South Arabian Federation and its British sponsors. Here is an area remote from the United Arab Republic, without visible impact on Egyptian security interests. Whether the Egyptian offensive is a diversionary ploy in the Yemen affair or a more general stirring up of trouble for trouble's sake, it only confirms American opinion that the United Arab Republic is always minding someone else's business.

This continuous "keeping the pot boiling" by Egypt causes serious problems for the United States. Not only does it have a number of specific interests in the countries involved, but its policy has been to promote tranquillity among Middle Eastern states. We believe that disputes, small in themselves, run the risk of inviting outside interference and so spreading into a major conflict. We do not want to see our friends in Arab countries threatened by Egyptian meddling and we do not intend to have world peace shattered by small-nation disputes.

The second set of American complaints against the United Arab Republic is related to the first. Egypt's ability to involve itself in affairs throughout the area is based in part on its military and propaganda strength, and this deflects money from urgently needed economic development. While not massive as modern armies go (about 150,000 men for a population of 28 million), Egyptian forces are the biggest and best equipped in the Arab world. Their weapons and aircraft are by far the most sophisticated. Egyptian secret activities abroad in the form of subsidies, weapon supply, and agents are large and continuous. These efforts are supported and extended by propaganda including subsidies to newspapers, writers, conferences, foreign students studying in the United Arab Republic, and an extensive multilingual radio program.

All this is expensive. It may be argued that all nations incur such expenses; they are accepted in our chaotic modern world as a necessary part of "national security" which costs us all so much. But the point for Egypt is that it cannot afford the role of a dominant or dominating power in the area and at the same time win its internal fight against ignorance, poverty and backwardness. Remarkable improvements have been made in Egyptian life under Nasser's regime, but it is still touch and go as to whether the Egyptian economy can permanently bear the burden. Why does the United Arab Republic insist on incurring a high bill for activities abroad when at least some of this money is so desperately needed at home?

A third general cause for American suspicion toward Egypt is the continuing concentration of political power in personal hands. This is what the American means when he speaks of "dictatorship"—not so much a theory of government (as fascism or nazism) as a practical situation which the fate of society and individuals is determined by one man or a small group of men upon whom the citizenry has no form of restraint.

It was to be expected that in the early days of the revolution, Colonel Nasser and his associates should become the de facto center of power in the country. But if a revolution is to be anything more than a coup d'etat, it must eventually broaden its base, diffuse its power and build a rule of law. None of these things appears to have happened yet in Egypt. Laws are promulgated by Presidential decree, there is no provision for a loyal opposition, and expressions of criticism of government policies are only possible within the very narrow limits set by the Government itself. The press is firmly controlled. At times private citizens are under sharp surveillance (as during the 1962 French spy trials) and guilt by association plays a large role.

All this does not add up to a police state in the full pattern so familiar in Communist countries. But it does have a profound effect on society, generating an atmosphere of unpredictability and curtailed liberty. Insofar as the American sees world issues as involving the principles of freedom and responsibility, he is suspicious of the character of the Egyptian regime and the direction it has thus far been traveling.

This suspicion is related to another American question about the United Arab Republic, namely its relation to the Communist world. The more extreme statements that Nasser is at least a crypto-Communist and that Egypt is in fact, if not in desire, a Communist satellite can be dismissed as uninformed and wishful thinking. But whatever its intentions, the United Arab Republic, as Americans see it, has put itself dangerously in fee to the Soviet system. The Egyptian Army is equipped from top to toe with Soviet weapons. This makes the nation entirely dependent upon Soviet good will for military spare parts and replacements. In fact, the Soviet monopoly on the Egyptian regime's chief instrument of power—its military establishment—gives the Russians an absolute veto on certain Egyptian policies if they care to use it. Whatever the United Arab Republic's dedication to independence may be, its freedom of action in relation to the Soviets is more sharply limited than it is in relation to the free world.

Added to this is the belief that Soviet and United Arab Republic policies in the Middle East too often coincide. A major Soviet objective has been to dispossess the Western powers of influence in the area, thus opening the way for Soviet action. The United Arab Republic would appear to serve this through its attack on the British position, foreign bases (which are all Western) and nonrevolutionary Arab States with which the West has close relations. Thus, while Egypt does not intend to be a Soviet satellite, its own activities sometimes aid and abet Soviet

interests and cause problems for the United States.

Finally, there is Israel. Depending on the knowledge and emotional commitment of the American, his attitude ranges from seeing in Nasser the dragon who will devour Israel as soon as he is strong enough, to the more sober recognition that the United Arab Republic's continued hostility to Israel is the keystone of the Arab attitude which refuses to consider even a remote possibility of peace discussions. This concerns many Americans who are in no sense Israeli protagonists. Insofar as the Arab-Israeli dispute is a constant source of tension and conflict, its lack of solution is a constant threat to tranquility, progress, and stability in the Middle East. Many Americans want it settled, not because they favor Israel or the Arabs, but because they are thoroughly weary of alarms and excursions which periodically set the world's teeth on edge. If the United Arab Republic would exercise its leadership in the Arab world for a gradual rapprochement with Israel, everyone would breathe easier.

Accusation and counteraccusation—how much of it is strictly true? Only a detailed study of each issue would answer this, and then it would be seen that there is confusion as to facts and highly questionable judgments in the interpretation of them. But one thing is clear, when all the mythology has been extracted from the mutual causes for suspicion, a hard core of fact remains. Egypt has sound reasons for mistrusting the United States, and the United States cannot help but mistrust it in return. The crisis in confidence is real, not artificial, and it is the chief factor which must be taken into account by both countries if they desire to continue reasonably cordial relations to their mutual benefit.

Can confidence be restored? Given the causes for suspicion recounted above, it may be argued that this is impossible; the gulf is too wide and has been deepened over too many years to be bridged now. This is certainly true for the immediate future. Both parties need to understand and admit that the restoration of confidence is a slow business and that no sudden change in foreign policies will bring it about immediately. For one thing, national as well as personal characteristics are hard to change. Egypt is a revolutionary society and nothing the United States can do will alter that fact. All the problems of dealing with its ebullient and frequently embarrassing activities will continue and must be recognized as part of the given situation. On its part, the United States will not change its character as a leader of the free world with interests that frequently run counter to Egyptian desires. No matter what Egypt thinks or does, America will not place its own and its partners' security in jeopardy by turning a blind eye on any Egyptian activity which causes tumult in the Near East or appears to strengthen the Soviet position.

This is to say that both countries will get along better only if each is more realistic about its capabilities of easily and quickly influencing the other's course of action. Americans are prone to think that they can play God in Near Eastern (and other) affairs, shoring up or bringing down regimes, or by threats and economic pressure forcing the United Arab Republic Government to take actions which it judges to be against its basic national interests. And Egyptians equally exaggerate their limited ability to put pressure on the United States through propaganda, appeals to revolutionary groups in other countries, or agitation against American positions such as Wheelus airbase and the petroleum interests at the head of the Persian Gulf. Each country can damage the other, but neither can force a basic change in policy unless it is prepared to resort to overt action—and in this the United States is in the stronger position.

If this fact is accepted, it means that differences and clashes of interest between the United States and Egypt will continue for some time. The problem is not to wipe these out (which is impossible) but to curtail and contain their power to threaten a reasonable relationship between the two countries. For this both sides must be prepared to take some positive steps. For the Egyptians, there must be a greater appreciation that the public image they create in the American mind largely determines what it is possible for the U.S. Government to do. The United States is a democracy, which Egyptians do not fully understand. Neither the Secretary of State nor the President can sustain a policy toward Egypt (even when it is in the best interests of the United States) without some Egyptian help in creating a climate of favorable public opinion. When this climate is unfavorable, it is not because (as alleged by Egyptians) the American press is controlled by pro-Israel interests or American Senators who are captives of the Jewish vote. It is because of what the Egyptians themselves do. They can now do several things which will help their position.

One is to display more dedication to carrying out their word. Failure to make even token troop withdrawals under the Yemen disengagement agreement has seriously shaken American faith in President Nasser's bona fides. Actions taken against foreign companies in Egypt despite earlier agreements and promises have the same effect. In general, Egypt must work to correct the impression of undependability which its actions have generated.

Egypt can also affect the American attitude by emphasizing accomplishments rather than propaganda as its implement of influence in the Arab world. The sound development of the Valley of the Nile economy with resulting success in raising living standards will do much more to win Egypt a good reputation in the Middle East and abroad than strident and vicious radio broadcasts. The real measure of the Egyptian revolution's place in history will not be the extent to which it can outdo other Arabs in invective, but the degree to which it can stand upon its actual accomplishments of a better society. The Egyptian image as a responsible Arab world power has been badly damaged by its unceasing and raucous broadcasts.

Again the American attitude will be affected by the efficiency with which the Egyptian social and economic plans are carried forward. Great changes for good have taken place in Egypt, but great wastage of human and economic resources has also taken place in the process. American economic assistance has been large; but it is difficult to make the case for its continuance unless the Egyptian developmental process is tightened and foreign adventures curtailed in the interest of internal development. Economic conditions in Egypt are not as bad as many foreign observers would like to believe, but they are considerably worse than the Egyptian official admits. If the American is to be induced to continue helping in the remaking of the Egyptian system, he must be given more confidence in the process.

Then there is the difficult matter of Israel, which creates a continuing and most exacerbating strain in United Arab Republic-United States relations. Americans cannot expect Egypt to change its basic attitudes on this, any more than France can expect the United States to change its attitude toward Red China. But there are several things Egypt can do to ease the situation and thus create confidence in America, particularly in non-Zionist circles. One is to let its actions speak rather than its words. The Egyptian policy toward Israel over the past few years has, in fact, been encouragingly moderate. Nasser's public eschewal of aggressive military action as an answer to the current Israeli utilization of Jordan waters is a case in point. The trouble is that Presidential speeches often outrun Presidential policies. The Israel dispute is unnecessarily dragged in on every occasion and vague verbal attacks on Israel are taken at their face value in Congress and by the American public.

Even more important would be some steps by the United Arab Republic toward alleviating the arms race with Israel. It is the American conviction that this can be done without imperiling the basic security of the United Arab Republic. Acceptance of international safeguards in the development of atomic power and some willingness to consider means by which the arms level can be frozen at its present position would create a very favorable world reaction. Even if Israel did not respond, or respond fully, Egyptian leadership in this would go far to encourage the great mass of Americans both in and out of government who want only to see peace in the Middle East.

But the task of creating confidence is not Egypt's alone; the United States must also be prepared to make some changes. The first is a greater consistency of approach. American foreign policy toward Egypt has been so erratic largely because Americans—like Egyptians—react rather than act. They do not recognize that it is possible for two countries to oppose each other on specific issues while maintaining a continuing and mutually profitable relation. It is too often an "all or nothing" policy. Either American wheat buys Egyptian compliance to an American viewpoint, or there will be no American wheat. This assumes that the object of American aid is to "bring Egypt to heel," and that when this fails the only alternative is pressure totally to stop the aid program. This seldom works, and particularly it does not work with President Nasser. If the United States desires to protect such national interests as involve the United Arab Republic, it must be prepared steadily and quietly to pursue a policy that does not fluctuate like the stockmarket with every political crisis. American policy must be aimed at maintaining a relationship with Egypt, not on seeking pretexts to sever it.

This means that the United States must be more clear sighted in defining for itself and the United Arab Republic what its vital interests are. There is a confusion in the American mind—even among policymakers—between American interests and what Americans consider desirable. The latter is as broad as the moral values of the particular observer and includes a free press, the parliamentary system, private enterprise—or even the whole gamut of the American political system. Desirable as these may be to the American, they are not per se American interest, involving the essentials of national security. It is these latter which are the central concern of foreign policy and the American approach to the United Arab Republic must be made consistent with them.

It is as difficult for the United States to decrease suspicions generated by its policy toward Israel as it is for the United Arab Republic in the same situation. But the attempt must be made if American interests in the Arab world are not to suffer needlessly. The United States—like the United Arab Republic—has certain commitments in the Arab-Israeli situation from which it will not retreat. These include recognition of Israel as a sovereign and continuing member of the international community of nations and support for and collaboration with the United Nations in dealing with questions arising from the Arab-Israeli dispute.

Arabs need to understand and respect these commitments, as Americans must do. It needs to be made clear both in Congress and in sections of the general public that the

American commitment to Israel is limited. Our commitments are not based on the assumption that in every and all circumstances we will come to Israel's aid. Nor is Israel (or any other Middle East state) the chosen instrument of the United States in its policy toward the area. The basic consideration must always be what serves American interests in the Middle East. And this must be so regardless of its effect in helping or hurting either Israel or the United Arab Republic.

This principle is understood in policy-making circles in Washington and, in general, action accords with it. The difficulty lies in the sensitive domestic political situation. Often it is felt that Israel and her protagonists must be placated by public statements, even though these do not herald a shift in American policy. It is too much to expect that all politicians will resist the temptation to drag Israel into their election campaigns as a vote-catching device, but at least responsible Government spokesmen can take more care as to the place and content of their speeches. It was unfortunate that President Johnson's first policy statement on the Middle East was made before an organization identified with Israel, just as it would have been equally unfortunate if it had been made to a pro-Arab group. It would also help if American policy decisions involving Israel could be kept out of election campaigns, thus underscoring their character as considered moves based upon American national interest and not merely election gestures.

Difficult tasks are evidently involved for both parties. Many will say, "Why bother to attempt them, when the differences between the two countries are so continuous and exasperating?" The answer is that both Egypt and the United States need each other; their realistic national interests demand reasonably cooperative relations. This is why, despite the strains and vagaries of policy during the past decade, there has never been an irrevocable rupture. In each period of bad relations, as the point of no return approached, both parties paused, took a new tack and tried to repair the breach. In the aftermath of the Soviet arms deal the United States did not succeed in isolating Egypt and possibly bringing about its downfall; and Egypt, despite strenuous efforts during the same period, did not permanently hurt American interests in the Arab world. Both found their capabilities more limited than they thought and their mutual interests more powerful than they had admitted. They therefore gradually returned to a policy of fostering better relations.

It is these mutual interests which form the basis of an enduring relation between the two countries. Despite suspicions, clashes, and differences in policy, the United States and the United Arab Republic have concerns in common on which a reasonable cooperation can be built. Egypt wants to develop in independence, without becoming either a Western or a Soviet satellite. Similarly the United States, now increasingly recognizing the inevitability (and often the utility) of the nonalined position of many nations, is concerned to see Egypt independent. Egypt wants a better and more stable social system, with a rise in living standards for the masses of the Nile Valley. Here again American and Egyptian interests coincide; a stable Egypt is very much desired by the United States, for a major catastrophe there would have repercussions throughout the entire Arab world. To improve its economic situation, Egypt needs continuing ties with the West; even if the Soviet connection were to be increased vastly, the Soviet bloc cannot do what needs to be done for the Egyptian economy. And all of Egypt's foreign cultural, intellectual, and technical traditions are of the Western World. With them the Egyptian feels at home. To make this Western connection secure in both its economic and cultural aspects, Egypt needs good relations with the United States.

So long as the United States has vital interests in Arab lands and the United Arab Republic has a role of influence and leadership, the two countries cannot escape doing business with each other. The question is whether they can be sufficiently mature, clear sighted, and patient to work out gradually a consistent and mutually profitable relationship.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise to explain my vote on House Joint Resolution 234, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture.

A supplemental appropriation bill is normally a routine measure, requiring no explanation. This particular resolution would appropriate funds to carry out the food-for-peace program under Public Law 480. I support the program of providing developing countries with our surplus farm commodities and would, under normal circumstances, vote in favor of this measure without a second thought.

I have serious second thoughts about this particular measure, however, because one of the countries which would receive assistance under the funds to be appropriated is the United Arab Republic.

If this were a simple question of whether to continue aid to the United Arab Republic, I would vote to end such aid. It is time that this Government, in no uncertain terms, told other nations of this world that we will no longer give assistance to governments which are bent on aggression.

The United Arab Republic has repeatedly threatened to annihilate Israel. It is now engaged in threats aimed at the United States. How can such a country be considered peaceful?

The American people want peace—in the Middle East and throughout the world. But there is no peace in the Middle East and, indeed, there will not be because of the blustering warlike threats of Nasser and his Arab League associates who, fortified in the main with Soviet weaponry, have arrogantly proclaimed to the world that when they feel ready they will annihilate Israel. If Israel is annihilated, who will be next?

Despite serious misgivings, Mr. President, I intend to vote in favor of the pending resolution.

The resolution embodies a substantial compromise between the action of the House of Representatives and the wishes of the President. The House voted to eliminate any further shipments of surplus commodities to the United Arab Republic. The President desired a free hand.

The compromise we have before us would allow funds to be used to finance shipments to the United Arab Republic only if the President found it to be in the national interest, and only under the agreement of October 8, 1962, between the United States and the United Arab Republic. That agreement terminates on June 30, 1965, so we are only authorizing further shipments for less than 5 months.

More important is the question at issue of the powers of the President of the United States. The power of the Executive to carry on the foreign policy of the country was of such import that our Founding Fathers clearly provided for it in the Constitution. At stake here is the flexibility and viability of the office of the President of the United States, the very essence of the execution of the foreign policy of our country.

I have, along with my colleagues, been assured that a complete review of our aid to the United Arab Republic is being undertaken within the State Department. I have full confidence that the Secretary of State, who pleaded so eloquently before the Members of this body for the continuation of aid to complete the 3-year agreement, will determine, after the utmost scrutiny, whether the exportation of these agricultural commodities is in the national interest.

Mr. President, it is with these reassurances, and in the light of the devastating nature of the alternative, that I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the issue today is not whether we approve of Mr. Nasser and the reprehensible acts that have occurred, but whether congressional action cutting off food-for-peace aid to Egypt advances our basic objective to preserve peace in the Middle East and protects the security and freedom of Israel.

President Johnson believes that our policy of pursuing these goals could be furthered by not tieing the administration's hands in this matter at this time. He has requested support from the Senate on this, his first foreign-policy test of the session. I believe that he deserves that support.

Furthermore, I have been impressed by the fact that members of the Appropriations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee have changed their opinion after receiving classified information about what can be accomplished by supporting President Johnson on this issue.

Therefore, I shall vote today to support the President—not to express my feelings toward Mr. Nasser—and I do so firmly believing it to be in the interest of the United States and in the interest of furthering our objective of preserving peace in the Middle East and preventing aggression against Israel.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, my position on the question of food-for-peace aid to the United Arab Republic has nothing to do with my approval or disapproval of the acts of that government, but stems instead from my strong belief that maintaining the President's discretion on the matter is the path best calculated to keep the peace in the Middle East and to assure the independence and territorial integrity of Israel.

The recent actions of Mr. Nasser in relation to this country have been insulting, and in relation to problems in Yemen, Aden, and the Congo have partaken of the kind of aggressive interference in the internal affairs of other nations that is inconsistent with fundamental American principles. Neverthe-

less, I feel just as strongly that President Johnson is right in asking that the administration's hands not be tied in this matter, and I am confident that leaving him free to act will further our primary purpose of preventing hostilities in the Middle East and protecting Israeli freedom.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is an agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], as modified, to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent because of Illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Calfornia would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Seantor from Pennsylavnia [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 7, nays 75, as follows:

[No. 16 Leg.]

YEAS—7

Dodd	Miller	Prouty
Hickenlooper	Pearson	Simpson
Hruska		

NAYS—75

Aiken	Bayh	Byrd, Va.
Allott	Bible	Cannon
Anderson	Boggs	Carlson
Bartlett	Brewster	Case
Bass	Burdick	Church
Clark	Jordan, N.C.	Neuberger
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Pastore
Cotton	Kennedy, Mass.	Pell
Dirksen	Kennedy, N.Y.	Proxmire
Dominick	Lausche	Randolph
Douglas	Long, Mo.	Robertson
Eastland	Long, La.	Saltonstall
Ellender	Magnuson	Smathers
Ervin	Mansfield	Smith
Fannin	McClellan	Sparkman
Fong	McGee	Stennis
Gore	McGovern	Symington
Harris	McIntyre	Thurmond
Hart	McNamara	Tower
Hayden	Mondale	Tydings
Hill	Montoya	Williams, N.J.
Holland	Morse	Williams, Del.
Inouye	Mundt	Yarborough
Jackson	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.
Javits	Nelson	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Bennett	Johnston	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Muskie
Curtis	McCarthy	Ribicoff
Fulbright	Metcalf	Russell
Gruening	Monroney	Scott
Hartke	Morton	Talmadge

So Mr. MILLER's amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment, was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have always supported the idea of a foreign aid program. I hope to be able in good conscience to continue my support so long as it serves our national interest and the interests of freedom in the world. Furthermore, I recognize the necessity of preserving executive flexibility in administering a program that involves such important problems of foreign policy and national security in a world of rapidly changing events.

Nevertheless, the increasing evidence of inefficiency, bad planning, contradictory policies, and plain bureaucratic blundering in administration of the aid program causes me to make my protest here and now. Our failure to effectively and properly use our aid program to expand private business sales abroad purely because of lack of policy, coordination, and planning urgently demands correction now—not next year.

I hope to see a substantial change in this program, a reconciliation of conflicting policies and programs, and a shakeup in the agencies administering it.

My only opportunity to effectively express my dissatisfaction is to cast a negative vote when an issue is before us. I am hopeful that an increasing expression of criticism of the program by its supporters will compel a substantial reevaluation of the program as well as a reorganization and streamlining of the agencies and methods of administering it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the committee amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, after line 3, to strike out:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act:.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act, except when such exports are necessary to carry out the Sales Agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Parliamentary inquiries are not in order.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw 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 Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 17 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Allott	Hayden	Neuberger
Bartlett	Hill	Pastore
Bass	Holland	Pell
Bayh	Inouye	Randolph
Bible	Jordan, N.C.	Saltonstall
Brewster	Kennedy, Mass.	Smathers
Burdick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Sparkman
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Church	Long, La.	Symington
Clark	Magnuson	Tydings
Cooper	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Dirksen	McGovern	Yarborough
Eastland	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Hart	Mundt	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Fannin	Morse
Anderson	Fong	Murphy
Boggs	Harris	Nelson
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Cannon	Hruska	Prouty
Carlson	Jackson	Proxmire
Case	Javits	Robertson
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Dodd	Lausche	Smith
Dominick	McClellan	Thurmond
Douglas	McIntyre	Tower
Ellender	Miller	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Montoya	

NOT VOTING—18

Bennett	Kuchel	Moss
Curtis	Mansfield	Muskie
Fulbright	McCarthy	Ribicoff
Gruening	Metcalf	Russell
Hartke	Monroney	Scott
Johnston	Morton	Talmadge

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 21 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 3, at the end of line 20, insert the following new section:

"VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"No funds heretofore appropriated to the Veterans' Administration shall be utilized for the purpose of implementing any order or directive of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the closing or relocating of any hospital or facility owned or operated by the Veterans' Administration or with respect to the withdrawing, transferring, or reducing of services heretofore made available to veterans."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I think I can briefly explain the amendment. It is not complicated; it is exactly on four squares with what we have already done today by approving committee action on behalf of agricultural experiment stations. My amendment has almost the identical language as that offered by the committee in relation to the proposed closure of a group of agriculture experiment stations primarily designed to cure diseases of cattle, hogs, poultry, swine, and rabbits.

If it is so important that such action on the matter of the research stations be deferred until Congress has had a chance to examine into it and I emphatically agree that it is, we have the same language in this amendment to provide for the same careful consideration for veterans. The amendment is offered on behalf of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself. I want to repeat that what we propose to do for the veterans is what has been done today with respect to agriculture experiment stations. The experiment station action was adopted unanimously by our Senate Committee on Appropriations following a motion made by Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, and seconded by the senior Senator of South Dakota. It was a wise and proper action and we should now take similar action to protect our veterans hospitals and service facilities.

The Mundt-Anderson amendment would do two things. It would delay the closing orders from being implemented until at least the next regular appropriation bill comes before us. It would provide us with an appropriate forum, namely, the Committee on Appropriations, to hold hearings, to call witnesses, to examine the facts, and to determine what, if any, economies actually can be effectuated, should the administration renew its closure proposals.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join the Senator from South Dakota in his brief explanation. This is one way to cope with a problem on which no consultation was had with Senators from the respective States or the Representatives from the respective districts. I sincerely hope the Senate will vote in the affirmative on the proposal offered by the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Montana. This situation evolved out of a colloquy which the senior Senator from Montana and I had in the Chamber yesterday, when we were trying to divorce this issue from the question of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, under the practice of the Committee on Appropriations, prescribed by resolution adopted in 1931 and continued in force since that time, it becomes my duty to raise the point of order that this amendment, which relates to no matter in the joint resolution, but instead refers to appropriations heretofore made in other bills, is legislation and is, therefore, not subject to being considered on the joint resolution.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from South Dakota, of course, concedes the point of order. I said earlier that we were writing legislation in the joint resolution with respect to livestock. We are likewise proposing similar action in connection with our veterans' hospitals and service facilities. I filed a motion yesterday, recognizing that a point of order might be raised, so we can set aside the rules of the Senate and take this salutary action on the Mundt-Anderson proposal.

Mr. President, I ask that there be a vote on the proposed legislation, notwithstanding the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not yet ruled on the point of order.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall await the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair now sustains the point of order.

Mr. MUNDT. I appeal from the ruling, and therefore I call for a vote. I have no desire to detain the Senate. If there could be a standing vote, to determine whether two-thirds of the Senate favor overruling the decision of the Chair, that would be satisfactory. Otherwise I can ask for a rollcall as I mean to be sure we have an opportunity to vote on this amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to have a standing vote. I invite attention to the fact that this proposal is not like the previously adopted amendment. That amendment was approved by the committee. This amendment was not submitted to nor considered by our committee. The other amendment was directed by the committee to be brought up, with instructions to file the appropriate notices given to the chairman. That is all I shall say about it. I shall not address myself to the merits of the amendment except to say that there is little similarity between it and the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MUNDT. No, it is not necessary. I have filed notice to suspend the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rule for the purpose of having the Senate consider the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, we need not detain the Senate much longer, because the same sentiment that prevailed earlier on a question that required a two-thirds majority will prevail now, I am sure, on our proposed rider which now requires only a simple majority.

The country has about 22 million veterans at the present time. The closing order involves some important national policies concerning the veterans of America.

As the majority leader has pointed out, congressional committees certainly have a right to consider what is proposed. All I ask is that Congress be heard and the closure proposals delayed until such time as that has been done and we have before us the regular appropriation bill pertaining to the Veterans' Administration.

So far as I am concerned, I now ask for a vote on the amendment, unless other Senators desire to discuss the proposal.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there has been much discussion of the subject on the floor of the Senate about what we could do about the closings. The Senator from South Dakota has shown us

exactly what we should do. It is an honor to support his amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the Mundt-Anderson amendment might well be termed the antipoverty and antihardship amendment, for it will have the effect of alleviating both these two evils.

Only hours ago the Senate approved the Appalachia bill which is designed to deal with some of the problems of the Nation's poor. The Appalachia measure has been surrounded by an aura of publicity calculated to show the compassion of the Administration for the underprivileged. It would serve us well to ascertain whether that compassion is fact or fiction.

Compassion is not a one-time thing that disintegrates and vanishes when the propaganda bugles have finished blaring. Rather it is a quality of sympathy and understanding that pervades and permeates every action of any consequence.

I leave it to the Senate, then, and ask, Does the administration have compassion when it initiates a plan which will for the first time in recent history deprive eight States of VA regional offices which serve disabled and in many cases impoverished veterans?

Does the administration show concern for the poor when, for a show of false economy, it takes out of a small community such as White River Junction, Vt., a payroll approximating $300,000 dollars a year and gives the displaced employees only the vague guarantee that somewhere in the United States there may be a job for them—admittedly far removed from home, admittedly at reduced levels with all the hardships that such changes would entail.

And what about the members of the families of displaced VA employees? Many of these people have jobs in private industry to supplement their husband's or father's income. Will they, too, get jobs when the VA employee is forced to move to a location not of his own choice?

I think Senators know the answer as well as I do.

What kind of games are we playing with Federal employees? Have they now become instruments that we can shift about at will in order to add to our list of depressed areas?

If you do not think that the proposed closing of 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries operated by the Veterans' Administration is going to cause great unemployment and hardships, then you are not willing to look at facts as they really are.

This, then, is the effect of the black thirteenth—the January 13th order of the Acting Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

In vaudeville days, Al Jolson used to say "You ain't seen nothing yet." These words have a rather ominous ring today.

James F. O'Neil, former commander of the American Legion, said only a few days ago in Rutland, Vt., that what we are now witnessing is only the beginning, and I think he meant the beginning of the end of effective service to veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Many of our older veterans have arteriosclerosis with chronic brain syndromes. Now they can go only a few miles away to White River Junction to put in an appearance in connection with their claims. These severely disabled veterans are met by Vermonters who take them to the proper offices and help to guide them around.

Under the "black 13th" order, these veterans with varying degrees of brain damage will have to go 250 miles to Boston. And who is going to meet them there, assuming that they are able to withstand the ardors of the journey?

Mr. President, how is any Vermont veteran, particularly an ailing one or an older one, going to be able to get down to Boston? There is no rail service from Vermont to the capital of Massachusetts. Air service is impossible a good share of the year because of weather and limited schedules, and from some communities in Vermont there is no direct bus service at all.

What a Great Society this Federal Government of ours is conjuring up for them.

The American Legion representative at White River Junction has reported to me that many Vermont veterans come into the regional office without funds for the return trip home. The Legion, he says, often tries to furnish the small sums needed to return these impoverished veterans to their home communities and this is true also of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans.

But, he asks, would not the cost be prohibitive if a trip from Boston were involved? The Legion simply does not have the funds to handle the problem.

Hundreds of older veterans with heart conditions and the like, are sometimes able, with difficulty, to withstand a 30-, 40-, or even 100-mile trip to White River Junction. In the "black 13th" order of the Veterans' Administration Administrator, there is no provision made for these veterans who will soon have to make long wearisome trips, often unattended, to Boston.

I cannot speak with authority about the problems of veterans in other States, but I do know what is going to happen in Vermont if the "black 13th" order goes through.

Let us suppose that a Vermont veteran is seeking to appeal a case in which he is asking for a small increase in pension. Let us assume, also, that his appeal is justified and that the Boston office awards him the small increase. Would not the monetary value of the increase be more than eaten up for a whole year because of the cost of the veteran's hotel room in Boston, his transportation, meals, taxi fares, and so forth? And let it not go unnoticed that in many cases the veteran will have to pay someone to accompany him because he is not well enough to make the trip alone.

When I first received word of the bad news of the black 13th, it was alleged by the VA that the closing of the regional office at White River Junction would not create any real problems because 98 percent of the workload is handled by mail. This was a very impressive statement but I found that it did not bear scrutiny. It turns out that the Veterans' Administration is not really talking about what percentage of the problems is handled by mail, but, rather what percentage of total communications is handled by mail and the VA lumps into this figure, according to the manager of the regional office at White River Junction, all mail received by that office whether it be administrative in nature, mail for patients at the hospital, mail dealing with supply problems, and so forth.

Let me give Senators an idea of how misleading this actually is. There are now on the books at the VA office in White River about 9,700 approved awards of disability or death benefits. Many of these awards have been made over a period of years and involved no new administrative work during the last year. Yet, despite this fact there were, during the last fiscal year, nearly 5,000 instances when veterans contacted the regional office at White River in person or by means other than mail.

Moreover, the central office of the Veterans' Administration in Washington informed me that veterans appeared in person only 20 or 30 times a year to make a formal or informal appearance before the adjudication board in White River. My office checked with Manager Flussi at White River and he told a member of my staff that there were between 200 and 300 personal appearances.

I am always willing to allow for a slight administrative error, but when an agency gives me statistics which are 1,000 percent or 1,500 percent wrong, then I think that the agency is trying to justify its actions without regard to ethics or equity.

At the present time when a veteran goes to White River Junction, Vt., if he has a clear-cut case which merits award, his American Legion representative can pull the case file immediately, set up a meeting before the adjudication board and the case is quickly handled. Once the regional office is removed from White River, the Legion, if it has power of attorney, will have to send to Boston for the case folder and the veteran will have to make several trips of considerable distance to get his claim settled.

Administrator Driver sent up to my office a Mr. Stratton, who is deputy benefits director. Stratton, when interrogated about the Administration's claims of economy resulting from the White River-Boston merger, informed us that there are about 12,000 square feet of office housing space at White River Junction and that if the merger goes through only about 4,000 square feet of space would be needed by the VA.

Later, when the VA was made to appear ridiculous, then and only then, its spokesman began to allege that much of the vacant space would ultimately be utilized.

I ask the Senate: Is it economy to abandon space in a low cost of living area such as White River Junction, Vt., in order to procure space in a high cost of living area such as Boston?

Mr. President, the VA cannot deny that only 7 or 8 years ago it spent

several hundred thousands of dollars to construct an administration building in White River, and now it wishes to abandon a high percentage of the space in that building in order to bring about a move to Boston.

If this be a new version of administration economy, then Heaven save us when it becomes extravagant.

Seventeen regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries have been placed under the VA hatchet and one wonders whether it is really true in Jolson's words that we "ain't seen nothing yet."

It used to be a guiding principle that those who served their country in time of need would be served by that country in time of their own need. That principle is now being given the heave-ho treatment.

With those who left their limbs and lives and hopes and dreams in the remote battlegrounds of the earth, we should never break faith.

To those who abandoned their jobs, their education, their security, in order that our liberties might remain safe, we have a solemn duty.

It is not a duty to close hospital doors, but rather to open them. It is not a duty to delay the handling of their just claims, but to expedite them. It is not a duty to injure, but instead to promote their welfare.

That is a duty I as one Senator mean to fulfill to the best of my ability.

Only a few short days ago I was told by a representative of the Veterans' Administration that no hospital can function well unless it gets to the 400 or 500 bed level.

Did he really mean to suggest that the hundreds of hospitals throughout this country with small bed capacities are performing useless services? Let him peddle this ridiculous theory to the thousands of citizens whose lives have been spared and who can walk and talk again because of the treatment they received at the small hospitals he so blatantly ridicules.

If gigantic hospitals are the one and the only type of installation worthwhile, why then did the present administration fail to say this when the Hill-Burton program was under consideration?

I will tell Senators why. It did not say so because it knew that it would be laughed down by every small community in this country. And it is saying so now only because it is desperate to find some justification for a drastic program of curtailment of service to veterans that was conceived in ignorance, born of misinformation, and which, with good fortune, will die because of the wisdom of Congress.

I urge the Senate to support the amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 13, 1965, the date when I was notified of the Veterans' Administration's decision to close 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and several regional offices, the machinery to phase out these facilities had already been set in motion. Of course, I had heard rumors to that effect, but I do not believe that a Senator should base his actions on rumor. Yet, in the hearings which have just been held before my Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, we were informed by Veterans' Administration officials that they felt it only fair to formally notify us of this action on January 13, because rumors were spreading.

This poses an interesting question, Mr. President: Just when would we have been notified, if rumors had not prompted the Veterans' Administration to tell us as late as January 13 of its action? We were not consulted beforehand; neither were veterans organizations consulted. Are the Senators of the United States, given the trust to see that the laws and mandates of Congress are followed, now relegated to a position of hearing by rumor about a star chamber decision which we witness only when we finally see our Veterans' Administration hospitals being phased out of existence?

Mr. President, in light of the importance of medical care for the veterans of this Nation, a decision which could adversely affect them should not be arrived at lightly. Because of this, our Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee has just completed hearings during which at least 30 of my fellow Senators voiced suspicions about the wisdom of this decision. I understand that the House committee is planning to conduct similar hearings. Since our action on this matter was forced to be "after the fact," due to lack of notification and consultation, it will take time before we can reach conclusions on these closings.

Yet, the secrecy and rapidity of this transition has raised such a cloak of suspicion about the Veterans' Administration decision that something must be decided now, or else we shall again be considering such matters "after the fact." In light of this situation, Mr. President, I think it in the interests of the veterans and the general public that this action be held in abeyance until conclusions can be reached. If it is a sound program, it can justify itself at any time; if it is not sound, then much will be lost by having it completed before effective objections can be raised. For this reason, I am supporting the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I strongly support the amendment to prevent the Veterans' Administration from utilizing its present appropriation for the purpose of closing veterans' hospitals. The veterans of this country deserve the service which the veterans' hospitals provide them, and I am convinced that the VA's action in announcing the closings is inconsistent with that need. My examination of the facts concerning Sunmount, Bath, and Castle Point hospitals in New York has convinced me that these hospitals should remain open. The facts show that they are not obsolete, that they are not difficult to staff, and, most important, that they serve a definite need. The brief chance which I had to question the officials of the VA in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs demonstrated the need for the kind of full and free inquiry which the present amendment will give us time to undertake.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I would like to stand in support of Senator MUNDT's amendment as it pertains to the Veterans' Administration facilities. It is my sincere belief that the whole story regarding the closing of Veterans' Administration facilities over the United States and particularly in my State of Wyoming has not been heard.

I want to emphasize my distress concerning the manner in which this matter was handled. A matter of this importance should warrant previous consultation with Members of Congress, the service organizations, and the veteran himself. I believe only shortsighted consideration of possible immediate savings dictated the orders to close. The many other conditions of service to veterans and short- and long-range additional costs to other State and Federal agencies were ignored.

The statement announcing the action taken to close the Veterans' Administration facilities mentions economy as one of the prime reasons for the proposed move. It is stated there will be a net savings of some $23,500,000 through this action. The relatively insignificant so-called savings of $23,500,000 in the fiscal year 1966 at the expense of the many services in so many widely separated places will make no real contribution to the President's social program which is projected in billions of dollars annually.

I am particularly concerned because of the effect of the proposed action on the veterans of my State of Wyoming. The contemplated action of the Veterans' Administration would move the major function of the Cheyenne veterans regional office to Denver, Colo. I am informed that of the 34 present employees, approximately 20 will be involved in the move. The case load being handled by the Cheyenne Veterans Center has increased and not decreased. Therefore, it is inconceivable to me how less than half a staff could handle the work being done by a full staff. It cannot be done and give the service the veterans and their dependents so justly deserve and were promised.

During the hearings before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it was stated by officials of the Veterans' Administration that additional funds will be requested for new and additional facilities. I oppose the shifting and not the sifting of Government appropriated funds.

In his budget message submitted to the Congress, President Johnson states:

> Our major emphasis in veterans programs should be concentrated on meeting fully our obligation to those who were disabled in the defense of the country and to their dependents and survivors.

I say "Amen" to this statement. However, since contrary action is contemplated by the Administration, in the words of one of the greatest statesmen of the 20th century, the late Sir Winston Churchill, I strongly urge the Members of this Senate, "to prevent them from putting the folly they speak of into action."

I fully support the amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I congratulate my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] on their amendment which would postpone action on the closing of Veterans' Administration facilities until Congress has had an opportunity to review the subject. The veterans and their representatives have a right to a full and careful hearing on this important matter. I hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment in the interest of my fellow veterans.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to express my strong support of the Senator from South Dakota's amendment to restrain the unwise closing of Veterans' Administration facilities. In New York, the effective hospitals at Sunmount, Bath, and Castle Point have been performing essential medical services for the veterans in the surrounding communities. Closing of these facilities, as well as consolidation of operational regional offices of the Veterans' Administration located in major cities in my State will impose an unjustified hardship on the veterans in New York. The hard facts forming the basis for this decision and others have not been developed. I believe it is absolutely necessary that the burden of proof for the closing of these important medical facilities and the resulting reduction in services be squarely met by the proponent, namely the Veterans' Administration. Until this full justification in the name of economy is set forth on the record and properly reviewed, these unwise closings should not be carried out.

The alleged savings set forth in the record of hearings by the Finance Committee on the nomination of Mr. Driver and on the subject of the closings by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee have not been explained in sufficient detail, and we should not accept these closings without receiving a further explanation of the reasons. I sent a telegram to VA Administrator Driver on the day he announced the closing of these facilities, asking for a justification for the plan to close them by June 30 of this year. I have still not seen a full and detailed justification. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it seems to me that many Senators would be convenienced by having a voice vote this late in the evening instead of a yea-and-nay vote. Many Senators desire to leave soon.

I should like to have the assurance and understanding, however, that the conferees will consider such a voice vote as important a mandate to sustain the amendment if it is adopted by a strong voice vote as if it were actually adopted by a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope that Senators have noted how much business has been transacted today without the use of a unanimous-consent agreement. If there had been a unanimous-consent agreement, the talk in the cloakroom is to the effect that the Senate would have voted on the measure some time tomorrow afternoon.

I shall continue to object to unanimous-consent requests.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, with further reference to the legislation we have just acted upon, as my colleagues know, New York State is the second largest producer of class I fluid milk in the country. I am, therefore, very much concerned over the reduction in funds in the administration's budget for the vital special milk program, funds for which are included in this bill. The 1966 budget request for this program is $100 million, while the fiscal year 1965 appropriation was $103 million. Senator HOLLAND, the chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], along with many other interested Senators, have worked to insure that sufficient funds have been provided each year for this essential program. I want to assure the distinguished Senator from Florida and my colleague from Wisconsin that I shall continue to work just as hard as in the past to insure that necessary funds for the special milk program are included in this year's Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. The record of committee hearings on House Joint Resolution 234 reveals that the fiscal year 1965 estimate of realized losses for the special milk program is $305 million. I would like to make it clear that any reduction in funds for this program would not only impose a penalty on low-income families, but might also end up in losses for the Government if purchases of surplus milk were necessary at 75 percent of parity.

I hope that the Appropriations Committee will do all possible to insure that sufficient funds for the special milk program are provided in the fiscal year 1966 agricultural appropriation bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I should like to query the majority leader as to the order of business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, there will be minor items considered tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this evening, it stand in adournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. It is then our intention to go over from tomorrow until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, next.

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

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today I reintroduce legislation which has come to be labeled the truth-in-packaging bill. I do this on behalf of myself and Senators BARTLETT, DOUGLAS, LONG of Missouri, MCNAMARA, METCALF, MONDALE, MUSKIE, and NEUBERGER, and ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

It seems superfluous to take time now to argue the pros and cons of this bill. These are stated eloquently in six volumes of hearings held on the general topic. And this is the third time the bill has been introduced so its intent and provisions are no strangers to my colleagues.

Since the first hearings on packaging and labeling practices were held by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in 1961, many changes have taken place in our supermarkets which some would credit as benefits brought about by the very existence of congressional interest. The changes are praiseworthy. But to those who would cite these improvements as evidence of the lack of need for enactment of the bill, I would cite in reply these facts:

First. Consumers who must fight the battle of the budget weekly in the supermarket are not convinced that the few improvements have come anywhere near correcting all the practices the bill is aimed at. Witness to this are the hundreds of letters I have received in recent weeks from every State in the Union—from economists, marketing professors, and from the lady known as the smartest shopper in the world, the American housewife.

Second. President Johnson still believes the bill is necessary—as witness his economic report to the Congress of last week. He said:

Informed consumer choice among increasingly varied and complex products requires frank, honest information concerning quantity, quality, and prices.

He added:

Truth in packaging will help to protect consumers against product misrepresentation.

Third. The Council of Economic Advisers also sees a need for the bill. The Council said:

All too often * * * consumers are not completely informed about products available and sometimes products are misrepresented, whether by accident or intent. Most of the responsibility for providing consumer information rests with private producers and retailers. But where the consumer is not able to obtain honest information, the Government has a role to fulfill.

The Council continued:

Abuses have become acute in the packaging of products sold in retail establishments. In today's marketing system, the package has become the silent salesman. The truth-in-packaging bill would assure consumers of simple, direct, visible, and accurate information as to the nature of the product and the quantity in the package.

Fourth. One of the major concerns of the Congress these days is how to help those Americans who are suffering along on extremely low annual incomes. One expert estimates that the average family could utilize this bill to save approximately $250 yearly. That, I point out, would add more to the average worker's budget than a 10-cent-an-hour raise.

Mr. President, one more point should be mentioned in regard to this bill. One of the areas of concern about the bill as previously drafted was that it was proposed as an amendment to the Clayton Act. Some objected to this. These objections have been considered and this session we introduce the bill as a new law.

A few other minor changes have been made in the bill reacting to arguments against the previous bill which seemed to have substance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the table for 1 week in order to give additional Senators who wish to cosponsor the opportunity to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not think it is necessary to ask unanimous consent under the circumstances. But, I wish to be heard on the matter of reference of this bill to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill has been before the Committee on the Judiciary. We have heard more than 80 witnesses over a period of 2 or more years. I shall probably address myself to the order of reference on tomorrow.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the bill, in view of this comment, will lie over, in any event, for 1 day. Is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a request that the bill lie on the desk until tomorrow?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the bill has been introduced with the request that it be appropriately referred and that it be held at the desk for 1 week in order that additional cosponsors may join.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let the RECORD show my reservation of objection. I have no objection to its lying on the table for a week. But I do have objection to its reference. I wish to address myself to that question later.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, under the rule, the bill would lie over for 1 day before reference. But, is it correct that the additional request that it be held for 1 week at the table does not affect the reference to committee?

I ask that in view of the usual language, which I note in connection with bills. When request has been made that they lie over for more than 1 day, reference is made to the fact that the bill nonetheless remains at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, of course if objection is heard, the bill could not be received today. It would have to lie over.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the presentation of the bill today. The distinguished Senator from Michigan has uttered some advance information on this matter. Therefore, I would have no objection. But, I do not want the reference to be made to the Committee on Commerce until I have been heard.

With that understanding, I would have no objection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be kept at the desk for a day.

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

Mr. HART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and for clarity only, are we to understand that the question of reference will recur tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the reference would be held over until tomorrow, and the question could then be raised.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mrs. NEUBERGER), introduced a bill (S. 985) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes, which, by unanimous consent, was ordered to lie on the table.

The following additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 986. A bill for the relief of Stevan Akocs, his wife, Rozalija Akocs, and their children, Carlos Akocs and Jorge Akocs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 987. A bill to reduce the excise tax on club dues and fees from 20 to 10 percent; to the Committee on Finance.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, February 4, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 3, 1965:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3305:

To be colonel, Medical Service Corps

Frick, Edward H., O31160.

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be major

Brown, Richard M., O61086.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Adams, Charles L., O95417.
Adams, Charles W., O97075.
Adams, William E., O96559.
Affourtit, Rene J., O92870.
Allison, William C., O92873.
Amick, Robert L., Jr., O92874.
Anderson, Bobby L., O95421.
Anderson, Jerome F., O95422.
Armstrong, Marvin C., Jr., O92883.
Arrington, Robert D., O96306.
Askins, William M., O96562.
Banks, Gary G., O96310.
Barber, Don W., O92895.
Bartlett, Harvey S., 2d, O96312.
Beadle, Norman L., O95119.
Beauchamp, Ramar K., O95434.
Beeman, Richard C., O99575.
Belanich, Joseph F., Jr., O92917.
Biggs, Danny J., O92935.
Bitler, William D., O92945.
Boggs, Carl A., Jr., O96323.
Bohls, Robert J., O95445.
Bond, Richard R., O88324.
Borneman, Edward L., O99795.
Bowers, George W., O92971.
Brewer, Charles R., O92983.
Brown, Billy C., O99799.
Brown, Keith I., O92996.
Brown, Reginald J., O93590.
Brown, Robert W., O95454.
Brownlee, Romie L., O95455.
Bruce, Gene D., O93007.
Bruington, Ray D., O95457.
Brumfield, Wetzel D., O93009.
Bunton, Terry, R., O93016.
Burke, Larry K., O95461.
Burlingame, John C., O95462.

Burtner, James R., O95464.
Butts, Samuel J., O96336.
Byrne, William F., O93055.
Campbell, David B., O93122.
Cappadona, Louis A., Jr., O94515.
Carter, James E., Jr., O95472.
Christopher, George L., O91173.
Coleman, Alan B., O93156.
Collins, Michael D., O95478.
Colson, David A., O93161.
Cone, Edward E., Jr., O93162.
Conner, Dan A., O93628.
Cook, Ronal B., O91335.
Cooper, Nelson J., O99495.
Corder, Joseph W., Jr., O97294.
Cote, Thomas G., O95483.
Counts, Ronald W., O99806.
Couture, John F., O93183.
Coy, Dale E., O93185.
Crane, James P., O95487.
Crockett, James R., O96352.
Crow, Stuart J., O99632.
Crowe, Charles E., O96354.
Davis, David L., O96758.
Davis, Joseph S., 2d, O95495.
Davis, Motier DuQ., Jr., O96359.
Dempster, Robert J., Jr., O96361.
DeWalt, Robert M., O95500.
Dill, Paul H., O99818.
Dinger, Timothy S., OF100258.
Dodson, Billie R., O93251.
Dondlinger, Jerome C., O99819.
Dorsey, James J., O96755.
Dunnington, Joseph C., O93277.
Durenberger, George M., Jr., O95510.
Dye, Preston C., O99829.
Eddy, Thomas F., O99831.
Eian, John N., O91718.
Elliott, David R., O99834.
Emge, William P., O96372.
Erway, Douglas K., O93301.
Eveleth, Robert G., O93687.
Farris, James L., O93320.
Ficalora, Paul B., O93338.
Firestone, Terry J., O93340.
Fisher, Donald J., OF100267.
Fleming, Roger S., O99644.
Frater, Arthur W., OF100269.
Freeman, Malcolm A., O99844.
Garner, John E., Jr., O96381.
Gerhardt, William F., O96384.
Gerst, Jackson C., Jr., O96385.
Gorman, Thomas, O97772.
Goulet, Donald J., OF101815.
Grindell, Chelsey V., O99854.
Gudat, Frank F., O95544.
Guinn, Jack L., O93468.
Guinn, William A., O95545.
Hagenhoff, Stanley R., OF100377.
Hahn, Wade E., O93472.
Haigler, Thomas E., Jr., O96392.
Halbritter, Frederick P., O94811.
Hale, William R., O93479.
Hall, Dennis C., O95548.
Hall, Thomas F., Jr., O93489.
Hamina, Robert K., O95549.
Hannan, William T., Jr., O92384.
Hansen, David G., O99857.
Harrison, David A., O99860.
Harrison, Phillip T., O93527.
Hartman, Benjamin C., Jr., O96395.
Hatch, George S., O94035.
Havlu, Don R., O99328.
Hawley, Gary D., O91734.
Heer, Bernard C., Jr., O94050.
Heinschel, Robert F., O94062.
Hendrix, Paul V., O94077.
Henry, Noah W., 3d, O94093.
Henson, Charles W., O95556.
Hicks, Billy W., O94125.
Highfill, Gary W., O94129.
Hilger, Charles N., O95559.
Hinds, Paul T., O94137.
Hines, Charles A., O94153.
Hintz, Norman C., O95560.
Hitti, John L., Jr., O99872.
Hobbs, Gary L., O94164.
Holcomb, Cecil B., Jr., O96409.
Holland, James R., O94178.
Hood, Brian C., O93202.
Horowicz, Richard E., OF100286.
Howard, John W., O94181.
Howard, Robert P., O94692.
Hurst, Curtis C., O95566.
Huser, Herbert C., O94185.
James, Arthur M., O95571.
Jarock, Norman F., O99885.
Jemison, Paul O., O96415.
Johnson, Charlton G., Jr., O89369.
Johnson, Thomas G., O91813.
Joiner, Robert E., 3d, O95579.
Jones, Donald H., O94908.
Jones, Malcolm W., OF100295.
Kallay, Michael T., OF100492.
Kingman, Dan C., Jr., O95583.
Kirby, Rance A., OF100523.
Kish, Joseph P., O99264.
Kitchings, Phillip, Jr., O96425.
Kobaly, George, Jr., O96426.
Koelsch, Raymond E., O95590.
Konopka, Thomas, O95591.
Kopcsak, George C., O95348.
Krebs, Joseph G., O99897.
Kuster, Bernard A., Jr., O95595.
Landrum, Benson F., O94363.
Larkins, John G., O95598.
Larson, Kermit E., Jr., O94369.
LaRue, Lowell G., O91996.
Lasecki, Ronald P., O94371.
Lee, Robert C., OF100307.
Leffler, Samuel A., O95600.
Leonard, William E., O93268.
Leonhardt, Thomas C., O94540.
Lewis, Bobby J., O95601.
Livingston, John J., OF100878.
Long, William H., O99682.
Lopez-Alonso, Juan R., O94212.
Luallin, John S., OF100202.
Lundy, James I., O94628.
Lunsford, Mirt S., Jr., O99683.
Lybrand, Charles W., O95608.
Mabry, David L., O95611.
Mackintosh, Eric I., OF100311.
Maher, Patrick J., O92670.
Maier, Nelson H., Jr., O94686.
Maksimowski, Richard J., O92672.
Markiewicz, Joseph, O92014.
Martin, Robert F., O99913.
Mason, Keith L., O94776.
Mason, Ralph A., Jr., OF100313.
Mason, Tommy R., O94789.
Mathern, Vernon J., O96439.
Matteson, Stephen C., O99914.
Matthews, Daryl B., O96440.
Maurer, George H., O94809.
Mayer, John H., OF100314.
Mayoras, Donald E., O94810.
McCoy, Ronald L., O96444.
McDowell, Thomas D., O96447.
McFarland, Lewis G., O94825.
McFerron, Darrel A., O94829.
McGregor, William L., Jr., O95622.
Meyer, Richard A., O97679.
Meyer, Robert W., O95628.
Miles, Donald F., O95630.
Miller, Robert L., O94821.
Mitchell, David G., O92720.
Moore, Calvin B., O95635.
Mottl, Richard J., OF100320.
Myer, Allan A., O99934.
Napier, Joseph S., O92071.
Napierkowski, Raymond J., O95644.
Neal, Clarke L., O99698.
Neisess, James A., O91237.
Newman, Harold M., O96460.
Newman, Ralph E., O95128.
Newman, William F., O95129.
Nolan, Donny R., O95645.
Oberholzer, John A., O95135.
Olive, Sergei V., O93871.
Olson, Raymond S., OF100324.
Oswald, Robert W., O95142.
Oualline, Charles E., O95143.
Owens, John V., O99701.
Paul, Leroy W., O96607.
Pendergrass, Larry L., O99376.
Perrin, William H., OF100330.
Pierce, Edward D., O96474.
Pierce, Robert V., OF100994.
Pippin, James D., O96477.
Portmann, Joslyn V., O95163.
Powell, Paul E., O95166.
Price, Carl N., OF100333.
Pryor, Robert W., O99960.
Queen, Charles E., O95169.
Quinlan, John L., 3d, O95663.
Raines, Austin M., O95171.
Randt, Richard C., O99962.
Ray, David E., O99364.
Redner, Paul C., O99964.
Reed, James L., O95177.
Remling, Arthur A., 2d, O95183.
Renigar, Frederick H., O95185.
Richardson, Hugh B., O95187.
Richardson, Johnny L., O97423.
Richardson, Joseph L., O98418.
Riggs, Harold E., O95189.
Riley, James E., O97855.
Ringham, Lee O., O95671.
Rippee, Eldon T., O95190.
Robertson, Robert S., O97965.
Ryan, William E., O94980.
Salerno, Jerry A., O95200.
Sanko, William J., O95678.
Saville, Duane E., O95679.
Sawyer, Frederick H., O95681.
Scharrett, William J., O99985.
Schmidbauer, James P., O95682.
Schmitz, James W., O95683.
Scruggs, James T., Jr., O99987.
Sebastian, Elmer G., O95685.
Shepard, John D., O96620.
Sheridan, John T., O95215.
Short, Alonzo E., Jr., O95689.
Silvey, Bedford J., O95218.
Sims, Thomas L., O95221.
Smith, Randolph L., O96506.
Smith, Richard F., O93508.
Smith, Robert P., OF100005.
Smith, Samuel W., O95225.
Sneed, Thomas A., O95226.
Snellings, David D., Jr., O95696.
Spaulding, William J., Sr., OF100006.
Spetz, Steven N., O95700.
Staehler, Joseph C., OF100007.
Statum, Herman C., O96510.
Stizza, John B., O95708.
Summers, Clark H., Jr., O96514.
Swendson, Joe A., O95715.
Sworts, Ned, O95716.
Sylvester, Carroll E., O95718.
Tate, Raymond A., O95242.
Tatum, Benjamin R., O95719.
Taylor, Carl S., O95720.
Taylor, Robert E., O96516.
Thomas, Billy M., O96517.
Thornton, Jack R., O96520.
Tippins, Gerald M., OF100018.
Tobin, Jacob G. W., O96527.
Toccafondi, Primo V., O95726.
Torres, Peter B., O95728.
Tucker, Charles G., O96529.
Turner, Harvey E., O95254.
Upchurch, Gilbert, O95730.
Vannes, Clayton L., O95260.
Varner, Thomas A., O95113.
Vaughan, Bernard W., Jr., O99752.
Velez, Agustin E., O94257.
Veselka, Reynold, O95263
Vivas, Ernest E., O96531.
Volta, Donald H., O99114.
von Hoene, John P. A., O95732.
Vozka, David, O95266.
Vucichevich, Ivan J., O95733.
Wagner, William J., Jr., O95267.
Walker, Charles R., OF100030.
Walters, Floyd J., Jr., O96535.
Walton, Elmer D., Jr., O95271.
Walton, Jamie W., OF100032.
Ward, John E., O95273.
Warren, Howard L., O95738.
Wassom, Herbert M., OF100035
Watkins, Leo F., Jr., O95740.
Watson, Neal C., OF100036.
Weber, James J., O95742.
Weber, Neal J., O95743.
Whitaker, Chester J., O95286.
Whitley, James R., Jr., OF101866.
Whittington, William R., O96546.
Wilbur, Paul A., O95289.
Wiley, Jerry D., O96547.
Wilkerson, Roger C., O96548.
Williams, Dock H., O95291.

Willis, Deral E., O95292.
Wilson, Lee B., O95749.
Wilson, Lester R., O96551.
Woods, James B., 3d, O96554.
Word, Larry E., O95303.
Wright, James A., O95754.
Wuench, Robert L., O96556.
Wulf, Bruce L., OF100049.
Yardas, Douglas A., O95306.
Zelez, Gordon N., O95308.
Zwicker, Gary L., O95311.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bell, George T., O96314.
Browning, Charles W., O96710.
Burch, Vernon R., O96952.
Candelaria, John J., O95467.
Curtis, James H., O93212.
Eppler, Larz D., O95513.
Fulghum, Joe R., Jr., O93412.
Gary, Dennis T., O93386.
Gerukos, John, O93402.
Gordon, Thomas J., O93442.
Grundstein, Amram S., O95330.
Hays, Walter R., O97128.
Holzer, Donald B., O92414.
Hunt, Dan W., O96987.
Johnson, Michael L., O95342.
Ketelsen, Keith D., O92441.
Lobingier, John H., O99907.
Lynch, Jeffrey G., O96436.
Mayer, Henry A., Jr., O97158.
McAllister, Hugh A., Jr., O92061.
McNeill, Douglas W., O97161.
Phillips, Robert E., Jr., O93269.
Ramirez, Oscar, Jr., O95172.
Roby, William W., Jr., O95674.
Rose, Robert D., O96494.
Rose, Walter E., O95675.
Rosenbleeth, Milton H., O96332.
Rowlette, Lemuel A., O95197.
Schiefer, Bernard A., OF100347.
Schorzman, Mark H., O99390.
Silverstein, Herman R., O97206.
Simpkins, Charles M., O95219.
Soberg, David A., O97039.
Tedrow, Thomas N., O95721.
Thompson, Jerry L., O95246.
Timberlake, John S., 3d, O97364.
Tolman, Joseph B., O96524.
Troy, Milton W., 2d, O96528.
Truscott, James J., O95252.
Williams, Charles M., O95746.
Wright, Robert E., OF101870.
Zimmerly, James G., O96557.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Cusick, Judith M., N3156.
Kisella, Mary A., N3100.
Whitman, Jacqueline K., N3150.

To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Webb, Annie J., M10200.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

White, Charles E. (SigC), O77773.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Carlson, Carl E. (CE), O89800.

To be first lieutenant

Sheridan, Richard M. (MSC), O94722.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Brannon, Buford W., O1080177.
Chancey, Clarence W., Jr., O964250.
Furrer, Robert C., O1338584.
Hyatt, Howard L., O1935862.
Riseborough, Charles M., O1922525.
Sapenter, Reginald J., O2206185.

To be captains

Adler, James M., O5301725.
Beames, Clare F., III, O1893275.
Blackwell, Cedric L., Jr., O5301830.
Bland, William L., O5302547.
Borum, Louis M., O4009763.
Bryant, Donald R., O5202213.
Bubon, John J., O4061442.
Burns, Billie R., O1890091.
Bussiere, Richard T., O5301587.
Cason, James P., O4047130.
Cataldo, Fulvio J., O2266988.
Champagne, Richard A., O4071209.
Daschle, Charles L., O4026377.
DeVilbiss, Donald R., O4010668.
Duke, Lynwood R., O4023902.
Everett, Robert W., O4012077.
Fargason, Leroy H., Jr., O4059160.
Ferguson, James C., O5502663.
Gieseke, Donald E., O4058299.
Graham, Harry C., O4074483.
Guglielmo, Eugene M., O5200886.
Hansen, James M., O4010412.
Holleran, Raymond F., O4034318.
Honma, Douglas T., O1932465.
Killette, James L., O4074402.
Klingman, Harold E., Jr., O4025562.
Lawrence, Ernest, O1936238.
Lenschau, Justus M. M., Jr., O5700210.
Lewis, Joseph W., III, O4084673.
Lindberg, Charles F., O1889049.
Lockwood, Bill G., O4006622.
Lowe, James W., O5301533.
Lyerly, Virgil T., O4083564.
Mantooth, John W., O1939728.
McCartt, James M., O4031086.
Melbye, John, O4031159.
Merritt, Ronald H., O4026628.
Miller, William D., Jr., O4009713.
Moye, Harold W., O4012178.
Mulvey, Francis P., O4009715.
Oden, Foster L., O4011949.
Parnell, Roy L., O4063814.
Paulk, Charles D., O5405183.
Platt, Richard L., O1880201.
Seldon, Felix L., O5502802.
Skulborstad, Glenn R., O2277200.
Smiley, Robert D., O4021071.
Smits, Robert G., O5503407.
Sorbet, John W., O1935401.
Sutherland, James C., O4032526.
Thomas, Stephen L., O4041884.
Turner, Clyde A., III, O5303252.
Vannoy, Claude E., O5405045.
Varoz, Roman, Jr., O4074340.
Viney, James L., O5301926.
Wakefield, Jack E., O1925579.
Winter, Robert G., O4085056.
Zieringer, Mathew P., O4074574.

To be first lieutenants

Abernethy, Robert J., Jr., O5008414.
Andrews, Anthony J., O5002967.
Archer, John R., O5314281.
Baker, Ronald L., Jr., O5514566.
Banks, William J., O5308543.
Becque, Peter A., O5510507.
Beebe, Merrell S., O5310215.
Bent, Robert E., O5405693.
Boyer, Albert J., O5211035.
Brauer, Paul F., O5009861.
Brown, Jerry L., O5512296.
Burns, Clifford H., O5213813.
Bushdiecker, William A., O5511874.
Butts, Don E., O5313770.
Candia, Ruben A., O5307315.
Carr, James A., O5307443.
Chapman, Jimmy R., O5410751.
Christensen, Don T., O2289329.
Copenhaver, Warren L., O5215460.
Corbett, John E., O5009952.
Cours, John D., O5411025.
Covington, Everett S., O5211640.
Cypher, Ronald P., O5208722.
DiCaprio, Anthony, O5211782.
Dobrzelecki, Eugene J., Jr., O5311434.
Downer, George R., O5211894.
Duckloe, John H., O5208148.
Dunaway, Fred C., O5405780.
Fish, Robert W., O5315084.
Ford, Randall L., O5313395.
Fowler, Calvin M., O5010161.
Gaffney, Richard L., O5307213.
Geisler, Burl O., O5705886.
Gentle, Gary S., O5308370.
Glenn, John T., O5310148.
Gooden, William J., O5215505.
Henderlong, James F., O5515142.
Hewett, James D., O5311169.
Higgins, John M., O5006674.
Hill, Howard D., O5515339.
Holder, Charles J., O5410867.
Holly, Frank D., Jr., O5212404.
Huff, Harold L., Jr., O5310036.
Johnson, Preston, O5409917.
Kam, David A., O5313382.
Lee, Philip L., O5409177.
Lewis, Ronald D., O5207636.
Lillvik, Carl V., O5313673.
Love, William H., O5210179.
Magee, David W., O5310097.
McGaw, Hugh R. L., O5409434.
Martins, Joaquim D., O5211073.
Maylie, John C., Jr., O5705320.
McCartin, John M., O5204834.
McGourty, Francis C., O5405802.
Mergner, George F., O5200089.
Moore, Edward M., Jr., O5310504.
Morgan, Lowell E., O5307505.
Murray, Hershell B., O5410480.
Murtha, Daniel F., O5705112.
Nicholson, Thomas L., O5307962.
Norris, Robert R., O5311495.
Osborn, Larry N., O5208466.
Perkins, Stuart L., O5310927.
Reinhard, Ransford A., O2293806.
Rittman, Charles J., O5512857.
Rizzo, Charles, O5310668.
Ruszkiewicz, John J., O2298329.
Rutledge, Gerald E., O5700983.
Schrauth, Michael R., O5005922.
Scott, Richard M., O5307140.
Shank, Edward L., O5513440.
Sheridan, Richard L., O5215021.
Sowle, Peter H., O5510551.
Stiles, Charles E., O5875187.
Stuessi, Dennis A., O5512516.
Suzuki, Daniel I., O5705492.
Swart, Oura L., O5508935.
Sylvia, William H., Jr., O5208124.
Theofanous, Angelo G., O5209187.
Turner, John M., Jr., O5213639.
Vaughan, Walter A., Jr., O5313117.
Voigt, Volkert T., O5008622.
Ward, William B., O5007798.
Watson, Vaden K., O5309966.
Wearden, Glen E., O5411780.
Wendler, Dale L., O5309963.
Wertz, Robert B., O5503567.
Weyand, John W., Jr., O5215171.
Whitley, Donwell D., Jr., O5405703.
Wilson, James E., O5211747.
Wooton, Windel E., O5210361.
Yazinski, Edward C., O5215332.

To be second lieutenants

Anderson, Edwin P., O5517192.
Bergeron, Paul R., O5012083.
Briggs, Donald T., O5406043.
Brooks, Joseph H., O5314331.
Burdett, John C., O5219625.
Bushong, James T., O5412098.
Carlton, Charles A., Jr., O5218841.
Caruso, Joseph G., O5320275.
Cebula, Joseph A., O5406205.
Craddock, Ollie C., Jr., O5406048.
Crews, Norman A., O5319638.
Donelan, James J., O5012050.
Donoghue, Glen M., O5515864.
Ernest, Marion D., O5406089.
Flebotte, Paul R., O5318172.
Frierson, Donald M., O5313177.
Haines, Charles O., O5208483.
Hammock, Millard E., O5317238.
Hoherz, Melvin A., O5530733.
Hovey, Roy A., O5517936.
Howerton, William R., O5413565.
Kampf, Michael E., O5316394.
Kennedy, John L., O5709183.

Lippincott, William R., Jr., O5014176.
Livingston, David R., O2308527.
Mahalik, Paul D., O5219047.
McCoid, Frederick E., O5219048.
McCullough, Joe G., O5317445.
Michles, Earl R., O5413211.
Moore, Julius B., Jr., O5406064.
Morrison, Carlos S., O5216296.
Pennywell, Johnson E., O5413785.
Pilgrim, Mark T., O5014365.
Plymale, Charles F., O5217094.
Powell, Horace W., O5317253.
Prather, Thomas L., Jr., O5218456.
Putman, Gerald H., O5413542.
Ruppenthal, Harry L., O5517476.
Samples, Watson L., O5320075.
Showalter, James V., O2308574.
Stack, Lawrence R., O5531005.
Stock, Lawrence W., O5516102.
Sydes, Thomas A., O5406119.
Tysdal, Thomas P., O2309017.
Vejar, Ray J., O5707070.
Wilkins, Harold H., O5216325.
Williamson, Clyde T., Jr., O5313157.
Wittbrodt, Thomas A., O5517471.
Wood, Smythe J., O5211691.
Woulfe, Robert J., O5413078.
Wurm, Charles M., O5015930.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and branches specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311:

To be major, Medical Corps

Salcedo, Jose R.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Bluemle, Madeline L., N901686.
Garbett, Jean A., N902242.

To be captains, Chaplain

Bell, Arthur F., O4070659.
Bell, Berdon M., Jr., O4063186.
Stevens, Ernest L., Jr., O2200941.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Combs, Frank F., O5518980.
Johnson, Billy, O5518093.
Mayotte, Richard V., O5518827.
Solo, James A., O5315699.
Takala, John A., O5518891.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Daniels, David C., O5217720.
Ferry, Darwin J., Jr., O2300697.
Fortini, Glenn E., O5706091.
Gemma, Frank E., O5219355.
Hutton, John E., Jr., O2313027.
Koebele, Eberhard, O5706107.
Macdonald, Joseph C., O2311575.
McKendell, Lawrence V., O5707189.
Moore, William L., Jr., O5312921.
Pierce, Joseph A., Jr., O5315697.
Thomas, Ernest M., Jr., O5707262.
Yhap, Edgar O. G., O5004937.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

May, Ralph J., Jr., O2298689.
McBride, Victor G., O2296294.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Kelly, John B., O2288592.
Massey, Robert A., O4074720.
Retzlaff, Donald H., O4060195.

To be captain, Women's Army Corps

Capacio, Marguerite L., L1010749.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Borg, Naldean J., N5501975.
Hiers, Frances A., N2298683.
Soper, Linda A., N5411329.
Vuyk, June J., N5411286.

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain

Hansen, James E., O2300188.
Johnson, Paul E., O2308998.
Martin, Richard K., O5217751.
Piskura, Joseph H., O5208196.
Woehr, David J., O2309561.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Almquist, Tod F., O2313927.
Baker, James E., O2313527.
Carabin, Dan L., O5414782.
Chandler, Norbet F., O2311523.
Malinoski, Joseph C., O2311224.
Phalen, James R., O2311791.
Rice, Leonard E., Jr., O5205634.
Von Kiparski, Hans, O2315039.
White, Charles A., Jr., O5215881.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Brazinsky, John H., O2316913.
Wagner, Kenneth J., O5507244.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Dolbier, James A., O2298921.
Lamke, Charles L., O5509725.
Lillard, Joseph K., O5215041.
Oberhofer, Thomas R., O5507201.
Rasmusson, James A., O2298337.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Seedle, Clyde D., O2312599.
Sims, James E., O2309551.

To be second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Webster, Norma J., N2314333.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Baggett, John A., O2314493.
Gmelich, James R., O5512319.
Hardgrave, Newt L., O5414517.
Harrington, Jack O., Jr., O5413591.
Kishimoto, Richard A., O2307664.
Picone, Gaspare P., O2311812.
Walker, Jimmy, O5413827.
Williams, David G., O2311693.
Yamanouchi, Kenneth K., O5708006.

To be second lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

Bransford, Ann H., L5322581.
Hery, Te-Ata R., L2314103.
Zimmerman, Mary Lou, L2313744.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Adams, William D., O5226394
Baines, Tyrone R.
Boehle, Daniel F.
Burlingham, Robert G.
Curtin, Thomas V.
Deger, Robert J. Jr.
Ferguson, Scott K.
Jones, Joseph B.
Jordan, Charles F.
Kennedy, George T.
Kramer, Kenyon K.
Lemieux, Edward C.
Lichte, Jack R., Jr.
Lynch, Edward F.
Markle, Brian C.
Matheney, Dennis S.
Medaugh, Robert A.
Millea, Daniel J.
Murphy, William D.
Parker, Thomas A.
Pommett, Francis A., Jr.
Saramanidis, Steven
Schnabolk, Howard J.
Scott, James A.
Sorensen, Wayne B.
Stees, Jack L.
Wear, Flavil L.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Adamowski, Paul L.
Adams, James B.
Adsit, Stanley L.
Aebischer, Louis J., Jr.
Aitken, John D., II
Alexander, Edward G.
Allcorn, William A.
Allen, John W., Jr.
Almes, Edward W.
Anderson, David L.
Anderson, Larry L.
Anderson, Robert B.
Arensdorf, David W.
Arey, Chester M.
Arico, Eugene
Armstrong, Grant W.
Arterberry, John D.
Arthur, Robert K.
Ayres, Larry F.
Bailey, Kenneth D.
Baldwin, Eldon C.
Banister, Alan H.
Barie, John P.
Barlow, Gregory P.
Baron, Anthony S.
Barrington, Donald.
Bartosik, Harry J., Jr.
Baseler, Robert W.
Baxter, Richard P.
Behne, James R.
Bellia, Matthew
Belt, Richard L., II
Benton, Norman W.
Berman, Barry A.
Berry, Robert H.
Bezek, Robert J.
Black, Elbert C., III
Blodgett, David S.
Blood, George H.
Boese, Frederick G.
Bondurant, William C.
Bouchard, Raymond E., Jr.
Bourne, Charles A., Jr.
Bowers, Norman L.
Braccia, Joseph C.
Braithwaite, Raymond G.
Braswell, Donald C.
Briganti, Francis L.
Brinkley, Barry A.
Briscoe, Charles H.
Brockstedt, Martin J.
Brooke, Ronald M.
Brown, Barry M.
Brown, Charles W., Jr.
Brown, Stephen W.
Brueckmann, Jan C.
Bryant, Michael W.
Buckley, John R.
Bunton, David D.
Buono, Michael J.
Burchett, Kenneth E.
Burke, Charles F.
Burres, Stephen W., Jr.
Burton, Gail O.
Bush, Joseph E.
Butler, James E.
Butner, Henry C.
Byerly, Paul J.
Byrne, Patrick C.
Caggiano, Anthony F.
Callarman, William G.
Campbell, Charles O.
Capps, Freddie L., Jr.
Carpenter, Bernard R.
Carpenter, Joseph E., Jr.
Carr, Freeman A., O5019523
Carr, Michael T.
Cashman, Richard M.
Chapman, Thaddius
Cheatham, Calvin W., Jr.
Childs, Richard E., Jr.
Chiles, Wayne D.
Clark, Alton A.
Cole, Carlos E.
Cole, Michael W.
Collins, Patrick W.
Cook, Jack C., Jr.
Cook, Theodcre L.
Coppolino, Ronald V.
Corson, Fred W., II
Cox, Calhoun W., Jr.
Cox, Robert S.
Cozens, George D., Jr.
Crittenden, John B.
Crittendon, William S., Jr.
Cross, Belford E., Jr.
Cummings, Donald L.
Czarniecki, John J.
Dacey, Bertrand J.
Daley, Victor N.
Dalton, William C.
Darnell, Robert T.
Davidson, Henry A.
Davis, Richard H.
Deakin, Craig E.
Deist, Robert P.
Dent, Charles A.
Dent, Norman M.
Devney, Alan E.
Di Matteo, Joseph R.
Diperno, Donald V.
Dobson, Ronald W.
Donsbach, William J.
D'Orso, Joseph V.
Dortch, William R.
Duck, Theodore A.
Duffy, Patrick M.
Dumont, Wayne R.
Eames, Jeremiah F.
Earle, Oliver P., III
Echols, Eugene W., Jr.
Emerson, William K.
Evans, Frederick H.
Evans, James L.
Evans, Russell S., Jr.
Evans, Walter L.
Everett, William W.
Ewing, Peter C.
Falke, William P.
Farrell, John B.
Faulkner, Donald S.
Faulkner, William L.
Feret, John M. E.
Fielden, Larry E.
Finn, Russell N.
Fitt, Charles B.
Flagg, Lewis N.
Flesch, Joseph E.
Fletcher, Roland G.
Ford, Robert L.
Fordiani, Daniel C., O5224228
Francis, Jerry D.
Frazier, Claude W.
Friedman, Daniel J., Jr.
Fuller, John D.
Fulton, George R.
Gagne, Herbert F., Jr.
Galebach, William D.
Gallagher, William A.
Gardner, Robert H.
Gibbons, Richard F.
Gibson, Donald A.
Glass, Maurice J., Jr.
Goodbary, Robert A.
Goodhart, Raymond R.
Goodloe, Albert T., II
Goolsby, James D.
Gordon, Clark G.
Gorka, Paul
Graham, Joe D.
Grant, John H.
Green, Gary L.
Griffard, Bernard F.
Griffin, Karl R.
Griffin, Peter J.
Grigalunas, Thomas A.
Gruggel, Carl A., III
Gunter, Terry A.
Habersberger, Albert J.
Haddad, Alan H.
Hagen, John F.
Haley, Richard L.
Hall, Conrad M.
Hammar, Peter L.
Hammond, Joseph P.
Hanf, Richard J.
Hansen, John R.
Happe, Robert W.
Harmeyer, George H.
Harold, Robert S.
Harry, Robert E.
Hartford, Thomas F.
Harvey, Frederick W.
Hastings, Hugh W.
Hawes, Thomas J.
Hawkins, Arthur G.
Heaston, William P.
Heelan, Richard A.
Hendrix, James E.
Hergen, James G.
Heslin, John G.
Hiett, Ronald S.
Hill, John J.
Hillquist, David K.
Hoffman, Kenneth C.
Hogler, James L.
Holbrook, William A.
Holder, James R.
Holford, Jack D.
Hollenbeck, Douglas B.
Hollister, Dennis J.
Hopgood, Daniel K.
Hopkins, William C.
Horn, James A., Jr.

Hough, Charles P.
Hubble, James A.
Hugus, David K.
Hupp, Dennis J.
Hurley, William J.
Hunt, Norman J., Jr.
Huse, James G., Jr.
Hyland, Thomas W.
Ingate, Jerome T.
Jablonsky, Edmund A., Jr.
Jackson, William H.
Jacubec, George P., Jr.
Jandreau, James L.
Jatnieks, Girts U.
Jaunitis, Juris
Jeffrey, David C.
Jeffries, Lewis I.
Jempson, James R.
Jester, John N., Jr.
Jobert, William A.
Johnson, Ernest L., III
Johnson, James R.
Johnson, Jay F.
Johnson, Kenneth E.
Johnson, Lehman H., III
Johnson, Wesley L.
Johnston, William V., III
Jones, Donald E.
Jones, James K.
Jones, Mills G.
Jordan, John M., Jr.
Jordan, Kenneth R.
Josey, Grover A., Jr.
Judd, John R.
Kahn, David S.
Karp, Andrew T.
Katin, Jon D.
Kellock, James A., Jr.
Kelly, John H.
Kelly, Kenneth F.
Kelsey, James H. P.
Kelsey, Ronald G.
Kennedy, George M., III
Kenney, Robert A.
Kidd, Franklin F., III
Kiernan, Thomas G.
Kimak, Michael D.
Kimbrough, Robert W.
King, Felix D., Jr.
Kline, Edward M.
Knight, Reid M.
Knirk, Ernest P.
Kobes, Eugene H.
Koga, Marvin R.
Kohoskie, Stephen E.
Krajniak, Charles A.
Krane, Ralph J.
Kruszewski, Joseph A.
Kulicki, John M.
Kuntzman, John C.
Laidman, David G., O5226741
Lake, William A., Jr.
Lane, Michael H.
Lanning, Forest D.
Larrabee, Willis F., O5224240
Laurence, Benedict E.
Laux, James H.
Law, Robert M.
Lawrence, Gordon C.
Lawson, Roger W.
Laycock, Richard J.
Leake, Sanford E., Jr.
Leatherwood, James M.
Lee, Robert E.
Lenderman, William, III
Linderman, Dean
Linley, John C., Jr.
Linnemeier, William D.
Lippay, Andrew P.
Little, Robert D., O5226131
Loeper, Charles P.
Logan, Thomas M.
Loomis, Robert L.
Lorenz, Albert
Love, Earl R.
Ludwig, William J.
Lund, Donald A.
Lyman, David A.
Lynch, James Q.
Lyttle, David A.
MacHarrie, William R.
Mack, Robert J.
Maiden, Douglas W.
Malaney, Dempsey L.
Malcolm, Jerry D.
Malone, James E.
Mandulak, John P.
Marksity, Ronald E.
Marold, George A.
Marshall, Grayson W., Jr.
Martin, John E.
Martin, Kenneth J.
Mattson, Bruce F.
Matthews, Stephen K.
Mayton, Joseph H., Jr.
McCarthy, Verlin L.
McColl, Winston F.
McConnell, Brian C.
McConnell, James T., O5323662
McCracken, Robert A.
McCumber, Irwin H.
McDonough, Edwin J.
McElroy, John J.
McGill, Howard L., Jr.
McGreevy, Michael E.
McMullan, Joseph C.
McShea, George M.
Melgard, Stephen C.
Merrill, Aubrey R., Jr.
Merritt, Frederick M., II
Metts, Isaac S., Jr.
Michel, William L.
Miller, James L.
Miller, Nathan N., Jr.
Miller, Ronald A.
Miner, Edward L.
Mitchell, Brent N.
Moberly, Kenton D.
Molin, Alton A.
Monahan, William J., O5534287
Montgomery, Joel E.
Montgomery, Paul D., O5323822
Montopoli, Jerome P.
Moore, Easley L., Jr.
Mooza, George R.
Moren, Jan W.
Moroney, John F., III
Mosakewicz, Felix J.
Mullaney, Walter E.
Muller, Bernhard J., Jr.
Murphy, Michael A.
Murphy, Richard F., III
Nartowitz, Edward S.
Nelson, Gary E.
Nelson, Jack E.
Newman, Robert F., Jr.
Newman, Robert L.
Neyer, John A.
Nicholls, Roger G., Jr.
Nichols, Joseph W.
Niedermeier, Bart W.
Nizolek, Martin C.
Norman, Forrest A., Jr.
Norris, Ethan R.
Norton, Gary J.
Obenchain, Ronald L.
Oberbeck, Keith M.
O'Connell, Edward W.
O'Connell, John J., Jr.
Orgain, Albert M., IV
Orr, Wallace C.
Ossorio, Peter M.
Ostlund, Donald T.
Otto, Thomas W., Jr.
Paju, Enno
Palmer, Robert R.
Pearson, David M.
Peary, Timothy H.
Pecce, Jan L.
Perryman, Gary M.
Pevenstein, Jack E.
Phelps, Dean A.
Pickup, Dana R., Jr.
Piper, John D.
Plaza, Richard J.
Popely, Paul E.
Potter, James V.
Poucher, James A.
Powers, Barry E.
Prehar, Bohdan, O5534439
Priestley, Robert R.
Quekemeyer, Henry B., Jr.
Radin, David A.
Rafter, David J.
Rampmeier, William A.
Rau, James J.
Rawlerson, Franklin S.
Ray, Larry H.
Rayback, James M.
Raymond, Daniel A., Jr.
Reagan, John E.
Rebold, Peter M.
Rector, David W.
Reinecke, Paul S., III
Rennie, David A.
Rhode, LeRoy E.
Riccabona, Steven V.
Rice, Richard A.
Rice, Robert R., III
Ricketts, Ormonde B.
Riddell, John M.
Riley, Richard E.
Ringer, Gordon J., Jr.
Risi, Anthony P., Jr.
Rivers, Robert D.
Roark, Thomas E.
Robertson, Alan R.
Roerty, Gerard J.
Rogan, Dennis W.
Rogers, John B.
Rosenheim, Harry T., III
Rossetti, Nicholas J., Jr.
Rubin, George F.
Rueger, Carlisle F., II
Ruth, Robert C.
Ryan, William F., Jr.
Rzepecki, Franklin J.
St. Germain, Henry J.
Sager, Wayne K.
Saliny, Dennis E.
Saponaro, Peter P.
Schafer, William L., Jr.
Schallenberger, Morris G.
Schauss, Charles T.
Schmelzer, Henry L.
Schnur, Dess E.
Scott, James L., Jr.
Scott, Robert H.
Scott, Wilmore S., Jr.
Sexton, Timothy J.
Shaw, Hubert S., Jr.
Sherman, Dennis D.
Sherman, Frank W.
Sherman, William A., Jr.
Shtogren, Thomas A.
Siegel, Charles L., Jr.
Simonds, Donald T.
Skidmore, David F.
Slaughter, Frank L., Jr.
Smith, Alan D.
Smith, Daniel A.
Smith, Michael J.
Smoluk, John J., III
Snyder, Robert A.
Southworth, Robert M.
Souza, Howell H., Jr., O5800475
Sparaco, Donald L.
Spiegel, Dennis J.
Spillane, Joseph A.
Spina, Charles
Sprague, Robert F.
Stadler, Richard J.
Stalker, Jesse R., Jr.
Stamilio, Michael E.
Starbuck, Todd R.
Stenger, James D.
Steuber, Thomas P.
Stewart, Samuel B., II
Stills, John D.
Strovas, Louis, Jr.
Stull, Michael D.
Sullivan, Raymond C.
Sullivan, Thomas H., Jr.
Sunshine, Michael D.
Surles, Thomas B.
Sutherland, Jack L.
Suydam, Martin J., Jr.
Tabar, Roger G.
Tabb Robert D.
Tamber, Stephen I.
Tarowsky, Edward G.
Taylor, Louis N.
Tedrick, William D.
Teigen, William K.
Tepper, Elliott I.
Thesing, John H., III
Thomas, David F.
Thomson, James L. H., III
Thornhill, Frank W., Jr.
Thornton Robert J.
Tiedje, Charles P., Jr.
Tilghman, Philip B.
Timmons, Richard F.
Troutman, Howard T.
Tuohig, Paul J.
Turnbow, Woody W.
Valentine, Dennis W.
Vasquez, Leopoldo R., Jr.
Vaughan, Thomas E.
Vernier, Roger A.
Viele, Frederick O., II
Voto, Fredric A.
Wagda, Joseph A., Jr.
Walker, Joseph, Jr.
Walker, Paul D.
Walker, Rex I.
Walsh, Gerard P.
Ward, Nathaniel P.
Watts, Phillip M.
Webb, Rockwell C.
Weigand, Donald A.
Wells, Owen W.
Westover, Dennis W.
Whaley, Robert E.
Wheeler, Thomas H.
Whirl, Robert G.
Whitaker, McKenzie.
White, Larry D.
White, Randolph C.
Whitesell, Thomas C.
Whitfield, Steven K.
Whittaker, Tom S.
Wilkerson, John R.
Wilkinson, Robert A., Jr.
Williams, Don E.
Williams, Hugh A.
Williams, Samuel I.
Wilmeth, James L., III
Winch, Jack J., Jr.
Wolfe, Ira M.
Wood, Marcus G.
Wright, Donald L.
Wright, Robert W. G.
Yaghoobian, Charles, Jr.
Yeary, John T.
Zak, William E.
Ziegler, John H.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 3, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela.

Wymberley Coerr, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named person to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy as an assistant professor with the grade indicated:

To be lieutenant commander

John D. Crowley

The following officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade indicated:

To be lieutenant commander

Thomas H. Rutledge

To be lieutenants

Roger V. Millett
Timothy J. Howard
Paul Resnick
Robert W. Davis
Fred M. Lane
Walter N. Warschun

The following officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade indicated:

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Marcus J. Wallace
William H. Tydings
James F. Hunt
Branson E. Epler
Stephen L. Richmond

The following officer of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade indicated:

To be captain

Otto E. Graham, Jr.

The following officers of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade indicated:

To be commanders

John D. Crowley
Carl W. Selin

The following officer of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade indicated:

To be lieutenant commander

Ronald A. Wells

The following retired officer recalled to active duty for promotion to the grade indicated:

To be lieutenant commander

Ellis P. Ward

The nominations beginning Walter R. Goldhammer to be lieutenant commander, and ending Albert E. Kaufmann, Jr., to be lieutenant (junior grade), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 26, 1965; and

The nominations beginning Douglas D. Vosler to be captain, and ending Thomas E. Brown to be lieutenant (junior grade), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 26, 1965.