

part of America. We in the United States have a vast reservoir of ideas that for some reason have never really been tried. We must test and implement these ideas to find new solutions to old problems.

Voluntary agencies are as representative of American capitalism as any other contemporary institution. There are hundreds of trade associations here that might well apportion a part of their income to send businessmen abroad, without Government subsidy, to do a better job of interpreting and selling America.

There are many examples of voluntary agencies—from profit entity business, the supermarket organizations, nonprofit corpo-

rate associations, savings and loan associations, finance and managerial organizations are just a few examples of what can be done. If just a few more organizations would light their own candles, study the situation, and find where their members particular talents and resources fit, perhaps by their efforts world tensions could be considerably eased.

In the April 17 issue of *Life* magazine, former Ambassador to Vietnam, Henry Cabot Lodge, set forth, in a very forthright and provocative article, a detailed analysis of the problems facing the United States in southeast Asia.

Partially quoting Ambassador Lodge, he said, "We should be sure that we are making

full use of the things in which we excel and in which the Communists are deficient.

"We cannot, as a general rule, surpass a young oriental guerrilla fighter, who doesn't mind the heat, who can get along on a daily handful of rice, and who can lie underwater for hours at a time, breathing through a straw.

"But we can do better in other things such as the use of airplanes, the art of medicine, improved farming and education, and the development of an energetic political system, based on justice."

It is to this end that I shall dedicate my efforts as I serve in the Congress of the United States.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1965

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord and Master of us all, 'midst the tumult of these earth-shaking days with all their angry fury, with contrite spirits we come to this shrine of Thy grace, seeking the unshaken confidence of those whose minds are stayed on Thee.

In all the din of clamorous hours, may our hearts and minds be steadied as each day there dawns the sweet consciousness that we are with Thee.

In this assurance, which makes the strength of each as the strength of 10, may those who in this Chamber of governance speak for a free people be delivered from the subtle lures of office and from the arrogance which lurks always in power. In these stern days on stormy seas, with so many false lights on the shore, strengthen the national will, we beseech Thee, to halt at any cost the design of tyrants drunk with sight of power, who would bring us and all people under their slavish rule.

Spending our brief years here as a tale that is told, may it be to the last page a record of service well done, of duty faced without flinching, and of honor unsullied; and when comes the twilight and the evening star, and our work is done, grant us a safe lodging and a holy rest and peace at the last.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 4, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 4, 1965.

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 5, 1965, he received messages in writing from the President of the United States.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—MANPOWER REPORT; NOMINATION OF WALTER M. KOTSCHNIG TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE 21ST SESSION OF THE ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate, for appropriate reference, two messages from the President of the United States, received on March 5 pursuant to the order adopted by the Senate on March 4, as follows: First, manpower report of the President; and second, the nomination of Walter M. Kotschnig to be representative of the United States to the 21st session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

MANPOWER REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

To the Congress of the United States:

I report on a year of progress toward an active manpower policy.

We have raised employment and lowered unemployment through programs: to stimulate more employment opportunities; to upgrade the skills and adaptability of our work force; and to link the two—jobs and men—more effectively.

Much remains to be done. We are still far from the goals of the Great Society.

Each individual must have a fair chance to develop his abilities and to engage in productive and rewarding activity. In the Great Society, all men must have the self-respect and economic security that flow from full use of their talents.

Remarkable advances of science must be directed to permit increasing freedom of choice in shaping the character and quality of our world. We have the potential in terms of manpower and material resources to apply new knowledge and techniques to insure that the life of all Americans—at home and at work—can be more creative, more productive, and more satisfying. Although we may not fully realize our goal of "human work for human beings" in our lifetime, we can make dramatic progress toward that goal in this generation.

Manpower problems are many and ever changing. But several are paramount—and call for the highest priorities in manpower policy.

The No. 1 problem is still unemployment. Despite recent improvements, unemployment and underemployment are intolerably high, particularly for those lacking education, skills, or opportunity because of poverty and discrimination.

A second problem relates to the needs of the great number of new young job-seekers. An unprecedented increase is occurring at a time when the rate of youth unemployment is already three times greater than adult unemployment.

A third major problem concerns rapid change that burdens many workers and communities, even while benefiting the economy generally. Technological change can be the key to ever-greater prosperity and individual opportunity. But it also brings the growth of new demands and the decline of old ones, readjustments in Government programs, migration of people from rural to urban areas, and other changes that require difficult adjustments.

A fourth problem concerns jobs that remain undeveloped. Despite high levels of unemployment and vast numbers of new workers and workers being released from outmoded work, the desires and needs of many consumers, businesses, and communities for additional services are not being adequately met.

These are the immediate challenges for an affirmative manpower policy: to open the way to employment for the undereducated and poverty stricken; to provide our young people with opportunities for education, training, and constructive work experience needed for satisfying adult worklife; to ease the sting of change for displaced workers and disrupted communities; to develop and fill jobs, especially in the service occupations, to satisfy unmet needs in business, at home, and in the community.

We can and shall meet these challenges. But while I focus here on Federal Government activities, success can come only through cooperation and hard work at all levels of government and by all sectors of our society.

Many policies are involved. Economic policy will have to promote necessary overall economic growth. Policymaking related to scientific, social welfare, health, education, and other fields will have to recognize manpower implications and objectives.

THE CHALLENGES

Some of these challenges are not new. And we have responded to them already. Our progress to date provides a firm foundation for an increased effort in the future.

In 1964—as reflected in the accompanying manpower report from the Secretary of Labor—more men were working, producing greater abundance at higher wages and profits, than ever before in history. Employment was up more than a million and one-half over the previous year, the largest increase since the 1959 recovery from recession. There are now more than 70 million Americans engaged in civilian work.

Last year we also cut into the waste of our manpower. Unemployment was reduced by 300,000, to the lowest percentage of our work force during the last 7 years. Long-term unemployment also decreased, as did the number of people working part time who wished to work full time.

UNEMPLOYMENT

But these lower unemployment levels do not indicate that we have eliminated waste of manpower and the hardship that accompanies such waste. In an average week during 1964, almost 3.9 million jobless persons sought and failed to find employment. Another 2.5 million who wanted full-time jobs could only find part-time work.

Many of our men and women on farms, though technically classified as employed, are underemployed. They are working at unacceptably low incomes, as are millions of other workers throughout the economy.

In 1964, the unemployment rate was reduced to 5.2 percent of the labor force; at the beginning of 1965, it stood at just under 5 percent. But it still is considerably higher than it had been in earlier post-World War II years.

The major problems of unemployment do not show up in these aggregate national figures. They show up in the sharp differences in unemployment rates between the undereducated and the highly educated, the unskilled and the skilled, the nonwhite and the white, and the young and the adult workers.

Workers who did not complete high school have unemployment rates nearly twice as high as those with more education, and five times as high as those who have gone through college.

Laborers and many types of semiskilled manual workers are unemployed at rates of two to three times the average for skilled and technical groups.

Unemployment of nonwhites, at nearly 10 percent, is more than twice as prevalent as for whites.

The unemployment rate for teenagers is almost 15 percent—over three times that for all adults and over five times as high as for married men. Nonwhite teenagers are unemployed at a shocking rate of over 25 percent.

Other concentrations of unemployment provide cause for alarm: jobless workers over the age of 45 remain unemployed far longer than do younger persons; more than 35 percent of the jobless in this age group remain unemployed 15 or more weeks; in some areas, jobless-

ness and gross underemployment blight the lives of a quarter of the residents.

There is no simple solution, no single means of providing employment opportunities for all these disadvantaged Americans. For many, greater economic growth will create new opportunities. For many others who are chronically unemployed, or underemployed, there must be special assistance to overcome handicaps barring the way to employment.

YOUNG WORKERS

A recent study has indicated some of the handicaps compounding employment difficulties for young people out of school.

The first handicap is lack of a basic education. There are about 7 million young people between the ages of 16 and 21 who are out of school. Of these, 3 million dropped out before finishing high school; 1 million completed only elementary school or less.

One out of every four dropouts in the labor force could not find employment—twice the unemployment rate of the high school graduates.

A second handicap is lack of skills or work experience. About 65 percent of the dropouts and 40 percent of the graduates had no work experience during the years they were in school. Nine dropouts out of every 10 reported no job training after leaving school. High school graduates, on the other hand, were three times as likely to enter an occupational training program.

A third handicap is poverty: 4 dropouts of every 10 still living at home were in families with less than \$3,000 annual income; only 2 high school graduates of every 10 came from such low-income families.

A fourth handicap is lack of knowledge of training and jobs that are available. Of every 10 high school dropouts, 8 reported that they had never been counseled by a school official or by a public employment office about job training or the kind of work to look for. Even among high school graduates, less than half reported that they had received occupational guidance.

A final handicap is the sharp increase in the number of new young jobseekers—crowding into a work force already containing high teenage unemployment.

CHANGE: MANPOWER RESOURCES

In 1965, the number of 18- and 19-year-old workers is expected to increase by 500,000—twice the increase of last year. Succeeding waves of new young workers will swell the 18-to-24-year-old work force by more than 3 million in the next 5 years, an increase two-thirds higher than in the past 5 years.

But the increase in the size of the work force will not be confined to young ages alone. Overall, the labor force is expected to grow by 7½ million workers in the next 5 years—50 percent greater than in the last 5 years.

There will be many more workers in those categories confronted by major employment difficulties—particularly nonwhites and older workers.

Negroes presently constitute only 10 percent of the work-age population, but they may account for 18 percent of the coming manpower increase. In the next

5 years, almost a million and a half nonwhites will be added to the work force; less than 800,000 were added during the last 5 years. The marked increase of nonwhites in the labor force will intensify the need for eliminating discrimination in employment, training, and education opportunities.

The increase of men age 55 or older in the labor force will require more attention to solving problems of discrimination against older workers. It will raise the importance of retraining and reemploying those with substantial but outmoded skills.

CHANGE: REQUIREMENTS

In our dynamic economy, occupational demands change continually: New skills are needed; old ones become outmoded; individual companies and industries often contract or expand rapidly. As a result, there are always some workers seeking new employment and some employers seeking new workers. Fluctuations in area growth rates and patterns often lead workers to relocate in order to find or fill job needs.

Too often this change requires workers to undergo dislocation, joblessness, or underemployment. It requires employers to experience unfilled job needs. These burdens and wastes can be minimized substantially by improving the mechanisms for anticipating and aiding needed adjustment to change.

We cannot pinpoint the timing, magnitude, and location of specific changes, but we can interpret broad underlying trends. We can do much to prepare to meet these trends more effectively.

We know that the growth of technology will change the content of many jobs and intensify the need for adaptation and retraining. But the impact of technology on total employment is not foreordained. That remains for us to shape and determine. New technology will not soon curtail need for human labor. Its impact varies by industry, expanding manpower requirements in many industries even while contracting in others.

We know too that we must have large quantities of highly trained manpower in many professional and technical fields if we are to obtain the rate and types of growth we seek for the future. We are now giving more attention to preparing for manpower requirements that will result from major public programs recommended this year.

In the long run, the need for semiskilled production workers and for many types of unskilled workers will continue to shrink in relation to demand in other occupational fields.

Here, we can learn from the experience of 1964. This was the best year for economic and employment growth in this decade; there was a marked increase in the employment of semiskilled production workers and even a small increase in employment of laborers.

But this upturn did not change the long-term trend: Most of the employment rise and the greatest rates of increase in 1964 were not in goods production industries, but in trade, services, and State and local government activities. The sharpest upturns in demand continued to be in clerical, professional, and technical occupations.

Demand for agricultural workers will continue to decline, releasing farm manpower for other sectors of the economy. During World War II, one worker of every six in the Nation was employed on the farm. Today only 1 worker in 16 is so employed. The skills required for farm employment are becoming less manual and more mechanical, scientific, technical, and managerial.

In many service fields, there is high and rising demand as consumers spend a growing proportion of rising incomes for various services. But this demand often remains unfulfilled for lack of qualified workers.

Demand for repair services, home maintenance, and hospital and other community services, for example, often goes unmet because trained workers and efficient firms to provide these services are in short supply.

The service industries provide new challenges for the development of new business enterprises and jobs to put to rewarding use more of the manpower no longer needed for industrial and farm production.

ACTIONS STARTED

Our general progress is no accident. Purposeful action is paying off and building the base for further advance.

The tax cut of 1964 met an immediate and vital objective: it helped generate more jobs. It rapidly spurred consumer and business demand and, in turn, expansion of employment to produce for that demand. It was the prime new moving force in last year's substantial employment upturn. My economic report outlines more specifically how it and other economic policies will continue to buttress general growth.

Many other actions have been initiated to meet many and varying manpower needs, but three efforts have been in the forefront in tackling the major challenges: The strengthening of education; the opening of the war on poverty; the start of the major program for training the unemployed and underemployed.

First, the education measures enacted by the last Congress are aiding a long-needed substantial expansion of both college education and vocational education. The principal focus of the legislation enacted thus far has been on: construction of facilities needed for universities, colleges, community colleges, technical and vocational schools; increasing and improving training for specific professions, most notably undermanned medical, dental, nursing and other health professions, and specialized teaching fields; support for more students to continue higher education through loans and fellowships; expansion and modernization of vocational education at the high school and post-high school levels, particularly in fields with expanding manpower requirements.

These steps will provide many long-run returns, but immediate values too are evident. More young people are being encouraged to pursue higher education rather than become part of a large undertrained young labor force seeking full-time employment. And more employment opportunities are being generated by higher education's expanding demand

for construction, services, and supply activities.

In the longer run, these education programs will better equip our youth for the challenge of constructively shaping and adapting to future economic change. And they will help to develop the increased numbers of better prepared professional, technical, and other highly trained manpower required by an advancing society.

Second, under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the war on poverty puts high priority on providing useful work experience, education, and skill development for disadvantaged youth and undereducated, jobless adults. Programs are moving ahead to establish: Rural conservation centers and urban residential centers to provide work experience and training away from home for young people who now live in environments which severely hamper their opportunities; work experience and training opportunities in public and nonprofit agencies to help potential or actual high school dropouts to continue or resume education to increase their employability; work opportunities to help needy college students earn their way through college; community action programs which seek, through locally conceived actions ranging from preschool programs for needy children to new types of work programs, to bring in more of those still left out of our record prosperity; basic education and literacy training for the uneducated; work experience projects to help adults on public assistance pave their way to self-support.

And third, training and retraining for the unemployed and underemployed under the Manpower Development and Training Act is providing another practical tool, in cooperation with the conventional education system and vocational schooling, to adapt skills of the labor force to changing needs.

This program is designed to equip unemployed workers, as well as underemployed farmworkers, with specific occupational training required for available jobs. It is giving thousands of jobless workers a new lease on working life—and is meeting employer demand for qualified manpower.

It is heightening awareness of workers and employers to values of occupational training. It is leading to new training techniques. And, utilizing the initiative of local groups, it is building in every State and hundreds of communities a base of retraining knowledge and experience to meet better the challenge of shifts in skill requirements.

In recent months more of the training opportunities are reaching the young, the nonwhites, the poorly educated, and the long-term unemployed—those with the greatest unemployment difficulties.

Beyond these three basic efforts, I want to summarize briefly other important actions newly initiated to meet today's and tomorrow's manpower challenges.

Equal employment opportunity: One way of getting at the employment difficulties afflicting much of the Negro population and other minority groups is to eliminate the discrimination which has excluded too many from the general

progress. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 has established as the law of the land that racial and other discrimination in employment shall not blemish the future as it has the past.

Youth services: We are developing additional ways of reaching constructively many of the urban and rural young people who need jobs, training, additional education, and other assistance to become self-supporting adults and contributing members of society.

Youth opportunity centers are being set up, as part of the Federal-State employment service system and youth programs in community action organizations aided by the Office of Economic Opportunity, to assist large numbers not now adequately being reached. Through special services established in or near disadvantaged neighborhoods, they will provide these young people with counseling, testing, information, and appropriate referral to training programs and placement services.

Apprenticeship information centers have been established in nine cities to work with labor and management in assisting young people to take advantage of opportunities for training as craftsmen. Particular emphasis is being placed on opportunities for minority youth.

Young men are being given selective service examinations at the earliest opportunity in order to identify as soon as possible educational or physical deficiencies which would disqualify them for military service. Those who cannot meet the minimum military requirements are being offered aid by the public employment service and other agencies in obtaining education, rehabilitation assistance, job training, job finding, and other needed services.

Appraisal of policies: To evaluate the broad currents of change and help determine how to meet them in a coordinated manner, there have been established a Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. Its 14 distinguished members, drawn from outside the Government, will examine our technological course, its likely impact on our way of life, and means of channeling technical progress toward meeting unfilled needs of our people. It is to present its report and recommendations by next January; the President's Committee on Manpower, composed of principal Federal executives. It is providing a continuing assessment of the interrelation of Federal programs and the country's manpower resources and requirements; an Interagency Committee on Education, composed of representatives of Federal agencies with major education activities. It is serving to review and coordinate Federal policies and programs affecting education.

Communities with major shutdowns: Change can also come when a community is hit by shutdown of a major plant or facility. Experience in many communities has demonstrated that normal mechanisms cannot cope with such economic reversal expeditiously—and we should not rely on time alone to heal economic sores. I have set up a Presidential Task Force on Community Assistance to offer assistance.

On request from a stricken or threatened community, the task force will help draw on the knowledge and resources of Federal agencies to supplement those of local representatives to meet the economic disaster, much as is done when natural catastrophe now strikes an area.

Unfilled manpower requirements: To overcome and prevent unemployment, we must improve information on current and prospective manpower needs. A new program for identifying job vacancies has been started. Pilot surveys have been initiated in 16 major communities to collect information on the extent and nature of unfilled job openings by occupation, so that steps can be taken more effectively to match unemployed workers and vacant jobs.

Farm labor: Another measure to match our needs and our manpower stems from termination of the legislation which had authorized temporary importation of Mexican farmworkers. To help employers make the transition to employment of American workers, a major recruiting effort is underway to attract unemployed American workers to fill seasonal farm jobs, at wage levels and working conditions consistent with American standards.

In another notable action, the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act will provide needed protection for domestic migrant farmworkers by requiring crew leaders to observe certain minimum standards.

Federal Government as employer: It is my intention to have the employment policies of the executive branch of the Government set a constructive example for all employers. I am glad to report that in the past year, operating effectiveness has been improved, without unreasonable burdens on individual employees. Employees facing displacement are helped to adjust by retraining, by transfer and relocation assistance, and by the use of attrition and phasing out rather than abrupt closedown of activities no longer needed; a new manpower analysis program is assessing Federal staffing needs as a basis for efficient program planning and management. The first analysis and projection have been completed for major white-collar occupations; fair employment programs are opening better opportunities for qualified Negroes; they have progressed in larger numbers than ever before into middle and upper salary levels of Federal service; qualified women have moved into higher level positions at an accelerated pace; productive employment opportunity in Federal service is being offered by a new program for mentally retarded persons, as an extension of the longstanding program for employing handicapped persons.

ACTIONS NEEDED

Our progress is cause for pride, but not for pause. Affirmative policy recognizes that vast tasks remain undone.

Far too many Americans still are unemployed and underemployed. Far too many lack skills or assistance needed to enter rewarding employment. Far too many are overwhelmed by change instead of being enabled to ride it to new heights. They are unable to contribute

or to share adequately in our unexcelled general prosperity.

And far too many children and young adults are headed for similar underachievement—and waste of their potential contribution to a better society—if we do not do better by them.

We must open opportunity, genuine opportunity for each of them—opportunity to learn and opportunity to earn in keeping with all their potential. Only then can we truly say and truly know that the Great Society is within our reach.

Our economic policies have a vital role in this task. The 1966 Federal budget provides for new tax changes and expenditure programs which will help fortify the stimulus to economic growth and employment provided by last year's tax legislation.

As my economic message sets forth, revision of excise taxes and increases in social security benefits this year will bolster needed current and future job growth. So will the change in depreciation rules being made this year to avert an increase in business taxes.

But, as I have also emphasized, fiscal and monetary steps to achieve the full measure of needed growth may encounter problems of inflationary pressures before unemployment targets are reached.

This makes it even more essential that we intensify efforts to improve the caliber of our work force and the effectiveness of our mechanisms for helping match jobs and men.

As we open up new demand and opportunity for work, we must be able to respond by having workers move into such jobs without delay—so that we can move on to full employment without inflation or adverse balance-of-payments effects.

Active manpower policy to upgrade the capacities of the work force and to improve means of bringing workers and jobs together is therefore needed to supplement economic policy to achieve economic growth.

This is why, along with my fiscal program, I have recommended that we build our manpower programs. I urge that we now: Increase investment in education to build basic abilities for all; enlarge occupational training opportunities for the poor, the young, the unemployed, and the underemployed; broaden job development activities to provide new jobs to meet unmet needs; improve assistance and protection for those bypassed or left behind in the general prosperity.

Details of most of the recommendations have already been presented to the Congress. In brief summary:

Education has immediate high priority. Many manpower difficulties can be traced to educational deficiencies.

Today's and tomorrow's world of work puts a premium on capacity for skill development—and for redevelopment to meet increasingly frequent changes throughout life. Education is the prime developer of such capacity, as well as of ability to use leisure time enjoyably, and to attain a higher level of life generally.

The educational program I have urged will bring better education to those who need it most. It will improve our educational methods and resources. It will provide greater opportunity for learning

at every age level. And it will help insure availability of the highly trained talent needed to spur and sustain broad national advance.

The war on poverty must now be enlarged. Its beginnings have stirred hope and effort.

For the next year I have asked for funds which would permit some 600,000 needy youngsters and adults to be enrolled in the work experience and training programs initiated under the Economic Opportunity Act.

I seek also to help some 300 cities and rural localities mobilize community action antipoverty programs, particularly for children and youth. These efforts would seek in new ways to combat economic and social handicaps which contribute to manpower waste and poverty.

Manpower training must be strengthened. Several major changes are now warranted in the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The feasibility and value of public investment in skill training for the unemployed and underemployed have become apparent. This act need no longer be considered temporary. I have asked that it be put on a continuing basis.

The States were to meet a third of training costs under the act next year. I am asking that this be modified to permit the Federal share to be up to 90 percent, so that the program can be carried forward without disruption.

I have urged also that we strengthen authority to experiment with and demonstrate new ways of surmounting barriers to skill development for the unemployed and underemployed, lengthen the maximum period of training allowances and liberalize allowance practices, and extend pilot efforts to aid unemployed workers through geographic relocation.

I have requested, too, that we enlarge investment in manpower research, including the establishment of regional manpower research centers, to develop the new knowledge and techniques needed to improve our manpower programs and to train more manpower specialists.

Job-development activities must also be increased. I have recommended expanded efforts under the Manpower Act to help develop many service employment opportunities now wasted because of lack of trained workers and lack of managerial skills necessary to provide such services efficiently.

Our people seek improved services—in home and equipment maintenance and repair, in the hospitals, in our eating places, and in a wide range of personal services. But a large part of such demand remains unmet.

My recommendations seek to tap these areas of job opportunity by offering assistance to the business community and to unemployed workers to take the organizational and training steps necessary to make these potential opportunities materialize into fruitful employment and service.

Area and regional recovery programs are also needed to overcome adverse effects of geographic shifts. Additional job-creating efforts must be focused in

areas lagging behind in employment opportunity. This requires comprehensive action to revitalize major regions hampered by large concentrations of poverty and joblessness.

I propose that we strengthen and improve programs initiated under the Area Redevelopment Act.

The Appalachian redevelopment program will inaugurate a farsighted development effort in this hard-hit region.

Employment services must be improved to strengthen national ability to adapt to changing manpower needs. I have recommended increases in budget to strengthen the present Federal-State employment service system's ability to provide information, counseling, recruiting, placement, and other assistance required for more effective bringing together of workers and employers.

Minimum wage and overtime protection should be extended to protect the unprotected. I will propose extension of coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act for this vital purpose.

Unemployment insurance has to be modernized. Present benefit coverage and levels do not adequately ease the financial blow of job loss. The changes I will propose are needed to better sustain the income of workers during the gaps between jobs and to add to the stability of the economy.

Other recommended programs of major new economic and social action are also directly relevant to our manpower concerns. Improvements recommended in public assistance, social insurance, and medical care programs will contribute to the employability of many of our people.

The reforms I have requested in immigration policy will base admission to this country chiefly on skills and talent rather than place of origin. Such change would be both true to our ideals and advantageous to our need for trained manpower.

And more broadly, I have asked that we undertake programs to rebuild our cities and conserve our countryside, to provide areas for recreation, to modernize mass transit systems, to improve our health, to control pollution.

Each has many manpower implications—but above all each will help build the Great Society and, in so doing, will open vast new opportunities to utilize our growing manpower constructively.

CONCLUSION

Much that I have reported and recommended here has a short-term focus, and necessarily so if today's actions are to meet immediate challenges.

But beyond seeking to master the current challenges, the directions charted here will move us further toward a vision, newly sensed, even if not yet wholly perceived.

That vision is a new relationship between man and work—to be made possible by advances in man's power to develop and apply his capacities and new technological capabilities.

In the Great Society, work shall be an outlet for man's interests and desires. Each individual shall have full opportunity to use his capacities in employment which satisfies personally and con-

tributes generally to the quality of the Nation's life.

That is the future to which we reach, the goal to which active manpower policy must evolve along with companion policies.

The way there is hardly clear. But we should not underestimate our potential for a rapid pace, lest we fall short of the attainable: seeking little, we will get little and deserve little.

We will have to try, adapt, try anew, and adapt again, but always on to this goal, always on until what is now too often only a dream—that no human talent shall go to waste, that each man shall have full opportunity to be all he can be—can become a reality for all.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Walter M. Kotschnig, to be a representative of the United States to the 21st session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under authority of the order of Thursday, March 4, 1965,

The Secretary of the Senate on March 5, 1965, received a message from the House of Representatives, which announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 301) to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics, and on today, March 8, 1965, it was signed by the Vice President.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 4, 1965,

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably, with amendments on March 5, 1965, the bill (H.R. 2998) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations, and submitted a report (No. 73) thereon, together with the individual views of Mr. CLARK and Mr. MORSE, which was printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

CRIME—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 103)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from

the President on the subject of crime. Since the message has already been read in the House, and if there is no objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD without its being read, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the message was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Crime has become a malignant enemy in America's midst.

Since 1940 the crime rate in this country has doubled. It has increased five times as fast as our population since 1958.

In dollars the cost of crime runs to tens of billions annually. The human costs are simply not measurable.

The problems run deep and will not yield to quick and easy answers. We must identify and eliminate the causes of criminal activity whether they lie in the environment around us or deep in the nature of individual men. This is a major purpose of all we are doing in combating poverty and improving education, health, welfare, housing, and recreation.

All these are vital, but they are not enough. Crime will not wait while we pull it up by the roots. We must arrest and reverse the trend toward lawlessness.

This active combat against crime calls for a fair and efficient system of law enforcement to deal with those who break our laws. It means giving new priority to the methods and institutions of law enforcement: to our police, who are our frontline, both offensive and defensive, in the fight against crime. There is a great need not only for improved training of policemen but for all people to learn about, to understand, and to assist the policeman in his work; to our courts, traditionally the symbol and guardian of our cherished freedoms. Local criminal courts are so overloaded that their functioning is impeded and their effectiveness weakened. More courts and judges is one answer, but every possibility of improvement must be explored; to our correctional agencies. We cannot tolerate an endless, self-defeating cycle of imprisonment, release, and reimprisonment which fails to alter undesirable attitudes and behavior. We must find ways to help the first offender avoid a continuing career of crime.

No right is more elemental to our society than the right to personal security and no right needs more urgent protection.

Our streets must be safe. Our homes and places of business must be secure. Experience and wisdom dictate that one of the most legitimate functions of government is the preservation of law and order.

Our system rejects the concept of a national police force. The protection responsibilities lie primarily with State and local governments. That is right and proper.

Yet, crime is no longer merely a local problem. Every city, every State is troubled by the same hard statistical—and human—facts. The extent and seriousness of the problem have made it of great national concern.

Crime is as old as history. It is hardly new to America. But in our increasingly mobile, urban society, crime problems are not only greater, they are immensely more complex.

We have not stood idly by in the face of these problems. Many cities and States, as well as the Federal Government, have developed new programs reflecting their growing concern. Yet the crime rate continues to increase.

The time has come now to check that growth—to contain its spread—and to reduce its toll of lives and property.

I believe the way to do so is to give new recognition to the fact that crime is a national problem—and to intensify our crime prevention and crime fighting at all levels of government.

THE ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

The starting point for such efforts is the individual citizen. Law enforcement cannot succeed without the sustained—and informed—interest of all citizens.

It is not enough to reflect our concern over the rise in crime by seeking out single answers or simple answers. They do not exist. The people will get observance of the law and enforcement of the law if they want it, insist on it, and participate in it.

It has been said, for example, that the fault lies with courts which "coddle criminals," or, on the other hand, that police officers do not observe the rights of the individual.

There is misunderstanding at times between law enforcement officers and some courts. We need to think less, however, about taking sides in such controversies and more about our common objective: law enforcement which is both fair and effective. We are not prepared in our democratic system to pay for improved law enforcement by unreasonable limitations on the individual protections which ennoble our system. Yet there is the undoubted necessity that society be protected from the criminal and that the rights of society be recognized along with the rights of the individual.

As Mr. Justice Frankfurter once said:

A democratic society, in which respect for the dignity of all men is central, naturally guards against the misuse of the law enforcement process.

It has been said that the fault lies in poor living conditions, limited education, and the denial of opportunity.

Plainly, laws are less likely to command the respect of those forced to live at the margins of our society. Stability and order have little meaning and small advantage to those who exist in poverty, hopelessness, and despair.

The longrun solution to this view of crime is jobs, education, and hope. This is a goal to which this country is now committed. But we should remember that not all crime is committed by those who are impoverished or those denied equal opportunity. In any event, we cannot postpone our responsibilities to act against crimes committed today.

It has also been said that the fault lies in a deep moral decay, particularly among the young; that juvenile delinquency and high crime rates among

younger adults have their origins in this decay.

In our increasingly complex society, it is becoming harder to perceive and maintain clear moral values. But the great majority of our young people lead law-abiding, creative lives. We need only look to the spirit which characterizes our youth today—the spirit of the Peace Corps, of VISTA, of commitment to the well-being and welfare of society. While crime by young people in our society is of very serious concern, it involves only a small proportion of our youth.

We must, in short, understand that the reasons for the growth of crime are many and complicated. We must accept hard facts at every turn. But like the related problems of poverty and of education, we must face them squarely if we are to succeed. And we must succeed.

Thus, while recognizing that the basic responsibility rests on local authorities, we must also recognize the burdens they now bear. To assist them in bearing these burdens successfully, I propose: increased Federal law enforcement efforts; assistance to local law enforcement efforts; a comprehensive, penetrating analysis of the origins and nature of crime in modern America.

FEDERAL LAW-ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

The average citizen is most directly concerned with what is called "crime in the streets." Crime of this kind—robberies, muggings, housebreakings—are the primary law enforcement responsibility of State and local governments. When criminals cross State lines, however, Federal enforcement is also available. Thus, Federal, State, and local investigators may all join to pursue the bank robber, the kidnapper, or the auto thief. Federal assistance in these activities has been and can continue to be helpful.

In some areas, however, the Federal Government has a special responsibility—organized crime, narcotic and drug control, regulation of gun sales, and law-enforcement activities in the District of Columbia.

1. Organized crime:

Organized crime is a cancer in the city. It has become an entrenched national industry. It embraces gambling, narcotics, stock and bankruptcy fraud, usurious loans, or corruption of public officials or labor-management relations.

Racketeering feeds on itself. Illegal gambling, for example, channels enormous profits to other criminal arenas. The citizen is the loser.

Organized crime also breeds lesser crime. The police in our large cities know from daily experience how much street crime results, for example, from narcotics addiction.

Perhaps the most alarming aspect of organized crime, however, is that it erodes respect for the law. Corrupting a public official may lend respectability to the racketeer, as it destroys the underpinning of law enforcement in a community.

Since 1961, the Federal Government has responded to this challenge in force. We have secured new legislative authority. We have achieved new levels of co-

operation among the 26 different Federal law-enforcement agencies. We have achieved new prosecutive energy. The result has been a tenfold increase in racketeering convictions.

But this accomplishment represents a mere beginning. Much remains to be done.

Consequently, I am calling on the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the other heads of the Federal law enforcement arms to enlarge their energetic effort against organized crime. The Department of Justice will submit legislative proposals to the Congress to strengthen and expand these efforts generally.

I urge the prompt enactment of these measures.

2. Drug control:

The return of narcotic and marihuana users to useful, productive lives is of obvious benefit to them and to society at large. But at the same time, it is essential to assure adequate protection of the general public.

To meet these objectives, the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse recommended enactment of a Federal civil commitment statute to provide an alternative means of dealing with those narcotic and marihuana users likely to respond to treatment and achieve rehabilitation. The Commission also recommended that those penalty provisions of the Federal narcotics and marihuana laws requiring mandatory minimum sentences and precluding probation or parole be applied restrictively in order to provide a greater incentive for rehabilitation.

The Justice Department will shortly submit proposals for a Federal civil commitment statute to the Congress and for limiting the coverage of the mandatory minimum penalty sentences. The proposals will seek to the fullest extent consistent with the public safety to give offenders a maximum opportunity for return to a normal life.

Increasing illegal sales of psychotropic drugs, such as barbiturates and amphetamines, must be controlled. These sedatives and stimulants, taken so easily in pill form, have been termed the "dangerous drugs"—and with good reason. Senseless killings, robberies, and auto accidents have resulted from the radical personality changes induced by the indiscriminate use of these drugs. Because they are less expensive and more available than narcotics, these drugs appeal to a much broader cross section of our population, particularly the young.

Our existing legal weapons are inadequate. I therefore urge the Congress to enact legislation to control the abuse of these dangerous drugs without constricting their legitimate medical uses.

3. Firearms control:

Drugs are, of course, only one cause of the rise in violent crime in the United States. Another significant factor is the ease with which any person can acquire firearms. Lee Oswald sent for and received a rifle through the U.S. mail. I believe that the people of the United States have learned, through the recent tragic loss of President Kennedy, the need for strengthened control.

Here the Federal Government's jurisdiction is limited. State and local action will be necessary. But at minimum, we must make effective local regulation of firearms possible by increasing Federal control over interstate shipment of firearms. In addition, limits must be imposed on the importation into this country of surplus military weapons and other used firearms.

I am proposing draft legislation to accomplish these aims. It would amend the Federal Firearms Act to prohibit firearms shipments in interstate commerce except among importers, manufacturers and dealers licensed by the Treasury Department.

Mail-order sales to individuals would thus stop. The legislation would also strengthen the present statutory standards for Treasury Department licenses and prohibit licensees from selling firearms to persons under 21 years of age (or under 18 in the case of rifles and shotguns). Other provisions of this legislation are designed to make it feasible for the States to impose effective controls over firearms within their own boundaries. I urge the Governors of our States and mayors and other local public officials to review their existing legislation in this critical field with a view to keeping lethal weapons out of the wrong hands.

I recommend this legislation to the Congress as a sensible use of Federal authority to assist local authorities in coping with an undeniable menace to law and order and to the lives of innocent people.

4. District of Columbia:

A fourth opportunity for Federal leadership is the Nation's Capital. As I said in my special message on the District of Columbia, we must improve law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice in the District. Washington shares with our large cities the special and acute problems associated with rapid urban population growth.

Both in its own right and as a model for other cities, Washington can and should be a focus for intensive efforts in crime prevention, the detection and prosecution of crimes, rehabilitation, and related activities.

To assist in this effort, I will shortly appoint the commission to which I referred in my message on the District of Columbia.

ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Whatever we may do to strengthen Federal law enforcement, the principal enforcement responsibility still rests on State and local governments—and that has become a very large burden indeed.

The cost of operating our police departments has risen by 50 percent in the last 5 years alone. Yet our law enforcement and corrections personnel are overworked. Our courts are overcrowded. Our penal and rehabilitative facilities and programs are understaffed or underdeveloped. To meet their large and growing burdens, State and local law enforcement agencies must have additional training and technical assistance from the Federal Government.

Federal assistance has long been provided in various forms to local law en-

forcement. Because of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's early recognition of the need for such assistance, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has provided a number of valuable services to State and local police organizations. It assists them with training activities and the FBI National Academy in Washington gives comprehensive instructions to State and local career law enforcement officers each year. The Federal Government also provides support for short-term vocational training for police officers and more extensive training in related fields through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Treasury Department provides instruction for narcotics enforcement personnel through the Bureau of Narcotics Training School.

The Federal Government has been giving active support to juvenile delinquency control efforts. Under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, programs have been developed to provide new approaches to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and to train needed personnel. Under this act important studies have shed new light on the complex causes of delinquency.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will shortly submit requests for urgently needed additional appropriations in this field. I support these proposals and request the Congress to act on them favorably and rapidly.

These are present and continuing endeavors. But we must do more. I believe a major opportunity lies in the development and testing of experimental methods of crime control. To this end, I am proposing the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. This legislation would authorize the Attorney General to assist State, local and private groups to improve and strengthen crime control programs and make generally available information as to their effectiveness.

This act would bolster present training programs for local law enforcement personnel and would support the development of new training methods. Fighting crime effectively under modern conditions requires professional police who are expertly trained in a variety of skills. The Federal Government now provides financial assistance for research and training in other professions—science, mathematics, foreign languages, medicine, nursing. Trained, professional law enforcement personnel are fully as essential to the preservation of our national health and strength—and no less deserving of increased Federal support.

This legislation would also authorize Federal support for the development of improved methods of enforcing criminal laws and administering justice. For example, experiments might be undertaken with different kinds and intensity of police coverage in high crime districts in order to learn more about the effective allocation of manpower. The effectiveness of different communication and alarm systems might be studied. By pilot projects in the administration of justice, we may find ways of making the judicial process fairer and speedier and the correctional process more effective.

The dissemination of information about projects supported under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act will be of substantial value to other communities in designing their own crime control programs.

PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION

The proposals which I have discussed are promising immediate approaches to a number of the specific problems of controlling crime. In the longer run we must also deepen our understanding of the causes of crime and of how our society should respond to the challenge of our present levels of crime. Only with such understanding can we undertake more fundamental, far-reaching, and imaginative programs.

As the first step, I am establishing the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The Commission will be composed of men and women of distinction who share my belief that we need to know far more about the prevention and control of crime. I will ask the Commission to make a comprehensive report to me by the summer of 1966 and to make interim reports when early action on the basis of its recommendations may be possible.

No agency of Government has ever in our history undertaken to probe so fully and deeply into the problems of crime in our Nation. I do not underestimate the difficulty of the assignment. But the very difficulty which these problems present and the staggering cost of inaction make it imperative that this task be undertaken.

It is of the utmost importance that the people of this country understand what is at stake in controlling crime and its effects. I believe therefore that the Commission should disseminate information on its work and findings and build a broad base of public support for constructive action.

Typical of the examples of important and troubling questions on which I believe the Commission can furnish guidance are:

(1) How can law enforcement be organized to meet present needs?

In too many instances present divisions of responsibility for law enforcement reflect unexamined precedent rather than practical organization. In addition to exploring improved law enforcement and correctional techniques, the Commission can be helpful in suggesting possible reorganization of law enforcement functions and methods of achieving greater cooperation where there are separate responsibilities.

(2) What steps can be taken to create greater understanding by those involved in the administration of justice at the State and local level of the efforts of Federal courts to insure protection of individual rights?

The Commission should seek understanding of the needs of those responsible for carrying out our criminal laws and the relationship to these needs of the historic protections our Nation has accorded to the accused. The Commission may well serve as a bridge of understanding among all those involved in the fair and effective administration of criminal justice.

(3) Through what kinds of programs can the Federal Government be most effective in assisting State and local enforcement?

The Commission can recommend new and imaginative ways in which the Federal Government can render assistance—without infringing on the primary responsibility of States and localities.

(4) Is the Nation as a whole providing adequate education and training opportunities for those who administer the criminal laws?

The Commission should evaluate the programs and institutions now available for law enforcement officers, correctional personnel, and both prosecution and defense attorneys and make recommendations on necessary additions.

(5) What correctional programs are most promising in preventing a first offense from leading to a career in crime?

A large proportion of serious crimes is committed by persons who are previous offenders. Thus, reducing the total volume of crime is, to a large extent, a problem of reducing the rate of recidivism. The first offender's initial contact with our correctional system is often a turning point in his life. The Commission should consider how we can best insure that his first contact will be his last.

(6) What steps can be taken to increase public respect for law and law enforcement officers?

In a free land, order can never be achieved by police action alone, no matter how efficient. There must be a high level of voluntary observance of the law and cooperation with public authorities. Citizens too often shun their duty to report crimes, summon assistance, or cooperate with law enforcement in other ways. In the light of recent examples of what happens when private citizens remain bystanders at tragedy, I hope the Commission will suggest means of improving public attitudes toward the individual's sense of responsibility to his community and to his neighbor.

These questions only illustrate those which this Commission must put to itself. It must also: consider the problem of making our streets, homes, and places of business safer; inquire into the special problems of juvenile crime; examine the administration of justice in our shockingly overcrowded lower courts through which so many citizens are herded wholesale; explore the means by which organized crime can be arrested by Federal and local authorities.

In its task, the Commission will not be working alone. In addition to its own staff and subpanels of experts in various fields and disciplines, it will have the close cooperation and support of representatives of the Federal Government.

I have directed the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to work closely with the Commission and to assist it in every possible way. Because of the importance of the Attorney General's responsibilities within the Federal Government for these problems—ranging from investigation and enforcement through administration of the Federal

prison system—I anticipate that the Department of Justice and especially its newly created Office of Criminal Justice should take a particularly active role in assisting the work of the Commission.

The Commission also will work closely with representatives of State and local government; with such groups as the American Bar Association, the American Law Institute, State and local bar groups and appropriate law enforcement organizations; and with universities and other institutions and individuals engaged in important work in the social sciences, mental health, and related areas.

The task before the Commission is one of consummate difficulty and complexity. But it could scarcely be more important. I hope and expect that its work will be a landmark to follow for many years to come.

CONCLUSION

This message recognizes that crime is a national problem.

That recognition does not carry with it any threat to the basic prerogatives of State and local governments. It means, rather, that the Federal Government will henceforth take a more meaningful role in meeting the whole spectrum of problems posed by crime.

It means that the Federal Government will seek to exercise leadership and to assist local authorities in meeting their responsibilities.

It means that we will make a national effort to resolve the problems of law enforcement and the administration of justice—and to direct the attention of the Nation to the problems of crime and the steps that must be taken to meet them. This effort will involve great difficulties.

It will not produce dramatic, visible results overnight. But it is an effort we must begin now.

I ask the help of the Congress. I believe that these actions and proposals are soundly based and give promise of meeting urgent needs of a growing nation. I commend them to the American people and to the Congress and urge their prompt enactment.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 8, 1965.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDER

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to limit to 3

minutes statements made in connection with the routine morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Resolved that the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] are hereby assigned to serve on the Committee on Government Operations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 85) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] are hereby assigned to serve on the Committee on Government Operations.

COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of both the majority leader and the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today and during sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

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

SENATOR MANSFIELD'S STATEMENT TO THE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete text of the statement which I made to the Democratic conference this morning.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD TO THE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE, MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1965, 10:30 A.M.

This meeting has been called to bring the conference up to date on the legislative situation, to report on leadership meetings with the President and to consider any other matters which members may wish to have considered on an informal basis.

First, the legislative situation. In the first 2 months of this session, we have disposed of just about every measure which the Senate could reasonably have been expected to consider up to this point. I want to express my

deep appreciation to the chairmen and members of the committees for bringing the so-called reruns and other bills to the floor expeditiously, and to all members for their cooperation on the floor. We have been able to act on important measures in excellent time and in excellent order. I refer to the agricultural supplemental, Appalachia, water pollution, the coffee legislation, the Inter-American Development Bank, Presidential succession, several Interior bills, among others.

This record which is outstanding in every respect has been achieved on an orderly schedule, with reasonable hours and an appropriate Lincoln recess. There is every reason to hope that we will be able to continue in the same fashion for the balance of the session, including the previously announced recesses, hopefully, to a midsummer adjournment.

There is, as you know, the conference report on the Inter-American Development Bank and a Disarmament Agency bill on the calendar for today. We will have, shortly, the Monroney congressional study bill. The rule 22 matter, although it will be reported as ordered, may be held up for the time being. May I say Senator RUSSELL did not in any way request the postponement of rule 22 but the leadership on both sides desires that it be postponed temporarily. Incidentally, I saw Senator RUSSELL last Saturday at Walter Reed and I'm happy to report he is convalescing nicely.

On the balance of the legislative program, at a recent meeting with the committee chairmen. I have been advised that committee work on other measures is proceeding very well. In that connection, may I say, that at the last leadership meeting on last Tuesday with the President—the second this session—I reported to him on the need for the executive branch to speed up the submission to the Senate of draft legislation to carry out the intent of many of the excellent Presidential messages which we have had so far this session. I have been assured that this will be done.

Other than that, there is not a great deal to report on the leadership meetings. I believe the President is quite content with the progress of the legislative program in the Senate. He has not made any comment at the leadership meetings on the discussion of Vietnam on the floor or on any, repeat, any Senator's speech in connection therewith. In my judgment that is a most appropriate course for the President to follow just as the debate itself has, in general, been most appropriate and helpful from the point of view of illuminating the great complexities of this situation and its implications for the national interest. Newspaper accounts have appeared which alleged that the President and the majority leader have, in effect, twisted arms on the Vietnam issue. Because of these reports I will read what I said to the caucus on January 3 and inserted in the RECORD for January 22.

I would anticipate that during the years ahead, the Nation will reach decisive crossroads at several points in foreign policy. The preponderant responsibility in these matters rests with the President. He will be confronted with grave questions not only in Vietnam but elsewhere in Asia; not only in NATO but in Europe as a whole; not only in the Congo but throughout Africa; not only with regard to fiscal difficulties but with a general organizational disarray in the United Nations.

I would hope that Democratic Members, indeed, all Senators would bear in mind at all times the great burdens which the President carries for all of us in these decisions of foreign policy. I would hope and expect that we will give him every support, by word and vote which can, in good conscience, be given. And I would hope that Members

qualified in questions of foreign policy would not hesitate, after careful study, to speak out on them. Contributions have been made, from time to time, by Members of the Senate, to the more effective formulation and conduct of our foreign relations. While such contributions usually come from members of the Foreign Relations Committee, others with experience and knowledge of these matters have frequently been most helpful. And clearly, we are at a stage, now, in world developments when prudent contributions of thought and idea can be very useful.

Before opening the meeting to general discussion, I should like to fix your attention for a moment on the foreign aid legislation. I think you are all aware of the attitudes and difficulties which exist on this question and the importance which the President attaches to it. I do not expect or ask any member to forgo his convictions on the bill or any part of it. But I do think we should give it every consideration and try to avoid, at all costs, getting into a protracted procedural jam over it. I would appreciate any expression of view on how this matter may be expeditiously handled.

JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP—STATEMENTS BY SENATOR DIRKSEN AND REPRESENTATIVE FORD ON VIETNAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statements made by myself and Hon. GERALD FORD, a Member of the House of Representatives, in behalf of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

In days past, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership have expressed support for a stiffened American military position in South Vietnam. At the very time we spoke, the Soviet and Red Chinese regimes were warning the United States against such action and promising the North Vietnamese increased military assistance. In many nations throughout the world, Communist agents were organizing riots and demonstrations against American diplomatic establishments in an all-out propaganda drive against the United States.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has stated, as American policy, that there can be no negotiations on the Vietnamese issue so long as the Communist nations promote aggression against South Vietnam. We believe this a worthy policy. In fact, we advocated it.

We suggest that logic would have the United States carry this policy one step further.

The Soviet Union has been espousing a policy of "peaceful coexistence." This policy was welcomed by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations and numerous moves were made to demonstrate American readiness to respond, particularly in the fields of trade, communications and diplomatic relations.

Yet the fact remains that the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations have not diminished, but stepped up, their promotion of subversion in the neutral and free-world countries. South Vietnam is only the most glaring example. The continued supplying of Cuba, the subversion in South America, notably Venezuela, and in Africa, notably the Congo, and the ceaseless agitation throughout southeast Asia, are typical.

The only thing peaceful about "peaceful coexistence" is the title. In any relaxed

relations, it is the United States that is supposed to do the relaxing. The Communist nations continuously outrage the rights of other nations. Too long have we heard the trumpet of retreat from those who seem to favor another Munich.

If we are not going to negotiate the Vietnamese question until the aggression against South Vietnamese ceases, an equally necessary step would be to stop entertaining the overtures of the Communist nations for broader trade and diplomatic relations and to intensify our efforts to persuade our friends abroad to do the same, until the Communists have demonstrated their good faith in areas where not only freedom but life and death are at stake.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE FORD

During the past 3 years the Soviet Union and other Communist nations have, under the so-called peaceful coexistence policy, made measurable gains in trade and diplomatic concessions from the United States while offering little in return. Here are some examples:

An agreement has been initialed for the establishment of a New York-Moscow air route which the Soviet Union has long sought.

An American-Soviet treaty has been negotiated, which now awaits Senate approval, that would give the Soviets consular offices they want in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco in exchange for similar American consulates in Russia which would avail us little and only give the Communists more targets for mob violence.

Having purchased \$140 million worth of badly needed U.S. wheat on which the American taxpayer paid \$44 million in subsidies so the Soviets could buy it far below our domestic price, Russia has now bought \$11 million in soybeans which the New York Times speculated might be going to Cuba.

In response to Communist bloc overtures for expanded trade, President Johnson has named a committee to explore stepped-up sales, and the Commerce Department's issuance of export licenses for sales to Communist nations has been increasing steadily.

Even more significant, our Government last month backed down completely on its widely publicized call for the Soviet Union to pay up its assessments to the United Nations, and then compounded this loss of face by lifting a 3-month freeze on voluntary contributions to the U.N. out of the U.S. Treasury.

From a standpoint of bargaining, we constantly give much and get little or nothing in deals with the Communist nations. We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership, urge a "no concession—no deal" policy, meaning that the Communists must be ready to make concessions as the price of agreements with the United States. Until we and our allies arrive at such a policy, we can only expect more Koreans and Vietnams and an ever-widening circle of Communist subversion around the earth.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1948, RELATING TO UNIFORM PROVISIONS FOR CROP LIENS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide uniform provisions for crop liens, interest on unpaid marketing quota penalties and the persons liable for such penalties for all commodities

for which a marketing quota program is in effect (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

FACILITATION OF WORK OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS UNDER TITLE I, AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, urban mass transportation, and community facilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONTINUATION OF STUDY OF EFFECTS OF INSECTICIDES, HERBICIDES, FUNGICIDES, AND OTHER PESTICIDES UPON FISH AND WILDLIFE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act with respect to the interconnection of electric facilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND AND THE FEDERAL DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, managing trustees of the trust funds, and members of the board of trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the Federal disability insurance trust fund, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

ACT TO REMOVE TAX BARRIERS TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove tax barriers to foreign investment in the United States, to make certain techni-

cal amendments, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF SOCIAL PROGRESS TRUST FUND

A letter from the President, Inter-American Development Bank, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the social progress trust fund, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

WILD RIVERS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve certain public lands for a national wild rivers system, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PAYMENT OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE CHARGES ON CERTAIN PUEBLO INDIAN LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the activities of the Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT AND CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT, RELATING TO TENURE AND RETIREMENT OF REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the tenure and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy (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 the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPEAL OF PROVISIONS OF LAW CODIFIED IN TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 39

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the provisions of law codified in 5 U.S.C. 39, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

VARIATION OF WORKWEEK OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit variation of the 40-hour workweek of Federal employees for educational purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

"Resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), requesting the Congress of the United States favorably to consider the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas the citizens in the State of Utah have for many years looked forward to the time when water from the Colorado River could be made available to meet the essential needs of areas of this State; and

"Whereas the continued economic growth of the State requires this supply of water to meet the increased municipal, industrial, and agricultural requirements of areas within the State; and

"Whereas the State of Utah by the Colorado River compact of 1922 and the Upper Colorado River Basin compact of 1948 is entitled to portions of the waters of the Colorado River; and

"Whereas on April 11, 1956, the Congress of the United States authorized the central Utah project; and

"Whereas on March 25, 1964, the Central Utah Water Conservancy District was formed as an organization to represent the citizens to be benefited by the central Utah project and to enter into agreements with the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has studied the engineering and economics of this project, has made available a definite planned report, and submitted in the original budget to Congress of \$3,600,000 to initiate construction on the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project; and

"Whereas it is believed that all necessary documents and required prerequisites to construction will be finalized within the next few months; and

"Whereas there is a desire on the part of all the citizens of the State of Utah that the construction of this project begin during the fiscal year 1966; and

"Whereas the President's budget as submitted to the Congress of the United States did not include funds for the purpose to initiate construction on the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor of the State of Utah concurring therein), do hereby unanimously request and pray that the 89th Congress of the United States will favorably consider this important and long awaited project to the State of Utah and thereby appropriate sufficient funds so that construction of the initial features of this project can be started during fiscal year 1966; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Utah is authorized and directed to send copies of this resolution to the Senate and to the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in the National Congress."

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Marseilles, Ill., protesting against the closing of the veterans hospital at Dwight, Ill.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13"

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to include penal institutions among the recipients of surplus food commodities

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

"Whereas food surpluses in this land of abundance continue to depress prices of agricultural commodities; and

"Whereas such surpluses have been made available to many charitable and correctional institutions, but not those of penal institutions; and

"Whereas a food is one of the heavy costs involved in operating State institutions; and

"Whereas surplus food in large quantities now is being distributed to nations which

encourage inimical actions toward the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to include penal institutions among the recipients of surplus food commodities."

COMMITTEE REPORTS ON FOREIGN CURRENCY AND U.S. DOLLARS USED IN 1964 IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act

of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Joint Economic Committee, the Select Committee on Small Business, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Committee on the Judiciary, concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by those committees in 1964 in connection with foreign travel.

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

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Elene Galloway	Dutch guilder					3,530.65	978.29			3,530.65	978.29
United Kingdom	Pound	6/16/6	19.04	2/17/6	8.06					9/14/0	27.10
Poland	Zloty	840	35.00	1,452	60.50	288	12.00	1,056	44.00	3,636.00	151.50
Total			54.04		68.56		990.29		44.00		1,156.89

¹ State Department purchased round-trip ticket Dutch guilders—no time spent in the Netherlands.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 1,156.89

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,

Chairman, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

FEBRUARY 23, 1965.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Henry J. Casso:											
Japan	Yen	28,260	78.50	20,282	56.34	654,984	1,819.40	6,480	18.00	718,286	1,972.24
Hong Kong, British Crown Colony	Hong Kong dollars	30,659	53.60	25,111	43.90	10,010	17.50	11,440	20.00	77,220	135.00
Total			132.10		100.24		1,836.90		38.00		2,107.24

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 2,107.24

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

FEBRUARY 18, 1965.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Joseph Clark:											
Germany	Mark					2,316.20	582.84			2,316.20	582.84
Switzerland	Franc	346.50	80.19							346.59	80.19
Total			80.19				582.84				663.03

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 663.03

LISTER HILL,

Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MARCH 1965.

March 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4283

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator B. Everett Jordan:											
Spain.....	Peseta.....			599	10.00			427	7.13	1,026	17.13
Italy.....	Lira.....	12,500	20	23,500	37.60	33,750	54	62,500	10.00	76,000	121.60
Total.....			20		47.60		54		17.13		138.73

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 138.73

FEBRUARY 25, 1965.

B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Economic Committee, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jacob K. Javits:											
France.....	Franc.....	3,009	605.00	1,450	290.00	170	34.00	390	78.00	5,019	1,007.00
Portugal.....	Escudo.....	719.75	25.00	575.80	20.00			143.95	5.00	1,439.50	50.00
Greece.....	Drachma.....	1,560	52.00	1,200	40.00			240	8.00	3,000	100.00
Turkey.....	Lira.....	306	33.85	675	75.00			135	15.00	1,114.65	123.85
Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....	106.32	26.60	200	50.00	3,778.80	950.88	40	10.00	346.32	1,037.48
Subtotal.....			742.45		475.00		984.88		116.00		2,318.33
Daniel Szabo:											
France.....	Franc.....	1,023.35	204.67	607	121.40	232.70	46.94	429.45	85.89	2,292.50	458.90
Portugal.....	Escudo.....	616	21.39	430	14.93	165	5.73	228.50	7.93	1,439.50	49.98
Greece.....	Drachma.....	770	25.66					130	4.33	900	30.00
Turkey.....	Lira.....	276.80	30.76	293.14	32.57	39	4.33			608.94	67.66
Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....					2,278.10	573.25			2,278.10	573.25
Subtotal.....			282.48		168.90		630.25		98.15		1,179.78
Hale Boggs:											
Switzerland.....	Franc.....	172.64	40.00	129.48	30.00			129.48	30.00	431.60	100.00
Belgium.....	do.....	992.8	20.00	744.6	15.00			744.6	15.00	2,500	50.00
England.....	Pound.....	7/3/7	20.00	5/7/10	15.00					12/12/5	35.00
Subtotal.....			80.00		60.00				45.00		185.00
Henry S. Reuss:											
Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....	180	45.00	298.80	74.70	886.80	221.70	272	68.00	1,637.60	409.40
Hungary.....	Forint.....	1,920	40.00	2,688	56.00			192	4.00	4,800	100.00
Yugoslavia.....	Dinar.....	36,000	48.00	31,500	42.00			7,500	10.00	75,000	100.00
Subtotal.....			133.00		172.70		221.70		82.00		609.40
Aurelio Peccei: ¹ Italy.....	Lira.....					421,646	676.80			421,646	676.80
Total.....			1,273.93		876.60		2,513.63		341.15		4,969.31

¹ Testified before Subcommittee on Inter-American Economic Relationships.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 4,969.31
Total..... 4,969.31

FEBRUARY 26, 1965.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert R. Locklin: France.....	Franc.....	572.30	116.80	686	140	205.8	42.00	842.8	172.00	2,306.90	1,470.80
Do.....	Deutsche mark.....					2,885	799.39			2,885.00	799.39
Daniel T. Coughlin: France.....	Franc.....	599.35	122.32	686	140	205.8	42.00	855.05	174.50	2,346.20	1,478.82
Do.....	Deutsche mark.....					2,885	799.39			2,885.00	799.39
Total.....			239.12		280		1,682.78		346.50		2,548.40

¹ Have receipt for \$7.22 returned to State Department.

² Have receipt for \$4.72 returned to State Department.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 2,548.40

MARCH 3, 1965.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Anderson, J. B.:											
Switzerland.....	Swiss franc.....	726.20	168.35	442.00	102.48	102.00	23.67	128.80	129.87	2,399.00	324.37
Italy.....	Lire.....	64,543	103.27	45,400	72.64	11,800	18.88	19,300	30.88	141,043	225.67
Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....	605.70	152.41	179.62	45.21	79.00	19.89	76.00	19.17	940.32	236.68
Netherlands.....	Gulden.....					751.54	208.24			751.54	208.24
Conway, J. T.:											
Switzerland.....	Swiss franc.....	878.00	202.77	425.00	98.15	210.00	48.50	638.00	147.34	2,151.00	496.76
Netherlands.....	Gulden.....					1,859.68	515.29			1,859.68	515.29
Switzerland.....	Swiss franc.....					187.00	47.00			187.00	47.00
Bauser, E. J.:											
Austria.....	Schilling.....	1,940.50	75.39	617.00	23.90	2,058.00	79.70	625.00	124.20	5,240.50	203.19
Italy.....	Lire.....	27,446	43.90	12,500	20.00	5,500	8.80	34,554	55.30	80,000	128.00
Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....					2,236.40	562.76			2,236.40	562.76
Murphy, G. F., Jr.:											
France.....	Franc.....	2,395.71	484.92	1,750.83	354.42	311.02	63.00	144.84	29.32	4,602.40	931.66
Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....					1,856.48	464.12			1,856.48	464.12
Do.....	do.....					2,076.40	519.10			2,076.40	519.10
Rosen, J.:											
Switzerland.....	Swiss franc.....	460.00	106.66	380.00	88.10	100.00	23.19	44.00	10.20	984.00	228.15
Italy.....	Lire.....	55,174	88.28	30,533	48.85	10,750	17.20	16,000	25.60	112,457	179.93
Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....	447.50	111.89	155.63	39.17	76.00	19.15	57.55	14.47	733.68	184.68
Netherlands.....	Gulden.....					751.54	208.24			751.54	208.24
Total.....			1,537.84		892.92		2,846.73		386.35		5,663.84

¹ Official overseas telephone calls.

² Commercial air transportation.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent).....	Amount
Appropriated funds: Other U.S. Air Force air transportation.....	5,663.84
Total.....	448.00
	6,111.84

CHET HOLIFIELD,

Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

MARCH 4, 1965.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Birch Bayh: Germany.....	Mark.....	139.05	35.00	131.78	33.17	108.86	27.40	20.18	5.08	399.87	100.65
Quentin N. Burdick: United Kingdom.....	Pound.....	23	64.02	24.83	69.13			24.86	19.59	54.86	152.74
Thomas J. Dodd:											
Germany.....	Mark.....	413.30	103.32	128	32.00	3,550.80	893.28	110	27.50	4,202.10	1,056.10
France.....	Franc.....	375.00	75.00	240	54.60			153	30.60	768.00	160.20
			178.32		86.60		893.28		58.10		1,216.30
David Martin:											
Germany.....	Mark.....	325.35	81.33	123	30.75	3,618.80	910.39	94	23.50	4,161.14	1,045.97
France.....	Franc.....	275.00	55.00	208	41.60			43	8.60	526	105.20
			136.33		72.35		910.39		32.10		1,151.17
Total.....			413.67		261.25		1,831.07		114.87		2,620.86

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. Dollar equivalent).....	Amount
	2,620.86

JAMES O. EASTLAND,

Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

MARCH 3, 1965.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Robert C. Good, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Zambia;

C. Robert Moore, of Washington, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Mali;

Raymond R. Guest, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ireland;

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs;

Angler Biddle Duke, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Spain;

Geoffrey W. Lewis, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador

Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania;

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Ambassador at Large;

Jack Hood Vaughn, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Dr. Homer Daniels Babbidge, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs;

Dr. Walter Johnson, of Illinois, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs;

Dr. Roy E. Larsen, of Connecticut, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on

International Educational and Cultural Affairs:

Arnold M. Picker, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs; and

William H. Brubeck, of California, and sundry other persons, for appointments and promotions in the Foreign Service.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Garth L. Mangum, of Utah, to be Executive Secretary of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress;

Roger L. Stevens, of New York, to be Chairman of the National Council on the Arts; and

Dorothea B. Chapman, and sundry other candidates, for personal action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

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

S. 1396. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wanda Martens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 1397. A bill for the relief of Vasileos Koutsougeanopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1398. A bill for the relief of Kaati Fonua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 1399. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1400. A bill to extend and expand title III of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 1401. A bill for the relief of Anthony N. Nicklow;

S. 1402. A bill for the relief of Kent Til Wong; and

S. 1403. A bill for the relief of Helen Dress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. McGEE):

S. 1404. A bill to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1405. A bill for the relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi; and

S. 1406. A bill for the relief of CWO Charles M. Bickart, U.S. Marine Corps (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1407. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Lipp; and

S. 1408. A bill for the relief of Ta-tuan Ch'en (T. T. Ch'en); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. CASE, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. FONG):

S. 1409. A bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through

projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1410. A bill vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 1411. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, as amended; and

S. 1412. A bill for the relief of military and civilian personnel whose personal property was damaged or lost by fire while stored pursuant to Government orders in a commercial warehouse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the first and above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 1413. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederate Tribes of Colville Indians located in the State of Washington and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1414. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide that an individual shall not be deprived of monthly insurance benefits thereunder solely because of marriage or remarriage, if such marriage or remarriage occurs after such individual attains age 55; and

S. 1415. A bill to establish and prescribe the functions of the Federal Tax Commission; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1416. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to prohibit discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1417. A bill for the relief of Joseph Zuzich;

S. 1418. A bill for the relief of Attilio Zupicich;

S. 1419. A bill for the relief of Miro Vulin;

S. 1420. A bill for the relief of Peter Vuckovic;

S. 1421. A bill for the relief of Josip Valjin;

S. 1422. A bill for the relief of Mirko Svorcina;

S. 1423. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Strucic;

S. 1424. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Stroligo;

S. 1425. A bill for the relief of Marko Spaleta;

S. 1426. A bill for the relief of Ante Spaleta;

S. 1427. A bill for the relief of Stefano Sovich;

S. 1428. A bill for the relief of Sime Radman;

S. 1429. A bill for the relief of Aloiz Radjkovic;

S. 1430. A bill for the relief of Jakov Pijaca;

S. 1431. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Pezzullo;

S. 1432. A bill for the relief of Svetko Petric;

S. 1433. A bill for the relief of Kazimir Perkovic;

S. 1434. A bill for the relief of Marko Pavlovic;

S. 1435. A bill for the relief of Andjelko Paylovic;

S. 1436. A bill for the relief of Sime Matesic;

S. 1437. A bill for the relief of Sime Martinovich;

S. 1438. A bill for the relief of Svetko Marfat;

S. 1439. A bill for the relief of Ivan Marfat;

S. 1440. A bill for the relief of Ivan Latkovic;

S. 1441. A bill for the relief of Dragan Kuric;

S. 1442. A bill for the relief of Jure Klaric;

S. 1443. A bill for the relief of Sime Kvanov;

S. 1444. A bill for the relief of Sime Grancaric; and

S. 1445. A bill for the relief of Nikolo Grancaric; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1446. A bill to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1447. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general telephone service; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. DODD, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. RIBICOFF):

S. 1448. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921, in order to provide that the foreign market value of imported firearms and ammunition which have been disposed of as surplus by a foreign government shall, for the purposes of such Act, be not less than the constructed value of the merchandise; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1449. A bill for the relief of Dr. Enrique Ramon Ducassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 1450. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Miller and Mildred M. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1451. A bill for the relief of Jovan D. Cubrilo, his wife, Melanita Cubrilo, and his daughter, Bojana Cubrilo; and

S. 1452. A bill to incorporate the Senior Reserve Commanders Association, U.S. Army Reserve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1453. A bill to change the name of the Cannelton Locks and Dam in the State of Indiana to the Winfield K. Denton Locks and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

S. 1454. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Stracquadanio; and

S. 1455. A bill for the relief of Parasram Manwani, Dewki Manwani, Ram Manwani, and Asha Manwani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF CON- GRESS THAT THE STATE OF NEW YORK SHOULD RAISE ITS LEGAL DRINKING AGE TO 21

Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. RIBICOFF) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) to express the sense of Congress that the State of New York should raise its legal drinking age to 21, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CASE, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

ASSIGNMENT OF SENATORS MET- CALF AND MONTROYA TO COM- MITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPER- ATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 85) assigning Senators METCALF and MONTROYA to the Committee on Government Operations, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO PROVIDE COST-OF-LIV- ING INCREASES IN BENEFITS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in benefits similar to the formula of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD and that it may lie at the desk until next Monday to permit cosponsorship by other Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 1399) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, 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 Section 202 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"COST-OF-LIVING INCREASE IN BENEFITS

"(v) (1) (A) For purposes of this subsection—

"(i) the term 'price index' means the annual average over a calendar year of the Consumer Price Index (all items—United States city average) published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; and

"(ii) the term 'base period' means the calendar year 1958.

"(B) For purposes of determining under this subsection the per centum of increase (if any) of the price index for any year over

the price index for the base period, the price index for the base period shall be regarded as 100 per centum.

"(2) As soon after January 1, 1965, and as soon after January 1 of each succeeding year as there becomes available necessary data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, the Secretary shall determine the per centum of increase (if any) in the price index for the calendar year ending with the close of the preceding December over the price index for the base period. For each full 3 per centum of increase occurring in the price index for the latest calendar year with respect to which a determination is made in accordance with this paragraph over the price index for the base period, there shall be made, in accordance with the succeeding provisions of this subsection, an increase of 3 per centum in the monthly insurance benefits payable under this title.

"(3) Increases in such insurance benefits shall be effective for benefits payable with respect to months in the one-year period commencing with April of the year in which the most recent determination pursuant to paragraph (2) is made and ending with the close of the following March.

"(4) In determining the amount of any individual's monthly insurance benefit for purposes of applying the provisions of Section 203(a) (relating to reductions of benefits when necessary to prevent certain maximum benefits from being exceeded), amounts payable by reason of this subsection shall not be regarded as part of the monthly benefit of such individual.

"(5) Any increase to be made in the monthly benefits payable to or with respect to any individual shall be applied after all other provisions of this title relating to the amount of such benefit have been applied. If the amount of any increase payable by reason of the provisions of this subsection is not a multiple of \$0.10, it shall be reduced to the next lower multiple of \$0.10."

SEC. 2. In addition to all sums authorized under other provisions of law to be appropriated to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the Federal disability insurance trust fund, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the aforementioned funds, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary to place each of such funds in the same financial position as that which it would have occupied if the preceding section of this Act had not been enacted.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the bill proposes to establish a base period of 1958, and whenever there is a 3 percent increase in the consumer retail price index, the benefits shall increase 3 percent. The increase in the index since 1958 has been more than 7 percent, so a 6-percent increase would be effective at once.

My bill also provides that the increased cost of these benefits shall come from the general revenue fund and not as a further drain on the social security fund, which now has \$320 billion in unfunded liabilities.

For some time, I have been concerned over this problem. The social tragedy of inflation—and this is what my proposed bill is designed to counteract—is that those who are hurt most are the ones least able to bear it. It strikes most deeply at older people who are living on their savings, insurance and pensions, and are helpless in the face of the continued increase in the cost of living.

Inflation, despite contrary words from official and unofficial experts and pundits, is measured by the amount of increase in the consumer retail price index, and not by the wholesale price index. During the last 4 years, the consumer retail price index has gone up from 214.6 to 225.

This, of course, means that the purchasing power of the dollar has gone down. Back in 1939, the dollar had a purchasing power of 100 cents. By December of 1960, this had fallen to 46.6 cents. Today, it is down to 44.4 cents.

Congress has not been entirely unmindful of the impact of inflation on social security pensions and has periodically increased them. But there has usually been a time lag of several years during which the pensioners have suffered from a drop in their purchasing power.

It may be recalled that many of us in Congress favored an increase in social security pensions last year. But, even if that increase had been enacted, it would not have restored the purchasing power which has been lost—just since 1958.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table and an explanatory note which illustrate the problem.

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

Year	Annual pension	Purchasing power of dollar compared to 1939 dollar worth 100 cents	Real value of pension
		Cents	
1940.....	\$499.20	99.2	\$495.20
1950.....	870.00	57.8	502.86
1952.....	930.00	52.3	485.59
1954.....	1,062.00	51.7	549.05
1958.....	1,140.00	48.1	548.34
1964.....	1,140.00	44.8	510.72
1965 ¹	1,219.80	44.4	541.59

¹ Proposed by administration, 7-percent increase.

(The annual pension is shown for a worker having a \$3,000 annual income base, single at retirement, and fully covered, commencing with 1940, the first year social security pensions were paid, and for each year in which Congress has enacted an increase; also for 1964. The 1965 proposed pension represents a flat 7-percent increase being proposed by the administration.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, Congress decided to do something about the situation insofar as retired Civil Service employees are concerned. Section 1102 of that act now provides for an automatic increase in Civil Service retirement pensions when there has been an increase of 3 percent or more in the consumer retail price index.

There is much to be said for the fairness of such a change in the law. After all, if a majority of the Members of Congress persist in deficit spending, why should not the Congress provide for an automatic offset against the hardship the resulting inflation brings on?

I can see no reason why the equity worked in the 1962 act should not be extended to our social security pensioners.

Most of them rely principally on their pension, and an automatic increase in these pensions to offset the loss in purchasing power due to inflation would avoid much hardship which is not of their own making.

UNIFORM TIME LEGISLATION NEEDED TO END CLOCK CONFUSION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on April 25, some 100 million Americans will advance their clocks 1 hour, go on daylight saving time, and leave behind them some 90 million Americans who will either remain on standard time all year, or move to daylight saving time on a later date.

Thus will begin our annual period of scrambled time and clock confusion—one of the greatest public inconveniences in the Nation.

This annual time scramble complicates the operations and the scheduling of the transportation industry. It confounds the television viewer, bewilders the vacationing traveler, and aggravates the businessman. A flood of missed appointments, and late arrivals, plagues many Americans.

The dimensions of the problem are easily sketched. Fifteen States observe daylight saving time on a statewide basis, and they all switch over on the last Sunday in April. But daylight saving time is observed in part of 16 other States whose clocks are advanced on 11 different dates. When fall comes, the switch back to standard time takes place on a score of different dates, ranging from August through October.

In Iowa, for instance, in 1964 there were 23 different combinations of dates on which community areas shifted to and from daylight time. In Central City, Iowa, you went to bed on standard time and got up by daylight time. In Hopkinton, Iowa, banks opened on daylight time and closed by standard time.

In Virginia, bus schedules must be revised and reprinted four times in 6 months, each year. Bus and train schedules between Chicago and Minneapolis must be revised and reprinted at least five times a year to keep up with the time changes. Testimony before our Senate Commerce Committee put the cost of this aspect of time confusion at more than \$1 million a year, just for the printing of revised timetables and schedules.

Radio and television network programs require extensive and expensive video taping in order to maintain some continuity in time of showings. Persons making, and receiving, long-distance telephone calls have their share of problems in this regard, increasing caller demands on operators making time of day service uncertain, especially where a consolidated telephone operation serves areas which observe different time standards.

Is it any wonder that we have reached the point where the greatest of nations must be labeled by its own time experts as "the worst timekeeper in the world."

Clearly, our river of time is heavily shoaled, filled with jagged rocks, and treacherous eddies. It is anything but a

smooth highway of commerce and communications, and I think we better do something about it.

One of the first things that must be done, in my view, is to modernize and improve the 47-year-old Standard Time Act of 1918, whose provisions are hopelessly inadequate to deal with the time problems of today.

To that end, for myself and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], I introduce a newly drafted measure to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those areas where it is observed.

The essential provisions of our bill would standardize the dates on which clocks would be set ahead in the spring and back in the fall. Those dates would be the fourth Sunday in April and the fourth Sunday in October. Under terms of the bill, every State and local jurisdiction would be free to determine for itself whether or not it wanted to observe daylight saving time, but if it adopted daylight saving time it would have to observe that time from the fourth Sunday of April until the fourth Sunday in October.

Frankly, Mr. President, the bill represents a compromise, aimed at winning broad enough support to insure enactment. The long history of efforts in this field clearly indicates that Congress will not approve nationwide daylight saving time, except under the lash of war—and why should it? Nineteen of our States do not observe daylight time, generally for good geographical or timekeeping reasons. At the same time, it seems wholly unreasonable to deny daylight saving time to the millions of Americans whose votes have put it into effect in all or part of 31 States.

But the bill would achieve uniformity in the single most troublesome area of time confusion—the bewildering multitude of changeover dates, and it would do this with a minimum of disruption and difficulty.

In addition, the bill would make some long overdue technical corrections in the Standard Time Act of 1918, by permitting the use of the four time zones needed in Alaska, and providing that the Administrative Procedures Act applies to proceedings of the Interstate Commerce Commission relating to boundaries of the standard time zones.

Work on the preparation of this legislation has been effectively aided by the efforts of the Committee for Time Uniformity, a nonprofit organization created by the Transportation Association of America, in order to work for a more uniform and rational timekeeping system in the United States. The committee is headed by Robert Ramspeck, former Member of Congress from Georgia, aided by Robert Redding, who is vice president and general counsel of the Transportation Association of America.

As Senators will recall, the Senate Commerce Committee in the last Congress conducted hearings on the problems of time uniformity, and reported a bill to the Senate. Unfortunately, the legislation was not acted upon. The new legislation we are presenting today is a

considerable improvement, in my view, over the bill approved by the committee in the 88th Congress.

Let me reemphasize that this bill will impose daylight time on nobody. Neither will it deny it to anybody. All that it does is to provide that States or subdivisions that choose to go on daylight saving time shall all start at the same day and end at the same day each year.

I am most hopeful that the committee will be able to schedule prompt hearings on this bill so that we can alleviate some of the burdens imposed by the present chaotic system of daylight saving and standard time.

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

The bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. McGEE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I would like to join in support of the measure introduced here today by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] to try to establish some order in our Nation's timekeeping problems. This measure, it seems to me, is a badly needed step in the direction of ending the chaos which has characterized our system of keeping time since its inception.

As one who is in constant communication with all sections of our country, I know from experience the difficulties and the additional cost and trouble that arises out of the variance in time standards in various parts of the country. Action is clearly necessary to alleviate this confusion and I am pleased to see the introduction of this bill and pledge my wholehearted support to its passage.

STATE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President of the United States sent to Congress today his message on law enforcement and the administration of justice. The message offers an important recognition of the need for strengthening joint Federal and local law enforcement, and contains a proposal for legislation similar to that which I, together with Senators KUCHEL, CASE, FONG, and SCOTT, introduced in March of 1963 to provide for Federal aid to local law enforcement.

I am again today, together with Senators KUCHEL, CASE, FONG, and SCOTT, introducing this legislation to provide Federal aid to local police forces to develop more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement. This bill, entitled "State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965," would provide a Federal matching grant-in-aid program, administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in consultation with the Attorney General, to assist in the improvement of training, education, and recruitment of local and State police officers.

I believe every effort should be made to strengthen the enforcement of law and order and alleviate the conditions which breed crime, especially in view of the alarming growth of crime statistics in our large cities. Effective criminal justice, however, is a two-edged process, involving not only vigorous enforcement of the criminal laws, but also the equally vigorous protection of civil rights and civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution.

We must be careful to insure that the traditional rights of defendants under the Constitution are fully protected. It would be little progress against crime merely to increase the possibility that innocent suspects might be convicted and punished for crimes which they did not commit.

These considerations underlay the very significant support given to this idea of Federal aid to State and local police training programs by the 1961 and 1963 reports of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. In the 1963 report the Civil Rights Commission made the following recommendation: That Congress enact a program of grants-in-aid to assist State and local governments, upon their request, to increase the professional quality of their police forces. Such grants-in-aid should be conditioned upon nondiscriminatory administration by the recipient and might apply to the development and maintenance of first, programs to encourage applications by qualified persons for appointment as police officers; second, recruit selection tests and standards; third, training programs in scientific crime detection; fourth, training programs in constitutional rights and human relations; fifth, college level schools of police administration; and, sixth, scholarship programs that assist policemen to receive training in schools of police administration.

The working language of the bill introduced today follows: For the purpose of assisting in improving the professional competence of State and local police forces, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in consultation with the Attorney General is authorized to make grants for projects to develop or demonstrate techniques and practices which in his judgment will substantially contribute to the effectiveness of State and local law enforcement agencies, including—but not limited to—techniques and practices relating to law enforcement administration, the recruitment, training, and education of police officers, and improved cooperation among the various law enforcement agencies in the United States and between State and local law enforcement agencies and other public and nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions.

I send to the desk for appropriate reference on behalf of myself, and Senators KUCHEL, CASE, FONG, and SCOTT, this measure to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement.

Mr. President, with further reference to the President's message on law enforcement, I am most gratified that the

administration has seen fit to make some move in the direction of an enlightened Federal approach to narcotics addiction, calling for legislation, which I have sought for many years, to provide civil commitment of addicts for treatment rather than the harsh punitive approach of present law, with its mandatory minimum sentences for all offenders, regardless of age or medical condition. Unfortunately, the President's request does not go as far as it should and leaves untouched the crucial needs for greatly increased Federal support for research into the causes and cures of addiction, about which shockingly little is presently known, and for medical treatment facilities and services, particularly outpatient treatment in the addict's home environment. This is urgently needed.

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

The bill (S. 1409) to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CARE AND MAINTENANCE OF ORIGINAL IWO JIMA MEMORIAL ON MOUNT SURIBACHI

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would vest in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Suribachi.

This famous monument is of great interest to all Americans and the U.S. Marines are particularly anxious to have it preserved. The Air Force along with the Navy was performing the task of replacing flags on the monument and the maintenance of the monument itself. Since this has been curtailed somewhat, the 50th Division Marine Association finds itself limited in seeing that the monument is kept in good condition. It is for this reason it is hoped that legislation can be enacted into law to give the American Battle Monuments Commission jurisdiction over this monument to assure its continued maintenance and I hope the bill I am introducing will receive early and favorable consideration by this Congress.

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

The bill (S. 1410) vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RELIEF OF MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL FOR LOSSES SUSTAINED TO PROPERTY IN COMMERCIAL WAREHOUSES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of military and civilian per-

sonnel whose property was damaged or lost by fire while stored pursuant to Government orders in a commercial warehouse.

Under existing law the Secretary of a military department may settle and pay such claims under \$6,500.

As a result of a fire on August 17, 1963, military and civilian personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps lost considerable property in a commercial warehouse located in Alexandria, Va., and operated by the Columbia Van Lines and the Meeks Transfer Co.

The purpose of this bill is to give the Secretary of a military department authority to settle such claims resulting from this particular fire up to \$16,000. There are a great number of claims involved in excess of \$6,500 and this measure will relieve the Congress from enacting private legislation to cover individual claims over the present statutory limit.

Several private claim bills for individuals have already been introduced in the 89th Congress. This proposal will take a great burden off of the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Not all personnel suffering loss have filed claims as yet since they may file within the 2-year statute of limitation which expires August 1965.

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

The bill (S. 1412) for the relief of military and civilian personnel whose personal property was damaged or lost by fire while stored pursuant to Government orders in a commercial warehouse, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PERMITTING REMARRIAGE WITHOUT LOSS OF SOCIAL SECURITY SURVIVOR'S BENEFIT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit remarriage of those over 55 without loss of social security survivors' benefits. This bill would correct an anomaly now in the law which penalizes widows and other survivors by cutting off their social security survivors' benefits if they marry or remarry.

The proposed legislation would specifically provide that a surviving dependent of a worker covered by social security would not lose his or her benefit if he or she marries or remarries after reaching the age of 55. There would be no premium on living arrangements which are not in accord with prevailing customs and standards of morality.

From information given me by the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, it is my judgment that the cost of this reform will be negligible. The percentage of widows over 55 who remarry is small, and many of those who do remarry qualify for wives' benefits on account of their new husbands.

I sincerely trust that prompt action will be taken to remove this existing defect in the social security law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1414) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide that an individual shall not be deprived of monthly insurance benefits thereunder solely because of marriage or remarriage, if such marriage or remarriage occurs after such individual attains age 55, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED FEDERAL TAX COMMISSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish and prescribe the functions of a Federal Tax Commission, comprised of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, with no more than three members being of the same political party. This Commission would be an arm of the Congress, similar to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Maritime Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The length of the term for each Commissioner would be 15 years, to insure independence and the benefit of experience in the complex field of tax law.

The purpose of introducing this tax measure is to afford the taxpayers of this Nation a forum, separate and distinct from the executive branch of the Government, where they may be heard on the interpretation of tax laws passed by the Congress.

The proposed independent Tax Commission would make substantive and interpretative rules and regulations in accordance with the intent of the Congress necessary for the determination of tax liability under the Internal Revenue Code.

Quite frequently the rules and regulations issued by the Treasury Department after passage of a tax law are not always construed in accordance with Congressional intent and this has caused considerable harassment to the average taxpayer throughout this Nation, who cannot afford the expense involved in connection with litigation that would necessarily have to ensue where a difference of opinion with respect to what Congress intended when such a ruling or interpretation issued by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Internal Revenue Service was adverse to the taxpayer's interest.

While the Constitution of the United States gives to the Congress the right to levy and collect taxes, and thereby enact tax laws, it is obvious that the Congress itself cannot write a law sufficiently detailed to cover the many hundreds of thousands of unique business and individual problems which arise under these laws.

Under existing law, the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is solely responsible for interpreting the tax laws as passed by the

Congress, and the issuing of subsequent regulations. Thus the bulk of tax legislation in connection with the interpretation and regulations issued is frequently dominated by the policy of the executive branch of the Government.

It seems to me that the intent of Congress in the important field of tax legislation can best be implemented by delegating the powers to issue rules and regulations to an unbiased quasi-legislative body such as a Tax Commission proposed in the pending bill. It is designed to provide the American taxpayer with the assurance that regulations issued subsequent to the enactment of tax laws by the Congress truly represent the intent of the Congress. The measure in no way will adversely affect the Internal Revenue Service's responsibility with respect to the assessment and collection of taxes imposed under the Internal Revenue Code.

I sincerely trust that this measure will be given early and favorable consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1415) to establish and prescribe the functions of the Federal Tax Commission, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROHIBITING EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION BASED ON AGE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice to discriminate against a person in matters of employment because of his age.

It is a fact within the knowledge of every Senator that such discrimination is practiced on a wide scale throughout the Nation. Among the studies which have confirmed the existence of widespread age discrimination in hiring was one made in 1963 by the U.S. Employment Service. This was a study of more than 25,000 employer job orders received in May 1963 in offices of the Federal-State Employment Service in eight cities. Forty-five percent, almost half, of the job orders specified an upper age limit on referrals. Eighteen percent, nearly one-fifth, of the orders restricted referrals to applicants under 35, 29 percent to applicants under 45, and 42 percent to applicants under 55.

Mr. President, it is a matter of great importance to every American that we seek to eliminate age discrimination in employment. For all of us are either old now and subject to such discrimination already or hope to live long enough to be old, when we shall need employment as productive members of our society.

So let us this year—during 1965—do something to help remove age as a barrier to employment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1416) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to prohibit discrimination in employment be-

cause of age, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN YUGOSLAV REFUGEES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, private legislation for the relief of certain Yugoslav refugees residing in New York State.

I have long been deeply concerned over the plight of refugees and escapees not only from Yugoslavia, but also from other totalitarian regimes. The question of involuntary repatriation of human beings to Communist nations is, in my judgment, a matter that should receive the very serious attention of the Congress. It involves a matter of our Federal Government's policy toward human beings in need, and, as this involves exchange of views with other nations, it involves issues of foreign policy.

These bills would not be necessary if comprehensive immigration reform legislation similar to S. 500, introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] on January 15, or S. 1093, which I introduced on February 10, had been enacted. These, along with other immigration reform measures are presently being considered by the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

The bills introduced today provide that, upon enactment, the named beneficiary shall be considered to have been paroled into the United States pursuant to section 1 of Public Law 86-648. These bills would, if enacted, simply charge off the admission status of the beneficiaries to the parole allotment of the United States under this law, and not reduce the regular Yugoslav immigrant quota.

These 29 refugees have been in our country for a varied period of years. They have excellent records during their stays here. These bills are necessitated by wholesale movement of Yugoslavian merchant marine workers into this country. This movement of Yugoslav refugees has raised material questions in our Nation with respect to giving aid to the refugees from Communist terrors. Tito very definitely controls a tight Communist state.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1417. A bill for the relief of Joseph Zuzich;

S. 1418. A bill for the relief of Attilio Zupicich;

S. 1419. A bill for the relief of Miro Vulin;

S. 1420. A bill for the relief of Peter Vuckovic;

S. 1421. A bill for the relief of Josip Valjin;

S. 1422. A bill for the relief of Mirko Svorcina;

S. 1423. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Strucic;

S. 1424. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Stroligo;

S. 1425. A bill for the relief of Marko Spaleta;
 S. 1426. A bill for the relief of Ante Spaleta;
 S. 1427. A bill for the relief of Stefano Sovich;
 S. 1428. A bill for the relief of Sime Radman;
 S. 1429. A bill for the relief of Aloiz Radjkovic;
 S. 1430. A bill for the relief of Jakov Pijaca;
 S. 1431. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Pezzulich;
 S. 1432. A bill for the relief of Svetko Petric;
 S. 1433. A bill for the relief of Kazimir Perkovic;
 S. 1434. A bill for the relief of Marko Pavlovic;
 S. 1435. A bill for the relief of Andjelko Pavlovic;
 S. 1436. A bill for the relief of Sime Matesic;
 S. 1437. A bill for the relief of Sime Martinovich;
 S. 1438. A bill for the relief of Svetko Marfat;
 S. 1439. A bill for the relief of Ivan Marfat;
 S. 1440. A bill for the relief of Ivan Latkovic;
 S. 1441. A bill for the relief of Dragan Kuric;
 S. 1442. A bill for the relief of Jure Klaric;
 S. 1443. A bill for the relief of Sime Kvanov;
 S. 1444. A bill for the relief of Sime Grancaric; and
 S. 1445. A bill for the relief of Nikolo Grancaric.

NATIONAL WILD RIVERS BILL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee [Mr. JACKSON], a bill to preserve certain of our remaining free-flowing and unspoiled streams—the wild rivers bill.

This is, as Senators know, proposed legislation which has been requested by the President, and is an outgrowth of studies conducted by the Interior and Agriculture Departments.

For my own part, it is more than that: I set out several years ago to prevent the construction of dams on one of the most beautiful and famous wild rivers in America, the Salmon of Idaho, and as early as 1959, introduced legislation to prevent the licensing of dams on the river pending solution of the fish passage problem. The wild rivers bill will accomplish that objective, and additionally, will preserve, reclaim, and make available for the benefit of all Americans, now and in the future, a national system of wild rivers.

In importance, it may well take its place alongside such other landmark legislation as the recently enacted Wilderness Act, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The idea of designating a share of the Nation's rivers, or segments of rivers, in their primitive, free-flowing condition could be another first for America, just as the perpetuation of great areas of natural beauty and attractiveness in a system of national parks is an American invention.

From our national beginnings, rivers played a major role in our expansion and

development, and in our way of living. Early explorers used the rivers as pathways into the wilderness. They were followed by hunters, trappers, and traders who boated and rafted these natural arteries, soon to become avenues of trade and commerce. Since then, the waterways have been harnessed for power, water supply, navigation, flood control, and used for the disposal of wastes. We are still in this latter process of comprehensive river development.

And now, suddenly, we have awakened to the realization that only a few rivers remain untamed, that a part of our scenic and cultural heritage is threatened with destruction by the sheer thrust of our economic growth. Unless we take immediate steps, the generations which wait at our threshold may never know the excitement of white water, fish in crystal-clear rivers, or leisurely float down blue streams which meander between tree-covered banks. Even as our wild rivers disappear, our need for this type of recreation escalates.

The President recognized this need in his state of the Union message when he expressed the hope that some of the unspoiled stretches of our waterways might be preserved by the enactment of a wild rivers bill. He made further reference in his recent natural beauty message in pointing out that the time has come to identify and preserve free-flowing stretches of our great scenic rivers before growth and development make their beauty a memory.

Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall said in his report to the Congress on this bill that "the time to act is now, before it is too late." I am in complete agreement.

This bill is the culmination of widespread concern that has been developing in recent years. It has already received careful consideration by the various Federal agencies involved, including the Bureau of the Budget.

As early as 1954, the Federal Power Commission denied a license to a private utility company to impound the Namekagon River in Wisconsin on the grounds that wilderness recreation was the ultimate use for the river. It was pointed out that of 10,000 miles of rivers in the State, by 1950 only 770 miles remained in their natural condition.

In 1961, the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources recommended "that certain streams be preserved in their free-flowing condition because their natural scenic, scientific, esthetic, and recreational value outweigh their value for water development and control purposes now and in the future."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I take it from the last sentences that have appeared in this very excellent presentation of national need that there will be discretion and discrimination shown as to what rivers remain as free rivers. This is not a blanket occlusion of all dams or rivers.

Mr. CHURCH. No, indeed. In fact, as I shall later point out, the bill specifies exactly the rivers, or the segments of rivers, which will be included in the

initial system, and it provides for studies of certain other rivers. But there is no intention to blanket out further development. In fact, most rivers will remain open for development, as the economic needs of each State may require.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator, and with that explanation I should be very happy to join him as a cosponsor of the measure.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much for his cosponsorship.

In 1962 the President, upon recommendation of the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, Army, and Health, Education, and Welfare, issued a policy statement concerning the use and development of water and related land resources. This policy statement provided, among other things, that in particular instances, certain wild river areas should be maintained and preserved as a proper use of rivers.

Also, in 1962 the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended that certain rivers of unusual scientific, esthetic, and recreational value be allowed to remain in their free-flowing state and natural setting without man-made alterations. Beginning in May of 1963, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture appointed a special wild rivers study team. Over an 18-month period, the team identified 73 rivers meriting some attention for preservation and studied 22 of these in some detail.

The bill I am submitting today is based on the results of this study. It is patterned after, and intended to be, a working partner to the Wilderness Act that was passed by the last Congress with very strong support in both Houses.

As the initial units in a National Wild Rivers System, the bill names six rivers.

Two of these, the Salmon, with its Middle Fork tributary, and the Middle Fork of the Clearwater, with its Lochsa and Selway tributaries, are located in my State.

Mr. President, the magnificent Salmon River system has so far escaped the works of man, and is the major nursery area for the great anadromous fish runs of the Pacific Northwest. It embraces the high mountain valleys in central Idaho, and has become nationally known as the "River of No Return." Most of the Salmon, its forks and tributaries drain the Idaho Primitive Area, a vast wilderness generally accessible only by trail and airplane. Abundant in beauty, fish and wildlife, the primitive area has long been a mecca for sportsmen of Idaho and the Nation. The main Salmon swings directly west across the center of the State through one of the most ruggedly beautiful canyons in America. When Lewis and Clark, the first white men to explore Idaho, came to this great canyon in 1805, they found it impassable. Today, white water adventurers are guided down its cataracts on rubber liferafts or specially built boats. The upper waters of the river provide ideal spawning grounds and have perpetuated the salmon runs since time immemorial. To dam the Salmon, without assured passage for the fish, would mean the end of the nurseries, and an almost fatal blow

to invaluable commercial and sports fishing. Even now, upper Columbia River developments are considered certain to impair other spawning areas as backwaters drown them out, and thus proportionately increase the importance of the Salmon River nursery in Idaho.

This bill would designate the Salmon as a wild river from the town of North Fork downstream to the town of Riggins, as well as its entire Middle Fork.

Just north of the Salmon, in north-central Idaho, is the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area. It is drained by a river the Indians called the Kooskooskia—literally translated now as the Clearwater. The Middle Fork of the Clearwater empties into the main stream at Kooskia. A few miles above Kooskia, it branches into two picturesque mountain rivers—the Lochsa, which rises near the summit of the Bitterroot Mountains to the northeast, and the Selway, which rises near the breaks of the Salmon to the southeast.

The Clearwater River also provides an important spawning area for salmon, and only one low dam near Lewiston presently spans the river. Here, ladders successfully move the fish upstream. The fish-passage problem remains to be decided at Dworshak Dam, now abuilding on the North Fork of the Clearwater, lending emphasis to the need to prevent upstream obstructions on the other forks of the river.

The bill would designate as a wild river the Middle Fork of the Clearwater from the town of Kooskia upstream to the town of Lowell; the Lochsa River from its junction with the Selway at Lowell, upstream to the Powell Range Station, and the Selway River from Lowell upstream to Thompson Flat.

Mr. President, both the Salmon and Clearwater sections flow almost entirely through public domain. There are few inholdings. Their wilderness character is presently almost 100 percent. To designate them as wild rivers will insure their unspoiled beauty for the pleasure of future generations, that their waters remain pure, and that these major salmon spawning grounds continue to supply both the sportsmen and the commercial fishing industry.

The other four rivers are a 102-mile segment of the Rogue in Oregon—also world renowned for its salmon and steelhead fishing in a setting of great beauty; a spectacular 50-mile segment of the upper Rio Grande in New Mexico; the primitive upper 63 miles of the Green River in Wyoming;

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

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the Senator from Idaho know whether or not the views of the Governors of the respective States involved were included in the initial report by the study group?

Mr. CHURCH. Although the bill itself contemplates joint Federal-State studies of those rivers specified for possible future inclusion in the system, I believe that the initial survey was done by Federal agencies. However, as the Senator knows, before any action is

taken by Congress on this legislative proposal, there will be full opportunity for the States to be heard.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is what disturbs me. The bill as introduced now includes the Green River in my State which has its source in the Bridger wilderness area to its confluence with Horse Creek near Daniel, Wyo. The Governor of the State of Wyoming was apprised by the study group that the Green River would not be included and did not have the specifics for inclusion. I should like to know who is responsible for placing the Green River in the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. The bill is an administration bill. To my knowledge, the provisions of the bill were worked out by the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and other interested Federal agencies.

Mr. SIMPSON. The Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture were represented in the study, and apprised the Governor of our State that the Green River was not subject to inclusion. I should like to know whether they have changed—

Mr. CHURCH. I cannot speak for the agencies involved in the matter the Senator refers to. I can only say that, as the Senator knows, the bill will be subject to full hearings in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am very grateful to the Senator from Idaho for his exposition of the bill. But I thought inasmuch as he had apprised me of the fact that he would be on the floor to introduce the bill, I should like to put those questions because I certainly would wish to ask them in the committee.

Mr. CHURCH. Certainly. I appreciate the fact that the Senator has done so.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield further?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the Senator from Idaho have any objection to the Senator from Wyoming placing in the Record, at the conclusion of our colloquy, a letter from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the U.S. Department of the Interior to the Governor of Wyoming?

Mr. CHURCH. I have no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION,
Denver, Colo., January 8, 1965.

HON. CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
Governor of Wyoming,
State Capitol Building,
Cheyenne, Wyo.

DEAR GOVERNOR HANSEN: The newspapers, television, and radio would indicate that I have breached my promise to you concerning the wild rivers study. First, all of us read Secretary Udall's release of January 3 about wild rivers legislation; then on the fourth, President Johnson reaffirmed this in his state of the Union message.

A check with Washington indicates that an initial legislation proposal of a broad wilderness area type with provisions for multiple-use is now being written for con-

sideration of the 89th Congress. A few selected sections of rivers which meet the criteria established by the proposed legislation may be included for classification in this or separate legislative proposals. In either event I have been assured that the upper Green River in Wyoming is not under consideration for any specific designation.

When Jules discussed the draft with you, Floyd Bishop and Harold Odde in Jackson last June, he stated that the draft reports would be consolidated into a single report by the Washington study team and then forwarded to the respective States for their review and comment. This was tentatively scheduled for last December. My latest information indicates that the consolidated report will not be completed prior to mid-February. When completed, the consolidated report will be forwarded for your review and comment.

I sincerely hope this brief explanation will allow you to alleviate the fears of your western Wyoming constituents that a crash program for classification of the Green River is in progress. I will keep you advised of the situation as new information is received. Copies of this letter are being forwarded to the Wyoming congressional delegation.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. DRESSKILL,
Regional Director.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, to recapitulate, the other four rivers are a 102-mile segment of the Rouge in Oregon—also world renowned for its salmon and steelhead fishing in a setting of great beauty; a spectacular 50-mile segment of the upper Rio Grande in New Mexico; the primitive upper 63 miles of the Green River in Wyoming; and the fabled Suwannee River in Georgia and Florida from its source in the Okefenokee Swamp 250 miles to the Gulf of Mexico; and the outlying Ichetucknee Springs.

In addition, the bill names and earmarks nine other rivers which could be added to the system by separate legislation after consultation with the various Federal agencies involved and negotiation with the Governors of the States where they are located. These are sections of the Buffalo in Tennessee, the Cacapon in West Virginia, the Eleven Point in Missouri, the upper Hudson in New York, the Missouri in Montana, the Niobrara in Nebraska, the Skagit in Washington, the Susquehanna in New York and Pennsylvania, and the Wolf in Wisconsin.

Provision is made in the bill for the addition to the system of other qualified rivers. Federal agencies would be required to assist in identifying outstanding wild river areas in future studies. The bill also provides that the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture make specific studies of wild river areas and periodically submit to the Congress their recommendations for inclusion.

The proposed method of administering the individual rivers included in the system is unique in that a portion of the national rivers would be administered by Federal agencies while others could be administered wholly by the States or jointly with the Federal Government. The two principal administering Federal agencies would be the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, the latter for those rivers located on or adjacent to national forest lands. The bill emphasizes that only a relatively small corridor

of land would be needed for control purposes.

This wild rivers legislation is a necessary corollary to the wilderness bill, but it is very different in the application of restrictions. It contemplates a limited area along the river banks which will be designated by map and included within the system, primarily for the preservation of scenic values. This does not mean that the Government must necessarily acquire ownership of the bank lands. In many cases the acquisition of a scenic easement will suffice.

As for the use of the land along the banks included within the system, the bill does not contain the exclusions which were required by the wilderness bill. No attempt is made to seal off corridors of wilderness through which the rivers flow, to the exclusion of other desirable uses of the land. Accordingly, this bill does not preclude the construction of needed roads.

Nothing in the bill affects the applicability of State water laws, impairs water rights, or affects the jurisdiction and administration authority of the States with respect to fish and wildlife.

Both lumbering and livestock grazing are allowed to continue on the bank lands, providing they do not conflict with the purpose of the bill.

Mining would continue as at present, except that it would be subject to those regulations required to effectuate the purposes of the wild rivers program.

Development of wild rivers by damming or other types of adverse uses that are normally accomplished through construction or licensing by Federal agencies would be prohibited unless expressly authorized by the Congress.

Federal action is required. The Constitution of the United States, in assigning the Federal Government power to regulate commerce among the several States, thereby gave it power to develop, or license the development, of interstate streams which are navigable or potentially navigable. Many of the remaining wild rivers fall in this category.

In conclusion, I want to stress again the importance of assuring for our children, and their children, the same opportunities for wild rivers use and inspiration that we have enjoyed. The bill that I am introducing today will accomplish this objective.

Let me quote from John Grave's book, "Goodbye to a River," in which he relives and recounts the fond experiences of his youth on the then wild Brazos River in Texas. During a last solo canoe trip down the Brazos, before it was altered forever by a series of dams, the author was again touched by his memorable experiences on the river. In dedicating his book to his newborn daughter, he hoped that the world that she had inherited would "still have a few rivers and other quiet things in it."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may appear in full at this point in the RECORD and that it may lie at the desk for 10 days, so that other Senators who may desire to join as cosponsors may have an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

The bill (S. 1446) to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. JACKSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Wild Rivers Act".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that some of the free-flowing rivers of the United States possess unique water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values of present and potential benefit to the American people. The Congress also finds that our established national policy of dam and other construction at appropriate sections of the rivers of the United States needs to be complemented by a policy that would preserve other selected rivers or sections thereof in their free-flowing condition to protect the water quality of such rivers and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes. It is the policy of Congress to preserve, develop, reclaim, and make accessible for the benefit of all of the American people selected parts of the Nation's diminishing resource of free-flowing rivers. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wild Rivers System to be composed of the areas that are designated as "wild river areas" in this Act, and the additional areas that may be designated in subsequent Acts of Congress. Areas designated as "wild river areas" by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of this Act unless the subsequent Acts provide otherwise.

DEFINITION OF WILD RIVER AREA

(b) A wild river area eligible to be included in the System is a stream or section of a stream, tributary, or river—and the related land area—that should be left in its free-flowing condition, or that should be restored to such condition, in order to promote sound water conservation, and promote the public use and enjoyment of the scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values.

NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

SEC. 3. (a) The following rivers, or segments thereof, and related, adjacent lands, most of which are public lands, as generally depicted on maps numbered —, are hereby designated as "wild river areas":

(1) Salmon, Idaho—The Salmon from town of North Fork downstream to the town of Riggins; and the entire Middle Fork.

(2) Clearwater, Middle Fork, Idaho—The Middle Fork from the town of Kooskia upstream to the town of Lowell; the Lochsa River from its junction with the Selway at Lowell forming the Middle Fork, upstream to the Powell Ranger Station; and the Selway River from Lowell upstream to Thompson Flat.

(3) Rogue, Oregon—The segment extending from the town of Grants Pass to the Pacific Ocean.

(4) Rio Grande, New Mexico—The segment extending from the Colorado State line

downstream to near the town of Pilar, and the lower four miles of the Red River.

(5) Green, Wyoming—The segment extending from its origin in the Bridger Wilderness Area, south to its confluence with Horse Creek.

(6) Suwanee, Georgia and Florida—Entire river from its source in the Okefenokee Swamp in Georgia to the Gulf, and the outlying Ichetucknee Springs, Florida.

Said maps shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

FEDERAL-STATE PLANNING FOR ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture where national forest lands are involved, after consultation with interested Federal agencies, are directed to consult with the Governors and officials of the States in which the rivers listed below are located to ascertain whether a joint Federal-State plan is feasible and desirable in the public interest to conserve segments of these rivers. They shall submit to the President their recommendations for inclusion of any or all of them in the National Wild Rivers System, and the President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate:

(1) Buffalo, Tennessee—The entire river from its beginning in Lawrence County to its confluence with the Duck River.

(2) Cacapon, West Virginia—Entire river from near the town of Wardensville to its confluence with the Potomac.

(3) Eleven Point, Missouri—The segment of the river extending from a point near Greer Springs downstream to State Highway 142.

(4) Hudson, New York—The segment of the mainstream extending from its origin in the Adirondack Park downstream to the vicinity of the town of Lucerne; Boreas River from its mouth to Durgin Brook; Indian River from its mouth to Abanakee Dam; and Cedar River from its mouth to Cedar River flow.

(5) Missouri, Montana—The segment upstream from Fort Peck Reservoir toward the town of Fort Benton.

(6) Niobrara, Nebraska—The mainstream segment lying between the confluence of Antelope Creek downstream to the headwaters of the proposed Norden Reservoir east of the town of Valentine, and the lower eight miles of its Snake River tributary.

(7) Skagit, Washington—The Skagit from the town of Mount Vernon upstream to George Powerhouse near the town of New-Halem; the Cascade River from its mouth to the confluence of the North and South Forks; the Sauk from its mouth to Elliott Creek; and the Sulattle from its mouth to Milk Creek.

(8) Susquehanna, New York and Pennsylvania—The segment of the Susquehanna River from a dam at Cooperstown, New York, downstream to the town of Pittston, Pennsylvania.

(9) Wolf, Wisconsin—The segment reaching from the confluence of the Hunting River downstream to the town of Keshena.

RIVER BASIN PLANNING FOR ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(c) In all planning for the use and development of water and related land resources, consideration shall be given by all Federal agencies involved to potential wild river areas, and all river basin and project plan reports submitted to the Congress shall discuss any such potentials. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make specific studies and investigations to determine which additional wild river areas within the United States shall be evaluated in planning reports by all Federal agencies as potential alternative uses of the water and related land resources involved.

OTHER ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(d) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall also submit to the President from time to time their recommendations for inclusion in the National Wild Rivers System of any other river or segment thereof. The President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate.

(e) Recommendations made under this section shall be developed in consultation with the States, those Federal agencies which normally participate in the development of recreation plans and comprehensive river basin plans, any commissions established pursuant to interstate compacts the assigned responsibilities of which would be affected, and commissions or other bodies which may be established for the purpose of developing a comprehensive plan for the river basin within which the contemplated wild river area would be located. Each such recommendation shall be accompanied by (1) expressions of any views which the agencies and States consulted pursuant to the foregoing may submit within ninety days after having been notified of the proposed recommendation, (2) a statement setting forth the probable effect of the recommended action on any comprehensive river basin plan that may have been adopted by Congress or that is serving as a guide for coordinating Federal programs in the basin, and (3) in the absence of such plan, a statement indicating the probable effect of the recommended action on alternative beneficial uses of the resources of the basin.

NEED FOR LAND ACQUISITION

(f) Any recommendation for an addition to the National Wild Rivers System shall indicate the extent to which land will need to be acquired by the State and by the Federal Government, and the extent to which the acquisition of scenic easements or other interests in land may be an adequate substitute for the acquisition of a fee title.

ADMINISTRATION OF SYSTEM

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the wild river area designated by subsection 3(a) paragraphs (4) and (6) and the Secretary of Agriculture shall administer the areas designated by paragraphs (1) and (2). The area designated by paragraphs (3) and (5) shall be administered in a manner agreed upon by the two Secretaries, or as directed by the President.

(b) Wild river areas designated by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior except that: (1) when the wild river area is wholly within, partly within, or closely adjacent to, a national forest such area shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture unless it is also partly within, or closely adjacent to, an area administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in which event the wild river area shall be administered in such manner as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, or as directed by the President; and (2) when the wild river area, exclusive of the bed of the stream, contains lands or interests therein planned to be owned wholly or substantially by a State or political subdivision thereof or by an Indian tribe, it shall be administered in such manner as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture if the wild river area is within or closely adjacent to a national forest, and the State agencies or Indian tribe involved. The States shall be encouraged to cooperate in the planning and management of such areas. Any Federal land located within a wild river area may, with the consent of the agency having jurisdiction thereof, be transferred to the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary for ad-

ministration as part of the wild river area. Any land transferred hereunder to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture for administration as part of a wild river area in connection with the National Forest System shall become national forest land.

(c) Within the exterior boundaries of a wild river area or portion thereof under his administration, the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire lands and waters or interests therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise. Any such lands acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture within or adjacent to a national forest shall upon acquisition become national forest lands. Money appropriated for Federal purposes from the Land and Water Conservation Fund shall be available for the acquisition of property for the purposes of this Act.

(d) A wild river area shall be administered for the purposes of water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values contributing to public enjoyment, but without limitation on other uses, including timber harvesting and livestock grazing, that are harmonious with these purposes. The Secretary of the Interior, in administering such areas, may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas of the National Park System and such statutory authorities otherwise available to him for recreation and preservation purposes, and the conservation and management of natural resources, as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture, in administering such areas, shall utilize the statutory authorities relating to the national forests in such manner as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The Federal Power Commission shall not authorize the construction, operation, or maintenance of any dam or other project work under the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1063), as amended (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), in any wild river area except as specifically authorized by the Congress.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall affect the applicability of the United States mining and mineral leasing laws within the National Wild Rivers System, except that all prospecting, all mining operations, and all other activities on a mining claim perfected after the date of this Act, either before or after the issuance of patent, and all mining operations and other activities under a mineral lease, license, or permit hereafter issued, shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of national forest lands, may prescribe to effectuate the purposes of this Act. Any patent so issued shall recite this limitation. All such regulations shall provide among other things for safeguards against pollution of the river. Any portion of a wild river area that is within the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be subject to the mining and mineral leasing provisions of both the Wilderness Act and this Act, and in case of conflict the more restrictive provisions shall apply.

(c) The head of any Federal agency administering a wild river area shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with the appropriate State water pollution control agencies, for the purpose of eliminating or diminishing the pollution of waters within a wild river area.

(d) The jurisdiction of the States and the United States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be determined by established principles of law. For the purpose of this Act, any taking by the United States of a water right that is beneficially used at the time a wild river area is established, that is vested under

State law at that time, and that prior to the date of this Act would have been compensable, shall entitle the owner thereof to just compensation.

(e) Nothing in this Act shall affect the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the States under other provisions of law with respect to fish and wildlife.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

GRADUAL REDUCTION AND ELIMINATION OF TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general telephone service.

The tax on general telephone service was imposed at the beginning of World War II, along with taxes on other utility services, in order to reduce traffic on the war-loaded communications network. However, this tax is still in effect despite the fact that there has been a tremendous expansion of our communications systems, and the wartime emergency has long since passed. The telephone is the only household utility subject to selective excise tax. Other services, such as electric power and land transportation, have had the tax removed.

I think that there can be little argument that the telephone today is a necessary household item. Therefore, the continuation of this tax cannot be justified on that ground. Police, fire, and other emergency protection is largely dependent on telephone service. Although less than 40 percent of U.S. households had telephone service in 1940, the percentage has doubled since then and now well over 80 percent of all households have a telephone. Even among those households with less than \$3,000 annual income, the so-called poverty level, as described by this administration, about 50 percent have telephone service.

The gradual elimination of the general telephone tax would provide significant tax relief to those people who need it most—the middle and low income families. Bureau of Census figures for March 1960 show that 86 percent of households with telephones had annual incomes of less than \$10,000; 53 percent had incomes of less than \$6,000; and 20 percent had incomes of less than \$3,000. Since nearly half the revenue raised by this tax comes from business users, its elimination would mean lower costs for essential products and services, which would also be a tremendous benefit to middle and lower income families.

The continuation of the general telephone tax also has the effect of causing more large business communications users to own and operate their own communications facilities in order to avoid the tax. This leads to higher cost common carrier service for small users and to less efficient use of the Nation's communications resources.

The arguments in favor of the repeal of this tax have been ably presented many times. The only reason for its

continuance is its desirability as a revenue-raising device. I think my bill eliminates the difficulties which would accompany a sudden revenue loss, and at the same time permits us to keep faith with the American people.

The revenue from the general telephone tax for 1965 is estimated at \$550 million, based on a tax rate of 10 percent. My bill would reduce this by one-fifth, or by about \$110 million for the first year. The tax would be further reduced by one-fifth each year until its complete elimination by January 1, 1969.

By so doing, we would avoid the disruption of revenue loss within 1 year, and it would result in the complete elimination of this tax over a period of time, an elimination which seems highly desirable to almost all of the American public.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1447) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general telephone service, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF ANTIDUMPING ACT OF 1921

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators DOMN, EDWARD KENNEDY, and RIBICOFF, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921 to prevent the dumping of surplus firearms and ammunition by foreign governments.

The dumping of these products has created a serious problem for American companies affiliated with the sporting-arms industry. Although the Senate Finance Committee in its report on the antidumping law amendments of 1958 stated that "the antidumping feature of our Tariff Act is of considerable importance in protecting domestic industries from inroads of foreign goods sold or offered for sale at less than fair value," it has not been of assistance to this particular industry. Approximately 100,000 foreign military surplus firearms were imported during 1964. Further, there is no indication as to how many foreign military surplus firearms are in bonded warehouses at various U.S. ports since these guns do not appear as "imports into the United States" until such time as duty has been paid on them.

Our bill would seek to remedy this situation by bringing the antidumping law into operation when foreign government surplus firearms and ammunition are imported at a price that is less than the cost of production as determined in the manner provided by law.

We all know of the difficulties which have arisen in recent years because of the ease with which individuals can obtain guns regardless of the purposes for which they will be used. We would hope that, quite apart from the remedy which this legislation would provide to an industry which is important to our Nation, a major effect of this legislation would be

to reduce the availability of surplus firearms at prices that are attractive to juveniles and to petty criminals.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1448) to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921, in order to provide that the foreign market value of imported firearms and ammunition which have been disposed of as surplus by a foreign government shall, for the purposes of such act, be not less than the constructed value of the merchandise; introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE STATE OF NEW YORK SHOULD RAISE ITS LEGAL DRINKING AGE TO 21

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I submit a Senate concurrent resolution, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], for appropriate reference.

The concurrent resolution would express the sense of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the State of New York should raise its minimum legal drinking age from 18 to 21. This would make the same minimum drinking age effective in the five States and Canada which border on New York.

The concurrent resolution was submitted earlier in the House of Representatives by Congresswoman FLORENCE P. DWYER. I am honored by the cosponsorship of Senator RIBICOFF, the former Governor of Connecticut and a leader in national highway safety. I ask that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 24

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring):

Whereas the State of New York is the only one of the fifty States which permits by law the sale of liquor to boys and girls of eighteen years of age; and

Whereas the five States which border on New York—New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Vermont—together with the Government of Canada all restrict the sale of alcoholic beverages to persons twenty-one years of age or older; and

Whereas over the years, a thriving trade has developed at many points along the border of New York adjacent to its five neighboring States and Canada in which bars and taverns cater to teenagers from outside New York who are prohibited from purchasing and consuming alcoholic beverages by the laws of their own jurisdictions; and

Whereas many boys and girls as young as fourteen and fifteen years of age, and therefore manifestly immature, are able to misrepresent their age as eighteen and purchase and consume such alcoholic beverages in New York; and

Whereas the unsupervised and unrestricted drinking of alcoholic beverages by teenagers, in public and private, has been demonstrated to result in a variety of harm-

ful, antisocial and immoral activities and behavior including, but not limited to, reckless and drunken driving, assaults upon persons and property and other forms of delinquency; and

Whereas teenage drinking in New York and the behavior associated with it have directly resulted in a growing number of deaths, injuries, and destruction of property in the States adjoining New York; and

Whereas the burdens on law enforcement officials in the jurisdictions adjacent to New York have increased proportionately and have necessitated such extraordinary procedures as the erection of roadblocks to apprehend teenagers returning from drinking in New York; and

Whereas the Governors of the several States, individually and in association with each other through such groups as the New England Governors Conference, together with other State officials outside New York have frequently and formally protested to the Governor and the Legislature of New York that the disparity in minimum legal drinking ages has created serious health and safety problems for their respective States and have petitioned New York to raise its drinking age to twenty-one; and

Whereas, despite many official and unofficial studies of the issue and massive evidence of the need to increase the drinking age in New York from eighteen to twenty-one, the government of New York has failed to take appropriate action; and

Whereas the issue of teenage drinking in New York has for many years ceased to be an intrastate matter, of interest and concern solely to the people and the government of New York, and has had increasingly critical interstate effects and implications; and

Whereas the failure of New York to take remedial action and its persistence in providing havens wherein young people from outside the State can obtain alcoholic beverages denied them in their own States has caused a severe strain in the official relations between New York and its neighboring States; and

Whereas the only practicable means of resolving the dispute is for the State of New York to raise its legal minimum drinking age to twenty-one; and

Whereas Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, as elected officials representing the people of their respective States and districts, have an interest in the teenage drinking problem arising from their obligation to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the people they represent; and

Whereas serious constitutional questions might be raised with respect to any attempt by the Congress to legislate directly with regard to the transportation and sale of alcoholic beverages within the several States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America hereby express their—

(1) concern at the evidence of the harmful effects on young people, the growing threat to highway safety, and the deteriorating relations between the several States directly resulting from New York State's minimum legal drinking age of eighteen; and

(2) support of the efforts of responsible officials of the several States adjoining New York to persuade the State of New York to raise its drinking age from eighteen to twenty-one.

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Senate and House of Representatives that the Governor and the Legislature of the State of New York, in the interests of harmony and cooperation between the States, of the promotion of highway safety, and of the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the States bordering on New York, should take appropriate action at the earliest practicable time to raise the

State's minimum legal drinking age from eighteen to twenty-one.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, residents of New Jersey have long been concerned about the unusual situation in the neighboring State of New York, which permits youngsters in the age bracket of 18 to 21 to buy drinks freely. This unsupervised and unrestricted drinking of alcoholic beverages by teenagers, in public and private, has resulted in a variety of harmful activities, including reckless and drunken driving, assaults upon persons and property, and other forms of delinquency.

It is heartening to many of us that Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, last week said that he would approve a bill to raise New York's minimum drinking age from 18 to 21, should the New York State Legislature pass such a bill.

The New York State Legislature is in session currently, and I am hopeful that the announcement by the Governor, added to the fact that the majority party in the New York State Legislature has a platform plank which supports such legislation, will result in finally ending this difficult and dangerous situation.

Numerous public officials and publications have pointed to the need for such legislative action, and I am hopeful that the adoption of a concurrent resolution in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States will expedite action by our friends in New York State. As Congresswoman DWYER has pointed out, in New Jersey alone during the 7-year period of 1955 through 1961, there were 27 accidents, 33 fatalities and 55 injuries resulting directly from the drinking of alcoholic beverages in New York by New Jersey drivers under 21 years of age. Since then, the rate has nearly doubled. In the 3-year period from 1962 through 1964 there were 19 accidents, 24 deaths, and 33 injuries from the same cause.

Dramatic facts such as these underscore the need for prompt and effective action, and I am grateful to Senator RIBICOFF for joining with me in this bipartisan effort. We shall do everything we can to bring an end to this unwholesome situation.

MEDICARE—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NO. 47 THROUGH NO. 51)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, although I am a cosponsor of S. 395, introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and still believe that this is probably the best of all proposals for providing health care for older people, I am also a realist.

The House is now considering the administration's medicare bill—a measure which has been built up in the public mind far beyond its capacity to provide benefits.

Since the administration controls both Houses of Congress by a 2-to-1 margin, however, it would seem that the President's desire will likely prevail.

If medicare is to prevail, as now seems likely, it should provide benefits somewhere near commensurate with the expectation that have been built up for it.

I am, therefore, offering five amendments to S. 1 which will, if approved, have the effect of really benefiting those older people who might be left high and dry under the bill as now written.

I ask that these amendments be printed and referred to the committee which will consider the bill itself.

These amendments will not by any means insure a perfect bill or even an adequate bill and I may offer others later on.

They will, however, go far toward preventing disappointment among those who have been led to believe that they would be helped by S. 1 as now written.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

(The amendments were referred to the Committee on Finance.)

WINFIELD K. DENTON LOCKS AND DAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, my legal residence is at Evansville, Ind., on the Ohio River. It is a community in which I took my undergraduate work in college at Evansville College, whose basketball exploits have this year received national attention because the team is unbeaten.

It is also a community which I served as mayor before coming to this body.

During the many years in which I was a part of the educational, civic, governmental, and political life of Evansville, WINFIELD K. DENTON was a leader in all these fields. WINFIELD K. DENTON has served his city, his area, his State, and his Nation in many outstanding ways.

Mr. DENTON was an officer in the U.S. Army in World War I and in World War II. He was a member of the Indiana General Assembly. He has been prosecuting attorney in Vanderburgh County. With the exception of a single 2-year period, WINFIELD K. DENTON has represented the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana in the Congress since January 1949.

Of all the fields in which Representative DENTON has worked, none has met with more outstanding success than his efforts at water resource conservation and development. Representative DENTON is a champion of effective development and use of good, clean water and of preventing the kind of floods that all of us who live along the great avenue of the Ohio River find all too familiar.

Currently, as my colleagues know, the Ohio River is being recanalized to make it more able to cope with the needs of a growing America and a growing American heartland. The Ohio River carries vastly more tonnage than any other waterway in the entire world, including the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Near its beautiful waters grow corn, soybeans, pastureland, wheat, and much of America's food and fiber. Under the adjacent lands lie coal, oil, gypsum, limestone, and other valuable minerals. Along its banks are new industries providing power for atomic development and new industries pouring forth aluminum and other modern necessities. Abraham

Lincoln's ferryboat plied the Ohio near Rockport, Ind.

Yet, the beauty of the river and its valley is only now beginning to be tapped for recreation, for tourist attractions, for transportation, and for industry.

One man whose steadfast devotion to the Ohio River and its development who has made much of this possible is WINFIELD K. DENTON.

Near the landing place of Mr. Lincoln's ferry new locks are being constructed at Cannelton, Ind. It is a matter of right, Mr. President, that these locks be named for Representative DENTON who would in this way, in his lifetime receive some recognition for his magnificent and unsung service to his constituents and to all America.

Therefore, I propose and introduce legislation herewith to rename the Cannelton locks and dam on the Ohio River "Winfield K. Denton locks and dam."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1453) to change the name of the Cannelton locks and dam in the State of Indiana to the Winfield K. Denton locks and dam, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR EXPENSES IN PROVIDING HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of S. 12, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education.

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

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it is well known that the cost of higher education is increasing every year. The many parents across the Nation who are providing their children with a college education are most aware of this. They have been meeting these necessary but heavy expenditures in spite of our tax laws, which do not, in my view, fully recognize the dependency of children in college. In many cases, young people have not been able to continue their education because of the high costs. With the increasing number of college-age people and the growing need for advanced education, this problem is becoming more serious. Our tax laws should be amended to encourage rather than discourage advanced education. It is clearly in the best interest of the country that such a change be made.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am cosponsoring S. 12 because it provides this necessary tax change. There are many features of the bill which recommend it over other legislation to amend our tax laws. It also complements other measures designed to aid higher education.

In the first place, the bill recognizes that families with different income levels face different problems when it comes to financing their children's higher education. The lower income families have

traditionally been favored when scholarships are offered. For example, nearly three-fourths of the National Defense Education Act loans were granted to families with incomes of less than \$6,000. On the other hand, high-income families do not face such a strain when paying for college education. Therefore, the bill gives less tax relief for families with income over \$25,000 and no relief at all for a family earning \$57,500 or more.

Since the many families in the middle-income group are hit the hardest when their sons and daughters go to school, this bill is designed to help that 62 percent of families with incomes between \$3,000 and \$10,000. Nearly two-thirds of the total tax saving will accrue to this middle-income group.

Second, the proposed amendment allows a tax credit on as much as \$1,500 of college expenses. This is better than a tax exemption or deduction which only reduces taxable income because families in the lower tax brackets realize little savings by just reducing their taxable income. A tax credit, on the other hand, is a direct reduction from the taxpayer's payment. After the taxpayer computes his taxes due the Government, he will reduce that payment depending on how much he has spent for certain college expenses—tuition, books, fees, and supplies. The tax credit will reduce the first \$200 of such expenses by 75 percent. Therefore, he must pay only one-fourth of college expenses up to \$200. The next \$300 of expenses will be reduced by 25 percent due to the tax credit. The final \$1,000 of expenses results in a 10-percent tax saving.

This feature recognizes the difference between those who attend public school and those in private colleges. The largest percentage reduction goes to those with children in the relatively low cost State universities and land-grant institutions since they will pay only 25 percent of college expenses up to \$200. Parents with children in higher cost private schools will receive more dollars of tax credit, but will pay a higher percentage of their expenses.

Another feature of the bill which deserves attention is that anyone who pays for a student's college education will be eligible for the tax credit. This includes parents, students themselves, or anyone else. This encourages private sources to finance college students.

I am cosponsoring the bill because it, above all other such tax amendments, deals directly with one of the country's great national problems. That problem is how can the average American afford to give his son or daughter the education necessary to succeed in our rapidly changing world. As a nation, we must make this investment in our future. It promises to yield a far greater return than the nominal cost of some lost tax revenue. As a cosponsor, I urge support of this important proposed legislation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Idaho

[Mr. CHURCH] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 709) to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 708) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that only those clubs whose annual dues exceed \$25 a year will be subject to the tax on club dues.

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on January 26, 1965, I introduced a bill (S. 735) creating a commission to be known as the Commission for Elimination of Pornographic Materials. I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill, the name of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] be listed as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 974) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes, the names of Senators RANDOLPH, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, NELSON, PROUTY, and JAVITS be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 1045) to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes, the name of Mr. TYDINGS be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, 24 other Senators have joined with me as cosponsors of my bill, S. 1203, concerning income tax deductibility for the expense of teachers in continuing their education. The bill was held at the desk through last Friday, but two of my colleagues who desire to join us were not included in the first printing of the bill.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the names of Senator CLARK and Senator MUNDT may also be added at the next printing.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be added as a cosponsor of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following

names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 10, 1965:

S. 1095. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Authority of February 17, 1965:

S. 1172. A bill to establish a National Teacher Corps: Mr. CLARK, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Authority of February 18, 1965:

S. 1203. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of providing entitlement to such deduction: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. DODD, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. TOWER, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Authority of February 23, 1965:

S. 1251. A bill to prescribe certain safety features for all motor vehicles manufactured for, sold, or shipped in interstate commerce: Mr. BIBLE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. McGEE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Authority of February 25, 1965:

S. 1297. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the silver content of certain coins of the United States, and for other purposes: Mr. GRUENING.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 8, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 301) to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

Address delivered by Senator RANDOLPH before 20th annual convention, National Limestone Institute, Inc., Washington, D.C., January 18, 1965.

STATEMENT BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ON THE TESTIMONY GIVEN BY DON B. REYNOLDS BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last Thursday two Members of our friendly party across the aisle undertook to criticize rather stringently the action of the majority of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration in relying on a memorandum prepared by the FBI for the Attorney General dealing with the

credibility of one of the witnesses, Don B. Reynolds, who appeared before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

I should like to read into the RECORD a brief statement made to the press on Thursday evening by the Attorney General, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach:

STATEMENT BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Questions have been raised about the Department of Justice report to the Senate Rules Committee concerning testimony given by Don B. Reynolds in executive session on December 1, 1964. The Department submitted this report to the Senate Rules Committee on February 25, 1965, pursuant to the unanimous request of the members of the committee that the Department investigate allegations made by Mr. Reynolds at this executive session.

This report was a detailed, 16,000-word résumé of extensive FBI investigation of each of Mr. Reynolds' allegations. I submitted it to the committee in the belief that it accurately described the investigation.

In the light of the questions raised, however, there are two statements which should be made about the investigation and the report. First, Mr. Hoover has confirmed to me that no limitations were placed on the FBI in this investigation. Second, Mr. Hoover has reviewed this report and confirms my belief that the report is accurate and succinctly portrays the facts developed during the FBI investigation.

MARCH 4, 1965.

PROPOSED REVISION OF COTTON PROGRAM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there is ample evidence that a piecemeal and patchwork approach accomplishes little, if anything, toward alleviating the problems of agriculture in the United States. It has long been my contention that rather than solving these problems, it compounds them.

No better demonstration of this fact can be found than in the hodgepodge of laws relating to cotton. In 1963, I urged Congress to adopt a cotton program which would mark a new approach and which would release cotton from the bonds of past mistakes and ineffective laws. My bill was cosponsored in the Senate by the then Senator from Minnesota, who is now the distinguished Vice President of the United States. The Talmadge-Humphrey bill was designed to strike the shackles of Government bondage from the cotton farmer, to give him an opportunity to farm, to increase his income, and to get the Federal Government out of the business of buying, selling, storing, shipping, and giving away cotton. At the same time, the Talmadge-Humphrey bill was aimed at eliminating the inequitable two-priced cotton system, thereby putting American textile manufacturers on an equal competitive basis with foreign mills. And not the least important feature of the Talmadge-Humphrey bill was that it would have greatly reduced Government costs and brought much needed relief to the American taxpayer. In the simplest and most direct terms possible, the Talmadge-Humphrey bill was designed to restore cotton to the free enterprise system.

Unfortunately, various segments of the cotton industry were divided as to what action should be taken relative to cotton,

with the result that the Congress again resorted to piecemeal and stopgap legislation.

And what, Mr. President, has been the record since then? The situation has not improved and in some respects, it has worsened. On February 25, I received a letter from Idris Traylor, president of the Lubbock Cotton Exchange at Lubbock, Tex. Mr. Traylor states:

The present cotton program is not working successfully. It has brought about a decrease in cotton exports, an increase in Government cotton stocks and much added costs, and a reduction in the cotton farmers income.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Traylor's letter in its entirety be printed in the RECORD.

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

LUBBOCK COTTON EXCHANGE,
Lubbock, Tex., February 25, 1965.

SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TALMADGE: This is to be a lengthy letter and I beg of you to please read its entirety as it is the only way we have of conveying to you the seriousness of cotton and the cotton industry. The present cotton program is not working successfully. It has brought about a decrease in cotton exports, an increase in Government cotton stocks and much added costs, and a reduction in the cotton farmers income.

For a period beginning August 1, 1964, to the present, cotton exports are about 40 percent of what they were a year ago during this same period. Exports in the 1963-64 season were 5,700,000 bales. The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that exports for the current season will reach approximately 4,500,000 bales. The cotton trade believes the export figure will be somewhere around 3 million bales. Up to February 9, 1965, we have only exported 1,758,000 bales. As of now, the total number of bales that have been taken into the loan this season is 6,946,000. We have redeemed 832,100 bales up through February 5, 1965. The Government has 10 sales programs currently being conducted. Cotton sales of three of these programs are listed below, these figures being the sales through February 8, 1965:

NOC-26.....	1,722,986
NOC-28.....	478,154
NOC-29.....	486,456
Total.....	2,687,596

The figures on the other seven programs are negligible and would not affect the above figure. As you can see, the Government has accumulated over 3 million more bales added to their already tremendous stock. The Government stock August 1, 1961, was approximately 1,485,000 bales. Today it is pushing the 14 million bale mark and is costing the Government hundreds of millions of dollars to carry on this program.

The cotton marketing co-ops in Texas have been a detriment to the marketing program. Unfortunately, they are encouraged by the Department of Agriculture. Some of these co-ops have cotton storage facilities and offer premiums to producers to surrender control of cotton to them after which a good percentage of this cotton is dead to the market as storage fees are more profitable than what these co-ops can garner for merchandising operations. The Government, of course, is paying the bill.

On the south plains of Texas, we raise approximately 2 million bales and the past two seasons saw 60-70 percent going into Government loans through co-ops and form A's. As

you know, the Commodity Credit Corporation ran completely out of money and 2 weeks ago was appropriated another \$1,600 million to carry on for the balance of the season.

In years past, the Department of Agriculture would confer with the cotton trade relative to what was needed, but this is no longer the case. Last season, the Department secretly conceived and suddenly announced the NOC-25 program whereby charges on form G and A were canceled with the Government taking the loss on all these carrying charges. No one can estimate the loss to merchants who were then carrying stocks of cotton and bearing all the cost of the carrying charges. This action shook the confidence of the entire legitimate cotton trade which resulted in hand-to-mouth buying and forced more cotton into the loan.

The elimination of micronaire premiums and discounts in the loan was a damaging factor for cotton. Premiums and discounts are now figured by the Government in its sales of acquired cotton while cotton continues to enter the loan with no distinction between low and high micronaire readings. New crop sales are adversely affected as a result of this. We urge restoration of the premiums and discounts in succeeding loans.

In Lubbock, Tex., alone, there have been 22 legitimate cotton offices closed in the past 2 years and these were all taxpaying firms.

There is only one simple solution to this serious condition and that is to pay the farmer a direct subsidy. The direct subsidy should be supplemented by support prices at a level that will permit cotton to move at the world price. Give them enough subsidy that they can survive and let them sell their cotton whether it go export or domestic. This will eliminate the tremendous Government cost and the cotton merchants of the United States will find a place somewhere in the world for every bale of American cotton. It will eventually restore our future markets whereby the cotton merchants can again stock cotton and protect themselves by hedges in the future market. The Talmadge-Humphrey bill provided for a direct subsidy when it was introduced into Congress last year. This is the best farm bill that has been presented to the Congress in many years. Our Congressman told us that the farmers did not want a direct subsidy. We have talked to thousands and they certainly do not oppose taking the subsidy. Wheat producers receive a direct subsidy and are very much satisfied with this direct subsidy.

The survival of the cotton industry depends on your decision, and we plead with you to study this carefully and help us in our fight to survive. If you should want any information, we shall be glad to help in any way we can.

Yours very truly,
IDRIS TRAYLOR,
President, Lubbock Cotton Exchange.

REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, ever since 1910, the people of California have enjoyed the right of initiative and referendum under our State constitution. By "initiative" I mean that under the California constitution the people are given the right to initiate, by appropriate petition, suggested legislation or changes in their State constitution. By "referendum," I mean that right by which the people themselves may refer actions on the part of the State legislature to the electorate, who then may finally determine whether they want or do not want to retain the legislation previously approved by the legislature.

The other day, I had an opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary which, as Senators know, is considering a proposed constitutional amendment to provide that the people in each State shall have a continuing right at the ballot box to determine the apportionment of one house of a two-house legislature based on factors other than population.

On the occasion of my appearance, I suggested to the subcommittee that it seriously consider writing into the proposed constitutional amendment—which I have coauthored, by the way—the right on the part of the people in each State to initiate legislation in the field of reapportionment. If this proposal were adopted, I think it would be one more clear demonstration that our proposed constitutional amendment seeks to give to the people themselves, at the ballot box, under judicial review, a continuing right to make their own determination with respect to apportionment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my comments to the subcommittee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PARTIAL TEXT OF REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, MARCH 3, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I believe that a constitutional amendment should be submitted by Congress for ratification at the State level which would permit the people of a State to determine whether or not they desire one house of a bicameral State legislature to be apportioned on other than a strict population basis. Thus, I coauthored Senate Joint Resolution 2 introduced by Senator DIRKSEN and almost 40 of our colleagues in both parties.

On June 15, 1964, in *Reynolds v. Sims* and several related cases, the Supreme Court of the United States found it had no choice but to apply the principle of one-man one-vote in accordance with the spirit of the equal protection of the laws clause of the 14th amendment to our Constitution. In brief, after years of failure by many State legislatures to resolve questions of malapportionment in their own State, the Court found it had no choice but to take the course which it did. A constitutional vacuum clearly existed as that great document did not specify the representational relationship which should exist between the citizens of a State and its State legislature.

I have long been impressed with the wisdom uttered by Justice Brandeis when he dissented in *New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann* (285 U.S. 262 (1932)):

"To stay experimentation in things social and economic is a grave responsibility. Denial of the right to experiment may be fraught with serious consequences to the Nation. It is one of the happy incidents of the Federal system that a single courageous State may, if its citizens choose, serve as a laboratory; and try novel social and economic experiments without risk to the rest of the country. This Court has the power to prevent an experiment. We may strike down the statute which embodies it on the ground that, in our opinion, the measure is arbitrary, capricious or unreasonable. We have power to do this, because the due process clause has been held by the Court applicable to matters of substantive law as well as to matters of procedure. But in the exercise

of this high power, we must be ever on our guard, lest we erect our prejudices into legal principles. If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold."

Both in governmental organization and in the policies which it seeks to carry out, a State should have the opportunity, if its people so desire, to serve as a laboratory and to experiment with the relationship between the elected and the electorate which might best fit its needs. Thus, Congress has a duty to render a decision on basic policy by submitting a constitutional amendment dealing with apportionment to permit the people in each State to decide on a continuing basis what form of legislative representation they desire. The people may, if they desire, choose the criterion of "one-man, one-vote." It is possible that because of overriding historic, geographic, economic, and other factors in their State, that they would wish to select a system of apportionment which adequately takes such factors into account. But let the choice be the peoples', provided, of course, that the system selected does not violate other constitutional and statutory guarantees such as those prohibiting discrimination because of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex, among others. Any reapportionment provision of the Constitution must, of course, continue to be subject to judicial review in its use by the people of the several States as to reasonableness and as to fidelity with constitutional guarantees.

Difficult questions arise as to the application of the "one-man, one-vote" principle below the State legislative level (such as a county board of supervisors or local school board) and deviation from its application in a unicameral situation. I do not believe any amendment we submit to the States should prohibit this principle from being applied in these situations.

While I recognize the desire for stability in governmental institutions, my personal view is that we should not limit the time period during which the people of a State would have the opportunity to decide or to reconsider the advisability of apportioning one house on other than a population basis or of reconstituting the legislative districts. Practically, the decennial census will largely limit such considerations.

In California and other Western States, the initiative and referendum provide a means by which the people can decide fundamental issues such as the one now before us. An initiative measure, designed either to amend the California Constitution or simply to enact legislation, is placed on the ballot by the secretary of state when its backers secure the signatures of 8 percent of the number voting for Governor in the last general election on a petition which sets forth in full the proposed amendment or law. The question is then decided by a majority vote at the next general election or at any special statewide election.

In California, the compulsory constitutional referendum, provides that, following approval by two-thirds of both houses, a legislative act to amend the constitution is submitted to the people and is agreed to if favored by a majority of those voting. The State constitution also provides that "if any provision or provisions of two or more measures, approved by the electors at the same election, conflict, the provision or provisions of the measure receiving the highest affirmative vote shall prevail" (art. IV, sec. 1).

I believe that this committee, in the interest of uniformity of the way in which the people in each State might best make known their will on apportioning their legislature, and have the potential of expressing their views on the issue should a sufficient number desire it, may wish to consider the possibility of a uniform initiative and referendum procedure to apply in each State on this question. At any rate, I hope this committee may

consider such subject matter. Thus language might be added to a joint resolution reported by this committee which would provide:

"In any State in which the membership of any portion of its legislature is allocated pursuant to any plan upon a basis other than population, such plan shall be resubmitted to the qualified electors of that State for approval or disapproval, by a majority of the votes cast upon such plan in a general or special election or in a referendum conducted under the law of that State, either by the legislature or upon the filing with the chief election officer of that State of a petition for such resubmission which bears the duly certified names of qualified electors of that State in number at least equal to 5 percent of the number of all votes cast for all candidates for the office of Governor at the last preceding general election at which a Governor of that State was elected."

Finally, I believe this committee should give careful consideration to the method the States should use in ratifying any proposed amendment submitted to them by Congress. Certainly, it would not be in the public interest to have a State legislature, malapportioned on a "rotten borough" basis, itself approve such ratification. One could argue, however, that even if this situation did occur, the implementation of such an amendment would be inoperable in the State, until the people of that State themselves, at the ballot box, had passed judgment on the question.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the committee and I urge that your committee give early and favorable consideration to an appropriate resolution, such as Senate Joint Resolution 2, which will resolve the vexing situation which now exists.

THE NATION'S NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I had the honor this morning to speak before the 30th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, held at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in the Nation's Capital. I ask unanimous consent that a partial text of my comments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOURCES OF PEOPLE

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the 30th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, Washington, D.C., March 8, 1965)

A great conservationist and dedicated public servant of a former day, the late Republican Senator Hiram W. Johnson, of California, once said: "Since man emancipated himself . . . men have been dreaming dreams for man and mankind, and it is the dreaming of these dreams that has marked the milestones in human progress during all the centuries past."

Let us ask ourselves, as conservationists: What are our dreams for America?

Are they dreams of green forests, lush valleys, unpolluted rivers, burgeoning wildlife, clean air, and mountains primeval?

Are they dreams of realistic and sensible utilization of our natural resources so that some of our fellow citizens can earn their livelihood in mining, in grazing, in timber, and in fishing?

Are they dreams of roadways spanning the continent which are constructed not only to move people faster from place to place, but also to enrich one's contact with God's handiwork as he drives across our beloved land?

Are they dreams of windswept skiers, care-free boaters, happy picnickers, energetic hunters, and leisurely walkers?

Are they dreams of once raging and turbulent streams being harnessed to prevent flood damage, to provide hydroelectric power for the farms, homes, and factories of our Nation, and to offer recreational opportunities which never existed before?

All these dreams, and many more, are shared by those who believe in conservation of the resources which belong to all our people, and which must be dedicated to the never-ending benefit of all our people.

For perhaps too long, we have emphasized the preservation of our natural resources, but we have not given adequate attention to bringing the benefits of conservation to 190 million people who are the beneficiaries of this heritage. For perhaps too long, conservationists have neglected the hopes and the dreams—and the needs—of the people in our cities. There is a real need for the conservationist in America to share his own dreams, his own high code, and the benefits of his successful labors with his city-dwelling brethren and with the urban planners who are responsible not only for our urban park and recreation programs, but for city housing and city environment as well, if we are to improve effectively the quality of life for every family in our land. Conservation of American human resources should go hand in hand with preservation of our natural resources. For contact with nature invigorates our people. It can, and it does, spiritually uplift us all, we who daily bog down in the busy work, tensions, and the fast pace of an industrial society in this fantastic age of nuclear power and scientific miracles. Perhaps never before—as in the few remaining years of this 20th century, as we reach out to the moon, the stars and beyond—has it been so necessary to reestablish, at the same time, our contact with the world about us on the mountain tops and in the valleys and underneath the seas.

Let conservationists think about, and work for, open space in our cities, and decentralizing some of the labor performed there to the countryside. That need be no affront to the better life, or to the precepts of conservation or of beauty. Let us remember esthetic considerations, as we construct suburban housing development and consider plans for re-creation of the central city. Let us devote ourselves to the tone and the tempo of American life wherever it may be. Let us concern ourselves with the quantity of wildlife and the quality of public life, as well.

Difficult questions and complex decisions confront our people—and those you elect to represent you at the local, State, and national levels—as we seek, you and I, to resolve the conflicts which arise in the natural resource area. Should decisions dealing with our priceless, and often irreplaceable, natural heritage be made solely on the basis of how many people will benefit, in the short run, or even in the long run? Should these decisions be made solely on the basis of the activities of either an articulate and dedicated conservation or user group, without regard of the effects such a decision may have on the well-being of most of the people in an area or region? I suspect that the wisest policy over the long breadth of time is to follow neither course exclusively, but to try to seek out the public interest—or what is the right thing to do as one sees it—on each new challenge as it unfolds, regardless of the whims of the many or the fallings of a few. Principles of sound conservation practices remain, of course, immutable. And they should be applied in a fashion best designed to preserve our heritage and thus to serve the people.

This is not an easy task. One must often develop a thick skin, but hopefully not a thick head, to fend off the abuse which will surely come his way as he makes his choice.

In the last Congress, for example, a small handful of irrigators accused me of being for the "ducks" rather than for the "people" when I successfully authored legislation providing congressional sanction for boundaries of the Tule Lake-Klamath wildlife complex. As a result of this measure, the water in these great refuges on our public domain which are the heart of the Pacific flyway, will for the first time be regulated so that water levels within them will primarily be dedicated to enhance the wildlife in the area. When I worked for 5 years with colleagues in both parties to enact a measure to establish a wilderness preservation system, it was said by some user groups that we wanted to lock up our primitive and wilderness areas and throw the key away.

For me, those choices were not difficult. Regarding the fullest possible development and utilization of our water resources, the choices are not so easy, as one seeks to balance the place and the benefits of flood control, hydroelectric power development, pollution abatement, navigation, recreation, wildlife preservation, scenic beauty, and esthetic considerations in a single multipurpose, reclamation or public works project. Such choices are no longer limited to the semiarid West, as concern with the adequacy—and the quality—of our water supply, for example, has become national in scope. Falling water tables, water rationing, inferior water due to stream pollution are as familiar to the Connecticut housewife as to the California farmer. Yet, we must act and act soon if we are to meet the needs of our people in this area.

Another basic public resource, at long last slowly getting our attention, is our vast reserve of public lands. The present statutory policy for our public lands stems largely from the needs and the requirements and the legislation of the 19th century. There is a need for realistic and forward-looking criteria to determine the uses to which such lands might best be put to meet the very real needs of our people. That study is now being undertaken.

During the last 10 years, the population of the United States has increased by 20 percent. Americans have had more to spend and more leisure time. In the same 10-year period, recreational boating has increased 160 percent, fishing 38 percent, and hunting 29 percent.

In addition, a great many other Americans, who neither boat, nor fish, nor hunt, have a continuing interest in the outdoors and enjoy the more simple activities such as driving, walking, hiking, swimming, and picnicking. It is estimated that by the year 2000—just 35 years from now—our population will double and the demand for recreation should triple.

Projections of the demand for electric energy—an important byproduct of multipurpose water resource development—show that we will probably have three times as great requirements in 1980—just 15 years away—as we now have. How will these demands for vital resources and leisure needs be met?

The Senate Committee on Public Works now has under study proposals for the development of a plan to collect surplus water in the Arctic, and, through a system of canals, tunnels, and rivers, to distribute it to water-scarce areas of Canada, the western United States, and northern Mexico. In addition, this project—estimated to cost \$100 billion—would provide a waterway from Vancouver, British Columbia, on the Pacific, to Duluth, Minn., on Lake Superior. The diverse channels would deliver water to the northern plains from Alberta to South Dakota, and increase the flow through the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system. As the water would descend through the proposed system of storage reservoirs and canals, it would generate electric power to help meet

our growing energy requirements and contribute toward the investment and the operating costs of the project. That is but one of many projects under consideration ranging in cost from a few million dollars to many billions. But the solutions to these vast and vital undertakings is not merely in the amount of concrete poured and the number of turbines installed, rather it is in the quality of ideas generated from a breadth of vision, and from dedication to the American dream.

Last week, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on which I serve, considered a bill to authorize a more adequate national program of water research. I am a coauthor of this legislation. I consider it vital to the national welfare. One distinguished witness discussed with us the possibility of capturing surface rainwater and putting it to beneficial use. In Arizona, he told us, an average of almost 82 million acre-feet of water falls every year, of which not more than between 5 and 6 million acre-feet of that amount is accounted for by stream-flow and additions to the underground supply. Yet, for three decades California and Arizona have been engaged in a bitter legal and political battle as to the appropriate division of 7½ million acre-feet of water in the lower basin of the ever-dwindling Colorado River. I must observe, parenthetically, that there is now a growing hope that amity and good comradeship between these two great States will now replace their past unhappy disruptions, and that they will now begin to work together to solve their common problem of water shortage in the river.

Throughout much of the Pacific Coast, hundreds of millions of acre-feet of water annually waste into the sea. And then there is the sea itself with its untold treasures—what potential lies before us if we but effectively focus the intelligence of our people on solving these problems. Should we not, by public and private assistance, in all parts of the country and at all levels of government, bring together the physical scientist, the biological scientist, and the practitioner of legal, political, and social science to work on such problems? Weather modification, saline water conversion, waste water salvage, surface water conservation: all these and many more require the dedicated attention of interdisciplinary researchers. Their successful solution also requires greater participation by the private sector of our economy and a more successful attempt, than has been true in the past, to apply the benefits of Government-supported research and development to the solution of these problems.

Above all, the successful solution of these intriguing and many-sided public puzzles and, indeed, of hundreds of others in the field of conservation, requires your concern, your study, and your action—as conservationists—back home in your own communities. For it is there in your own counties, cities, and towns that decisions are being made on local bond issues dealing with water supply facilities, parks, and recreation. It is there that a zoning board decision can be made with regard to establishing a new industry which could effect the water supply and recreational potential of your whole community. It is there that we all must learn to work together with people in other walks of life if we are to improve the quality of our environment. It is there that the availability of the people's resources for generations of tomorrow will be protected and committed to the highest use, if the people bestir themselves sufficiently to participate in the decision.

I recall the words of Theodore Roosevelt when he said in 1908 that "the prosperity of our people depends directly on the energy and intelligence with which our natural resources are used." That is your challenge. If you meet it, then you can truthfully say that you have done what Hiram Johnson described as

dreaming dreams for man and mankind, and that you succeeded in bringing those dreams into reality.

TRIBUTE TO MISS CHARLOTTE DEE GRASS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, there is a young lady in Maine of whom I am very proud. She sets an example for others to follow—and an example which I hope that I can follow in the performance of my official duties as a U.S. Senator.

She is Miss Charlotte Dee Grass, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John Grass, Jr., of Blaine, Maine. She has the amazing achievement of a perfect attendance for all of her 11½ years of public school. She has only less than 3 months to go to achieve a perfect attendance record for all of her 12 years in public school.

Without a doubt, this is a phenomenal record. It may have been equaled by some, but, if so, the number must, indeed, be rare. Certainly it is a record unsurpassed. I not only tremendously admire Charlotte Dee Grass in her great achievement—but I deeply envy her. Would that I could achieve such a record.

Her record is a testimonial to dedication and perseverance, to a seriousness that all youth could well emulate, and to a follow through attribute that so few people have.

But Charlotte Dee Grass has not only been punctual and steadfast in her attendance. She has other admirably distinctive achievements. She is a member of the National Honor Society. She is her class secretary. She is cheerleader of her school. She is a member of the yearbook editorial staff. She is worthy adviser of the local chapter of the Rainbow Girls.

It is abundantly clear that this young lady is going places in the future and that she has an illustrious future ahead for her. She has brought great pride and honor to her school, to her town, to her State of Maine, to her parents and friends, to herself—and certainly to me.

I salute her as I know all Members of the U.S. Senate do on her remarkable achievement.

THE PERFORMING ARTS PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a report by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund on the performing arts in the United States. This report was so extraordinary in scholarship, in the fine work done in deliberation, and factfinding, that I commend it to all of our Members. The report analyzes the role of the performing arts in American life and what takes place at certain levels of government with regard to aid to the arts. The report concludes that they should be aided not only by private foundations but by Government as well.

There is now very powerful support for the belief. Last year Congress created a National Council on the Arts. The Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities will try to do half of the job by providing for appropriate Federal financial

participation in this enormous effort which now looms so large in the country.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the Rockefeller panel report, together with comments on the report published in this morning's New York Herald Tribune and New York Times may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS FROM THE PERFORMING ARTS PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS, ROCKEFELLER PANEL REPORT ON THE FUTURE OF THEATER, DANCE, MUSIC IN AMERICA

FOREWORD BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER 3D

This report on the state of the performing arts in the United States is intended as a challenge, not an answer. Only in our time have we begun to recognize the arts as a community concern to be placed alongside our long-accepted responsibilities for libraries, museums, hospitals, and schools.

If the arts are vital to a mature civilization, how do they best flourish? What organizations are needed to nourish them? How are they to be supported and maintained? Questions such as these, especially when applied to the performing arts, need public discussion and are worthy of thoughtful inquiry and debate. For these reasons, in the fall of 1963, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund asked a group of citizens from all parts of the country who are identified with many segments of American life to join in a study of the future development and support of the performing arts in the United States.

From the beginning, the panel had particularly in mind a study that would be useful to those responsible for the direction and management of performing arts institutions. We also wanted to be helpful to foundation and corporate executives who are considering support for the arts. We hoped, too, that the study might be of value to local, State, and Federal officials as the arts become increasingly important to the well-being and happiness of the people. And finally, we wished to serve private citizens who are working to enhance the quality of life in their communities.

PREFACE BY THE PANEL

We hope to engage the attention of the American people and to waken their concern about the performing arts in the United States. For in spite of tremendous growth and exciting promise, the performing arts as we see them today are in trouble.

Our experience confirms our judgment that among the key problems of the performing arts in America today are the lack of sufficient data and a central source of information. This is the first time that a comprehensive report on the state of the performing arts has been attempted. Although not every member of the panel subscribes to every detail, the report reflects our substantial agreement. It is breaking new ground and providing factual material that has not previously been assembled. Agreement with our findings would be gratifying, but continuing consideration that leads to effective results would be more rewarding.

CHAPTER 1. THE ARTS IN AMERICA

Observers of American society, since the establishment of the Republic, have proclaimed the incompatibility of democracy with the attainment of high standards of excellence in the arts. A significant minority, however, has never accepted this judgment. This minority has sought to prove two things: that democracy is as capable of fostering works of artistic excellence as any aristocracy and, more important, that it is capable of creating a far broader audience for them than any other form of society. Indeed, there have long been thoughtful

people among us who believe that the ultimate test of democracy lies in the quality of the artistic and intellectual life it creates and supports.

Within our reach is the possibility of developing a standard of living assuring education and leisure in undreamed-of abundance. But there is a growing realization that simple materialism cannot permanently satisfy a society, that political and economic progress alone cannot satisfy spiritual hunger, that entertainment which makes no demand upon the mind or the body offers neither a permanent enrichment of the spirit nor a full measure of delight.

With this realization has come a general reevaluation of the role of the arts in society. We are beginning to see them as the culmination of other achievements—the attainment that in the end gives a society its hope for a lasting place in history and its people the chance for the fullest freedom and happiness.

Effective development of the arts is a complex matter. It becomes, in our time and country, a matter of creating new organizational arrangements—for teaching, for performing, for supporting the artist. It becomes a matter of developing an audience as much as it does of training the artist. It becomes a matter of money, of energy, of time. It is also, of course, an unprecedented challenge for democracy. For we are seeking to create cultural institutions that will serve huge numbers of people—more than any cultural establishment of any other time or place has tried to serve. We are seeking to demonstrate that there is no incompatibility between democracy and high artistic standards. And we are seeking to do so on a grand scale.

Our study is limited to the live performing arts, and we concentrate on the professional organizations that sponsor and present opera, drama, instrumental and choral music, and dance. This is where the need is greatest and where the problems presented in the performing arts are uniquely susceptible to solution by public interest and action.

The potential for successful development of the performing arts is tremendous. There are millions of Americans who have never seen a live professional performance or participated in a live performance of any kind. There are untold numbers who might, with opportunity and training, become first-rate performing artists.

The panel is motivated by the conviction that the arts are not for a privileged few but for the many; that their place is not on the periphery of society but at its center; that they are not just a form of recreation but are of central importance to our well-being and happiness. In the panel's view, this status will not be widely achieved unless artistic excellence is the constant goal of every artist and every arts organization, and mediocrity is recognized as the ever-present enemy of true progress in the development of the arts.

CHAPTER 2. THE PERFORMING ARTS—TODAY AND TOMORROW

A tremendous expansion has taken place in the arts in this country in the past two decades, but almost all this expansion is amateur. By way of rough illustration:

The recent total of 1,401 symphony orchestras is more than double the number existing in 1939, but only 54 are composed predominantly of professional musicians.

The 754 groups now presenting opera are almost twice the number so engaged a decade ago. But only 35 to 40 are fully professional, and not more than 10 of these provide performances more than 15 days in the year.

The number of dance companies approaches 200. However, in the entire country there are only five or six that meet high professional standards and possess any real degree of institutional stability; only one approaches giving year-round performances.

Theatrical enterprises now number about 40,000 and have increased by about 15 percent in the last 10 years. However, the number of commercial theaters in the country has dropped from 590 in 1927 to barely 200. And Broadway, historically the creative center of the American theater, has reduced its output from an average of 142 productions per year during the thirties to 63 in 1963-64, and its playhouses have diminished in number from 54 to 36 in the same span of years.

Problems in common

In the broadest possible terms, the task before the professional performing arts organizations is the creation of new organizations of two types. A wide variety of service and information organizations is necessary to collect statistics, to provide guidance on the general direction of growth and change, and to bring together those responsible for the direction of arts organizations to exchange ideas about the solutions for common problems.

More organizations devoted to the presentation of the arts are also required. Here, there is need for experiment. There are today large population centers that lack adequate facilities for the presentation of the arts or—much worse—lack the dance or opera or theater company that would add a significant dimension to their cultural lives. In the long run, it is essential to encourage formation of resident organizations. In the meantime, there is perhaps more pressing need for regional organizations designed specifically to serve large geographic areas.

Many of the specific problems, to which we now turn, would be well on their way to solution if this kind of basic expansion were undertaken.

Poverty for the professional: Most performing artists are poorly paid. The miserable income of the majority reflects both a shortage of jobs and the brief duration of employment that is available. For example, in all except the small handful of our major and metropolitan orchestras, the musicians earn an average of only a few hundred dollars a year from their professional labors.

Second-class training: If the performing arts are to fulfill their cultural mission in the United States, marked improvement in the quality of the training of professional artists will be required.

A place to perform: Physical facilities for the performing arts as a whole remain woefully inadequate. More than 100 cultural centers are being built or planned in communities throughout the country. Only about 30 of these are true arts centers, specifically designed to accommodate more than one performing art; many are merely sports arenas and convention halls that can house a cultural presentation only inadequately.

Sponsoring organizations: The lack of development and stability of the performing arts is frequently due to the absence of strong sponsoring organizations. Although it is characteristic of the performing arts that outstanding success can almost always be traced to some gifted, inspired, and driving individual, organizations can give this individual effort an underpinning.

Curse of crisis financing: There are relatively few performing arts organizations that do not leap from deficit to deficit in Elizabethan fashion as they struggle to continue their activities. Although nonprofit corporations do not aspire to make a profit but simply to balance income and expenditure, they have not found this easy to do in spite of the expanding market.

Planning and research—neglected resources: Most arts organizations have had little chance to study their long-range goals in the community and the means for achieving them. Even fewer have undertaken to explore systematically what the continuing scientific revolution can mean for the improvement of their artistic endeavors.

The way ahead

The panel recommends that the artistic goal of the Nation be the day when the performing arts are considered a permanent year-round contribution to communities throughout the country, and our artists are considered as necessary as our educators.

This, of course, is a long-term goal. In the view of the panel, a worthy interim objective for the Nation would be the development and maintenance of the following high-quality nonprofit professional organizations operating on a year-round basis:

Fifty permanent theater companies—a number approximating the metropolitan areas with populations over 500,000, a size large enough to support a year-round resident theater.

Fifty symphony orchestras—presenting concerts by the full orchestra as well as providing musicians for smaller orchestral and chamber music groups.

Six regional opera companies—offering short seasons in several metropolitan areas not yet ready to support year-round performances—in addition to the four major resident companies and two permanent national touring companies already established.

Six regional choral groups.

Six regional dance companies, in addition to the two major resident dance groups now in existence.

There is obviously room for substantial differences in estimating the cost of such a nationwide performing arts establishment. The best available estimates indicate that the amount currently being spent on running high-quality nonprofit professional performing arts organizations—which are now, in most cases, part-time operations—approximates \$60 million. (It needs to be emphasized that this figure does not include the commercial theater or the semiprofessional and amateur artistic activity in the country.) Well-informed estimates of the annual operating cost of the establishment outlined above fall between \$150 and \$200 million (in current dollars). Therefore, somewhere between \$90 and \$140 million of additional operating funds would be needed to put a professional performing arts establishment of the sort envisaged on a year-round basis of operation.

Between \$50 and \$80 million annually could ultimately be expected to come from the sale of tickets at the box office. It follows that somewhere between \$40 and \$60 million of new support would be required annually to meet the normal operating expenses of a professional performing arts establishment of the type indicated. The larger amount is not much over one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Nation's present annual income.

CHAPTER 3. BOX OFFICE AND OTHER EARNED INCOME

For almost all performing arts organizations the only major source of earned income is the sale of admission tickets for performances. In considering the broad problem of financial support, the first question is: Why can't the sale of tickets pay all of the costs; if they have such an important cultural contribution to make, why can't the performing arts be self-sustaining?

The answer is complicated, filled with variables, and no single rule applies to all the arts or to all arts organizations. But this panel believes that as a general principle the nonprofit performing arts organizations should not be expected to pay their way at the box office. Indeed, they cannot do so and still fulfill their true cultural mission. This does not mean that box office income cannot be improved or costs cut even as artistic and public obligations are met. On the contrary, every effort should be made to increase operating efficiency.

The success of an artistic venture cannot be measured by the sale of tickets alone. To

do so would be to submit to the tyranny of the box office, to surrender the right to fail and the right to experiment. In addition, the obligations of the nonprofit arts organization to its art and community include: maintaining the highest possible standards of performance; serving the community as broadly as possible; doing its best to protect and perpetuate the finest in its artistic heritage; developing new and experimental works; maintaining educational programs; and providing opportunities for new talent.

In actual practice there is usually little conflict between what the nonprofit performing organization can do and should do. In most instances, no matter what the policy, costs would still not be covered. The binding economic limits often are one or a combination of the following:

The shortness of the season with its attendant increase in overhead costs per performance.

The undesirability of raising ticket prices to a level where they can cover all of the rapidly rising costs of performance.

The limited capacity of the hall necessary for a performance of high quality in terms of acoustics and a desired intimacy with the audience.

The necessity of incurring heavy costs for large casts or ensembles, for artists with sufficient reputation to attract patrons, and for qualified technical staff.

The difficulty of anticipating the constantly changing and varied demands of the audience and the unwillingness of the audience, in many instances, to attend performances of new or experimental works.

Symphony ticket sales: As a group, the Nation's 25 major symphony orchestras presently receive about 52 percent of their total expenses from the sale of tickets, with individual orchestras ranging from 29 percent to 75 percent.

Grand opera: For the Nation's handful of major opera companies, the box office presently pays an average of 70 percent of the costs of operation. For individual companies, the box office pays as much as 80 percent in the case of Goldovsky Opera Theater and as little as 33 percent for the Santa Fe Opera in New Mexico. Ticket sales cover 74 percent of total costs of the Metropolitan Opera.

The dance: Most major dance groups in the United States fall far short of meeting their expenses from the sale of tickets. A major segment of the dance world has no institutional support whatsoever, which almost guarantees box office failure.

The theater: Of the nonprofit permanent professional theaters operating in the 1962-63 season, three—the Arena Stage in Washington, the Tyrone Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis, and the UCLA Theater Group in Los Angeles—reported operating surpluses. In 1963-64, only the Tyrone Guthrie Theater had a surplus. Other theaters reported losses ranging up to about \$500,000.

Performing arts organizations can, and generally do, earn some income through such arrangements as the sale of their services for broadcasting and recording, concessions, and program advertising. But for all except a few this additional income makes a very minor contribution to paying the bills.

There is no prospect that supplemental earned income can be increased to a point where, combined with box office income, it will make these organizations self-sustaining. On the contrary, the gap between earned income and total costs can be expected to widen in the years immediately ahead.

CHAPTER 4. INDIVIDUAL GIVING TO THE PERFORMING ARTS

The private donor—the individual, the foundation, the corporation—has the major responsibility for insuring the survival and growth of the performing arts organizations.

Actually, cultural activities receive a surprisingly small percentage of the total amount of private philanthropy, which amounted to over \$10 billion in 1963. It is estimated that less than 2 percent (about \$200 million) goes to cultural programs of all kinds, with the performing arts receiving much less than half that total.

But there is nothing immutable about the way the charitable dollar is divided up. Although religious giving has been the largest and most stable element in private philanthropy, there have been changes in the relative positions of the other beneficiaries. These changes reflect long-term shifts in the pattern of American philanthropy. It is only in the past few years that cultural activities have entered seriously into competition for the philanthropic dollar.

The individual

Now, as in the past, it is the individual—not the foundation nor the corporation—who shoulders by far the heaviest share of the responsibility for supporting American nonprofit institutions of all sorts.

Sources of charitable contributions

(Dollars amounts in millions)

	1963		1958	
	Per- cent	Amount	Per- cent	Amount
Individuals.....	78.6	\$7,875	79.2	\$5,650
Foundations.....	8.2	819	7.1	505
Charitable bequests.....	7.9	795	6.3	450
Business (corporations).....	5.3	536	7.4	525
Total.....	100.0	10,015	100.0	7,130

Source: American Association of Fund-Raising Council, Inc., and special studies staff calculations.

While individuals make by far the largest total contribution to philanthropy, they use only a small fraction of the 30-percent deduction from their taxable income that the Federal Government now permits.

The philanthropic donations of an individual are an expression of his sense of community with others, and the more he identifies with some cause, community, or organization, the greater and more consistent his donations will be. These contributions are also conditioned by his awareness of the importance of the enterprise being supported and its needs. The vigor and consistency with which this awareness is cultivated is a key element in stimulating financial support. In addition, if arts organizations are to become important beneficiaries of bequests, they must first succeed in enlisting lifetime support from individuals.

What can be done

A substantial portion of the support for the arts will continue to come from a relatively few large donors. Nevertheless, the panel stresses the value to arts organizations of broadening the base of their financial support. This can only be accomplished if the organizations are imaginative and effective in developing programs to serve the artistic needs of the community and if the public is made fully aware of the significance of the work being done.

To attract substantial and sustained support, an organization must demonstrate that it has responsibility, continuity, and the promise of some stability. The organization must also have clear concepts of its purpose, its development plans, and why its existence is important to the community. And it must communicate these concepts to the public.

Attempts to increase and broaden support for the arts are hampered by a tendency on the part of the sponsors of one performing art to deprecate the importance of other per-

forming arts and to discount the importance of cooperation with other community organizations in money raising. This does not strengthen economic support for the arts, individually or collectively.

CHAPTER 5. CORPORATE SUPPORT FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The arts can be a major source of strength for the business community. They provide cultural resources increasingly recognized as essential to a suitable environment for business enterprise. Their presence or absence in a community frequently plays a role in the decision of personnel to join or stay with a company. Their availability certainly encourages new firms to locate in a city and helps attract tourists and conventions. They help make the increased leisure with which our greater productivity has rewarded us a boon rather than a dangerous emptiness. They constitute a growing market and provide expanding avenues for employment. There are, therefore, compelling reasons why, in the interest of his community and, indeed, in his own self-interest, a businessman and his firm should be concerned with the cultural and artistic life of his community.

Yet the typical American corporation has so far shown very little enthusiasm for financial support of the performing arts. Recently the Rockefeller Brothers Fund surveyed 100 corporations of varying sizes. It learned that 55 percent gave something to the arts. But about half of these gave less than 1 percent of their total contributions to the arts. In some instances in which large grants had been made, the range was from 3 to 7 percent, and one bank allocated 22 percent.

It can be estimated that slightly over half of the corporations in the United States give to the arts. Of the total contributions made by all corporations, only a tiny fraction—at most 3 to 4 percent, or some \$16 to \$21 million in 1963—goes to the arts.

The Federal Government permits deductions of up to 5 percent of net corporate income for contributions to charitable and educational organizations. It has been the practice of American corporations in recent years to use only a little over one-fifth of the allowable tax exemption. For example, in 1963, their contributions totaled \$536 million, or 1 percent of their taxable income of \$51.3 billion. There remained a total of over \$2 billion of business income that would have had the Government as an equal partner in giving if it had been contributed to eligible nonprofit organizations. At present only a handful of business firms use the full 5 percent tax exemption. If there is fuller general use of this allowance, the arts are likely to gain a fair share of the increase.

A lead by arts organizations

There is a tendency on the part of leaders of arts organizations to assume that anyone who is moderately perceptive will understand the significance of the arts. This is a poor assumption. It is not even safe, as a matter of fact, for an arts organization to assume that the direct economic contribution of the arts to the business community is fully appreciated. The Stanford Research Institute has calculated that in 1960 the arts market, exclusive of books and expenditures for education, was a \$2.5 billion market, with 50 million people involved, and by 1970 may approach \$7 billion.

Arts organizations owe it to themselves and to business to make well-reasoned and well-documented cases for corporate support. Responses received in the Rockefeller Bros. Fund survey underlined the importance of responsible planning and good management. One way arts organizations can improve their managements and sharpen their objectives is to encourage corporate executives to assist them. Given careful orientation, the business executive can be a great

help, and he can be particularly effective in making the case for corporate and community financial support.

Corporate responsibility

Corporate support of the arts can take a notable diversity of forms. Contributions for operating expenses are extremely helpful and are the most frequent means of support. Commissioning presentations of special works—often beyond the regular operating budget of an arts organization—can significantly enhance the quality of production provided. In addition to actual dollars given for capital purposes, corporate executives who are involved in municipal development projects can assure that adequate facilities for the performing arts are considered in urban planning. Some corporations are helping to build audiences for the arts through special employee concerts and subsidized tickets for employees and by sponsorship of the arts on radio and television.

Business support for the arts is important in preserving a healthy balance between private and government support. The arts now receive public assistance, particularly at the local level, and more is anticipated. But strong private support is just as essential to the economic structure of the arts as it is to our system of higher education, which receives massive public aid.

Leadership in investing in the artistic life of a free society, based on reasoned policy, is the opportunity now afforded the corporation. Corporate dollars are important dollars, capable of making the difference between life or death for an arts organization. If business corporations have not done so, as most of them have not, the panel urges that they look carefully at the arts and their place in the community. Support for the arts is a part of community responsibility, and a healthy cultural environment is clearly in the self-interest of the business community.

CHAPTER 6. FOUNDATION SUPPORT FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The innovative role of the charitable foundation in American society has been long and distinguished. However, with a few exceptions, foundations have not yet come to recognize the arts as a field as important as education, scientific research, and welfare, which until recently have claimed their primary attention. Foundations, large and small, national and local, could play a significantly larger role in the development of the arts than they have in the past.

Seeking foundation support

Arts organizations have not adequately made their case for foundation support and, in comparison with other claimants on foundation resources, suffer all too often from poor management and inadequate planning. Lack of funds is often the reason given for failure to follow good management procedures, but this is hardly a valid argument.

Too often, the foundation is thought of as a bottomless reserve of funds, the cure for all financial ills. Nothing could be further from the truth. Foundation funds are far from limitless, and those now available for the performing arts represent only a tiny fraction of the whole. For arts organizations to turn to foundations, large or small, in hopes that their needs will be swiftly satisfied, is almost certain to lead to disappointment.

While the size of the foundation does not invariably dictate program, the arts organization should understand that it is generally true that the purposes of almost every grant made by a large foundation are at least partially national in scope, while the small foundation usually concentrates on its own geographic area or on a special purpose.

Foundation giving

Total foundation giving in 1963 amounted to \$819 million, only 8.2 percent of all philanthropy, and current foundation support for the performing arts is minuscule. It can be estimated that only some \$20 to \$30 million will have been directed to the performing arts during 1964. This may amount to between 3 and 4 percent of the total foundation dollar.

The local foundation can make its greatest contribution by fostering the stability of established organizations and by encouraging the development of new cultural resources and audiences in the community. The panel believes the role of the local foundation in providing continuing support cannot be overestimated. Indeed, it may turn out to be as important as any single factor in the development of the arts.

The panel believes the large national foundation can make its greatest contribution to the arts in planning and innovation. It has a special capacity to determine the most critical areas of national concern and to devise effective means of solving basic problems. Available funds could not, of course, satisfy the total financial needs of the arts, even if foundations were inclined to try, but they are sufficient to undertake experimental programs and demonstration projects and to assist in the development of nationwide and regional programs and organizations. Projects designed to encourage and guide new sources of support are of particular value.

Flexibility in foundation giving is essential, and an important requirement is the acceptance of risk. It is unrealistic for foundations or any other patrons to expect that any project in the arts will be a guaranteed success.

The panel urges foundations to increase their interest in the arts and in so doing to recognize the necessarily speculative element in the development of the performing arts and give particular encouragement to the bold and the venturesome—an encouragement they are especially equipped to provide.

CHAPTER 7. GOVERNMENT AND THE ARTS

Through the centuries, the governments of most great States and cities have participated in promoting the arts and enriching the lives of their citizens. It has been generally recognized that societies are ultimately judged by the quality of their cultural life; that the worlds of the artist, the dramatist, and the poet outlive more transient victories and defeats. It has been known, too, that the happiness of the citizens is related to the variety and depth of the cultural experiences open to them.

In the United States, we have reached a point in our history where we must come to grips with the question of the role of Government in our cultural life. The panel believes no form of government aid to the arts should vitiate private initiative, reduce private responsibility for direction, or hamper complete artistic freedom. These must remain the prerogative of the citizens who direct performing arts institutions and of the artists. The problem is to determine what kinds of aid Government can provide and what techniques it can use in providing them without violating the principles just enunciated.

No rigid pattern of aid can be laid down. In general, the local government is best suited for assuring that adequate opportunities are available for its citizens to enjoy the arts and in seeing that appreciation for the arts is developed in the school system. State governments are best suited to sponsor touring activities and to promote cooperation between arts organizations within the State. They, too, are probably in the best position to promote regional cooperation between the arts organizations of sev-

eral States. As to the Federal Government, it has a vital function in setting a national tone of interest in and concern with the arts. It, too, can be an important force in fostering cooperation between organizations and between Government agencies concerned with the arts, and it is uniquely placed to study our cultural growth in broad, long-term perspective.

The local role—Municipal and county

Twentieth-century America is only now facing the fact that it is inescapably an urban civilization and that the quality of its life must ultimately depend upon what men make of their metropolitan centers. American cities are now being rebuilt on a hitherto unimagined scale. It is important that the cultural life of these cities be re-examined and that it be asked how, in the course of this rebuilding process, they may provide citizens with greater opportunities for esthetic enjoyment.

The panel believes every local government should have as an accepted goal the strengthening of local arts organizations and the broadening of their service to the community. For example, by insuring adequate facilities for performance; providing funds for operating costs; supplying supporting services; purchasing the services of the arts for schools and the community; exempting arts organizations from taxes and license fees; helping mobilize community support for the arts.

The absence of suitable facilities is often a definite handicap to arts organizations, and rental, purchase, or construction may be beyond the resources of a single institution. If an arts center is projected by a city or county, great care should be taken with the design and arrangement of physical facilities. Of equal importance is the attention devoted to planning the artistic program for which the facilities will be used, including the maintenance of the performing arts organizations that will occupy the buildings. Without such planning the center will turn out to be a hollow monument to good intentions.

Many local governments have for years been making highly beneficial direct contributions to the performing arts with no evidence of political interference, and a great number provide supporting services including advertising and promotion, centralized administration, and maintenance. However, the purchase of arts organization services—for public and school performances—probably represents the most customary local government involvement in the arts, although surveys indicate that only a minority of school systems have money specifically provided for the purchase of professional performances for their pupils or for special training in the performing arts. The panel believes that local governments have a direct responsibility for seeing that study, appreciation, and training in all the arts is an accepted part of the curriculums of their school systems. In the longer view, this panel believes that the provision for adequate education in the performing arts may prove the most effective way by which local governments can promote the well-being of the arts.

Some cities refuse to give nonprofit arts organizations exemption from local taxes. Where necessary, local tax laws should be amended to give nonprofit arts organizations treatment equal to institutions of education and social welfare.

Local governments can exercise important leadership in stimulating and mobilizing community support of the performing arts. No elaborate mechanism is needed for this, but experience indicates that an effective job requires, in many instances, an imaginative, energetic, and competent individual attached to the mayor's or city manager's office as a cultural officer and given the help of a small staff.

The State role

One of the most encouraging signs on the American cultural scene is the increasing concern of State governments with the arts. New York and North Carolina have led the way, with California now joining them. In all parts of the country these examples are being watched, and comparable initiatives considered or undertaken.

The panel believes the principal role of State governments in regard to the performing arts is to see that presentations of high professional quality are made available to citizens throughout the State, particularly where local arts organizations cannot provide such opportunities. The range of programs that a State should consider includes: assessing statewide needs and making inventories of State and regional resources; supporting professional touring programs; providing technical assistance for local organizations; encouraging regional cooperation and development; developing the cultural programs within State educational institutions; removing tax burdens and legislative restrictions.

There are more than 20 State arts councils or commissions that have been authorized by legislative sanction or executive order. Not even half are beyond the paper stage of development. Their first step, once they are firmly established, is obviously to take a survey of needs and resources in the arts. If this is to be done well, some financial provision is necessary.

Some smaller communities cannot generate audiences large enough to support anything like a regular season of professional performances. A large portion of the funds of the New York State Council on the Arts, for example, is used to support tours. In North Carolina, the largest appropriation for the performing arts supports the North Carolina Symphony, essentially a touring organization.

Arts organizations in smaller communities—both amateur and professional—frequently suffer from lack of expert technical assistance in performance, administration, and provision of physical facilities. The New York State Council on the Arts has taken a lead in overcoming this difficulty by making the services of expert technical consultants available to arts organizations.

In drafting legislation dealing with the arts, it is particularly important for the States not to place legal barriers in the way of regional cooperation. Many arts organizations quite naturally serve the interests of an area much larger than the State in which they are physically located. The Tyrone Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis, for instance, draws its audiences from several surrounding States and Canada.

Whether financial support for the performing arts via a State arts council or by specific legislative appropriations is likely to be the more effective procedure necessarily depends in large degree on circumstances peculiar to the State involved. However, as a general proposition, the Panel believes that a State arts council, commission, or similar body, permanently constituted and strongly staffed, can provide elements of stability and continuity in support of the arts that may well be lost where the support depends primarily on continuity of individual leadership and legislative appropriations for specific projects.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

In contrast to the numerous precedents for local and State government interest in the arts, the support and attention the Federal Government has given the performing arts—and, for that matter, the arts in general—has been largely incidental to some other purpose. The Federal Government first became deeply involved in the performing arts with the establishment of the Federal theater project in 1935 as a means of providing employment during the economically

depressed thirties rather than as an affirmative artistic endeavor. The project was plagued in the Halls of Congress, and in 1939 the House of Representatives made a specific proviso that no new funds could be spent.

A place in the Government structure

Despite this action, there has been increasing presidential advocacy of Federal support for cultural activities and a growing number of congressional proposals to give effect to such a policy.

President Kennedy took pioneering steps when, in March 1962, he appointed August Heckscher as his special consultant on the arts. In April 1964, President Johnson also recognized the importance to the National Government of fostering the arts by appointing Roger L. Stevens as his special assistant on the arts to "organize and direct the administration's cultural program."

Persistent congressional efforts culminated in the passage of a bill, signed by President Johnson on September 3, 1964, which provides for a Chairman and a 24-member Arts Council to be located in the Executive Office of the President. This Council has been a long time coming, the first bill to create an organization of this kind having been introduced in Congress in 1877. Among its duties are to recommend ways to increase the cultural resources of the United States, encourage private initiative in the arts, consult with local, State, and Federal departments and agencies on methods by which to coordinate existing resources and facilities, and conduct studies with a view to formulating ways by which creative activity and high standards and increased opportunities in the arts may be encouraged.

The panel supports the development of a National Council on the Arts and urges that sufficient funds be provided to carry out the responsibilities assigned to it by Congress.

Strengthening and utilizing present programs

The panel believes that existing Federal arts programs, limited though they are, can be strengthened and that Federal programs indirectly affecting the arts should be administered with a greater awareness of their cultural implications.

Direct commitment to the arts: There are a few continuing Federal programs that recognize and provide opportunities for the professional performing arts. In the aggregate they are of slight magnitude and are largely dependent on private gifts. Among them are the literary and music programs of the Library of Congress and the National Gallery, and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, which is the Federal Government's most direct commitment to the arts.

The Office of Education has established an Arts and Humanities Branch to strengthen general arts education and improve the level of public appreciation. There are important possibilities for encouraging the development of the arts in its programs.

Incidental but direct support: The cultural presentations program of the State Department and the entertainment programs of the Defense Department are among the several areas in which the Federal Government directly supports the arts, but only incidentally to fulfilling some other purpose.

Indirect support of value: There are also Federal programs unrelated in origin to the arts that could give great assistance to them if administered with this possibility in mind. The urban renewal program can be of help in providing suitable and strategically located land for new facilities for the performing arts, and cultural facilities can be included in Federal public works.

Encouragement, not restriction: The Federal Government imposes special tax burdens on presentation of the performing arts. This is most notably true of the commercial theater, subject to a 10-percent excise tax on admissions. The commercial theater's

artistic and economic future is vital to the performing arts, and it should be spared the burden of the admissions tax.

Direct financial assistance

There is urgent occasion for searching study on a continuing basis by the National Council on the Arts to determine the most desirable types of Federal support and the most desirable ways of providing them. One kind of support would be to make matching grants for adequate physical facilities, of which there is a grave shortage for the professional performing arts. Another would be to make matching grants to the States, which would administer aid to their arts organizations. Still another would be embodied in national education programs to improve the quality of training in the arts and to increase popular appreciation for them, which, viewed in the longer perspective, is essential to their economic salvation.

The panel believes that for the present Federal aid for arts organizations, apart from the minuscule amount now available, can be most effectively provided through matching grants to meet the capital needs for arts organizations.

In urging that grants be restricted at present for assistance to building, it seems appropriate to point out that we need far more general experience in making grants to arts organizations. Matching grants for capital development can help provide this experience. Grants for other purposes related to the arts can be considered as the Nation's cultural program develops.

Meantime, we will have made a contribution toward solving a basic problem in the performing arts—the need for adequate physical facilities. The record demonstrates that the Federal Government, by the judicious use of the matching principle, can stimulate increased State and local, public and private support.

In summary, the panel concludes that while private support should remain dominant, the Federal Government—together with State and local governments—should give strong support to the arts, including the performing arts, by appropriate recognition of their importance, by direct and indirect encouragement, and by financial cooperation.

CHAPTER 8. ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE ARTS

Too many people believe that a simple infusion of more money will solve all the problems of the performing arts in this country. But money is, in the last analysis, a neutral object, a tool. It has no capacity for vision; this must be supplied by men. As talent is needed to create and perform a work of art, so equal talent—though of a different sort—is needed to create and govern the institutions that provide the settings for these arts. It is for this reason the panel believes it essential for an arts organization to have an effective board of trustees and competent management in addition to talented artistic direction.

The governing board

Whenever performing arts organizations reach the stage of development where permanence is sought, they almost invariably become nonprofit corporations, headed by a board of trustees vested with the responsibility of maintaining and expanding the organization.

This board has certain obvious functions: to determine the larger objectives of the organization, to retain the best available artistic direction and business management, and, having accomplished the latter, to back their judgment when the inevitable conflicts with artists or with elements in the community arise. In fulfilling these responsibilities, the board has a pressing obligation to make certain the institution has finan-

cial stability, for without it there can be little hope of attaining either the long-range or the short-term goals the board may decide upon.

The actual selection of goals is crucial. A careful step-by-step plan, projected over a number of years, is essential to the arts organization, as is the selection of ultimate goals that are realistic in terms of the needs and desires of the community served.

As the number and complexity of arts organizations grow, board membership is becoming much more arduous than in decades past. Yet board recruitment remains much too casual in most organizations. Meticulous auditioning procedures are used for second violinists, members of the opera chorus, and bit players in the theater, but people about whom practically nothing is known often are chosen to be trustees. The potential for serious and prolonged damage to the organization is as high in the board room as on the stage.

Although effective trustees are bound to work continuously with their artistic directors and business managers, they do not meddle in artistic direction and business management. For them there is profound wisdom in the injunction: Do your best to see that the organization is good, that it is well manned, and that it runs smoothly—but don't try to run it.

Artistic direction

The task of selecting an artistic director is perhaps the most critical a board of trustees faces. The artistic director sets the standards of production, and artistic results can be no better than the quality of artistic direction.

What, generally, are the conditions from which high standards derive?

Well-trained artists: The training and experience of the ensemble, individually and as a whole, are crucial elements in determining standards of performance.

Rehearsal time: Most critical in the preparation of new and unfamiliar works, insufficient rehearsal hours can likewise damage with almost equal force the standard repertory. Few artists ever feel adequately rehearsed, but it is too often true in fact as well.

Length of season: Quality thrives on practice and sustained performance. It can scarcely grow in a season that is nothing but a limited engagement or a scattered handful of performances.

Compensation of performers: Whatever the size of the group or the length of its season, an ill-paid performer is a dissatisfied performer.

Physical facilities: Many a performance might as well go unheard and unseen as to play in halls so ungrateful to sound and sight that players and audience alike have trouble perceiving a total effect.

Audience: Only at its peril does an artistic director ignore his audience's taste. This is a delicate and difficult measurement to make, not unlike the statesman's: How to lead forward, but not too fast.

Each of these conditions is to an extent controllable by trustees and management, artistic and business. Each decision carries a price tag and each requires judgment, knowledge, and taste, in order that proper decisions may be arrived at by all concerned. It is essential, therefore, that artistic and business management work in true partnership, the director respecting the manager's concerns, and vice versa, and the trustees respecting both. Only a smoothly functioning team, in which each of these elements complements the others, can create a strong arts organization.

Management

Resourceful business and administrative leadership is a necessary element in the successful development of the performing arts.

Too often the dilettante mentality—belief that all that is needed for success is talented artists—prevails. But a good orchestra, a good theater, a good opera or dance group cannot be established or run by well-wishing volunteers.

What constitutes a good manager? He has been described as a man "who must be knowledgeable in the art with which he is concerned, an impresario, labor negotiator, diplomat, educator, publicity and public relations expert, politician, skilled businessman, a social sophisticate, a servant of the community, a tireless leader—becomingly humble before authority—a teacher, a tyrant, and a continuing student of the arts." It is obvious that artistic knowledge of the field is not the only qualification for a successful manager. The steps that have been taken to train a new generation of arts administrators are welcome, but more effort, on a more formal basis, needs to be made.

Labor negotiations are one of an arts manager's preoccupations. The core of the performing arts—the actor, the musician, the dancer, the singer, the stagehand, the scene painter, the trucker, the press agent, and sometimes even the usher and the ticket taker—is made up of union members. Management in effect is an agent for the performer in collecting money, providing the stage, and creating the audience. Hence, there is a clear demand for mutual responsibility. A constant balance has to be struck between management's drive for quality at a reasonable cost and the union's aim of job security with fair pay for services rendered. If either fails, both suffer.

It is precisely for this reason that there is considerable hope in mechanisms through which management and the unions discuss their problems in a relaxed atmosphere, without the pressure of a strike deadline. To tell employees, when a contract is about to expire, how badly off the employer is, has never been a persuasive management tactic. More candor and more contact on a year-round basis would help both sides anticipate issues and achieve greater understanding of their mutual problems.

A national center for information

There is an evident need for increasing communication in the performing arts both within and among the various fields.

In addition to the encouragement of the rapidly expanding arts council movement and the development of service organizations, there is need for a national repository of information, a place to which inquiries about all the performing arts may be directed. Despite the diversity of problems confronting the various arts, it is also evident that there are many common problems as well, and that groups in each field can learn from the experience of the others and that the general public needs to know more about all of them.

The panel believes there is urgent need for an independent national information center that can assume an important and continuing role in the development of the performing arts and urges that every encouragement be given to its establishment.

CHAPTER 9. THE UNIVERSITY AND THE PROFESSIONAL PERFORMING ARTS

The traditional role of the university in the arts has been to develop appreciation and understanding among its students. This role has greatly expanded in the years since World War II, and many universities now find themselves involved in areas of experience that are quite new to them. Some have become homes for professional arts groups and artists-in-residence; almost all have discovered that their responsibilities as artistic impresarios, offering more programs of higher caliber to their own and surrounding communities, have grown mightily. Still others are attempting to strengthen their arts and humanities programs in an effort to

maintain a balance between them and the burgeoning teaching and research programs in the sciences and to contribute to a greater public appreciation of the arts.

Nor is this an end to the growth of the university's influence in our artistic life. As independent drama schools, art institutes, and music conservatories have declined in number, the universities with a generally broader base of public and private support have begun to assume increasing responsibility for training future performers.

There are some who feel that proper training cannot take place in the context of general education, and that university educators do not understand the single-minded concentration that must go into the training of the professional performer. They feel that private professional schools and conservatories are the only institutions capable of providing the environment and discipline that nurtures commitment to the arts. Sufficient evidence is by no means available to support these claims. However, the panel believes schools and conservatories of recognized standards must not be allowed to weaken or disappear, as some have in recent decades. They must, instead, be strengthened, for they continue to produce the majority of solo artists and the ensemble musicians who man our finest musical institutions; from them come some of our best trained actors and virtually all our professional dancers.

Nonetheless, the panel believes that the universities will play an increasingly important role in the training of professional performing artists. Those universities that decide to assume a responsibility for professional training must be prepared to adjust their admissions policies and curricular requirements as necessary to meet the special needs of students of the performing arts, and they must attract the most highly qualified performing artists as teachers to their faculties.

Research and experimentation in the performing arts are an important new role for the university. Experiments in electronic music and in the development of new staging and lighting techniques already have been launched and could well be expanded. Research into the conditions under which performers and artistic talent best flourish could be undertaken.

The expansion of the university's role in sponsoring performances on the campus offers the encouraging prospect of more employment for professional artists and increased availability of cultural opportunities for greater numbers of people. University concert bureaus are generally free from commitment to the star system and have provided young, relatively unknown artists with opportunities to establish their reputations. Indeed, without them the modern dance could not exist at all in the United States. In many parts of the country the university is the only agency capable of organizing programs of high quality in all the arts. In this respect it provides a public service for which, as a public institution, it is uniquely qualified.

The panel believes there is urgent need to redress the existing imbalance in the financial support of the physical sciences and that of the arts and humanities in universities.

CHAPTER 10. BUILDING GREATER APPRECIATION

A basic problem for the performing arts is to create an environment favorable to their growth. It is not enough for our country to have artists of high quality. It is not enough to have strong performing arts institutions—opera companies, repertory theaters, symphony orchestras, choral and chamber music groups, dance companies. There must also be a sizable public prepared through education, both formal and informal, to receive aesthetic pleasure from

their efforts and eager to join in the attempt to enhance the Nation's cultural life. Without a public of this kind, the artist has no one with whom to communicate, arts institutions operate in a vacuum, and there cannot be growth and liveliness in our culture.

Education

The creation of a propitious environment for the arts depends primarily upon the education of a people. Any significant increase in demand for the performing arts will derive only from a citizenry that has come to love them and to depend on them.

The role of the family cannot be overemphasized. If it is not interested in the arts, is not willing to offer youngsters at least an occasional opportunity to satisfy their curiosity about what goes on inside the theater or recital hall or opera house, then no formal effort at cultural education is likely to be very successful.

While the performing arts have traditionally been a part of the school curriculum, the development of selective performing groups—bands, orchestras, and choruses—representing a relatively small segment of the total school population, has generally been stressed. Only minor attention has been given to cultivating the artistic tastes of the large mass of students not engaged in performing organizations. We need more and better trained teachers in the arts, particularly at the elementary school level. School administrators need to be made more aware of the place of the arts in a balanced curriculum. The American school, in general, should show greater imagination, initiative, and responsibility than it has in bringing art to the school and the child to art.

Independent agencies, such as Young Audiences, are also helping build audiences among children of school age and in recent years performing arts organizations themselves have assumed greater responsibility for building appreciation of their arts among youth. Observing what has been done in Europe, some have established children's matinees, other youth events, and special student ticket prices.

While present day activity by the schools, by independent agencies, and by arts organizations themselves are heartening, it must be candidly admitted that they are but a fraction of what will have to be provided if the education of young people in the live performing arts is to be measurably broadened in our lifetime. The effective exposure of young people to the arts is as much a civic responsibility as programs in health and welfare. Although the panel recognizes that the initiative for an expanded educational effort in the arts will generally come from individuals, success in the measure necessary will require the combined backing of the family and school system. Also important are the encouragement of private organizations, local and State arts councils, and the cooperation of local governments and the Federal Office of Education.

Availability of performances

For adults, too, the actual presence of the performing arts is essential to audience development. The ready availability of music in Germany, Austria, and Italy, of drama and ballet in Russia, has no counterpart today in America.

The new mobility

Many more resident professional performing arts organizations are needed in communities throughout the country, but if the arts are to be made as widely available as is desirable, the panel emphasizes the necessity of increasing the mobility of the performing arts by new means and on a new scale.

What is needed is a new, broader concept of touring, of increased mobility. Established organizations touring within a State under the sponsorship of a State arts council

is a recent development. Another new kind of touring is that undertaken within a single metropolitan area, bringing theater or music to people who are remote psychologically rather than physically from the cultural center of things. So is touring by a regional company, its settings and equipment specifically designed for a homeless life. So is touring by a company set up to appeal to a specific kind of audience—children, workers, the institutionalized.

Mass media

Television, radio, and recordings offer the technical means to provide virtually every American with the possibility of witnessing—albeit remotely—performances of high quality. There is no possibility now for live performances of similar quality to reach this mass audience. Hence, the media have a unique opportunity to fill a gap that is likely to exist indefinitely, even though it may be contended that the live arts and the electronically transmitted arts are two quite separate forms. This panel, however, believes the importance of the electronic media cannot be overstressed in increasing the availability of the performing arts of high quality and in creating new audiences and even new works for them. In the view of this panel, the commercial television industry has a definite responsibility to improve its methods of presentation and programing in the performing arts.

Educational television, not being bound by the same requirements as commercial television, has potentially greater flexibility in programing material relating to the performing arts. It can encourage appreciation of fine drama and music, familiarize the audience with the complexities of technique in performance; increase appreciation of the modern and classical repertory through reiterated hearing; and illuminate matters of form and content through critical discussions.

But educational television generally has not done these things well enough or often enough. It lacks funds, in some cities it has been unable to reach agreement with performer unions, and it has not in general attracted top-quality television production. Most serious of all, it is still debating its proper function: Should it be primarily a teaching service offering in-school services and adult education services? Or should it be a general cultural medium? When it surmounts these hurdles, when it decides what it is and what it wants to be, the panel believes educational television has a great opportunity to make a significant contribution to the arts. The panel urges the community to provide the support necessary to exploit this opportunity vigorously.

Amateur activity

The extent to which amateur activity in the performing arts strengthens audiences for professional performances is a question on which opinions are deeply divided. Inexperienced audiences, whose only exposure to the living theater is through amateur dramatics of less than first-rate quality, sometimes compare it to the superior quality of television and motion pictures and conclude that the difference is in the media rather than in the level of acting. Amateur and community groups occasionally are antagonistic to professional drama—and vice versa—since both compete for box office and financial support. On the other hand, amateurism can be an ally of successful professional performance. The individual who finds a personal commitment beyond his own satisfaction in playing in a string quartet at home or in performing on the boards of the local little theater surely gains an increased understanding of the crafts involved.

So long as neither professional nor amateur confuses the two areas of expression and both retain a perspective toward excellence, the relationship between them can be lively

and constructive. The panel believes that thriving amateurism can play a major role in creating audiences for high quality professional performance and that amateur interest in the arts should be encouraged in every possible way.

CHAPTER 11. THE CHALLENGE OF THE PERFORMING ARTS

This study of the performing arts is made with the conviction that the arts are one of the central elements of a good society, an essential of a full life for the many, not a luxury for the few. However, we can never expect to fill our concert halls, our theaters, our opera houses—the ones we now have and the ones we shall build—unless men and women and young people experience within their walls some new perception of man and the meaning of his life. We cannot hope to hold the audiences we now possess or gain new audiences without drama that is moving and exciting, music that stirs and grips the listener, and dance that creates true enjoyment. We may talk ad infinitum of box office prices and subscription campaigns, press agency and public relations, classes and seminars and critics; the only thing that will draw and hold audiences, present and future, is a world of the performing arts that is vital, beautiful, and relevant—in classical as well as contemporary forms.

It is a bold venture to envisage a great enlargement of the mission of the performing arts when all of them are in deep economic difficulties in carrying out their present programs. The full development of our potential in the arts presents a challenge to the restless American spirit that will call upon its reserves of strength, imagination, and capacity to innovate. We believe the challenge is worthy of the Nation and that the Nation is equal to the challenge.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar 8, 1965]

ROCKEFELLER FUND REPORT CREATES A NICHE FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS (By John Molleson)

The performing arts in America are deeply in trouble, but the day will come when the arts are central in our society, and performers will be considered as necessary as teachers.

Private initiative must be paramount in strengthening the performing arts, though local, State, and Federal Government should give their support. Above all, the direction of the arts must remain in private hands enjoying complete artistic freedom.

These are some of the conclusions of a 30-member Rockefeller Bros. Fund panel after an 18-month study of the nonprofit, professional performing arts in America. Earlier Rockefeller reports, issued between 1958 and 1961, were on foreign policy, defense, education, democracy, and economic affairs.

"Only in our time have we begun to recognize the arts as a community concern to be placed alongside our long-accepted responsibilities for libraries, museums, hospitals, and schools," said John D. Rockefeller 3d, chairman of the panel, and of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts.

Underlying the report is an unstated theme that Government, business, and the arts are compatible in American society—and that an American solution will be found to the problems of cultural development on a continental scale.

It makes the first time, the panelists said, that a comprehensive report on the state of the American performing arts has been attempted. Its findings are based on surveys of 100 corporations, interviews with officials of 75 philanthropies, discussions with dozens of expert witnesses, and hundreds of interviews.

Although one panelist, Samuel R. Rosenbaum, trustee of the Recording Industries Trust Funds, estimated that the present pay-

ing audience of the live professional performing arts does not exceed 1 percent of the population, the report emphasizes that "the arts are not for the privileged few but for the many * * * their place is not on the periphery of society, but at its center * * * they are not just a form of recreation but are of central importance to our well-being and happiness."

One of the chief findings of the report is that the size of America and the present shortage of competent professional arts organizations call for the establishment of institutions that will serve large geographic areas. New concepts of putting shows on the road and of regional organization will be required, the panel said.

WHAT'S ASKED

The panel asked for the formation of non-profit professional theater companies and symphony orchestras in 50 metropolitan areas, along with 6 regional opera companies, choral groups, and dance companies—operating year round. To support them, an additional \$40 to \$60 million above projected box office receipts would be needed annually—about one-hundredth of 1 percent of the national income, the survey said.

In a foreword to the 272-page report, "The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects," published today by McGraw-Hill, Mr. Rockefeller calls the study "a challenge, not an answer. If the arts are vital to a mature civilization, how do they best flourish? What organizations are needed to nourish them? How are they to be supported and maintained?"

The study found a "tremendous potential" for the arts in America, but despite the growth of amateur activity in the past decade, the professional troupes and institutions producing opera, drama, music, and dance are "in trouble."

These arts, the panel found, are unable to pay their own way, lack strong sponsorship and are shabbily housed. Their artists are underpaid, underemployed and, often, undertrained. Arts management is beset by problems of money, labor, audiences and standards.

Rather than rely exclusively on Government subsidies, the panel placed "major responsibility" for the survival and growth of American performing arts on the shoulders of the private contributor—individuals, foundations and corporations.

The performing arts are not self-supporting, and should not be expected to be, the study said. To cover all costs with ticket sales would price the arts beyond much of the potential audience and discourage new and experimental works.

The panelists noted that culture receives a surprisingly small percentage of private philanthropy in the United States. Private gifts to all causes totaled \$10 billion in 1963, the report said, and less than 2 percent (about \$200 million) went to cultural programs of all kinds, with the performing arts receiving less than half that amount.

"But there is nothing immutable about the way the charitable dollar is divided up," the panel said. "It is only in the past few years that cultural activities have entered seriously into competition for the philanthropic dollar."

In encouraging increased foundation support, the panel urged local foundations to stimulate audience growth and new cultural institutions in the communities. The large national foundations were asked to make their contribution in planning and innovating on a national scale.

As for Government aid, the study recommended that local governments take primary responsibility for adequate arts education in the schools. State governments for support of touring groups and cooperation among regional organizations, and the Fed-

eral Government for providing matching funds for building concert halls and theaters.

THE MEN

The 30 panelists, most of them board members and trustees of arts organizations, included such men as August Heckscher, director of the 20th Century Fund and former special consultant on the arts to President Kennedy; Devereux C. Josephs, former board chairman of New York Life Insurance Co. and trustee of Lincoln Center; John H. MacFadyen, former director of the New York State Council on the Arts; Joseph Verner Reed, chairman of the American Shakespeare Festival, Stratford, Conn.; and Frank Stanton, CBS president.

Among their other proposals were these: Formation of a national information center to assist the arts and communities, corporations, foundations, and governments seeking knowledge of the arts and art developments.

Construction of concert halls and theaters. More than 100 cultural centers are being built or planned, but only 30 are designed for more than 1 performing art.

Encouragement of community and State arts councils.

Adequate pay and longer seasons for artists.

Year-round communication between management and unions.

Repeal of the 10 percent Federal tax on theater admissions.

Increased and better arts programs by educational and commercial television.

Greater attention to the arts in primary and secondary schools.

Revision of university entrance requirements to meet the special needs of young artists.

Performing arts organizations should seek funds in joint fundraising efforts, emphasizing more clearly than they now do their goals and their value to the community.

The report concludes: "In the middle of the 20th century the full development of our potential in the arts * * * presents a challenge to the restless American spirit that will call upon its reserves of strength, imagination, and capacity to innovate. We believe the challenge is worthy of the Nation, and that the Nation is equal to the challenge."

[From the New York Times]

VAST NEW PROGRAM OF AID FOR ARTS URGED ON NATION—REPORT BY ROCKEFELLER BROS. WARNS OF NEED FOR FUNDS

(By Richard F. Shepard)

A vast, comprehensive program of augmented nationwide support for the performing arts is called for in an exhaustive report issued today by the Rockefeller Bros. Fund.

The 55,000-word report, 2 years in the making, finds that the arts are in trouble despite a cultural boom, and urges increased support by Government at all levels, foundations, business, and the public.

The most extensive inventory of its kind ever undertaken here, the report examines the problems, goals, and methods of progress for nonprofit, professional performing arts such as resident theater symphonies, operas, and dance troupes.

Its objective is to explore ways to expand the performing arts in the United States without sacrificing indispensable high standards. The report is the seventh done by the fund's special studies project. Since 1958 the project has studied foreign policy, defense, education, economics, democracy and economic and social aspects of American life.

The performing arts were chosen as a topic because, the report says, "the arts are not for a privileged few but for the many; their place is not on the periphery of society but at its center."

Most of today's cultural expansion represents amateur activity, the report finds.

Comparatively few Americans see live professional performances, which are largely seasonal.

The report concludes that ultimately performing arts should be considered as a year-round contribution. It makes specific proposals, as an interim goal, for permanent companies for each of the arts, to supplement those already in existence.

The study, published today by the McGraw-Hill Book Co. in a \$4.95 clothbound edition and a \$1.95 paperback under the title "The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects," says, "In spite of tremendous growth and exciting promise, the performing arts as we see them today are in trouble."

A 30-person panel, headed by John D. Rockefeller, board chairman of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, met in five 2-day sessions to agree on 27 recommendations. The panel was made up of representatives of the arts, humanities, business, and labor.

It made its decisions on the basis of what was learned from 40 witnesses from the arts and other fields, from 30 specially commissioned papers, and from more than 400 interviews conducted by staff members. The staff surveyed 100 corporations, 8 States, and 47 municipalities.

"Our work is not intended to provide all of the answers," Mr. Rockefeller said. "Rather it is a challenge. The presentation of facts on a focus basis can be meaningful and helpful. We are attempting to point the way to action. The arts are forging ahead. They are moving fast and facing real problems."

Some of the problems outlined in the report are:

A lack of service and information organizations to provide badly needed statistics that could guide growth.

A dearth of performing arts organizations that could provide facilities for presentations or that could sponsor dance or opera companies in large population centers.

Poor pay for most performing artists, and short seasons that make for unemployment.

A need for technological research. "The performing arts have been laggard in sharing the research revolution."

A need for marked improvement in the quality of training for artists. For instance, there is an acute shortage of well-trained stringed-instrument players for orchestras.

Perennial crisis financing, just to balance the books from season to season. Fiscal problems increase even at a time when there is more public interest in the arts.

Woefully inadequate physical facilities, despite the growth of centers.

While more than 100 so-called cultural centers are being built or planned, the report states only about 30 are true art centers that can handle more than one performing art. Others are basically sports arenas or convention halls.

GOVERNMENT ACTION PUT FIRST

The major recommendations fall into the following categories:

Government

While government should in no circumstances vitiate private initiative, reduce private responsibility for direction, or hamper complete artistic freedom, the relationship, traditionally standoffish, between government and the performing arts must be examined anew.

"Increasingly the question has been not whether government should act but how it should act and at what level and by what principles it should shape its policy," the report observed.

The Federal Government should develop the newly formed National Council on the Arts, strengthen existing Federal arts programs, and administer programs that indirectly affect the arts with a greater awareness of their cultural implications. It should also

provide matching grants for the construction of facilities.

The report called for changes in the copyright law, which now permits juke boxes to avoid royalty payments, and suggested that the duration of copyrights be extended to protect artists. It urged abolition of the 10 percent tax on tickets for the commercial theater, which it described as "the experimental laboratory for drama in the United States."

State government should foster arts councils remove tax burdens and restrictive legislation, support touring programs, encourage regional cooperation and assess arts resources.

Local governments can strengthen local arts groups by insuring adequate facilities, providing funds for operating costs, supplying supporting services, purchasing arts organization services for schools and community activities and exempting such groups from taxes and license fees. Perhaps most important, the study of the arts, for appreciation and performance, should be part of school curriculums.

Business

Of all corporate contributions to all causes, only 3 or 4 percent go to the arts. Only a few more than half of all corporations give anything at all to the arts. Corporate contributions can make a life-and-death difference to performing arts organizations. Companies should realize that a healthy cultural environment is in the self-interest of the business community.

Foundations

The performing arts are often inept in seeking foundation grants. Foundation support is "minuscule," although there is some evidence of a general increase. The role of local foundations may be as important as any single factor in the development of the arts. They should provide continuing support.

National foundations can contribute most effectively in areas of planning and innovation. Foundations are particularly well suited to encourage bold and venturesome projects.

Public

Of the Nation's total philanthropic giving, cultural projects receive only about \$200 million a year, or less than 2 percent of the whole. Performing arts get much less than half of this small sum. Despite tax burdens on larger incomes, high and middle income brackets can still provide more support.

Education

Training schools and conservatories of recognized standards, which have been disappearing in the last decade, must be strengthened because they produce the majority of solo artists and ensemble musicians of our finest musical institutions as well as our best-trained actors and virtually all our professional dancers.

Universities and colleges will play an increasingly important role in training artists. They should adjust admission policies and curricular requirements for such students and should attract the most highly qualified artists to their faculties. There is an urgent need to redress the existing imbalance in the financial support of the physical sciences and that of the arts and humanities in universities.

Effective exposure of the young to the arts is as much a civic responsibility as health and welfare programs.

Audience

The performing arts should not be required to live entirely on box office receipts, and indeed, they cannot do so and still fulfill their true cultural mission.

There is a need for touring companies as well as for many more resident professional performing arts organizations throughout the

country. The mobility of the arts must be increased by new means on a new scale.

Broadcasting and records play an important role in making quality works available to large audiences. Commercial television should improve its methods of presentation and programming, and communities should provide support for educational TV.

Thriving amateurism can play a major role in creating audiences for high-quality professional performances and should be encouraged.

Organization

Board members should be as carefully screened as performers.

Officials should be receptive to change and innovation. Full time paid chief executives and presidents should be considered.

Too often the dilettante mentality—belief that all that is needed for success is talented artists—prevails. But a good orchestra, a good theater, a good opera or dance group cannot be established or run by well-wishing volunteers.

Often unions cooperate with management to help the performing arts. On the other hand, featherbedding and needless extra charges afflict the theater. No artist should be called upon to subsidize the performing arts by working for low wages.

Goals

The Nation's artistic goal will be realized when the performing arts are considered a permanent year-round contribution to communities around the country and our artists are considered as necessary as our educators.

Until this long-term goal is achieved, an interim objective would be to develop and maintain a number of companies that would operate on a 12-month basis, in contrast to the seasonal operation of most organizations at present.

These would consist of the following:

Fifty permanent theater companies, approximating the metropolitan areas with populations of more than 500,000, sufficiently large to support year-round resident theater.

Fifty symphony orchestras, which would provide, along with full orchestra concerts, musicians for smaller musical groups.

Six regional opera companies, offering short seasons in several metropolitan areas not yet ready to support year-round performances. These would be in addition to the present four major resident companies and two permanent national touring companies.

Six regional choral groups.

Six regional dance companies in addition to the two major resident dance groups already established.

The report estimates that, at present, \$60 million is being spent each year to operate high-quality nonprofit arts organizations, excluding commercial theater and semi-professional and amateur activity.

"Well-informed estimates of the annual operating cost of the establishment outlined for the future fall between \$150 and \$200 million," the report said. "Therefore, somewhere between \$90 and \$140 million of additional operating funds would be needed."

Tickets could account for between \$50 and \$80 million a year, the report continued. The proposed arts establishment would then need between \$40 and \$60 million annually from other sources for normal operating expenses. This estimate is based on current costs, and does not take into account capital expenditures for more and better halls and theaters.

"The larger amount is not much over one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Nation's present annual income," the panel observed.

In addition to Mr. Rockefeller, the following persons were panel members:

Patricia M. Baillargeon, board member of the Seattle Repertory Theater and Seattle Youth Symphony.

Walker L. Cislser, a director of the Detroit Symphony Orchestra.

Kenneth N. Dayton, a director and past president of the Minnesota Orchestral Association.

T. Keith Glennan, president of Case Institute of Technology.

Samuel B. Gould, president of the State University of New York.

William B. Hartsfield, trustee of the Atlanta Symphony Orchestra and the Atlanta Music Festival Association.

August Heckscher, director of the Twentieth Century Fund and trustee of the National Repertory Theater Foundation.

Margaret Hickey, senior editor for public affairs of the Ladies' Home Journal.

Norris Houghton, cofounder of the Phoenix Theater.

Devereux C. Josephs, vice chairman of the board of Lincoln Center, trustee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the New York Public Library.

Abbott Kaplan, chairman of the board of the Theater Group and chairman of the California Arts Commission.

Dexter M. Keezer, economic adviser of McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Louis Kronenberger, professor of theater arts, Brandeis University.

Warner Lawson, dean of the College of Fine Arts of Howard University, member of the Advisory Committees on Arts for the State Department and of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

John H. MacFadyen, architect and former executive director of the New York State Council on the Arts.

Stanley Marcus, director of the Community Arts Fund of Dallas, the Dallas Symphony Orchestra, and the Dallas Theater Center.

Henry Allen Moe, president and board chairman of the New York State Historical Association and president of the American Philosophical Society.

James F. Oates, Jr., trustee of the American Museum of Natural History.

Perry T. Rathbone, director of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.

Oliver Rea, managing director of the Minnesota Theater Company Foundation, Tyrone Guthrie Theater.

Joseph Vener Reed, Sr., chairman of the board and executive producer of the American Shakespeare Festival Theater.

Samuel R. Rosenbaum, trustee of the Recording Industries Music Performance Trust Fund.

Emile H. Serpos, director of the music division of the Chicago public schools.

Charles M. Spofford, director and chairman of the Metropolitan Opera Association's executive committee and vice chairman of the board and executive committee chairman of Lincoln Center.

Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

James A. Suffridge, international president of the Retail Clerks International Association.

Helen M. Thompson, executive vice president of the American Symphony Orchestra League.

Frazar B. Wilde, board chairman of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Company.

Harold Lionel Zellerbach, president of the San Francisco Ballet Guild.

CULTURAL ESTABLISHMENTS SEEK PATRONAGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call attention to the fine analysis entitled "Cultural Establishments Now Seek Patronage From Broad Base," published recently in the New York Times as to the outstanding business concerns and business leaders who are now giving their active support to the development of arts and culture as an essential element of Ameri-

can life and the very constructive contribution which has been made toward this effort through the generosity of American business.

I ask unanimous consent that this 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:

CULTURAL ESTABLISHMENTS NOW SEEK PATRONAGE FROM BROAD BASE

(By Milton Esterow)

The city's culture establishment is experiencing a quiet revolution. Reflecting an era of some of the greatest social changes in the Nation's history, with cultural ferment spreading from coast to coast, the city's arts patrons, once a tight little body bounded by social position and great wealth, are being transformed into an expanding group that would have surprised, and perhaps even shocked, grandmother.

"We are swinging away from the patronage of the few to the patronage of the many," a director of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts says.

The shift is considered far from complete. Increasingly, the city's power structure is being drawn to the arts, resulting in a broadening of corporate giving as well as in direct participation by prominent executives.

And still another development may be the emergence of the city and State as wide-ranging arts patrons, as part of the growth of a distinctly American pattern for support of the arts.

More and more, bankers, industrialists, stockbrokers, real estate men, lawyers—some of whom not only would have been unable to become directors of the Metropolitan Opera decades ago but who also would have had difficulty even getting into the place—are becoming Manhattan's Medici.

With a growing sense of responsibility for providing outlets for the growing leisure, the arts patrons are giving time and energy, as well as money, to furthering the city's cultural life.

Some, like the 15th century Florentine patron Lorenzo de Medici, can speak fluently on painting, sculpture, music, philosophy, and poetry. Some cannot. Not all deserve the title but some still use it for social climbing.

A COMMON DESIRE

But for the most part, they are motivated by a desire to bring new faces, new money, and new ideas to support and improve the city's concert halls, theaters, opera house, museums, and libraries. They are dominated by a segment of the establishment that is not obsessed with personal publicity and, in fact, prefers to stay in the background.

Some devote a few hours a week, some a few hours a day, and some a few days a week. None receive payment for their services.

"You have a much broader base today," a museum director says. "The average age has gone down. The younger crowd—a lot of people in their thirties—is much more interested. And you have many more women active."

In the 1920's, one man, the financier, Otto Kahn, could and did support the opera. In the 1930's, when the late Charles Triller was board chairman of the Philharmonic-Symphony Society of New York, he would go to Wall Street once a year, after finding out the size of the organization's deficit. In those days the figure was about \$50,000. Mr. Triller would spend just one morning calling on friends and then head back uptown with the deficit wiped out.

DEFICIT AND COSTS RISE

This does not happen today. The Philharmonic's fundraising goes on almost all year. "You no longer have so many people

to give substantially," says David M. Keiser, chairman of the board of the Philharmonic and president of North American Sugar Industries, Inc. "In addition," he said, "the deficit has grown to \$300,000 as costs and the orchestra's activities have increased."

"Often, in major capital campaigns for a major development, a substantial proportion comes from a few donors," said John D. Rockefeller 3d, chairman of the board of Lincoln Center. "But in annual giving, support is much broader."

"In the early 1930's there were probably not more than 100 people who supported the opera," says Anthony A. Bliss, president of the Met and a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy. "You no longer have an Otto Kahn to pick up the tab today. But we now have 70,000 supporters."

If Mr. Kahn paid the way, he had other colleagues who also simply wrote checks. Now, however, patrons still write checks, but they also ring doorbells. "In the old days the directors wouldn't dream of going out and drumming up trade," Lauder Greenway, chairman of the board of the Met and a director of the Philharmonic says.

NEW MONEY USED

In the old days, too, if your money dated only from the Civil War and not from the Revolution, it was considered tainted. Today, there is not only money from Astors and Goebels but also money that dates from World War II.

"It's no longer true that you must be exceedingly wealthy to be on the Met opera board," Mr. Bliss said. Checking a list of the 37 board members (the board has nearly doubled since 1930), he declared: "I see eight people whom you would classify as among the very wealthy. The majority don't have real money to be real patrons of the arts. Their effectiveness now is more from the work they do than from the money they can give."

"I will not recommend a person to be a board member solely because he has money," Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., president of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, says. Mr. Houghton, who is also president of Steuben Glass, Inc., paused, smiled, and added: "But I won't hold it against him."

In all cultural institutions the trend these days in broadening support is to establish such fundraising arms as "friends," "patrons," or "members" of a particular organization.

The Met is typical. The Metropolitan Opera Guild, founded in 1935, has sustaining, associate, contributing, and donor members (prices range from \$20 to \$100 a year; total membership is 62,501). In 1952 the National Council, to promote the Met as a national institution, was established (520 members, who pay \$250 to \$500 annually).

In 1961, patrons of the opera was born; in 1962 company patrons. The Met's deficit has also grown. In 1943, the figure was \$110,000. This season, the deficit is \$1.75 million.

But attendance at the opera has grown, too. "It has become an opera for all the people," says John W. Drye, Jr., a member of the law firm of Kelley, Drye, Newhall Maginnes & Warren. He is also chairman of the board of the Juilliard School of Music and a director of the opera and of Lincoln Center.

"By and large, people go to enjoy opera," Mr. Drye added. The audience, according to opera experts, is no longer divided between those who look down on each other and those who look at the stage.

REQUESTS ARE YEARLY

"Since it is difficult to get tremendous gifts to increase your endowment," Mr. Houghton said, "what you try to do is obtain additional funds annually. Every additional \$40,000 you raise, for example, is equivalent to adding \$1 million to your endowment. That is

what is happening with cultural and educational institutions. You try to increase annual giving by a couple of hundred thousand through various activities. This is a healthy thing. It associates the giver with the institution."

Last November, the Costume Institute of the Metropolitan Museum of Art raised \$74,000 in its annual ball at the museum.

"More important than the \$74,000 was the interest in the institution that you generated on the part of the public," Mr. Houghton said.

Smiling, he continued: "What would the early trustees have thought of people from the dress and garment industry, critics and such having a ball at the Metropolitan Museum? But I think it's wonderful that people use these institutions now. They're at ease in them. It's become a part of them."

"I think what has happened in the arts is that for a long time business activities and the people who operated them operated within society, but without being a part of it. There is an increasing realization that business and industry are a part of society and have a responsibility to society."

CORPORATIONS LISTED

Among the major business organizations that contribute to the arts here or whose executives serve on arts boards are the American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, the Chase Manhattan Bank, First National City Bank, Ford Motor Co., General Motors, International Business Machines, Lehman Bros., Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., Radio Corp. of America, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), Union Carbide and the United States Trust Co., of New York.

"More and more, the arts are becoming a basic element in community life, the same way education is, and business leaders, as well as others, are recognizing this," Mrs. Rockefeller said.

Amid the change from private to public support, the culture establishment sees further changes.

"The process is by no means complete," says Charles M. Spofford, a vice chairman of Lincoln Center, and one of the most active New Yorkers in the arts. He is a partner in Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, one of the city's most prominent law firms.

Mr. Spofford declared:

"Gradually, there will be greater support from cities and States to cultural institutions. It has already been accepted in the case of libraries and museums. And in ventures like Lincoln Center I think it will gradually come to be accepted. This will make a difference between stability and instability. The city's performing arts institutions are a generation behind its libraries and museums, which for years have been receiving city support."

CITY OWNS PROPERTY

Among institutions receiving city support is the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The city owns the building and the land and contributes \$1.29 million of the expenses. The current annual budget is \$5.25 million. Attendance at the museum was 5.75 million last year. In 1953 it was 1.53 million. The New York library system, with 80 branches receives \$9.37 million.

"There have already been steps in this direction," Mr. Spofford said. "The State and the city each contributed \$15 million to Lincoln Center." In addition, the city owns the City Center, which pays a token \$1 in rent. In 1962, when Carnegie Hall seemed doomed to demolition, it was purchased by the city for \$5 million and leased to a non-profit corporation.

"This is not to shift the responsibilities onto the city," Mr. Spofford observed. "But I think that since these institutions are community assets, it is fair and feasible that the community contribute to their support."

This is beginning to happen all over the country. I think in this way we will have an American pattern for support of the arts, working it out with the community governments."

Devereux C. Josephs, former board chairman of the New York Life Insurance Co., and a vice chairman of the Lincoln Center, agrees.

ATTRACTS VISITORS

"Cultural institutions attract people to the city," he said. "Why do you suppose the Austrian Government, for example, gives money to arts festivals and to the support of arts organizations? Because it attracts tourists and a lot of money is derived from tourism."

Money played an important part in the recent dispute over the operations of the Lincoln Center Repertory Theater, one of the city's newest cultural institutions. Center and theater board officials were dissatisfied with costs and critical reaction and began looking elsewhere for artistic and administrative help. This led to the departure of Robert Whitehead and Elia Kazan, the theater's coproducing directors.

If there is dissatisfaction with artistic and administrative help in other places, no one is saying so. At any rate, there is seldom interference with the artistic side of the operation.

"The opera board never interferes in artistic matters," Mr. Bliss said. "On the other hand, Mr. Bing (Rudolf Bing, the Met's general manager) keeps me informed of what is happening."

Mr. Ames of the Philharmonic said: "We do have a music policy committee and some members of the board, for example, may have been critical of the avant-garde series put on last year, but if Mr. Bernstein (Leonard Bernstein, the orchestra's music director) wants to put it on he has complete authority and nobody questions it."

One Philharmonic observer put it this way: "Whatever Lennie wants, Lennie gets."

Mr. Drye said that he does not interfere with the artistic side of Juilliard. "I don't think any board of directors can run the artistic side of anything. They should know what things cost. It's like a big corporation. You get the best man you can. If he doesn't run it well, you get rid of him."

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY PERSONS CONSIDERED

"The management should go to exhaustive lengths to make sure they've got the right person," Mr. Houghton said. "When Francis Taylor resigned from the Metropolitan Museum some years ago we spend a good many months and considered well over 150 names before we selected James Rorimer."

Not everyone shares the view there is no artistic interference. One observer had this to say: "Theoretically, what they say is true. But don't you control artistic things by means of economics? Would you have had the blowup at the Lincoln Center Repertory Theater if they felt that Robert Whitehead had run a tighter ship? Don't you go back to money no matter how you spell it? Should the business morality of the business world govern all this?"

"We could use a little less conservative control. We could use boards that are a little more venturesome. It seems to me that the arts are not a business and can't be run like a business. Without a realization of artistic problems or professional know-how you can't make intelligent decisions. I don't think they know enough about culture. I don't think it's that vital in their lives."

Another comment occasionally heard is: "Why do you have so many on more than one board?"

Mr. Houghton's reply is: "You have a type in this city and other cities, the trustee type. You put them on a board of any institution

and it will be well run, whether it's a library, a museum or a hospital. You do not pick them because of a special knowledge of the field in which the institution is engaged."

He continued:

"The trustees have the ability to select good people. They know where to turn to get the answers. Whether it's running a hospital or a library, a certain breadth of experience is a very useful thing. That's why a number of people sit on more than one institution."

At any rate, many people are devoting much time to the arts. And many women have become extremely active in recent years. Among them are Mrs. Lewis W. Douglas, a member of the board of the opera, and wife of the former Ambassador to the Court of St. James'.

"I've been in it since 1953, when I got back from London," Mrs. Douglas said. "When I'm in New York I'm at the opera every day or every other day. I believe strongly that the opera is a force for good. You can think better, you can live better if you have good music in the world. And I love the opera."

As to why more women are participating, Mr. Greenway offers this explanation: "They're very wonderful workers." Then, smiling, he adds: "Think of how many women have the money these days."

ONE OF MOST ACTIVE

One of the most active men is Mr. Bliss, president of the opera since 1956. His father, the late Cornelius N. Bliss, banker and philanthropist, was with the Met from 1926 to 1929, serving as chairman for a number of years.

"After father died, Spofford, who was then president, asked me to join the board," Mr. Bliss said. "I found it fascinating. Now, there are days devoted exclusively to opera. Sometimes Saturdays and Sundays. Some weeks there is more opera. Some weeks, more law. I enjoy it."

Mr. Spofford became involved in Met affairs as a young lawyer in the 1930's, when he was assigned by his law firm to handle some negotiations for the opera. He joined the board in 1938.

"Why do I devote my time? The problems are of real interest and I like to work at them. It becomes part of your life. All of this is seldom by design. You just don't go out and say 'I'll become a patron of an organization.' Someone asks you, you become interested, and before you know it, you're caught up with it."

Mr. Spofford is constantly looking for additional candidates for arts boards. In his firm, which is counsel to the Lincoln Center Music Theater, is a lawyer in his thirties named Wallace Hopkins who handles the theater's legal affairs.

"As so often happens, professional interest becomes personal interest," Mr. Spofford said. "He's interested in its affairs and giving his time beyond that of being a lawyer."

Since the men in the culture establishment are quite busy, it is difficult to find mutually agreeable times to meet. They have found that breakfast time is the most convenient.

"Starting the day with knotty problems is not the best way," Mr. Spofford says. "It's a lethal time. But it's the best way to get people together in a hurry."

TRIBUTE TO DR. ROBERT DOWLING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that we are issuing invitations in New York City through Dr. Robert Dowling, the unpaid head of our Department of Cultural Affairs, to the mayors of 31 cities to send representatives to a 2-day regional conference on "The Municipality and the Arts." The

conference will be held in New York City on April 2 and 3.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the New York Times of March 7, 1965, entitled "Dowling Asks City To Raise Arts Aid," may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DOWLING ASKS CITY TO RAISE ARTS AID

(By Murray Schumach)

Robert W. Dowling urged the city yesterday to realize that its cultural activities bring in about \$2.5 billion a year and to expand support of the arts for financial as well as esthetic reasons.

In his first report as nonsalaried head of the city's Office of Cultural Affairs, the multimillionaire businessman warned that there was "a real hiatus" between artist and audience that must be closed by an ambitious program to aid the artists as well as the arts in the city.

"The concentration of the arts in New York," he continued, "is of the greatest possible importance both to the local community and to the Nation at large."

The report, which is addressed to Mayor Wagner, is also a survey of the city's many artistic enterprises and makes suggestions for programs to help men and women in the arts.

"The best of American painting, theater, ballet, and music," Mr. Dowling declared, "has evolved within our midst and constitutes our distinctive contribution to world culture."

This exciting showcase of the arts in a city that is the seat of the United Nations, he observed, impresses foreign dignitaries with the Nation's varied cultural interests.

"Such an atmosphere," he said, "must be maintained and encouraged in order for New York to continue to exercise leadership."

Mr. Dowling noted that the city already has invested millions of dollars in the arts and should protect this commitment. He showed, for instance, that in the 1965-66 capital budget the city has earmarked nearly \$11 million for the cultural field. This allotment ranges from public libraries to free concerts in the parks by the New York Philharmonic.

He urged the city to pay particular attention to the problem of the continuing crisis in studio housing for artists and he advocated an eight-point program to ease this situation.

Mentioned in this plan is the possibility of including in new low-cost or middle-income housing ventures some provision for artistic facilities. Another idea put forward is possible conversion of historic landmarks for use by artists.

The report points out that some buildings can be rehabilitated for artistic use and urges that in considering future land-use in the city, the position of the arts be considered.

As an example of how much the city can do for the arts, Mr. Dowling cited its purchase of Carnegie Hall for \$5 million in 1960, when it was threatened with demolition. He noted that the city has invested \$10,750,000 in Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts and had contributed more than a million dollars to the New York Shakespeare Festival.

The creation of an optimum environment for the arts in New York City, said Mr. Dowling, represents a major challenge to all concerned in both public and private life.

As part of its program, the Office of Cultural Affairs has extended invitations to the mayors of 31 cities to send representatives to a 2-day regional conference on the municipality and the arts, to be held here on April 2 and 3.

These cities are members of the Cultural Alliance, established in 1963 to exchange artistic performances and loan exhibitions as well as cultural information.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DR. LAWRENCE L. BETHEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the death in New York of Dr. Lawrence L. Bethel, one of our most gifted educators.

Dr. Bethel was the head of the Fashion Institute of Technology. The fashion industry is now coming into its own as one of America's great industries, in part because of the fine work of Dr. Bethel and the excellence of the institute and its graduates.

Dr. Bethel was a leading citizen of New York. Not only the fashion industry in this country, but also other industries abroad were the benefactors of his work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the obituary of Dr. Bethel and two articles published in the New York Times of March 1, 1965, printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LAWRENCE L. BETHEL

The board of trustees and administrative officers of the Fashion Institute of Technology record with profound sorrow the untimely passing of Dr. Lawrence L. Bethel, president of the college, whose vision and imaginative leadership serve as an inspiration to all connected with the college. To his beloved wife Lola and his daughters, we extend our deepest sympathy in their bereavement. Memorial services at Church of the Redeemer, Cold Spring Road and Whitney Avenue, New Haven, Conn., Tuesday, March 2, at 4 p.m. In lieu of flowers contributions may be made to the Cancer Fund.

MORRIS W. HAFT,

Chairman, Board of Trustees.

SAMUEL L. DEITSCH,

Executive Committee Chairman.

SHIRLEY GOODMAN,

Vice President-Secretary.

B. FRANK FULLER,

Vice President-Dean.

LAWRENCE L. BETHEL

The officers and board of directors of the Education Foundation for the Apparel Industry deeply regret the passing of Dr. Lawrence L. Bethel, president of the Fashion Institute of Technology and the foundation's educational director. The loss of his devoted leadership will be felt by all. To his bereaved family we extend our sincere condolences.

DAVID ZELINKA,

Chairman, Board of Directors.

SHIRLEY GOODMAN,

Executive Director.

DR. BETHEL OF FASHION INSTITUTE

Six years ago, 200 design students marched from crowded old classrooms to a brandnew \$8.7 million building at 227 West 27th Street. There the class took part in a ribbon-cutting ceremony opening the new home of the Fashion Institute of Technology, with an enrollment of 1,300 full-time and 2,700 part-time students.

Also taking part in the ceremony was Dr. Lawrence L. Bethel, who had been president of the institute since 1953.

The institute was founded in 1944 as a cooperative 2-year community college by the garment industry and the garment unions under the program of the State University of New York.

For 15 years, it occupied 21 rooms in the High School of Fashion Industries at 225 West 24th Street. Under Dr. Bethel's presidency, the new building was planned and financed jointly by the State University, the Board of Education, and the Educational Foundation of the Apparel Industry.

EXPANSION

Under Dr. Bethel's administration the institute expanded its program of instruction in apparel, textile and interior design, in administration, promotion and merchandising, and in many aspects of advertising.

Its students came from all over the United States and many foreign countries to study in the 35 academic classrooms, 40 technical shops and laboratories, and to take part in the activities in the auditorium, gymnasium and other facilities of the nine-story building.

After a little more than 11 years as president, Dr. Bethel was stricken with cancer, and he died yesterday at University Hospital at 58. He lived at 832 Ridge Road, Camden, Conn.

Dr. Bethel was a member of the President's Committee on Education Beyond High School, a member of the board of directors of the Council of Higher Educational Institutions of New York City, a member of the State Advisory Council on Higher Education, and former president and director of the American Association of Junior Colleges. In Connecticut, he was former president of the State Council on Higher Education and former president of the State Conference of Junior Colleges. He also was former president of the New England Junior College Council.

He was the coauthor and editor of three textbooks, "Industrial Organization and Management," "Production Control" and "Essentials of Industrial Management."

EDUCATION

Born in Warrensburg, Mo., he obtained a bachelor of science degree in education from the Central Missouri State College, a master's degree from Columbia University, and a Ph. D. degree from Yale University.

Before heading the Fashion Institute, he taught commercial education in high schools in Missouri, New Jersey and Connecticut and was director of New Haven College in Connecticut.

After coming to New York he lectured at Harvard and Yale Universities and half a dozen other universities in the West and Southwest.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Lola Cavan Bethel; two daughters, Mrs. Ann Elizabeth McGregor and Miss Kathleen Bethel; three sisters, Mrs. Robert Brockman, Mrs. Curtley DeWitt and Mrs. Robert Powell, and one grandchild. A funeral service will be held Tuesday in the Congregational Church of the Redeemer in New Haven.

L. L. BETHEL DIES; EDUCATOR WAS 58—HEAD OF FASHION INSTITUTE LED MAJOR EXPANSIONS

Dr. Lawrence L. Bethel, president of the Fashion Institute of Technology since 1953, died of cancer yesterday in University Hospital. He was 58 years old and lived at 832 Ridge Road, Hamden, Conn.

Dr. Bethel was a prime mover in the expansion of the institute, a 2-year community college that trains young men and women for creative and executive posts in the fashion trades. The college is under the auspices of the State University, the city board of education, and the Educational Foundation of the Apparel Industry.

Under Dr. Bethel's administration, the college moved in 1959 into its nine-story, \$12 million building at 227 West 27th Street, between 7th and 8th Avenues.

A serious, hard-working educator, he was also a leader in the college's 10-year, \$36 mil-

lion development plan, started in 1963, which is to add four buildings to the campus.

INITIATED SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Dr. Bethel opened up new areas of study for the institute, including programs for the millinery and men's wear industries, and courses in communications and fashion buying and merchandising. He organized "industrial associates" throughout the apparel industry to serve as honorary alumni and to help the college develop a partnership between business and education.

In 1957, Dr. Bethel, a member of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, told a State education conference in Albany that the committee favored community college expansion.

"The growth of community and junior colleges," he said, "is a significant development of our educational system in this century, and is probably the next logical step in filling in and rounding out our educational system."

Dr. Bethel had helped Israel, Mexico, and Puerto Rico to set up schooling for careers in the soft-goods industries.

Before coming to the Fashion Institute, he was director, from 1937 to 1953, of New Haven College, a community college operating at Yale University. He had lectured on Industrial Administration at Yale from 1950 to 1952.

Earlier he held administrative posts with the Hamden High School, Hasbrouck Heights, N.J., High School; Nevada, Mo., High School, and Adrian, Mo., High School.

HELD YALE DOCTORATE

He was born in Warrensburg, Mo., and graduated from Central Missouri State College in 1928. He held a master of arts degree from Columbia and a Ph. D. from Yale.

Dr. Bethel had edited and was coauthor of three textbooks on industrial management.

A former president of the American Association of Junior Colleges, he was a director of the Council of Higher Education Institutions of New York City and a member of the State Advisory Council on Higher Education.

Surviving are his widow, the former Lola Cavan; two daughters, Mrs. Douglas McGregor and Kathleen; three sisters, Mrs. Robert Blockman, Mrs. Robert Powell, and Mrs. Curtley De Witt, and one grandchild.

A memorial service will be held at 4 p.m. in the Congregational Church of the Redeemer in New Haven.

THE SITUATION IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 10 minutes on a certain subject.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, anyone who has been listening to the radio and watching television, or reading the papers today cannot help but be shocked by the exercise in terror which goes under the name of police action in Selma, Ala., as illustrated yesterday by the breaking up—with great violence, many injuries, and hospitalizations—of a peaceful, nonviolent march of 600 Negroes who were seeking to assert their constitutional rights of free speech and petition. I use every word with great understanding, as a lawyer, of what the words mean. That is what they were doing in their march.

I am lawyer enough to know that it must be assumed they were well aware of the order of Governor Wallace which said that such a march should not take place. But I have very grave doubt as to

the legality of this order. These orders have been tested before in the courts.

Yesterday in Selma a disgraceful display of terror was used to inhibit the exercise by citizens of their constitutional rights, and their right to test whether or not those rights existed in a given situation.

It is one thing to arrest Negroes, even if they are arrested under some phony statute which does not have a basis in law, or on an order of the director of public safety, a police chief, or a Governor, which orders have no basis in the law.

That is very different from breaking up a peaceful, nonviolent exercise with the use of terror. It is at the least an effort to negate the law.

It seems very clear that wise government would never indulge in such action. That statement is true without regard to the intentions of those who promoted the march. Perhaps their intention is to invite just such violence, but their intention has no bearing on the matter.

There is in Selma, a direct confrontation between the United States and the State of Alabama. This situation has arisen before. President Eisenhower, under the authority of title 10, section 333 of the United States Code, sent troops to Little Rock to deal with such a situation. That section reads as follows:

The President, by using the militia or the armed forces, or both, or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, if it—

(1) so hinders the execution of the laws of that State, and of the United States within the State that any part or class of its people is deprived of a right, privilege, immunity or protection named in the Constitution and secured by law, and the constituted authorities of that State are unable, fail, or refuse to protect that right, privilege or immunity, or to give that protection; or

(2) opposes or obstructs the execution of the laws of the United States or impedes the course of justice under those laws.

In any situation covered by clause (1), the State shall be considered to have denied the equal protection of the laws secured by the Constitution.

Later, President Kennedy, acting under the same statute, sent U.S. marshals to Alabama to deal with a similar situation. There was also an occurrence of this kind in Mississippi.

It seems to me that the time has come to act. The subjecting of American citizens to brutality inflicted under the color of law is both senseless and shocking.

The law is quite adequate to give the President power to proceed. I think, in all fairness, that anyone who has seen or read of this occurrence must come to the conclusion that affairs in Alabama have gotten completely out of hand.

There is no reason why the President cannot declare that the incidents in Selma do not represent law and order as we know it in our country. The Selma police have taken the law into their own hands. Abdication of law for anarchy is equally bad for whites and Negroes and it is unconscionable for the police to substitute their terror for law.

In view of the bloody heads and terror-filled attacks which have been reported,

it is indeed a grim Monday morning if we say that the Federal Government has no responsibility to maintain law and order. It has exactly that responsibility when the rights of citizens of the United States are involved as they are here.

I know that great movements do not end without some kind of sacrifice. Many sacrifices have been made in these cases. But great movements should not take place under the law of the jungle and the law of tooth and claw, but under the rule of law.

Mr. President, I end where I began. There is a confrontation between the United States and the State of Alabama. We have had such confrontations before in civil rights and we shall have them again.

This is the time when the United States must take its full responsibility to protect the lives and safety of its citizens, inasmuch as these are matters that can under law be redressed by the Federal Government. In section 902 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Congress contemplated such application in providing as follows:

SEC. 902. Whenever an action has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws under the 14th amendment to the Constitution on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States may intervene in such action upon timely application if the Attorney General certifies that the case is of general public importance. In such action, the United States shall be entitled to the same relief as if it had instituted the action.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. JAVITS. There are many such actions pending, arising out of the Selma situation and I would hope that the Attorney General would carefully consider this section of the new law.

In this particular matter, as happens from time to time, we have reached the boiling point. Let us not get beyond the point of no return. It is time for the United States to assert itself in respect of Selma, Ala., in no uncertain terms and say whether or not excessive police action is violating the due process of law. It is clear that such action was taken to a degree which really was not required by the conditions, or the laws as they were interpreted by the Governor and authorities of the State of Alabama. In my judgment, this is unacceptable, to the point where the President will, I hope, assume direct authority in the situation.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—VI

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in a hastily conceived and clumsily executed maneuver to gloss over the actualities of the situation in Vietnam, the State Department issued its so-called white paper on Vietnam.

A leading editorial in this week's New Republic says of this publication that at its best it is "entirely unconvincing." At its worst, says the editorial, "it has

a desperate purpose: to prepare the moral platform for widening the war."

I share the New Republic's mistrust of any document that seeks to persuade by half-truths, by half-quotes, by omissions, and by twisting the facts. The so-called white paper is guilty of these serious faults.

The excellent editorial in the New Republic contains a point-by-point analysis of the white paper on Vietnam and shows that there has been an obvious attempt to mislead the American people and to use the "double think" technique of trying to convince them that black is white.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. In the same publication, in an article entitled "Not for Attribution," Alex Campbell gives a vivid account of the manner in which the white paper was issued and explained. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Campbell's article be likewise printed in the RECORD after the previous insertion at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

THE WHITE PAPER

The best that can be said about the State Department's white paper on Vietnam is that it is entirely unconvincing. The worst is that it is contradictory, illogical and misleading. It has a desperate purpose: to prepare the moral platform for widening the war. The bombs which United States and South Vietnamese attackers hurled at North Vietnam last week were probably being loaded as the white paper was distributed in Washington. Still, American sensibilities demand some small assurance that precipitous acts of war spring not from blind frustration but from considered judgment. The white paper attempts to prove that escalation is the only reasonable response to a war which is quite simply a case of "flagrant aggression" by North Vietnam.

Not even the North Vietnamese would deny that they have given the Communist Vietcong in the south some measure of military aid and moral support. It is hard enough to find a purely civil war in history, and increasingly in this century internal conflicts are attended by international kibitzers on all sides—in the Congo, the Yemen, and Cuba, no less than in Vietnam. But the State Department is out to prove much more than meddling: North Vietnam, it says, "has used every resource of its own government to carry out its carefully planned program of concealed aggression. North Vietnam's commitment to seize control of the south is no less total (equally total? or more total?) than was the commitment of the regime in North Korea in 1950." Then begins a summary of the massive evidence of North Vietnamese infiltrators make up the filled and picture-padded pages.

All the State Department's Himalayan labor has brought forth a mouse of an argument. The first conclusion made is that North Vietnamese infiltrators make up the bulk of the Vietcong forces, and 19 cases are cited as proof, complete with photographs of the men, their military history and dramatic narrative ("Then the more than 300 men began walking to the south; they marched by day, rested at night"). But of the 19 infiltrators, 16 are South Vietnamese natives who were returning to their homeland, 1

is unidentified by place of birth, and only 2 are North Vietnamese. All were captured in either 1962 or 1963, although the white paper can't be that outdated; it contains other material about 3 weeks old. In a very short section which appears to be an afterthought, six more infiltrators of North Vietnamese origin are named, without photographs or military history. They provide the only evidence for the paper's contention that "as many as 75 percent of the more than 4,400 Vietcong who are known to have entered the south in the first 8 months of 1964 were natives of North Vietnam."

Figures are given to support the State Department's claim that "infiltrators from the north—allowing for casualties—make up the majority of the so-called hard-core Vietcong." But the white paper conspicuously ignores its own advice; it does not allow for casualties among the 19,500 confirmed and 17,550 estimated infiltrators of the past 5 years. Allowing for the generally accepted Vietcong casualty rate of 50 percent, half of the infiltrators must be removed from battle each year. In the hard-core Vietcong force of 35,000 and the full army of 115,000, that leaves a current total of only 4,200 confirmed and perhaps 3,300 more estimated infiltrators—of whom perhaps fewer than half are native North Vietnamese.

But the State Department would have it both ways: Even if careful readers of the white paper should discover that North Vietnamese aid the Vietcong in roughly the same proportion that Americans aid the Government troops, they are assured that mere numbers are unimportant. The infiltrators are as tough as tigers, and 10 feet fall. "The infiltration of 5,000 guerrilla fighters in a given year is the equivalent of marching perhaps 50,000 regular troops across the border," cautions the State Department. Though the Vietcong fights against all the State Department holds dear, neither napalm in the south nor bombs in the north seems to shake its determination. What the white paper does not explain is the stubborn courage and tenacity of the Vietcong of whatever provenance or hardness of core, year after year, for none of the usual rewards and against staggering odds of survival.

The second conclusion the white paper draws is that war material from North Vietnam and its Communist-bloc allies is pouring into the south. The paper is crowded with photographs of weapons, like a mail-order catalog, to bring home the full impact. But the long inventory of all Communist-made weapons captured from the Vietcong in an 18-month period from June 1962 to January 29, 1964, includes only 22 crew-served weapons (mortars, recoilless rifles, etc.) and 155 smaller arms, hardly enough to equip one of the 139 Vietcong companies. These weapons could have come from anywhere, including Alexandria, Va., where a private arms supplier lists almost all of the items mentioned. Communist weapons captured from the Egyptians by Israeli soldiers in 1956 turn up regularly on the open market, in enough quantities to allow any government to prove Communist involvement in the rebellion of its choice.

Before it became necessary to deny the existence of a civil war in South Vietnam, American military men admitted that about 80 percent of the Vietcong's weapons were unwittingly supplied by the United States by loss, theft, or sale by enterprising South Vietnamese. It now appears that the experts were wrong; if only 177 foreign weapons could be found in Vietcong hands in 18 months, the enemy must be 99-percent equipped with American materiel. Obviously no believable case for a claim of massive arms infiltration could be built on the official list in the white paper, even stretched as it is by the inclusion of every bullet, mess-kit, and pair of socks. And so, quite providentially, a larger supply of infiltrated arms

was found in a sunken North Vietnamese junk in a southern harbor, just as the white paper was being prepared. In the annals of mystery ships, this one poses a fine puzzle. Perhaps the combined United States and South Vietnamese naval patrols are more inefficient than is usually conceded, but the ship was the first encountered in the history of the war. In any case, it hardly merits the full-throated treatment afforded by the white paper. The ship was about the size of a Coast Guard cutter, or slightly larger than the original *Santa Maria*, carrying about one-seventieth of the tonnage of a standard World War II Liberty ship. In relation to the amount of arms supplied regularly to the South Vietnamese by the United States, its supply was insignificant.

The white paper fails to sustain its two major contentions, that there is a large, militarily crucial infiltration of both men and materiel from Hanoi. It also fails to make its political points. The State Department claims that hostilities in South Vietnam began in 1959, as "a brutal campaign of terror and armed attack inspired, directed, supplied, and controlled by the Communist regime in Hanoi." But it was the late President Diem's abolition of the elected village councils in 1956 which made South Vietnam a true dictatorship and alienated a sizable proportion of the population.

In response, the rebellion began early in 1957. It is still an ugly war. According to the white paper, the Vietcong killed 1,359 civilians last year. According to our allies the South Vietnamese, and not reported in the white paper, the United States kills about 20,000 villagers and volunteers every year, largely by napalm bombing. The white paper cites as evidence of North Vietnamese involvement a report of the International Control Commission for Vietnam, which criticized Hanoi's activities in June 1962. The paper does not include item 20 of the Commission's report, however, which charges both the United States and South Vietnam with violating the 1954 Geneva Agreement on Indochina. Nor does it mention the Commission's reported criticism on February 13 of American attacks on North Vietnam, which were called unjustified. The paper destroys all credibility when it selects those findings of the Commission which seem to help its case, and then ignores those which contradict it.

To misunderstand the war in Vietnam is to condemn the United States to dishonor, defeat or worse. The white paper repeats the misunderstandings of the last 6 years, and compounds them with deception. It is no good pretending that there is no civil war in progress in South Vietnam, and that the whole bloody business would end if North Vietnam would "leave its neighbor alone." There is no point in maintaining the fiction that the United States is involved "at the request of the people of South Vietnam," as the white paper does. There is no democratic way for the people of South Vietnam to express themselves—Diem and his successors have seen to that. If asked, and they will not be, the people of South Vietnam would doubtless want to send everyone away, Americans, Vietcong regulars and North Vietnamese. The white paper says that this war is not like any others; that is true, and banal. Like all of the guerrilla wars of our generation, this one cannot be settled one way or the other by military action. The white paper cannot change a complex political conflict into a simple case of aggression over a border.

EXHIBIT 2

NOT FOR ATTRIBUTION
(By Alex Campbell)

Some scores of journalists were asked by telephone on Friday night, February 26, to drop by the State Department Saturday

morning, to pick up a document called "Aggression From the North: The Record of North Vietnam's Campaign To Conquer South Vietnam," and to attend a briefing on it by a Government spokesman. In room 2113, the office of the State Department's News Division, the journalists were handed a bulky mimeographed document that was dated February 26 but also had on its cover, "For release at 6 p.m. e.s.t. Saturday, February 27. Not to be previously published, quoted from, or used in any way." After a quick glance the correspondents, who read the New York Times as a necessary part of their job, realized they had read all the juicy bits in that morning's Times.

An official of the news division said the Government spokesman would give the briefing in room 1912. Room 1912, in another part of the building, was a big conference room, with a lecture platform and rows of comfortable chairs. The correspondents sat down and began reading "Aggression From the North" while awaiting the Government spokesman. The contents said they would find a conclusion on page 74, but "Aggression From the North" had only 71 pages, and there were 9 appendices missing as well as the conclusion. Page 5 was blank, except for the word "Map" and a caption saying, "This map shows the infiltration route from North Vietnam to the south followed by VC Sgt. Huynh Van Tay and a group of North Vietnamese Army officers and men in September 1963. Tay was captured during an engagement in Chuong Thien Province in April 1964." At the foot of page 8 it said, "Insert picture of Major Dan on this page," and in the middle of page 12 it said, "Insert picture of Thao." One or two journalists wondered aloud if it was a do-it-yourself press kit, and if they ought to start coloring Major Dan and Thao by themselves, or wait for the Government spokesman.

Other correspondents were reading in the document about Tran Quoc Dan, Nguyen Thao, and Nguyen Truc. They were infiltrators sent from the north into the south, who had soon realized from talking with the local people that what they had heard in the north about conditions in the south was wrong, so they had defected. Some correspondents wondered if the way to handle infiltrators was to send defectors back north to tell the rest of the people there how wrong they were about the south. But most thought the one honest man in the document was Nguyen Hong Thal, a defector who explained that he had begun to be depressed by combat conditions and the rigors of guerrilla life.

"Aggression From the North" had its own description of life in the south. It said, "The military and insurgency situation was complicated by a quite separate internal political struggle within South Vietnam which led in November 1963 to the removal of the Diem Government and its replacement with a new one. Effective power was placed in the hands of a military revolutionary council. There have been a number of changes in the leadership and composition of the government in Saigon in the ensuing period." Most of the journalists thought this too bald and almost as misleading as what the infiltrators from the north were told about the south.

Reading on, they learned that the infiltrators sometimes carry "a small knife that can inject poison into the body of a victim," and that they get their instructions over the official government radio in Hanoi, which sends them their orders "in veiled code." This puzzled the journalists who read on another page of the document that infiltration groups are issued "a set of black civilian pajama-like clothes, two unmarked uniforms, rubber sandals, a sweater, a hammock, mosquito netting, and waterproof sheeting." No radios.

The State Department's spokesman turned up, looking remarkably like his brother in the White House, and asked the journalists not to name him in their stories, though he would answer their questions.

"Bill," a journalist asked him, "why is this document marked for release at 6 o'clock tonight when it was in the Times this morning?"

The spokesman said stiffly that somebody's ethical standards were "different from mine, and I hope from yours."

"Bill," another journalist asked, tactfully changing the subject, "why does it say in the second paragraph of the introduction to 'Aggression from the North' that the war in Vietnam is 'a new kind of war'?"

The spokesman said there had been a steady rise in the number of infiltrators but he agreed it was "not a quantum jump." Someone asked what a quantum was. Looking more than ever like his brother, the spokesman told him.

Another correspondent wanted to know why the document finished on page 71, before the conclusion and the appendices, and where was the missing map? The spokesman had a man from the news division explain that the mimeograph that the journalists had been given was incomplete and that a full, printed version would be ready for them after the spokesman finished.

The correspondents were curious about the 81-millimeter mortars that the Vietcong are now using. They asked if these were American mortars that the Vietcong had captured. The spokesman said they were "Chinese-made copies of American weapons." The journalists wondered how he knew that. He said the Vietcong had 130 81-millimeter mortars, and the Americans in Vietnam had lost only 16, so obviously the Vietcong's mortars couldn't all be ones they had captured. He added that nothing like a majority of Vietcong weapons were captured weapons, and the Vietcong were becoming increasingly dependent on shiploads of arms from outside, as they switched to more sophisticated weapons of larger caliber. However, he admitted that the Vietcong in spite of their bigger, more sophisticated weapons seldom hurtled themselves against the South Vietnamese and American forces at even battalion strength.

Finally, a journalist asked what the document meant when it said that the United States would continue necessary measures of defense against aggression from North Vietnam, until the regime in Hanoi decides to halt its intervention in the south, or until effective steps are taken to maintain peace and security in the area.

"Bill," asked the correspondent, "what is that 'or' about?"

The spokesman said he wouldn't elucidate it. "It is policy, and so has to stand on its own bottom."

As he got up to go, one correspondent remarked that "Aggression From the North" stood on its own bottom as far as he was concerned.

EFFORTS TO DEAL WITH RACIAL IMBALANCE IN NEW YORK PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have two other matters to discuss.

I call attention to a situation which is developing in New York relating to efforts to deal with racial imbalance in our public school system, which indicates how sharply different the situation is when the community, State, and municipal governments have an understanding of constitutional rights and equal opportunity for education, and, on the other hand, when the so-called social

order is geared against it, and every step must be literally dragged out of the authorities by court action.

It is for that reason that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD various newspaper articles and editorials about the integration plan of the city of New York in its public school system, widely published this morning.

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

[From the New York Times, March 8, 1965]
GROSS INTEGRATION PLAN BACKS ALLEN ON SCHOOLS; OMITTS Busing AND PAIRING—REFORMS ADVISED—NEW GRADE PATTERNS, SHIFTING OF 32,000 STUDENTS URGED

(By Leonard Buder)

Basic changes in the city school system to provide better integration and improved education were proposed in a report made public yesterday by the Board of Education.

The plan, which would cost \$28 million to implement, was prepared under the direction of Dr. Calvin E. Gross, the deposed superintendent of schools.

The report did not propose the compulsory assignment of busing of white children to heavily Negro schools to correct racial imbalance. Nor did it recommend any new elementary school pairings or junior high school zoning changes to promote integration.

The introduction of such measures on a limited basis last fall evoked bitter protests from white parents and led to charges that more drastic action would be put into effect next September.

UPHOLDS ALLEN REPORT

The report called for the adoption, as the basis for school policy, of the recommendations made last spring by a special advisory committee appointed by Dr. James E. Allen Jr., the State education commissioner. Civil rights groups have made this a principal demand.

In addition, the report urged these specific measures:

The transfer of 32,000 sixth- and ninth-grade pupils next fall to junior and senior high schools, respectively.

The addition of a fourth year to high school programs.

The conversion of all regular academic and vocational high schools into 4-year comprehensive secondary schools by 1972-73.

The elimination of two all-Negro junior high schools next September. Twenty-eight other de facto segregated junior high schools would be closed in the following years if Negro parents were willing to send their children to integrated schools elsewhere.

The creation of six educational complexes, or clusters, to test new patterns of organization, including a 4-year middle school recommended by the State committee.

The elimination of all short-time instruction in the elementary schools by 1967-68.

Efforts to strengthen the education of the so-called disadvantaged children, including the establishment of more prekindergarten classes.

A systemwide emphasis on promoting better human relations.

NO COMMENT BY BOARD

Dr. Gross' report, which he completed on his final day in office last Thursday, was entitled, "Blueprint for Further Action Toward Quality Integrated Education." It was released by the board without comment.

Dr. Gross was placed on a forced leave of absence with pay, and the board is now looking to settle his \$45,000-a-year contract, which has 4 years to run. The board has expressed dissatisfaction with the superintendent's leadership during his 2 years in

office, including his asserted slowness in drafting a satisfactory integration plan.

Last Friday James B. Donovan, president of the board, said the report was intended to provide a basis for further discussions and public hearings. The board is scheduled to adopt an integration plan for next fall at its meeting on April 28.

Dr. Gross noted in his preface that 9 months of "intensive study and planning" had gone into the report. Dr. Jacob Landers, assistant superintendent in charge of coordinating integration efforts, played a major role in the staff.

"The record of New York City in the field of quality integrated education is second to none among the large cities of our country," the superintendent said in his opening statement. He added: "Although much has been done, it must also be recognized that even more remains to be done."

The key recommendation in the Gross report was the proposal that the Allen committee report provide the guidelines for all school integration policies.

A major recommendation of the State committee was that the city's present 6-3-3 pattern of education (6 years of elementary school and 3 years each of junior and senior high school) be changed to a 4-4-4 arrangement.

This would provide for 4-year neighborhood primary schools; integrated 4-year middle schools, covering grades 5 through 8 and drawing pupils from a wider area; and integrated 4-year comprehensive high schools.

WIDE EFFECT NOTED

Although Dr. Gross in his report acted upon many of the State committee's recommendations he did not urge committing the system to a 4-4-4 pattern.

"Transformation of the school system to a 4-4-4 organization would entail the conversion of some junior high schools to high school annexes and of many elementary schools to middle schools," he said.

"The educational dimensions of the 4-year middle school remain to be explored."

In line with the State committee's recommendations, Dr. Gross proposed that the 4-year comprehensive high school become "the basic organizational unit of secondary education."

All high schools, he said, should become 4-year comprehensive schools "as rapidly as possible except for special academic high schools [the Bronx High School of Science and others] and unit trade vocational schools [such as the High School of Printing]."

However, Dr. Gross noted that because of various factors, including ethnic considerations, he was recommending for next fall that comprehensive programs on the ninth-grade level be started at only two schools—John Jay in Brooklyn and Woodrow Wilson in Queens.

Comprehensive schools provide a wide range of programs, including academic and vocational courses.

Dr. Gross emphasized that new high schools should be built in integrated and predominantly white areas. He added that a vast stepup in building was needed to provide suitable accommodations for the increased number of pupils who will be attending high schools because of their take-over of ninth-grade classes from the junior high schools.

As a further step toward reducing racial imbalance, Dr. Gross proposed that Negro and Puerto Rican pupils be given the option of attending any regular city high school they chose, subject only to space limitations.

The shift of 17,616 ninth-grade pupils to the high schools next fall, as proposed by Dr. Gross, would mean a vast acceleration of a move started last September when 4,717 ninth-grade pupils were transferred.

Next fall, if the recommendations are implemented, nearly half of the city's ninth-

grade pupils would be attending classes in high schools, the report said.

One reason for the shift of the ninth-grade pupils to senior high schools is that it creates room in the junior high schools for elementary school pupils. This, in turn, frees room and staff in the elementary schools so they can reduce overcrowding and add services and programs, including prekindergarten classes.

The six proposed educational complexes would establish clusters of primary schools centered on a middle school for academic and administrative purposes.

Each complex would be a somewhat autonomous unit, headed by an official who would have authority to move teachers and pupils among the member schools to provide better education and integration. Additional services, personnel, and facilities also would be given to these complexes.

The complexes would involve primary and middle schools of varying grade structures.

One would be a 4-4 complex—4-year primary schools (kindergarten through fourth grade) and a 4-year middle school (fifth through eighth grade). This would be set up in Queens and affect Junior High School 126 and Public Schools 7, 83, and 171.

OTHER COMPLEXES LISTED

Three would be 5-3 complexes—primary schools ranging from kindergarten through fifth grade and middle schools covering the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. These would involve the following sets of schools:

Bronx: Junior High School 22 and Public Schools 53, 90, 114, and 132.

Brooklyn: Junior High School 246 and Public Schools 92, 181, and 139.

Manhattan: Junior High School 44 and Public Schools 9, 87, 166, 191, and 199.

The remaining two complexes would be 6-3, involving no departure from the present grade pattern, although one is listed tentatively and may be shifted to a 5-3 setup. These two complexes would affect the following schools:

Brooklyn: Junior High School 162 and Public Schools 123 and 299.

Queens (tentative 6-3 arrangement): Junior High School 180 and Public Schools 104, 114, 183, 47, and 225.

The report called for public discussion and hearings on the concept of educational parks—large-scale complexes containing high schools and possibly community facilities, such as libraries and museums.

The omission of additional pairings—the most controversial feature of last fall's integration program—was in line with a promise that there would be a careful evaluation of them before new pairs were created.

At present there are five pairs in which white and Negro schools have been combined for integration purposes. In these pairings, one school takes all the pupils in the combined for certain grades and the other schools take them for the remaining grades.

GROSS PREPARED PLAN BUT NAME IS OMITTED

The integration plan issued yesterday by the board of education is described on its pale blue cover as "recommendations of the superintendent of schools to the board of education."

But nowhere in the 145-page report does there appear the name of Superintendent Calvin E. Gross, under whose direction it was prepared. The date on the cover is March 5, 1965, 1 day after the board placed Dr. Gross on a 3-month leave of absence with full pay after having advised him privately the week before to look for another job.

A last-minute addition to the report, written in red pencil on the cover, describes his recommendations as "proposals for discussion." Board President James B. Donovan

explained on Friday that the report would become final only after full public hearings.

ORDERLY SCHOOL PLAN—INTEGRATION BLUEPRINT AVOIDS PAIRING AND BUSING TO ACHIEVE STABLE GOALS

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

The new blueprint for "further action toward quality integrated education" in the city schools aims at bringing about a consensus. To achieve this, the superintendent and his staff risked abandoning some of the flashy devices of integration and tried to attract attention to the long-range, orderly reorganization of the schools. There is no call for increased use of that highly publicized device—the Princeton plan, or the pairing of two schools as a means of getting a better racial mixture. The bus as a major instrument of integration has been sent back to the garage.

Instead of viewing integration as a constant reshuffling of children, the report's main efforts are directed at bringing about a stability of school attendance, without at the same time freezing the system into a segregated mold.

What are the major assumptions on which consensus could be expected to rest?

The great majority of parents, white and Negro, do not want young children to be taken out of the neighborhood school, especially when this means bus transportation.

FOUR-YEAR SCHOOL BACKED

The great majority of educators favor the 4-year, comprehensive high school over the 3-year school and over separate academic and vocational schools. The weakest link in the present system is widely believed to be the 3-year junior high school of grades 7, 8, and 9.

The usually unspoken but crucial assumption of any successful integration plan furthermore is that it must do nothing to speed the exodus of white children as well as middle-class Negro children from the city's public schools. Consensus therefore is not only desirable but essential.

Based on these areas of substantial common ground, the new blueprint, in effect, asks parents and, of course, civil rights leaders to accept the following long-range premises:

The proposed 4-year, comprehensive high school system would be a boon to everybody. It would permit a better, more cohesive and challenging curriculum by giving all academic subjects a longer stretch of work under the same educational auspices. But since the high schools are the largest institutions and least neighborhood-bound, they already are and would most readily remain the most naturally integrated ones.

By reducing the elementary schools from 6 to 5 years—with the possibility of an eventual further reduction to 4 years—the neighborhood school is maintained. But since it is naturally most vulnerable to de facto segregation, children may move out 1 year sooner.

As children move into the new middle schools—the former junior highs—community preferences are more easily taken into account. Middle schools can, if the local parents prefer it, be situated outside a de facto segregated neighborhood.

Why have the much-advertised devices, such as pairing, been played down in the new report? A major reason is undoubtedly that most experts agreed from the outset that these devices, at best, would affect only a few children in the fringe areas of the ghettos; at worst, they would have to be constantly readjusted to shifting population.

In addition it was feared that these devices, unpopular with many white parents,

would create more rather than fewer segregated schools.

What about the Allen report? That document, prepared in May of 1964 by the Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions, appointed by Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., the State education commissioner, has been widely adopted by the civil rights leaders as a blueprint for action. In fact, one of the picketing slogans has become: "All the way with Commissioner A."

ALLEN REPORT ACCEPTED

Part of the effort at gaining consensus therefore appears to be the opening sentence of the new report, which says: "The superintendent of schools recommends to the board of education that it adopt and accept as a basis for policy . . . the Allen report."

Those who have been turning the Allen report into the textbook for school integration may charge that the new blueprint departs from the text by not calling for an immediate reorganization to a 4-4-4 plan—4 years each of elementary, middle, and high school. But the new plan maintains that such a step would lead to chaotic use of facilities and would commit the system to an organization that to date exists only in the minds of theorists.

The move toward a 5-3-4 system, on the other hand, leaves the door open for an orderly transition to an eventual 4-year middle school.

Some observers felt from the start that the danger of the Allen report was that it would be misunderstood. Instead of accepting it as a set of guidelines, based on theoretical goals rather than one local practicality, many groups insisted that it should be implemented in full.

LIMITATIONS RECOGNIZED

The misunderstanding was aggravated because some persons contended that the Allen report promised easy, instant, and citywide integration.

Though generally ignored, the Allen report contained this qualifying observation: "Ethnic segregation cannot be wholly eliminated from the schools of New York City in the foreseeable future, but the adoption of wise and intelligent policies can reduce segregation substantially."

SPEARHEAD FOR INTEGRATION

The new integration proposals by the superintendent of schools deserve careful consideration. The report is honest enough not to promise any quick and easy solutions to the city's school problems, but it sketches a broad outline of attainable goals, along with a timetable for immediate action. To say that it offers something to everybody is not, in this instance, adverse criticism; the reform of this vast, 1-million-pupils system must assure that every child is offered improved schooling in the most beneficial environment.

It is of utmost importance that this report and proposals be considered apart from the controversy between the board of education and the superintendent. Prepared under the direction of Dr. Calvin E. Gross before the board asked for his resignation, the document has had the benefit of expert staff work. Although the board has labeled the report "Proposals for Discussion," it is to be hoped that, apart from necessary public scrutiny and review by the board, there will be no effort to downgrade it from its intent as a blueprint for further action. By the same token, the civil rights leaders, rather than anticipating the board's actions with new threats of opposition, can show their interest in constructive action by helping to turn a feasible blueprint into reality.

The strength of the proposals is that they attempt to merge the interest of overall improvement of educational quality with the

purposes of greater education. They rely heavily on the 4-year, comprehensive high school to set off a chain reaction—the substitution of a middle school for the controversial junior high school and the earlier move of children out of the most frequently segregated neighborhood elementary schools.

If the integration impasse is to be broken, sloganeering must give way to serious consideration of these proposals. Since the recommendations follow in principle, even though not in tactical detail, the outlines of the Allen report, the authors of that earlier study could do a substantial service to the city's schools by offering their comment and, if possible, their support. This might put an end to the damaging myth that the Allen report could overnight bring about total integration and quality education.

The success of Dr. Gross' blueprint depends ultimately on the speed with which high schools and middle schools can be built and enlarged. The timetable is essentially a matter of money. Many of the city's high schools are already seriously overcrowded, and the most unfortunate aspect of the long delay in the preparation of this report is that revision and speedup of the construction program have thus been put off. If the board now moves with dispatch, city and State fiscal authorities can demonstrate their readiness to make education the spearhead in the battle for equal opportunity.

PROPOSED CIVIL DEFENSE SHELTER PROGRAM EXPENDITURES SHOULD BE DENIED

Mr. YOUNG OF Ohio. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG OF Ohio. Mr. President, in the recommended budget for fiscal year 1966, officials of the Department of Defense have requested an appropriation of more than \$194 million of taxpayers' money for civil defense purposes. Over the past 14 years, more than \$1,300 million of taxpayers' money has been absolutely squandered on the civil defense boondoggle. In the event of a nuclear war, no American is one whit safer today than he was 14 years ago when the civil defense boondoggle began.

Through the years, while this Nation and the Soviet Union were building up their nuclear capacities, no real interest could be stirred up among the public or in Congress for any form of civil defense. During that time, over \$1 billion was appropriated in piecemeal fashion, but not for any serious or effective plan of action.

Whenever there was an international crisis such as the Berlin crisis of 1961 and the Cuban crisis of 1962, we hurriedly appropriated additional hundreds of millions of dollars for fallout shelters which were never built—and should not have been built—for marking public and private buildings as fallout shelters, for stocking the so-called fallout shelters with survival biscuits, which eventually rotted away, and for other silly schemes which did nothing but soothe our consciences "just in case" nuclear war did come.

Before all the prattle about fallout shelters, civil defense officials were advocating that cities be evacuated in the event of nuclear attack.

One such silly scheme was perpetrated in Columbus, Ohio, which spent \$3/4 million to have all its traffic lights synchronized for evacuation purposes, as if men, women, and children in a moment of peril and terror would look at traffic lights. Another foolish evacuation scheme was concocted by Cuyahoga County paid civil defense officials. They directed that citizens evacuating Cleveland in a westerly direction take the lake road to Lorain, and in Lorain, the thimble-brained civil defense officials instructed evacuees to travel east on the same road.

In Cleveland, there were several policemen sitting around doing nothing, just waiting for the bomb to drop, when women were being assaulted on the streets. I had hoped that we were getting away from that kind of situation, but now the civil defense planners come in and ask for another huge appropriation. For years there has been no official civil defense policy and now planners should realize how ridiculous the various plans have been. They have abandoned some of the old programs but during the past 14 years, \$1,300 million has been spent.

It is hard to conceive of a more absurd, impossible and unworkable proposal than evacuation, but for years this was the official civil defense policy. Eventually, even civil defense planners realized how ridiculous it was and abandoned the evacuation policy entirely.

No administration or any Congress over the past 14 years has really faced up to this issue. It was always easier to pretend that something was being done. It assuaged the fear of a possible guilty conscience.

It is only human to grasp at straws when faced by an overwhelmingly difficult situation, and in appropriating these funds which gradually began to total a staggering sum, this is what was done. No one in his heart really believed that the civil defense fishnet would be of any protection in a surging sea of nuclear destruction. There is no shelter building program in Great Britain, France, or in any of the major Western Powers.

Likewise, reliable observers in the Soviet Union report that there is no fallout program in Russia.

Our best—and probably only—civil defense in this nuclear age is a firm, determined, resolute stand against aggression, such as was taken by President Kennedy in October 1962 and President Johnson in the Tonkin Gulf incident and in the recent retaliatory blows toward North Vietnam responding to their aggressions against South Vietnam.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the majority leader and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. We would be far wiser to appropriate additional funds for our missile programs, our jet aircraft, and our missile-bearing Polaris sub-

marines, than for civil defense schemes that are hopeless from their inception.

Nevertheless, the civil defense planners continue to mesmerize the American public with the illusion that we have an effective defense program.

Mr. President, let me cite these astounding figures in the Office of Civil Defense in the Department of Defense. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, wishes to impose economy in Government—and I am for that and I am for him starting to do so in his own Department.

A total of 990 employees work in the civil defense division. Of this number, 480—nearly half—receive \$13,336 per year up to \$24,500 per year. Six employees receive \$23,320 per year; 20 more employees receive in excess of \$20,000 per year. There are 510—approximately the remaining half—who receive from \$4,400 up to \$10,982 per year. I doubt that there is any other agency in the Federal Government with such a disproportionate percentage of its employees earning such high salaries—where so many are paid such stupendous salaries and do so little.

The average salary of all civil defense employees in the Department of Defense is \$11,478 a year.

By comparison, employees of the FBI earn an average of \$8,467 a year, and in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, where many scientists are employed, the average salary is approximately \$10,085 per year.

Mr. President, civil defense officials will tell us later on when they come for appropriations that the planners have figured out that if the Soviet Union were to attack us with nuclear weapons, if we had a widespread fallout shelter program, instead of losing 100 million men, women, and children, the loss might be only 40 million men, women, and children, under such and such circumstances. Evidently, the civil defense people have nothing to do but sit around on their tailbones and play with figures. Then they come forward with those statistics. Mr. President, figures do not lie, but liars can figure.

These civil defense, high-salaried persons, sit around in their sumptuous offices and do very little for their money except to concoct plans and send messages to each other, plan shelter spaces in public buildings and buy what they call survival biscuits which will soon rot and be of no use.

Mr. President, the administration is doing its utmost to effect economy in Government wherever possible. Only recently Veterans' Administrator Driver ordered the merging of VA offices and the closing of needed VA hospitals throughout the country. In Ohio, the Cincinnati VA office was closed and merged with the Cleveland office. It did not matter that the Cleveland VA office is in a privately owned building and the Cincinnati VA office is in a Federal building. It mattered not that additional rental must be paid in Cleveland and that veterans in southern Ohio with VA problems must make the 250-mile trip to Cleveland. The total amount expected to be saved by these VA directives is \$23,500,000 a year. At the same time

it is proposed that we spend almost \$200 million a year on an outmoded, useless, completely ineffective civil defense program.

VA officials have indicated to me that they believe \$891,000 per year will be saved in Ohio through the merger of VA offices and the closing of the Brecksville Hospital. Mr. President, it is startling but it is true that this amount of taxpayers' money can be saved annually merely by eliminating one-third of the civil defense bureaucrats now earning \$18,000 a year or more. This would mean the abolishing of 45 civil defense positions out of a total of 134 presently being paid \$18,000 a year or more. It is unconscionable to deprive war veterans of needed services in order to save an amount of money that could be saved by eliminating useless and needless bureaucrats in this one department alone.

If the administration wants to save taxpayers' money—and I hope it does—why start with those who served their country in time of war? Let Secretary of Defense McNamara stop shameful extravagances and waste in the civil defense boondoggle which is overstaffed with fancy-dan bureaucrats drawing high salaries, doing little or nothing, except sitting on their backsides writing directives and messages to each other. The same holds true of many other Federal agencies which I intend to discuss in the near future in this Chamber. Let us first eliminate high-salaried bureaucrats who do little or nothing before we start pennypinching with our veterans.

Mr. President, many talk in favor of economy. Before we appropriate additional millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to continue this boundless civil defense boondoggle, I urge that we take a good hard look at what these expenditures will accomplish. I also urge that the administration review its entire civil defense policy. We hear talk about spending millions of dollars for insurance. We all believe in insurance protection, but when the risk is so unlikely and out of the question, then it is merely a waste of money. Let us put an end to wasting more of taxpayers' money on ridiculous holes in the ground, and on ugly yellow and black signs on beautiful public buildings, on apartment buildings, and on business buildings in the cities of our Nation. This is a way for Senators who are in favor of economy to show that they mean what they say. I do not know of a single proposal with respect to which we could more clearly demonstrate our desire for economy and to save taxpayers' money, which otherwise would be squandered.

OIL SHALE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, an excellent editorial by KLZ radio and television, of Denver, on oil shale has just been brought to my attention. The editorial pinpoints some of the extremely difficult problems we are having in trying to get the Department of the Interior to develop a domestic oil shale policy. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

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

OIL SHALE

KLZ radio and television are extremely disappointed that development of the oil shale industry in Colorado seems to be sitting on dead center. We urge Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, to move promptly and establish a clear leasing policy so that all Americans, not only those of us who live here, can reap the benefits of this vast untapped natural resource. We recognize the yeoman efforts which Colorado Senators ALLOTT and DOMINICK and Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL have made in recent years to bring about such development. We encourage them and the other members of our congressional delegation to continue to act forcefully so that the matter can be accomplished during the present session of Congress. This is the heart of the problem: In 1930, an Executive order was issued withdrawing these oil shale lands from leasing or any other form of development. These lands are now sought by private industry so that they can begin production of oil from shale on a sound financial and legal basis. But this is impossible because of that Government-imposed freeze.

Secretary Udall has expressed concern about lifting the freeze because he foresees the danger of a giant giveaway of a possible Teapot Dome scandal like that which occurred during the Harding administration. KLZ radio and television maintains that—with adequate safeguards—such fears, while understandable, are groundless because there is no real parallel between the Teapot Dome scandal and the present leasing question surrounding oil shale development. Mr. Udall did make a sincere effort to get the ball rolling. A year ago he appointed seven men to an Oil Shale Advisory Committee, among them Dr. Orlo Childs, president of Colorado School of Mines. However, the committee report provided the Secretary with still another dilemma; with one member abstaining, the other halfdozen split 3 and 3 over the question of mineral leasing and Government versus private industry development of this resource. Clearly, the Secretary's position is a tough one.

For the sake of Colorado's and the national economy—to which oil shale would provide an impetus greater than the national debt itself—and for the sake of tapping a rich new resource of immeasurable value to the future of our country, KLZ radio and television urges Secretary Udall to act in double harness with our congressional delegation and move now in authorizing private industry to begin an orderly development of oil shale.

A WYOMING TOWN AND A HELPING HAND

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, recently the citizens of a progressive community located in the north-central portion of my State combined their talents and monetary resources to make possible a very warm and human story. The city of Thermopolis, Wyo., boasts some of the finest mineral springs in the world, springs which have long been used by people suffering from various circulatory afflictions. The springs were a benign gift of nature; but an even more impressive medical phenomenon has been raised by the hand of man. I refer to the Gottsche Rehabilitation Center, a private nonprofit foundation incorporated under the laws of Wyoming. The center combines, in one unit, complete facilities for occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech therapy, orthopedic surgery, reconstructive hand surgery,

intensive medical care, and the area's only certified brace and limb shop.

The significance of this facility and the new vistas of hope which it has made possible in the functional rehabilitation of patients have been the subject of a series of articles by Max Jennings, United Press International correspondent in Cheyenne, Wyo. Publicity lauding the latest of these accomplishments, the development of an artificial limb which closely resembles a natural member of the body in its outward appearance, reached Mrs. J. Megchellina Shore, a resident of Denver, Colo. Mrs. Shore read of this new limb with an intense interest, for she was concerned with the plight of her young cousin, Carolien Bos, a native of the Netherlands, whose right leg had been amputated following an allied bombing raid over the Netherlands in the Second World War. At the time when she received this maiming injury, Carolien was only 4 years old.

Mrs. Shore addressed an inquiry to Mr. Jake Pool, Gottsche administrator, requesting his opinion as to the feasibility of an artificial limb that would be attractive enough so that Carolien could wear "normal dresses." Mr. Pool replied that he thought that such a limb could be created for Carolien, but this good news was tempered by Mrs. Shore's doubts that the family could afford the cost of Carolien's trip to Thermopolis from her home in Schiedam, in the Netherlands. Mr. Pool's next letter dispelled any doubts on that score.

It seems that the plight of this young Dutch woman had reached Hugh Graham, manager of radio station KTKE, in Thermopolis. Mr. Graham determined that Carolien's was a worthwhile cause, and proceeded to bring the matter of financing such a transatlantic voyage to the attention of his listeners in Thermopolis. The response was immediate. The Thermopolis Kiwanis Club enthusiastically took up a fundraising drive; and, in cooperation with KTKE, more than \$2,000 was raised to finance the trip and to cover miscellaneous expenses. This amount represented the contributions of hundreds of local residents who were touched by the appeal, and who desired to do a small part toward aiding the plight of a young woman whom they had never seen, a resident of a foreign land to which they had never been.

Armed with these contributions, Mr. Pool and Mr. Graham proceeded to make the arrangements for Carolien to fly to Thermopolis and to spend approximately 4 weeks at the rehabilitation center. Her arrival in Wyoming was marked by the presentation of the title of "Honorary Bronco Buster" by the Governor. Her long sessions with the medical and prosthetic staff at Gottsche have been intermingled with trips to various points of interest in the State, including a visit to the former ranch-retreat of "Buffalo Bill" Cody.

Mr. President, the stay of this young Dutch woman in my State is nearing its completion. I am informed that her new leg has been completed by John Kormylo, Gottsche's prosthetist. Truly, this is the story of a great medical achievement; but perhaps more impor-

tant is the lesson it teaches in terms of human compassion and the natural desire which dwells within all of us to do something for our fellow man. Carolien Bos is being fitted with her new leg; but of equal importance has been her opportunity to feel the warmth and understanding of her thousands of new friends.

Mr. President, this mutually rewarding experience of a Dutch woman and a small city in Wyoming and a great example of the achievements of the private medical institutions which we, as a people, have come to enjoy are worthy of study. I have collected several accounts of this story, taken from Wyoming newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

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

[From the Thermopolis (Wyo.), Independent Record, Jan. 21, 1965]

GRATEFUL DUTCH GIRL HAS HOPE AND DESIRE (By Ray Savage)

Carolien appeared nervous and sat twisting a piece of scrap bandage material as we sat in John Kormylo's office at Gottsche and began our interview.

Because nearly everyone knows of Carolien Bos and how she lost her leg in a bombing during the war, how the people of Thermopolis rallied behind the Kiwanis Club to raise enough money for her trip, new leg, and rehabilitation. I was wanting to interview Carolien to find out what sort of person she was. I wanted to write "something different," something that would let her benefactors know what kind of person they had befriended.

Carolien is of slight build with short wavy hair and a ready smile. She speaks English very well and after the first few moments of talking with her, you almost forget she has been here only a week and has learned her English out of schoolbooks.

Her first impression of Americans came shortly after the war and the bombing in which she lost her leg. Being only 4 years old at the time, she doesn't remember who he was or what he looked like, but she does remember that an American soldier saw her hobbling along on her crude wooden pegleg. He was so "touched" that a small child should be the victim of war, he bought her several books as a gift. She said she treasured and kept the books long after the GI was gone.

Carolien is perplexed with the attention she is getting and one can readily see she's not the type who is used to being "fussed" over. She is extremely grateful and wants to show it. And, yet, she is still bewildered to find herself here in America and in a town she had never heard of, befriended by people she had never met and some she'll never meet. Only the stories she has heard and read of Americans allow her to believe that it can really happen here.

Being the outdoor type, Carolien wants to go swimming and horseback riding. She timidly asked if a bikini swimsuit is proper here. Fearful of doing something that isn't "acceptable" she wanted to make sure it would be all right to wear the bikini. She seemed relieved when assured it would be "all right." I later found out it is the only swimsuit she has.

Carolien graduated from high school and according to the requirements in Holland, she speaks three languages in addition to her native Dutch. "This," she explained, "is required of all students in high school." In addition to English she speaks French and German. Since "there was no money for

college" she went to work as a secretary. She had to quit her job to come to Gottsche, but she said, "There is no unemployment in Holland and good help is hard to find." She isn't worried about finding a job when she returns.

Being fitted for a new limb, one that is entirely different than the one she is used to, takes many hours of casting, fittings, adjustments, and trials. Carolien takes it all with a smile. She is anxious to help John Kormylo—Gottsche's prosthetist—and answers his questions readily.

After wearing a cumbersome limb for many years, Carolien was apprehensive about the new lightweight leg John showed her. Instead of a big heavy belt to hold on the limb, John is using a suction devise and a small light belt which will allow her to wear fitted skirts and dresses. And, when she had a few doubts about the leg staying on, she discussed it with John. After being assured it would stay on and would work much better than her old one, she was much relieved, especially when John told her he would work on it until it did work.

Even after being here a week, you could tell she is still a little surprised that she is the center of attention in the brace and limb department at Gottsche, and a cloud lifted when Kormylo assured her the leg would stay on.

To someone who has worn slacks and jeans most of her life, a dress is about the most important thing in the world. Carolien is anxious to see "how I will look" and is willing to spend long hard hours being fitted with the new leg and in practicing to use it.

Since she was busy with fittings and with visitors, trying to interview her was difficult because of many interruptions; however, before I left, she had talked of many things, especially about the "bigness" of our country and the warmth and friendliness of our people.

She was amazed that the Governor of Wyoming would take time out to present her with an "Honorary Bronco Buster" Award. "In Holland," she said, "even if a government official did take time out to meet a foreigner, it would be a stuffy, formal affair."

One cannot help but notice that Carolien is a bit shy and is sometimes embarrassed that she cannot return the many kind deeds and favors being done for her.

As the interview ended, she asked me to thank all of the wonderful people in Thermopolis and especially those who made the trip to America possible.

[From the Cody (Wyo.) Enterprise, Feb. 18, 1965]

A NETHERLANDS GAL VISITS THE CODY COUNTRY

(By Vincent M. Vukelich)

Twenty years has brought a lot of change into the life of Carolien Bos, of Schiedam, Holland.

Once a child with a wooden leg after a bombing raid in her hometown during World War II tore off her right leg near the hip.

Today she has a new limb and a chance to look at America's wonderful West.

The story of Carolien Bos is a strange one in the fact that someone still unknown had arranged for her trip to the Gottsche Rehabilitation Center in Thermopolis for a new limb.

Her parents said the opportunity to have a new limb was "wonderful, as her old artificial leg made a lot of noise and made a house plant (wallflower) out of her."

The only thing stopping her from coming to the United States and Thermopolis was the cost of transportation. This was soon remedied when the Thermopolis Kiwanis Club, under the leadership of President Bert Leonard, launched a campaign to raise money for her trip to the United States.

"We got enough money (\$720) in 3 weeks to pay for Carolien's trip on Royal Dutch Airlines, round trip," Leonard explained. "Even after we collected the needed amount of money," he said, "we were still receiving aid from local and other interested persons."

Leonard said residents of the Big Horn Basin offered Carolien new dresses, special shoes, dry cleaning, laundry, and to have her hair done at their expense.

Carolien landed in the United States January 11, arriving in Denver. She was then flown to Thermopolis by private airplane owned and operated by Empire State Oil Co. of Thermopolis.

She has been in Thermopolis for the past month being fitted and learning to walk all over again with her new artificial limb.

Doctors said her old limb was badly worn and as a comparison of techniques involved with the new limb, the old had a chameaus socket, whereas the new employs plastics.

The 25-year-old blond Netherlander was recently taken on a trip to the TE Ranch on Southfork where this reporter had the opportunity to "tag along and observe."

It was about 10:30 when Mr. and Mrs. Jordie Acker, Mary Ann Tamaye, a therapy student at Gottsche from Honokaa, Hawaii, Carolien and I left the Irma Hotel for the TE Ranch on Southfork.

Acker, a medical technician at Gottsche, served as our driver. As we drove up the Southfork highway he told Carolien and Mary Ann of the rugged beauty of Wyoming and the West. Carolien and Mary Ann, who was herself making her first trip west, quickly agreed upon the magnificent sight of the Absorka Range in which the TE Ranch nestles.

We arrived at the TE approximately 11:30 a.m., and were warmly received by Jack Saxton, assistant foreman at the ranch. He was traveling to the post office when we met on the narrow road to the main section of the ranch.

As soon as we disembarked, Saxton invited us in for coffee as it was rather chilly that Friday morning. Carolien didn't seem bothered with the cold in the least * * * she was too busy looking at the huge and rugged mountains surrounding the TE.

Mrs. Saxton soon had heaping plates of brownies and steaming hot cups of coffee before us in which seemed like seconds after we arrived.

Not satisfied with letting her guests wander off in search of new finds at the ranch, Mrs. Saxton soon had steaks and salad prepared for dinner. "After dinner," she explained, "you guys can go look around the ranch, but right now it's time to eat."

Carolien's eyes sparkled when she stepped into the living room of the Dick Loftsgarden home, where Mr. and Mrs. Saxton are staying in the absence of Mr. and Mrs. Loftsgarden who are on vacation. Immediately Carolien's eyes went to the huge silver tip grizzly mounted on the wall. "Gee, he sure has little eyes for being such a big thing," she remarked. She stepped a little closer to the animal and touched its teeth and claws.

"That's how you can tell if its a grizzly or brown bear," explained Saxton as Carolien rubbed her fingers over the bear's claws. "If you find claw marks in the tracks," Saxton explained, "then you can be sure it's a grizzly."

Carolien then went into the dining room and admired the fine china and exquisite dinnerware the Loftsgardens have displayed on a shelf overhanging the dining room window. She remarked, "my parents have some of these (dinnerware) in their house too."

Then Mr. and Mrs. Saxton took us on a tour of the ranchhouse which once served as Buffalo Bill's home. The dirt roofs, skylights, and wooden logs which serve as the house exterior were still the same as when Buffalo Bill lived there.

After touring the ranchhouse Saxton took us and another group of Thermopolis people who joined us at lunch time on a tour of the TE guest cabins.

After a tour of the cabins Saxton took us to the main house where ranch owner R. W. Woodruff lives.

Designed in an almost "C" formation Carolien and most of the touring party, including this reporter, were surprised at the enormity of the ranchhouse.

The blue-eyed Carolien remarked, "Gosh, what a huge place * * * and look at that fireplace." The fireplace covered most of the east wall in the Woodruff den.

After visiting the Woodruff house we visited the linen and storage cabin. Inside were beautiful Navajo scatter rugs, saddles used by Mr. and Mrs. Woodruff, various linen, and cabin supplies.

Carolien then went over to Buffalo Bill's one-time retreat cabin. She stood on the porch, peeked inside at the now refurbished furniture. "Was this really Buffalo Bill's hideaway?" she asked Saxton. The foreman agreed, and explained further, "when Buffalo Bill wanted to get away from all of the activity at the ranch, he would go to his retreat cabin and lock himself in for the night."

Saxton then took the group to the "maternity ward" of the ranch.

"The maternity ward," Saxton explained to Carolien, "is the place where we have our calves each year." "Oh, wonderful," Carolien exclaimed, "I've always wanted to see baby cattle," and went her way down to the cattle pens.

After a tour of the cattle pens Saxton took us for a drive to a herd of cattle grazing in the upper meadows. Carolien promptly asked Saxton if she could rope a calf.

"Have you ever roped a calf before?" Saxton asked.

"No," she replied rather hesitantly.

But that didn't stop Carolien. She asked Saxton to fix up a lariat and went after a calf. On her first toss she narrowly missed her calf and shrugged off the miss as a good chance to hop on the back end of the pickup and visit Senator MILWARD SIMPSON's Bob Cat Ranch, a mile west of the TE.

Red faced and not complaining of the biting cold, she hopped off the pickup and into the Simpson ranchhouse. Inside she studied old Indian garb hung on walls in the living room of the Simpson place. It was the first time she saw any Indian clothing.

Upon leaving the Bob Cat Ranch, she signed the Simpson guest book, as did all of us upon our departure.

Then into the back of the pickup again for Carolien. Upon arriving at the TE we had another round of coffee and then Carolien had the chance to shoot a couple of the rifles.

Saxton loaded a .410 shotgun and a .22 rifle for Carolien and set up four clay pigeons as targets.

It was the first time she ever fired a shotgun. On the first shot she was rocked by the blast from the gun, but she hit the target directly. A second blast came roaring from the .410 and another target was shattered.

She then took the .22 rifle in hand. This was a bit harder for her to handle with the longer stock, built for the husky ranch hands of the TE. She missed her targets with the .22 rifle.

It was back to the ranch house and Mrs. Saxton's hot coffee. The sun was beginning to set and an end was drawing quickly to a close for the girl from the Netherlands and her tour of the Cody country.

"I hate to leave," she said, looking at the Absorka Mountains surrounding the TE, "but I will return again if I can."

And so we bid our thanks to Mr. and Mrs. Saxton for their hospitality as we took leave of the TE Ranch with a blonde-haired girl from Holland. Still murmuring in the car

taking her back to her hospital in Thermopolis * * * "what a wonderful day * * * what a wonderful country."

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.), State Tribune, Jan. 15, 1965]

MANY GIFTS SENT TO DUTCH WOMAN

THERMOPOLIS, WYO.—Mrs. Alma Levenson, of Tulsa, Okla., has never met Carolien Bos, but she sent her a \$25 check because she thought the young Dutch woman might need some spending money while she is in Wyoming.

Miss Bos, 23, of Schiedam, the Netherlands, arrived in this northwestern Wyoming town of 4,000 this week to get a new artificial leg and a new way of life.

Her trip was paid for by the residents of the town who raised the money for a woman they had never seen.

Miss Bos lost her leg during World War II when she was 4 and since that time has worn pants to hide the ugly artificial limb—the only kind she had been able to obtain until now.

The Gottsche Rehabilitation Center here is fitting her with a new limb, a new dress, and plenty of hospitality.

Carolien's story was printed in newspapers across the country and her welcome to America is coming from many places, all unexpected, as the check from Mrs. Levenson.

Carolien met Wyoming Gov. Clifford Hansen this week. And if all goes well, she will take her first steps on her new limb in about 10 days. And she's almost certain to wear her new dress soon after that. She picked out the material for the dress Wednesday.

This weekend she is going to a nearby ranch to watch Wyoming cowboys work.

Iced tea, cheeseburgers, and beans are new experiences for her.

Wednesday she had lunch with a sheriff who took her for a ride in his patrol car.

But Carolien's story will not end when she puts on a dress and walks out of the Gottsche Center.

Because Gottsche Prosthesist John Kormylo is not content just to get Carolien walking without a limp—something she has never done before.

Kormylo, who wears an artificial leg himself, has declared he is going to teach her how to dance before she leaves his care.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on February 14, the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day was observed in many parts of our country by citizens of Lithuanian descent. The purposes of such observances are to reinforce our own appreciation of the blessings of freedom, and to reassure the people of the Baltic States that the United States remains constant in our policy of not recognizing their annexation by Soviet Russia.

This, our firm policy, was initiated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and has been reiterated by each succeeding administration. It was confirmed by Congress in 1959 by the adoption of the captive nations resolution, which I sponsored. Each July, during Captive Nations Week, we are reminded of the plight of the oppressed peoples of the world.

This year, on the occasion of Lithuanian Independence Day, the Lithuanian Council of Chicago sent a moving plea to our President. The council expressed appreciation for our policy of nonrecognition, and urged concern for the plight of the people of Lithuania

who, with great faith in the power of freedom, look forward to the day when their country will again be liberated.

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

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

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., February 15, 1965.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The American Lithuanians of Chicago and vicinity, proud of their heritage and of the Lithuanian nation's honorable 700-year history, gathered in mass meeting on Sunday, February 14, 1965, at the Maria High School auditorium in Chicago, to commemorate the 47-year anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. Having been reminded of the end of the 18th century occupation of Lithuania, which lasted for 125 years, and of the restoration of the independent State of Lithuania on February 16, 1918, the meeting also observed with great sorrow the present tragic plight of the Lithuanian nation under the continuing Soviet occupation and colonialism in Lithuania, already a quarter of century in duration.

Utilizing the occasion, this meeting expressed its desire to again thank our Government for its stand on the nonrecognition of the illegal Soviet armed occupation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia. It is our fervent wish that our Government maintain this just policy of de jure recognition of independent Lithuania.

We also appeal to our Government to continue defending the cause of Lithuania, to keep on supporting the liberation of Lithuania from the Soviet Russian occupation, and to bring up the case of Lithuania and the other captive Baltic States in the United Nations for the express purpose of demanding the complete withdrawal of Soviet army units, police and administrative apparatus, as well as the non-Lithuanian colonists brought into Lithuania since June 15, 1940; and that our Government insist that all Lithuanian citizens, forcibly deported into exile in Siberia and the depths of Russia during the last 25 years of occupation be returned to their homelands, thus eliminating all obstacles to the restoration of Lithuania's independence and sovereignty which were forcibly interrupted by Soviet Russian force.

Assuring you of our continued esteem and support, we are,

Respectfully,

CHICAGO LITHUANIAN COUNCIL.

THE PROPOSED CLOSING BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION OF 32 INSTALLATIONS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in the past month, I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams from officers and members of veterans' organizations in my State, as well as from countless numbers of persons in our veterans hospitals or from those with friends or relatives in those hospitals. As you know, the State of Minnesota is not directly affected by the proposed closing of these facilities; but as a representative of my people, I want to state that I fully support those who are asking for further consideration of these measures. We already have the facts and figures relating to costs and economy. But I think we have a legitimate concern in determining the cost in terms of human lives,

human relationships, and human needs. I submit for the RECORD, as an indication of the conviction of my people in the State of Minnesota, a copy of an editorial which was published in the Gopher Overseer of this month. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Gopher Overseer]

VA ECONOMY MEASURES

The Veterans' Administration order closing 32 VA facilities came as a sudden shock to the Nation's veterans.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars had been aware that a study of the Veterans' Administration by the Bureau of the Budget had been going on for more than a year. It was no secret that a few very old, obsolete VA hospitals might be closed down and their patients transferred to more modern facilities, and that some regional offices in areas already served by another office might be discontinued.

Nowhere was there any indication of the change in policy which resulted in the wholesale downward revision of the entire Veterans' Administration structure.

Present law authorizes the establishment and operation of 125,000 hospital beds in the VA system. In addition to this, President Kennedy authorized 2,000 beds within the hospital system to provide nursing care for invalid veterans. The 88th Congress last fall passed H.R. 8009 authorizing the Veterans' Administration to establish still another 4,000 nursing care beds in VA facilities and other beds in State and private homes.

Despite these mandates, the VA at last count had only 46 nursing beds in operation with only 1,000 scheduled for operation this next fiscal year. Likewise, the authorized 125,000 VA beds are not being full utilized as indicated by the 1965 VA budget request which anticipates an average daily patient load of 110,268.

The announced closing of 11 hospitals and 4 domiciliaries involves more than 6,000 beds. Some 3,000 of these are classified as domiciliary and serve to care for a class of citizen for whom there is no other provision.

The closing of regional offices will leave eight States without the personal service accorded to more fortunate veterans living in other communities. The difficulties of travel, additional expense, and lost time from work for veterans living in those States, which include our neighbors of North Dakota and South Dakota, will undoubtedly result in many of them passing up the rights to which their service has entitled them.

The entire reason given for the sweeping VA order is economy. Economy of operation, economy of maintenance, and, undoubtedly, economy because less veterans will be cared for.

The Veterans' Administration and its newly appointed Director, Mr. William Driver, is taking the brunt of the blame for this situation. Actually, the "bogyman" in this case is a shadowy Federal agency known as the Bureau of the Budget. It is from this executive group that the order has come and it is the job of the Veterans' Administration to carry out this order.

We are fortunate that influential Members of Congress have also been shocked at this arbitrary action and that they have added their voices of protest to those of the veterans organizations. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the Senator majority leader, and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the Senate minority leader, have joined to denounce the arbitrary nature of the action. Both Senate and House committees have scheduled hearings and the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been

given its opportunity to express its feelings, as have other veteran groups.

Whether the closing of the VA facilities actually goes through will probably depend upon the feeling of the people themselves. If they oppose it, and indicate so to their Congressmen, the VA hospital system can be saved. If they are apathetic, this cut will be followed by others.

Some of us are not going to enjoy being part of the Great Society very much if we have to watch our less fortunate comrades wistfully peering in at us from the cold outdoors.

L.J.E.

NEW ULM, MINN.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in my home State of Minnesota, there is in the southwestern portion of the State, a thriving and industrious community which has a fine record of achievement and progress in economic and social development. New Ulm, Minn., has good reason to be proud of the progress it has made in the past year. In recognition of that record of achievement, I call to the attention of Senators an editorial published in the New Ulm Journal of February 14, 1965, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New Ulm Journal, Feb. 2, 1965]

OUR LEAP FORWARD YEAR

When we come to assess the progress made since the last progress edition published in 1964, we are simply forced to call 1964 the "Leap Forward Year" in the history of New Ulm.

Never in the 110-year history of New Ulm have so many, spent so much in so many fields as they did in 1964 for the building and improvement of New Ulm.

For the group of New Ulm business and professional men who pledged their faith in New Ulm in those dark days of 1953 by paying \$1,000 to \$3,000 in risk capital to bring new industries to this city, 1964 has been the crowning fulfillment year. Forming the New Ulm Industries, Inc., they gave their money and their time freely without even submitting legitimate expense accounts so that their \$55,000 risk capital could turn cartwheels. Now they are collecting another \$50,000 risk capital fund so they can keep attracting industries in the future. Industries, as well as individuals, are born, grow, expand, and then often change their minds, slow down, sell out, and even quit. It is necessary to have something else to take their place or expand.

Industrywise, 1964 was New Ulm's greatest expansion year. This is the year that the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. completed their 130,000-square-foot addition to the former Webcor plant and then turned around and brought in a new 120,000-square-foot building to produce office and business machines. They are employing almost 200 people now but when the two 3M organizations get going in full capacity, you can guess the total employment and even the wildest guesses may not be too far off.

The Kraft plant, the biggest and steadiest employer in the past 10 years, has built some additions to its southside plant and greater employment can be looked for there, too. In addition New Ulm has steady employment from the B. F. Goodrich plant, International Milling, our two breweries, and many small industries and local employers who collectively employ a large number of people in our city.

This explosion of growth has resulted in the building of 90 new homes in this city in 1964, 4 new service stations, a medical center, a big Swanson's supermarket, a new high school, and many new or remodeled business places.

This year the State opened its new overpass over the Minnesota River into New Ulm. This will miss the business section of New Ulm but for those who wish to come downtown there are several thoroughfares.

To handle the population explosion, New Ulm schools are meeting the challenge. The public school system is building a high school, Luther College has expanded and the Cathedral parochial school is planning new additions.

New Ulm's population has been increasing until the most pessimistic are willing to settle for 12,000 population right now. The most optimistic believe we will pass the 15,000 mark in 1970.

UTAH STATE LEGISLATURE ASKED FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON APPORTIONMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, recently the Utah State Legislature almost unanimously approved a joint legislation asking Congress for a constitutional amendment on apportionment of State legislatures. The Utah Legislature urges that the recent Supreme Court apportionment decisions be overturned in considerable part by constitutional amendment.

As a sponsor of legislation both in this Congress and in the last to accomplish this objective, I am pleased that the Utah Legislature has taken this action and hope that Congress will give its approval swiftly. I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 3, introduced by State Senators Samuel J. Taylor, Thorpe Waddingham, and G. Stanford Rees, be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

S.J. Res. 3

Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 36th Legislature of the State of Utah applying to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for apportioning the membership of one house of a bicameral legislature on factors other than population

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that membership in both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned according to population and has thus asserted Federal judicial authority over the basic structure of government in the various States; and

Whereas this rule denies to the people of the respective States the right to establish their legislatures upon the same pattern of representation deemed advantageous for the Congress of the United States and provided by the Federal Constitution; and

Whereas this action of the Supreme Court goes so far as to restrict the ability of the citizens of the respective States to designate the manner in which they shall be represented in their respective legislatures thereby depriving the people of their right to determine how they shall be governed; and

Whereas the implications of this action by the Supreme Court raise serious doubts as to

the legality of the present form of the governing bodies of many subordinate units of government within the States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the 36th Legislature of the State of Utah, That this legislature respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress"; be it further

Resolved, That when and if Congress shall have proposed such an article of amendment this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

Resolved, That the proper officer of this State be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the several Members of said bodies representing this State therein; also to transmit copies hereof to the legislatures of all other States of the United States.

BUREAU OF BUDGET FLOUTS CONGRESS—IMPOUNDS FUNDS FOR UPPER COLORADO FISH HATCHERY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an alarming situation concerning funds for the proposed Jones Hole National Fish Hatchery in Utah. The site of the hatchery is north of Dinosaur National Monument, 28 miles northeast of Vernal.

The Upper Colorado Storage Project Act of 1956, of which I had the honor to be a sponsor, in section 8 authorized construction of the hatchery to supply fish to the various reservoirs in the upper basin. Considerable and extensive investigation by the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife carefully documented and justified the need for the fish hatchery to serve the upper Colorado River storage project, and the Jones Hole site was selected as the best and most suitable location, also on the basis of careful investigation. This site was withdrawn from the public domain and is available to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for construction of a large trout hatchery.

The Bureau began its investigations in 1960 at my request. Its findings confirmed the need for the hatchery, and the Jones Hole site was selected. In the fiscal year 1963 budget, I supported an appropriation of \$231,000, some \$55,000 of which was used for investigation and design of an access road to the hatchery and the remainder kept in re-

serve until the balance of the road construction funds could be appropriated. We were successful last year in obtaining congressional approval of an additional \$991,500 for construction of the road leading to the hatchery. By combining the two appropriations plus a small amount transferred from another project, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife had available \$1,200,000 which is the amount needed to construct the 14-mile Jones Hole Road. It was preparing to turn these funds over to the Bureau of Public Roads for awarding of a construction contract when, in January, it was learned that the Bureau of the Budget had impounded the \$1,200,000 because the access road leads to—in the Budget Bureau's words—a "nonexistent hatchery" and therefore there would be no road until money is appropriated for the hatchery.

Needless to say, I am shocked at the action of the Bureau of the Budget, as are many fish and wildlife leaders, both locally and nationally, from whom I have received letters of protest. The truth of the matter is that the hatchery cannot be built until the road is built because of the isolation of the area and the steep grade to get into Jones Hole.

Let me emphasize that the \$991,500 was included in the fiscal year 1965 budget submitted by the President, as was the \$231,000 in the fiscal year 1963 budget; the funds were not added in the Appropriations Committees. Therefore, the action of the Bureau of the Budget in impounding the funds is contrary to its own recommendations as well as a flouting of the will of Congress in appropriating the funds.

Immediately upon learning of the impoundment of funds for the Jones Hole road, I wrote to Director Kermit Gordon, of the Bureau of the Budget, to urge the release of the funds. His reply, however, was totally unsatisfactory.

I asked the Department of the Interior for its views on the matter, and John S. Gottschalk, Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, has responded with a letter stating that agency's justification and strong support of the Jones Hole National Fish Hatchery. Mr. Gottschalk's letter states:

We are convinced that a hatchery of this capacity is essential if the responsibility given to the Secretary of the Interior by section 8 of the Colorado River Storage Project Act is to be adequately discharged.

Moreover, he states:

Our investigations of alternative sites and alternative means of supplying hatchery stock persuaded us beyond any reasonable doubt that the Jones Hole site offers the best combination of qualities needed. Our preliminary investigations extended not only to alternate sites but to possibilities of expanding existing hatchery facilities.

The Director cited technical stream flow and temperature conditions which make the Jones Hole area the most desirable location for a hatchery from which fish could be supplied to a number of upper Colorado River storage project reservoirs.

Mr. President, the Jones Hole National Fish Hatchery is urgently needed. The

major dams authorized in the upper Colorado River storage project have been built and the lakes formed, and already their recreational uses are exceeding estimates. At Flaming Gorge in northeastern Utah and southwestern Wyoming, for example, it was forecast that the reservoir would provide 120,000 days of sport fishing a year by 1970. Skeptics branded the early forecast unrealistic. Then last fall, 1 year after opening to fishing, the Utah Fish and Game Department announced that the first year's recreational use of Flaming Gorge Lake provided 185,000 angler days—exceeding by 50 percent the estimate projected for 1970. Similar heavy recreational usage is occurring on the other large reservoirs of the upper Colorado River storage project. Moreover, additional reservoirs will be created with the construction of participating units of the project—nine in connection with the initial phase of the central Utah project alone.

To supply needs for trout in the distribution area to be served by the Jones Hole Hatchery, an annual production of approximately 300,000 pounds is required. Production of this magnitude cannot be met with existing hatchery facilities, which already have an excessive burden.

I have again contacted the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to urge the release of the funds that Congress provided for construction of the access road. Also, I shall appeal to the Appropriations Committee to appropriate funds so that construction of the hatchery itself can commence this summer.

I ask that the letter I have received from Mr. John S. Gottschalk, Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, be printed in the record at the conclusion of my remarks. Also, following this, I would like to include my earlier exchange of correspondence with Mr. Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. In addition, I would like to include a letter which the executive director of the National Wildlife Federation, Mr. Thomas L. Kimball, addressed to the President.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND
WILDLIFE,

Washington, D.C., March 1, 1965.

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: Thank you for your letter of February 15 which raised some searching and pertinent questions about our plans for the proposed Jones Hole National Fish Hatchery.

We are convinced that a hatchery of this capacity is essential if the responsibility given to the Secretary of the Interior by section 8 of the Colorado River Storage Project Act is to be adequately discharged. We are equally convinced that, despite the remoteness of its location, the Jones Hole site in northeastern Utah is clearly the best of possible alternatives. Our conclusions are based on the following facts and considerations.

Section 8 of the authorizing act directs the Secretary "to provide for public use and en-

joyment" of project lands and resources and to provide "facilities to mitigate losses of, and improve conditions for, the propagation of fish and wildlife." We believe that this is clearly a directive to provide, among other things, for sport fishing on waters affected by the project and to do so by whatever means that are found most reasonable and appropriate. Sport fisheries created by units in this vast project are generally of a type that can be maintained only by stocking. That is, they are cold water, or trout, fisheries. The initial, and unfortunately inadequate, stocking of the waters created or improved to date has been drawn from existing State and Federal hatcheries at the cost of deferring or denying fulfillment of other regular but urgent demands. Even so, results have been remarkable and fishing use of Flaming Gorge Reservoir, for example, has already exceeded preconstruction estimates of annual use. In brief, the maintenance of recreational fishing is believed to be clearly within the intent of section 8 and the only means of maintaining this activity is through the construction of one or more additional hatcheries.

Our investigations of alternative sites and alternative means of supplying hatchery stock persuaded us beyond any reasonable doubt that the Jones Hole site offers the best combination of qualities needed. Our preliminary investigations extended not only to alternate sites but to possibilities of expanding existing hatchery facilities. Springs at Jones Hole provide a constant flow of 30 c.f.s., or more, of high quality water having a constant temperature approximately 54° F. There are no upstream drainage problems. Its headwater location and the public ownership of adjacent land permits control of potential sources of contamination or other physical impairment of the water supply.

Construction of the access road and the hatchery facility must be considered as a unit, of course, and timing of their construction will depend somewhat on the season of the year in which funds become available. Assuming that weather conditions permit prompt inspection of the road right-of-way by prospective bidders, the contract could be awarded within 90 days following the release of funds by the Bureau of the Budget. Six months of "construction weather" would probably permit completion of the road into the site. Completion of the road is a prerequisite to the transport of men and materials into the area for construction of the hatchery itself. An additional 15 months at least should be allowed for completion of the hatchery structure. Again, the influence of weather on the construction schedule could be substantial and could alter this timetable by several months.

Funds appropriated to date are sufficient to finance the award of a contract to construct the road and additional funds will need to be appropriated to construct and develop the hatchery. Total costs of the latter are estimated at \$1,290,700. This amount can be made available advantageously in two phases (2 fiscal years). The additional funds would be expended approximately as follows.

FIRST PHASE	
Water intake structures and pipeline, approximately 3 miles----	\$65, 000
Concrete raceways (40)-----	275, 000
Service and storage building-----	140, 000
Hatchery building-----	180, 000
Residences with garages (10)-----	200, 000
Power and electric lines, approximately 8 miles-----	110, 000
Domestic water and sewage system	30, 000
Fish cultural and maintenance equipment -----	50, 000
Total, 1st phase-----	1, 050, 000

SECOND PHASE

Paint and oil storage building-----	\$3,000
Guardrails, drains, fencing road right-of-way, and seal-coating roads-----	179,700
Landscaping-----	18,000
Automatic equipment-----	20,000
Automotive equipment-----	20,000
Total, second phase-----	240,700
Grand total-----	1,290,700

In brief, then, we remain firmly committed to the construction of a national fish hatchery at the Jones Hole site and believe that it is not only consistent with the authorization of section 8 but most essential to its satisfactory implementation.

If we can be of any further assistance to you at any time, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. GOTTSCHALK,
Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1965.
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: In reply to your letter of January 13, I appreciate your strong feelings about the need for getting on with the Jones Hole Fish Hatchery.

It is correct that the money appropriated for the access road has been placed in contingency reserve pending appropriation for a hatchery at the Jones Hole site. The amount is \$1,200,000, which is the more recent cost estimate for this 14-mile road. We believe that a final decision should be made concerning the construction of the hatchery at this location before funds are spent on an access road. As you know, the President has not recommended the construction of the hatchery in his 1966 budget. The President has been faced with the difficult task of assigning priorities—deferring, restricting, or rejecting some programs in arriving at decisions for the next year's budget. This has, of necessity, limited the amount of funds for any given purpose.

The holding of the access road funds in contingency reserve in no way prejudices the question of a new hatchery. Studies now being carried on in the area should throw additional light on the type and size of fishery the reservoirs will support over a period of time as well as the need for and problems related to the stocking of trout in this situation. In the meantime, construction of a hatchery is underway at the Curecanti unit. Assuming a decision supporting the need for additional fish stocking beyond the combined capacity of the hatchery at Curecanti and other Federal and State hatcheries in the area, it appears to us that the unusual problem and increased cost of access to the Jones Hole site call for another look at alternative locations and water supplies.

I can assure you that if the Congress provides for the construction of the hatchery itself, we will promptly apportion the money for the road.

Sincerely,

KERMIT GORDON,
Director.

JANUARY 13, 1965.

MR. KERMIT GORDON,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: For several years now I have been working diligently to secure funds to start the vitally needed Jones Hole Fish Hatchery in Utah. Section 8 of the 1956 Upper Colorado River Storage Act, of which I had the honor to be a sponsor, authorized construction of the hatchery to furnish or to supply the various reservoirs in the upper

basin with fish. After years of effort on my part in which I was joined by many people in Utah and in the other Upper Basin States, I was successful in getting Congress last year to appropriate funds to start construction of a road leading to the hatchery. A member of my staff just talked to Mr. William Carey of your Bureau who confirmed that the Bureau has impounded the \$991,000 appropriated by Congress for the road. My purpose in making the inquiry was to determine why this was done. I am advised by Mr. Carey that a member of your staff informed him that the access road leads to a "nonexistent hatchery" and therefore, there will be no road until money is appropriated for the hatchery.

The clear implication is that the Members of Congress in the Upper Basin States and those who serve on the Appropriations Committees in the House and in the Senate were guilty of an act of consummate ignorance in appropriating funds for a road because the hatchery is not yet built. The truth is that the hatchery cannot be built unless the road is built because of the isolation of the area and the steep grade to get into Jones Hole. Unless the Bureau of the Budget now proposes that Congress appropriate funds so that helicopters can fly in materials to build a hatchery, then it is guilty of the worst kind of cart-before-the-horse reasoning. The cost of helicopter-conveyed construction would be astronomical.

In supporting funds for the road I had the best expert advice available, both from road engineers and wildlife experts. All agreed that the road must be built first. Now this expert advice apparently is to be waived aside by what to me is the most specious reasoning imaginable by your underlings in the Bureau of the Budget.

I have not written this type of letter for years. My relations with the Bureau of the Budget and its officials have on the whole been good. In fact, my staff and I have a great admiration for the general high quality of personnel in the Bureau. But this action so amazes me that I think my criticism is fully justified.

I sincerely hope that you personally will investigate this matter and immediately release the funds that are impounded so that the road can be built and then include funds in the President's budget that will be submitted to Congress this month to construct the Jones Hole Hatchery itself. If this is not done, another year's needless delay will occur. The lakes have been formed by the dams and the fish which would be produced by the hatchery already are directly needed in the five-State area involved.

Sincerely yours,

WALLACE F. BENNETT.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1965.
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We should like to take this opportunity to call your attention to an unusual attitude of the Bureau of the Budget toward appropriations for a fish hatchery in Utah. This procedure has us baffled and we are seeking clarification through your Executive Office since we do not know where else to turn.

According to information reaching us from citizens in Utah, and from officials in the Department of the Interior, no funds are proposed in fiscal 1966 for the Jones Hole Fish Hatchery adjacent to Dinosaur National Monument. The omission of these funds apparently is predicated upon the fact that the site is inaccessible. On the other hand, the Bureau of the Budget has impounded \$1,200,000 of funds already appropriated on grounds that the hatchery should be constructed first. Obviously, since this site is remote and inaccessible, the hatchery site can be reached only by helicopter unless the

road funds are released. Something has to come first.

We cannot understand this unrealistic attitude. While the Bureau of the Budget invokes a chicken-or-the-egg controversy over which comes first, a badly needed facility is deferred. Inquiries reveal that the hatchery will produce 300,000 pounds of trout per year and is essential to meeting recreational needs on impoundments on the Colorado River. Wyoming and other nearby States are affected as well as Utah.

We are hopeful that you can resolve this difficulty by having the impounded funds released.

Sincerely,

THOMAS L. KIMBALL,
Executive Director.

WHY MINERAL SUPPLIES ARE VITAL TO OUR SECURITY

MR. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Dr. Charles Will Wright, former Chief of the Mining Division of the U.S. Bureau of Mines and chief foreign mineral specialist of the Department of State. The statement, dated February 28, 1965, is entitled "Why Mineral Supplies Are Vital to Our Security."

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

WHY MINERAL SUPPLIES ARE VITAL TO OUR SECURITY

THE REASONS WHY

Our industrial strength and security depends upon minerals, many of which are in short supply. If some of the billions now being spent to build missiles and supersonic aircraft could be used to explore for and develop our potential resources of manganese, chromite, mercury, tungsten, asbestos, and other minerals we now import, and new processes developed for their beneficiation, domestic self-sufficiency in certain minerals is possible. Castro's confiscation of the Moa Bay nickel-cobalt deposits, Mexico's nationalization of mines, Bolivia's confiscation of tin, tungsten, and other mines, makes us realize that the alternative is to rely more and more on our domestic mineral resources and do more toward their development so as to be prepared for any eventual shortage.

The seriousness of the situation is well presented in an article by Elmer W. Pehrson "Survival Through Mineral Strength" in the November 1963 issue of Mining Engineering—"Survival" means our ability to withstand the political, economic, and propaganda offensive of our enemies while "mineral strength" means the availability of adequate mineral raw materials to withstand cold and hot wars.

The Bureau of Mines is now the most important Federal agency for the mineral industries and its minerals yearbooks, summaries of commodity data, and world production statistics are invaluable in presenting progress in mineral exploration, development, production, and marketing of mineral products. Its Mineral Trade Notes, issued each month, keep our industrialists informed on mining activities and new discoveries abroad.

The Bureau of Mines commodity specialists are making estimates for the next few years, based on past consumption statistics, for civil industrial requirements of the individual mineral products and the Department of Defense is doing the same for military needs. These include estimates of availability of these products from domestic sources, and through our mineral attachés, information on tonnages that may be available for export to the United States. Na-

tionalization of mineral resources is having a detrimental effect on exports of these products to the United States. We should therefore continue to add to our stockpiles of invulnerable mineral supplies, as a protection against the threat to our industrial and military needs in time of emergency. We are now dependent upon our traditional foreign sources of supply for minerals we lack. In 1963 the United States for its consumption requirements, imported all of its tin and chromite, 70 percent of its iron ore, 77 percent of its aluminum, 69 percent of copper, 54 percent of tungsten, 48 percent of zinc, 29 percent of mercury, 25 percent of lead, 11 percent of nickel, and 32 percent of its silver requirements.

The flow of minerals between nations is often hindered by many trade barriers, tariffs, quotas, embargoes and cartels, which have been political as well as commercial sources of friction. Therefore it is essential that a minerals attaché, under the supervision of the Bureau of Mines, be assigned to the Embassy in each of the less developed mineral producing countries, about 30 in all. He would advise on technical and financial matters pertaining to the economic development of their mineral resources.

Our main concern today, however, is how we are to supply future demands for minerals to maintain our industrial and military strength as well as the civilian needs of our growing population during the next decades. It is estimated that our population will increase to 350 million in the year 2000 and our GNP from \$600 to \$1,800 billion.

The United States has led the world in economic methods of exploration and development of its mineral resources which technical know-how it has shared with other countries. This has been done to supply the need of our industries for mineral supplies not available within our borders as well as for financial gain. However, the present situation may be modified in the near future by more efficient beneficiation processes for our extensive low-grade ore deposits. In this category are the low-grade iron ore, taconite, beryllium, chromite, cobalt, tungsten, and vanadium deposits. For most of these metals we are in danger of being deprived of our traditional sources, such as tin from southeast Asia, cobalt from the Congo, beryllium from Nigeria, and tantalite from Nigeria and Norway, and until recently imports of manganese ore from Brazil. However, with the overthrow of the pro-Communist control of Brazil this situation has now changed in our favor. There is hope that Brazil's example will be followed by other mineral-exporting nations.

In 1964 the United States with 6.33 percent of the world's population consumed over 18 percent of the world's output of metals.

Together with our allies we should adopt a more aggressive policy to control, through propaganda and financial as well as technical aid, the sources and flow of mineral supplies, thus to encourage the leaders of the less developed nations to withstand the dangers of dealing with dictators and their agents from Moscow and Peking as well as to check the spread of the false ideology of communism in the mineral-producing countries.

DR. CHARLES WILL WRIGHT,
Former Chief of Mining Division, U.S.
Bureau of Mines and Chief Foreign
Mineral Specialist, Department of
State.

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 28, 1965.

EXEMPTION OF PHYSICIANS AND CERTAIN MEDICAL FACILITIES FROM FEDERAL ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, last week I introduced on behalf of myself, Senator CARLSON, Senator HOLLAND,

Senator McCARTHY, Senator NELSON, Senator PEARSON, Senator SCOTT, Senator SYMINGTON, and Senator TOWER, a bill (S. 1353) to exempt hospitals, physicians, and nonprofit, community blood banks from the jurisdiction of the Federal antitrust laws.

Today, I would like to emphasize the importance and urgency of this legislation.

In 1962, the Federal Trade Commission instituted proceedings against the Kansas City Area Hospital Association, the community blood bank of the Kansas City area, and certain doctors in the city. They were charged with restraint of trade. The FTC claimed that the Kansas City doctors were preventing the sale of blood by two commercial banks in the area.

Following lengthy hearings on the matter, the initial ruling of the FTC hearing examiner declared that the respondents in the proceedings—the Kansas City Community Blood Bank and a number of prominent area doctors—were in restraint of trade. The final decision of the full Commission has not yet been rendered. Unless it drastically modifies or reverses the initial ruling, the operation of a valuable community medical facility is threatened with curtailment, or even with being put out of business. Similar blood banks in cities across the country face a much similar possibility. The FTC proceedings are being viewed with alarm in many States besides Missouri. Even if the examiner is reversed, legal expenses incurred by the respondents in this ill-considered action have run to well over \$150,000.

These proceedings were brought on the basis of the Federal antitrust laws. It is my firm conviction, Mr. President, that they are founded on a basic and very serious misinterpretation of these laws.

Our antitrust laws were never intended to serve as the basis for actions against valuable, nonprofit community medical facilities and service.

Our antitrust laws were meant to apply to economic and profitmaking business activities, not to nonprofit, medical services such as blood transfusion.

Whole blood is a living human tissue. It should never be considered a commodity to be sold on the market like maple sirup.

In view of this critical situation, I introduced a bill in the last Congress to exempt physicians, hospitals, and nonprofit community blood banks from the jurisdiction of the Federal antitrust laws.

Hearings on this measure were held last year before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. They revealed widespread support for the bill from virtually the entire American medical profession. Organizations endorsing the measure included: the American Medical Association, the American Association of Blood Banks, the American Hospital Association, and the American Public Health Association. Opposition to the measure at the hearings was slight.

Those in a position to know most about blood transfusion, the problems created by commercialism in this area, and the advantages to be gained from coopera-

tive, community effort were strong in their support of the measure.

However, no further committee action was taken. The failure of the Federal Trade Commission thus far either to reverse or confirm the initial ruling has left the need for this legislation still urgent. Community efforts to meet the transfusion needs of the American people are still threatened by a grave misapplication of Government antitrust action. My bill would provide a solution to this unfortunate situation.

It is my earnest hope that the Senate will give this legislation the close consideration that it deserves.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1353) be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was 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 it shall not be deemed to be an act in restraint of trade under any law of the United States for any nonprofit blood bank, nonprofit reservoir of other human tissue or organs, any hospital or any physician to refuse, or to join together with others in refusing, to obtain from or to accept delivery of blood, blood plasma, other tissue or organs from any other such blood bank or reservoir.

FORTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on February 24, the people of Estonia marked the 47th anniversary of the founding of their democratic republic. It is important to draw attention to this occasion, so as to reassure all friends of freedom that we do not forgive the Soviet aggression which robbed the Baltic peoples of their hard-won independence.

Following President Wilson's declaration of the 14 points, the State of Estonia claimed her right of self-determination, and declared herself a freely constituted, democratic republic. It was a brave beginning, for history had shown her to be seriously vulnerable to the territorial ambitions of powerful neighbors. Since the time of Peter the Great, Russia had actively sought access to the sea. With her other Baltic neighbors, Estonia fell victim to the aggression of Soviet Russia in 1940. She was violently annexed to the U.S.S.R., and her people were subjected to cruel and widespread deprivations and deportations.

Our Government has never recognized this annexation; and we have maintained diplomatic relations with the Baltic peoples, through their free governments now in exile. We want all people to know that we earnestly look forward to the time when all who govern will realize that the welfare of a nation improves in direct proportion to the liberty and self-respect enjoyed by its people.

Some day, we feel sure, the proud people of Estonia will again be free to pursue their destiny as an independent nation.

FOR A NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on Friday, March 5, the chairman of the

Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities, of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the able junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], concluded hearings on bills to establish foundations to strengthen our arts and humanities.

Witnesses appearing before the subcommittee have been sympathetic and helpful. They have pinpointed the urgency for constructive action.

Humanities and the arts are entwined. To separate them would create an undesirable and needless alienation. So I hope we shall perfect a single bill which will strengthen our arts and humanities and will help us as we build the Great Society.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my testimony, before the Senate Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities, on S. 111, my bill to establish a National Humanities Foundation, including the arts, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES OF THE SENATE LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE ON S. 111, A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION, MARCH 5, 1965

Senator GRUENING. Mr. Chairman, we stand at a crossroads. Ahead lies an uncharted sea, an unmarked road, an unexplored universe. Tomorrow, if we wish, can be the age when mankind prospers, an age when we are a part of rather than apart from our culture. Do we want knowledge or know-nothingism? The choice is ours.

For two weeks witnesses have appeared before the Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to testify on bills to establish foundations of the arts and humanities.

Let me say that I support enthusiastically the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation encompassing also the arts as proposed in my bill, S. 111 which I introduced on January 6, 1965. This bill is cosponsored by 36 Members of the Senate. I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, that you are a cosponsor of S. 111 while I am a cosponsor of your bill, S. 316, which also proposes the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation for the humanities and the arts. By working together we can perfect a bill.

Humanities and the arts are entwined. To separate them will create an undesirable and needless alienation. This we should not favor, if we are to build the Great Society.

The 1964 Report of the Commission on the Humanities should be required reading, and its passages deserve to be quoted as often as possible.

Early in the report, in the section devoted to a statement and recommendations appear these sentences:

"Even the most gifted individual, whether poet or physicist, will not realize his full potential or make his fullest contribution to his time unless his imagination has been kindled by the aspirations and accomplishments of those who have gone before him. Through the humanities we may seek intellectual humility, sensitivity to beauty, and emotional discipline. By them we may come to know the excitement of ideas, the power of imagination, and the unsuspected energies of the creative spirit." I have underscored the phrase "and the unsuspected energies of the creative spirit."

What are the humanities?

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language defines humanities as encompassing the branches of learning concerned with human thought and relations, as distinguished from the sciences. However, we may paraphrase the Commission sentences I have just quoted and suggest that humanities may also be the study of the past to create the future.

Humanities encompass the study of the past to create a rewarding future. We build and refine and distill.

This means that the scholar, and we need not specify his discipline, plays an active role in our society. His research, his love of man's past, a past into which we have only begun to dig, develop the tools for creativity, thereby assuring us that our creative and performing arts will flourish.

Humanities encompass the branches of learning concerned with human thought and relations. How far reaching are the humanities? As wide as we wish them to be.

Humanities, of course, means education. Thomas Jefferson, writing in 1818, said:

"If the condition of man is to be progressively ameliorated, as we fondly hope and believe, education is to be the chief instrument in effecting it."

Jefferson was one of our great humanists. He had a deep interest in the past. He molded his present. He lives today in his future, is quoted today and will be quoted in our future.

Jefferson had a genius for timeless writing. He said of history in 1782:

"History, by apprising the people of the past, will enable them to judge of the future; it will avail them of the experience of other times and other nations; it will qualify them as judges of the actions and designs of men; it will enable them to know ambition under every disguise it may assume; and knowing it, to defeat its views."

We have some splendid blocks on which to build. Learned men of past centuries and vanished civilization have left their contributions, some of which we have found. But we dare not be content. We must continue our search. We should take notice of the statement in the Humanities report made by the Archaeological Institute of America. Writing in the Commission report the institute emphasizes:

"Briefly, the health of our discipline depends on the availability of Greek and Latin in the secondary schools. Our greatest single need is for high school teachers who can teach the classical languages. Funds are required, moreover, to insure that they are free to teach the two languages full time, and to guarantee the existence of classes, no matter how small, in Greek and Latin. Unless Greek and Latin are maintained in the secondary schools, our discipline is threatened at its roots."

Mankind cannot afford to allow this to occur. We need competent archeologists. How else are we to learn more about the once highly developed civilizations which have perished? How else are we to try to ascertain that we do not make their mistakes and that we may as well learn from them?

The late T. S. Eliot was proficient in both classical and modern languages, and used them skillfully. Eliot revolutionized the English-language poetry world. But he did not write "The Hollow Man" with the view in mind that we would follow it. We do not intend to have the world end with either a bang or a whimper.

I would like to comment on the similarities and differences of the language proposed in S. 111 which I have introduced and in S. 316, which has been introduced by the chairman. My remarks will be brief on these points because our bills are not far apart. Specifically:

1. We seek a National Humanities Foundation to strengthen both the humanities and the arts;

2. We enumerate in our statements of purpose why such a foundation is needed, and we agree that while the encouragement and support of the humanities and the arts, while principally "a matter for private and local initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government";

3. We agree, for example, that our Nation "must not limit its efforts to science and technology alone but must give full value and support to the other great branches of man's activity such as scholarship, literature, and culture";

4. We believe that assurance must be given against Federal interference and we state: "In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, or the administration or operation of any school or other non-Federal agency, institution, organization or association";

5. We agree, generally as to the functions of the Foundation and that it shall be authorized and directed to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of scholarship, education, research, creative work and performance in the humanities and the arts by suitable means, such as grants, loans, and other forms of assistance;

6. We concur that this assistance should be used for education and developing "at any stage of their growth" the artists, scholars and teachers in the humanities and the arts.

7. We seek improvement of library and museum resources "at all levels";

8. We encourage interchange of scholarly information in the humanities and the arts among scholars, teachers and students at home and in foreign countries.

The chairman's bill S. 316 includes language in support of the National Council on the Arts. I agree.

S. 316 outlines a program in support of the performing arts. So much the better.

In content, as to purposes, on need, the two bills are in agreement for the most part.

What are the differences between S. 111 and S. 316?

S. 111 envisions a National Humanities Board of 24 members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and of the Director ex officio.

S. 316 suggests a Board of 20 appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It names as ex officio voting members, the Foundation Director, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Chairman of the National Council on the Arts.

The Board, as defined in each bill, would have a membership of 24 plus the Director. Both S. 111 and S. 316 stipulate that the members of the Board—

1. shall be eminent in the fields of the humanities or the arts;

2. shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service and scholarship or creativity; and

3. shall be selected so as to provide comprehensive representation of the views (S. 111—scholars and teachers) (S. 316—professional practitioners) in the humanities and the arts in all areas of the United States.

The Board members would be appointed for 6-year terms if the language of either S. 111 or S. 316 became law. The mechanics of rotation would have to be worked out at that time.

The bills differ slightly as to the salary of the Director. S. 111 prefers that the Director receive the same salary paid the Director of the National Science Foundation—\$28,500 annually. S. 316 suggests he be compensated at the same rate as provided for the Librarian of Congress—\$27,000. I urge

that these two parallel foundations be given equal status.

The bills differ as to the funding of the Foundation. S. 111 suggests it be in "such sums as the Congress may determine." S. 316 stipulates \$10 million for fiscal year 1966, \$20 million for fiscal year 1967; and an undesignated amount thereafter. I suggest in this instance we do the best we can for the arts, and hope that the Appropriations Committee will be generous.

"The price of wisdom is above rubies," according to the Book of Job, and so, too, is the value of a National Humanities Foundation.

All of us can be proud of the outstanding and productive efforts in this area by Chairman PELL, the members of the subcommittee, and by the friends of the humanities in the House of Representatives. Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, has kindled a fire supporting the proposed National Humanities Foundation wherever he has appeared. His January 21, 1965, address before the members of the American Council of Learned Societies was outstanding, a masterpiece of wisdom and knowledge.

Representative MOORHEAD agrees with Senator PELL and with me, Mr. Chairman, as to our concept of a single foundation, for he said that night in New York City:

"It is not well enough recognized that while a National Humanities Foundation is broad enough to include the creative and performing arts, a National Arts Foundation is not broad enough to include the other humanities."

Representative MOORHEAD believes that: "Great creativity in the arts alone is not enough, the Great Society must have a great audience."

We must know what it is that we see as well as what we do. We will be better equipped if the National Humanities Foundation becomes reality.

When I introduced S. 111 on January 7, I said: "In the sciences, our progress has been aided greatly in recent years by a vast program of aids by the Federal Government to basic and applied science. This is as it should be, and I can only applaud the use of any of the funds which have been intelligently spent in scientific endeavors."

"But, in directing our efforts to aid the sciences, we have created an imbalance in the advances in the humanities and the arts. I therefore urge that we initiate a humanities program of corresponding scope which will enable us to understand one another better. As President Johnson said in his state of the Union message: 'We must also recognize and encourage those who can be pathfinders for the Nation's imagination and understanding.'"

Witnesses appearing before this subcommittee have been sympathetic and helpful.

Mr. Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, supports "a combined Arts and Humanities Foundation." He pointed out in his testimony that government support of the arts has been the rule for centuries in the countries of Europe. Mr. Stevens believes the Foundation could be a "tremendous help . . . toward solving the unemployment problems, especially as increasing numbers of high school and college graduates are thrown into the labor market."

The able L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, feels it would be desirable to afford the Library the support that is envisaged for private groups and for the States. He asks that we make certain that the District of Columbia and our territories, and I assume he includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, too, not be excluded.

Mr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution testified: "We at the Smithsonian consider the heritage of the past important. Millions of visitors view and receive inspiration and stimulation from

our exhibits of the accomplishments of our forefathers. Cultural, political, military, scientific, and technological history is studied by our curatorial researchers who write and publish scholarly treatises in the above fields."

The Smithsonian, reports Mr. Ripley, has informed the White House and the Bureau of the Budget of its support for the creation of a Humanities Foundation.

For more than 118 years the Smithsonian Institution has worked to develop the humanities and arts. Mr. Ripley ably described why the Smithsonian supports creation of the National Humanities Foundation. He said, "We have informed the White House and the Bureau of the Budget of our support for the creation of a Humanities Foundation."

When Dr. Barnaby Keeney, chairman of the Commission on the Humanities and president of Brown University, testified, he said:

"The humanities and the arts must be considered together. A considerable part of the substance of the humanities is a consideration of the arts, particularly the verbal arts—poetry, fiction, and rhetoric—but also of the performing and visual arts. Without the interpretation of the humanists, the work of the artist is less meaningful, less rewarding and less disciplined."

Dr. Keeney also had a substantive suggestion to make as to allocation of funds. He would set a bottom appropriation for each State.

Testimony presented by Theodore Bickel, vice president of the Actors Equity Association, revealed that the U.S. Information Agency statistics indicate that \$25 million are spent per year in support of the arts in the United Kingdom. Therefore, our proposals embody no new and rash move.

Support for the proposed legislation comes from many persons. President Frederick H. Burkhardt of the American Council of Learned Societies only a week ago testified:

"More positively, both S. 316 (PELL) and S. 111 (GRUENING), H.R. 2043 (FOGARTY) and H.R. 334 (MOORHEAD) seem to me to make admirable provision for dealing with the major needs in the humanities. So far as I am competent to judge, this seems true of the arts as well, but I shall confine my remarks to the area in which I am at home."

Testimony before the subcommittee has pinpointed a number of trouble spots. I am disturbed by the observation of Alvin C. Eurich, president of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, who testified on March 3 as to the distressing disparity in teaching time of the humanists as opposed to the scientists. The former appears to be overburdened. To quote from Mr. Eurich's statement:

"The Commission on the Humanities, established in 1963 by the leading scholarly organizations of the Nation, studied university budgets and other statistics to ascertain the status of support for the humanities on campus. These studies revealed that in almost all universities, the younger faculty members in the science departments devote half of their time to teaching and half to research. But those in the humanities departments devote practically all their time to teaching. As we all recognize, high quality teaching requires the stimulation of advanced research opportunities."

"What is even more alarming is the fact that a full professor in the humanities is, as a general rule, more heavily burdened with teaching and supervisory responsibilities than is an instructor in the natural sciences. At one of the east coast's leading institutions, which is typical of other large, reputable universities, a full professor in the humanities devotes over 7 hours a week to teaching and supervising, while an instructor in the natural sciences spends less time at these tasks. There is good reason to consider these figures as typical, which means that the

research opportunities for teachers in the humanities during an academic year are indeed anything but plentiful."

An outstanding statement on behalf of the need for expanding our cultural knowledge was made when the hearings opened February 23. At that time our able U.S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel said:

"Today a substantial proportion of our attention and our national budget is directed toward motion in space. Our aspirations and goals are linked, literally, with the moon and the stars. This is understandable in view of the importance of science and technology as the chief instruments of national survival. It seems to me that at the same time, however, we must devote the time and money required to do a satisfactory job of transmitting our cultural heritage to the rising generation."

Further in his remarks Commissioner Keppel said that the administration "suggests new legislation to increase the effectiveness of the Office of Education in these fields." The fields to which he referred are those of the arts and humanities. Such support is welcome because it is obvious that the National Humanities Foundation will not, for at least at this moment, be able to reach all of its goals. However, we cannot meet the problem halfway and I am fearful that the attempt to do it through existing departments of government is inadequate.

I will not quote further from the testimony which has been received by this subcommittee for there will be ample time to peruse the hearing record, but I did want to emphasize certain statements by leading authorities in the field. The need for a National Humanities Foundation is apparent and obvious. The time has come for actions—deeds not words.

Interest in legislation to develop the humanities, and let us include the arts automatically as a part of the humanities, is phenomenal. I asked for comments and suggestions for the improving of my bill. The response has been gratifying. I have excerpted pertinent portions of but a few of these letters for my testimony today. I ask the committee's consent the full text of these letters and others appear in the hearing record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The president-elect of the American Library Association, Dr. Robert Vosper, librarian of the University of California at Los Angeles, outlines the need for great research libraries for humanistic research, libraries similar in resources to the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C. Mr. Vosper suggests that the humanities-arts bill include a section authorizing the Foundation "to support improved library resources and services for research and teaching in the humanities and the arts."

A similar opinion came to me from Harvard University librarian Douglas W. Bryant.

And what about the lack of distinguished journals of review and criticism? Dr. Robert N. Wilson, the School of Public Health, the University of North Carolina, writes me to ask that consideration be given to the possible subsidy of one or more such journals. Consider, too, the validity of his remark:

"It has often been remarked in literature, for instance, that America seems unable to sustain a single first-rate critical forum on a regular publication basis."

Of the proposed legislation, Dr. Wilson suggests that the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation "may well be more important for all of us in the long run than any other piece of current legislation."

Other writers while acknowledging the need "by the Federal Government for fostering the arts and the humanities" question the further separation of the sciences and the humanities they feared would occur if a separate National Humanities Foundation were established. This opinion was articulately expressed by Morris Halle, professor in the

Department of Modern Languages at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dr. Halle prefers a broadening of the National Science Foundation charter by assigning to it "the task of supporting the humanities as well."

Conversely Dr. Cedric G. Boulter, Department of Classics, the University of Cincinnati, believes the statement of purpose in S. 111 should be strengthened. He writes:

"There has perhaps never been a time when the values the humanities seek to preserve and communicate have been more crucial to man's survival."

Dr. Gregory Vlastos, Department of Philosophy, Princeton University, states:

"I merely wish to say that if this were passed it would constitute in my opinion the greatest single benefit that has ever been conferred on the humanities in this country."

The executive director of the National Institute of Public Affairs, Carl F. Stover, stated simply and affirmatively: "I wish you success in this worthwhile endeavor."

The present state of the humanities prompted Associate Professor Robert L. Monahan, department of geography, Western Washington State College in Bellingham to write:

"We have seen the sciences blossom under Federal assistance and I feel that the great upswing in interest related to the humanities is highly desirable. However, the social sciences also have an important contribution to make and I feel that it would be distinctly detrimental to overlook them."

Concern for the humanities is national. Mrs. Viola Lillard, of Ketchikan, Alaska, last month informed me:

"This happens to be somewhat of a personal thing with me, but I'm sure many others feel as I do. My son is a student of English and history. Most people seem to think something is wrong in his makeup because he is not interested in the sciences. You and your fellow Senators are giving our younger generation, that are interested in creating and preserving our arts, something to look forward to."

Mrs. Lillard, I believe, would be delighted with the response the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities has had for this proposed legislation during these hearings.

Attorney Warren C. Christianson, of Sitka, Alaska, shares Mrs. Lillard's belief that a humanities foundation is necessary. Last month he wrote to tell me:

"I want to congratulate you on your introduction of a bill to establish a National Humanities Foundation. I feel that too often, too many of us, write to our Senators either as personal friends or as our voices in Washington, to ask for something; and in this particular matter, I simply want to say it is heartwarming and encouraging to see you introduce a bill of this nature. I certainly hope it passes."

Perhaps a quotation from a letter I received January 28, 1965, from President Barnaby C. Keeney of Brown University, chairman of the Commission on the Humanities, best expresses the purpose for this hearing and for the work of Members of the Senate in this area. President Keeney wrote, in part: "My greatest hope is that out of the two bills we will get one that will move things forward."

I can only add "amen."

CHILEAN ELECTIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Chilean congressional elections which took place yesterday constituted a truly remarkable victory, not only for President Eduardo Frei, but also for Chile. Last year, there was real danger that a Communist-Socialist coalition would win the

Chilean Presidency, becoming the first Communist-oriented government in the world to be constitutionally elected. In the September presidential election, Christian Democrat Frei decisively defeated his opponent of the group which included Communist Senator Salvador Allende. Since the election, however, President Frei has been blocked from carrying out his ambitious program of rapid economic development and social reform by the absence of sufficient support in the Chilean Congress. Yesterday's elections, which brought the Christian Democrats a majority in the House of Deputies and significant gains in the Senate, gave President Frei both the power and the mandate he needed to make his administration a success.

The stake of the United States in Chilean democracy is great. If President Frei is able to bring his programs to fruition, the rest of Latin America will look to Chile as an example of what can be accomplished by a democratic movement dedicated to rapid, even radical, but nontotalitarian, reform, as a viable alternative to Castroism in Latin America. But these elections are only the beginning for President Frei. The problems of Chile remain to be tackled; and President Frei's solutions will not be universally popular. We in the United States must do everything proper in our power, as a matter of highest priority, to smooth the road and see to it that Chile receives the closest economic and political support of the United States and of our Western allies.

I ask that two newspaper articles on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 8, 1965]
FREI'S PARTY WINS ELECTION IN CHILE: PRESIDENT OBTAINS A CLEAR MAJORITY IN CONGRESS

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—President Eduardo Frei Montalva's Christian Democrats scored a stunning victory today in congressional elections that represented a major test of Latin America's first Christian Democratic Government.

Nearly complete unofficial results indicated that the Christian Democrats won 76 of the 147 seats in the Chamber of Deputies.

The results showed the Radical Party with 20 seats, Communists with 14, Socialists with 13, Liberals with 7, and Conservatives with 2. Results from 15 districts were still to be decided. In the previous Congress, the Christian Democrats had only 23 Deputies and 4 Senators.

A DECISIVE VICTORY

(By Henry Raymont)

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—The Christian Democratic Party of President Eduardo Frei Montalva scored a decisive victory tonight in Chile's congressional elections.

The left-of-center party came to power last September when Mr. Frei defeated a Communist-Socialist coalition to become Latin America's first Christian Democratic President. The party advocates evolutionary—not revolutionary—social and economic reforms.

Today's Christian Democratic triumph reflected striking strength, though the party's percentage of the popular vote dropped from the 56 percent of the presidential election. In the presidential poll, the Christian Democrats had the support of the Centrist Radicals and of the Rightist Liberals and Con-

servatives. This time they had no outside support.

President Frei said in an interview shortly before midnight that the party was assured of at least 65 seats in the 147-seat Chamber of Deputies. All of its 11 candidates for the Senate won. Twenty-one Senate seats were at stake in the election.

Although the Christian Democrats will not hold an absolute majority in the new Congress, Mr. Frei was confident of winning the cooperation of enough independents to put in motion his program of social and economic reforms.

In a late official bulletin, the Ministry of the Interior announced the following returns, representing nearly two-thirds of the votes cast: Christian Democrats, 554,770; Radicals, 192,190; Communists, 160,834; Socialists, 120,000; and Liberals, 107,038.

President Frei said he was "full of pride at this new and extraordinary demonstration of civic maturity demonstrated by the Chilean people."

The 52-year-old President, a tall gaunt intellectual, was referring to the peaceful atmosphere in which the balloting took place.

Shortly before 11 p.m. he stepped onto a balcony of the Government palace to wave to about 5,000 followers.

In Santiago, all three Christian Democratic candidates for the Senate and the party's 10 candidates for the Chamber of Deputies were swept into office.

In Valparaiso, Chile's second largest city, Benjamin Prado, the Christian Democratic Governor of Valparaiso Province, was elected to the Senate seat left vacant by the appointment of Radomiro Tomic as Ambassador to Washington. Mr. Prado's vote was larger than the combined total for three of his opponents.

VOTE OF CONFIDENCE

Another development in the election was a comeback by the Centrist radical party, which virtually collapsed in the presidential vote last fall. Chile's political forces were torn by what was essentially a two-way presidential fight between Mr. Frei and Socialist-Communist contender, Senator Salvador Allende Gossens.

Luis Alberto Cuevas, president of the Radical party, conceded tonight that the size of the Christian Democratic vote was "truly remarkable." But he emphasized that the Radicals, after their bitter defeat in the presidential election in which Senator Julio Duran received a bare 5 percent of the vote, had now emerged as the country's second political force.

Renan Fuentealba, chairman of the Christian Democrats, hailed the election as a massive vote of confidence for Mr. Frei. It also completely demolished rightist claims that they had contributed half the vote in Mr. Frei's victory last September, he contended.

Although today's voting was the first major political test for the Frei administration, the first Christian Democratic government in the Western Hemisphere, the suspense of the September vote was lacking.

In September, fears that a victory for Dr. Allende, a sympathizer of the Cuban Premier, Fidel Castro, might take Chile outside the inter-American system and cause grave internal strife, rallied Liberals, Conservatives, and most Radicals behind the Christian Democrats.

Now that the Socialist-Communist coalition no longer poses an immediate threat, the country seems more relaxed.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1965]
LANDSLIDE VOTE IN CHILE SPURS FREI PROGRAM
(By Milan J. Kubie)

SANTIAGO, March 7.—Chile's "revolution in liberty," born 6 months ago with the election of President Eduardo Frei, received a

massive push today in a landslide congressional victory by his Christian Democratic Party (PDC).

According to an unofficial count, the PDC won 79 seats in the 147-Member House of Deputies and 10 of the 21 contested Senate seats. Its popular vote margin of 43 percent is without precedent in modern Chilean politics, where a single party rarely wins more than one-quarter of the votes.

The main losers on this quiet election day were the traditionally powerful parties of the center and of the right. The Liberals dropped from 16.5 percent in the last congressional elections to 7.5 percent, and the Conservatives have plummeted from 14.7 percent in 1961 to a disastrously low 4.9 percent. The middle-road Radicals, who carried the last race with 22 percent of the vote, are down to 14 percent.

The tightly organized Communists and their Socialist allies have kept their 11 percent each.

Today's elections were a sequel to the race last September in which Frei defeated Marxist Senator Salvador Allende, the standard bearer of a major Communist-Socialist bid for power in the hemisphere. Frei's big victory in the presidential race, however, had no effect on the Congress where there were only 23 Christian Democrats in the House and 4 in the 45-seat Senate, far from the majority he needed to move his reform program.

Frei's drive for more support, which started the day he was elected, was a shrewd blend of statesmanship, propaganda, and politics. Calling for a "wartime footing against backwardness, injustice, and misery," he proposed bills and congressional amendments revolutionizing Chile's moss-covered economic and social structures, and pressed them on Congress with the urgency of Franklin D. Roosevelt's "100 days."

Just 2 weeks after his inauguration on November 3, he signed an executive order to build schools for 250,000 children. Within a week, he followed up with salary readjustment and a new property tax to pay for the mushrooming social programs.

Then came a request for special administrative powers to reshuffle ministries, and an unprecedented constitutional proposal to permit a plebiscite on any defeated government bill. Accompanying it was a request for easier expropriation procedures to spur the sluggish land reform.

Next, Frei added an urban renewal program, and just before Christmas he introduced an imaginative plan to bring the U.S.-owned copper mines under partial government ownership. On February 18, he added two new "Chilenization" proposals for the acquisition of, or partnership with, foreign-owned utilities.

While Congress waded through the bills, Frei toured the country to explain his program. "Give me the tools to do the job," he asked his audiences.

Sure of the diminishing force of the Conservatives, he concentrated on winning over the low-income, change-minded groups on the left. In the 4 months of his government, Santiago slums received more new water, electricity, and telephones than in the previous 30 years.

Though firmly pro-United States, Frei pleased the left-leaning Nationalists by recognizing Soviet Russia and a flock of satellites. And although anxious to stem the 38-percent annual inflation, he printed more money and postponed unpopular austerity measures.

One result was a political outcry on all sides and a dead, if temporary, halt to the Government program. The Conservatives and the Liberals, Frei's former allies against Allende, fought his new taxes and the social improvements.

The Radicals, fearful for the jobs of thousands of their members in the Government, opposed the special powers request. The

extreme left resentfully declared war on the whole program as a "deceit of the masses."

But Frei did not care. Making allies with a body that's on its way out is poor politics," explained one of his top aids. "If we have to make deals, we'll make them in the next Congress."

Another result was that the Chileans were offered a clear chance to vote for democratic but profound changes representing most of the key points in the Charter of Punta del Este. "In effect," said a high American Embassy official, "Frei has put up to a vote the whole program of the Alliance for Progress."

The strategy worked. When the new Congress convenes on May 21, the road for Frei's reforms will be wide and clear.

PROPOSED OMNIBUS BAIL REFORM BILL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, Senator ERVIN, in sponsoring S. 1357, the Bail Reform Act of 1965. This omnibus bail reform bill results from the information gained from the subcommittee hearings on S. 2838, S. 2839, and S. 2840 in the last session of the Congress.

Not only does it contain the best features of the original bills, such as provisions for pretrial release for those who would be denied it merely because of a financial inability to purchase a bail bond, credit against the sentence for pretrial detention, and the deposit of a cash bond with the court in lieu of a commercial bail bond, it provides several other constructive alternatives to existing Federal bail procedures.

The proposed section 3 which amends section 3146(a) of chapter 207 of title 18, United States Code, allows the judge additional latitude in authorizing pretrial release. The amendment to section 3147 will give the accused the option to appeal from the conditions of release imposed by the judge under the provisions of section 3146. Section 3 of the bill would provide a credit against a fine for the number of days of preconviction detention.

Because of my firm conviction that a person's financial status has no relevance in our system of criminal justice, I am pleased to note that the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee has scheduled early hearings on this legislation.

In the area of bail, wealth versus poverty has been substituted on the scales of justice for innocence versus guilt. Currently, bail is made available, not on the basis of the innocence of the accused or the protection of society, but almost solely on the basis of financial resources. Pretrial release goes to those who can buy it. The specter of detention remains to haunt the poor.

Experience with various experimental bail projects across the country has indicated that this need not be so. Many who have been accused of crimes can be safely released on conditions other than bail bonds. The statistics developed by the program, such as the Vera Foundation bail project in New York, show that ties in the community and other indexes of social stability are a more reliable measure of the advisability of pretrial release than is the ability to purchase a commercial bond.

This bill should prove to be a step in insuring the guarantee that is the birthright of all, rich or poor: "Equal justice for all." If our system discriminates against some because of their economic status, the concept of equal justice becomes distorted and takes on a George Orwell cast and says to the poor: "All are equal, but some are more equal than others."

It should bring us one step nearer compliance with the dictates of Judge Hand's commandment "Thou shalt not ration justice."

KANSAS A LEADER IN THE MIDWEST AND IN THE NATION—ADDRESS BY GOV. WILLIAM H. AVERY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Kansas has long been known as the Wheat State. This, of course, is quite proper, in view of its history of consistently producing the Nation's largest wheat crops. Few seem to realize, however, that this great State, which I proudly represent, ranks fourth in beef production, sixth in the production of oil and natural gas, and first in the production of light aircraft. These are only a few of our accomplishments.

In spite of this fine record, Kansans are looking to the future, recognizing that with changing times we must constantly review our own capabilities, so as to fulfill our place in the Union.

In this regard, I point to the recent Governor's Economic Development Conference called by Gov. William Avery, and held in Topeka, Kans., on February 11, 1965. This conference, built on the theme "Business and the Community—Together We Grow," was keyed by an excellent summary of my State's effort to develop its leadership and to improve its capacity to grow and to prosper, through utilization of its own resources and the stimulation of the energies and talents of its people.

I ask unanimous consent that the keynote address by Gov. William H. Avery at this conference be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY GOV. WILLIAM H. AVERY

We are here to discuss today the development of Kansas as a leader in the Midwest and in the United States. I am confident it is a goal Kansas can reach.

It will take hard work, determination, brains, some sacrifices and time. Hard work has never frightened a Kansan and determination is taken for granted in this State. The same kind of great minds that made this State the Nation's pantry and who erected the complex of aircraft industries so vital to our economy, are still here. A lot of sacrifices have been necessary in the past and we have the capacity to make others if necessary.

Time, however, is an element which cannot be manipulated. Therefore, we must pace our actions to conform with time. It would be a shame to let the great heritage from those early settlers stagnate and die. The shame would be even greater if the growth potential of Kansas were to become stunted and allowed to decay.

Your attendance at this conference is proof that a start has been made. A new movement toward unified action is in the air. Our

people are thinking about progress. Our youth are looking for opportunities. And our wisest leaders are seeking ways to make those opportunities. As of this date Kansas has an additional 128 new industries which she did not have 14 months ago.

Today's meeting is the start of an extensive program that will continue at a rapid pace for the rest of the year. Economic development is a total concept including such diversified parts as planning, education, industrialization, agriculture, finance and an endless list of social aspects of the community. We must take advantage of the many services available to us, as both a State and individuals.

One concept that I believe may be profitably explored is greater utilization of services available to both the State and her citizens from other governmental levels. For example, as a member of the House of Representatives Small Business Committee for many years, I know the valuable services which the Small Business Administration can render. We should make sure that we use the knowledge and specialized abilities of such organizations in making plans for the future development of our economy.

Another example of the type of creative thinking which is going on in an effort to strengthen the overall program of economic development in Kansas is the recent announcement by the Kansas Research Foundation that a statewide program involving all State colleges and universities for technical industrial extension is being worked out in conjunction with Kansas State University. This program should move Kansas a long way toward maintaining a free flow of ideas and processes between business, industry and our higher educational facilities. Such a program could easily be for industrial development and expansion what the agricultural extension services have been to that sector of our economy. It also points up the need for greater coordination of all activities centering around economic development. The discussions in this conference will point out the need for complete coordination.

My office is always available to make that coordination a reality. The success of this or any development program in Kansas, however, will depend on the amount of enthusiasm among our citizens. The programs for this year are designed to allow the active participation of citizens and it is hoped that you will take advantage of this opportunity.

We are blessed, now, with a vast system of water resources, primarily designed for flood control and conservation. Our reservoirs have opened an opportunity for recreation that must be recognized and fully utilized in the immediate future. To this end, the First Annual Congress of Water Recreation will be held on February 24, in Junction City.

The purpose of this meeting is the unified promotion of the water recreation opportunities opened by these new reservoirs. Policing, zoning, sanitation, and other related problems will be discussed at this meeting. Kansans interested in the promotion of all aspects of water recreation are urged to attend this meeting.

A myriad of problems will have to be faced before we can even come close to tapping the full potential of this great asset. To those of you who have traveled along the coasts or around the reservoirs in other States, I'm sure the importance of this meeting is plain.

In section "I" of Senate bill No. 156 there is an emphatic expression of the legislature's concern for the necessity known as the Kansas Economic Development Act of 1963, to acquaint the people of this State with the industries within the State and encourage closer cooperation between the farming, commercial, and industrial enterprises and the people of the State.

We owe a lot to our industry—farming, commercial and manufacturers. The low un-

employment rate of which we are so proud is due to the stable, expanding leaders in those fields. We can be proud that this State has been chosen by scores of the top manufacturing concerns in the United States as a location for their facilities. And what better advertisement to industry outside Kansas boundaries can there be than healthy, growing, satisfied firms on the inside?

Our support of Kansas industry is needed and appreciated. The week of April 19 through 24 has been designated Kansas Industrial Appreciation Week. During that time you will be hearing a slogan—"What Kansas Builds, Builds Kansas." Industrial Appreciation Week is an intensive internal educational program designed to make Kansans aware of what is made in Kansas and to encourage the support of Kansas-made products.

There is a great need for statewide education on the importance of the travel industry. To give you an idea as to the extent of this business, a recent report from the University of Kansas indicates that the traveling public spent \$410 million in Kansas in 1963. This includes tourists, transients, and traveling businessmen.

This is money brought into the State with a minimum effort by the State in comparison with the extensive programs initiated in other States. This business is growing. An estimate of how tourist interest in Kansas is growing can be obtained from the number of pieces of promotional and historical literature requested by travelers or potential travelers. The Kansas Historical Society distributed in excess of 54,000 copies of their various brochures, while the Kansas Department of Economic Development distributed over 50,000 items of both a promotional and historical nature. Each year the office of the secretary of state distributes 35,000 pieces of literature, though much of this goes out through several State agencies.

As the economic value of travel continues to grow, it becomes even more important that Kansans coming in contact with the traveling public are aware of the potential of this business. For that purpose, a travel promotion conference will be held here in Topeka on May 7.

On May 18, through 21, a group of Kansas businessmen will accompany me to Dallas, Houston, and New Orleans for a business appreciation trip. On this trip we will visit and express our appreciation to firms in those cities with branch plants or business relationships in Kansas.

Here again, the good will generated between our State and the industries located here places us in a good light with other companies considering expansion into this area.

The feasibility of agrirelated industry and the aircraft industry have already been demonstrated in Kansas. Hesston, Balderson, and Richardson are just a few of the names in the agriindustry that are regarded in high esteem in the United States. Beech, Boeing, and Cessna have long demonstrated the fact that Kansas is well-suited to the aircraft industry. Lear Inc. and Alon are adding laurels to that reputation.

In an effort to bring about a closer relationship between these industries and the State, staff members of the Kansas Department of Economic Development and I will tour Hesston, Liberal, Garden City, Goodland, Colby, and Cawker City on June 24 and 25. These are communities where agribusiness is thriving. A similar tour will be made of the Alon facilities at McPherson and the Beech, Cessna, Lear, and Boeing plants in Wichita on July 22 and 23.

Agrirelated manufacturers and aerospace activity are natural industries for Kansas. It is my intention that they be encouraged. If the business climate is made better for these industrial complexes, it is probable that other industrial complexes will see the

possibilities. Again, this is an effective way of advertisement, plus the obvious fact that the healthier our existing industries, the easier and more likely it is for them to expand.

In view of the fact that the Kansas Legislature, in 1945, established the fourth Saturday in September as American Indian Day, a proclamation concerning same will be issued on September 25. Every year tourists have shown a great interest in knowing more about the role of Indians in our past. This is partly a result of the Kansas Historical Society's work in the recovery of archeologically important Indian artifacts, and its promotion of historical sites concerned with Indian activity in the State. In issuing this proclamation I shall be following in the direction indicated by the late, former Gov. Andrew Schoepel, who proclaimed the first Kansas American Indian Day, and helping to point out this side of our history to the many visitors to Kansas.

Kansas businessmen will have an opportunity to learn about the exporting potential of Kansas in either continental Europe or South America during the foreign trade mission that is planned for October 4 through the 22d.

Official recognition of new ideas has never before been offered in the State of Kansas. This will be ended in Kansas this year. On November 18 and 19, the First Annual Inventors Congress will be held in McPherson.

Inventors will be given the opportunity to show their ideas to people who may want to market, purchase, or manufacture their inventions.

I feel that these programs will benefit the State and give each of you a chance to participate in the development of Kansas. Without your assistance and the assistance of every citizen, development will remain an elusive dream. We cannot bring industry and increased development to Kansas with conferences among ourselves. We must get out and let the world know we are ready; that Kansas is on the move.

Action is what will count in the immediate future. Doing something instead of talking about what to do. We know the problem. We should know both sides by now. The time has come for concrete action.

One specific area that is ready for action is finance. For years, our small business firms, and even some of the larger ones, have had the need for long-term credit for what is basically risk capital.

Small businessmen have been caught in the web of not being big enough to expand without long-term credit. Banks and other financial institutions, with a set responsibility to stockholders, have been unable to supply this except on a short-term renewal basis.

It is expected that most of the development in Kansas will come from within. For a number of reasons we have a better chance of expanding and starting industry from within the State than we do of attracting them from another State. But, we need to recognize the financing for the expansion of Kansas industries and the starting of new Kansas industries will usually have to come from within the State.

To this end, the Kansas Development Credit Corp. is being established. The groundwork has been laid. What this corporation will be basically is a fund pool to supply industry with a source of capital not available in banks and with longer terms that can be obtained normally. Venture capital. Money set aside for the manufacturer who has expansion plans for a progressive firm but who is unable otherwise to obtain the needed financing.

We can thank the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce and the Kansas Bankers Association for initiating action on this corporation. Surveys were conducted by both organizations and a third was conducted by

the Kansas Department of Economic Development. The need for this corporation according to the findings of these surveys is very real. The need is for at least \$28 million. This is the amount of money that Kansas businessmen said they needed and had tried to obtain through other sources.

The corporation is now in the process of selling \$500,000 worth of stock which will be matched by the banks of Kansas on a 10-to-1 ratio, providing an operating fund of about \$5 million.

At \$5 a share for common stock, I consider this a good investment in the future of Kansas.

But even more important is the fact that we are doing something. This program can never be labeled a government giveaway. This is the people of Kansas, saying they are ready to meet the challenge and providing the action that demonstrates their faith in the future of the State.

I would also like to mention the school foundation program I proposed to the legislature last week. One compelling reason for recommending this plan was that I felt some assurances should be given industry that the increasing cost of education would not be continually added to the ad valorem tax. Our ad valorem taxes were reaching a point that exceeded ability to pay.

The population of the United States is expected to reach 300 million within the next 36 years. Only 20 percent of that population will live in rural areas, according to the President's Council of Economic Advisers. The same Council is predicting that in those 36 years, the average American's income will be about \$18,000 in dollars of present buying power.

If these figures are anywhere near correct, it means industrialization on a grand scale. Kansas must play a part in that industrialization. The productivity of Kansas soil will be sorely needed, as will the other natural resources in this State.

We could sit on our hands and do nothing and the State would make slow, erratic gains. Or we can start acting now and assure the next generation that the economy of Kansas will be stable, progressive, and well planned. Gentlemen, the choice is ours.

DEVELOPMENT AND VALUE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the American Association of Junior Colleges has appointed a distinguished National Advisory Committee on the Junior College. The committee recently prepared an important statement on the development and value of junior colleges. As one who has long been interested in junior colleges, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from that report be printed in the RECORD.

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

A NATIONAL RESOURCE FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

(Statement by the National Advisory Committee on the Junior College)

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Chairman: Ralph M. Beese, president, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Arthur S. Adams, president, Salzburg Seminar in American Studies, Washington, D.C.

James E. Allen, Jr., commissioner of education, State of New York, Albany, N.Y.

Joseph A. Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

Edward E. Booher, president, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, N.Y.

Robert D. Calkins, president, the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

LeRoy Collins, Director, Community Relations Service, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Frederick L. Deming, President, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minn.

John A. Hannah, president, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

Charles D. LaFollette, honorary vice president, director, Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.

Terry Sanford, Governor of North Carolina, Raleigh, N.C.

William L. Slayton, Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C.

Robert G. Sproul, president emeritus, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

O. Glenn Stahl, Director of Bureau of Programs and Standards, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C.

John C. Warnecke, John Carl Warnecke & Associates, architects and planning consultants, Washington, D.C.

For the American Association of Junior Colleges: Kenneth H. Freeman, president; Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., executive director; William A. Harper, director of public information.

BACKGROUND FOR NEW OPPORTUNITY

All Americans will share with us, we are convinced, the conviction that opportunity for education beyond the high school must be expanded. There has been sustained national discussion regarding this need in recent years, reaching a crescendo during the past several months. This is a natural result of the sharp increase in population and an accompanying rise in the number of young people seeking admission to our colleges. Moreover, Americans have always linked education with elimination of social and economic ills.

Once, not too many years ago, it seemed that we had found the solution to providing necessary educational opportunities. We built public high schools, on the one hand, and their doors were opened to all comers. And we built large State colleges and universities for those at the other end of the scale, the increasing numbers of young people who would be needed for the professions and for corporate management. This combination of efforts contributed greatly to the welfare of the country and of the individual.

But times change. Technological and scientific development have altered the world of work markedly, eliminating vast numbers of unskilled and skilled jobs that formerly could be assumed by high school graduates. Successful completion of secondary education no longer guarantees satisfactory employment, and even present high school vocational training falls far short of meeting the new manpower requirements of modern business and industry, and at the technician level in the professions.

Moreover, high schools today must give more and more attention to the provision of general education that will at once prepare young men and women for further study and provide them with the background to think clearly and intelligently about the very meaning and the responsibilities of being contributive members of society. Secondary schools can do only so much in the time allotted to them. With the burst of knowledge, the advance of science and technology, the high school must concentrate its efforts toward the development of foundations that will lead to the satisfactory pursuit of further education and appropriate career objectives on the part of the majority of young Americans.

Recent examinations of this problem, the changing world of work and its educational implications, have also made amply clear

the fact that a majority of the new jobs of today do not require 4-year college programs culminating in baccalaureate degrees. The jobs demand, instead, a kind of resourcefulness that can be developed in college programs that depart from traditional patterns of higher education. This represents a challenge that cannot be overlooked.

Therefore, any discussion of the expansion of educational opportunity beyond the high school must take into account the changing manpower needs of the Nation coupled with the hopes and aspirations of millions of Americans for individual fulfillment in jobs, home, and the community. If education is to be expanded, then the experiences that are provided must be meaningful. Training for specific purposes as well as general or liberal education must be provided.

NEW OCCUPATIONS

Today there is a vast array of occupations for which at least 2 years of college study are necessary. These occupations are often referred to as middle-manpower jobs, the semiprofessional and technical positions which comprise a major category of employment in business, industry, and the professions. These jobs are an outgrowth of the technological revolution in which automation has combined with mechanization to replace the unskilled and even the skilled worker in many instances in factories, in offices, on farms, and in hospitals and laboratories.

It is ironic that, while there is widespread unemployment today, there is a growing shortage of people to fill the new and more sophisticated jobs in American business and industry. Almost all work today requires education and training of the individual as a thinking, problem-solving person, rather than as an automaton engaged in repetitive tasks which require only manual effort. The market for the unskilled and even the semi-skilled is shrinking rapidly.

The national need for semiprofessional and technical manpower has been well documented—though perhaps not as widely publicized as has been the unemployment problem. The National Science Foundation reported in 1964 that by 1970 all industry would require more than 1,300,000 technicians. This figure, contrasted with 775,000 employed in 1960, gives some suggestion of the education and training job that lies ahead.

The technical and semiprofessional gap extends into such areas as engineering; nursing; medical, dental, and X-ray technology; business data processing, accounting, and office management; agriculture technology; law enforcement; home economics; and specialized secretarial work. There are scores of occupations in the semiprofessional and technical fields, highly desirable positions, which are being filled by professional men and women whose talents could be more appropriately utilized at other levels in the manpower structure. Yet, there is growing need for men and women with the know-how and ability to take on the many new jobs in science and research, business management, engineering, health, and industrial technology.

Manpower requirements in the service industries—business, personal, and government—are increasing, too, as the result of population growth and a healthy economy. While there is a wide range of skills required for service employment, it seems clear that many of the more sophisticated jobs will require training beyond the high school.

Rapid changes in technology, the growth of automation, have also displaced men and women from present jobs or forestalled their advancement to better positions in business and industry. It is incumbent upon society to provide programs of education to retrain and upgrade these men and women for the new jobs.

NEEDS RELATED TO SOCIAL PROBLEMS

The needs for specialized manpower and the education required to meet them relate directly to some of the most critical problems in American society today—poverty and unemployment, social and ethnic unrest. Through education these problems can be alleviated. It must be the right kind of education.

This committee is certain that an appropriate kind of education for many of these new needs is that which is occupationally oriented—offered in 2 years or less of college. We recognize that this concept is not yet well understood, that it represents a marked departure from traditional thinking about the meaning of higher education. Yet we are convinced that college-level occupational or vocational education makes sense as we consider ways in which to expand college opportunity and at the same time proffer new, more satisfying employment possibilities.

We believe that the education and career goals of many Americans can be accommodated, that our new manpower needs can be met, and that many of our social ills can be effectively treated by worthwhile college experience in 2 years or less. Furthermore, we believe that the kind of institution which should accept this responsibility has already been developed and nurtured in many parts of the country. It is the junior college.

The community-centered junior college offers unparalleled promise in the occupational education field. Patterns of education and training have already been established in such States as California, New York, Florida, and Michigan. These States, and several others, have shown initiative and inventiveness in preparing many young people for technical and semiprofessional jobs, and in starting others on their way to professional careers. With their flexible admissions policies, careful guidance and counseling, and accessibility in terms of costs and location, these institutions have pioneered in expanding and multiplying opportunities for college experience.

Labor Department statistics, as well as the records of the colleges that have pioneered in occupational training, show that the graduates of these 2-year programs are in great demand, that their opportunities for employment in technical and semiprofessional work are excellent. There is evidence that this kind of employment offers highly rewarding working conditions, wage levels, and opportunities for advancement.

Despite the demonstrated effectiveness and utility of college-level occupational programs in several locations across the country, there continues to exist a grave shortage in most States of facilities for college-level vocational training. Many factors account for this gap. Lack of understanding, lack of planning, and lack of interest impede the rapid development of necessary facilities and programs to attack the problem.

Let us stress here that the committee does not wish to negate the importance of pre-professional and liberal arts studies in junior colleges. This is also a paramount obligation as the student population and the demand for college education mounts ever more rapidly.

Neither does recognition of the need mean that a junior college program must be so exclusively vocational that it shuts out extension of cultural horizons or restricts adaptability to change. Time must be provided, even in a 2-year curriculum, for at least basic courses in language, arts, and social sciences. The technicians of the future must be inoculated against the malady of overspecialization, a condition from which many professionals of the past suffered. They must not be forced to concentrate so narrowly on technology that they cannot be

useful citizens or cannot accommodate to changes in their own specialties.

There must be balanced programming that will recognize community manpower needs and the needs of the individual. The need for expanded college opportunity will not be met by traditional academic programs alone in most communities.

Indeed, there are many areas of the country, some of them heavily populated with underemployed people, where college opportunity does not exist for a majority, where college doors are closed to those who do not have the funds nor the scholastic prerequisites usually required for admission to college, and where there is little provision for occupational education at any level. We think there is no excuse for such conditions.

If the promise and the hope that we persist in holding out to the people of this country are to be realized, then we must take action. There must be concerted local, State, and national planning involving labor, industry, education, and Government to carry out this tremendous educational and social task.

PROGRAM OF RESPONSE

This committee, therefore, calls for immediate response to manpower and education needs. Response should involve consideration of the following aspects of planning for appropriate occupational education programs.

It should be clearly understood by those responsible for education at all levels that middle-level job education is a legitimate function of higher education, and that the junior college is an appropriate instrument for this purpose. Until such understanding is reached, it will be impossible to move forward rapidly and wisely enough in planning for the future.

Every State and local community should review and study educational patterns in terms of population growth, manpower development, and human needs and aspirations. Junior colleges should be established where necessary; other educational resources should be strengthened and expanded.

Where needs for the establishment of junior colleges are ascertained, the colleges should be planned and organized to include in their curriculums programs of occupational education. Furthermore, the colleges should be planned in terms of accessibility to students, flexible admission policies, appropriate counseling programs, and low cost.

Large cities should take special interest in the development of community-centered junior colleges that will meet occupational needs and at once contribute to resolution of urban social problems. Colleges should be planned for the inner cities as well as suburbs.

Federal authorities, as well as State agencies, should consider the potentiality of the junior college in attacking the roots of poverty and unemployment. The Government should investigate ways in which the junior college can take part in large-scale retraining and vocational programs.

Business, industry, and labor should take steps to project manpower needs so that appropriate programs can be planned in advance. College-level programs should be taken into plants and business offices to upgrade and retrain employees. The junior college represents a means of providing high-quality inplant training that has as yet been untapped.

Adequate financial support must be made available from local, State, and Federal sources for the equipping of programs for semiprofessional and technical education in junior colleges. New funds provided by the Federal Vocational Education Act of 1963 should be apportioned to the several types of institutions eligible for them on a basis that will insure rapid and full development

of resources needed in vocational and occupational education.

Universities and 4-year colleges should plan with junior colleges for the preparation of men and women to teach the new technologies, and for research into problems that may face junior colleges in the future. It is clear now that thousands of teachers will be needed by junior colleges in coming years. It seems evident also that these teachers will require special preparation and attention if they are to take on the responsibilities of teaching the heterogeneous junior college population.

In the area of research, we are convinced that much more must be known about the junior college—its approaches to education, its students, the functions it serves. It would appear that this kind of research ought to originate in and be carried out by colleges and universities in cooperation with junior colleges.

Junior colleges must accept the challenge to establish technical and semiprofessional programs and to expand them commensurate with manpower requirements. Leadership must come from the institutions which have the greatest role to play in this national endeavor.

The American Association of Junior Colleges, with support from interested agencies, should launch a national information program to acquaint the public with junior college occupational education opportunities.

It must be understood, and understood quickly, how high school and college functions are related. Significant sums of money have been allocated by the Federal Government in recent months for vocational training at both high school and college levels. If these funds are to be spent wisely in the interest of all Americans, there must be careful coordination and understanding between and among secondary schools and junior colleges.

Local, regional, and State school authorities, as well as interested citizens, are encouraged to establish committees and/or other organizations that will provide leadership for community action related to planning for occupational education.

CONCLUSION

The 2-year college offers unparalleled promise for expanding educational opportunity through the provision of comprehensive programs embracing job training as well as traditional liberal arts and general education. Occupational education efforts already initiated in junior colleges should be reinforced, and new resources and programs should be developed where necessary.

If we want our citizens to have and accept the responsibilities and privileges of a free society, we must provide them with appropriate education and training. This is an obligation not only of educational organizations but of all American institutions. All of us must share in a planned program for the expansion of opportunity for education beyond the high school. This committee, with the American Association of Junior Colleges, stands ready to cooperate with other agencies and institutions, with business, industry, labor, and government in this critical and urgent enterprise.

VALUE OF POI AS A FOOD FOR BABIES AND CHILDREN

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in the February 23 issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin there appeared an article entitled "Poi Keeps Isle-Born Baby Alive on Coast." The article points out that one Kody Lynn Morris, a 13-month-old girl, daughter of Marine Lt. and Mrs. Phillip R. Morris, of Richland, Wash., suffered from a bronchitis condi-

tion caused by allergy to baby foods and cereals. When poi, airlifted from Hawaii, was fed her, the allergy disappeared.

Poi, a pasty carbohydrate food of high nutritional quality, is made from the root of the Hawaiian taro plant—*Colocasia spp.*

Pediatrics specialists at the University of Rochester found that babies allergic to cereals and other foods thrive on poi.

On May 8, 1963, I brought to the attention of Senators and the American public the value of poi as a food for infants and young children.

Today, I wish again to utter the praise of poi as a baby food and as a substitute food for children who suffer cereal allergies.

For the benefit of all who may be interested, I ask that the entire 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:

POI KEEPS ISLE-BORN BABY ALIVE ON COAST

A 13-month-old girl who is allergic to nearly all kinds of known food, is being kept alive by her twice daily servings of poi in Richland, Wash.

Doctors there said that Kody Lynn Morris, who was born in Windward, Oahu, began regaining strength after taking poi airlifted from Hawaii.

Kody Lynn is the daughter of Marine Lt. and Mrs. Phillip R. Morris, who left here about a month ago.

Morris was stationed at the Kaneohe Marine Corps Air Station for about 3 years.

Kody was born prematurely and weighed only 16 pounds last month when her father was transferred to the mainland.

Military families usually ride troopships from Hawaii. But a physician ordered the Morris family's return by jet airliner because Kody couldn't stand the 5-day boat trip.

Within 2 weeks after the family arrived Kody's weight dropped 2 pounds and she was taken to a hospital with bronchitis. A doctor said it was caused by an allergy. The bronchitis was cured, but the child refused to eat.

The family is visiting Washington before heading to the lieutenant's new assignment in Bridgeport, Calif.

Morris will become an instructor in a mountain warfare school there.

The parents believe the air 7,000 feet up in the mountains will have less allergy-producing pollen, so their little girl will be better off.

Lt. Michael A. Donlan, a Kaneohe Marine Corps doctor, said that the girl's condition began to worsen when the family's supply of poi ran out.

They had taken some poi with them when they left for the mainland.

Donlan said he received a call from the family February 12 with a plea for a shipment of poi.

Eight 13-ounce jars of poi were airshipped February 15, he said.

"The mailman doesn't know how close he came to being kissed," the child's grateful mother said.

Mrs. Morris said that after Kody had consumed a jar of poi, the little girl perked up.

Getting poi by airmail from Hawaii is a sort of expensive undertaking, though, so Morris searched for a less costly way of getting the stuff.

George Makimi, a Hawaiian schoolteacher living in Kennewick, Wash., steered them to a store in Seattle. Makimi often puts on

Hawaiian parties and gets some of his food from the store.

Kody Lynn, born prematurely, quickly showed dangerous symptoms of her nearly universal allergies to food, weighing less than 5 pounds at birth.

Donlan said, "We tried all kinds of formulas and cereals, but they provoked violent reactions."

Then poi was tried.

When she was 7 months old, she was placed on a poi diet.

Donlan recommended poi for the girl after consulting with Dr. Alexander Roth, a specialist in allergic diseases at Kaiser Hospital here.

He said the girl can live only on poi and tea, although she is able to take small amounts of lamb, sweetpotatoes, and broth.

"I am very happy to hear she's doing fine with the poi," he said when informed about her condition.

RESEARCH PROJECT

He said he had heard about the research project on the use of poi as a cereal substitute for infants and children being conducted by Dr. Jerome Glaser of the University of Rochester in New York.

Glaser, who will be here next month for a taro conference, reports that for one child, who was allergic to all cereals and a large number of other foods, the poi was lifesaving.

His study is financed by a \$10,000 State grant.

T. JOE CAHILL

Mr. McGEE, Mr. President, "Mr. Wyoming" is dead. I refer to the late T. Joe Cahill, of Cheyenne, who died recently at age 87, after a career ranging from frontier lawman to what he liked to call a position as "chief chiseler" in behalf of his favorite charity, the St. Joseph's Orphanage, at Torrington, Wyo.

T. Joe earned the name "Mr. Wyoming." He was there at the inception of the world-famous Cheyenne frontier days. He was there at the hanging of the notorious Tom Horn. He was Cheyenne's police chief 6 years, and the chief of its first paid fire department.

The Cheyenne Star has capsuled his career. I ask unanimous consent that the Star's obituary of "Mr. Wyoming" be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Cheyenne Star, Feb. 18, 1965]
"MR. WYOMING"—T. JOE CAHILL: MOURNED BY ENTIRE WEST

"Mr. Wyoming" is dead.

T. Joe Cahill died Friday evening at the age of 87. His death will sadden the hearts of people all over the Nation, because he was known all over the Nation.

T. Joe lived a unique code: "do a good turn today—you may not be here tomorrow." He won't be here tomorrow, but his spirit will live forever.

T. Joe saw history in the making and even helped make some. He was born August 7, 1877, in what was then known as Camp Carlin, southwest of Cheyenne, of immigrant Irish parents.

"Mr. Wyoming" had a great sense of humor. Flat on his back and in great pain, his favorite remark was, "the old gray mare, she ain't what she used to be."

During his youth, T. Joe knew what it was like to live in fear of Indian attacks. As the Indians were subdued, a new element came into being, the Western badman.

During this era, T. Joe served the law well. He was a deputy sheriff and police chief. As a lawman, he helped hang one of the most notorious and controversial killers in Wyoming—or Western history—Tom Horn.

"Tom asked me to help with his execution," he said several years ago. "He and my uncle Joe chased Geronimo together down in Arizona Territory. I guess Tom figured I would try and do the job up right."

T. Joe served his State and humanity well. He called himself, "the chief chiseler" for St. Joseph's orphanage at Torrington. They were his kids. He traveled thousands of miles, made hundreds of appearances at benefits to beg, borrow and he was not above passing out a few threats to squeeze an extra buck out of somebody's pocket for "those kids up there at Torrington."

Over a year ago, T. Joe conducted his annual fund raising campaign while a patient in DePaul Hospital. He couldn't travel, but he had a lot of friends who did the traveling for him. He made his goal.

T. Joe launched his philanthropic career the same year St. Joseph's was founded in 1929. How much money he poured into its coffers isn't known. T. Joe wasn't interested in that. His work with the orphanage, he said several times, "kept him young, spry, and very happy."

It also warranted him his greatest honor, knighthood from the Pope.

From the cluttered upstairs office at his home, and recently from hospital rooms, T. Joe kept the flood of his famous birthday greetings pouring out. He mailed over 10,000 a year saying, "do a good turn today—you may not be here tomorrow."

They were sent to the great, the near-great, common people, and one Cheyenne youngster started getting his at the age of 4—and always looked for it on his birthday. He won't be getting a card this year.

Orphan fund promotions came natural to T. Joe. For 5 years, 1928-32, he teamed up with the fabulous Tex Rickard, then owner of the new Madison Square Garden, to produce one of the earliest rodeos to appear in New York City. He also took an active part in organizing the famous Cheyenne Frontier Days and invented the slogan: "Daddy of 'Em All."

T. Joe was the first secretary to the old Wyoming Commerce and Industry Commission, executive secretary to the Wyoming Dude Ranchers Association, and for 6 years was Cheyenne's chief of police and assistant fire chief to the first paid Cheyenne fire department.

In the meantime, he started his own business, married Susan Brady, who served for over 50 years as choir director and organist at St. Mary's Cathedral. The couple had four children.

T. Joe is survived by his wife and two daughters, Mary Ann Gehres, of Casper, and Elizabeth Cahill, of Sheridan. A son, Joseph, died in 1932, and another son, Jack, died last year.

A friend once wrote, when he dedicated a book to T. Joe and St. Joseph's:

"T. Joe has only one defect—he is going to die as all of us will. But no man will do it better or give it less importance than he."

J. BYRON WILSON

Mr. McGEE, Mr. President, J. Byron Wilson was a longtime spokesman for the American wool industry. Mr. Wilson, 44 years the executive secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association, was a native of Ohio, but moved to Fort Fetterman, where his father was staff physician, at the age of 2.

In later years J. Byron Wilson made his home at McKinley, Wyo., a center of activity for the wool industry, until his retirement in 1962. Now he has passed on. The Casper Tribune has presented us with a feeling memory of this man and his work. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on the death of J. Byron Wilson, from the Casper (Wyo.) Tribune of February 26, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Casper (Wyo.) Tribune, Feb. 26, 1965]

J. BYRON WILSON

If you detected the scent of a certain aromatic cigarette, you knew that the portly man from McKinley was somewhere near. You knew also that whether it was a ram sale, a convention of woolgrowers, or just a drop-in visit, there was news to be obtained here and J. Byron Wilson would be the one to give it out.

Byron Wilson was a good man for the wool industry. Serving as secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association 44 years, he had national stature and his voice was heard in Washington. The large white house where he lived at McKinley is a kind of landmark and somewhat of a symbol pointing to the fact that men who have a hand in shaping national policy do not necessarily come from the crowded avenues of large cities. McKinley is almost remote, isolated, and yet it was from here that there emanated much of the coordinated thinking of the industry.

When, as a child of 2 years, Byron Wilson arrived in Wyoming, in the middle 1880's the sheep industry already had a good foothold, although it was not generally accepted by cattlemen, who resented this intrusion of the range. Young Byron grew up with it. He lived to recognize its importance not only to Wyoming but to many other States of the West and Southwest. He had come to fight its battles. In common with others in the industry, he resisted the menace of imports from Australia, but he was to see danger from another quarter—the synthetics, from which there could be no legislative relief. Only a hammering on the argument for virgin wool, education of the public as to its value, could be of any avail. He was to see a U.S. Senator from Wyoming, the late H. H. Schwartz, introduce a subsequently approved truth-in-fabric bill which would require a statement of the amount of wool in cloth. He was to see reciprocal trade treaties, advanced by Secretary of State Cordell Hull, which were of doubtful benefit to the American wool industry.

In a Nation of beefeaters, he would be associated in the endeavor to get people to eat more lamb.

He would see the feuding between cattlemen and sheepmen become a matter of history and the open range less open than he had known it as a boy at Fort Fetterman. He would be among the first to recognize the importance of developing good breeding stock, and in this movement he was to take an important role through the annual Wyoming ram sale in Casper. He would be influential in bringing a convention of the National Wool Growers Association to this city, a decision no little motivated by the fact that the Casper press would give more attention to such a gathering than would the newspapers of some larger cities.

He would see good times and bad times in the sheep industry, the periods in which wool was in heavy demand and when prices were high, and periods when the market was glutted and growers were holding their

fleeces. He would know about the losses from storms, such as the blizzard of 1949.

His life was to encompass an era. His death may have been to finish a chapter, but it was not to close a book. He would know that the industry he loved so well—the sheep nibbling at the buffalo grass of the plains or feasting on the verdure of the mountain, timbered country or eating cottonseed cake in winter—was not to be written off as an anachronism.

B. J. RICKEY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the State of Wyoming and the trade union movement have both recently lost a dedicated citizen and hardworking, sincere leader. I refer to the late B. J. Rickey, who was director of district 2 for the Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, and president of the Wyoming AFL-CIO.

Reporter Don Tucker, of the Casper Morning Star, in Mr. Rickey's hometown, Casper, Wyo., has written a moving eulogy in the form of an editorial published on February 23.

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

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

[From the Casper (Wyo.) Morning Star, Feb. 23, 1965]

LABOR'S LOSS

A big man on the labor scene has stepped down.

B. J. Rickey, president of the Wyoming AFL-CIO and director of district 2, Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, was planning a campaign to rid Wyoming of what he termed "the iniquitous right-to-work law," even as he was dying early Sunday.

Although B.J.'s formal education was cut short after 2 years of college, he died a well-educated, keen-witted man. He was an avid reader and made it a point to learn everything possible before going to bat for one of his union members.

It would be ridiculous to say Rickey had no enemies or that everyone approved of what he said and did. But all would agree that they respected his ability either as an opponent or as a champion.

Rickey was above all honest in his convictions. He would fight with everything he had when he believed in what he was fighting for. He was tough and relentless at the bargaining table—yes, even ruthless at times.

In hearings before the National Labor Relations Board he frequently matched wits and arguments with top-flight lawyers and, more often than not, successfully.

In recent years, Rickey devoted more and more of his time to civic enterprises. While chairman of the county parks board, he was instrumental in having established in Natrona County a fire protection system and in park development—particularly on Casper Mountain. For years he was tricity head of labor's committee on political education.

But there was one soft spot in this man of steel. He would be hurt, rather than angry, whenever a person—friend or foe—let him down.

B. J. Rickey will long be remembered—by his friends as a strong man in their corner, by his opponents as a titan facing them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The FBI Didn't Write It," which appeared in the Wilmington Evening Journal on March 5, 1965.

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

THE FBI DIDN'T WRITE IT

Now it turns out that the "FBI report" made public the other day by the Senate Rules Committee, which has been charged with inquiring into the Bobby Baker case, was not a report. Neither was it written by the FBI. Department of Justice lawyers produced this condensation of hundreds of pages of material gathered by FBI agents.

These points were established by Dom Bonafere of the New York Herald Tribune staff. They throw a very different light on the document that was handed out by the committee majority—the three minority members did not agree to it—as proof that the testimony given by Don B. Reynolds last December 7 was unworthy of belief. The FBI, it will be noted, did not reach this conclusion. All it did was interview people mentioned by Reynolds and bring in the results.

In the nature of things some part of these results had to be left out by the Department of Justice lawyers. So it's possible that the FBI agents dug up some statements, here and there, that did not tend to contradict Reynolds' testimony. No such statements got into the presentation released by the committee majority.

Reynolds' revelations last December look worse than unsubstantial against the background provided by this document. But the document itself fails to command confidence. Evenhanded it is not. Senator CURTIS, speaking for the Republican minority on the committee flatly charged that "the report was obtained and released for the purpose of prejudicing the public mind against the testimony of witnesses who testified against the politically powerful."

We could wish the basis for that accusation were less substantial. For this latest disclosure must reinforce the conclusion that the committee majority was more interested in covering up the truth than in digging it out—and that is a sad and shocking thing to say of a committee of the U.S. Senate.

ALLEGED FUNDRAISING SOLICITATION FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES WITHIN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Washington Star of February 24 there appeared an article entitled "Post Office Probed Under Hatch Act." The first two paragraphs of the article read:

The Justice Department is investigating allegations that one or more Post Office Department officials in Washington last fall helped direct a nationwide fund-raising solicitation for the Johnson-Humphrey ticket among postmasters, post office employees, and rural mail carriers.

The charges originally came to the attention of Postmaster General John Gronouski in mid-December from persons outside the Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed 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:

MONEY AND POLITICS: POST OFFICE PROBED UNDER HATCH ACT

(By Walter Pincus)

The Justice Department is investigating allegations that one or more Post Office Department officials in Washington last fall helped direct a nationwide fund-raising solicitation for the Johnson-Humphrey ticket among postmasters, post office employees and rural mail carriers.

The charges originally came to the attention of Postmaster General John Gronouski in mid-December from persons outside the Department.

In January Gronouski turned the matter over to the Justice Department for investigation.

If proved true, the matter would constitute violation of the Hatch Act which, among other things prohibits one Federal employee soliciting political campaign funds from other Federal employees.

HIGHER AUTHORITY

As pieced together from talks with persons both inside and outside the Post Office Department, the allegations now under investigation are these:

At the request of "higher authority" a Post Office Department political appointee arranged to have each of the 15 regional department offices designate a man to receive campaign funds to be collected from local postmasters and employees within the region. Solicitation at the local level reportedly was carried out primarily by retired postal employees chosen by persons said to be working under the direction of the Democratic National Committee.

Funds were transmitted first to the regional office employee, then to a special post office box in Ben Franklin Station, located within the Department's Washington headquarters building. From there they went to the Democratic National Committee.

VERY BIG PROGRAMS

One former post office employee familiar with the allegations said yesterday that when the fund-raising activities were underway last fall, regional postal department aids were permitted to deduct their political expenses from the campaign funds they collected.

He described the Post Office effort as "a very big program" and said postmasters and rural mail carriers were likely prospects as contributors because "they know they can be kicked out with the emnity of the political forces."

A Post Office Department spokesman, yesterday, would not describe the allegations but said since "they were turned over to Justice . . . I'm under wraps talking about it." He did make it clear, however, that no original complaints about the matter had come from post office employees.

The Justice Department had no comment. The Post Office allegations mark the second campaign fund matter being looked into by the Justice Department in the wake of last year's presidential campaign. The first—solicitation of \$100 tickets to the 1964 Democratic gala among employees of the Rural Electrification Administration by officials of that agency—is also being investigated for possible Hatch Act violations. The basic facts in that case were developed by a now-completed Civil Service Commission inquiry.

The Commission has delayed taking any action based on its study pending determi-

nation of whether any criminal statutes had been violated.

Actual investigative work in both these cases is being done by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under Justice Department direction.

It is understood that FBI agents visited Democratic National Committee headquarters last week to interview party treasurer Richard Maguire.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in commenting on the article I call attention to the fact that on May 26, 1964, the Senate unanimously adopted Senate Resolution 332, of which I, along with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] was the sponsor. I quote from the resolution because it is pertinent to this subject.

Resolved, That the Attorney General is requested to investigate the alleged solicitation of career employees by either political party to purchase tickets to political fund-raising dinners for the purpose of ascertaining whether such solicitation by either political party has involved a violation of existing laws, and (1) if it appears that any such violation has occurred, to take appropriate steps to punish those responsible therefor, or (2) if it appears that the alleged solicitation was not in violation of existing laws, to formulate and recommend to the Congress, within sixty days, the enactment of such additional laws, or amendments to existing laws, as may be necessary to prohibit further solicitations of this nature.

Mr. President, this resolution was unanimously adopted by the Senate. It has not been 60 days, but 6 months, since this resolution was adopted, we are still waiting for a report from the Attorney General's office as to what he has found as a result of the investigation which we instructed him to conduct.

Perhaps the Attorney General can find time to tell us what the FBI found when these charges were investigated—that is if they were investigated.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, times of great national crisis, when American bombs are being dropped, and American lives are being lost, the easiest course for any newspaper to take is the belligerent stance of "Hit 'em again, harder." An American newspaper which deserves the highest commendation for restraining itself during this current crisis is the New York Times. The editorial "Negotiate or Escalate," which appeared in the February 25 issue, is one of a long, distinguished series of articles on Vietnam which have appeared in the New York Times during recent months.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial and another fine editorial entitled, "Realities Become Clearer," from the February 23 issue of the Detroit Free Press, inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 25, 1965]

NEGOTIATE OR ESCALATE

It is time for someone in Washington to remember John F. Kennedy's words in his inaugural address: "Let us never negotiate

out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

The pressures on this country to seek a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese conflict are approaching a point where the United States is being isolated. In recent days Russia has joined France in appealing for talks; the British would like to see negotiations started; the news from North Vietnam hints at a desire to confer; India had previously expressed the same wish, and yesterday Secretary General Thant of the United Nations disclosed that he has been engaged in discussions with the United States and other involved nations and has made concrete proposals for a negotiated settlement.

Washington, to be sure, is not quite alone. Communist China has been adamant against negotiations, and it is quit possible that Peiping will refuse to talk. However, Mr. Thant, President de Gaulle and the Russians believe that China can be induced to join a reconvened meeting of the 14-nation Geneva Conference.

Yesterday it was announced that American jet bombers, with Americans manning the weapons as well as the controls, are now fighting in Vietnam. Their involvement makes Americans open combatants in the war, not just advisers; thus the conflict has again been escalated. Correspondents in Washington are being informed that U.S. policy now permits attacks on North Vietnam even without further provocations. The point of no return on a wider war may be at hand.

A State Department spokesman goes on repeating that the United States will reject negotiations so long as Hanoi supports the Vietcong guerrillas; Peiping says it will not talk until all American troops are out of Vietnam. Both preconditions are utterly unrealistic. One of the fundamental reasons for negotiations is precisely to arrange for a cease-fire and nonintervention.

Unquestionably, President Johnson worries about the effect on South Vietnamese morale of any move toward negotiations, but the recent upheavals in Saigon have indicated that the will to resist the Vietcong, even among the commanders of the armed forces, is already near the vanishing point.

Time is working against the United States. Secretary Thant is right in saying that the situation is going "from bad to worse." The notion that to negotiate would be a defeat for the United States has become one of the most pernicious misapprehensions of the conflict. The United States is amply proving its military strength and its determination to stay in South Vietnam in present circumstances. An agreement to negotiate surrenders nothing; it opens up the possibility for determining whether the goals of effective neutralization now being sought militarily can be achieved at the conference table.

The most significant thing that Secretary Thant said yesterday was this: "I am sure that the great American people, if it only knows the true facts, will agree with me that further bloodshed is unnecessary and that political and diplomatic negotiations alone can create conditions that will enable the United States to withdraw gracefully from that part of the world."

President Johnson is the man to whom the American people look for the true facts.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Feb. 23, 1965]

REALITIES BECOME CLEARER

Saigon's coveters of power have been at each other's throats again. As usual, only two things can be said with certainty.

One is that whichever faction winds up in possession of the symbols of government, it will hold them only briefly. The other is that real government will not exist.

The war against the Vietcong rebels will be prosecuted only feebly, and concern for South Vietnam's bedeviled people will be nil.

All of which renders the assignment which the United States has given itself in South Vietnam impossible. We cannot assist a nation to win a war when interest is lacking at every level.

Moreover, as truth has finally emerged, it becomes evident that while the South Vietnam war has multiple facets, its chief characteristic is that of a civil war. And outsiders have no business intervening in civil wars.

Unfortunately, the United States has gotten so involved that we can hardly pile our people aboard homeward bound ships and planes and stop writing checks.

However, nothing but folly prevents the United States from changing course—accepting realities which became evident months ago.

What we need is not more scuffling on hopeless battlefields, but a search for some formula, some accommodation which will permit a truce, and provide footing for permanent peace.

Had the past couple of years seen as much zeal put into this search as has been given to the compounding of futilities, both this country and South Vietnam would have been better served.

While the successive coups say nothing for South Vietnam's ability to attain self-government, they may have the virtue of shaking our policymakers awake. In that light, the latest one may not be all bad news. At least it cannot breed more chaos than there already was.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 67, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, the so-called Monroney resolution, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a joint committee on the organization of the Congress, was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the Members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitu-

tion. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress: *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House: *Provided further*, That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-ninth Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$150,000 through January 31, 1966, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(d) The committee shall report from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, the first report being made not later than one hundred and twenty days after the effective date of this concurrent resolution. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. All reports and findings of the committee shall, when received, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the appropriate committees of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

VA ADMINISTRATOR, WILLIAM J. DRIVER APPLAUDS GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the course of past hearings conducted on the cold war GI bill the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs has had the privilege of hearing testimony from numerous outstanding leaders in both the arts and the sciences in support of this worthy and necessary legislation. Many of these prominent citizens look back with pride upon the fact that without the valuable economic assistance provided them by the GI bills of World War II and the Korean war, they would have been unable to further their education and thus attain the positions of leader-

ship and responsibility which they occupy today.

One of these prominent leaders on the American scene who recognizes the value of the GI bills is the new Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, Mr. William J. Driver. Mr. Driver expressed his personal indebtedness to the GI bill in an illuminating article which appeared in the February 1965 issue of the *Veterans of Foreign Wars* magazine. He said he might not have finished law school and probably would not now be Administrator had it not been for such bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article indicating Mr. Driver's recognition of the benefits provided by the GI bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEW VA ADMINISTRATOR: WILLIAM J. DRIVER

At 8 a.m. on January 4, William J. Driver walked across the hall from his old office, crossed the threshold of another marked Administrator, and assumed his duties as head of the largest independent agency of the U.S. Government.

Those steps set a first.

As the President commented, when he announced his intention in late December to nominate the Deputy Administrator to succeed John S. Gleason, Jr., as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Driver is the first Federal career official to direct the affairs of America's former servicemen and women.

Mr. Driver, at 46, is the second youngest VA Administrator, Gleason was 45 when he took the oath of office in 1961.

Gleason's resignation, effective January 1, was tendered to allow him to resume a banking career and direct other business enterprises in Chicago.

The announcement of Driver's appointment was highly pleasing to officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars who actively supported his nomination to the high post. He is a life member of VFW Post 8816, Rochester, N.Y.

The new Administrator is a 6-foot-3, 190 pound veteran of World War II and Korea who has spent 16 years in the Veterans' Administration.

Driver has a common interest with the 8 million World War II veterans who took advantage of the GI bill to further their education and reclaim the classroom opportunities they lost temporarily while in uniform. Early after his association with the VA in Washington, he attended law school at night under the GI measure and earned his LL.B. degree in 1952.

A grateful beneficiary of this wartime legislation, he told newsmen shortly after the announcement of his appointment as Administrator:

"I wouldn't have made it through law school without the GI bill. So you might say I wouldn't be here today without it."

The new Administrator's earlier education was received in his native Rochester, N.Y., where he was graduated from high school and from Niagara University. At Niagara he underwrote his college expenses by working with a Rochester insurance firm before receiving his degree in business administration cum laude in 1941.

Administrator Driver served during World War II as a commissioned officer with Headquarters, Adjutant General, European Theater, from 1942 until his separation in 1946. His military decorations include recognition from Great Britain, France, and the United States. He holds the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, the Order of the British Empire and the French Croix de Guerre.

Driver joined the VA in 1946 as special assistant to the Assistant Administrator for Contact and Administrative Services.

During the Korean conflict he returned to duties with the U.S. Army and served with the office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1. He returned to the VA in August 1953.

His postwar VA career included duties with the Compensation and Pension Service, and later as Chief Benefits Director before becoming Deputy Administrator in February 1961.

Driver holds the VA's two highest awards: The Exceptional Service Medal and the Meritorious Service Medal.

His distinguished record of service won for him, at our 1964 National Convention, the VFW Medal of Merit and these richly earned words from Past Commander in Chief Joseph J. Lombardo: "In appreciation of your personal cooperation with the VFW and for your exemplary record as an exceptionally able administrator recognized as one of the top career officials in the Federal Government."

The National Civil Service League also took cognizance of Mr. Driver's unique achievements by giving him its Career Service Award as one of the 10 outstanding men in Federal public service.

On the occasion of that honor, Gleason told Driver that "Your selection for a 1964 Career Civil Service Award reflects two facts. Primarily, of course, the selection stems from the significant contributions that you have made in your 16 years with the Veterans' Administration, most notably your initiating or bringing to fruition:

"A new veterans pension law, Public Law 86-211, which is more equitable to veterans and taxpayers.

"The work measurement and performance standards program which provides knowledge essential in improving our ability to render service.

"The large scale application to veterans benefits of automatic data processing and the establishment of a new Department of Data Management to assure achievement of the full potential of advanced electronic management tools.

"Equally important, your selection for this high award is in reality a tribute to the quality and dedication of the employees of the Veterans' Administration. The honor you have won further confirms the conclusion I reached shortly after I became Administrator of Veterans Affairs: That in my years of experience in banking and business, and in military affairs, I have never known a group more devoted, diligent, and productive than those who serve their country through their work in the Veterans' Administration."

Mr. Driver is in hearty agreement with that evaluation of VA employees.

"They're a great group of people," Driver declared. "Their teamwork and devotion to duty has astounded every Administrator. I am aware that the Administrator gives broad policy guidance in the conduct of VA operations, but it is the individual employee who gives the Veterans' Administration a continuity of purpose to the humanitarian service for which our agency exists."

During his 16 years of association with the VA and his steady advancement to more important duties, Driver has been eminently successful at thinking for himself and encouraging others to think for themselves. The popular clichés of conformity just don't fit him. His years in Government service have sharpened his sense of the critical importance of teamwork whether it be high-level administrative decisions or direct personal service to veterans. But he has never lost sight of the value and role of each individual on the team.

And he has never lost sight of the mission of the VA.

"We are in business to provide high-quality service to which our veterans and their dependents are entitled," he has said. "The VA is a big agency which produces a lot of statistics, but we do not deal in statistics. We deal with human beings. The statistics are but a measuring rod of the individual human impact that VA makes each day and each hour on the important, individual concerns of people."

THE ALABAMA TRAGEDY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we cannot win the war for liberty and democracy and freedom of opportunity around the world by losing it at home. Every lash of a bullwhip on human flesh in Alabama will cost us in treasure and likely in blood, all around the world. The tragic events in Alabama yesterday, on what should have been a day of prayer and meditation, the first Sunday in Lent, will hurt us more than losing two battles in Vietnam.

As a southerner in the tradition of George Washington, George Mason, and Thomas Jefferson, I abhor this brutality which so smears the good name of one of the fairest sections of our land. Shame on you, George Wallace, for the wet ropes that bruised the muscles, for the bullwhips which cut the flesh, for the clubs that broke the bones, for the tear gas that blinded, burned, and choked into insensibility.

These Americans so brutally attacked yesterday sought only their constitutional right to vote. They did not resist arrest. While I do not condone lawlessness or defiance of law and order, I abhor the violent and brutal attack upon Americans who attempt only to march peacefully.

George Wallace should pattern his conduct on that of real southerners, like George Washington, George Mason, George Wythe, and Alabama's own Justice Hugo Black. Let him join great spirits like Thomas Jefferson and Robert E. Lee with a vision for the future. He needs to atone for the shame he has brought to Alabama, to my beloved Southland, and the injury he has brought to the Nation.

TEXAS SENATOR SUPPORTS GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I doubt whether any conservation proposal before Congress has more complete support of all concerned than the bill establishing a Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas. The creation of this national park as proposed in my bill, S. 295, is favored by the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service, the principal landowner affected, the surrounding communities and governmental units. All are agreed on the need for preservation of these beautiful forested mountains, including the highest peak in Texas, as a national park.

As further evidence of the widespread support for this park, I have a copy of a resolution recently adopted by the Senate of the Texas Legislature which asks the Congress to enact this legislation "with all deliberate speed." This resolu-

tion was authored by State Senator Snelson of El Paso and Deen Kennard of Fort Worth, both able State senators. I ask the unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 44

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish, in west Texas, the Guadalupe Mountains National Park

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States several bills having for their purpose the creation of a Guadalupe Mountains National Park; and

Whereas the creation of the Guadalupe Mountains National Park has been recommended by the Southwest Regional Office of the National Park Service to the U.S. Department of the Interior; and

Whereas Mr. J. C. Hunter, Jr., of Abilene, Tex., has expressed a desire to sell his 71,790-acre ranch in the Guadalupe Mountains region located near the northern border of west Texas between Odessa and El Paso; and

Whereas Mr. J. C. Hunter, Jr., has expressed the further desire that this ranch be used for parks and public recreational purposes; and

Whereas it has been further recommended by the Southwest Regional Office of the National Park Service that the J. C. Hunter, Jr., ranch be purchased for the formation of such a park; and

Whereas Mr. Wallace Pratt has donated to the National Park Service 5,632 acres of land in the northern McKittrick Canyon area in New Mexico, immediately north of and adjacent to the Hunter ranch, which donated Pratt land alone is inadequate for development as a national park; and

Whereas the area offers a natural game and fish preserve for its various species of wildlife including bear, lion, elk, bighorn sheep, deer, turkey, and smaller birds, and the only fresh water mountain trout stream in the State; and

Whereas the proposed Guadalupe Mountains National Park would complement and adjoin the Lincoln National Forest and the Carlsbad Caverns National Park areas in New Mexico; and

Whereas the current rate of growth of our cities and our population creates a demand for additional recreational areas; and

Whereas a national park in the Guadalupe Mountains would prove to be an economic benefit to the citizens of this State, attracting many tourists to the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to enact the required legislation with all deliberate speed to purchase land and establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas and New Mexico; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this concurrent resolution be furnished to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each of this State's Representatives to the Congress, and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

ESTONIA AND LITHUANIA COMMEMORATE THEIR INDEPENDENCE DAYS WHILE THEY REMAIN IN CAPTIVITY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, too often many of us are prone to take our freedom for granted and it is through

joining in the celebration of independence days with those unfortunate countries that are in captivity, that we are reminded of our treasured liberties.

One of the most inspiring periods in history was that following the First World War, when there was an upsurge of self-determination and a fight for freedom by many countries, including these two Baltic countries of Estonia and Lithuania. President Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points, and his declaration for self-determination, helped spark this drive for freedom around the world.

It is among the great tragedies of the Second World War that many countries were occupied by the Red Army, and then subsequently incorporated into the Soviet Union. When these countries were robbed of their freedom and lost their independence, our sympathy was intensified for them, and we did all in our power to assist them in remaining free from Communist tyranny.

We join the American citizens of these countries in their hope and determination for the future that once again they might enjoy the fruits of achievement which can only be attained by a free country.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

February 16 marked the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Since the end of the First World War, American citizens of Lithuanian ancestry have annually celebrated their independence, and we have joined them for several reasons. During the years when Lithuania was a free and independent country, we joined hands with them in this annual event, confirming the close and warm friendship existing between our two countries. This tradition endures as a token of admiration and appreciation for the signal services our Lithuanian-American citizens rendered to their adopted country during both world wars as gallant fighters in our forces. Another reason for our celebration is our admiration for Lithuania's constant struggle for freedom, and their remarkable performance in rebuilding their war-ravaged land.

In recognition of the distinct contributions some of our Lithuanian-Americans have made to our way of life, and enriched our heritage, I would like to mention the distinguished composer of Boston, Misas Petrauskas; the famed operatic singer of the Metropolitan Opera in New York, Miss Anna Kaska; and two well-known jurists and highly gifted public servants, Judge Casimir Kriauciunas "Kay" of the Superior Court of Seattle, Wash., and Judge John T. Zuris of the Chicago municipal court. On the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I gladly join all Lithuanian-Americans in their celebration.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

February 24 marked the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Estonian Republic. Although the life of this young republic was unfortunately short, during its two decades of freedom, the Estonians distinguished themselves by their economic progress, as well as their educational, artistic, and cultural achievements.

After years of oppression by czarist Russia, it appeared that this industrious and imaginative people had finally secured their freedom. On November 15, 1918, Lenin declared all peoples of former czarist Russia free to secede from Russia. Thirteen days later, in a complete breach of promise, Soviet troops invaded Estonia. The people of that diminutive nation rose to face the armies of the neighboring giant and in a display of heroism seldom equaled in modern times, repelled the invader for 14 months. On February 2, 1920, the Soviet Union signed a peace treaty, renouncing all rights of sovereignty over Estonia.

Estonia then adopted a democratic constitution, and in 1921 was admitted to the League of Nations. Thus, in the field of both domestic and foreign affairs, Estonia was establishing herself in a most progressive and admirable fashion. Since that time, however, the Russians have again occupied Estonia, a most regrettable event.

It is with great sympathy and admiration that we join in celebrating this independence day with all Estonian-Americans.

THE NEED FOR A HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, what can we do to achieve America the beautiful?

This is the question I hear everywhere I go these days. Today, America is more conscious than ever in its history of the need to correct the ugliness, devastation, neglect, dreariness, and downright dirtiness that assail our eyes in some places where we may live or travel in the United States. And, accordingly, we have become more conscious than ever of the need to do something about this neglect before it is too late.

For more than three centuries we have been devastating this great land of ours—polluting its waters, neglecting its cities, ripping out its forests, despoiling its hillsides, junking up its roadsides. We have, to be sure, let our consciences be our guides on relatively few occasions. We have legislated laws for saving and restoring National and State parks, begun some tentative legislation on clean water, and approved legislation for urban renewal and open space preservation in our cities.

And—let me make abundantly clear—we have made real progress in these directions. I shudder to think what America would look like without these laws and the actions taken to carry them out. In urban renewal, for example, we have made an excellent beginning in rebuilding our cities. During the past 4 years under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, urban renewal has made tremendous strides. Some 800 cities are now undertaking 1,800 projects. From the slums of yesteryear are now arising residential and nonresidential buildings and even whole new neighborhoods, cleaner, more efficient and more livable than ever before.

The program for open space acquisition has achieved remarkable results for

a program so new. In its brief 4-year history of helping cities acquire open space in urban areas, 300 applications have been approved, for a total of 125,773 acres that have been purchased. These will be saved for recreation, scenic, historic, and conservation purposes for generations to come.

This is a good record—but it is not nearly good enough. To rescue America from being made the not-so-beautiful, before it is too late, will require much more than merely measures to repair the ravages of past neglect and indifference. We must also look to the future—to the vast population growth of our children and our children's children, and their needs for industrial growth, highways, elbow room, recreation, and beauty.

That is why I am urging passage of the President's Housing and Urban Development program as outlined in his message. He urges that we undertake the achievement of America the beautiful on the comprehensive scale that is needed. Such legislation would:

Continue and expand authorization for urban renewal, so that more deteriorated sections of our older cities can be renewed and revitalized.

Continue and expand the open space program, so that more acreage can be saved before it is used up for highways and housing developments that could be built elsewhere.

Authorize new programs for helping cities meet their problems of urban growth—mass transportation, water and sewer systems, urban service facilities, and urban planning.

In this way, and only in this broad-scale fashion can we hope to remove from the face of America the neglected spots that now mar once shining vistas.

Fortunately, we have as President a great leader who has both seen the peril in our wasted resources, and pointed the way to better living. President Johnson's message on the cities' problems offers the American people a great opportunity to formulate a legislative program for coping with our needs for beauty and orderliness, and for carrying out many of the renewal and conservation practices we have been preaching for so long. A program, in short, for achieving America the beautiful.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business was concluded when Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 was laid before the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 45) to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report see House proceedings of March 4, 1965, p. 4205, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senate version of this bill contained two provisions not found in the House version. The first of these, in effect, applied to the Fund for Special Operations of the Bank, the terms of the Hickenlooper amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, which prohibits assistance to countries expropriating American property without compensation. The second required dollar repayment of one-third of the loans made from the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations.

The conference agreement retains the first of these Senate provisions in modified form, but does not retain the second. The modification made in the first clears up a technical ambiguity and also limits the effect of the amendment to the U.S. dollar contribution provided by this bill. As passed by the Senate, the amendment would also have applied to Latin American contributions; and the conferees felt that this was not the proper thing to do.

The House conferees were adamant in their opposition to the one-third dollar repayment requirement in the Senate bill, and the Senate conferees receded.

Thus the conference report contains in substance 50 percent of the changes made by the Senate in the House bill, and this seems to me a fair compromise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I see no representative from the minority members of the Foreign Relations Committee present in the Chamber. Has the Senator from Arkansas consulted with them?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They all agreed. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] were members of the conference. The provision with regard to expropriation concerned the so-called Hickenlooper amendment which the Senator from Iowa proposed to the Foreign Aid Act. The Senator was present. He approved the slightly modified version. The only change of substance is with respect to the return of the loans in dollars, which applied to the return of loans from Latin-American countries. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] approved this version of it.

Mr. COOPER. The amendment would protect the Hickenlooper amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In effect it does. Of course, the policy of our representative is already that. He stated it. The Secretary of the Treasury stated that that is the policy. But this provision puts it into the law. I do not know what more one could want.

Mr. COOPER. I did not see the Senator from Iowa present, and that is why I asked the question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He was a member of the conference. I assume he is not present because he has no objection.

Mr. COOPER. I assume so.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I had considerable doubt about the desirability of this legislation when it came before the Senate. My doubt was based upon its seeming like another attempt to pull the wool over the eyes of our colleagues and the American people, in the matter of foreign aid.

We remember the great publicity which followed when the President sent to Congress the current foreign aid bill, several weeks ago. It was presented to the Congress as a "barebones" bill, requesting the lowest amount asked for since the beginning of the foreign aid program. This was widely hailed in the newspapers both in editorials and news stories. I recall that both the local morning and afternoon newspapers headlined that this was the lowest amount on record. But a few weeks later came another request, the one we are again considering today, which would add \$750 million to the amount to be expended in foreign aid. It embodies the additional objection from my standpoint that it is taking control over foreign aid from Congress and turning it over to international banks. After they get the American taxpayers' dollars they can dispose of these funds as they see fit. Congress will have lost all control. This is part of a steady drive to erode the power of Congress.

I had great reservations about that, and expressed them on the floor of the Senate on February 24 and 25. However, I felt that the bill should be supported, despite my reservations, provided it could be improved by amendment.

One amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was designed to take care of a rather flagrant omission; namely, that the provisions of the Hickenlooper amendment, which would withdraw aid when a country confiscated American property and expropriated it without adequate compensa-

tion, was not protected in the bill. The Hickenlooper amendment is an established policy in foreign aid. Why this attempt to nullify it in a new piece of foreign aid legislation?

It also struck me that we were giving away this additional amount of foreign aid too generously by making it possible for such loans to be repaid in soft currencies of the countries involved. Whether they are cruzeiros, soles, or pesos, they are often depreciated and unstable currencies, and so often when we talk about a loan, it may turn out not to be a loan at all.

In addition, the usefulness of these currencies is limited. They stay in the country to which the loan is made. We cannot take them out. We have to keep them there. The problem of the great accumulation of such currencies was treated by me analytically in a 472-page report which I made on 10 countries in the Middle East, 2 years ago. The problem of these accumulating currencies will become increasingly difficult.

One of the obvious reforms or improvements, it seemed to me, that could be made in the legislation would be to insure that some of the loans would be paid back in hard currency, American dollars, so the loans would not be a double loss for the American taxpayers.

My distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] offered what I thought was a reasonable amendment; namely, that 50 percent of the loans should be repaid in dollars. This amendment failed of adoption by a single vote. I think the vote was 43 to 42 against it.

That vote was so close that it seemed obvious that there was substantial support for this policy. I therefore offered a more moderate amendment, providing that one-third of the money loaned under that legislation would not be paid in soft currencies, but in dollars. That amendment was agreed to by a vote of 40 to 32.

Now I find that in conference, as so often happens, that amendment was deleted. The American taxpayers have been taken for another ride. I had a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] the other day. He assured me that these amendments were always duly considered. I have no doubt that they are, and that they were. I have no doubt that they were discussed. Yet I find it difficult to understand why amendments which have such good support are so often subject to short shrift in conference. It has been humorously stated that there are not two but three bodies here—the Senate, the House, and the conference committee. We have seen the same thing happen again and again. Last year an amendment was adopted to deny aid to that estimable creature, Dictator Sukarno of Indonesia, which passed the Senate by a very large majority. Although our continuing support to Sukarno is a scandal, some of us suspected the amendment would go out in conference. It did. It has happened again and again.

I would hope that someday that a point of view which is supported by a majority of the Senate or the House

would get proper recognition in conference. I am sure my friend from Arkansas will continue to say that these amendments receive proper consideration and are discussed in conference. But the chances of their survival seem to be very slight.

I voted for the bill with some hesitation, for reasons I have given. It seemed to me that we had gotten some reforms and improvements when the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to put the Hickenlooper amendment in it, was accepted, together with my modest amendment providing that one-third of the loans be returned in dollars. Therefore, not to be unreasonable and grateful for small favors, I voted for the bill.

I regret to say that since there is so little left in the way of improving amendments, my reservations about the bill are still valid, and I shall feel obliged to vote against the conference report. The time has come when we must take a much more realistic view of the foreign aid program. It is altogether too large. Much of it is wasteful. I have not been unsympathetic to it. I have supported it, but I have also tried to improve it. Some of my amendments have been adopted. Vast sums of money are going out of the country. Congress has more or less abdicated its authority to the Executive on the assumption, always voiced, that the President is in charge of foreign policy. I do not deny that. The statement is true as far as policy is concerned.

On the other hand, an entirely new element entered into foreign policy beginning with the Marshall plan, and that was the use of vast sums of money as an instrument of foreign policy. Such an element did not exist before 1947. Prior to that time, the function of Congress, and particularly of the Senate, was to approve treaties by a two-thirds vote, or to disapprove them, and to confirm the appointments of Foreign Service officers and State Department officials; and that was about all.

(At this point Mr. BURDICK took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. GRUENING. That was the extent of the advising and consenting which the Senate practiced. But since the beginning of the Marshall plan 18 years ago we started using vast sums of money—billions of dollars in our foreign aid program. We learned this morning that the total amount to date is in the neighborhood of \$111 billion.

Congress has a constitutional duty to be vigilant over the expenditures of sums of money especially of this magnitude, and to express its approval or disapproval of the use of our people's funds.

The way Congress has been functioning, it has little to say about it now. We find that foreign aid budgets are vague and often elusive. The purposes which are often alleged before the congressional committees are not necessarily carried out. Granted, there is need for flexibility and for modification, but in foreign aid we have departed from the wise formula we adopt in connection with domestic legislation. We should try to apply the same procedure abroad that we have established at home.

In domestic legislation, suppose a small appropriation is desired. Let us say the National Park Service wishes to build a ranger cabin at a cost of \$50,000 or \$100,000. That request has to go through regular established processes. First the request originates in the appropriate department—in this case, the Department of the Interior—and then it goes to the appropriate committee, which would be the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which holds a hearing and listens to the reasons for and the reasons against approval of the request.

Let us suppose that the request is authorized. It then goes before the subcommittee on appropriations dealing with that agency which then must approve the request. The request then goes to the full Committee on Appropriations for approval or disapproval; and then it comes before the whole body and then this procedure is repeated in the other body. In other words, there are four steps to this procedure in each House. These four steps—although they may be cut short—take place before the funds are available for expenditure.

That is the constitutional process. That is the method by which we in the Congress are able to control expenditures.

We do not go through such a procedure with foreign aid. This is left largely to the discretion of the Executive in matters of money, which I maintain are no less and primarily the business and the concern of Congress.

For those reasons, I view with alarm and with sorrow the escalation of the foreign aid program, which we have been told is a bare-bones program. This is not the end of the program, however, because in addition, there are all kinds of other spigots—to which I have previously referred—by which foreign aid will be ladled out all over the world. There are the various banking institutions, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank, the International Development Fund, the Inter-American Bank, and so on. Many of these loans are made on very loose terms. There have been arguments on the floor of the Senate repeatedly over the matter of interest rates. I can understand the reason why a loan on very generous terms should be made to a poor country on a project that is not self-sustaining—let us say for schools, or roads, or hospitals—and that the most generous terms possible should be used, although in those circumstances we had better make a grant. But the same generous terms have also been used for revenue-producing projects.

Two years ago, I happened to be in Cairo and was present when the U.S. Ambassador at that time signed a project with the appropriate Egyptian officials for a loan of \$30 million to build a powerplant in west Cairo. A powerplant is a revenue-producing, self-sustaining profitable enterprise. The minute it starts generating power, it produces revenue, particularly in this case, because with Dictator Nasser the people of Cairo would have to pay whatever rates he decided to impose. In other words, it was a sure thing.

However, the terms of that particular loan were that no repayment on the prin-

cipal would be made for 10 years, and then at three-quarters of 1 percent interest for the remaining 30 years. That means that in the first 10 years, when there is no repayment on principal—and we were borrowing money from the American people at 4-percent interest more or less—we were actually making a concealed grant of many millions of dollars. So by the time that loan is repaid we shall not only have been lending them \$30 million but we shall also lose the difference between the 4 percent interest on money borrowed from the American people, and the three-quarters of 1 percent interest we would make on the loan. There will be a concealed grant of well over half the face value of the so-called loan.

There are many situations of this kind that the Senate should consider. For that reason, I believe that it is time we bring these facts out into the open. I intend to do so again and again. I intend to show that this is not a barebones program, that this is not the last spigot which Congress will be asked to approve.

We have just passed the coffee program for the second time, the objective being to help the Latin American coffee-growing countries. It will undoubtedly increase coffee prices for the American housewife. The price of coffee will go up. I voted for the program nevertheless because I thought, on balance, that it was desirable, and that the coffee-producing countries should have this assurance of stability for their major product. But it is in effect another contribution to foreign aid. Yet we are being asked that we must give more and more and more. When we study the program in detail, as I have, we find that much of the money is wasted and there will be great inflation in recipient countries with little sustained effort to combat it. We have been through this situation several times with Brazil. In the case of a country so rich in natural resources we have had runaway inflation. Everytime there is a new government, we are told that now things are to be different, that it will now reform, that stringent measures will be introduced to help the economy, that taxes will be levied, and inflation will be checked.

Accordingly, we advance another \$100 million or more to the new government. Of course, these loans will go by default. Of course we do not permit such a harsh term to be used. When the repayment falls due the debt is refunded, which is a euphemism for postponing the day of judgment.

Yesterday, I was reading in the paper that the austerity measures and reforms on the basis of which the last Brazilian Government came up and received a billion dollar credit, are likely to go by the board, because the people of Brazil are now wearying of the restrictions. That would not be surprising. It has happened time and again, and will continue to happen unless we become more vigilant and more concerned for the American taxpayer, and a little more vigilant about our dollars—which we have not been.

I believe that this latest piece of legislation, with virtually the only drastic reform—the Hickenlooper amend-

ment, which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] secured—is merely a continuation of policy already established, which the bill, without his amendment, would have scrapped. Therefore, I offered this small amendment, this very reasonable amendment in the Senate that one-third of the funds should be repaid in hard currency. But it has been taken out in conference. Under those circumstances, I do not see how I can conscientiously vote for the conference report. I may be alone in this view, although I understand that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—who is on his way to the Capitol—will have something to say on the subject. I doubt that he will support it, although, of course, I am not privileged to speak for him; but I believe that those of us who wish to see the foreign aid program succeed, who feel that the Alliance for Progress is a desirable program, that its purposes are high and its objectives commendable, must feel that we have a right to expect better administration, greater vigilance, less extravagance, and a consideration of the reciprocity which was voiced by President Kennedy when he launched the Alliance for Progress, and was made an integral part of the agreement at Punta del Este.

We receive optimistic reports that tax programs are being entered into, but when we study the reports, we find that the programs are not being enforced and that taxes are not being collected. We also find that land reform programs have been entered into, but when we study the land reform program, we find that it consists of giving the poor, disinherited underdogs of the population some worthless arid land in an area where one could not grow a bean.

We need to be more vigilant with a foreign aid program which is so large. Actually, instead of it being \$3.3 billion, as announced in the President's message, we shall find it to be about twice that amount or more. That is not my own judgment. That is the information furnished by the agency itself and by the State Department. It runs close to \$7 billion.

The public does not know that. The Congress does not always know it, either; but I believe that it is important for Congress to take cognizance of this fact and be more realistic about the money it is sending abroad.

There are a great many domestic needs which we cannot fulfill. The President has sent to us many magnificent domestic programs, all of which I favor. Among such programs are the anti-poverty program, the beautification program, the housing program, and the educational program.

It is rather disappointing when we see the budgetary items to carry out these programs, to note that they seem to fall far short of the needs. I was to testify this morning before an appropriations subcommittee dealing with various Alaska items. I find that here, there, and everywhere else, cuts are being made which seriously impair the programs.

We have striking examples of these, and it is happening all over the coun-

try. Two years ago a Forest Research Laboratory was established on the campus of the University of Alaska. This was the first time that an effort had been made to do something about studying with a view to conserving and utilizing the vast interior forests of Alaska, which cover an amazing 200,000 square miles of land, a little less than a third of the area of Alaska. Those forests do not include the two national forests along the coast. In this vast interior great timber stands of white and black spruce, poplar, aspen, cottonwood, and other trees, are largely going to waste. We do not know very much about them. Some of them are being ravaged by insects, and others are being destroyed by fires. There is also the problem of marketing their products.

The laboratory was designed to study these problems, and it projected projects for combating destruction by fire, destruction by insects, and ascertaining how to process and market the timber. What happened? The laboratory was established with a presumed budget for 14 researchers, scientists. The Bureau of the Budget allowed only four. Last year they allowed only four, and again this year only four.

How absurd that is, when the need is so obvious, and when it represents such a great investment. If we could utilize these vast stands of timber effectively, it would be a revenue produced for State and Nation, a boost to employment, a conservation measure.

At the same time, the Bureau of the Budget has drastically reduced the personnel in the Interior Department's Bureau of Mines at Douglas, Alaska.

Mining is neglected by the Federal Government and it, along with fisheries, is one of the stepchildren of our Government.

I have often noted that if we treated the people who develop food from the sea the way we treat those who produce food from the land, the fisheries would have a better chance of surviving against foreign competition.

There is a great inconsistency between the fine programs which the President has sent to Congress—and, as I have said, I am an enthusiastic supporter of them—and the very narrow, tight budgetary allowances which have been made to carry out the programs.

How can we beautify the landscape in Federal areas if there is no adequate means to carry out the program? Shall we merely talk about beautification?

The same is true with respect to pollution. There is a new pollution laboratory in Alaska, which is nearly completed. The amount projected to operate this facility is totally inadequate to carry out its function.

All of this may be an indirect reason for my hesitating to vote more money to the foreign aid program, but I feel that all the circumstances justify my decision to vote against the conference report.

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

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

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very brief in my comments on the conference report. My views are very well known. I oppose the conference report. I shall vote against the conference report, or be recorded against the conference report. So as far as I am concerned, I wish to say to the majority leader that I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote. I have no objection to a yea-and-nay vote, of course. But in a spirit of cooperation with the leadership, I shall not ask for it. We know that the conference report will be adopted because, by a substantial vote the other day, the Senate approved this very unsound proposed legislation in the first instance. I know of no reason why we could expect that the will of the Senate would change on another yea-and-nay vote. So I shall recapitulate my opposition to the conference report because of the bill that is attached to it.

The conference report contains the substance of the amendment that I offered the other day. That amendment will extend the Hickenlooper amendment to this particular bill. The American Board of Governors has 42 percent of the vote, which constitutes a veto power over loans in view of the requirement that they be approved by a two-thirds vote. Therefore, if the American representative on the Board of Directors is prohibited by statute from supporting a loan in a case in which the Hickenlooper amendment applies, the loan, so far as American dollars are concerned, cannot be granted. I believe it is interesting that the conferees saw fit to clarify the amendment, as they put it, by making it perfectly clear that it would apply only to American dollars, and that our so-called allies in Latin America could go ahead and lend their money even though there was expropriation of American property without compensation.

But, on the other hand, I wish to be perfectly fair and to say that if they wish to demonstrate that that is the kind of lack of cooperation they would extend to the United States, the sooner we find that out the better.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I now serve notice that if in any event a Latin American country does that, it need not look to the senior Senator from Oregon for support in any request for funds by that country. Unless we can have cooperation from the Latin American countries in trying to bring to an end the tendency on the part of certain governments in Latin America to steal American property, with no intention of giving compensation for it—which is what happens in the case of expropriation when they do not want to give adequate compensation; they want to support thievery on the part of other countries in Latin America—that is the way to serve notice on the American taxpayers that such is their desire. That will only add further fuel to the already blazing fire at the

grassroots of America on the part of the taxpayers of this country against the waste of American foreign aid.

Mr. President, the retention of the principle of my amendment does not make the bill sufficiently suitable for me to vote for it, because the Gruening amendment was dropped. Even if the Gruening amendment had been retained, I would still vote against the bill because of the multilateral approach that it makes, and thereby sacrifices a very precious checking power of the Congress of the United States.

My good friend the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and I are as far apart as opposites can be with regard to the administration of foreign aid in respect to his program, which he announced on the floor of the Senate last week, all seeking to transfer more and more of our foreign aid administration into foreign bodies, because that is what these international bodies are.

They do not even have the kind of check that we have in the Inter-American Bank. I will not go along with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and other Senators who wish to continue to decrease the checking control of the Congress of the United States in protecting the taxpayers' interest in regard to the administration of foreign aid.

They have a perfect right to take that position, but I believe they are dead wrong. It is a new technique, a new device, a new strategy to take away from the American people, through their elected representatives, the checks they ought to have in the matter of wasteful foreign aid expenditure. The new proposal is that Congress should have an opportunity to pass on foreign aid only once every 2 years, although the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations would really prefer to have the check made only once every 4 years.

I say, most respectfully, that I believe this action shows a growing fear of the checking power of Congress on the administration's foreign policy which, in my judgment, is day by day and week by week taking the administration down the road to complete discredit. If the administration continues its present policy of conducting an aggressive, uncalled for war in South Vietnam, a shocking violation of international law, and if it continues the policy it has in mind in regard to foreign aid, by telling the American people that it is a barebones foreign aid program of some \$3.380 billion, when the foreign assistance program—and that is what we ought to talk about, because it is all foreign aid—is much nearer \$7 billion. I say, as a Democrat, that if my party continues this foreign policy, it will go out of office, 4 years hence, the most discredited administration in the history of the Republic. I am satisfied as I go across the country that at the grassroots of America there is already rising an attitude of repudiation of the President's policy.

That is only a tiny segment of the subject. This bill transfers to the executive branch, by the diminution of the checking power of the Congress, another segment of foreign aid.

This is the beginning of the big drive. The big drive will take place when the major foreign aid bill reaches the floor of the Senate some weeks hence. I am satisfied that by that time the American people will be much more enlightened as to the procedures that are contemplated for reducing more and more the checking power of Congress, and placing more and more administrative authority in the executive branch of the Government. I fear that, because I believe it is irreconcilable with our system of government, based upon the checking power of the three coordinate and coequal branches of Government.

I shall vote against the conference report. I know it will be said by those who do not want to take the time to get across to the American people the basic, abstract principles of constitutional government, on which all our liberties inevitably hinge, that these proposals will have no such effect as the Senator from Oregon fears, because Congress always is able to take back any power that it delegates. That sounds good; but the fact is that is not in accord with the record. Once it becomes possible to have Congress delegate its power, it will be difficult to try to get that power back. The attempt, for the most part, is seldom made. The time to protect the rights of the American people under our system of checks and balances is before the delegation of power takes place. In my judgment, this proposal is a part of the tendency on the part of the administration to have Congress delegate more and more of its power to the executive branch of the Government.

I shall vote against the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTANA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

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

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

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 would authorize the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress composed of six Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of

the Senate, and six Members of the House, appointed by the Speaker. Not more than three Members from each House could be from the majority party. The Joint Committee would elect its chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

The committee would be authorized, first, to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress, and second, to recommend improvements with a view toward strengthening its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution.

The study would include, but not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House, the relationship between the two Houses, the relationships between Congress and other branches of the Government, the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of each House and officers and employees of the committees and Members, and the structure of and the relationships between the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress.

The committee would not be authorized to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House. The committee would be specifically authorized to study and make recommendations with respect to the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

The committee would be authorized to hold hearings, issue subpoenas, and employ necessary personnel. Its expenses could not exceed \$150,000. Its reports and findings would be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and to the appropriate committees of the House.

Except for differences of a technical nature relating to expenses of the committee and limitations on staff and stenographic help, the resolution is identical to the resolution introduced in 1945 by Senator Robert La Follette in this body and myself in the House. The 1945 resolution launched an extensive study and investigation of Congress which resulted in the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Congress has let 20 years pass without correcting some of the defects in the 1946 act, without acting on some of the recommendations made by the previous joint committee which are as valid today as they were then, and without making improvements in the legislative machinery required by the enormous increase in the tasks and responsibilities imposed on the Congress by the events of the past 20 years. Congress must finish this task and modernize itself or jeopardize its position as a coequal partner in our tripartite system of government. I think Congress is ready to act now.

It is significant to me that the only opposition to this resolution has come from those distinguished Members of this body who are staunch advocates of congressional reorganization. They are opposed to the restriction on the joint committee's jurisdiction. They do not

think the resolution goes far enough and have said that this committee would have nothing worthwhile to investigate. I think they mistake the purpose and the intent of this resolution, which is to seek solutions to the problems of Congress on which there is a consensus that something should be done.

They overemphasize the restriction and are seemingly unaware of the important problems on which this committee would have jurisdiction to act.

The previous joint committee operated under an identical restriction and I challenge any Member who would argue that that committee did not have anything worthwhile to investigate and that it did not make recommendations wholly within the scope of its jurisdiction which resulted in worthwhile and urgently needed reforms.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was based on the joint committee's recommendation. Under that act the standing committees of both Houses were drastically reduced and reorganized. The operations and procedures of all committees were improved.

The Office of Legislative Counsel and the Legislative Reference Service were greatly expanded. Members of Congress were for the first time provided with adequate and professional staffs.

The format of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was changed to provide Congress with more meaningful and concise information. Improvements were made in the appropriations process.

Congressional pay was raised and a retirement system established for Members of Congress.

Congress workload was reduced by banning the introduction of private bills for payment of pensions or tort claims, construction of bridges, and correction of military records. Lobbyists were required to register and report their expenditures.

These were all things worth investigating and were significant accomplishments in themselves. Separately and together they improved our legislative machinery and enabled Congress to better perform its tasks and fulfill its responsibilities.

But there are many other things we need to do. There are other problems which have arisen that require the attention of a Joint Committee of Congress.

The greatest problem Congress has is dealing annually with a Federal budget of \$100 billion. Congress does not have the proper tools to do the job.

We need to take advantage of the breakthroughs in automation by using electronic data processing equipment to aid in assembling, comparing, and consolidating Government revenue and expenditure figures. The most important function of the Congress is still the exercise of the power of the purse. If we use this power well, we can and will be able to control the size of Government, its activities, and its expenses. We dare not fail in this assignment.

We need to take another look at our committee system, because committees are the heart and key in any improvement in congressional machinery. If our

committee system is improved, the speed and efficiency of handling legislation will be greatly accelerated.

We must examine again the structure of our committee system, in particular the proliferation of subcommittees which has occurred since 1946. We need to realign some of the committees' jurisdictions to achieve a better balanced workload.

We need a workable rule which will permit earlier adjournment of the Congress or a system of designated recesses during the year to permit Members of Congress to go home and talk to their constituents.

We need to abolish the Tuesday to Thursday workweek. Congress should not be hamstrung because a few of its Members are out of town making speeches.

We must find ways to further reduce the individual Member's caseload. We spend entirely too much time appointing postmasters and nominating candidates to military academies.

The need for legislative and administrative assistants should be recognized and funds made available to all Members of Congress to hire professional staff members.

There are also many small improvements which can be made to improve the operation of the Congress, such as:

First. Putting the Capitol guides under civil service and removing the 25-cent tariff imposed on U.S. citizens who want to see their Capitol.

Second. Hiring an architect for the Capitol who has talent and imagination.

Third. Hiring a construction manager to oversee all construction work on Capitol Hill.

Fourth. Hiring a business manager who would be responsible for the operations of all the Capitol buildings.

All of these things, major and minor, need to be studied and considered by the joint committee.

Mr. President, 20 years ago when the first resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was debated on the floor of the House, I made a statement in support of the resolution. I want to quote from that statement at this time:

It is fundamental, I believe, that the framers of the Constitution intended the Congress to be a coequal branch of our Federal Government. It is mentioned first in the Constitution, and I believe more often, in that document, than any other of the three branches of Government. Yet we find the Congress remaining almost static in its equipment and resources for doing its job, to cope with the problems that have become increasingly more confusing and complex.

The difficulty with Congress is not in its constitutional authority. It is in the tools that Congress has supplied itself with to do the job. The Congress is literally trying to serve as the board of directors—the comptroller—of the biggest business in the world—with hopelessly outmoded tools and organization.

The machinery that Congress has was once adequate. It was adequate in those gay nineties when the chief problems before us were the determination of what cities would get new post-office buildings, or what few harbors would be deepened, or whether a slight revision would be made in the tariff

laws. Those were the chief tasks before the Congress when the machinery in use today functioned adequately.

Today Congress allots the funds for a business a hundred times bigger than General Motors, Ford, and the United States Steel all put together. It administers an insurance program many hundred times bigger than any of our great insurance firms and does a banking business that would make Wall Street look like a country bank. It does this job practically with a quill pen and an old-fashioned bookkeeper's ledger. Aside from the mammoth business operations, it has the important function of passing the laws that affect world peace, the farmer, labor, investments, and business of all kinds.

In my opinion we have been penny wise and pound foolish not to insist that this important branch of the Government be as well equipped for efficiency and facts as American ingenuity can make it.

Yet, Congress is not able to carry even a fraction of the load the Members have a right to expect it to carry. Literally, great amounts of the information gathered by the departments downtown, compiled in vast volume by business interests, and by special economic studies flow past Capitol Hill almost like the Mississippi River. Yet, we cannot ladle out of this vast stream of information even a teaspoon to be of assistance to the Congress.

This resolution does not propose any witch hunt. It proposes a careful, constructive study in order to find a way to make Congress effective, to improve the relationship between the two bodies. It is bipartisan in its nature and is aimed only at constructive help for the institution of Congress. We must not, we dare not, consider that the way we run Congress is the personal and private business of the membership. Our efficiency is a public trust.

Mr. President, I believe my remarks are as cogent today as they were 20 years ago. I urge my colleagues to act favorably on Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], I move to strike everything in the concurrent resolution beginning with the word "Provided," at line 24 on page 2, down to and including the word "committees," ending in line 7 of page 3.

I should like to address myself to the motion to strike.

I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. I ask, as a parliamentary inquiry, whether that motion is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is no Member of the Senate for whom I have a higher regard as a Senator or as a person than my close friend, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE]. I honor him for his effective work in the past in connection with reorganization of the Congress, and I respect his zeal this year, for the first time, I think, in 19 years, in carrying again the torch which he carried so ably in 1945 and 1946.

But I find myself unable to agree that the resolution as he has caused it to be drawn would accomplish what the body of the resolution purports to do.

Let me develop this thought. Section 2 of the resolution starts very bravely, very much like the Duke of York who, with 10,000 men, marched up the hill, full of fight. It directs this joint committee to "make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States."

That is pretty broad.

It "shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the U.S. Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution."

Brave words, Mr. President. Brave words, indeed. Hosanna and hurrah. I agree.

Section 2 becomes more specific. It provides:

This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress.

Brave words again. So now the Duke of York, having marched up the hill bravely, turns around and runs helter-skelter downhill again, by reason of the proviso which destroys the valiant and noble effort which my friend from Oklahoma has removed from the resolution.

This is the proviso:

That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House.

I have been waiting for a long while to have the opportunity to take a few steps of improvement with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedures, and practices, and/or precedents of either House. But how can we make recommendations or a study of the organization and operation of the Congress when we exclude rules, parliamentary procedure, practices and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House? It cannot be done. In my opinion, it practically nullifies the brave words of section 2.

I point out that a committee cannot study completely and fully the organization and operation of the Congress if it does not look at its rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, and/or precedents. It cannot make recommendations for improvement in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the U.S. Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution, without modifying and improving the rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, and precedents.

I suggest that very little effectively can be done with respect to the organization and operation of the two Houses of Congress or their relationship with each other, or even the relationships between Congress and other branches of Government, if we do not change drastically, and revise the rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, and precedents of both Houses.

I yield to my friend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. I wonder whether the Senator has been moved by the old nursery jingle:

Mother, may I go out to swim?
Yes, my darling daughter,
Hang your clothes on a hickory limb,
But don't go near the water.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator's suggestion is even better than mine.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I have two or three questions I should like to ask the Senator for clarification purposes. First, offhand, I do not recall whether the proviso clause was in this resolution when it was first submitted.

Mr. CLARK. The proviso clause was not in Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, as offered by me with the support of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and 77 other Senators in the 88th Congress.

However, my good friend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], refused to cosponsor that measure. During the period immediately preceding the election of President Johnson—the Senator from Oklahoma will check me, of course, if I am misquoting him—the Senator became filled with new zeal concerning congressional reorganization, and he prepared a resolution which is identical with the resolution which was passed in 1945 creating the Joint Committee, of which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the late Senator La Follette were the chairmen. That resolution contained the same proviso. As a result of that proviso, the committee did not then go into the rules, procedures, and precedents of either House, and therefore did something less than one-half its job.

I can only suggest that as a result of an exemplary disregard of the charter which they wrote for themselves, they did bring in certain recommendations in violation of the proviso in their own resolution, which resulted in some changes in the rules, procedures, and precedents; but that was done in spite of the charter under which they were operating.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield at that point? I believe he is mistaken.

Mr. CLARK. In one moment I shall be glad to yield.

This year, the Senator from Oklahoma introduced his Concurrent Resolution 2, which contained the identical proviso which was in the original.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure that the Senator has read the language on page 3, line 4, beginning with "Provided fur-

ther," specifically charging the committee with the right to study and recommend consolidation and reorganization of committees. Every student of government learns in his college course that reorganization of the vast, sprawling system of congressional committees was one of the major functions of the previous reorganization, which was done specifically. The language referred to specifically authorized this action.

Much study needs to be done on committee structure once again because some committees are greatly overworked and understaffed. Some are underfunded with legislative business. This problem should be looked into for possible realignment. I believe it is important to make a study and examine this problem as well as the others.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I should have given him due credit for inserting the proviso which permits him to take another look at committees. However, my point is that this resolution has the same unfortunate limitations in it which the original resolution of 1945 had, and that all that can be done now is to go over the same ground which was covered in 1945 and 1946. Let us see what that ground is.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question, although I will follow his pleasure if he wishes to finish his thought.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am one of the cosponsors of the resolution now before the Senate. I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania to strike the proviso clause. Let me say now what I have said before on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere, that I believe a considerable amount of good can come from this resolution, even with the proviso of limitation. But so much more good could come from it with the proviso limitation eliminated that I believe we should eliminate it.

My questions are as follows: First, the committee had to make a choice, did it not, as to what medium it would use for conducting the study and investigation, either through a joint committee of the two Houses, as proposed by the resolution, or by calling in recognized governmental and parliamentary experts from the laity to conduct a study for us, somewhat in the nature of the old Hoover Commission, but with a modification, or to have each House conduct an independent study, or to have a joint lay and congressional committee. The Rules Committee decided to have a joint congressional committee; did it not?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania have any doubt, if we follow the medium of having an independent public commission, a noncongressional committee, investigate the operations of Congress, that it will probably spend more time on rules and procedures in its job than on any other subject matter?

Mr. CLARK. Of course it would. The move for congressional reform—and I am happy to say that I am rather proud to

have played a minor part in it—has developed and grown since 1960 in an extraordinary way. Later today, I shall invite the attention of the Senate to the recommendations made by an extremely able group of citizens called together by the American Assembly at Arden House in New York, in October of last year. It made 18 specific recommendations for changes in the organization and operation of Congress. Hardly one of them could be effected under the proviso, unless the joint committee ignored its own charter.

Mr. MORSE. That leads to the next question I was about to ask the Senator. It is true, is it not, that both Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], I and a goodly number of other Senators, have expressed growing concern in recent years over the loss of standing of Congress with the American people because of their growing dissatisfaction with our outworn procedures? That is a fair statement, is it not?

Mr. CLARK. It is indeed a fair statement. If anything, it is an understatement, in my opinion. The concern felt by those of us in Congress has been multiplied many times over by keen students of government, both at the national and international level.

Mr. MORSE. The committee report states, does it not, that in view of the fact that each body of House and Senate has authority to provide its own rules; therefore—if I follow the committee correctly—the majority of the committee decided it should not give jurisdiction to a joint committee to study the effect of the rules on the operation of the Congress? Is that not the position of the majority?

Mr. CLARK. That is the ostensible position of the majority. However, I believe that I am being fair and within the limits of senatorial courtesy when I say that the real position of the majority is that they do not wish to put their support behind any investigation, if only for the purpose of making recommendations, which might conceivably overthrow the balance of power in the Senate, which is now exercised by the minority bipartisan group which I have chosen to call the Senate establishment.

Mr. MORSE. That leads me to this question: It is true, is it not, that the resolution really proposes a joint congressional committee for the purpose of studying recommendations? It would have no authority to change the rules, but only to present to us its findings and observations as to what the facts are concerning the effect of the operation of our present, in many instances, outworn rules?

Mr. CLARK. The group which controls the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration apparently fears that if an objective study of the rules, procedures, practices, and precedents of either House were made by an objective body, it would blow the whole thing out and we would have to change the rules. They

are not prepared to let anyone even make recommendations. They will not even agree to hold effective hearings to determine what changes should be made.

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

Mr. CLARK. I shall yield in a minute. The position of the Subcommittee on Standing Rules of the Senate is such that it is impossible to get a thoroughgoing investigation of these matters by the subcommittee. It is impossible to get a discharge petition because of the way this group operates. So long as the subcommittee, supported by a majority of the full committee, chooses to sit on the hatch, so to speak, we can be sure that no successful effort will be made to change the rules, procedures, and so forth, of the Senate. This is what has led me to believe, along with the Senator from New Jersey and others, that perhaps, inasmuch as that is the situation, we would do well to try to adopt a concurrent resolution which would enable us to bring back some objective recommendations with respect to what should be done about the cancer that is eating out the heart of this institution.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Oklahoma will permit me—and I would like comments on what I am saying—all I am doing at this stage of the debate is to try to get myself correctly oriented as to what the objectives are. It is true, is it not, that we have a bewhiskered precedential rule of comity between the two Houses, under which the Senate never comments upon the policies and procedures of the House, and the House supposedly never comments on the policies and procedures of the Senate?

As Members of both bodies know, what is done in each body, and the rules maintained in each body, have great effect in a multitude of instances upon the legislative parliamentary operation of both bodies. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not also true that off the floor of the House and off the floor of the Senate, when we get together in joint meeting and unofficially—

Mr. CLARK. Even in conference?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; even in conference. I was referring to unofficial meetings, but sometimes this is true also in official meetings. Is it not true that on such occasions invariably we say to one another, "When are we going to do something about cleaning up the rules of each of our establishments so that both can operate more effectively?" That attitude is rather prevalent, is it not?

Mr. CLARK. It is almost universal.

Mr. MORSE. It is prevalent.

Mr. CLARK. It is certainly the majority view.

Mr. MORSE. Would not the resolution, with the proviso clause eliminated, provide us with a medium whereby respected leaders of the two Houses, who would be appointed to the committee, could sit down and come to grips, as Representatives and Senators, with what they know are the procedures in each body and what ought to be provided not only for the purpose of helping the body

in which the existing procedure prevails, but also helping the other body, because of the effect of that procedure in either the House or the Senate on the transaction of business in the other body?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is entirely correct. I would add to his thought only the observation that if there were some concern expressed because of our tradition of courtesy of one body to the other, and if some Senators were not happy about Members of the House making recommendations for changes in the rules of the Senate, a very simple procedure would be available. If the 12 members of the committee had talked it over together, and there were such a concern, the Senate Members could report back to the Senate on proposed changes in the Senate rules, and the House Members could report back to the House on proposed changes in the House rules.

Mr. MORSE. I gather, from both the resolution and the committee report, that if the committee were to adopt a recommendation it would require a majority vote of the six Members from the Senate and of the six from the House; therefore, there would be no great danger of the final report containing any recommendation that a majority of the Senators and a majority of the Representatives did not approve. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. There is further protection. Because of the way in which the Senator from Oklahoma has drawn his resolution, a completely bipartisan group would comprise the membership of the committee. Three Members from each House would be Republicans and three Members from each House would be Democrats.

Mr. MORSE. I shall not take any more time, except to add this point, to reinforce, I hope, the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania. We have an excellent opportunity, offered by the Senator's motion to strike, to demonstrate to the people of the country that Members of Congress themselves, in a duly appointed joint committee, are now ready to answer the demands of the public that we proceed to grapple with the archaic rules of both Houses. By selecting 12 Members from both bodies, who would go to work with a thorough study—and of course they would call in for advice and assistance recognized parliamentary experts and governmental experts—we would demonstrate to the people of the country as a whole that we will come to grips with the problem.

If we retain the proviso clause in the resolution it will weaken our position with the public, and the public will say, "They will not come to grips with their procedures. They are not really going to tackle what the Senator from Pennsylvania says is the real heart of the problem; namely, the archaic rules." Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is entirely correct. I point out that the Washington Post, in an editorial, has already indicated its skepticism about the validity of the resolution with the proviso clause in it. From editorial comment generally, it is obvious what would be done if the proviso clause were left in.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand the thrust of the discussion or colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, an appropriate reminder is that each House is the judge of its own rules. So the House would have to take action to curb the power of the House Rules Committee, and the Senate would modify the Senate seniority system—

Mr. CLARK. No, no.

Mr. MONRONEY. Or abolish rule XXII. The Constitution, in section 5 of article I provides:

SEC. 5. Each house shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.

Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

The Washington Post may be in favor of the Senate judging the House and the House judging the Senate, but the Constitution provides otherwise, and I am sure that even the most ardent advocate of congressional reform on the editorial board of the Washington Post would not advocate overriding the Constitution.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oklahoma misunderstood the thrust of my argument and the thrust of the argument of the Senator from Oregon. I yield to the Senator from Oregon if he wishes to make his own point.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Pennsylvania states my position. I said we had several choices for this study. We could use a laymen's commission on the model of the Hoover Commission, or we could use a joint commission of the Congress, or we could use a mixed commission of laymen and Members of Congress.

But I made the point that if they made such a study as a Hoover Commission type of body, they would be bound to make findings and recommendations as to what ought to be done by way of changing the rules of the two bodies. I made the point, as I said to my friend from Oklahoma, that we have not proposed to authorize this committee to change the rules of the House or to change the rules of the Senate. The purpose of the resolution is to present the facts to the Congress with recommendations for each body to do what it wishes. If the committee says that there ought to be a change in rule XXII or that there ought to be a change in the power of the Committee on Rules of the House or that there ought to be a change in the procedure for discharging a committee of a bill over on the House side, the House would still have to adopt the proposed change, and the Senate would have to adopt any proposed change of its rules.

The advantage would be that we would then have a body of facts and recom-

mendations based upon what I think the public would accept as an objective study. It would be pretty difficult for the House and Senate to fly in the face of that study unless they could show that those who drafted the study were wrong in their facts. I believe that is the advantage of the study.

I am not proposing, and, under the Constitution, I could not propose, otherwise. We are the judges of our own rules.

But I thought the main purpose of the Senator from Oklahoma, and my main purpose, as I have advocated this kind of study, was to develop a body of information that would inform and enlighten the public as to the type of changes that ought to be adopted, in the judgment of a group in which we would have confidence. If we do not have that kind of study, and if we are to leave it up to the House and the Senate to act independently, without the kind of supporting study that I am talking about, Senators in the year 2050 will be talking about the same problems we are talking about today.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. In one short sentence I should like to dispose of the argument made by my able friend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. The Constitution of the United States has nothing whatever to do with the subject we are discussing. What we are talking about is a joint committee to make recommendations. The Constitution provides that each House must adopt its own rules. It does not say a word about recommendations. I have never been able to understand why I have never been able to get through to the members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration or to my friends in the Senate establishment or to my friend the Senator from Oklahoma the difference between recommendations made by a joint body and the adoption of the rules by the Senate of the United States. The difference is so great that I am somewhat at a loss to understand why I have not been able to make my position clear.

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

Mr. CLARK. I shall yield in a moment. I wish to reiterate the point. The Senator from Oklahoma, I am sure, would be happy to have this proviso out. It was out of Concurrent Resolution 1 when 30 Senators cosponsored that measure the year before last. The Committee on Rules and Administration put it in. When the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and I moved to strike it on the floor of the Senate, there was what was in effect a filibuster. It was a filibuster because the bipartisan Senate establishment knew perfectly well that if the question came to a vote, we would win. So they would not allow it to go to a vote. I ask my friend from Oklahoma if the real reason that the proviso is included is that he is afraid he could not get his resolution before the Senate for a vote if he left out that proviso.

Mr. MONRONEY. No; that is not the reason. For over 20 years I have watched the unsuccessful efforts of others. I have watched the distinguished Senator from

Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] attempt congressional reform which he has never been able to achieve, although he has put in more work than the Senator from Oklahoma or any other Senator or any Member of the House of Representatives.

There is no need for a congressional study of rule XXII. Due to the diligent efforts of distinguished members of this body, the dissatisfaction with rule XXII is well known and the problems are well documented. The purpose of the Reorganization Act is to study the myriad matters that will help make the legislative machinery more efficient. We are concerned particularly with questions of committee strength, staff, technical and mechanical assistance, and things of that kind.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator—

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator permit me to complete my statement?

Mr. CLARK. I am sorry.

Mr. MONRONEY. If we start working to repeal rule XXII, we should begin with the Senator from Pennsylvania's resolution which I believe is the subject of a report from the Committee on Rules and Administration. We should get a clearcut vote from that committee on the question of rule XXII. Any amount of study that we would undertake on rule XXII would not add one iota of information to the fund of knowledge of the newest Member of the Senate, because he would certainly be as well informed as I am, after some 14 or 15 years, in relation to rule XXII. That is a subject on which Senators come into this body with a thorough knowledge. Therefore, I see little cause to sit down and study rule XXII. By saying that our Senate rules are completely archaic and that we ought to make another attempt at reorganization, he wishes to have another fight on rule XXII.

Mr. CLARK. I should again like to disabuse my friend from Oklahoma of another firmly fixed idea which is in his mind, and which is not correct. Every time the question of rule XXII has arisen I have said to the Senator from Oklahoma—and I repeat it—that I am not here concerned about rule XXII. We can take care of that in the Senate in God's good time. Though it may be a long time coming, it will come. But if the Senator thinks that I am worried about rule XXII, I should like to ask him to change the proviso so that instead of reading in the comprehensive way in which it now appears—that we cannot touch any rule, any parliamentary procedure, any practice, or any precedent of either House—making it a study largely valueless—it would read in the following way:

Provided, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed as authorizing the committee to make any recommendations with respect to rule XXII.

If the Senator from Oklahoma will agree with me on that point, we can be out of here in 10 minutes, because I could not care less about rule XXII being in the jurisdiction of this committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has undoubtedly noticed that the sponsors of the con-

current resolution now number 56. I would hesitate to agree to one amendment to please one Senator, and not have the opportunity to secure the agreement of the other 55 cosponsors. For that reason I would certainly not be willing to change the concurrent resolution. At least we have had experience with a similar resolution. The concurrent resolution is verbatim to the one adopted in 1946. One of the reasons it was written in that way was so that there would be no question about what could be accomplished. Under the original resolution we accomplished 38 reforms. Some were rather minor, I admit, but some reforms were major in character so far as the committee system is concerned. For that reason I believe that the proposal comes too late. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has said that the specific exclusion of rule XXII might make the change of language acceptable to the sponsors of the concurrent resolution. I have read the Senator's book and I have heard his valuable statements. I know he has several rules in mind, but none of them seem to be of as great an import in the operations of the Senate except rule XXII.

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

Mr. CLARK. I shall yield in a moment. I point out to my friend the Senator from Oklahoma that 56 Senators supported his resolution as it came to the floor a few minutes ago, and now there are only 55. If we could bring more Senators to the floor, that number might be brought down to 45 or 40. There might be a majority for the motion. I am trying to induce Senators to pay some attention to the measure. We know how difficult that is, in view of the way we operate.

I should like to disabuse my friend from Oklahoma as to what is so important in changing the rules. He said he has read my various statements. I am flattered that he has. I am most flattered that he has read my book. I trust that it did not put him to sleep.

Last year I made 27 separate recommendations for changes in the Senate rules. I intend to reintroduce them. There was only one that related to rule XXII. I am prepared to let rule XXII meet its own fate in due course.

I yield to my friend the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I seldom disagree with my colleague the Senator from Pennsylvania, but I do not join him in his willingness to jettison rule XXII changes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make one statement?

Mr. CASE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. I do not intend to jettison proposed rule XXII changes. I say that we can handle that subject in another way than through the present measure.

Mr. CASE. I am perfectly aware that the Senator from Pennsylvania is equally strong with me in that respect.

Mr. CLARK. In favor of majority cloture.

Mr. CASE. In favor of majority cloture.

Of course, that question is now pending, and we have assurance that it will come before the Senate shortly. However, I should like to make the point that these rules need changing, not only for the benefit of the institution in getting things done, but also for the benefit of the very cause in which so many people are interested; namely, resistance to change in the protection of the individual Member of the Senate.

I see the distinguished Senator from Oregon in the Chamber. On a number of occasions he has been taken off his feet by a motion to table. The same thing has happened to me, but more often to him, because he is more active than I. A discussion of serious amendments has been practically blanketed, and consideration has been prevented by that kind of power on the part of the majority leader or whoever is acting in that capacity.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have never been taken off my feet by a motion to table. I merely had my head "chopped off" by a guillotine called a motion to table.

Mr. CASE. Of course; the Senator from Oregon has never been taken off his feet; that was a misstatement. So long as he can talk, he can hold the floor, as any Senator can. But as soon as he loses the floor, he is subject to having the matter in which he is deeply interested eliminated entirely for the remainder of the session.

This is a very bad proposal. It is an illustration of the need for rules changes, not only to make the institution of the Senate more vigorous and more able to act against a determined minority, but also to protect the legitimate rights of even a single Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not intend to take the part in the proposed rule changes that has been taken by both the distinguished Senators who have just spoken. I have been much pleased to have them as my spokesmen, and shall endeavor to support them with my vote.

I feel that we are seeking to modernize our procedures and to bring them abreast of the times, if only by halves, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, by merely repeating a situation which faced Congress when the Monroney-La Follette bill was passed and which will result in exactly the same sequel. We shall be precisely where we are now in a relatively short number of years after exactly the same kind of limited reform.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from New York was a Member of the House in those days, was he not?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator well remembers that because of a proviso identical to the proviso we are now asked to accept, the La Follette-Monroney committee concluded that they should not consider the operation of the House Committee on Rules. Now we hope we have that situation curbed.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall certainly support the Senator's motion. But I wish to ask a question about a matter in which I have a strong interest. Perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma, in his gracious manner, can help us.

Does the Senator feel that there is excluded from the resolution any question of a code of ethics for the Senate, a subject on which we have made a kind of abortive start by authorizing the establishment of a committee which has never been established and appointments to which are under consideration now? I wondered whether that proposal would be barred from the provisions of the resolution.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will defer to me for a moment, I suggest to him that he, as a lawyer, look at the word "practices" to see whether, perhaps, that would not prohibit the recommendation of a code of ethics, as is suggested.

Mr. MONRONEY. I see no reason whatever why there should be a possible conflict. The establishment of the proposed committee would be the result of statutory law. As I understand, the proposal referred to by the Senator from New York, has already passed the Senate and become law.

Mr. JAVITS. I am not speaking in opposition now. I feel sympathetic toward what the Senator from Pennsylvania is seeking to do; but I am referring to a different matter. The Senate has agreed to a Senate resolution establishing a bipartisan Select Committee on Ethics to pass upon questions of an ethical character in the Senate. We have not established any standards of ethics which could be incorporated into the rules. This does not mean that the joint committee proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma, if one were established under the pending resolution, could not do that. I ask the Senator whether it is his design—and I am sure he has thought the question through—that this is one subject of which the joint committee to be appointed under the pending resolution would be seized, or whether it would not. I speak of the authority of the joint committee although it might not exercise it, to recommend to the Senate, as a part of the rules, a code of ethical conduct for Senators and their employees.

Mr. MONRONEY. I seriously doubt whether the Committee on Reorganization would have any authority to examine into a matter which had already been taken care of by the action of the Senate. Therefore I believe it would be a change of the rules for us to consider a recommendation to modify what had already been adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not believe it would modify what had been adopted. But I take it, then, that whether it is because the Senate has acted or because of exclusions which are here incorporated, the Senator from Oklahoma would not consider it within the authority of the Committee on Reorganization to recommend a code of ethics for Senators and their employees as a part of its recommendation.

Mr. MONRONEY. I seriously doubt whether, having adopted a resolution to establish such a committee, on which the senior Senator from Oklahoma has agreed to serve if one is established, the Reorganization Committee should preempt or presume to take over work that had been entrusted, as recently as a few months ago, to a Committee on Rules and Ethics Procedures of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. What has been developed today with respect to ethics and what the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] have developed with respect to procedures on the floor of the Senate and other rules of the Senate clearly indicate that an effort is being made to require a substantial reinventorying of the reforms which have heretofore gone under the banner of the Monroney-La Follette resolution. I believe that is inadequate to the occasion and to the work of the Senate in this modern age. I am deeply troubled about how the Senate can be tied up if some Senator desires to do so. Notwithstanding the fact that the very survival of the Nation may be at stake, we have no procedures by which we can determine that other rules shall apply because the Nation might go up in flames if they did not. There are many differences of opinion on that point.

Because the Senate could be tied up in knots, no matter what issue might be at stake, I feel that it is our duty to untie ourselves—to disenthral ourselves, as Lincoln said—and I shall support the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will allow his motion to come to a yea-and-nay vote. I shall ask for such a vote.

Mr. CLARK. I intend to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope so. At least, let us see how many Senators feel, as we do, that this proposal is something to build upon in order to get half a loaf.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from New York is considerably more astute and familiar with the methods of legislation in the Senate than I am. Eight Senators are now in the Chamber.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Enough Senators are now in the Chamber to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Montana for his suggestions, but I shall not ask for them now.

The Senator knows the fate of the pearls of wisdom which have been emitted from the well-tested voices of the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from New York, and myself. He knows full well that, as usual, we are talking to an empty Chamber. If we could devise some procedure—and now I invite the attention of the majority leader—either toward the end of today or possibly tomorrow, when we could obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate to 15 minutes on each side, so that more Senators might come to the Chamber to listen to us, we might be able to reach a vote.

The Senator knows well what will happen. The Senator from Oklahoma

is one of the most popular Members of this body. He comes before it with a proposal which he strongly supports. He has the overwhelming support of a 7 to 2 vote in the Committee on Rules and Administration. He has on his side my dear friend from Massachusetts, who was an original cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 without this proviso in it last year; but now, for reasons that I am sure are quite appropriate, he has gone over to the other side. We shall have ourselves voted down, because Senators will not be present in sufficient numbers to listen to what is said.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania for the astounding attendance he has on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. It is unusually high.

Mr. MORSE. I have not seen an attendance like this on a vital bill for a long time. The other day there was a major debate on foreign aid, but I do not believe there were in attendance half the number of Senators now in the Chamber. So I congratulate the Senator.

The Senator said I was opposed to the resolution. I strongly favor the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I shall support his amendment. If his amendment should be rejected—I hope it will not be—and all that is left is the inadequate coverage that the resolution would then have with the proviso in it, I would vote for it as something that was better than nothing. It would not be as strong as I should like to have it. I wish to make that clear.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I might even vote for it myself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand from the majority leader that the fine attendance in the Chamber is an adequate number to order a yea and nay vote. Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me so that I may make a statement about a matter unrelated to this subject?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should be glad to propose a unanimous-consent request to put this matter aside.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I do not want the Senator to be laboring under any misconception that he will obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to fix the time to vote. That has nothing to do with what the two Senators from Arkansas are asking for.

The Senator from Pennsylvania started to ask that there be a unanimous-consent agreement to fix the time to vote on his motion to strike. I shall object to that.

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

Mr. CLARK. I shall yield, but first let me question the Senator on a procedural matter. Does not the Senator from

Oregon agree with me that we ought to find some device by which we can bring Senators to the Chamber so that this measure can be explained to them? How else can we accomplish this except by a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. MORSE. What makes the Senator think that they would come then? Many times in the past we have been in the Chamber for a vote. The bells would ring for the vote, and Senators would flock through the door. A staff assistant would be standing there and say, "It is the Clark amendment, and the vote is 'no.'"

Mr. CLARK. And now and then they would say "It is the Morse amendment, and the vote is 'no.'"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not now and then, but almost always.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, during the colloquy between the senior Senator from Oklahoma and the senior Senator from New York, I thought an encouraging note was struck and that at some time we might be able to expect the appointment of Members to the committee appointed last year with reference to the matter of congressional ethics. Is there any substance to such hope?

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

Mr. CASE. I shall be happy to hear any statement if the Senator cares to expand on that question. We have been awaiting an announcement with bated breath.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At the appropriate time, it will be announced.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator have any word from Olympus as to when the appropriate time will be?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not too long.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I state a rumor which I have heard—and if it is false, I hope the majority leader will correct me. It has been rumored that, of the 100 Senators, 6 cannot be found to serve on the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is incorrect.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad of that.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I heard the rumor, but I did not believe it. I cannot conceive that there are not six Senators who would serve. I am sure that will not be a problem.

I personally feel that it would be most demeaning to the Senate for anyone to entertain seriously that rumor.

I share the hope of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] that the appointments will be made promptly. We have great responsibility for the standing of the Senate.

It concerns me as much as it concerns the majority leader. I believe Senators will find that when we act on this measure, whatever may be the limitations of our action, it will be received with great approval by people generally. The people are very deeply concerned that Congress has imposed standards on others which we have been slow to impose on ourselves. It is not too creditable. Everything that has happened is past.

The Senator is laconic. I know that he was not 100-percent serious. I know the Senator considers this matter as seriously as any of us.

I hope there will be action within a very short time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. One does not have to be loquacious in order to explain anything. He can be concise and say yes or no. That is what I was trying to do. I was not fooling.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I just left an important hearing before the Committee on Armed Services.

I support the resolution of the senior Senator from Oklahoma as written. I took part in the debate when the measure came before the Senate 20 years ago.

I am opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I believe that if the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania is adopted, there will be great division among ourselves, whereas, if we follow the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the resolution of the senior Senator from Oklahoma, we shall accomplish something to modernize the way in which Congress works.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest to my good friend the senior Senator from Massachusetts, who has not been present during the entire debate, that perhaps he will chuckle when he reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow morning and sees references to the Duke of York, who acted in the same fashion as did the Senator from Massachusetts, who was a cosponsor of a resolution last year which did not contain this proviso in it.

The Senator has every right to change his mind. I respect his honesty.

OVERPLANTING OF RICE AND COTTON ALLOTMENTS IN ARKANSAS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, some few days ago a question arose in the Senate with respect to certain overplantings of cotton and rice allotments in the State of Arkansas. A statement was made by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that the Department of Agriculture was covering up some pertinent information that should be made available.

Upon learning of the statement and the information that was placed in the RECORD, I immediately requested the Department of Agriculture to give me a full report on the action it had taken and the present status of the investigation being conducted.

I received a letter today from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Murphy, permanent Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter, dated March 8, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1965.

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR McCLELLAN: This is in response to your request for an up-to-date report on our investigation into overplantings of rice and cotton allotments in Arkansas.

As you will recall from your earlier discussions of this investigation with the Depart-

ment, our first indication of overplantings of allotments came from an audit of the Woodruff ASC county office in March 1964. This audit had been scheduled for April of that year, but in February an allegation of payoffs to performance checkers in the county to permit overplantings for the 1963 crop was received. We reported the allegation to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and in March our inspector general began the audit in cooperation with the FBI investigation of the alleged payoffs.

No indications of bribery or payoffs were uncovered, but our audit turned up evidence of overplanting. By that time, much of the land had been reworked in preparation for the 1964 crop, and the full extent of overplanting in 1963 could not be determined.

The decision was then made by the Department to make special audits of the performance checks of the 1964 cotton and rice allotments. These performance checks normally are made in the summer to determine compliance with acreage allotments. St. Francis and Craighead Counties were selected for the audit.

The St. Francis audit began in late August and disclosed indications of overplanting. The Craighead County audit began in late September, and this, too, uncovered evidence of overplanting. We began a full investigation of both counties immediately, and extended the investigation at the same time into two additional counties.

By late October, these investigations had shown that overplantings were widespread enough that our investigators suspected the practice could extend throughout the cotton and ricegrowing area of the State. Additional help would be needed if a broad investigation were to be completed in time for us to make an accurate finding—and to enable farmers who had complied with their allotments to market their product free of suspicion.

We organized investigators from the Office of the Inspector General, together with nearly 100 ASC employees from Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Mississippi, into a special task force of teams to carry out rapid and intensive investigations, including re-measurement of allotments, in 30 major cotton and rice-producing counties in Arkansas. These teams completed remeasurements of allotments in these counties by early February of this year.

In the 32 counties where we made the investigations, we found widespread overplantings in 5. In six counties, no evidence of significant overplantings was found. In the remaining 21 counties, while there were individual cases of significant overplanting, the practice was not found to be widespread.

Overall, our investigation disclosed evidence to show that 6,830 acres of cotton and 3,009 acres of rice were planted in excess of the allotments held by farmers. Almost three-fourths of the total overplantings for both crops was found in the five counties where the practice was widespread.

The information developed by the Department in this massive investigation is being processed as rapidly as possible. Further investigations are underway to pinpoint the need for additional legal and administrative actions to prevent this type of situation from recurring.

At this point, the Department is proceeding along two directions: Reports are being prepared and submitted to the Justice Department where evidence suggests that criminal prosecution or civil action should be considered; and administrative action by this Department is underway to assess overplanting penalties and to recover Federal funds which were improperly obtained.

Legal action could involve both farmers and Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation employees in Arkansas. For consideration of legal action, two reports have already

been submitted to the Justice Department and additional reports will follow.

Overplanting penalties totaling over \$487 thousand already have been assessed by this Department in these cases and over \$395 thousand of these penalties have already been paid. We are preparing a more detailed report of these actions, and I will provide you with copies as soon as additional pertinent information is received from Arkansas.

In addition to possible legal action against some Arkansas ASC employees, the Department is considering personnel actions where laxity or poor performance has been discovered. Investigation into this matter is continuing.

Until these actions have been completed, particularly where they relate to possible criminal prosecution, we have refrained from any formal announcements as a simple matter of allowing the courts to determine the guilt or innocence of any individuals involved. The existence of an investigation and the reasons for it have been widely publicized in Arkansas and the surrounding States. This Department has pressed this investigation vigorously and zealously, with over 125 investigators and other Department personnel involved in the case at its peak. In view of this widespread and intensive investigation by this Department, any allegation that the Department is attempting to cover up the situation in Arkansas is self-contradictory on the face of it.

I hope this letter is responsive to your request. Your interest has been appreciated, and we are particularly grateful for the support of the Department's actions to enforce the law fully and without favor which you indicated at the February meeting in your office to discuss the case.

As soon as a full and complete report on this case can be prepared, it will be made available, and I am certain that a detailed review will show that the Department acted promptly and vigorously to protect the public interest and the integrity of these programs which are its responsibility.

Sincerely yours,

Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to three or four paragraphs of the letter. I do not believe the Agriculture Department is covering up a scandal. On the contrary, I believe the Department of Agriculture has acted with diligence and vigor in these matters.

The letter reflects that about a year ago the Department received information that there were some manipulations or payoffs occurring in Arkansas with respect to overplanting. It immediately started an investigation. It did not find any evidence of payoff, but found an indication of overplanting in some counties.

The letter states that:

By late October investigation showed that overplants were widespread enough that our investigators suspected the practice could extend throughout the cotton and rice growing area of the State. Additional help would be needed if a broad investigation were to be completed in time for us to make an accurate finding—and to enable farmers who had complied with their allotments to market their product free of suspicion.

So the Department proceeded with the investigation, and covered 32 counties. Among the 32 counties where the investigation was made, widespread overplantings were found in 5. In six counties, there was no evidence of significant overplantings found. In the remaining 21 counties, while there were individual

cases of significant overplanting, the practice was not found to be widespread.

The investigators found that 6,830 acres of cotton and 3,009 acres of rice were planted in excess of the allotments held by farmers, and that about three-fourths of the total overplantings for both crops were found in the five counties where the practice was widespread.

They pointed out the actions that have been taken.

They point out that overplanting penalties totaling over \$487,000 have already been assessed by the Department in these cases, and that over \$395,000 of these penalties have already been paid.

Then the letter continues:

The existence of an investigation and the reasons for it have been widely publicized in Arkansas and the surrounding States.

The letter continues:

This Department has pressed this investigation vigorously and zealously, with over 125 investigators and other Department personnel involved in the case at its peak. In view of this widespread and intensive investigation by this Department, any allegation that the Department is attempting to cover up the situation in Arkansas is self-contradictory on the face of it.

I wish to add this statement. This is not a pleasant thing for me, or my colleague, or anyone else in Arkansas. There are instances in which apparently people have violated the law and have not observed the regulations with respect to planting only that acreage which they had been allotted for those crops.

From the very beginning of this matter and all the way through, the Arkansas delegation, to a member, has supported the Department of Agriculture in taking appropriate action to make an investigation and take any corrective action that is to be taken. I can appreciate that in the course of making the investigation, as the distinguished Senator from Delaware indicated, there will be borderline instances. There may be a number of cases in which it may appear that a farm has been overplanted, and by inadvertence or error a farmer has overplanted to some extent. But those cases are not cases that deserved to be penalized or publicized. Those involved should not be held up to ridicule if there is an honest error or inadvertence. But before a list is published of those under investigation, the investigation should proceed to the point where the Department can, by its determination, name those who have frankly overplanted and violated the law and whose cases should perhaps be referred to the Justice Department for such attention with respect to which duties as it may deem proper.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to yield to my distinguished colleague in a moment.

So far as I know, this investigation has proceeded with full force. It has proceeded expeditiously. When 32 counties are covered, we should take into account the way the measurements are made. They are not made with a chain or rope. Some photographs are taken from airplanes, and in some cases by driving

across a field and making an estimate this way or that way. So there is room for error, and sometimes considerable error. But this has been a thorough investigation so far as we know, and it is proceeding.

Before I conclude, let me say that I believe it might have been well if some representative of the Department, after receiving a letter from the distinguished Senator from Delaware, had come here and discussed the problem with the Senator and given him a clearer picture of the situation. Some of the remarks that have been made might have been avoided.

But I say with emphasis that, so far as I know—and I believe I speak for all of the members of the Arkansas delegation—there has been no coverup. There has been support to correct this situation and make an investigation that would disclose the facts, so that proper action could be taken with respect to those who are doing an injustice and those who may have inadvertently or by error overplanted to some extent.

There are cases in which, obviously, there was a willful intent on the part of some to violate the law, to cheat, to plant more than they were entitled to. Those are the cases we hope will be disclosed, and with respect to which proper action should be taken.

I am glad to yield to my colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my senior colleague from Arkansas.

As the Senator from Arkansas mentioned, a meeting was held in the office of the senior Senator from Arkansas, to which were invited members of the Department and certain persons from Arkansas. This situation was thoroughly discussed at that time. The principal point of the meeting was to fortify what the senior Senator from Arkansas has said with regard to there being a coverup. This matter has been widely publicized in my State, as well as discussed in meetings, and there have been no efforts to cover it up.

It is quite evident that mistakes have been made, involving small acreages. It is difficult to measure plots accurately. In large operations it is necessary to use aerial maps. Slight variations in the instruments can make a difference of 5 or 10 acres. It is almost impossible to measure twice and arrive at exactly the same acreage.

This varies in a small amount. It is also clear, as the letter indicates, as well as the other information, that we had them make an indication that there was involved here some cases of violations involving as much as 100 or 150 acres which cannot reasonably be considered to be in error. It was a deliberate violation. That accounts for the fines which have been levied and the indictments which have been brought and if there was any reluctance to discuss it or to respond to the question of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I believe it was because they felt that it did involve certain names. I do not know why they did not do so. I agree they should have been more responsive to the inquiry

of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

I conclude by saying that I do not believe that there has been any idea whatever to conceal anything. They have gone vigorously into the question. I know that members of the Department feel that they have been wrongly accused. They are sensitive in view of certain past experiences in other States and I believe that they went after this more vigorously than usual because of the activities that occurred in Texas a year or so ago, which were investigated by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and his committee and at that time there was clearly even grosser kinds of violations.

The Department of Agriculture has been sensitive on this occasion and did move with a great deal of speed. It has hurt their feelings that they have been accused of a "coverup." Therefore, I wish to make that clear that I do not believe they have tried to call this a "coverup," but have gone into the matter as vigorously as it possibly could.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my friend, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I am glad you mentioned the matter referring to the meeting of many of us, which you attended, and which was also attended by Representative GATHINGS, in whose district some of these counties are located. In the letter which I have placed in the RECORD, I quote from the next to the last paragraph:

Your interest has been appreciated, and we are particularly grateful for the support of the Department's actions to enforce the law fully and without favor which you indicated at the February meeting in your office to discuss the case.

Mr. President, all members of the Arkansas delegation feel that way about it that the case should be thoroughly investigated and the law enforced.

I am very happy to yield now to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Let me emphasize that my criticism of the manner in which this problem has been handled by the Department of Agriculture is in no way intended as a reflection on the two Senators from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT] or any member of the Arkansas delegation. That certainly is the furthest from my thought.

The reason I took the Department of Agriculture to task and the reason I still believe that they are wrong is that as the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out, they refused to give me any information. The Senator says there has been approximately half a million dollars collected in penalties. That in itself is an indication that there have been some rather widespread violations. Who were these violators?

The Department claims now that much of this has been publicized in the press in Arkansas and I understand that that is true and that there has been perhaps an indictment and some cases are being taken before the grand jury.

With that background it is hard for me to understand the reason why the Department refused to answer my letter, and give me the same information they gave to the Senators from Arkansas.

On February 4, I directed a letter to the Department of Agriculture, and I should like to read it:

DEAR MR. CONDON: This is in response to your letter of January 25, 1965, concerning the investigation which the Department is conducting on the cotton and rice plantings in the Arkansas area.

In this connection, there are five audit reports which I would like either to see or to have a summary thereof.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., February 4, 1965.

MR. LESTER P. CONDON,
Inspector General, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONDON: This is in reference to your letter of January 25, 1965, concerning the investigations which the Department is conducting on the cotton and rice plantings in the Arkansas area.

In this connection there are five audit reports which I would like either to see or to have a summary thereof:

1. Report dated June 30, 1964, designated as the Woodruff County report. With this report I would like to have the names and positions of the various employees involved, along with notations as to the action taken and the present status.

2. Report dated December 30, 1964, designated as the St. Francis County report. This report deals with large overplantings.

3. Report dated January 14, 1965, designated as the Craighead County report. This report deals with a number of cases of substantial overplantings.

4. The Craighead Rice Milling Co. report. This report deals with overplanting by this company and was issued along with the Craighead County report.

5. Report dated January 12, 1965, designated as the Swan Lake Plantation Co. report. This report concerns a company in Jackson County.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I identified these audit reports and asked for either a report or a summary thereon. I received the reply from Mr. Condon under date of February 18.

I quote from his reply:

I must respectfully decline to make the requested information available to you.

And I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

Washington, D.C., February 18, 1965.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This refers to your letter of February 4, 1965, in which you request information concerning the investigations which this Department is conducting on the cotton and rice planting in the Arkansas area.

As you know, all of our investigation reports in this matter either have been or will be furnished to the Department of Justice for consideration of possible criminal and/or civil action. Thus, premature release of in-

formation in these investigation reports could greatly prejudice future legal actions by the Department of Justice. Such premature release could also impair administrative action by this Department. During these and all other investigations we have a duty to protect sources of information and the innocence of those who are falsely accused. To make available these reports where they might be made public would not be in keeping with this responsibility. Therefore, I must respectfully decline to make the requested information available to you.

I appreciate your concern in this matter and can assure you that appropriate action is being taken by this Department to resolve all irregularities disclosed by the investigations. As I stated in my January 25, 1965, letter to you we would be glad to add to the scope of our review and particular items which you believe should be explored.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER P. CONDON,
Inspector General.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, Mr. Condon takes the position that their report was forwarded to the Department of Justice and therefore he cannot make any of the information available. I talked to them on the telephone and suggested that they come down and we discuss the matter. I felt that with all the widespread violations that it was inconceivable that it could have happened without some official's knowledge. Mine was a very proper question.

I understood that there were reports indicating that some employees did know. Certainly Congress has a right to an answer. Again they refused the information and stated that they would not discuss the matter. It was top secret, apparently.

Now we find that their justification is that this is all in the newspapers anyway. What kind of department are we running? Certainly if it has been publicized as they say in the newspapers they could have answered my letter.

I do not, for one moment, question the intentions of the Senator from Arkansas. I say again—not only was there no reflection intended but there is also no two men in the Senate for whom I have higher regard than the two Senators from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT].

I wish to make that clear. I know that they, too, would wish to make sure that all the information which is pertinent be made public and those who are responsible be taken to task. I did not know that they had had conferences in their offices with the Department. That is perfectly proper. But why is it that I, as a Senator, was denied the right to have some information on this same problem? I would strongly suggest that in the future the Department of Agriculture recognize that they have a responsibility to answer these letters when they receive them from Senators even though the Senators may be members of the minority. As one in the minority I intend that my letters be answered and that they be answered directly to me and not through some other Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that I thank him for his comments concerning the two Senators

from Arkansas. I know in my own mind that the Senator intended no reflection upon either of us. However, let me point out that in view of the Senator's statement, the Senator did request information which they have not yet given to us. The letter concerning the wide publication in Arkansas does not refer to all of the facts made known in this letter, but does refer to the fact that the full publication in the press concerning a large amount of overplanting and about a thorough investigation being in progress has been publicized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct, but they now give some important statistics.

Mr. McCLELLAN. With respect to what the Senator asked; namely, to what extent have laws been violated, No. 1; maybe they are not prepared to tell to what extent, yet, because they have not completed the investigation.

Then, what large planners have been violating these laws. They have not given us the names of them yet. On some I am sure they have determined them and on others there is still a question as to whether they actually did violate or did not. They still have that information to give us, then the question on Government officials being in collusion and stupid, I am sure they are still investigating that matter. I do not believe the Senator would necessarily seek to have all that information released to the public before the cases are processed further.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to emphasize that I did not ask the Department to release this information to the public. If they had come down and said that the investigation was still continuing and explained the background I would have cooperated with them. I have cooperated with them in the past. But I do not like the blunt statement they gave in this case: "I must respectfully decline to make the requested information available to you."

Even after I called them they would not come down and tell whether it goes beyond the Arkansas area.

In that same statement I referred to a report of the Comptroller General on another phase of their operations about which they had done nothing.

The Department was allowing large-scale shipments of cotton by producers and storage operators in the southwestern area, an arid area, to be made to the more humid southeastern area, where they could add 9 to 12 pounds of extra moisture to the cotton and where they could get a higher support price. In that way they were able to collect money for the extra moisture that was added to the cotton. This was not intended under the farm program. Over \$1 million went down the rathole in connection with that procedure.

All the Department had to say was, "We will see to it that this does not happen again." This could not have happened in the first place without either collusion or stupidity on the part of some official. Farmers in the southwestern area were allowed to transport cotton to the southeastern area, where the weather is more humid, and in that

way they added more moisture to the cotton and were able to collect more money under the support program.

Someone knew that that was going on. Someone is responsible. The Department should tell us how it happened. If controls are so lax that it did not know anything about it until some of us on the outside called it to the attention of the Department something is wrong.

With all due respect to the Senators from Arkansas. I say to the Department that if it is doing nothing wrong it should not be ashamed to discuss it. When the Department gets a letter from a Member of the Senate that letter is to be answered—at least if it is my letter I intend to get an answer.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished Senator. He has referred to some other matters in the letter which did not pertain to Arkansas, and of course I made no inquiry about them. I merely wished to set the record straight by saying this has been one of the most thorough investigations in Arkansas that has ever been conducted anywhere. It may not yet have disclosed all the facts. There may be some reason why some of them should not be disclosed, but I have a sort of off-the-record feeling that probably the Department did its best in Arkansas because of some special reasons which I could mention.

At any rate, I trust that it will, as expeditiously as possible, wind up the investigation in Arkansas, because we are approaching a new crop year. Although there are definitely some who have not lived up to their obligations in obeying the rules with respect to planting only the acreage allotted to them, there are, at the same time, a good many farmers who should not be made to suffer because of the transgressions of a few others. We are as eager to have this matter expedited and cleared up as is any one else, so that the program can begin to function properly again, and so that those who are innocent may not be penalized because of the actions of a few who have violated the law or the regulations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on that point, I say to the Senator from Arkansas that we are in complete agreement. I will even join the two Senators from Arkansas in pointing out that no doubt there have been scores of so-called violations involving a fraction of an acre or merely an acre or 2 acres, which are unintentional errors. Being familiar with farming operations, I know that that could happen with a farmer who was doing his best to comply with the law. I do not in anyway advocate that those farmers who are trying to live up to their obligations should be punished or publicly censured for an unintentional error in acreage.

But, as the Senator has pointed out, in the case of a hundred or more acres being overplanted, they are not accidents. These were deliberate violations, and we have a right to know who did it.

The Government has already collected close to half a million dollars in fines; they know from whom they have collected those fines. There is nothing im-

proper about asking who the violators were. Does this go beyond the Arkansas area, and were there any Government officials involved?

In addition to the fines collected for overplanting I want to know how much extra this overplanting cost the Government under our support program.

The Department letter which the Senator from Arkansas has put in the RECORD today is the first indication as to the extent of the fines they have assessed.

Let us roll back the cloak of secrecy on some of these situations. I hope they will do so before they are through, and I am determined that they shall.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator. I especially thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for yielding to my colleague from Arkansas and to me.

Mr. CLARK. I am always happy to yield to the Senator.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

Mr. CLARK. For the benefit of other Senators, and so that the Senate page boys may alert the two cloakrooms, I should like to say, after having discussed the matter with the majority leader and with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator in charge of the concurrent resolution, there will be no votes today on the pending business.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAR- RISS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SHOCKING BRUTALITY IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in this morning's newspapers I read with consternation and dismay the news of another shocking incident of brutality in Selma, Ala. A group of some 500 Negroes planned a march from Selma to Montgomery in protest against the unconscionable deprivation of their voting rights. Governor Wallace of Alabama had forbidden the march, and dispatched State troopers and volunteer officers of the Dallas County sheriff's office.

The news accounts stated that the Alabama police authorities had stopped the protest march and the Negroes had stood unmoving and silent. Without warning and without provocation, the troopers and sheriff's officers rushed forward and attacked the Negroes. The Negroes were trampled, beaten, and terrorized by these outrageous tactics. We are told that white spectators

watching this shocking display whooped and cheered with joy.

When law enforcement officials in these United States of America find it necessary to turn on a peaceable group of citizens, who have no weapons and who indicate no signs of impending aggression or violence, find it necessary to use nightsticks, tear gas and whips to attack and brutalize these citizens, then the very foundation and root of our American democracy is in jeopardy.

Now more than ever it seems to me that the bare assurance of civil rights for the southern Negro, coupled with the assurance of the right to vote in Federal elections, is not enough. In the last few weeks we have seen police brutality enough to last us for centuries.

It is time we recognize that it is the local elected official—not the Federal marshal or Federal judge—who daily dispenses justice or injustice to the Negro. It is the State police, the local sheriff, the local chief of police, the local school board members, the local voting registrar who set the pace in closing the glaring gap between the Federal "right" and local "practice" under which that right is denied.

We know that the forces of oppression in the South will continue their sordid efforts of intimidation, brutality, and murder. We know that the many courageous leaders in the Negro community—and, I might say, in the white community as well—and in the human rights movement will continue their efforts to speak out, to protest, and to declare the rights of mankind.

The only question facing us in the Congress is what we and the decent and honorable people who know better will do. We can no longer remain silent in the face of such outrageous denials of basic human rights and decency, and I think the situation should command the immediate attention of the Senate of the United States.

Sadly enough, this situation has reached the point where Negro citizens in the South who wish to assemble peaceably for the purpose of adjusting grievances must bring along doctors and nurses and medical supplies and ambulances. It has reached the point where the bare exercise of rights as a human being and as a citizen of the United States brings the threat of physical injury and even death. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the news account of this incident from the Washington Post.

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

TEAR GAS, CLUBS HALT 600 IN SELMA MARCH: STATE TROOPERS BEAT AND INJURE MANY NEGROES

(By Leon Daniel)

SELMA, ALA., March 7.—State troopers and mounted deputies bombarded 600 praying Negroes with tear gas today and then waded into them with clubs, whips, and ropes, injuring scores.

The troopers and possemes, under Gov. George C. Wallace's orders to stop the Negroes "Walk for Freedom" from Selma to Montgomery, chased the screaming, bleeding marchers nearly a mile back to their church, clubbing them as they ran.

Ambulances screamed in relays between Good Samaritan Hospital and Brown's Chapel Church, carrying hysterical men, women, and children suffering head wounds and tear gas burns.

In Atlanta, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., announced that he would lead a new march from Selma on Tuesday and called on clergymen from throughout the Nation to join him.

HOSPITAL TREATS 50 TO 60

(A hospital spokesman told the Washington Post in a telephone report that between 50 and 60 marchers had been treated for injuries that included broken arms and legs and severe head gashes.

(None of the victims was considered in serious condition, but "there is a great deal of pain and suffering," the spokesman said. About a dozen marchers were reported admitted to the hospital.

(Most of the injuries appeared to be the result of heavy blows, the spokesman said. No gunshot wounds were reported.

(The Reverend Richard Boone, Alabama project coordinator for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, estimated that 90 to 100 marchers had been injured.)

Among the injured was Chairman John Lewis of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, who suffered a possible skull fracture.

At his office in Montgomery, Wallace said "those folks in Selma have made this a 7-day-a-week job but we can't give in 1 inch. We're going to enforce State laws."

HORSEMEN MOVE IN

The Negroes had just reached the end of the long bridge that leads out of Selma's business district when they were confronted by 50 blue-helmeted State troopers.

The troopers gave them 2 minutes to disperse. The Negroes did not disperse, and about 2 dozen troopers, swinging their clubs, rushed the head of the column.

Pushing and clubbing, they drove the Negroes back about 50 yards and then began firing tear gas. The tear gas bombs boomed like gunshots and a dense cloud of yellow smoke enveloped the screaming Negroes.

Then the troopers charged into the gas-dazed Negroes again, and from behind the column Sheriff Jim Clark's horse-mounted civilian possemen charged in, swinging clubs.

The hysterical Negroes broke and ran back to the church. Those who fled in other directions—between buildings—were quickly headed off by the hard-riding possemen.

As the Negroes streamed through the town toward the church where they started their march, the possemen darted in at them, clubbing them down. Several witnesses said they saw the horsemen use bullwhips and lengths of rope to flog the fleeing Negroes.

Several hundred white bystanders cheered and hooted as the Negroes were driven back to the church. But the white crowd made no attempt to break through police lines.

It had been expected earlier that Dr. King would lead today's march, but the civil rights leader said tonight that he had remained in Atlanta to take care of his church responsibilities and to "mobilize national support for a larger thrust forward." He said his aids argued him out of leading today's march at the last minute.

Dr. King also announced that he will go into Federal court immediately to seek to restrain Governor Wallace from blocking Tuesday's march.

In his statement tonight, Dr. King said: "In the vicious maltreatment of defenseless citizens of Selma, where old women and young children were gassed and clubbed at random, we have witnessed an eruption of the disease of racism which seeks to destroy all of America. The people of Selma will struggle for the soul of the Nation, but it is fitting that all Americans help to bear the burden. I call, therefore, on clergy of all

faiths, representative of every part of the country to join me in Selma for a ministers' march on Montgomery Tuesday morning."

When the Negroes reached the church, some of the less seriously injured hurled a few bricks and bottles at the pursuing possemen. Within moments, a contingent of nearly 50 troopers and possemen, under the orders of Sheriff Clark, marched down the street outside the church in a phalanx. The Negroes quickly cleared the sidewalks, darting into houses, the church, and its adjacent parsonage.

The Negroes started out today to walk the 50 miles to Montgomery to protest to Wallace the denial of Negro voting rights in Alabama. Wallace announced yesterday he would not allow the march, and authorized his troopers to use "all necessary means" to stop it.

When they reached the foot of the bridge, Highway Patrol Maj. John Cloud raised a bullhorn to his mouth and ordered the Negroes to stop.

"This march you propose is not conducive to safety," he said. "This march will not continue. You have 2 minutes to disperse."

Hosea Williams, a Negro leader at the head of the column, asked Cloud if he could "have a word with you."

"You may disperse or go back to the church or we will break it up," Cloud replied. "There's nothing to talk about."

Silence fell across the road as the 2 minutes passed, the Negroes and the troopers staring at each other. Then Cloud ordered the troopers in.

About two dozen ran into the line of Negroes, shoving them back and clubbing them. The possemen advanced from the rear.

The Negroes retreated about 50 yards, then stopped. Suddenly the troopers began firing round after round of tear gas into the crowd.

The Negroes, coughing, choking, and screaming, stumbled, fell, trooperse charged in every direction. The troopers charged from the front and the possemen galloped in from the rear.

Selma was quiet but tense tonight. Sheriff Clark started broadcasting radio appeals late in the day asking everyone to stay off the streets tonight.

However, many of the Negroes who had taken part in the march gathered tonight at Brown's Chapel Church for a mass meeting.

PROFESSOR TELLS WHY HE MARCHED

SELMA, ALA., March 7.—Dr. Frederick Kraus has remained silent on the issue of civil rights during his 12 years as a professor at the University of Alabama, but he says his conscience now has forced him to take a public stand with the Negro in his drive for equality.

Kraus is a member of a new group known as Concerned White Citizens of Alabama. The group of about 70 staged its first demonstration march in Selma Saturday and indicated this was only the beginning of its work.

"We have remained silent for a long time, trying to give moral support to the Negroes," Kraus said in an interview.

"I personally felt it was time to show that a group of demonstrators can have a face other than that of the Negro," he said.

"There were a lot more people who wanted to march with us, but they were afraid," he said. "Next time it will not be so."

Kraus is a professor of dentistry at the university medical center in Birmingham. He was joined in the march by two other Alabama professors, Dr. Ted Klitzke, head of the art department at the university's main campus in Tuscaloosa, and Dr. Ed Carlson, a physics professor.

Mr. MONDALE. I would like to call special attention to the following paragraphs:

State troopers and mounted deputies bombarded 600 praying Negroes with tear gas to-

day and then waded into them with clubs, whips, and ropes injuring scores.

The troopers and possemen, under Gov. George C. Wallace's orders to stop the Negroes "walk for freedom" from Selma to Montgomery, chased the screaming, bleeding marchers nearly a mile back to their church, clubbing them as they ran.

Ambulances screamed in relays between Good Samaritan Hospital and Brown's Chapel Church, carrying hysterical men, women, and children suffering head wounds and tear gas burns.

Mr. President, Sunday's outrage in Selma, Ala., makes passage of legislation to guarantee Southern Negroes the right to vote an absolute imperative for Congress this year. The citizens of Minnesota and of the United States can no longer tolerate the trampling of human rights by southern law enforcement officers in the name of law and order. This is totalitarian oppression at its worst—it is what we fought against in World War II and it is what we are fighting against in the cold war today.

Mr. President, in the President's moving state of the Union address he called upon the Congress, not once, but twice, to enact legislation to insure the right to vote for those who are denied it in the United States. I believe that the instances of outrageous behavior in Selma, Ala., eloquently underscore the importance of the President's plea.

Yesterday was a sad day for America. It was a day of which we shall always be ashamed.

I suppose we could be content with the observation that the State troopers of Alabama produced an enormous psychological weapon which the Communists will surely use. But I do not believe it is enough for us to predicate our activities on what is good or what is bad for the Communist Party. Rather, we should base our activities on what is basic to the freedom, the welfare, and the decency of American society. I am proud of those in the South, both white and black, who have been brave enough to stand strong and without compromise in the common plea for the civil rights of all Americans. I hope that we can say in justice and decency that help is coming.

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

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I have listened with great interest to the Senator's eloquent comment on the most unfortunate—to put it mildly—occurrences in Alabama yesterday. I wonder if my friend will agree with me that the Congress of the United States will have to pass some proposed legislation assuring voting rights if we are to bring that situation under control.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for that inquiry. I believe the evidence clearly reflects the need for such legislation. We are all proud of the fact that in 1964 Congress took the most forward looking step since the Civil War to advance the cause of human rights by the adoption of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. But in the course of the adoption of that legislation, it was necessary to make some compromises that now appear to have been costly. Of particular importance was the compromise that was made

in the field of enforcing voting rights. As former head of the civil rights section of the U.S. Department of Justice, Mr. Burke Marshall pointed out in a brilliant document entitled "Federalism and Civil Rights," it is necessary to make further improvement by way of legislation in that field if we are to accord to the Negro in the South his right to vote. Surely the activities of recent days have underscored that need with clarity.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I have been interested in the apparent impatience of some of our Republican friends on the other side of the aisle—impatience indicating a keen desire to move ahead with additional voter registrar legislation. Speaking for myself only, I would hope very much that the Department of Justice and, indeed, the President, would move expeditiously to send such proposed legislation to Congress. I understand there is still not complete agreement in the executive branch as to what the terms of the proposed legislation should be. This is an extremely complicated subject. I can understand how wise lawyers might differ on the appropriate provisions. But I hope that we shall have such a bill before us pretty soon. If we do not, speaking for myself and several other Democrats who were active in that fight for the Civil Rights Act of 1964, we shall introduce our own bill.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for that comment. I am confident that this administration is concentrating on the matter of preparing legislation in this field to be presented to Congress. The activities that we have just witnessed on the past Sunday ought to underscore the need for prompt action in this field.

VFW HONORS THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, most Members of the Senate are, I am confident, aware that the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK will, on Tuesday, March 9, be the recipient of one of our Nation's outstanding awards.

The occasion is the annual congressional banquet of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. The banquet is to be held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel. At the banquet, the national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who is well known to many Members of the Senate—John A. Jenkins, of Birmingham, Ala.—will present the VFW's Congressional Award to Speaker McCORMACK.

Mr. President, I am sure that Members of the Senate will agree with me that Speaker McCORMACK is fully qualified for this high award, because its inscription, "for outstanding service to the Nation," accurately describes his contributions and achievements during his long years of able and faithful service to our Nation.

It is my understanding that a very large number of the Members of the Sen-

ate and the House will be present at the VFW banquet on Tuesday evening, to join with VFW Commander Jenkins in honoring Speaker McCORMACK.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the text of the statement of VFW Commander Jenkins in announcing that the 1965 VFW Congressional Award will be made to the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

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

KANSAS CITY, Mo.—John A. Jenkins, Birmingham, Ala., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, announced Tuesday that Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, had been selected by the organization's National Council of Administration to receive the VFW's second annual "Congressional Award."

The recipient of the first Congressional Award was Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona. In addition to a large plaque depicting the U.S. Capitol, a \$1,000 scholarship is established in the name of the recipient for graduate study in government or political science. The award carries the simple inscription "for outstanding service to the Nation." It will be presented to Speaker McCORMACK, March 9 on the occasion of the organization's annual dinner in Washington honoring Members of Congress who served in the Armed Forces.

In announcing the selection of Speaker McCORMACK, Commander in Chief Jenkins said, "It is the hope of our National Council of Administration that by granting this award it will call attention not only to the dedicated service of the recipient, but to other deserving Members of the Congress who share the accomplishments for which the VFW Congressional Award is made each year."

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I return to the discussion of the pending business, which is Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and a large number of additional Senators, and to the pending motion, which is my motion to strike the proviso which begins on line 24, page 2.

Before the debate was interrupted in order to extend courtesy to some Senators who wished to speak on other subjects, I had said that this proviso, which in effect provides that the committee shall have no power to make recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House, would prohibit the proposed joint committee from looking into those matters which, in my judgment, are the principal difficulties which have reduced Congress to what I have described as the "sapless branch" on our tree of government.

I point out again that it is difficult, indeed, if not impossible—I suggest it is impossible—to make any full and com-

plete study of the organization and operation of Congress, as the resolution provides, if the committee to be appointed under the resolution is forbidden to make any recommendations with respect to the heart of congressional reform which, in my judgment, consists of the need to revise and modernize the rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, and/or precedents of either House, and matters being considered on the floor of either House.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Pennsylvania wish to yield at this time, or does he wish to complete his statement?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma; then I shall complete my statement.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has repeated two or three times that this proposal would prohibit the committee from studying anything other than what is completely outside the practices, procedures, or rules of either House.

Mr. CLARK. I thought I said "making recommendations."

Mr. MONRONEY. No; the Senator said "study and make recommendations." If I am incorrect, I apologize. I thought I understood the Senator to say "study." That was the point I wished to make, to keep the record straight. There is no prohibition against listening to or studying any testimony that might affect Senate rules, practices, or procedures. Obviously, a large number of political scientists will come before us to testify, as they did in previous years when the question of reorganization was being considered. They did not come to speak in behalf of one reform, but in behalf of many reforms.

Obviously, there will be critical discussion of committee reform; and that will be all right. I shall be happy to receive any critical testimony concerning committee organization, the same as I should be with respect to rule XXII, or with respect to evidence that might be derogatory to the House Committee on Rules.

During the entire 1946 process, when Senator La Follette was chairman of the committee and I was vice chairman, witnesses were at liberty to testify with full latitude. But when it came to writing the report, we based our recommendations on those matters within the scope of our authority. We made our recommendations without transgressing the restrictions that were imposed when the resolution was adopted.

Today, the Senator from Pennsylvania has criticized the language on page 5 of the committee report. I quote from his statement in the minority views:

We realize that the resolution of 1945 setting up the La Follette-Monroney committee contained a similar exclusion. But it requires no more than a casual scanning of the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to conclude that much of the useful work accomplished by that committee was done in violation of the limitations in the committee's charter.

As the Senator well knows, I have always said—and I believe it to be true—that fully 50 percent of the committee

work related to realignment, reorganization, and definition of the jurisdiction of the various committees, together with a 50-percent reduction in the total number. The Senator has previously stated—in testimony before the committee—that the language of the bill did not permit us to do this. He is laboring under a misapprehension because not only was the first proviso:

That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House * * *.

But, the second proviso, also: "that the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees," was in the original La Follette-Monroney Act. So the study was specifically authorized to make recommendations as to the structure of the committees and their various jurisdictions. To have done otherwise would have been to prevent the major achievement of reorganization.

These other matters discussed by the Senator from Pennsylvania are generally so well known that they do not require study by a reorganization committee. Any time we have the votes, as the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania knows, we can modify or change a Senate rule. Any time we have the votes, we can change or modify rule XXII. Any time the House has the votes, as has happened a number of times, to invoke the 21-day rule, that action can be achieved.

Once the reorganization ball is rolling, many things that might not come within the strict limits of the jurisdiction of the resolution will come in later as a by-product of the mood of reorganization that Congress engenders. We begin to achieve one end, although we may be initially prohibited from including a second or a third goal. But the spirit of reorganization and improvement of the internal operation of Congress takes hold, and in that spirit we find a willingness to act on other matters.

For that reason, the Senator from Pennsylvania might not be losing as much as he thinks by accepting the restrictions that were included in the original La Follette-Monroney charter of 1945 and in the act of 1946. Much was accomplished by the enactment of some 38 reforms. Much more was accomplished after the passage of the act by the enactment of many other reforms not contemplated in a strict interpretation of the charter under which we worked at the time, but which became a part of the House and Senate rules.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oklahoma has made two points. With respect to the first one, he is technically correct. He said there was nothing to prevent the proposed joint committee from studying questions of rules, parliamentary procedure, and so forth. But having studied them, they could not make any recommendations. One wonders what good it would do to study them if, by a charter given to the joint com-

mittee, there were no authority to make recommendations resulting from the study. Nonetheless, of course, the Senator is technically correct. They can study the matter to their hearts' content under the resolution of the Senator. But they cannot make any recommendations.

If I were a member of that committee, being a former lawyer, I would be a little concerned at the desirability of our studying something with respect to which we have no authority to recommend.

The second point made by the senior Senator from Oklahoma is also correct. The Senator said that the La Follette-Monroney committee actually did make a good many recommendations which, in the end, led to the changing of some of the rules and procedures in both Houses. I again suggest, with all due deference, that, in doing so, the joint committee would, certainly from a legal point of view, exceed its authority. It is perfectly true, as the Senator said, that rather substantial reforms and changes were made in the committee structure in both Houses. That was all to the good.

I should point out, however, that on page 34 of the report of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, filed under date of March 4, 1946, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 18, the membership of which committee, of course, included our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, then a Member of the House of Representatives, it is stated:

In addition to the matters discussed above, the joint committee heard testimony from Members of Congress and others in support of, and in opposition to, other changes in the organization and operation of Congress. The more noteworthy of these suggestions pertain to—

1. Selection of committee chairmen by some method other than seniority.
2. The powers of the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives.
3. Experimentation with periods for questioning executive department heads.
4. Limitation of debate in the Senate.

For various reasons, each of these suggestions was not brought forth in the way of a recommendation by the members of the joint committee. Two of the suggestions were not considered because the committee felt that under the charge given it by the concurrent resolution, they were not at liberty to make any recommendations under the terms of the joint resolution.

So my suggestion still is that what this proviso would do now would be to bind again, as was done in 1946, the hands of the members of the proposed joint committee so that they could not really make recommendations on most of the important matters which, at least in my judgment, are essential if we are to have a meaningful report which would make recommendations to bring up to date the methods of operation, and the organization and operation of Congress.

Such organization and operation would go far toward strengthening Congress, simplifying its operations and relations with other branches of the Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibility under the Constitution.

I am still at a loss to understand why this proviso is necessary. I could be in error, but, in my opinion, this measure

can be agreed to if we come to a vote on its merits. We shall try to do so tomorrow.

I think that from a legal as well as practical point of view, it really cuts out half, two-thirds, or perhaps three-fourths of the work which the committee ought to do, the studies it ought to make, and the recommendations it should bring back to both branches of Congress if the committee's work is to result in a meaningful improvement of the organization of Congress.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have been associated with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania at previous times when he was trying to secure reorganization, although I could not cosponsor his measure because of the limitations which I felt were necessary to get this study underway.

I am at a loss to know what the two-thirds of the duties are that the Senator feels would be eliminated under reorganization. The improvement of Senate action within the committees is given full latitude and full leeway in this reorganization.

All of us know that approximately three-fourths or four-fifths of the work of Congress is fundamentally and primarily done at the committee level. The limitation that we considered we had imposed on us in 1945 is as follows: We were eligible to study everything until we got to the doors of the Senate Chamber. In operating in this manner, we were taking care of the main expenditure of the energy unit that goes into the legislative picture. As we improve the committee structure and staff, and improve the allocation of committee assignments so that we would have two committees per Senator and one committee per Representative, we would automatically improve the entire structure of our congressional government. It rests primarily on the committee structure itself.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me, I hope to elaborate on what I just said, that perhaps anywhere from half to two-thirds or three-fourths of what needs to be done cannot be done under the concurrent resolution with this proviso in it.

My explanation will be rather detailed. My colleague and I are stuck with the obligation of remaining here because of the desire of the majority leader to keep the session in progress.

In my consideration of what the study can include, I go back to page 2 of the resolution. There are some things that can be done under the resolution which might be helpful to some extent. I believe there are certain aspects of the relationship between the two Houses which the committee could usefully go into although I think the extent to which the committee could go into the relationship between the two Houses would be quite substantially restricted by the prohibition against making any recommendations with regard to the rules. As I said before, many of the relationships between the two Houses are a matter of rules, precedents, practices, and procedures. As soon as we begin to go into

any subject which raises the relationship of the two Houses, we would have to stop when we arrived at the point of dealing with rules, precedents, procedure, or practice.

It is clear that some good work could be done in the working relations between Congress and other branches of the Government. Much of that can be done without regard to rules, procedures, precedents, and practices. But one thing which the LaFollette-Monroney committee felt it could not take up, because it would involve a change in the rules, was a proposal to create an opportunity to question the executive members of the Government on the floor of either House of Congress.

I ask the Senator for enlightenment, whether he would not feel that we could get into any such situation under this provision.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is referring to relations between Congress and other branches of the Government?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. I was also referring to the suggestion raised in 1946 concerning whether members of the executive branch of the Government, as is the case in other democracies, would have to appear on the floor for questioning. To be more specific, it is No. 3 in the things which were not gone into by the earlier committee. It reads, "Experimentation with periods for questioning executive department heads."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I do not believe that was because of any specific prohibition in the resolution empowering the committee to study the matter.

As I recall—and it is a recollection of something that occurred 20 years ago—we did not feel there was sufficient demand for calling executives to the floor or before the full body of Congress. The suggestion was on the basis of informing Congress and the public as to what the executive department was doing.

I would appreciate it if the Senator would refresh my memory. My recollection of the vast amount of words in that report did not attribute our failure to recommend that to the prohibition in our charter.

There were many things being agitated for at that time that we did not go into, although we took countless pages of evidence from witnesses who recommended and urged implementation of various suggestions.

Mr. CLARK. Let me refresh the Senator's recollection. The specific matter I am referring to is No. 3 of four matters. The third one is headed "Experimentation with periods for questioning executive department heads."

The report continues:

The third and fourth topics listed—

The third one being the one we referred to—

deal with aspects of floor procedure upon which we are not at liberty to make recommendations under the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 18.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator seems to be correct in that, because the general consensus was that we were not to go on the floor of either House; that we were

to work outside the Chamber. The Senator has refreshed my memory on the basic principle. Moreover, no recommendation was made because it was thought that better results would be obtained by searching questions to department heads when they came before Senate or House committees.

Mr. CLARK. Let me turn to one other matter which the committee would go into—"the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress."

This the committee could clearly go into. This the Senator did go into in 1945 and 1946. He could go into it again. I wonder how fruitful that could be in view of the fact that last year we passed a substantial increase in the salaries of Members of Congress and a corresponding increase in the salaries of officers and employees of the committees of Congress. What is the use of stirring up that question again?

Mr. MONRONEY. There is no intention on the part of the original sponsor of the resolution to go into that. In 1945 and 1946, there was a vast demand for adequate staffing, and this study was a part of our authority. I was a member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House when we were involved in considering the Bretton Woods agreement, the International Bank, the World Bank, and the Monetary Fund; our staff consisted of one retired mail carrier. The committee had its records intermingled with the personal and political matters of the chairman of the committee. In the reorganization study we were trying to staff ourselves to meet the standard of the staffs that the executive departments enjoyed.

Our committee staffs were well compensated in the last pay bill; and it would be futile to go over that measure again. Since the able Senator did so much to bring this bill to passage, I am sure he agrees.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend. I agree with him. I do not believe I would have objection to leaving that part in the resolution, but I am glad my friend agrees with me that this is not one of the most fruitful areas which the joint committee might look into.

So we come down to the last directive in section 2. That provides that the joint committee shall make a full study of the structure of and the relationships between the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress.

That was done, and very ably done, by the Senator from Oklahoma and his colleagues back in the middle 1940's. I do not doubt that it would be useful to look into that subject again. This is one of the real advantages which might come from this resolution, even with the proviso to which I object still in it; but I point out that a comprehensive revision of the committee system was made at that time.

I wonder, in terms of making a little legislative history, whether the Senator from Oklahoma could inform us as to what areas he would hope the joint committee would look into.

Mr. MONRONEY. With respect to select, special, and standing committees.

Mr. CLARK. Yes. There are some subcommittees which have little factual justification—in fact, hardly any justification at all. On the other hand, some subcommittees are absolutely essential to doing business. I suppose the Senator would look at the overall situation under rule XXV and see whether some of the committees could be consolidated, and, generally speaking, look into what the committees do and how their work could be expedited.

I ask my friend if, in this connection, he does not agree that one of the real problems we have to deal with, and soon, is that every Senator is badly overworked, because he has so many committees and subcommittees on which he is required to serve. This makes it almost impossible to be on top of the work of the committees of which we are members.

I serve on three committees—the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Last week every one of those committees had a meeting at 10 o'clock. Every one of them was important. One cannot be at all three places at the same time. Is this the kind of thing the Senator has in mind?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma has in mind examining both the overload and underload in our committee structure. Some of these committees have light workloads. Others have a great deal more. Perhaps we can find ways and means, with the carte blanche authority we would have over the committees, to see if they could be reconstituted, and divide the workload more evenly.

With regard to the subcommittees, it would take a searching analysis to see whether they should be consolidated or eliminated. Many of those may be found to have completed their work and have become merely appendages. If there is no work for them to do, let us get rid of them and reapportion their functions and membership among the other existing committees. Thus, we can bring about a better distribution of the workload.

Often special committees are created by Congress to study and work on the unfilled needs of committee activity. This is particularly true of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Joint Committee on the President's Budget—

Mr. CLARK. In my case I would like to see a Joint Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe a Joint Committee on the Budget would be very good. I have joined many times in trying to have such a matter adopted. I would not rule out the possibility that some day a Joint Committee on the Budget might be possible, so that some of these budgetary matters would be able to get over the hurdles in the House.

So let us put these matters on the table and receive the criticisms of political scientists and other knowledgeable people. Let us hear from those who see Congress at work, and the Members themselves.

One of the great experiences I had was that of hearing Members of Congress testify day after day as to what they thought the need was for eliminating the knocks and squeaks and groans in our congressional machinery. Out of that comes a wealth of information on our procedures, practices, and improvements in our ways of doing business. I would hope that this would be true again.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to my contention that from one-half to three-quarters of the problems which should be looked into by the joint committee are prohibited by the proviso which the Senator from Oklahoma has caused to be inserted therein.

First, let me point out that there was held at the 26th American Assembly, at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., from October 29 to November 1, a meeting of distinguished Americans who made a report on the subject of Congress' and America's future.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of that assembly together with the names of the persons who attended the assembly, a brief explanation of the auspices under which they met, and the kind of sessions they held, which appears on page 67 through page 72 of the hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 may be printed in the RECORD.

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

"THE CONGRESS AND AMERICA'S FUTURE"—
REPORT OF THE 26TH AMERICAN ASSEMBLY
(Submitted for the record by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK)

THE CONGRESS AND AMERICA'S FUTURE
(Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., October 29–November 1, 1964)

PREFACE

These pages contain the recommendations of a group of Americans of diverse pursuits and interests who met at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., October 29–November 1, 1964, to review the functions and procedures of the Congress of the United States. The meeting was convened by the American Assembly of Columbia University which conducts policy studies. "The Congress and America's Future" was the 26th study initiated by the assembly.

The recommendations were adopted by the assembly in plenary session after 3 days of meetings in small discussion groups. As a nonpartisan, educational institution, the American Assembly takes no stand on the subjects it presents for public discussion. This same may be said of the Ford Foundation whose generosity made the entire 26th American Assembly possible.

Final report of the 26th American Assembly

At the close of their discussions the participants in the 26th American Assembly reviewed as a group the following statement. Although there was general agreement on the final report, it is not the practice of the American Assembly for participants to affix their signatures, and it should not be assumed that every participant necessarily subscribes to every recommendation.

We have discussed what steps might be taken to assure the continued vitality and effectiveness of the Congress of the United States. We feel a respect for the values underlying the American system of representative government, in which the Legislature is crucial. We desire to see those values perpetuated and reflected in institutions that

will protect freemen and provide the capacity for effective government.

Many of the problems of the Congress, and many of the criticisms and complaints directed at it, have roots in conditions affecting not only the United States but all representative governments. As these governments have been obliged to meet the problems created by the industrialization and urbanization, complicated almost beyond measure by persistent and critical issues of foreign policy, representative bodies have confronted a troublesome situation. The matters that they consider are far more significant, numerous, and complex than those of their predecessors half a century ago. Little can be done to alter these conditions, but something can be done to improve the capacity of the institutions that must deal with them.

These problems that the Congress shares with other parliamentary bodies are paralleled by others that arise from distinctively American arrangements: the constitutional separation of President and Congress, the decentralizing effects of federalism, and the structure and practices of the House and Senate that frequently reflect long tradition and distinctive styles in our political life. One need not assume fundamental changes of a constitutional character in order to conclude that changes are both desirable and possible of achievement. In meeting these problems we may help to assure a Congress whose role in America's future is vigorous and worthy of the respect of free and intelligent men.

Three specific sets of convictions have guided our deliberations:

1. The distinctive functions of the Congress must be maintained. Congress must retain and strengthen its capacity to bring critical political judgment to bear on the major issues of the day. Congress thus can function more effectively in relation to the increasingly active role of the President and his executive associates in the initiation of legislative proposals. In consequence it will better reflect the broad wisdom available in our total political system.

If the Legislature is to perform this basic function, the Members of Congress must also continue to handle problems of their individual constituents. Such activities, far from being a handicap to the Congress, provide a sympathetic link between citizens and the bureaucracy. The Congress must also maintain its oversight of the decisions and actions of executive officials. Both service to constituents and oversight of the executive agencies are subject to abuse, but their proper exercise is necessary to the American system.

2. The vigor of the Congress as a legislative body and the effectiveness of our constitutional arrangements require that the Congress warrant and command the confidence and respect of the electorate. A Congress able and equipped to discharge its central functions rationally, expeditiously, and with integrity is essential to the survival of representative government in this country.

3. If the Congress is to perform these functions well, ways must be found to strengthen the elected leadership in the House and Senate—chiefly the Speaker and the floor leaders—and through that leadership to assure that the majority sentiment of the Congress is effectively expressed. Individuals or minorities in the Legislature must not be permitted to frustrate the will of a majority, whether in a standing committee or in one or both of the Houses.

This conviction is not inconsistent with a due regard to the rights of a minority or in conflict with the continuation and encouragement of expertness in the standing committees. Such competence is essential to the effectiveness of the Congress. But no single committee in either House can be assigned a jurisdiction broad enough to achieve coordinated action in such complex areas as

national security policy and national economic policy. If such action is to be achieved in the Congress, it should be accomplished through the central leadership.

In support of these general convictions we recommend:

1. The system of designating chairmen and ranking minority members of the standing committees on the basis of seniority must be modified. There is merit in the seniority principle, provided some choice is offered to the majority and minority parties in each House. We suggest that the choice be made either by the elected leaders in each House or by secret ballot in the caucuses of each party, in either case from among the three senior party members of each committee.

2. No Senator or Representative should be permitted to become or to remain a committee chairman, Speaker, or floor leader after reaching the age of 70. This provision should not apply to incumbents.

3. Any Representative or Senator should be permitted to retire on full pay after reaching the age of 70, provided that he has had at least 10 years of service in the Congress.

4. The rules of the House should be amended to provide that signature of a discharge petition by 218 Members or by 150 Members and the Speaker be sufficient to bring any bill out of committee and before the House.

5. In the Senate the majority leader should be authorized to offer a motion designating any bill a major item of legislation. Adoption of this motion would require the committee to which that bill had been assigned to report it to the Senate within 30 calendar days.

6. The Rules Committee of the House must be at all times an instrument of the leadership of the House. To this end the Speaker might be restored to his position as chairman of the committee. Alternatively, he might be given authority in each Congress to appoint its majority members, including the chairman. At minimum, the Speaker of the House should be empowered to call up a special rule for the consideration of any bill on which the Committee on Rules has failed to act for 21 calendar days.

7. The Committee on Rules should have no part in determining whether a bill passed by the House should be sent to conference with the Senate. Agreement to conference and on instructions to conferees should be by majority vote on a privileged motion by the majority leader.

8. Freedom of debate in a legislative body has value, even at the cost of delay, but its abuse in the form of a filibuster exposes the Senate and the Government of the United States to ridicule and may dangerously delay action. Such tactics should be restrained so that a majority can act after a dissenting minority has had adequate opportunity to be heard.

The present cloture rule is inadequate for this purpose. At the least the Senate should amend its present rule to provide for the adoption of a cloture petition by three-fifths of those present and voting.

9. At the start of each Congress a simple majority of the Senate should have the power to adopt and amend its rules without prejudice to the concept of the Senate as a continuing body for other purposes.

10. Further to assure majority control of legislation, a majority of the Members from each House designated to serve on a conference committee should have indicated by their votes general agreement with the bill as passed by that House.

11. Each Chamber should adopt and enforce effective procedures to protect the constitutional and other traditional rights of citizens called before its committees.

12. The growing practice of requiring that administrative agencies obtain permission from or "come into agreement" with committees or subcommittees of the Congress, or

their chairmen, before taking action, exceeds the proper bounds of congressional oversight of administration and subverts Presidential responsibility. It grants arbitrary power to chairmen of committees or subcommittees that is not subject to account. The practice should be abandoned.

13. Campaign costs are excessive; requirements for reporting on contributions are ineffective; and existing ceilings on expenditures are unrealistic. The consequences too frequently are waste, deception, and corruption. To correct these evils:

(a) Time on television and radio stations should be made available by law to candidates for Congress.

(b) Ceilings should be raised to realistic levels, but legislation governing campaign contributions and expenditures should provide for full and prompt reporting to an agency designated by Congress responsible for complete disclosure. These reports should be public property, should be locally available, and should cover all receipts and expenditures on behalf of any candidate for the House or Senate in a primary or general election.

(c) The income tax laws should be amended to encourage campaign contributions by a larger number of persons, thus reducing candidates' dependence on a small number of large donations.

14. Respect for the Government requires respect for its individual officials. Each Senator and Representative and all Presidential appointees should be required to report annually their financial interests and the sources of their income.

Furthermore, the number of Members of the House and the Senate holding Reserve commissions in the military forces while serving in the Congress is a cause for concern. We regard this practice as undesirable and of doubtful constitutionality.

15. The standing committees in their specialized jurisdiction serve the Congress well, but no adequate overview in Congress is taken of such large areas as national security policy and national economic policy. Responsibility for dealing with this difficult problem should lie with the elected leadership, and these leaders should be adequately staffed for this purpose. The executive performance in this area needs to be improved, but much more needs to be done on the legislative side.

16. The Congress should divest itself of direct responsibility for the Government of the District of Columbia.

17. We agree with the recent decision of the Congress to increase salaries of Senators and Representatives, and we recommend that salaries, allowances, and staff services be kept at a level commensurate with the dignity and responsibilities of these offices.

18. A majority of participants who considered this report favor a 4-year term for the Members of the House of Representatives, with elections in the presidential years.

Participants of the 26th American Assembly

Arthur G. Altschul, partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co., New York.

Stephen K. Bailey, dean, Maxwell School, Syracuse University.

Margaret M. Ball, dean, Woman's College, Duke University.

Richard J. Barnet, codirector, Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, D.C.

Joseph W. Barr, chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, D.C.

Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr., president, Lincoln Liberty Life Insurance Co., Houston.

Philip Broughton, Pittsburgh.

John Anthony Brown, Jr., vice president, George Washington University.

Frank Caizzi, Harriman scholar, Columbia University.

Holbert N. Carroll, chairman, Department of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh.

CLIFFORD P. CASE, U.S. Senator, New Jersey.

JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania.

Benjamin V. Cohen, Washington, D.C.

Earl Coke, vice president, Bank of America, San Francisco.

William T. Coleman, Jr., Dilworth Paxson, Kalish, Kohn & Dilks, Philadelphia.

Arthur G. Coons, president, Occidental College.

John J. Corson, professor of public and international affairs, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University.

Ovid R. Davis, vice president, Coca-Cola Co., Atlanta.

Philip Donham, Arthur D. Little Co., Cambridge, Mass.

Eleanor Lansing Dulles, research associate, Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University.

Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Washington, D.C.

Richard F. Fenno, Jr., professor of political science, University of Rochester.

Robert H. Finch, Finch, Bell, Duitsman & Margulis, Los Angeles.

Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer, American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington, D.C.

George B. Galloway, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Bernard L. Gladieux, vice president, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc., New York.

James A. Gorrell, Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease, Columbus, Ohio.

Edward H. Harte, president, Corpus Christi Caller Times, Texas.

H. Field Haviland, Jr., director, foreign policy studies, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Frank Hawkins, editor, editorial page, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pennsylvania.

Thomas A. Henderson, Harriman scholar, Columbia University.

Donald G. Herzberg, executive director, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University.

Merritt D. Hill, president, J. I. Case Co., Racine.

Allen C. Holmes, Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, Cleveland.

Ralph K. Hult, professor of political science, University of Wisconsin.

Samuel P. Huntington, professor of government, Harvard University.

Evron M. Kirkpatrick, executive director, American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Allan B. Kline, Western Springs, Ill.

John D. Lane, Hedrick & Lane, Washington, D.C.

Sol M. Linowitz, chairman, Xerox Corp., Rochester, N.Y.

William P. McClure, McClure & Trotter, Washington, D.C.

David McDonald, Harriman scholar, Columbia University.

Carl McGowan, judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, Washington, D.C.

Marshall McNeill, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, Washington, D.C.

Arthur Maass, professor of government, Harvard University.

David W. MacEachron, director of program, Council on Foreign Relations, Inc., New York.

Harvey C. Mansfield, professor of political science, Ohio State University.

Carl Marcy, chief of staff, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Washington, D.C.

Roger G. Mastrude, vice president, Foreign Policy Association, New York.

Robert Molyneux, Newspaper Enterprise Association, Cleveland.

Frederic A. Mosher, executive associate, Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.

Emil Narick, assistant general counsel, United Steel Workers of America, Pittsburgh.

Richard E. Neustadt, professor of government, Columbia University.

N. B. Obbard, executive vice president, United States Steel Corp., Pittsburgh.

Michael O'Leary, assistant director, Public Affairs Center, Dartmouth College.

Albert J. Rosenthal, professor of law, Columbia University.

John S. Saloma III, professor of political science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Howard D. Samuel, assistant president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, New York.

Wallace S. Sayre, professor of public law and government, Columbia University.

William V. Shannon, editorial board, New York Times.

Robert F. Steadman, director, Committee for Improvement of Management in Government, CED, Washington, D.C.

Theodore Tannewald, Jr., Well, Gotshal & Manges, New York.

A. W. Tarkington, president, Continental Oil Co., Houston.

David B. Truman, dean, Columbia College, Columbia University.

David A. Valenti, president, Allied Stores of Michigan, Grand Rapids.

Franklin Wallick, United Auto Workers, Washington, D.C.

Francis O. Wilcox, dean, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University.

About the American Assembly

The American Assembly was established by Dwight D. Eisenhower at Columbia University in 1950. It holds nonpartisan assemblies of American leaders and publishes authoritative books to illuminate issues of U.S. policy.

An affiliate of Columbia, with offices in the Graduate School of Business, the assembly is a national educational institution incorporated under the State of New York.

The assembly seeks to provide information, stimulate discussion, and evoke independent conclusions in matters of vital public interest.

American assembly sessions

Currently two national programs are initiated each year. Authorities are retained to write background papers presenting essential data and defining the main issues in each subject.

About 60 men and women representing a broad range of experience, competence, and American leadership meet for several days to discuss the assembly topic and consider alternatives for national policy.

All assemblies follow the same procedure. The background papers are sent to participants in advance of the assembly. The assembly meets in small groups for four or five lengthy periods. All groups use the same agenda. At the close of these informal sessions participants adopt in plenary session a final report of findings and recommendations.

Regional, State, and local assemblies are held in every major area of the United States. A number have already been scheduled following the national session at Arden House, on the Congress and America's future—with Occidental College, Tulane University, George Washington University, the University of Oregon, and the U.S. Air Force Academy.

Assemblies have also been held in Canada, Europe, Asia, and Latin America. Over 70 institutions have cosponsored one or more assemblies.

American assembly books

The background papers for each assembly program are published in paper and hard cover editions for use by individuals, libraries, business, public agencies, nongovernmental organizations, educational institutions, discussion and service groups. In this way the deliberations of assembly sessions are continued and extended.

The background papers for the 26th American Assembly will be published under the title, "The Congress and America's Future," by Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Arden House

Home of the American Assembly and scene of the national session is Arden House, which was given to Columbia University in 1950 by W. Averell Harriman. E. Roland Harriman joined his brother in contributing toward adaptation of the property for conference purposes. The buildings and surrounding land, known as the Harriman Campus of Columbia University, are 50 miles north of New York City.

Arden House is a distinguished conference center. It is self-supporting and operates throughout the year for use by organizations with educational objectives. The American Assembly is a tenant of this Columbia University facility only during assembly sessions.

The American Assembly, Columbia University Trustees

Dwight D. Eisenhower, honorary chairman, Pennsylvania.

Arthur G. Altschul,¹ New York.

William Benton, Connecticut.

Courtney C. Brown, ex officio, New York.

William P. Bundy, Washington, D.C.

John Cowles, Minnesota.

George S. Craft,¹ Georgia.

Marriner S. Eccles, Utah.

Thomas K. Finletter, New York.

Alfred M. Gruenther, Nebraska.

W. Averell Harriman, New York.

H. J. Heinz II, Pennsylvania.

Oveta Culp Hobby, Texas.

Grayson Kirk, ex officio, New York.

Allan B. Kline, Illinois.

Leonard F. McCollum, Texas.

Don G. Mitchell, New Jersey.

Clifford C. Nelson, ex officio, New Jersey.

Robert W. Woodruff, Georgia.

Henry M. Wriston, ex officio, Rhode Island.

Officers

Henry M. Wriston, chairman.

Clifford C. Nelson, president.

Paul M. Elsele, secretary.

Olive B. Haycox, treasurer.

Mary M. McLeod, assistant to the President.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator and student of government who opened the session of the American Assembly was none other than the able senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], who is in the Chamber. He did not remain in the sessions very long. I came up, after he had left, and participated in the discussions for one afternoon and part of another morning. I did not stay very long either, because the Senator from New Jersey and I were, at that time, engaged in aiding some of the candidates of our respective political parties in the election which took place on the 3d of November last. He and I were the only Members of Congress who attended the meetings, although an able former Representative from Texas, who is no longer in the House, stayed on through the sessions.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania agree that perhaps it would have been better for our respective beneficiaries if we had stayed there instead of attempting to aid them? I did not have very good luck in New Jersey with the Senator's candidate, and the Senator

from Pennsylvania had a rather tough time in his own State in the same manner.

Mr. CLARK. While there is a germ of truth in what the Senator from New Jersey has said, nevertheless, I was pleased indeed with the results of the presidential election both in New Jersey and in Pennsylvania; and I suspect my good friend the Senator from New Jersey was not particularly chagrined himself.

Mr. CASE. I was discussing and will continue to limit my comments to the Senate campaigns in our respective States.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to hear that that is the Senator's intention.

Mr. CASE. In regard to the substance of the Senator's remarks, I thank the Senator for his kind references to my participation in the American assembly. The recommendations which the distinguished body made as a result of its deliberations were most useful. The Senator will point out that practically every single one of them requires an amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I agree with the Senator. I am hoping to cover the 18 recommendations. Since we are dealing with this problem in a leisurely fashion this afternoon, with almost every Senator absent from the Chamber, I ask my friend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], whether he does not agree with the Senator from New Jersey and me that the overwhelming majority of these recommendations could not result in recommendations which the joint committee could consider.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator from Pennsylvania tell me whether the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Pennsylvania agree with the recommendations, and wholeheartedly subscribe to all of them? Some of them seem drastic and radical to this old-fashioned Senator from Oklahoma, such as retirement at full pay at the age of 70 with only 10 years of service.

Mr. CLARK. I will come to that subject in a moment. If my good friend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] would be willing to bear with us for a moment and remain in the Chamber, I believe that we can both enlighten the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. This is a subject which those of us approaching 70 might well enjoy, but we have had experience in enacting past retirement programs and recognize the need to pay into the retirement fund enough money to keep it afloat. Yet here we would not make any contribution to the fund and yet would retire at 70, even if we had served only 10 years. This would be on a salary of \$30,000 a year.

Mr. CLARK. I would prefer to deal with that subject seriatim, but I shall let the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] take on the Senator from Oklahoma right now on that point. I shall return to it later.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. I am glad that the Senator from Oklahoma brought up this ques-

tion, because this is the only one of those recommendations which it would be possible for the joint committee to consider, because it does not involve the rules and practices and procedures of the Senate. I happen to disagree with this recommendation. If we take out what we disagree with in the Senator's resolution as now constituted, it would permit us to have precisely nothing.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I see no restriction that would prohibit consideration of the seniority system if they chose to do so. Of course, we do not have to worry about the seniority system being a violation of the rules, because the rules do not describe the seniority system.

Mr. CLARK. But it is not only the rules they will not let us look into; it is also the practices and procedures, and the hallowed traditions of both bodies. If there is anything which is clearly engraved on the sacred practices and procedures of the Senate, it is the seniority system.

Mr. MONRONEY. But operated by declaration of the Senate. The seniority rules govern rank in the committees, as the distinguished Senator knows, and have very little reference to the floor procedure.

Mr. CLARK. I am not talking about floor procedure, and never have. There are all kinds of things which have nothing to do with the floor, with which the rules of parliamentary procedure, practices, and precedents of either House deal, and one could not look into them, in my opinion.

Mr. MONRONEY. We did look into them. We spent much time trying to determine a suitable substitute for the seniority system, but no one came up with anything better than the one we had.

Mr. CLARK. My quarrel with the Senator is not that he looked into it—although I am glad that he did—but that he had no right to look into it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator keeps slipping off base. We are not advertising that we are going out in a search for the "broad horizon," but under the resolution it is the good judgment of the committee that limits what it looks into. The stated restriction is on what we recommend. I repeat that one of the reasons for the restriction on what we recommend is that we must go before the Rules Committee of the Senate, of which the distinguished Senator is a member, and we must go before the Rules Committee of the House—on which we have no members—and we must ask for permission to report on a bill directly from the special committee, which the distinguished Senator knows is an unusual procedure.

But, if we cannot do that, we might as well kiss any hope of reorganization goodbye. We have to go to the Rules Committee and ask for its consent to bring one bill, and one bill only, before the Congress—House and Senate—without any other subsequent right to report any kind of legislation. But this "one

¹ Trustees elect.

shot" piece of legislation must be reported by the special committee—that is, the joint committee—or we might as well not look into anything.

Mr. MONRONEY. I fear the Senator has not followed me. I say, after we make our report and recommendations, we must go before the Rules Committees with a bill and humble ourselves to obtain permission to report it to the Senate or the House of Representatives as the case may be. No such authority is contained in this resolution, as I explained when I testified before the Rules Committee the other day. We must go to the Rules Committee of each House and ask for permission to report a bill, as though we were a legislative committee. That was the procedure in 1946. Unless we can follow this procedure, and consider proposed legislation in its entirety rather than dividing it among the Rules Committee and the Appropriations Committee and other committees that might wish to deal with it, there would be virtually no chance of having any reorganization effected.

Mr. CLARK. With all due respect, that comment is irrelevant. However, I say again that we have been over this ground before. I cannot see any sense in making a vast study of subjects on which no recommendations are allowed to be made. I cannot see why the Senator is so frightened at the idea of having recommendations made by the joint committee. As he points out, the recommendations are meaningless unless the Rules Committees approve them. Why should he be so afraid of recommendations on matters which very clearly call for drastic reforms?

Mr. MONRONEY. Because, we intend, if we are as fortunate as we were the previous time, to accomplish a great many reforms that need to be made. We all know that reforms or changes in the rules of the House and of the Senate are very difficult to obtain. Traditions and precedents of long standing are difficult to upset. Therefore, we could once again go for 20 years without effecting any changes, as we did between the time the 1946 act was passed and the act that we hope will soon be forthcoming.

Because of the difficulties that exist, we need to have an overall look at the situation, in an attempt to wrap up a package that will be considered by both Houses and passed by both Houses. If we should incorporate in it anything that might cause a policy dispute, anything that might be intermingled with other matters which are highly controversial among Members of Congress in either House, we would not stand much chance of bringing about any reforms. In such a case there would be a tendency to block the whole attempt. We would destroy any chance of obtaining any reforms.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator is an excellent advocate of government by consensus. He has strong support from the White House. I do not fear to say that government by consensus from the White House will not last much longer than it is now lasting in Congress. We know that in Congress we very largely legislate by unanimous consent. Our trouble is that we cannot legislate by the sacred principle of majority rule, on

which the Constitution was founded. We must legislate by unanimous consent, or by consent arrived at by two-thirds of the Members present and voting after a cloture petition is filed, which can drag on and on, as it dragged on for more than 3 months last year before we were able to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Unless we can change the rules of the Senate and a number of the rules of the House, so that a majority can act when a majority is ready for action, in order that the President's recommendations can be voted up or down, and passed or defeated without being stopped by a small, willful minority, who are opposed to the President and a majority in Congress, this well-established, old, and revered tripartite form of government of ours, created to preserve the balance of power and to prevent tyranny by the executive, will go down the drain in our lifetime, just as other parliamentary bodies in the free world are in danger of going down the drain, because we will not have been able to restore the vital sap in this branch to enable it to perform its constitutional duties.

Mr. President, I apologize to my friend from Oklahoma, for the fervor of my remarks. I know he does not agree with me. There is no reason why he should.

I ask my friend from Oklahoma to turn now to the 18 recommendations of the American Assembly of Arden House. There are a few recommendations that do not apply. I ask him whether these could not be the subject of recommendations by the joint committee. The first recommendation is:

1. The system of designating chairmen and ranking minority members of the standing committees on the basis of seniority must be modified. There is merit in the seniority principle, provided some choice is offered to the majority and minority parties in each House. We suggest that the choice be made either by the elected leaders in each House or by secret ballot in the caucuses of each party, in either case from among the three senior party members of each committee.

Does not the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that the proviso in the resolution, to which I raise objection, prohibits recommendations with respect to any matter dealing with the rules, procedures, and practices of either House, and would make it impossible for the committee to make recommendations regarding this matter?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not certain. I would be quite reluctant to see the "establishment," to which the Senator has alluded so often, placed in charge of naming committee chairmen without reference to any factor other than the personal choice among certain senior Members. The distinguished Senator has written very eloquently on the establishment a number of times. I would hesitate to give the so-called establishment the right to select committee chairmen from a list of three or four Senators who might have the most seniority.

Mr. CLARK. The question is not, as the Senator well knows, whether this particular recommendation is sound. Does not the Senator agree that the subject of seniority is prohibited in terms of a recommendation being brought back, under the proviso?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would not agree that it is prohibited. The recommendation is one which I believe would have to be thought out by all concerned, because I seriously doubt that many Members who have accumulated seniority would like to see themselves bumped off because they might refuse to campaign in a caucus of a party.

I have been through that kind of situation, and I would not like to submit myself to it again at a time when I might have reached some seniority and be close to being chairman of one of the three committees on which I serve.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in my opinion, as one who has practiced law nearly all his adult life, I say that the first recommendation could not be looked into and could not be a subject of recommendation by the joint committee. Does the Senator agree, or would he reserve judgment on whether or not I am correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would reserve judgment on that point. I would wish to get the opinion of the legislative drafting service on whether that would or would not constitute a prohibition. I doubt that it would be a prohibition.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator believe the joint committee should be permitted and, indeed, encouraged, to look into the matter of the seniority system, to see whether it is a good system?

Mr. MONRONEY. I went through the last reorganization with the same set of rules. A great deal of testimony was taken from a great many witnesses. A great many witnesses appeared to testify regarding this subject with many different ideas, including ideas similar to this one.

They did not discuss the seniority system. They did not discuss sought-for cures for it, because we had page after page of testimony upon which no restriction was placed. As the witnesses appeared before the committee, the testimony was given in full. If the number of paragraphs or words that involved the question of seniority were counted, I believe it would be found to have been the top-ranking item of discussion in the testimony of most of the witnesses that appeared before the committee.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps to make some additional legislative history, as we discussed, would the Senator agree with me that it would be highly desirable that the joint committee should be permitted and encouraged to make recommendations dealing with the seniority system in the course of its report?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would not say that there would be recommendations unless I had an analysis from the Legislative Reference Service or the Legislative Drafting Service as to whether they consider that from a legal standpoint we would be bound by that language.

I repeat that there were no inhibitions upon receiving the testimony in full, and from almost every witness who appeared we heard something about the seniority system. But no one has ever offered a better solution than the one that we heard in the testimony produced by the committee, whatever it was. It would be up to the 12 members, 6 on each side,

to determine what would be done. It is possible that the six Members on the Senate side would decide that retention of the seniority system would be desirable, and yet the House Members might decide the other way.

Mr. CLARK. We have been over that ground before. As the Senator knows, the key word is "recommendation."

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. If the Senator will permit me, I merely wish to ask him if he does not think that the Senator from Oklahoma is likely to be a member of the joint committee.

Mr. CLARK. I would be disappointed if he were not the chairman.

Mr. CASE. I would be most disappointed if he were not a leading member, as I am sure he will be. But, so far as he is concerned, I am rather reassured that he would not feel that any witness who chose to discuss the seniority system in all of its ramifications would be out of order.

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed not. I was vice chairman of the committee that formerly studied the question. If the Senator will refer to the hearings at that time, he will find that almost every day there was some reference to the seniority system and discussion of the subject. I feel that the investigation would be open to all viewpoints, and that nothing would be prohibited from the study that was relevant and germane.

Mr. CASE. And the subject which we have been discussing would be relevant to that broad objective.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes, indeed. I should like to refer the specific question to the Legislative Reference Service or the Legislative Drafting Service, who are experts in that field. I am not a lawyer.

Mr. CASE. The Senator is very fair. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Pennsylvania in yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. If I may have the attention of my friend the Senator from Oklahoma again, I call his attention to the second recommendation of Arden House American Assembly, which reads as follows:

No Senator or Representative should be permitted to become or to remain a committee chairman, Speaker, or floor leader after reaching the age of 70. This provision should not apply to incumbents.

Does not the Senator agree that any proposal dealing with the qualifications, whether in terms of age or anything else, of committee chairmen, Speakers, or floor leaders would require a vast change in the present rules, procedures, practices, and precedents of both Houses, and therefore could not be looked into by the committee?

Mr. MONRONEY. Certainly it could be looked into.

I would seriously question the wisdom of playing politics with the issue and saying, "We are not going to include any of you who are already on the rung of the ladder where you might be considered for the assignment of committee chairman."

The proposal is political rather than idealistic in its treatment of what to do about that question. It would concern

those who had reached toward the age of 70 and who had also reached the higher rungs on the ladder when they might be only a step from the chairmanship of a committee, after having served on the committee some 20 years, perhaps hoping that the mantle would fall on them.

I admit that if anything is ever to be done about seniority, the seniority that has already been earned by Members of this body and the other body, on both sides of the aisle, would have to be ignored.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is astute in an effort—and I do not blame him—to get me to debate the merits of each of these proposals.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am merely attempting to be practical.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to know whether the Senator believes that what I have read is a subject on which the committee would be permitted to make recommendations. In my opinion, it is not.

Mr. MONRONEY. Again I must say, as I did in relation to the other question, that I would have to submit the question as to whether the committee would have a right to make such recommendations to someone more competent than I am, because I am not a lawyer. I could refer the question to the Legislative Reference Service or the Legislative Drafting Service, which have more competent legal counsel than I am able to supply.

Mr. CLARK. My suggestion to the Senator, which he will probably be reluctant to adopt, is that instead of going to that trouble, we should strike out the proviso.

Mr. MONRONEY. That would be the quick and easy approach to the question, but I think it would greatly complicate the passage of any meaningful measure—either for the establishment of a Committee on Reorganization or the adoption of the recommendations of such a Committee on Reorganization once the recommendations were drafted.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps, then, we should withdraw from the Senate further consideration of the measure until the Senator from Oklahoma could obtain the erudite opinion of legislative counsel, which I, too, believe would be very helpful. If the Senator wishes to do that tomorrow morning, I shall be glad to cooperate with him.

I turn now to the third recommendation of the Arden House American Assembly, which reads as follows:

Any Representative or Senator should be permitted to retire on full pay after reaching the age of 70, provided that he has had at least 10 years of service in the Congress.

I am in accord with my friend from New Jersey that the proposal is not very wise. Nevertheless, is it not true that if any such requirement is to be made, it could not come as a result of the recommendation from the joint committee, because consideration of that subject would clearly involve rather drastic changes in the rules of parliamentary procedure, practices, and precedents of both Houses?

Mr. MONRONEY. Is the Senator directing that question to me?

Mr. CLARK. I was asking the Senator whether or not he agreed with point

No. 3. Could the committee look into that subject?

Mr. MONRONEY. Point No. 3 is so ludicrous that I would not even apply the measuring yardstick to determine whether it would fall within the bounds of the committee's work. I do not believe that we would intend to give \$30,000 a year to a Member of Congress who had paid nothing into a fund for retirement and who had served only 10 years. The suggestion is rather typical of some fuzzy thinking. It is proposed that a Representative or a Senator should be permitted to retire on full pay after he had at least 10 years of service and had reached the age of 70. That is all there is to it.

I suppose the amounts that Senators and Representatives had carefully contributed to that fund would be paid back. Since the establishment of the fund in 1946, that fund has had a smaller outflow of cash than has been paid into it. Over the past 20 years a surplus of nearly \$2 million has been accumulated. That amount has been paid in by present Members of Congress and those who have retired.

One reason the fund has accumulated the amount which it now contains is that no Senator wishes to cease being a Senator upon reaching the retiring age of 65 or 70—

Mr. CLARK. Or 75, 85 or 90—that is one of the troubles.

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed. So the idea of retirement at 70 at full pay would be one thing that would cause Members of Congress to get into serious disrepute with their constituents.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is clever indeed in diverting me. He successfully diverted me, despite my strenuous efforts to the contrary, from the real question, which is whether or not the age for retirement and the terms of the retirement of Representatives and Senators would be an appropriate subject for the committee to make recommendations on, or whether under the proviso such recommendations would be forbidden. I do not happen to agree with that particular recommendation. I think it is too drastic. Nevertheless, a provision quite similar to that one is in effect in the Federal judiciary right now and is working very well.

I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Pennsylvania, as he so often does, has taken the words out of my mouth. The reason, in part, for the retirement program for the judiciary was that it would help to get rid of superannuated judges. I do not happen to favor it for the legislative branch, in view of the fact, among other things, that Congress now has an ample and good system, which is contributory, as the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out. I do not believe that it is what the Senator uncharitably called utterly ridiculous, or some words to that effect. There is a sound reason for it. I do not happen to agree with it.

Mr. CLARK. I share the view of the Senator from New Jersey.

I turn to the fourth recommendation of Arden House, despite the fact that the House of Representatives, in response

to its rules, parliamentary procedures and practices, has made the very change which Arden House recommended:

4. The rules of the House should be amended to provide that signature of a discharge petition by 218 Members or by 150 Members and the Speaker be sufficient to bring any bill out of committee and before the House.

To be sure, they made the change, not in the identical way recommended by Arden House, but they did make the change, and therefore, for the time being, that suggestion has been accomplished.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Did they include the "150 Members and the Speaker"?

Mr. CLARK. I do not believe they did.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not think so either. I think the 218 has been in and out, as a rule, for 7 years past. It has been an "on-again, off-again, gone-again, Finnegan" rule. I do not believe the Speaker was able to account for all those additional Members.

Mr. CLARK. About 68.

Mr. MONRONEY. That seems a little heavy for a Member, even though he be Speaker.

Mr. CLARK. I am inclined to agree, but again, we are getting at the merits of the proposal. The House acted in a little different way.

What they did was to adopt the 21-day rule and then to change the ratio of membership of the committees, to make them reflect the ratio of membership on the floor; thus, as a practical matter, making it far simpler to have legislation supported by the President reported by the committee to the House.

I turn now to the fifth of the Arden House recommendations:

In the Senate the majority leader should be authorized to offer a motion designating any bill a major item of legislation. Adoption of this motion would require the committee to which that bill had been assigned to report it to the Senate within 30 calendar days.

The purpose of that recommendation is to enable the leadership to bring to the floor, for reasonably prompt action, any major legislative recommendation of the President of the United States. Of course, that recommendation would require a substantial change in present Senate rules, procedures, and practices. So I take it that the Senator from Oklahoma would agree with me that it is in many ways one of the three or four most important reforms, and yet it could not be the subject of recommendation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would not this violate the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration? I presume it would do so.

Mr. CLARK. We are not talking about the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. This, in effect, is a simplified method of using a discharge petition, which, as the Senator knows, is not used in the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. I understand; but would not this proposal circumvent the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. CLARK. No, because, as the Senator knows, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, as contrasted with the House Committee on Rules, has nothing to do with determining what legislation shall be reported to the Senate. Proposed legislation reaches the floor of the Senate without the intervention of any legislative committee. It comes directly from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any other committee; but whether it is called up or is not called up, depends not on a standing committee of the Senate, but on the policy committee of the majority party. So to that extent the recommendation of the Arden House meeting quite clearly—and I think the Senator from Oklahoma would agree with me—could not be the subject of a recommendation by the joint committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I ask, in the light of this discussion, which I find quite interesting—and the proposals are quite interesting, as well—during all this concurrent consideration of how to revise and perfect our congressional system, how many days were consumed in generating these proposals?

Mr. CLARK. The assembly itself met for 3 full days.

Mr. MONRONEY. Three days?

Mr. CLARK. Before they took action, a series of briefing papers was prepared, under the editorship of Prof. David Truman, who is one of the outstanding experts in the country on congressional government. These papers were sent to all of us before we came to the meeting. They made a number of fairly specific suggestions as to what the report should contain.

Those in attendance at the Arden House meeting were divided into three panels. Each panel was given a specific series of areas of recommendations which were drawn from the briefing papers. We considered them in some depth. We had quite a lengthy discussion and we came forth with these recommendations. I believe most of them are sound.

I move on to the sixth recommendation, which reads as follows:

The Rules Committee of the House must be at all times an instrument of the leadership of the House. To this end the Speaker might be restored to his position as chairman of the committee. Alternatively, he might be given authority in each Congress to appoint its majority members, including the chairman. At minimum, the Speaker of the House should be empowered to call up a special rule for the consideration of any bill on which the Committee on Rules has failed to act for 21 calendar days.

As the Senator from Oklahoma knows, the House has adopted the 21-day rule; but it did so by changing its rules, procedures, and customs. Had this matter still been one of importance, instead of one that has already been adopted, I feel certain that the Senator would agree with me that it could not have been the subject of recommendation by the joint committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Primarily, it would not have been the subject of recommendation by the joint committee, because

of the constitutional limitation which prohibits one House from directing the other House what to do. To my way of thinking, concerning the colloquy earlier in the day with the Senator from Oregon, Senators should not be criticized for not interfering in House matters, nor House Members for not interfering with Senate matters. That is something that relates not to a limitation by resolution, but to the constitutional limitation that each House shall be the judge of its own rules. I would not wish to serve for 1 day on any committee that was considering reorganization, in which we could undertake to direct the House to change strictly House rules, and the House could direct the Senate to change strictly Senate rules.

When the original legislation was written and passed, it was done under special privilege, with a special rule being granted so that the bill could be reported directly. But it contained no rule changes for the House of Representatives; it contained only changes of Senate rules. Similarly, the bill introduced in the House affected only House rules.

For that reason, more than any other, while I as a former Member of the House approve the 21-day rule, I feel it would be exceeding the authority of the Senate or of Senate Members to try to tell the House how to conduct its committees, just as we would not wish the House to tell us how to operate our committees.

Mr. CLARK. I thought the Senator from Oregon and I had persuaded the Senator from Oklahoma a little earlier. I do not say this in any arrogant way; but the Senator from Oregon and I are lawyers, and it is a part of our training to interpret the Constitution of the United States. There is nothing unconstitutional in the charge given to the joint committee to make recommendations to both Houses as to what changes they wish to have made in the organization of Congress. After the recommendations have been received, the Senate or the House, in each case, has the sole authority to deal with its own rules.

I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma will agree with me now, as he did an hour or two ago, that the constitutional point is entirely irrelevant to what we are discussing. We are talking about recommendations.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am talking about recommendations, too; but I believe it is good policy to have each House keep its hands out of the internal affairs of the other House. If it is good practice under the Constitution, it is good practice under the rules and precedents. Certainly, without referring back to the prohibition, I should say it is not a practical matter to do what the Constitution tells us would be a violation.

Mr. CLARK. Let us agree that we are not talking about the Constitution; we are talking about recommendations made by a joint committee, as to which each House would have to act.

I refer back at this point in the argument to the comments I made earlier this afternoon to the effect that such recommendations could easily be made to the House by the House Members of the joint committee, and to the Senate by the

Senate Members of the joint committee, and thus avoid the alleged and, I believe, quite unfounded charge that one House was trying to tell the other House what to do.

I turn now to the seventh recommendation of Arden House, which reads as follows:

The Committee on Rules should have no part in determining whether a bill passed by the House should be sent to conference with the Senate. Agreement to conference and on instructions to conferees should be by majority vote on a privileged motion by the majority leader.

That has been done in the course of the House reforms of last January; but would not the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that that is just the kind of thing, had it not been done, that the Joint Committee ought to have looked into, but would be prohibited from looking into by the former concurrent resolution?

Mr. MONRONEY. No, I do not agree that it would be prohibited. The practice of permitting the conferees to put everything in conference by using the parliamentary practice or procedure of striking everything after the enacting clause is something that was intended to be considered. When conferees say that everything is in disagreement, it limits seriously the provisions adopted by the last Reorganization Act. The conferees thus change the whole meaning of the bill as it passed both Houses. If this is legal—and I presume it is, because no question was raised as to its legality—then as to any proposal of this nature—I would want to hear more testimony before committing myself to what the proper procedure was. I would not think it would be in violation of the restrictions under which the committee would operate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I think my friend again misconstrued either what I was talking about or what they were talking about. The Arden House recommendation deals only with the fact that until January of this year, unless unanimous consent was given in the House, under the rules of the House, a measure could not go to conference without the approval of the Rules Committee.

The Arden House people believed, and I agree, that that provision gave undue, arbitrary power to the Rules Committee. They recommended that it should be changed by changing the House rules. It was changed by a change in the House rules. The matter which the Senator has raised has nothing to do with the question we are talking about.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am merely trying to say to my good friend the Senator from Pennsylvania that under my interpretation of the rules under which we work, we can put that in a reorganization measure. The fact that it has already been done leaves the question moot.

Mr. CLARK. The question being dismissed concerns a change in the rule under which the conferees could operate. I agree with respect to that. The Arden House recommendations have nothing to

do with this issue. They had to do with the internal workings of the House.

Mr. MONRONEY. Previously, when a measure went to a conference, there would have to be unanimous consent to bring it back. Now this can be accomplished by the rules change. It is a part of the rules of the conference.

Mr. CLARK. Let me put it in this way: When a bill has passed the Senate in terms that are different from those of the House, the Senate bill goes back to the House side. An effort is made to obtain unanimous consent to send the bill to conference to iron out the differences between the two Houses. At that point, before the conference, unless unanimous consent is given, the bill cannot go to conference unless the House Rules Committee agrees.

That is why we so often say in this body that we have been legislating in the shadow of the House Rules Committee. That is entirely different from the point raised by the senior Senator from Oklahoma. I agree that the rule covering conferences might well come outside the scope of the rules of either house.

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

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the majority whip.

AUTHORIZATION TO ALL COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE TO MEET DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW UNTIL 1 P.M.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is planned that the Senate will meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that, between the hours of 11 and 12 tomorrow, during which time there will be a discussion of the labor shortage program by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and others, Senate committees may be authorized to meet while the Senate is in session.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I probably shall not, the Committee on Foreign Relations is meeting at 10 o'clock tomorrow to hear the Secretary of State on the foreign aid bill.

Under the Senate rules, all committees are permitted to sit while the Senate is in session during the morning hour. Would the Senator from Louisiana object drastically if we obtained permission for all committees to sit tomorrow until 1 o'clock? That would enable us to complete the hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I should like to be present. I am also anxious to be here for the debate on this measure.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I so amend the request.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from New Jersey, and I have conferred concerning the debate on the pending business. There are some 10 additional recommendations made by Arden House which I should like to discuss with the Senator from Oklahoma. There are some 27 recommended changes in the rules of the Senate which I have suggested. I should like to discuss those, perhaps a good deal more briefly, with the Senator from Oklahoma. It seems wise, to agree with our colleagues who wish to terminate the session at this point, to go over until tomorrow.

I wonder if the whip is in a position to agree that the debate on this particular measure would not be resumed until 1 o'clock. This would give us ample time to reach a vote before the Senate adjourns tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I did not know what additional debate might be necessary. But I should hope that we might proceed in an orderly fashion, and that the problem might not arise at all. In the event that it did, I am sure the leadership could arrange to notify the Senator and suggest the absence of a quorum prior to getting around to the amendments that the Senator wishes to discuss, so that he can be here to discuss them.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that can be done. I should also hope that the majority whip in discussing the matter with the majority leader would be able to arrange to put off the continuation of this debate until after 1 o'clock. I should be happy to assure both the majority leader and the majority whip that as far as I am concerned, I should be willing to vote at a reasonable hour tomorrow afternoon.

I would urge the majority leader that, at approximately 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, he ask unanimous consent to give perhaps 15 minutes or so additional time to a side, and then vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the majority whip was under the impression that the Senator from Pennsylvania has been ready to vote all day long provided that enough Senators were present to hear his argument and understand what he was advocating.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should not like to leave the record in such a condition. I would not say that I have been filibustering, but I have been engaged in an extended discussion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has the right to clear the impression that was left on the record.

The junior Senator from Louisiana gained the impression that the Senator from Pennsylvania was prepared to vote on either one or a number of his amendments as soon as he felt that Senators generally were aware of what he was proposing to do and the changes he had in mind.

I suggest that we go ahead with the unanimous-consent agreement that we have, and that those of us who try to represent the leadership here clear the matter with the Senator from Pennsylvania and try to alert him when the discussion on the labor problem comes to an end. I should not be at all surprised if the hour of 1 o'clock arrived and the discussion of the labor problem was still continuing, in addition to the morning business.

REPRINTING OF REMARKS BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ON UKRAINIAN PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is the intention of Representative Flood, of Pennsylvania, to reprint the remarks made by various Senators and Representatives on the occasion of the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian proclamation of independence in booklet form. If any Members of the Senate object to the reprinting of their remarks, kindly contact Mr. Raymond F. Noyes, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk. The purpose of this statement is to conform to the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that, under the previous order, the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 9, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 5, 1965:

REPRESENTATIVE TO 21ST SESSION OF ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND FAR EAST OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 21st session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 8, 1965:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be Lieutenant

Dee E. Kimbell

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Jack T. Conway, of Michigan, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The following-named persons to be Assistant Directors of the Office of Economic Opportunity:

Glenn W. Ferguson, of Maryland.

Otis A. Singletary, of North Carolina.

Theodore M. Berry, of Ohio.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted from the epistle of I Peter 5: 7: *Cast all your care upon Him, for He careth for you.*

Let us pray:

O Thou who are the Lord God Almighty, grant that we may meet the duties and responsibilities of this new week with a resolute faith in the guiding and sustaining presence of Thy spirit.

May we share the blessings of Thy divine providence with the needy members of the human family and in a spirit that is truly indicative of a personal interest in their welfare and happiness.

Inspire us with a clear understanding and appreciation of the greatness and glory of the ideals and principles of our democracy which we cherish.

May we feel the constraints and certainty of its ultimate triumph when men and nations shall be members of the kingdom of peace and brotherhood.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 5, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

THE SELMA, ALA., SITUATION

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at Selma yesterday, a savage attack was made upon American citizens attempting to secure their right to vote. This storm-trooper-style action was undertaken at the direction of a reckless demagog. It must have shocked and shamed every decent American.

Our Speaker, JOHN MCCORMACK, properly described yesterday's unconscionable activities at his press conference this morning as a "disgraceful exhibition of arbitrary power."

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the advocates of States rights now are calling for a convention

to amend our Constitution. If this misguided effort succeeds, the first duty of such a convention should be a reexamination of the doctrine of States rights as it affects constitutional rights.

The people of the United States cannot and will not condone outrages such as that which occurred at Selma yesterday.

STATE DEPARTMENT'S WHITE PAPER ON VIETNAM

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend I read an advertisement appearing in the New York Times called a reply to the State Department's white paper on Vietnam.

Apparently this advertisement is the brainchild of a publication known as I. F. Stone's Weekly. Fronting for this so-called independent weekly newspaper in solicitation of funds for a surrender in South Vietnam is a Dr. H. A. Crosby Forbes. As you can imagine, this article is critical of our actions and policies in South Vietnam and suggests very strongly that we should surrender and leave the people of South Vietnam to the Communists who are determined to force their will upon all freedom-loving people. Their arguments for surrender are just as shortsighted as Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's theory of "peace at any price" during the late 1930's in the United Kingdom's relations with Nazi Germany.

This article states that the North Vietnamese support for guerrillas in South Vietnam is no more of a secret than the U.S. support of the South Vietnamese Government against them. This is true but there is one very, very basic difference in these two positions—the U.S. Government is in South Vietnam at the invitation and urging of the South Vietnamese Government. The North Vietnamese Communists are supporting naked aggression against their neighbors, the south.

Stone's Weekly also suggested that we and the South Vietnamese Government have violated the Geneva Agreement on the partition of Indochina. We have not violated any such agreement because neither the United States nor the South Vietnamese Government were signatories to the Geneva accords.

It is time to support our President's position in Vietnam, instead of gutter-snipe attacks.

SCHEDULE FOR HEARINGS ON PRIVATE IMMIGRATION BILLS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members have inquired of me concerning the progress being made by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality on private bills which they have introduced. I am sure other Members who have introduced private bills are similarly interested.

Early in January, I requested the counsel assigned to the subcommittee by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to prepare a list of the bills ready for consideration, together with a summary of the individual case involved and to present this material to me as chairman of the subcommittee. Mr. Cline, the counsel assigned, has not yet met this request. As a consequence, the subcommittee has not been in a position to consider any of the pending private bills. As soon as the counsel assigned to the subcommittee meets my request, our subcommittee will then be in a position to announce hearings on private bills.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Crime has become a malignant enemy in America's midst.

Since 1940 the crime rate in this country has doubled. It has increased five times as fast as our population since 1958.

In dollars the cost of crime runs to tens of billions annually. The human costs are simply not measurable.

The problems run deep and will not yield to quick and easy answers. We must identify and eliminate the causes of criminal activity whether they lie in the environment around us or deep in the nature of individual men. This is a major purpose of all we are doing in combating poverty and improving education, health, welfare, housing, and recreation.

All these are vital, but they are not enough. Crime will not wait while we pull it up by the roots. We must arrest and reverse the trend toward lawlessness.

This active combat against crime calls for a fair and efficient system of law enforcement to deal with those who break our laws. It means giving new priority to the methods and institutions of law enforcement—

To our police, who are our frontline, both offensive and defensive, in the fight against crime. There is a great need not only for improved training of policemen but for all people to learn about, to understand, and to assist the policeman in his work;

To our courts, traditionally the symbol and guardian of our cherished freedoms. Local criminal courts are so overloaded that their functioning is impeded and their effectiveness weakened. More courts and judges is one answer, but

every possibility of improvement must be explored;

To our correctional agencies. We cannot tolerate an endless, self-defeating cycle of imprisonment, release, and re-imprisonment which fails to alter undesirable attitudes and behavior. We must find ways to help the first offenders avoid a continuing career of crime.

No right is more elemental to our society than the right to personal security and no right needs more urgent protection.

Our streets must be safe. Our homes and places of business must be secure. Experience and wisdom dictate that one of the most legitimate functions of government is the preservation of law and order.

Our system rejects the concept of a national police force. The protection responsibilities lie primarily with State and local governments.

That is right and proper.

Yet, crime is no longer merely a local problem. Every city, every State is troubled by the same hard statistical—and human—facts. The extent and seriousness of the problem have made it of great national concern.

Crime is as old as history. It is hardly new to America. But in our increasingly mobile, urban society, crime problems are not only greater, they are immensely more complex.

We have not stood idly by in the face of these problems. Many cities and States, as well as the Federal Government, have developed new programs reflecting their growing concern.

Yet the crime rate continues to increase.

The time has come now to check that growth, to contain its spread, and to reduce its toll of lives and property.

I believe the way to do so is to give new recognition to the fact that crime is a national problem—and to intensify our crime prevention and crime fighting at all levels of government.

THE ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

The starting point for such efforts is the individual citizen. Law enforcement cannot succeed without the sustained—and informed—interest of all citizens.

It is not enough to reflect our concern over the rise in crime by seeking out single answers or simple answers. They do not exist. The people will get observance of the law and enforcement of the law if they want it, insist on it, and participate in it.

It has been said, for example, that the fault lies with courts which "coddle criminals," or, on the other hand, that police officers do not observe the rights of the individual.

There is misunderstanding at times between law enforcement officers and some courts. We need to think less, however, about taking sides in such controversies and more about our common objective: law enforcement which is both fair and effective. We are not prepared in our democratic system to pay for improved law enforcement by unreasonable limitations on the individual protections which ennoble our system. Yet there is the undoubted necessity that society be

protected from the criminal and that the rights of society be recognized along with the rights of the individual.

As Mr. Justice Frankfurter once said:

A democratic society, in which respect for the dignity of all men is central, naturally guards against the misuse of the law enforcement process.

It has been said that the fault lies in poor living conditions, limited education, and the denial of opportunity.

Plainly, laws are less likely to command the respect of those forced to live at the margins of our society. Stability and order have little meaning and small advantage to those who exist in poverty, hopelessness, and despair.

The longrun solution to this view of crime is jobs, education, and hope. This is a goal to which this country is now committed. But we should remember that not all crime is committed by those who are impoverished or those denied equal opportunity. In any event, we cannot postpone our responsibilities to act against crimes committed today.

It has also been said that the fault lies in a deep moral decay, particularly among the young; that juvenile delinquency and high crime rates among younger adults have their origins in this decay.

In our increasingly complex society, it is becoming harder to perceive and maintain clear moral values. But the great majority of our young people lead law-abiding, creative lives. We need only look to the spirit which characterizes our youth today—the spirit of the Peace Corps, of VISTA, of commitment to the well-being and welfare of society. While crime by young people in our society is of very serious concern, it involves only a small proportion of our youth.

We must, in short, understand that the reasons for the growth of crime are many and complicated. We must accept hard facts at every turn. But like the related problems of poverty and of education, we must face them squarely if we are to succeed. And we must succeed.

Thus, while recognizing that the basic responsibility rests on local authorities, we must also recognize the burdens they now bear. To assist them in bearing these burdens successfully, I propose—

Increased Federal law-enforcement efforts;

Assistance to local law-enforcement efforts;

A comprehensive, penetrating analysis of the origins and nature of crime in modern America.

FEDERAL LAW-ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

The average citizen is most directly concerned with what is called crime in the streets. Crime of this kind—robberies, muggings, housebreakings—are the primary law-enforcement responsibility of State and local governments. When criminals cross State lines, however, Federal enforcement is also available. Thus, Federal, State and local investigators may all join to pursue the bank robber, the kidnapper or the auto thief. Federal assistance in these activities has been and can continue to be helpful.

In some areas, however, the Federal Government has a special responsibility—organized crime, narcotic and drug control, regulation of gun sales, and law-enforcement activities in the District of Columbia.

1. ORGANIZED CRIME

Organized crime is a cancer in the city. It has become an entrenched national industry. It embraces gambling, narcotics, stock and bankruptcy fraud, usurious loans, or corruption of public officials or labor-management relations.

Racketeering feeds on itself. Illegal gambling, for example, channels enormous profits to other criminal avenues. The citizen is the loser.

Organized crime also breeds lesser crime. The police in our large cities know from daily experience how much street crime results, for example, from narcotics addiction.

Perhaps the most alarming aspect of organized crime, however, is that it erodes respect for the law. Corrupting a public official may lend respectability to the racketeer, as it destroys the underpinning of law enforcement in a community.

Since 1961, the Federal Government has responded to this challenge in force. We have secured new legislative authority. We have achieved new levels of cooperation among the 26 different Federal law-enforcement agencies. We have achieved new prosecutive energy. The result has been a tenfold increase in racketeering convictions.

But this accomplishment represents a mere beginning. Much remains to be done.

Consequently, I am calling on the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the other heads of the Federal law enforcement arms to enlarge their energetic effort against organized crime. The Department of Justice will submit legislative proposals to the Congress to strengthen and expand these efforts generally.

I urge the prompt enactment of these measures.

2. DRUG CONTROL

The return of narcotic and marihuana users to useful, productive lives is of obvious benefit to them and to society at large. But at the same time, it is essential to assure adequate protection of the general public.

To meet these objectives, the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse recommended enactment of a Federal civil commitment statute to provide an alternative means of dealing with those narcotic and marihuana users likely to respond to treatment and achieve rehabilitation. The Commission also recommended that those penalty provisions of the Federal narcotics and marihuana laws requiring mandatory minimum sentences and precluding probation or parole be applied restrictively in order to provide a greater incentive for rehabilitation.

The Justice Department will shortly submit proposals for a Federal civil commitment statute to the Congress and for limiting the coverage of the mandatory minimum penalty sentences. The proposals will seek to the fullest extent con-

sistent with the public safety to give offenders a maximum opportunity for return to a normal life.

Increasing illegal sales of psychotoxic drugs, such as barbiturates and amphetamines, must be controlled. These sedatives and stimulants, taken so easily in pill form, have been termed the "dangerous drugs"—and with good reason. Senseless killings, robberies, and auto accidents have resulted from the radical personality changes induced by the indiscriminate use of these drugs. Because they are less expensive and more available than narcotics, these drugs appeal to a much broader cross section of our population, particularly the young.

Our existing legal weapons are inadequate. I therefore urge the Congress to enact legislation to control the abuse of these dangerous drugs without constricting their legitimate medical uses.

3. FIREARMS CONTROL

Drugs are, of course, only one cause of the rise in violent crime in the United States. Another significant factor is the ease with which any person can acquire firearms. Lee Oswald sent for and received a rifle through the U.S. mail. I believe that the people of the United States have learned, through the recent tragic loss of President Kennedy, the need for strengthened control.

Here the Federal Government's jurisdiction is limited. State and local action will be necessary. But at minimum, we must make effective local regulation of firearms possible by increasing Federal control over interstate shipment of firearms. In addition, limits must be imposed on the importation into this country of surplus military weapons and other used firearms.

I am proposing draft legislation to accomplish these aims. It would amend the Federal Firearms Act to prohibit firearms shipments in interstate commerce except among importers, manufacturers, and dealers licensed by the Treasury Department.

Mail-order sales to individuals would thus stop. The legislation would also strengthen the present statutory standards for Treasury Department licenses and prohibit licensees from selling firearms to persons under 21 years of age—or under 18 in the case of rifles and shotguns. Other provisions of this legislation are designed to make it feasible for the States to impose effective controls over firearms within their own boundaries. I urge the Governors of our States and mayors and other local public officials to review their existing legislation in this critical field with a view to keeping lethal weapons out of the wrong hands.

I recommend this legislation to the Congress as a sensible use of Federal authority to assist local authorities in coping with an undeniable menace to law and order and to the lives of innocent people.

4. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A fourth opportunity for Federal leadership is the Nation's Capital. As I said in my special message on the District of Columbia, we must improve law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice in the District. Wash-

ington shares with our large cities the special and acute problems associated with rapid urban population growth.

Both in its own right and as a model for other cities, Washington can and should be a focus for intensive efforts in crime prevention, the detection and prosecution of crimes, rehabilitation, and related activities.

To assist in this effort, I will shortly appoint the commission to which I referred in my message on the District of Columbia.

ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Whatever we may do to strengthen Federal law enforcement, the principal enforcement responsibility still rests on States and local governments—and that has become a very large burden indeed.

The cost of operating our police departments has risen by 50 percent in the last 5 years alone. Yet our law enforcement and corrections personnel are overworked. Our courts are overcrowded. Our penal and rehabilitative facilities and programs are understaffed or underdeveloped. To meet their large and growing burdens, State and local law enforcement agencies must have additional training and technical assistance from the Federal Government.

Federal assistance has long been provided in various forms to local law enforcement. Because of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's early recognition of the need for such assistance, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has provided a number of valuable services to State and local police organizations. It assists them with training activities and the FBI National Academy in Washington gives comprehensive instructions to State and local career law enforcement officers each year. The Federal Government also provides support for short-term vocational training for police officers and more extensive training in related fields through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Treasury Department provides instruction for narcotics enforcement personnel through the Bureau of Narcotics Training School.

The Federal Government has been giving active support to juvenile delinquency control efforts. Under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, programs have been developed to provide new approaches to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and to train needed personnel. Under this act important studies have shed new light on the complex causes of delinquency.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will shortly submit requests for urgently needed additional appropriations in this field. I support these proposals and request the Congress to act on them favorably and rapidly.

These are present and continuing endeavors. But we must do more. I believe a major opportunity lies in the development and testing of experimental methods of crime control. To this end, I am proposing the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. This legislation would authorize the Attorney General to assist State, local, and private groups to improve and strengthen crime control

programs and make generally available information as to their effectiveness.

This act would bolster present training programs for local law enforcement personnel and would support the development of new training methods. Fighting crime effectively under modern conditions requires professional police who are expertly trained in a variety of skills. The Federal Government now provides financial assistance for research and training in other professions—science, mathematics, foreign languages, medicine, nursing. Trained, professional law enforcement personnel are fully as essential to the preservation of our national health and strength—and no less deserving of increased Federal support.

This legislation would also authorize Federal support for the development of improved methods of enforcing criminal laws and administering justice. For example, experiments might be undertaken with different kinds and intensity of police coverage in high crime districts in order to learn more about the effective allocation of manpower. The effectiveness of different communication and alarm systems might be studied. By pilot projects in the administration of justice, we may find ways of making the judicial process fairer and speedier and the correctional process more effective.

The dissemination of information about projects supported under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act will be of substantial value to other communities in designing their own crime control programs.

PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION

The proposals which I have discussed are promising immediate approaches to a number of the specific problems of controlling crime. In the longer run we must also deepen our understanding of the causes of crime and of how our society should respond to the challenge of our present levels of crime. Only with such understanding can we undertake more fundamental, far-reaching, and imaginative programs.

As the first step, I am establishing the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The Commission will be composed of men and women of distinction who share my belief that we need to know far more about the prevention and control of crime. I will ask the Commission to make a comprehensive report to me by the summer of 1966 and to make interim reports when early action on the basis of its recommendations may be possible.

No agency of Government has ever in our history undertaken to probe so fully and deeply into the problems of crime in our Nation. I do not underestimate the difficulty of the assignment. But the very difficulty which these problems present and the staggering cost of inaction make it imperative that this task be undertaken.

It is of the utmost importance that the people of this country understand what is at stake in controlling crime and its effects. I believe therefore that the Commission should disseminate information

on its work and findings and build a broad base of public support for constructive action.

Typical of the examples of important and troubling questions on which I believe the Commission can furnish guidance are:

(1) How can law enforcement be organized to meet present needs?

In too many instances present divisions of responsibility for law enforcement reflect unexamined precedent rather than practical organization. In addition to exploring improved law enforcement and correctional techniques, the Commission can be helpful in suggesting possible reorganization of law enforcement functions and methods of achieving greater cooperation where there are separate responsibilities.

(2) What steps can be taken to create greater understanding by those involved in the administration of justice at the State and local level of the efforts of Federal courts to insure production of individual rights?

The Commission should seek understanding of the needs of those responsible for carrying out our criminal laws and the relationship to these needs of the historic protections our Nation has accorded to the accused. The Commission may well serve as a bridge of understanding among all those involved in the fair and effective administration of criminal justice.

(3) Through what kinds of programs can the Federal Government be most effective in assisting State and local enforcement?

The Commission can recommend new and imaginative ways in which the Federal Government can render assistance—without infringing on the primary responsibility of States and localities.

(4) Is the Nation as a whole providing adequate education and training opportunities for those who administer the criminal laws?

The Commission should evaluate the programs and institutions now available for law enforcement officers, correctional personnel and both prosecution and defense attorneys and make recommendations on necessary additions.

(5) What correctional programs are most promising in preventing a first offense from leading to a career in crime?

A large proportion of serious crimes is committed by persons who are previous offenders. Thus, reducing the total volume of crime is, to a large extent, a problem of reducing the rate of recidivism. The first offender's initial contact with our correctional system is often a turning point in his life. The Commission should consider how we can best insure that his first contact will be his last.

(6) What steps can be taken to increase public respect for law and law enforcement officers?

In a free land, order can never be achieved by police action alone, no matter how efficient. There must be a high level of voluntary observance of the law and cooperation with public authorities. Citizens too often shun their duty to report crimes, summon assistance, or cooperate with law enforcement in other

ways. In the light of recent examples of what happens when private citizens remain bystanders at tragedy, I hope the Commission will suggest means of improving public attitudes toward the individual's sense of responsibility to his community and to his neighbor.

These questions only illustrate those which this Commission must put to itself. It must also—

Consider the problem of making our streets, homes, and places of business safer;

Inquire into the special problems of juvenile crime;

Examine the administration of justice in our shockingly overcrowded lower courts through which so many citizens are herded wholesale;

Explore the means by which organized crime can be arrested by Federal and local authorities.

In its task, the Commission will not be working alone. In addition to its own staff and subpanels of experts in various fields and disciplines, it will have the close cooperation and support of representatives of the Federal Government.

I have directed the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to work closely with the Commission and to assist it in every possible way. Because of the importance of the Attorney General's responsibilities within the Federal Government for these problems—ranging from investigation and enforcement through administration of the Federal prison system—I anticipate that the Department of Justice and especially its newly created Office of Criminal Justice should take a particularly active role in assisting the work of the Commission.

The Commission also will work closely with representatives of State and local governments with such groups as the American Bar Association, the American Law Institute, State and local bar groups and appropriate law enforcement organizations; and with universities and other institutions and individuals engaged in important work in the social sciences, mental health, and related areas.

The task before the Commission is one of consummate difficulty and complexity. But it could scarcely be more important. I hope and expect that its work will be a landmark to follow for many years to come.

CONCLUSION

This message recognizes that crime is a national problem.

That recognition does not carry with it any threat to the basic prerogatives of State and local governments. It means, rather, that the Federal Government will henceforth take a more meaningful role in meeting the whole spectrum of problems posed by crime.

It means that the Federal Government will seek to exercise leadership and to assist local authorities in meeting their responsibilities.

It means that we will make a national effort to resolve the problems of law enforcement and the administration of justice—and to direct the attention of the Nation to the problems of crime and

the steps that must be taken to meet them.

This effort will involve great difficulties.

It will not produce dramatic, visible results overnight. But it is an effort we must begin now.

I ask the help of the Congress. I believe that these actions and proposals are soundly based and give promise of meeting urgent needs of a growing nation. I commend them to the American people and to the Congress and urge their prompt enactment.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 8, 1965.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SPECIAL REGULATIONS FOR AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the resolution (H. J. Res. 195) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the American Legion National Convention of 1966, to be held in Washington, D.C., to authorize the granting of certain permits to the American Legion 1966 Convention Corp. of the District of Columbia on the occasion of such convention, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the period of the American Legion National Convention of 1966, to be held in the District of Columbia on August 29, 30, and 31, and September 1, 1966, the Commissioners are authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure the preservation of public order and protection of life, health, and property; to make special regulations respecting the standing, movement, and operation of vehicles of whatever character or kind during said period; and to grant, under such conditions as they may impose, special licenses to peddlers and vendors for the privilege of selling goods, wares, and merchandise in such places in the District of Columbia, and to charge such fees for such privilege, as they deem proper.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent or agents;

(b) "Corporation" means the American Legion 1966 Convention Corporation of the District of Columbia, or its designated agents;

(c) "Convention" means the American Legion National Convention of 1966, to be held in the District of Columbia on August 29, 30, and 31, and September 1, 1966;

(d) "Period" and "convention period" mean the ten-day period beginning August 25, 1966;

(e) "Secretary of Defense" means the Secretary of Defense, or his designated agents; and

(f) "Secretary of the Interior" means the Secretary of the Interior, or his designated agents.

Sec. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, payable in like manner as other appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia, to enable the Commissioners to advance to the corporation's guaranty fund \$25,000, for the reimbursement of which the District shall have a prior claim on any moneys available to the corporation for repayment to guarantors, and to provide additional municipal services in said District during the convention period, including employment of personal services without regard to the civil service and classification laws; travel expenses of enforcement personnel, including sanitarians, from other jurisdictions; hire of means of transportation; meals for police, firemen, and other municipal employees; construction, rent, maintenance, and expenses incident to the operation of temporary public comfort stations, first-aid stations, and information booths; and other incidental expenses in the discretion of the Commissioners.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of such officer as may exercise jurisdiction over any of the Federal reservations or grounds in the District of Columbia, is authorized to grant to the corporation permits for the use of such reservations or grounds during the convention period, including a reasonable time prior and subsequent thereto; and the Commissioners are authorized to grant like permits for the use of public space under their jurisdiction. Each such permit shall be subject to such restrictions, terms, and conditions as may be imposed by the grantor of such permit. With respect to public space, no reviewing stand or any stand or structure for the sale of goods, wares, merchandise, food, or drink shall be built during the convention period on any sidewalk, street, park, reservation, or other public grounds in the District of Columbia, except with the approval of the corporation, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or the Commissioners, as the case may be, depending on the location of such stand or structure. The reservation, ground, or public space occupied by any such stand or structure shall, within ten days after the end of the convention period, be restored to its previous condition. The corporation shall indemnify and save harmless the District of Columbia, the United States, and the appropriate agencies of the United States against any loss or damage to such property and against any liability arising from the use of such property, either by the corporation or a licensee of the corporation.

Sec. 5. The Commissioners are authorized to permit the corporation to install suitable overhead conductors and install suitable lighting or other electrical facilities, with adequate supports, for illumination or other purposes. If it should be necessary to place wires for illuminating or other purposes over any park, reservation, or highway in the District of Columbia, such placing of wires and their removal shall be under the supervision of the official in charge of said park, reservation, or highway. Such conductors, with their supports, shall be removed within five days after the end of the convention period. The Commissioners, or such other officials as may have jurisdiction in the premises, shall enforce the provisions of this joint resolution, take needful precautions for the protection of the public, and insure that the pavement of any street, sidewalk, avenue, or alley which is disturbed or damaged is

restored to its previous condition. No expense or damage from the installation, operation, or removal of said temporary overhead conductors or said illumination or other electrical facilities shall be incurred by the United States or the District of Columbia, and the corporation shall indemnify and save harmless the District of Columbia, the United States and the appropriate agencies of the United States against any loss or damage and against any liability whatsoever arising from any act of the corporation or any agent, licensee, servant, or employee of the corporation.

Sec. 6. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to lend to the corporation such hospital tents, smaller tents, camp appliances, hospital furniture, ensigns, flags, ambulances, drivers, stretchers, and Red Cross flags and poles (except battle flags) as may be spared without detriment to the public service, and under such conditions as he may prescribe. Such loan shall be returned within five days after the end of the convention period, the corporation shall indemnify the United States for any loss or damage to any such property, and no expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, replacement, or operation of such equipment. The corporation shall give a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

Sec. 7. The Commissioners, the Secretary of the Interior, and the corporation are authorized to permit electric lighting, telegraph, telephone, radio broadcasting, and television companies to extend overhead wires to such points along and across the line of any parade as shall be deemed convenient for use in connection with such parade and other convention purposes. Such wires shall be removed within ten days after the end of the convention period.

Sec. 8. The regulations and licenses authorized by this Act shall be in full force and effect only during the convention period, but the expiration of said period shall not prevent the arrest or trial of any person for any violation of such regulations committed during the time they were in force and effect. Such regulations shall be published in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia and no penalty prescribed for the violation of any such regulation shall be enforced until five days after such publication. Any person violating any regulation promulgated by the Commissioners under the authority of this Act shall be fined not more than \$100 or imprisoned for not more than thirty days. Each and every day a violation of any such regulation exists shall constitute a separate offense, and the penalty prescribed shall be applicable to each such separate offense.

Sec. 9. Whenever any provision of this Act requires the corporation to indemnify and save harmless the District of Columbia and the Federal Government or any agency thereof against loss, damage, or liability arising out of the acts of the corporation or its licensee, or to give bond to an agency of the Federal Government guaranteeing the safe return of property belonging to such agency, the requirements of any such provision shall be deemed satisfied upon the submission by the corporation to the Commissioners and the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the several agencies of the Federal Government, of an insurance policy or bond, or both an insurance policy and bond, in such amount or amounts and subject to such terms and conditions, as the said officials in their discretion approve as being necessary to protect the interests of the respective governments.

Sec. 10. Nothing in this Act shall be applicable to the United States Capitol Buildings or Grounds or other properties under

the jurisdiction of the Congress or any committee, commission, or officer thereof.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that this bill provides for a \$25,000 appropriation to the District of Columbia or to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, whichever it is; may I ask the gentleman if that is correct?

Mr. McMILLAN. I understand they had a similar resolution when the American Legion had their convention here in 1954 and that all that money was paid back. It did not cost the District or the Federal Government any money whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. I would ask why this \$25,000 appropriation at all? Why should there be a \$25,000 appropriation?

Mr. McMILLAN. I understand it will be refunded.

Mr. GROSS. This is not an advance to the American Legion; this is an advance to the Commissioners?

Mr. McMILLAN. The American Legion would like the Commissioners to have this money for preparations to be made for the convention.

Mr. GROSS. Is the District government so strapped for money that it cannot come up with \$25,000 to stage this convention?

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not know; that is what they asked for.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. The gentleman says that the \$25,000 appropriated for the last American Legion Convention in Washington, D.C., was paid back. It was paid back to whom? Do I understand correctly—and I hope the gentleman will correct me if I am wrong—that this \$25,000 will come out of the Federal Treasury and be made available to the District of Columbia for the staging of this convention? If the \$25,000 is paid it will be paid from revenues accruing from the holding of the convention and will be paid to the District Commissioners, will it not, or to the District treasury? Nothing will come back to the Federal Treasury; is that correct?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. This money does not come from the Federal Treasury. This will be handled as a District item. The money will be placed in the hands of the District Commissioners to be used initially in making preparations for the convention of the American Legion. In 1954 we had a comparable situation; a comparable convention and a comparable advancement of funds, every penny of which was repaid and every bit of which in this instance will be repaid to the District at the conclusion of this particular convention.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman this question, then. There are no Federal funds involved?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is my definite understanding of the matter.

Mr. GROSS. It is the gentleman's understanding that there are no Federal funds involved. This simply authorizes an expenditure from the District treas-

ury for the purpose of staging this convention; is that correct?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is what the bill says; that is what I understand it to say. It says, "payable in like manner as other appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia."

Mr. GROSS. I thought the bill authorized the taking of \$25,000 from the general funds of the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the gentleman is mistaken. Even if it did come from general funds I think it would be a good investment. As in the past, this money will be refunded as it was at the time of the 1954 convention.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman hopes it will be.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am quite sure it will, because the Legion is a responsible organization.

Mr. GROSS. If this money were to come out of the Federal Treasury I would be constrained, when the appropriation bill comes up for the District of Columbia, unless repaid to the Federal Treasury—I would be constrained to offer an amendment to cut \$25,000 from the District of Columbia appropriation. I want the American Legion to have the finest possible convention in Washington but if public funds are to be used I want those funds to come from the District of Columbia treasury and not the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important bill, House Joint Resolution 195, which would permit the District of Columbia government to make all the vital official arrangements to accommodate the large numbers of American Legionnaires, their many guests, and their activities during the 10-day convention beginning August 25, 1966.

Every effort should be made by the Congress to insure the proper welcome, the comfort, the safety, and the smooth operation of the 1966 convocation of this splendid veterans organization. This bill will materially assist in the success of the convention next year.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the District Committee which unanimously reported this bill, I urge its immediate passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners and certain Federal officers to undertake such actions as may be necessary in connection with the American Legion Na-

tional Convention of 1966, to be held in the District of Columbia on August 29, 30, and 31, and September 1, 1966.

PRECEDENTS

This resolution is nearly identical to the resolution adopted by the Congress on July 28, 1964 (78 Stat. 337) in connection with the 91st annual meeting of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington in July of this year, and also to the act in connection with the American Legion, Convention of 1954—68 Stat. 743. It is patterned substantially also after the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1049).

Your committee wishes to point out that the only provision of this resolution which was not contained in House Joint Resolution 888 of the 88th Congress, which was adopted in connection with the forthcoming Shrine convention to be held this year, is the authorization for the appropriation of \$25,000 for advancement by the Commissioners to the guarantee fund of the American Legion National Convention Corp. of the District of Columbia. It is provided that the District shall have a prior claim for the reimbursement of this money, upon any moneys available to the corporation for repayment to guarantors. As a matter of fact, there was an identical provision in the resolution pertaining to the American Legion Convention of 1954, and in that instance the entire amount was repaid to the District.

REASONS FOR THE RESOLUTION

Your committee is informed that this convention is held annually in various cities all over the United States, and that the convention proposed to be held in Washington in 1966 will bring to the city some 25,000 to 35,000 persons associated with the American Legion. In addition, many other persons will be attracted to the city to witness the parade and other convention activities. This affair will, of course, result in the spending of a considerable amount of money in the District.

At the same time, however, conventions of this magnitude present special problems, such as the handling of large crowds, erection of reviewing stands for the parade, the need for special traffic regulations, and for rules and regulations incident to bringing special police officers in from out of town, and so forth. This resolution is designed, therefore, to provide the necessary authority to allow Federal officials and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to cooperate fully with the American Legion 1966 Convention Corp. of the District of Columbia in making this forthcoming American Legion convention in Washington a pleasant, safe, and memorable event.

The following is the letter from the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, under date of March 3, 1965, requesting this legislation and summarizing its principal provisions:

MARCH 3, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the

honor to submit a draft of a joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the American Legion National Convention of 1966, to be held in Washington, District of Columbia; to authorize the granting of certain permits to the American Legion 1966 Convention Corp. of the District of Columbia on the occasion of such convention; and for other purposes.

On the occasion of the American Legion National Convention of 1966, the resolution authorizes appropriate action to be taken to provide for the comfort and protection of all persons within the District of Columbia during the 10-day period of the convention. The resolution is patterned after the joint resolution approved July 28, 1964 (78 Stat. 337; Public Law 88-386), relating to the 91st Annual Session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America.

The resolution authorizes the Commissioners and certain specified Federal officials to deal with the special problems which will arise on the occasion of the 1966 National Convention of the American Legion, and which are expected to exert a heavy burden on the municipal services of the District of Columbia, and, to a certain extent, on the Federal Government. These problems relate principally to the handling of traffic and large crowds, and the erection of reviewing stands for the parade to be held in connection with the convention. In addition, there is need for increased services by the Metropolitan Police Department and the Department of Public Health to protect the personal safety and health of the citizens of the District and the many visitors who will be present in the District for the occasion. The Commissioners have been informed that the minimum number of persons associated with the American Legion expected to be present in the District during the convention period has been estimated at 25,000 to 35,000. This number of visitors, together with the many other persons who may come into the District to witness convention activities, will generate a need for increased activity on the part of the municipal government of the District of Columbia. The joint resolution is intended to provide authority for such an increase.

The principal provisions of the joint resolution are as follows:

1. The Commissioners are authorized and directed to make regulations to preserve peace and order, specially regulate traffic, and issue special licenses to peddlers and vendors, such regulations to be effective during the period of the convention, defined by the resolution as a 10-day period beginning August 25, 1966, and ending September 3, 1966, both dates inclusive.

2. Appropriations are authorized for advancement by the Commissioners to the corporation's guarantee fund of \$25,000, for the reimbursement of which the District shall have a prior claim on any moneys available to the corporation for repayment to guarantors; and to pay the cost of providing additional municipal services and to pay for other municipal expenses connected with the convention, estimated at \$250,000.

3. The Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioners are authorized to grant permits for the use of public space under their respective jurisdictions, subject to certain limitations imposed by the resolution.

4. The Commissioners are authorized to permit the installation of temporary electrical facilities of all kinds, also subject to certain limitations imposed by the resolution.

5. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to lend certain equipment belonging to the Department of Defense to be used in connection with providing for the well-being of the expected crowds, also subject to limitations imposed by the resolution.

6. The temporary placing of wires along and across the line of any parade for use by electric lighting and communications concerns is authorized.

7. The effective period of the regulations authorized to be adopted and a penalty for their violation (a fine of not more than \$100 or imprisonment for not more than 30 days) are prescribed.

8. The resolution requires the American Legion 1966 Convention Corp. of the District of Columbia to indemnify and save harmless the District of Columbia and Federal Government against loss, damage, or liability and provides that such requirements shall be satisfied by the corporation's submitting to the District of Columbia Commissioners and the Secretary of the Interior an insurance policy or a bond, or both, in such amounts and subject to such terms as these officials may deem adequate to protect the interests of the respective governments.

9. Finally, the resolution specifically exempts from its provisions the Capitol Building and grounds and other property under the jurisdiction of the Congress.

Legislation similar in scope to the draft resolution has been enacted in the past years when conventions and other public gatherings have brought large numbers of people into the District. The most recent enactment is the joint resolution approved July 28, 1964, relating to the 91st Annual Session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America.

The Commissioners, in the belief that the resolution will adequately provide for the safety and well-being of all persons in the District of Columbia during the period of the 1966 National Convention of the American Legion, recommend its approval.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

AUTHORIZING VFW TO RENT CERTAIN PROPERTY

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] to call up a bill which comes from his subcommittee.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 4338) to authorize the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to rent certain property in the District of Columbia for certain office purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4338

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States are authorized to lease or rent for office purposes to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or the District of Columbia or to any nonprofit organization any of the property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia by the Act of July 19, 1954, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 47-832).

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, immediately after "authorized" insert ", subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the Act of December 24, 1942 (D.C. Code, sec. 47-801b, 801c, and 801e)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH], the author of the bill.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I strongly endorse H.R. 4338 and express the hope that the House will pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, may I assure everyone here that there is no money involved in this legislation at all. It merely provides a zone variance so that the Veterans of Foreign Wars may rent two stories of their five-story building, located at 200 Maryland Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this proposed legislation—as set forth in House Report No. 142—is to authorize the Veterans of Foreign Wars to rent or lease any part of their Memorial Building, located at 200 Maryland Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia, for office purposes only, to any agency of the Federal or District of Columbia Governments or to any nonprofit organization.

Many years ago, the Veterans of Foreign Wars established offices in the District of Columbia to aid veterans, their widows, and their orphans with their petitions before various Federal agencies. Their services are free to all veterans and their widows and orphans, regardless of whether they are members or not. Hence, the Veterans of Foreign Wars is truly a charitable and eleemosynary organization.

Mr. Speaker, some 12 years ago, the national commander in chief and the National Council of Administration of the VFW decided that in view of the rental being paid for the Washington offices it would be more economical to erect its own building in the District. They purchased a lot for this purpose on First Street NE., between the Carroll Arms and the Plaza Hotels. However, before construction of the building could be started the Congress decided that it needed this ground for a parking area, and the VFW was forced to sell this property and seek another location. They finally purchased the old Rolland Hotel property at the corner of Maryland Avenue and Second Street NE., demolished the old existing structures, and in 1960 erected a very attractive five-story office building of white marble, at a total cost of some \$1.7 million.

The location of this building on Capitol Hill makes it extremely attractive to various Federal Government agencies and commissions, and inasmuch as some of the space in the building was not immediately needed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars for its own purposes, the organization rented space in the building for the past several years to the following Government organizations: The President's Railroad Commission; the President's Commission on the Status of

Women; the President's Task Force on Employment-Management Relations; Office of Manpower, Development, and Training, U.S. Department of Labor; Study Group B-1, U.S. Department of Defense; Bureau of Employment and Compensation; Office of Civil Defense; and the Warren Commission. Most of these commissions, it will be noted, have had U.S. Senators and Congressmen among their membership.

Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that the local real property of the VFW was exempted from District of Columbia real estate taxation by act of Congress—District of Columbia Code, 47-832. Since this exemption does not apply to any commercial use of the property, however, the organization has paid tax each year upon that part of its building for which rental has been received. This tax has amounted to approximately \$6,000 per year.

The 3-year contract between the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the GSA, under which this space was leased for Government use, expired on January 15, 1965, and the GSA notified the VFW several months prior to this date that they would not renew the contract because of improper zoning of the property. This referred, apparently, to some zoning regulations which had been approved on May 20, 1958, under which the VFW's own use of the property for philanthropic purposes is nonconforming, although this had not been the case in 1957 when the Board of Zoning Adjustment granted an appeal to permit the construction of the building for such purpose.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars immediately appealed for a zoning variance which would permit unrestricted office use of the basement, fourth floor, fifth floor, and part of the third floor of their building. However, this request was denied by the Board of Zoning Adjustment on December 1, 1964.

At present, therefore, the Veterans of Foreign Wars finds itself with space in its building excess to its own present needs and highly desirable for certain Government usage, yet unable to make these facilities available for this purpose. The Food Marketing Commission had moved into this building, and wished to remain there. In fact, GSA had advised the Veterans of Foreign Wars that they could keep all the available space in the building leased if the proper zoning could be obtained.

Meanwhile, the National Association of Government Engineers had sought to lease office space from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This is a nonprofit organization engaged in philanthropic activities in behalf of its members, the engineering profession, and the national interest. In its opinion of December 1, 1964, referred to above, the Board of Zoning Adjustment had advised the VFW that, under the provisions of section 3105.37 of the District of Columbia zoning regulations, the organization is free upon proper appeal to the Board to request the use of unneeded or excessive office space by other organizations which may qualify as philanthropic or eleemosynary institutions. Such a proceeding by the Board would be in the nature

of an extension of the nonconformance throughout the building. In the belief that the National Association of Government Engineers would qualify under this provision as a tenant in their building, the VFW sought this permission on January 8, 1965. They were advised, however, that the National Association of Government Engineers apparently could not qualify under this privilege because "its primary purpose or effect is the promotion of special benefits for its membership," which is forbidden in the definition of "philanthropic or eleemosynary institution" as it occurs in the zoning regulations.

Mr. Speaker, these unfavorable developments have left the Veterans of Foreign Wars with no apparent means of utilizing the excess space in their building except by legislative provision such as would be offered by H.R. 4338.

I wish to emphasize the fact that whereas the zoning variance which was refused by the Board of Zoning Adjustment would have permitted the Veterans of Foreign Wars unrestricted office use of any part of their building—that is, they could have leased office space to any tenants whatever—H.R. 4338 will restrict such tenancy to departments or agencies of the Federal or District of Columbia Governments, or to nonprofit organizations. Hence, the authority sought in this proposed legislation is far more limited than that which was sought in the appeal for zoning variance.

At a public hearing conducted by our Subcommittee No. 4 on February 25, 1965, testimony was offered to the effect that special purpose zoning was granted in the case of a structure located at the intersection of Maryland Avenue and Second Street NE., diagonally across from the Veterans of Foreign Wars building. Also in the same square are a cleaning and dyeing establishment, a leather goods repair shop, a youth center for the Young Women's Christian Association, and real estate and other types of offices. Hence, the character of the neighborhood is not all residential, and certainly the highly restricted use which this bill would authorize for the VFW building would have no detrimental effect whatever upon the integrity of the area.

At the hearing, a representative of the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel's office expressed the opinion that the provisions of this proposed legislation will in no way affect the present status of the VFW property with respect to real estate taxation. That is, the parts of the building occupied by the Veterans of Foreign Wars in connection with their philanthropic activities will continue to be exempt from District of Columbia real estate taxation, and any part of the building from which income is derived through the authority granted by this bill will be subject to such tax, exactly as has been the case in the past 3 years. Upon his advice, however, amending language was added to preclude any possible misunderstanding on this point.

It is the opinion of the committee that the present situation represents a hardship for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and that in view of the dire shortage of

suitable Government office space on Capitol Hill, the relief which H.R. 4338 would offer is in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, the District Committee, on which I am privileged to serve, gave this problem a thorough hearing and review and unanimously concluded that the bill should be favorably reported to the House for final passage. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues here in the House to lend their support to this legislation.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 4338, which, in effect, authorizes the Veterans of Foreign Wars to rent several floors of space in its national headquarters building which, as we all know, is located here on Capitol Hill almost adjacent to the Senate Office Buildings.

Briefly, this is corrective legislation drawn to right a wrong imposed by a late zoning change in which the VFW was caught in the middle with a terribly large amount of valuable and beautiful office space in its headquarters in excess of its own needs. But, due to the untimely zoning change, the VFW is now precluded from renting such space which, until just recently, was rented to the Government and other nonprofit groups. Incidentally, among the Government groups previously renting there was the Warren Commission.

Mr. Speaker, this bill in no way affects the tax exempt status of the VFW but does assist the Government of the District of Columbia tax revenues in that the VFW under this bill will continue—as it has done religiously in the past—to pay the full District of Columbia tax on the property that it would be allowed to rent under this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support immediate passage of this bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor have until midnight tonight to file its report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, H.R. 2362.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I could not hear the gentleman's request. I wish he would speak louder.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Education and Labor have until midnight tonight to file its report on the elementary and secondary education bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, does that include the right of the minority?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that includes the rights of the minority to have until midnight tonight to file its views.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? There was no objection.

EXPLANATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY OF THE ACT TO REMOVE TAX BARRIERS TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the RECORD an explanation prepared by the Treasury Department of the bill H.R. 5916 which I introduced today entitled "An act to remove tax barriers to foreign investment in the United States." I am advised by the Government Printing Office that the estimated cost of printing this explanation is \$343. Notwithstanding the cost I request that this be inserted in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

EXPLANATION OF H.R. 5916, AN ACT TO REMOVE TAX BARRIERS TO FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

(Prepared by the Treasury Department)

GENERAL EXPLANATION

Introduction

In his balance-of-payments message of February 10, 1965, the President proposed a series of measures designed to reinforce the program to correct the balance-of-payments deficit of the United States. Among the proposals made by the President is one to remove the tax deterrents to foreign investment in U.S. corporate securities so as to improve our balance of payments by encouraging an increase in such investment. The recommended legislation described herein would effectuate this proposal.

The review of the tax treatment of nonresident foreigners and foreign corporations investing in the United States resulting in these legislative recommendations was prompted in large measure by the report of the Task Force on Promoting Increased Foreign Investment in U.S. Corporate Securities. This task force, which was headed by the then Under Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler, was directed, among other things, to review U.S. Government and private activities which adversely affect foreign purchases of the securities of U.S. private companies. In its report, the task force made 39 recommendations designed to help the United States reduce its balance-of-payments deficit and defend its gold reserves. Among these were several directed at changing the tax treatment of foreign investors so as "to remove a number of elements in our tax structure which unnecessarily complicate and inhibit investment in U.S. corporate securities without generating material tax revenues." The task force report cautioned, however, that its tax recommendations were not intended to turn the United States into a tax haven, nor to drain funds from developing countries.

The legislation being requested deals with all of the tax areas discussed in the task force report, although in certain instances the action suggested differs from the proposals made by the task force. Furthermore, the draft bill contains recommendations in areas not mentioned in the task force re-

port which deal with problems which came to light in the Treasury Department's study of the present system of taxing nonresident foreigners and foreign corporations. It should be emphasized that the recommendations embodied in the proposed legislation were considered not only from the viewpoint of their impact on the balance of payments, but also to insure that they contributed to a rational and consistent program for the taxation of foreign individuals and foreign corporations. Thus, all legislative suggestions made herein are justifiable on conventional tax policy grounds.

It is estimated that the adoption of these proposals would result in a net revenue loss on an annual basis of less than \$5 million.

Foreign purchases of U.S. stocks constitute the largest single source of long-term capital inflow into the United States, with even greater potential for the future. Net purchases have averaged \$190 million a year between 1956 and 1963, while the outstanding value of foreign-held stocks has risen from \$6.1 to \$12.5 billion during this period. It is extremely difficult to measure the precise impact of this proposed legislation on our balance of payments because of the various factors affecting the level of foreign investment in the United States. It is anticipated that, when combined with an expanding U.S. economy, the proposed legislation will result over the years in a significant increase in such investment.

Most provisions of the draft bill are proposed to become effective to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965. However, those provisions which provide a revised estate tax treatment for the estates of foreigners are made applicable to the estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment of the proposed legislation. In addition, those special provisions applicable to U.S. citizens who have surrendered their U.S. citizenship are made applicable if the surrender occurred after March 8, 1965.

Specific recommendations

The following paragraphs describe the specific changes in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which are proposed. For this purpose the technical language of the Internal Revenue Code has been used, e.g., foreigners are described by the technical term "alien."

1. **Graduated rates:** Eliminate the taxation at graduated rates of U.S. source income of nonresident alien individuals not doing business in the United States.

Under present law, nonresident aliens deriving more than \$21,200 of income from U.S. sources are subject to regular U.S. graduated rates and are required to file returns. However, graduated rates on investment income already are eliminated by treaty in the case of almost all industrial countries, except where a taxpayer is doing business in the United States and has a permanent establishment here. Only a very small amount of revenue is collected from graduated rates at present. For example, for 1962 graduated rates resulted in the collection of \$746,743 above the taxes already withheld. Although graduated rates are rarely applicable they complicate our tax law and tend to frighten and confuse foreign investors.

Thus, graduated rates, whether applied to investment income or such types of income as pensions, annuities, alimony, and the like, serve no clearly defined purpose, deter foreign investment, and should be eliminated. The elimination of graduated rates will limit the liability of nonresident aliens not engaged in trade or business to taxes withheld, and where the alien is not engaged in trade or business here no return need be made. (However, graduated rates would be retained for the U.S. business income of nonresident aliens engaged in trade or business here.)

2. **Segregation of investment and business income and related matters:** Provide that (a)

nonresident alien individuals engaged in trade or business in the United States be taxed on investment (nonbusiness) income at the 30 percent statutory withholding rate, or applicable treaty rate, rather than at graduated rates; (b) foreign corporations engaged in business in the United States be denied the 85-percent dividends-received deduction and be exempt from tax on their capital gains from investments in U.S. stocks; (c) nonresident alien individuals and foreign corporations not be deemed engaged in trade or business in the United States because of investment activity in the United States or because they have granted a discretionary power to a U.S. banker, broker, or adviser; and (d) nonresident alien individuals and foreign corporations be given an election to compute income from real property and mineral royalties on a net income basis and be taxed at graduated rates on such income as if engaged in trade or business in the United States.

Segregation of business and investment income

Under present law, if a nonresident alien is engaged in trade or business within the United States, he is subject to tax on all his U.S. income (including capital gains), even though some of the income is not derived from the conduct of the trade or business, at the same rate as U.S. citizens.

A nonresident alien individual engaged in trade or business in the United States should be subject to taxation on his investment income on the same basis as a nonresident alien not so engaged. Thus his investment income would be taxed at the 30-percent statutory rate or applicable treaty rate, rather than at graduated rates. For the purpose of determining the applicability of treaty rates the alien will be deemed not to have a permanent establishment in this country. All business income should remain subject to tax at graduated rates, but the rates on business income would be computed without regard to the amount of investment income.

This change conforms to the trend in international treaty negotiations to separate investment income from business income. Whether a taxpayer is helped or harmed by segregating his investment from his business income, separate treatment is proper and equitable. Investment decisions may be made on the same basis whether or not the alien is engaged in business here, since income arising from investments here will not be subject to taxation at graduated rates in either event.

Moreover, a nonresident alien individual engaged in trade or business here should not be taxed on capital gains realized in the United States which are unrelated to the business activity carried on by him in this country, except where he would be subject to tax on those gains under the rules pertaining to nonresident aliens generally.

Tax treatment of income from U.S. stock investments by foreign corporations

Under present law all the activities of a corporation are treated as part of its trade or business. Thus, for example, all its expenses are treated as deductible as business expenses. Accordingly, it would be inappropriate to segregate a foreign corporation's U.S. investment income from its U.S. business income. However, there is one abuse in this area which should be eliminated. Frequently, a foreign corporation with stock investments in the United States engages in trade or business here in some minor way (such as by owning a few parcels of real estate) and then claims the 85-percent dividends-received deduction on its stock investments in the United States. Such a corporation thereby may pay far less than the 30-percent statutory or treaty withholding rate on its U.S. dividend income, although its position is essentially the same

as that of a foreign corporation doing business elsewhere which has U.S. investment income.

To eliminate this abuse and treat all foreign corporations with investments in U.S. stocks alike, the 85-percent dividends-received deduction should be denied to foreign corporations doing business here. Their income from stock investments would be made subject to the 30-percent statutory withholding rate, or any lesser treaty rate applicable to such income, rather than regular U.S. corporate rates. For the purpose of determining whether the treaty rates on dividend income apply, a foreign corporation will be deemed not to have a permanent establishment in this country. To fully equate the tax treatment of stock investments of foreign corporations doing business in the United States with that of foreign corporations not doing business here, such corporations are exempted from the U.S. tax on capital gains realized on their U.S. stock investments.

Definition of "engaged in trade or business"

Present law provides that the term "engaged in trade or business" does not include the effecting, through a resident broker, commission agent, or custodian, of transactions in the United States in stocks, securities, or commodities. There is some confusion as to whether the amount of activity in an investment account, or the granting of a discretionary power to a U.S. banker, broker, or adviser, will place a nonresident alien outside of this exception for security transactions so that he is engaged in trade or business in the United States. This uncertainty may deter investment in the United States and is undesirable as a matter of tax policy.

The fact that a discretionary power of investment has been given to a U.S. broker or banker does not really bear a relation to the foreigner's ability to carry out transactions in the United States—the discretionary power is merely a more efficient method of operating rather than having the investor consulted on every investment decision and frequently is merely a safeguard to protect him in case of world turmoil. Nor, where the alien is an investor, is the volume of transactions material in determining whether he is engaged in trade or business.

Accordingly, the proposed legislation makes clear that individuals or corporations are not engaged in trade or business because of investment activity in the United States or because they have granted a discretionary investment power to a U.S. banker, broker, or adviser. No legislative change is necessary to provide that the volume of transactions is not material in determining whether an investor is engaged in trade or business in the United States as this is the rule under present law.

Real estate income and mineral royalties

Under present law it is not clear whether a nonresident alien (or foreign corporation) is engaged in trade or business in the United States by reason of the mere ownership of unimproved real property or real property subject to a strict net lease, or by reason of an agent's activities in connection with the selection of real estate investments in the United States.

If because of such activity a nonresident alien is considered as not engaged in trade or business he becomes subject to withholding tax on his gross rents. Since the consequent tax could exceed his net income, the taxation on a gross basis of income from real property should not be continued where taxation on a net basis at graduated U.S. rates would be more appropriate.

Therefore, a nonresident alien or foreign corporation should be given an election to compute their income from real property (including income from minerals and other natural resources) on a net income basis and

at regular U.S. rates as if they were engaged in trade or business in the United States. Such an election is comparable to the one now appearing in many treaties to which the United States is a party. Such an election would not affect the method of taxation applied to his other income.

3. Capital gains: Eliminate the provision taxing capital gains realized by a nonresident alien when he is physically present in the United States, and extend from 90 to 183 days the period of presence in the United States during the year which makes nonresident aliens taxable on all their capital gains.

The underlying policy of U.S. taxation of nonresident alien individuals has been to exempt capital gains realized from sources in this country. This policy has been proper both from a tax policy standpoint and from the viewpoint of our balance of payments. However, existing law has two limitations: U.S. capital gains realized by a nonresident alien while he is physically present in the United States, or realized during a year in which he is present in the United States for 90 days or more, are subject to a U.S. tax of 30 percent.

The limitations now contained in our law, especially the physical presence test, contain illogical elements and are likely to have a negative impact on foreigners who are weighing the advantages and disadvantages of investing in the United States. The physical presence test was added to the law after World War II when many nonresident alien traders were frequently present in this country. Since this is no longer true, and moreover, since the tax may be readily avoided by passing title to the property outside the United States, the provision now serves little purpose. However, it does pose a threat to the foreign investor which may deter him from investing in this country and therefore should be eliminated.

The limitation relating to presence in the United States for 90 days or more in a particular year should be retained, but the period should be lengthened to 183 days. This extension will remove a minor deterrent to travel in the United States and help mitigate the harsh consequences which may arise under the existing rule if a nonresident alien realized capital gains at the beginning of a taxable year during which he later spends 90 days or more in the United States.

4. Personal holding company and "second dividend" taxes: (a) Exempt foreign corporations owned entirely by nonresident alien individuals, whether or not doing business in the United States, from the personal holding company tax; (b) modify the application of the "second dividend tax" of section 861(a)(2)(B) so that it only applies to the dividends of foreign corporations doing business in the United States which have over 80 percent U.S. source income.

Under present law any foreign corporation with U.S. investment income, whether or not doing business here, may be a personal holding company unless it is owned entirely by nonresident aliens, and unless its gross income from U.S. sources is less than 50 percent of its gross income from all sources.

The personal holding company tax should not apply to foreign corporations owned entirely by nonresident aliens. The only reason for applying our personal holding company tax to foreign corporations owned by nonresident aliens has been to prevent the accumulation of income in holding companies organized to avoid the graduated rates. With the elimination of graduated rates as suggested in recommendation 1 (and the revision of the second dividend tax, discussed below), U.S. investment income in the hands of foreign corporations will have borne the U.S. taxes properly applicable to it and accumulation of such income will not result in the avoidance of U.S. taxes imposed on the company's shareholders. Hence, there is no

longer any reason to continue to apply the personal holding company tax to these corporations.

With respect to the "second dividend tax," section 861(a)(2)(B) now provides that if a corporation derives 50 percent or more of its gross income for the preceding 3-year period from the United States, its dividends shall be treated as U.S. source income to the extent the dividends are attributable to income from the United States. As a result such dividends are subject to U.S. tax when received by a nonresident alien. This tax is often referred to as the "second dividend tax." However, under section 1441(c)(1) a foreign corporation is not required to withhold tax on its dividends unless it is engaged in business in the United States and, in addition, more than 85 percent of its gross income is derived from U.S. sources.

It is now proposed to levy this second dividend tax only where the foreign corporation does business in the United States, and 80 percent or more of its gross income (other than dividends and capital gains on stock) is derived from U.S. sources. Where a foreign corporation is not doing business in the United States, it will pay U.S. withholding taxes on all investment income and other fixed or determinable gains and profits derived from the United States, and since that is all the tax its foreign shareholders would owe if they received the income directly, no second tax seems warranted.

With the adoption of the rule that the income from the U.S. stock investments of foreign corporations doing business here be taxed at flat statutory or treaty withholding rates, no further U.S. tax should be imposed on such income. Therefore, in applying the proposed 80-percent test, such income of the foreign corporation, whether from U.S. or foreign sources, should be disregarded and the test applied only to the corporation's other income. Furthermore, if the 80-percent rule is met, the dividends of such corporations should be subject to tax only to the extent that such dividends are from U.S. source income other than income from stock investments in the United States.

Withholding requirements should conform to the incidence of tax, and therefore withholding should be required on dividends paid by foreign corporations doing business in the United States with 80 percent or more U.S. source income to the extent such dividends are from U.S. source income other than income from stock investments in the United States.

With the adoption of the revisions proposed in U.S. system of taxing nonresident aliens and foreign corporations, the regulations dealing with the accumulated earnings tax will be revised to eliminate the application of this tax to foreign corporations not doing business in the United States which are owned entirely by nonresident aliens. The accumulation of earnings by such corporations will not result in the avoidance of U.S. taxes. However, because of possible avoidance of the revised second dividend tax, the accumulated earnings tax will remain applicable to foreign corporations doing business here.

5. Estate tax and related matters: (a) Increase the \$2,000 exemption from tax to \$30,000 and substitute for regular U.S. estate tax rates a 5-10-15 percent rate schedule; (b) provide that bonds issued by domestic corporations or governmental units and held by nonresident aliens are property within the United States and therefore are subject to estate tax; and (c) provide that transfers of intangible property by a nonresident alien engaged in business in the United States are not subject to gift tax.

It is generally believed that high estate taxes on foreign investors are one of the most important deterrents in our tax laws to foreign investment in the United States. Our rates in many cases are higher than those of

other countries and in these situations, despite tax conventions and statutory foreign estate tax credits, nonresidents who invest in the United States suffer an estate tax burden. Moreover, under present law a nonresident alien's estate must pay heavier estate taxes on its U.S. assets than would the estate of a U.S. citizen owning the same assets.

To mitigate this deterrent to investment and to rationalize the estate tax treatment of nonresident aliens, the exemption for estates of nonresident alien decedents should be increased from \$2,000 to \$30,000 and such estates should be subject to tax at the following rates:

If the taxable estate is not over \$100,000, the tax should be 5 percent of the taxable estate.

If the taxable estate is over \$100,000 but not over \$750,000, the tax shall be \$5,000, plus 10 percent of excess over \$100,000.

If the taxable estate is over \$750,000, the tax shall be \$70,000, plus 15 percent of excess over \$750,000.

The increase in exemption and reduced rates will bring U.S. effective estate tax rates on nonresident aliens to a level somewhat higher than those imposed upon resident estates in Switzerland, Germany, France, and the Netherlands, for example, but substantially below those imposed on resident estates in the United Kingdom, Canada, and Italy. Thus U.S. investment from these latter countries bears no higher estate tax than local investment because of foreign tax credits or exemptions provided in such countries. The proposed tax treatment of the U.S. estates of nonresident aliens is similar to the treatment accorded the estates of nonresidents by Canada, whose rates on the estates of its citizens are comparable to our own. Where additional reductions are justified these may be made by treaty.

These changes should result in more appropriate estate tax treatment of nonresident aliens and thereby improve the climate for foreign investment in the United States. Particularly in the case of nonresident alien decedents who have only a small amount of U.S. property in their estates, present U.S. rates and the limited exemption provided result in an excessive effective rate of estate tax. The proposed changes correct this situation. The new rates will produce for nonresident aliens' estates an effective rate of tax on U.S. assets which in many cases is comparable to that applicable to U.S. citizens who may avail themselves of the \$60,000 exemption and marital deduction (which are not available to nonresident aliens).

The following figures show the effective rates for nonresident aliens under present law, and the effective rates produced by the proposed exemption and rates as compared to those applicable to the estates of U.S. citizens electing and not electing the marital deduction:

U.S. gross estate	Nonresident alien under present law	Nonresident alien under proposed law	U.S. citizen with marital deduction	U.S. citizen without marital deduction
\$60,000-----	12.5	2.0	-----	-----
100,000-----	17.3	3.0	-----	3.0
500,000-----	25.8	7.4	8.0	22.1
1,000,000-----	38.8	8.8	11.1	26.7
5,000,000-----	43.0	12.6	16.9	42.3

As part of this revision of the estate tax, the situs rule with respect to bonds should be changed. The present rule, very frequently modified by treaty, is that bonds have situs where they are physically located. This rule is illogical, permits tax avoidance, and is not a suitable way to determine whether bonds are subject to an estate tax as their location is one of their least significant characteristics for tax purposes. Other intangible debt obligations are pres-

ently treated as property within the United States if issued by or enforceable against a domestic corporation or resident of the United States. Accordingly, it is recommended that our law be amended to provide that bonds issued by domestic corporations or domestic governmental units and held by nonresident aliens are property within the United States and therefore subject to estate tax.

Furthermore, a present defect in the operation of the credit against the estate tax for State death taxes in the case of nonresident aliens should be corrected. Under present law the estate of a nonresident alien may receive the full credit permitted by section 2011 even though only a portion of the property subject to Federal tax was taxed by a State. The amount of credit permitted by section 2011 in the case of nonresident aliens should be limited to that portion of the credit allowed the estate which is allocable to property taxed by both the State and the Federal Government.

Our gift tax law as it applies to nonresident aliens should be revised. Under present law a nonresident alien doing business in the United States is subject to gift tax on transfers of U.S. intangible property. This rule has little significance from the standpoint of revenue and tax equity. Therefore, our law should be amended to provide that transfers of intangible property by a nonresident alien, whether or not engaged in business in the United States, are not subject to gift tax. Gifts or tangibles situated in the United States which are owned by nonresident aliens will continue to be subject to U.S. gift taxes.

6. Expatriate American citizens: Subject the U.S. source income of expatriate citizens of the United States to income tax at regular U.S. rates and their U.S. estates to estate tax at regular U.S. rates, where they surrender their U.S. citizenship within 10 years preceding the taxable year in question unless the surrender was not tax motivated.

As a result of the proposed elimination of graduated rates, taken together with the proposed change in our estate tax as it applies to nonresident aliens, an American citizen who gives up his citizenship and moves to a foreign country would be able to very substantially reduce his U.S. estate and income tax liabilities.

While it may be doubted that there are many U.S. citizens who would be willing to give up their U.S. citizenship no matter how substantial the tax incentive, a tax incentive so great might lead some Americans to surrender their citizenship for the ultimate benefit of their families. Thus, it seems desirable, if progressive rates are eliminated for nonresident aliens and our estate tax on the estates of nonresident aliens is significantly reduced, that steps be taken to limit the tax advantages of alienage for our citizens.

The recommended legislation accomplishes this by providing that a nonresident alien who surrendered his U.S. citizenship within the preceding 10 years shall remain subject to tax at regular U.S. rates on all income derived from U.S. sources. A similar rule would apply for estate tax purposes to the U.S. estates of expatriate citizens of the United States. Thus, the U.S. property owned by expatriates would be taxed at the estate tax rates applicable to our citizens (but without the \$60,000 exemption, marital deduction and other such provisions applicable to our citizens), in cases where the alien decedent's surrender of citizenship took place less than 10 years before the day of his death. The \$30,000 exemption granted nonresident aliens would be allowed to expatriate citizens.

To prevent an expatriate from avoiding regular U.S. rates on his U.S. income by transferring his U.S. property to a foreign corporation, or disposing of it overseas, the recommended legislation treats profits from

the sale or exchange of U.S. property by an expatriate as being U.S. source income. To preclude the use of a foreign corporation by an expatriate to hold his U.S. property and thus avoid U.S. estate taxes at regular U.S. rates, an expatriate is treated as owning his pro rata share of the U.S. property held by any foreign corporation in which he alone owns a 10-percent interest and which he, together with related parties, controls. Furthermore, the recommended legislation makes gifts by expatriates of intangibles situated in the United States subject to gift tax.

These provisions would be applicable only to expatriates who surrendered their citizenship after March 8, 1965, and would not apply if contravened by the provisions of a tax convention with a foreign country. Moreover, they would not be applicable if the expatriate can establish that the avoidance of U.S. tax was not a principal reason for his surrender of citizenship.

7. Retaining treaty bargaining position: Provide that the President be given authority to eliminate with respect to a particular foreign country any liberalizing changes which have been enacted, if he finds that the country concerned has not acted to provide reciprocal concessions for our citizens after being requested to do so by the United States.

One difficulty which may arise from the liberalizing changes being proposed in U.S. tax law is that it may place the United States at a disadvantage in negotiating concessions for Americans abroad as respects foreign tax laws. Moreover, the failure to obtain concessions abroad may have an effect upon our revenues since the foreign income and estate tax credits we grant our citizens mean that the United States bears a large share of the burden of foreign taxation of U.S. citizens. To protect the bargaining power of the United States the President should therefore be authorized to reapply present law to the residents of any foreign country which he finds has not acted (when requested by the United States to do so, as in treaty negotiations) to provide for our citizens as respects their U.S. income or estates substantially the same benefits as those enjoyed by its citizens as a result of the proposed legislative changes. The provisions reapplied would be limited to the area or areas where our citizens were disadvantaged. Furthermore, the provisions reapplied could be partly mitigated, if that were desirable, by treaty with the other country.

It is essential, if we are to revise our system of taxing nonresident aliens as is being suggested, that this recommendation be adopted. Otherwise, we risk sacrificing the interests of our citizens subject to tax abroad and reducing our revenues in an effort to simplify the taxes imposed upon nonresident aliens.

8. Quarterly payment of withheld taxes: Provide that withholding agents collecting taxes from amounts paid to nonresident aliens be required to remit such taxes on a quarterly basis.

Under the present system, withholding agents are required to remit taxes withheld on aliens during any calendar year on or before March 15 after the close of such year. This procedure varies considerably from that applicable to domestic income tax withheld from wages and employee and employer FICA taxes, where quarterly (in some cases monthly) payments are required.

Withholding on income derived by nonresident aliens should be brought more closely into line with the domestic income tax system. There is no reason to permit withholding agents to keep nonresident aliens' taxes for periods which may exceed a full year before being required to remit those taxes, when employers must remit taxes withheld on domestic wages at least quarterly. The Government loses the use of the

revenue, which revenue in 1962 exceeded \$80 million, for the entire year. Accordingly, section 1461 requiring the return and payment of taxes withheld on aliens by March 15 should be revised to eliminate this specific requirement. The Secretary or his delegate would then exercise the general authority granted him under sections 6011 and 6071 and require withholding agents to return and remit taxes withheld on income derived by nonresident aliens quarterly. However, no detailed quarterly return would be required.

9. Exemption for bank deposits: Under present law, an exemption from income taxes, withholding, and estate taxes is provided for bank deposits of nonresident alien individuals not doing business in the United States. By administrative interpretation, deposits in some savings and loan associations are treated as bank deposits for purposes of these exemptions, but such exemptions do not apply to most savings and loan associations. There does not appear to be any justification for this distinction between types of savings and loan associations and it should be eliminated by extending these exemptions to all such associations.

10. Foreign tax credit—similar credit requirement: Section 901(b)(3) provides that resident aliens are entitled to a foreign tax credit only if their native country allows a similar credit to our citizens residing in that country. Apparently the provision is designed to encourage foreign countries to grant similar credits to our citizens. However, this requirement works a hardship on refugees from totalitarian governments. For example, the Castro government is not concerned with whether Cubans in this country receive a foreign tax credit. Therefore, it is recommended that the similar credit requirement of section 901(b)(3) be eliminated, subject to reinstatement by the President where the foreign country, upon request, refuses to provide a similar credit for U.S. citizens. Of course, no request would ordinarily be made in a case, such as Cuba, where the possible reinstatement of the present reciprocity requirement would have little or no effect upon the foreign government's policy toward U.S. citizens.

11. Stamp taxes on original issuances and transfers of foreign stocks and bonds in the United States to foreign purchasers: Our stamp tax on certificates of indebtedness is imposed on issuances and transfers within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States. The stamp tax on issuances of stock does not apply to stock issued by a foreign corporation, but the transfer tax applies to transfers in the United States. These taxes have forced U.S. underwriters who handle issuances of foreign bonds and stocks and their original distribution to foreign purchasers to handle closings overseas. In view of the limited association of such issuances and transfers with the United States and the fact that these taxes are ordinarily avoided by moving the transactions outside the United States, our law should be revised to exempt original offerings of foreign issuers to foreign purchasers from our stamp taxes where only the issuances and transfers take place in the United States. Such an exemption would facilitate such transactions and their handling by U.S. underwriters and is consistent with our balance-of-payments objectives.

12. Withholding taxes on savings bond interest: The Ryukyu Islands, the principal island of which is Okinawa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific, principally the Caroline, Marshall, and Mariana Islands, although under the protection and control of the United States, are technically foreign territory. Thus, the islanders are nonresident aliens and subject to a 30-percent withholding tax on interest on U.S. savings bonds. This interferes with the selling of U.S. savings bonds. Therefore, the 30-per-

cent withholding tax as it applies to the interest income realized from U.S. savings bonds by native residents of these islands should be eliminated.

In addition to the changes discussed above, the proposed legislation makes a number of clarifying and conforming changes to present law.

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS, REPUBLICAN WHIP

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a column entitled "Politics, Illinois Viewpoint," by William H. Rentschler, which is a regular column appearing in a number of newspapers in Illinois.

That of February 27, which I am inserting, is of special interest as it pertains to the reelection of our colleague the gentleman from Illinois, LESLIE C. ARENDS, as Republican whip. It bespeaks the high regard we have for him, not only here in this House, but especially throughout the entire State of Illinois. The article follows:

POLITICS: ILLINOIS VIEWPOINT

(By William H. Rentschler)

"Nice guys finish last." Leo Durocher said it.

But the recent reelection of Congressman LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Melvin, Ill. (population 550), as minority whip of the U.S. House of Representatives, disproves that theory.

Nearly everybody likes the long, lank Illinoisan with the silver ducktail, who first went to Congress the year the Dionne quintuplets were born, who has survived all sorts of Republican disasters, and who has yet to lose an election.

"Nice guy" ARENDS reaped the most recent harvest in January, when the 89th Congress (the 16th in which ARENDS has served) convened. Republicans were smarting from the drubbing of last November 3. Indiana's conservative old pro, CHARLIE HALLECK, had been dumped as minority leader in favor of Congressman GERRY FORD, of Michigan.

The eastern wing of the party, tasting blood, wanted LES ARENDS' scalp, too. They picked Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, a suave, well-born New Jerseyite, to oppose him. FORD, staking a certain measure of prestige on the outcome, said he was backing FRELINGHUYSEN.

The press sensed another Republican rift and gave plenty of ink to this new evidence of internecine warfare. Many felt the "new broom" approach would sweep the veteran ARENDS into the discard.

ARENDS didn't see it quite that way, and showed no evidence of panic as the balloting neared. Long accustomed to rounding up stray votes from the Capitol cloakroom, he and his informal campaign manager, Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Peoria, working with the other nine Illinois GOP Congressmen, had been buttonholing fellow legislators.

Just before the secret vote, ARENDS, the master nose counter, predicted he'd win by 10 votes. He was almost right. The final tally: ARENDS 70, FRELINGHUYSEN 59. Eleven Republican Congressmen were absent, and ARENDS believes he had nine of them.

With the issue settled, LES ARENDS was asked if he could work in harness with the new minority leader. His answer, plain and unvarnished, showed in part why ARENDS has such an incredible record of longevity as whip:

"Of course I'll work with him. Just as hard and as faithfully as I've worked with GERRY's predecessors—JOE MARTIN and CHARLIE HALLECK—over the past 20 years."

He meant just that. Observed highly respected New York Times columnist Arthur Krock: "Few, if any, among the House Republicans doubt that the pledge will be meticulously redeemed."

ARENDS continued, head earnestly forward, peering over half spectacles: "My interest is in the Republican Party and its service to the country. Nothing else. The party is greater than any individual."

That sums up LES ARENDS—no bitterness, no backbiting, no vindictiveness, no negativism. Many other Republicans could take a page from his book.

ARENDS was a gangling country boy when he first arrived in Washington three eventful decades ago. He has known the great, the near great, and the not so great of America over this span of years. He golfed regularly with Ike, has worked intimately with the titans of Congress. He has acquired polish and finesse, yet today, at 69, he is still a gangling, likable, country boy with a charm faintly reminiscent of Will Rogers. And he is one of those rare men of power without a trace of pomposity or awe of self.

One evening last fall, LES ARENDS drove up from Melvin to Aurora to speak at a dinner honoring his able and beauteous colleague, Representative CHARLOTTE REID. He told a story that night worth repeating.

A man approached a construction site where three men were chipping stone, and he asked each in turn what he was doing.

The first replied, "Can't you see, I'm chipping stone."

The second said, "I'm trying to make a living."

The third looked toward the sky and answered, "I'm building a majestic cathedral."

LES ARENDS' point was that the Republican Party, to succeed and win, must do more than chip stone. They must build a cathedral. Republicans must project a dream that will inspire people. They must offer plans and programs with the magic to stir man's blood.

Some nice guys finish first—like LES ARENDS.

THE BRIDGE AT REMAGEN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the story of the bridge over the Rhine at Remagen is a classic of American heroism, and I am privileged and honored to join with the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], in marking with tenderly remembering remarks the 20th anniversary of an event in World War II in which the daring and the courage and the blinding drive, against incalculable odds of American soldiery reached the heights of the sublime.

Our able colleague from West Virginia, then Captain HECHLER, was there and all

the action and all the phases and personalities of this classic he has immortalized in his book, one of the really great books of the World War II period that is still among the best sellers. His colleagues in this Chamber look forward to many future occasions when they may join with him in reliving the glory of the bridge at Remagen.

THE LEGISLATION NEEDED TO STRENGTHEN CONGRESSIONAL CONTROLS OVER U.S. INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much lately about the increase in so-called snooping by various U.S. Government agencies. The Post Office, for example, has admitted putting mail covers on as many as 24,000 persons, and that the practice of watching their mail has been going on for several years.

Food and Drug Administration officials have used concealed tape recorders while visiting businessmen, no advance warning being given that the conversations were being recorded.

And stories are circulated about the CIA operating right here inside the United States—activities ranging from a charity foundation in New York to an oil business in Miami. Certainly we in Florida are aware of CIA activities inside the United States due to the role our State has played in the Cuban situation.

I am asking whether snooping by mail cover, concealed tape recorders, or domestically based cloak-and-dagger operations are proper activities for the U.S. Government in terms of authority granted by acts of the Congress. Many questions can be raised concerning Government operations going beyond the limits originally authorized by Congress. What assurances have been given that mail covers, taped visits by an agency seemingly outside the intelligence field, and a number of other actions in questionable areas carried out by various Government agencies are not being done at the request of the intelligence community?

To allow this trend to go unchecked would transform the American version of democracy into a police state. Who knows what uses the Government will find for information obtained through invasions of individual privacy? The Congress ought to find out through constant scrutiny of the various agencies concerned.

I urge the establishment of a joint House-Senate watchdog committee to oversee the activities of the CIA, the Defense Department, the State Department, and any other U.S. Government agency concerned with intelligence gathering, interpretation, or operations. The joint committee would have broad jurisdiction, but its jurisdiction would be no broader than that already allowed the

U.S. Government agencies engaged in this field.

Intelligence activities are of vital necessity in the world today. Certainly it is of the highest national priority that this Government carry on covert operations, and that they be executed with the tightest secrecy is of the utmost importance. However, the Congress, which authorized such functions to begin with, has a duty to the American people to review these functions on a regular basis.

Intelligence activities have been concentrated in the Central Intelligence Agency, although other Government agencies also carry out phases of this function. No such centralization of this subject matter exists in the Congress. The creation of the joint committee as proposed in my resolution would solve this problem and not only aid coordination in congressional dealing with the intelligence community but assist the intelligence community as well as the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the intelligence community needs closer congressional review. Former CIA Director Allen Dulles, himself, said that the Congress can keep a secret, and that the early development of the atomic bomb was related to certain Members of Congress is now common knowledge. Security can be protected and in fact improved by the creation of this congressional watchdog committee.

Vice President HUMPHREY introduced legislation similar to the measure I offer today during his service in the Senate. Other Senators and Members of the House have done likewise. I urge the early enactment of legislation to establish this joint committee to oversee the intelligence community. This aspect of the Government is like any other in that if not supervised regularly it will get out of hand.

CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle are aware of the controversy stemming from the administration's announced closing of 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals and 4 domiciliary homes. A subcommittee in the other body and our own Committee on Veterans' Affairs have heard Veterans' Administration spokesmen attempt to justify the closing order. We have heard testimony from opponents of the closing order that contradict the Veterans' Administration statements on this subject.

Whether the Veterans' Administration or its opponents in this matter are in error is somewhat academic at this point. The indisputable fact remains that the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget in open testimony before committees of both Houses of Congress

have failed to prove administration claims that the announced closings will result in either economy or improved service to veterans.

Certainly, no one is more interested in effecting economy in Government than I. Is it economical to create new depressed communities and make their residents eligible for Federal assistance because the payroll of the closing hospital provides in excess of 40 percent of the community's income? Is it economical to abandon a Veterans' Administration hospital which was completely renovated and remodeled in 1952 at a cost in excess of \$2 million? Is it economical to abandon a hospital built in 1951? Is it economical to abandon one Veterans' Administration hospital while constructing another less than 100 miles away? Is it economical to transfer patients to hospitals with per diem costs that are higher than those of the closing hospitals?

Can better services to veterans result from the elimination of 3,000 domiciliary beds established for the sole purpose of providing, in the words of a Veterans' Administration publication, "a home—bed, board, and incidental medical care—for men who are so disabled that they cannot support themselves"? Are we providing better service by making a sick veteran travel hundreds of miles from home to obtain the hospital care that a grateful nation has said he deserves? All of these questions, Mr. Speaker, must be answered in the negative.

I have devoted considerable thought to a possible solution to the problem posed by the closing of these installations. The most obvious solution, of course, would be to prohibit the closing of any Veterans' Administration hospital or domiciliary unless approved by the Congress. I do not believe, however, that it would be wise to tie the hands of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in this manner. The shifting veteran population and other factors require that the Administrator have some degree of flexibility in determining the locations of hospitals.

Coincidental to such authority, however, is the responsibility for exercising sound judgment in determining the location of these hospitals. The events of recent weeks have seriously shaken my confidence in the ability of Veterans' Administration officials to exercise sound judgment when confronted with pressures from higher authority.

Therefore, I have today introduced a bill that will require the Veterans' Administration to publish the notice of proposed closings or relocations of hospitals, domiciliaries or outpatient clinics in the Federal Register at least 6 months in advance of the effective date. This provision of my bill will serve to prevent a recurrence of the precipitous action taken by the administration in the present instance. Appropriate committees of the Congress will then have sufficient time to examine the propriety of the action if the circumstances warrant it.

Equally alarming, Mr. Speaker, although somewhat obscured by the intensity of feeling about individual hospital closing, are the long-range implications of the administration's actions. According to information furnished by the Vet-

erans' Administration, 2,536 fewer general and neuropsychiatric hospital beds will be operated in fiscal 1966 than are currently being operated. In these same hospitals, an average patient load of 1,352 fewer veterans will be treated each day in fiscal 1966 than are currently being treated.

Now, the Veterans' Administration will point with pride to the fact that during this same period they will operate 1,239 more nursing care beds in 1966 than were operated in 1965. Let me remind my colleagues that the Congress in Public Law 88-450 authorized the Administrator to establish and operate 4,000 additional nursing care beds. The report of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which accompanied this legislation at the time it was favorably reported to the House authorized immediately 2,000 additional nursing care beds. Let me quote from that report, "the 2,000 additional nursing home care beds are to be provided in the immediate future and to be fully operated at the earliest practicable date." The plain facts, Mr. Speaker, are that the administration has failed to view the nursing care beds as additional to the beds already being operated and they have failed to provide them in the immediate future. These figures alarm me, Mr. Speaker, because they represent the erosion of the splendid system of Veterans' Administration hospitals that have been maintained over the years. I am unable to reconcile this callous disregard of the needs of the Nation's sick and needy aging veteran with the stated goal of the Great Society "to improve the quality of life for all."

The bill which I have introduced today also contains a provision making it mandatory that the Veterans' Administration operate not less than 124,000 general, neuropsychiatric, and nursing care beds. This will assure the continued operation of the Veterans' Administration hospital system at least at the 1965 operating level in addition to the 4,000 authorized nursing care beds. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

FEDERAL POWER ACT

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to clarify the intent of the Federal Power Act.

The Federal Power Commission recently began an effort to regulate intrastate electrical power, already regulated under State laws and not under Federal control in the past.

From recent actions, it is apparent the Federal Power Commission is seeking to regulate the activities of companies engaged in the transmission of electric energy whose operations heretofore have been regulated by the States. Where there is a bona fide interstate transaction the Commission should obviously have jurisdiction and does under the law. But

where the transaction is local, the Commission has no jurisdiction and should have none. Their extension of authority would result in unnecessary duplication of State and Federal jurisdiction and would cause extra expense to individual companies and consumers because of overlapping requirements regarding the filing of reports and information.

My bill would eliminate the duplication by stating in clear terms that are not subject to misinterpretation that the Commission is to regulate interstate sales and the States are to regulate intrastate sales.

This legislation would not be necessary had the intent of Congress been carried out as set forth in the original legislation. A situation similar to the present one presented itself in relation to regulation of natural gas almost 10 years ago, when the Commission attempted to exercise jurisdiction over the local distribution of natural gas, even though distribution and sale was being regulated by State agencies. At that time, as well as now with electricity, there was no question of the right of the Federal agency in regard to regulating the interstate transactions. However, they sought to control the intrastate operations of local companies as well.

Congress was quick to amend the Natural Gas Act so as to restore its original intent and preserve local regulation by the States, while in no way restricting the Commission's jurisdiction over interstate distribution. We presently find the Federal Power Commission attempting to extend its jurisdiction in a like manner in the electrical energy field.

It was hoped in the present case of electric power the Commission would look to the instruction of the Congress in regard to the natural gas matter to see congressional intent. Apparently, the Power Commission does not understand the congressional intent and they seek to interpret the Federal Power Act to broaden their own jurisdiction. Congressional action is therefore necessary once again.

ACADEMIC RESEARCH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an editorial from the Bulletin of the Greene County Medical Society in Springfield, Mo., for February 1965, entitled "A Path and Its Pitfall." It speaks for itself, and I commend it to all Members of the House and specifically those of the 88th Congress' Special Committee on Research and Development, as well as existing ones in the Armed Services Committee on which I serve, and others.

For too long, as one of the trained scientists of the Congress, I have been concerned about direct and indirect overutilization of scientific researchers and technologists throughout the country by Government. I am further concerned

by our various universities and postgraduate schools depending too heavily on Federal grants or contracts for research—with or without percentages of overage per project—and so forth. Finally, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the R and D, T and E Subcommittee of the Armed Services, it has become increasingly apparent to me that too much present research is built on the vertical style of blocks such as basic, applied, developmental, testing, engineering, procurement, and possibly, finally, production. The "horizontal approach" is much better, if the end-result is to be in the hands of those who need it so badly at the earliest practicable date, and supported by taxpayers money inasmuch; as all basic and applied research must eventually come to engineering specifically. Why not simultaneously? Admittedly, research is duplicative and sometimes overlapping and may even be wasteful, but it is the seat of expanded knowledge. Why therefore, I repeat, not engineer, test, and develop good ideas from the caldron of basic and applied research, simultaneously?

Indeed, private industry with its own funds has adopted this "combined system's approach" to R and D, T and E with startling results. This places the finally evolved tool in the hand of the user at a much earlier date, saves time, moneys, and evolves "breakthroughs" of first magnitudes.

Toward that end I am also enclosing my recent news releases showing the folly of too much taxpayers' money support in areas that are analogous to those of "A Path and Its Pitfall" by Wilfred E. Wooldridge, M.D., the editor of the Greene County Medical Society Bulletin.

[From the Bulletin of the Greene County Medical Society, Springfield, Mo., February 1965]

A PATH AND ITS PITFALL

(By Wilfred E. Wooldridge)

The greater part of medical research of the last 10 years has been devoted to the laboratory approach to illness rather than the clinical. This has not been altogether healthy for medicine for a complication of this state of affairs has been a widening breach between the physician in practice and the physician in research, the latter usually representing a teaching institution.

The technical advances of these 10 years have been tremendous and it is not realistic to advocate that the tools thus made available not be used, but it is equally unrealistic to make broad assumptions that human illness can be reduced to the manipulation of mechanical gadgets. It is a failing of the human mind that the thinking process under those circumstances becomes also mechanical, once the leavening of consideration for the illness of a fellow man is somewhere lost beneath all the equipment.

This aseptic approach to medical research in our institutions has resulted in reams of reports so sophisticated that they are of use only in other institutions, thereby bypassing the great legion of medical men who live with patients every day. I do not mean to belittle this pure research, except to the extent that it encroaches upon and replaces that which is applicable to human disease. But such does occur and we must thus beware that the availability of new techniques, and the awesome laboratories in which they are used, not preoccupy us so completely that medicine becomes split into one camp

representing the professor and another the practitioner. The implications of such a division are at once obvious, especially in these times so perplexing for medicine.

This trend to purely laboratory science is nowhere more evident than in one of our dermatologic journals which has been undergoing a gradual desiccation of spirit in the decade past. Formerly I found myself referring, time after time, to key reports in that journal, reports which would aid me with my problems of practice. Those pages are well-worn and I love the articles and their wisdom as I love old friends. There was little love wasted, however, on the November 1964 issue of that same journal which led off with "Experiments in the Sweating on the Palms of the Green Monkey" and proceeded with more and more of the same until I come to "The Direct Effect on ACTH on the Rat Preputial Gland." Both of these projects were accomplished under grants from the National Institutes of Health. I have no argument with them except that they should have appeared in a journal of comparative zoology; this particularly when the society publishing the journal would be out of business without the practicing physician to support it.

Neither has this trend been limited to publications. Indeed, the publishing of such oblique medical articles is only a reflection of where the interest all too frequently lies in our schools of medicine. A good example recently occurred in one of our more prominent schools when the professor of medicine showed commendable vigor in arranging with a great foundation for almost a half-million dollars to endow a chair of dermatology. Once that was accomplished, the professor then hired an immunologist and installed him as professor of dermatology, despite the fact the man could not have diagnosed a case of scabies on a clear day. He was then expected to administer a group of volunteer clinicians and the avowed purpose of the department was the training of young men in dermatology. The result was exactly what a child might expect; internecline revolt, which set the department back several years, but not until the "Precipitation Reactions of the Golden Hamster in a Cold Chamber," or some such piffle, had been thoroughly studied.

I do not presume to chart a path for medical research. I am neither qualified by training nor by mental capacity to do so. But not for a moment do I doubt that a great deal of medical research funds are being foolishly expended, one consequence being that the concentration of interest in our teaching institutions too seldom lies in the training of the young men on whom we must depend tomorrow to heal our sick.

[Release from the office of Representative
DURWARD G. HALL]
ANTS IN OUR GRANTS

Representatives DURWARD G. HALL, Republican, of Missouri, believes the Federal Government is betraying its responsibility to the taxpayer by expending vast sums of money on certain research projects "which may not be justified at all, but certainly not in a year when the country experiences a \$5 billion deficit.

"During 1964, the Federal Government through the National Science Foundation allocated \$358,551,437 in research projects which are incredibly broad in scope. No doubt many of these projects are valid, but I suspect many others should more rightly be financed by interested private foundations rather than by the taxpayers.

"Academic research often serves as useful purposes, but it's not such a 'sacred cow' that we can afford to allocate such great amounts of Federal funds for every purpose under the sun. In many cases, the lure of Federal money diverts thousands of professors from their primary duty to teach, while their classes are taught instead by assistants chosen from among students."

Among the research grants questioned by HALL, and listed in the latest compilation by the National Science Foundation:

Population Biology of Indo-Australian Ants—\$70,000; The Analysis of Nest Building in *Textor Cucullatus*—\$36,000; Decision-making in Small Groups—\$89,000; Preparation of a Handbook of Middle American Indians—\$124,700; Studies of Social Institutions—\$88,100; Ambiguity in Personality Assessment—\$80,000; Prehispanic Settlement Patterns of Teotihuacan—\$17,900; Formal Analysis of Interpersonal Relationships—\$41,900; Urban Structure of the Soviet Union—\$23,900; Prehistoric Mexican Influence on the Maya—\$4,400; Nubian Prehistory—\$98,000; Bronze Age Influences in Eastern Europe—\$3,200; Archeological Salvage in the Aswan Reservoir Area (Egypt)—\$53,800; Anthropological Study of Central Polynesia—\$6,800; Conference on the Status of Research in Prehistoric Archeology in the Aswan Dam Area—\$17,400; Aboriginal Occupation and Land Utilization in Northwestern Colorado—\$20,700; Chromosomes of the Chipmunks—\$12,600; Cultural Relationships Among Prehistoric Cultures—\$34,000; Phylogeny and Faunal Affinities of Fossil Bryozoa in the Middle Ordovician Through Silurian—\$34,400; Behavior and Breeding of Tree Shrews—\$20,200; Speciation in Cave Beetles—\$14,000; Social Structures in Madagascar—\$630; Human Ecology of the New Guinea Rain Forest—\$20,000; Early Man in South America—\$13,500; A Basic Index of Social Change—\$25,500; Study of American Kinship Structure—\$6,500; Paleocology of the Nile—\$24,700; Linguistic Study of Kymara and Kawki—\$5,400; a Multilingual Thesaurus of the Languages of the World—\$79,700; Directed Culture Change—\$25,000; and so on ad infinitum.

Representative HALL said the projects cited are only a minute percentage of the total grants, but they serve to illustrate how deeply the taxpayer is involved in every conceivable area of academic interest.

"I think the Congress must relate the benefit which may or may not flow from such expenditures to the danger of mounting national debt, deficit financing, and a restrictive and prohibitive tax rate.

"One project in particular which I take exception to is a poll, taken at taxpayers' expense to determine among other things, how popular politicians are in relation to other occupations. The poll is being conducted by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago.

"As a physician as well as a Congressman, perhaps I should be pleased that the poll shows that physicians rank No. 2 in prestige. But I challenge the prudent use of taxpayers' funds to conduct such a poll and perhaps this kind of expenditures of public funds are one reason that 'political occupations in general have lost prestige' as the poll states.

"All the lights that have been turned out at the White House wouldn't pay for the \$70,000 study of Indo-Australian ants. I think perhaps we've got ants in our grants."

POPULARITY POLL

Congressman DURWARD G. HALL said today a poll financed by the Federal Government—at a cost to the taxpayers of \$186,000—to determine the popularity of politicians in comparison to other occupations was made by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago, and covers a 3-year period. The study was financed by means of a grant from the National Science Foundation.

"Any private foundation, of course, is free to conduct any kind of poll it wants, but I do not believe the taxpayers should be financing such a poll at a time when the Federal budget is experiencing deficits averaging \$6 billion, the past 3 years. As one of the ranking Republican members of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Re-

search and Development, I've always supported sound and justified research projects, and have, since 1961, voted for appropriations totaling over \$24 billion for projects, which I believe to be vital and necessary.

"But this makes it all the more important that great discretion be used in determining what is a proper area for Federal expenditures and what is not. I do not believe that popularity polls costing almost a quarter of a million dollars are justified at the very time when Congress is attempting to finance a multitude of vital programs dealing with domestic and international problems, especially when there are numerous private polling organizations engaged in similar activity at no cost to the taxpayer.

"For this expenditure what have we learned? This is the way the poll rates the prestige of various occupations:

Occupations:	"Rank in poll"
U.S. Supreme Court Justice.....	1
Physician.....	2
Nuclear physicist.....	3
Scientist.....	3
State Governor.....	5
Government scientist.....	5
Cabinet member.....	7
U.S. Congressman.....	7
College professor.....	7
Chemist.....	10
Lawyer.....	10
Diplomat.....	10
Dentist.....	13
Architect.....	13
County judge.....	13
Psychologist.....	16
Director, large corporation.....	16
Mayor, large city.....	16
Minister.....	16
Department head, State government.....	20
Airline pilot.....	20
Priest.....	20
Civil engineer.....	20
Banker.....	24
Biologist.....	24

"I make no issue over the accuracy of the poll, however interesting some of its conclusions may be. I do question whether it was worth \$186,000, especially when the Congress is making every effort to preserve the value of our currency, by keeping expenses within available revenues.

"To further illustrate the need for sound priorities in the selection of research projects, it should also be pointed out that the Johnson administration has proposed a severe slash in Federal support for soil and water conservation programs. I think this program of technical assistance is far more important to farmers throughout the Nation than any 'popularity' poll. In Dade County alone we have almost 500 farms under cooperative agreement and 270 of these have developed complete soil and water conservation plans. This program has been so well received in southwest Missouri that we have organized seven new districts in 6 years. The administration proposal for a revolving fund to collect for SCS technical assistance would seriously jeopardize the program, which was developed 30 years ago to provide SCS technical assistance without charge to farmers willing to follow scientifically developed conservation programs on their properties. I have always supported the program in every Agriculture Department appropriation bill in the 5 years that I've served in the Congress, because it replenishes our basic resource—the soil—for future generations.

"If there's to be a cutback in Federal expenditures, I believe it should be in the field of financing 'popularity' polls, and not in a service of vital importance to our farm population. The administration has also announced plans for a sharp cutback in agriculture research stations throughout the country, at the very time when we need to find new markets and uses for agriculture by-

products. We managed to secure a 3-month delay in this slash, but the administration has announced its intentions to put it into effect at the end of that time along with the further cutback in VA facilities. These are all the more reasons why the people have cause to challenge federally financed popularity polls, under the guise of 'research.'

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN LATIN AMERICA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, with all of the trouble we are having in Vietnam, we are completely losing sight of what is happening closer to home in Central and South America. It seems strange to me that for almost the past year, neither from the President nor the Secretary of State has any information been given out about Cuba and the training of the saboteurs in that country who are sent into the Latin American countries.

The story appearing in the Washington Star of March 5 is one of the first stories that I have seen recently in regard to Communist activities in any of the Latin American countries. I dare say that those saboteurs causing the difficulty mentioned were probably trained in Cuba.

The article follows:

LATIN AMERICA, 1965—PEIPING-LINE REDS IN GUATEMALA TURNING BOLDER

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

GUATEMALA CITY, GUATEMALA.—Terrorists believed to be Peiping-line Communists are growing increasingly bolder in the 2-year war they have been waging against the military government of Col. Enrique Peralta Azurdia.

Their boldest move came recently when they took advantage of a national celebration to attack a convoy of Guatemalan troops as they passed under the Olympic Bridge overpass on one of the busiest streets in the capital.

Two soldiers were killed and four critically wounded when the terrorists dropped a fragmentation grenade into a crowded army truck on heavily traveled 10th Avenue in broad daylight. The government later said the terrorists also opened fire with a machine gun emplaced under the bridge.

By unofficial count, the deaths raised the number of persons slain by the terrorists in the last 2 years to about 80.

The government withheld all news of the attack until an army colonel issued a communique at the palace at 8 p.m. This reporter had arrived at La Aurora Airport about 2 hours after the attack and had put in a radio telephone call to the Star to tell about the attack hours before the formal announcement. Just as the reporter started to relate what had happened, the Guatemalan operator broke in to say there would be an interruption to change radio frequencies. And for the next 4 hours, the Tropical Radio Co. insisted that weather conditions had disrupted all service.

Guatemalan newspapers the next day said the army captured a machine gun at the overpass, seized numerous persons under preventive arrest, and described the government's action as a "suceso."

To many observers here, however, the Government's measures against the terrorists

generally are regarded as far from successful. In the last few weeks, since the new crisis over counterattacks by the United States against North Vietnam, the terrorists have become bolder. They took a potshot at an American military attaché here, but missed, soon after the United States bombed North Vietnamese bases.

Crudely painted signs have begun appearing on walls all over Guatemala City, reading, "Yankis—Fuera de Vietnam"—"Yankees, get out of Vietnam."

The Peralta government is under attack in two sectors—in the capital by an underground of about 1,000 antagonists and in the Izabal-Puerto Barrios jungle section of the Caribbean coastal region by an estimated 150 to 300 men. Government leaders believe that the guerrillas in the country and terrorists in the city take their lead from Castro Cuba, a bitter enemy of Guatemala, and from Peiping.

The known leader of the underground is a young, half-Chinese former Guatemalan Army officer named Marco Antonio Yong Sosa. He has admitted to a leftist Mexican magazine writer that his forces have carried out a number of political assassinations.

Ironically, Yong Sosa was trained in guerrilla operations by the U.S. Army at its Ranger training base in Panama.

Some observers believe he is tipped off by sympathizers in the army whenever a move is planned against him. Others point out that about 99 percent of the Guatemalan Army is made up of Indian troops. Yong Sosa's men also are Indians and it is said the troops are reluctant to fight against their own people.

The best estimate is that the Peralta government is far too strong to be toppled by the terrorists and guerrillas. But it is conceded that there is strong nuisance value to the attacks and that they cause political unrest in Guatemala.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM MUST HAVE STATE COORDINATION

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution from the cabinet of Florida.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the recently enacted Economic Opportunity Act is designed to eliminate the causes of poverty within these United States. The Governor and the cabinet of the State of Florida are anxious to cooperate in this program, to make its dreams a reality.

However, the Governor and the cabinet have been highly concerned that projects under this program, which are subject to approval by the Governor, have been negotiated directly by the Washington Office of Economic Opportunity and other Federal agencies having delegated responsibilities under the act, and local public and private nonprofit agencies in Florida, with no involvement of State agencies or officials.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious mistake. Florida has established within the office of the Governor a division of economic opportunity, staffed with competent professional personnel, to coordinate and assist in this program, and to bring the full resources of the State, when pos-

sible, to bear on the solution to these problems.

I urgently request that the Office of Economic Opportunity be made aware of the seriousness of this problem and that all such further projects be coordinated with our State officials. I call this to the attention of the Members of the Congress, to point out a problem which has arisen in my State, and may well be true of their particular State.

The cabinet of Florida felt so strongly about this matter that they have passed a resolution which sets forth their objection and recommendations. I sincerely hope they will be adhered to.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 has been enacted into law; and

Whereas widespread interest in the programs and services made possible by this act is evidenced among State and local organizations and agencies in Florida, both public and private; and

Whereas the Governor of Florida and members of this cabinet have indicated their desire to cooperate with the Federal Government and assist in the planning and implementation of worthy projects and programs designed to eliminate the cause of poverty in this State; and

Whereas this cabinet has established within the office of the Governor a division of economic opportunity in which professional personnel are employed to provide information and technical assistance to local agencies and groups in connection with programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, and to arrange for the specialized resources of other State agencies to be brought to the aid of project planners at the State and local levels wherever possible; and

Whereas it is firmly believed that through the proper involvement of State agency personnel and other resources in the planning and operation of projects, more effective programs will result in the war on poverty; and

Whereas projects under the said Economic Opportunity Act which are subject to approval by the Governor of the State have been negotiated directly by the Washington Office of Economic Opportunity (and other Federal agencies having delegated responsibilities under the act) and local public and private nonprofit agencies in Florida, with no involvement of State agencies or officials; and

Whereas plans for the initiation of the said projects thus negotiated have been publicly announced to the Nation by Federal authorities prior to any consultation with or referral of information concerning the said projects to the Governor of the State; and

Whereas State and local tax moneys are involved as matching funds in some of the projects thus negotiated and announced to the Nation; and

Whereas the procedures described above whereby State officials and the established department of State government are bypassed in the negotiations and planning between Federal and local authorities appear to represent an established policy of the Washington Office of Economic Opportunity, and portend an even wider application on the part of the Federal Government into other Federal assistance programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Governor of Florida and members of this cabinet who hold direct responsibilities under the constitution and laws of Florida for the general oversight and management of the operating public agencies and programs in this State, including health, education, welfare, industrial development and planning, and resource conservation and development, do hereby object to and protest the course of action currently

being pursued by the Office of Economic Opportunity and related Federal agencies which results in the said officials and agencies of the State being bypassed and ignored in the negotiations having to do with activities and programs in their above stated respective areas of operational responsibility; and further be it

Resolved, That the said Federal agencies be requested to cease and desist from this policy and to pursue instead a policy of Federal-State cooperation in these programs of mutual interest and concern; and further be it

Resolved, That favorable consideration of projects referred to the Governor of Florida under provisions of section 209(c) of the Economic Opportunity Act, shall be conditioned hereafter upon the cooperation of both Federal and local authorities in affording the opportunity for appropriate State participation in the planning, development, and implementation of the said projects.

HAYDON BURNS,

Governor.

TOM ADAMS,

Secretary of State.

EARL FAIRCLOTH,

Attorney General.

RAY E. GREEN,

Comptroller.

BROWARD WILLIAMS,

Treasurer.

THOMAS D. BAILEY,

Superintendent of Public Instruction.

DOYLE CONNER,

Commissioner of Agriculture.

ARE BANKS SHIRKING THEIR SMALL BUSINESS FINANCING ROLES?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement I made before a committee this morning concerning Small Business Administration loans.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I testified before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on the budget request for the Small Business Administration. Recently SBA was forced to curtail its lending activity because of a shortage of funds. One of the main reasons for this shortage was that banks had not participated in the SBA lending program as frequently as expected. On the other hand, while banks have not been supporting small business, the Small Business Investment Co. program has performed admirably in this area and the prospects for increased small business financing for this industry are bright.

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION REFUSES TO ACCEPT THE BLAME FOR SMALL BUSINESS FINANCING PROBLEMS

Mr. Speaker, recently several trade publications reported that the American Bankers Association will oppose certain legislative goals of the small business investment company industry because it is alleged that some small businessmen told ABA they were unable to obtain financing from SBIC's. The ABA implication is that SBIC's are not helping small business.

Certainly, every small businessman who applies to an SBIC for a loan will

not be granted the financing. This is true in every type of lending operation.

The SBIC industry is not a finished product. There are still rough edges to be smoothed, but the future of this industry as a source of financing for small business is indeed bright.

Since the American Bankers Association has brought up the subject of small business financing, I think it would be both educational and extremely interesting to look into the records to find out who does supply the capital for small business operations.

At the present time there are some 700 small business investment companies in operation in the United States. Although the act setting up SBIC's was passed in 1958, it was not until late 1959 that a significant amount of companies were in operation. Since 1959 SBIC's have accounted for more than 15,000 investments in small business concerns. These investments total more than \$718 million.

The SBIC program was instituted because banks were not providing the financing needed for small business. If banks were doing the job in the small business area, we would not have an SBIC program today. A similar banker shortcoming led to the creation of the savings and loan industry. If banks had provided adequate funds for home purchasing, they would not be faced with the competition from savings and loans today.

These feelings toward banks and small business are not mine alone. The Small Business Administration for years has been trying to sell its seasoned loans to banks.

In addition, a concerted effort has been made by SBA to interest banks in participating with SBA in small business lending. Have their efforts been successful? In a December speech SBA Administrator Eugene Foley provided the answer when he said:

Banks have not participated in our loan guarantee program to the extent we had hoped they would, and in joint loans with SBA they provide an average of only 25 percent of the total financing.

Had banks taken an active interest in small business, we would not have been faced with the situation that developed this winter that saw SBA almost entirely depleted of lendable funds, thus causing a ceiling of \$15,000 on direct loans. Since SBA operates on a revolving fund basis, the amount of money it can have outstanding at any one time is limited. Its loan supply is determined by the degree of speed with which the loans are repaid. To establish a secondary market, SBA long ago tried to interest banks in purchasing certain seasoned loans so that the Agency would have the money available for loans at the present time rather than waiting for the full maturity period. In order to entice banks, SBA sold these loans on a 90-percent-guarantee-payoff basis. The guarantee included both principal and interest. For this guarantee the bank had to pay only one-half of 1 percent. They still received 5 percent interest on the purchased loan. That means that if SBA sold a loan to a bank and the small business concern defaulted on that loan SBA would re-

imburse the bank for 90 percent of the outstanding principal and interest of the loan.

Since the guarantee included the interest payments and provided a 90-percent payoff, the bank for all intents and purposes had a 100-percent guarantee as far as principal was concerned and stood to lose nothing in the event of a default.

SBA has also tried to interest banks in participating with the Agency in direct loans to small businesses and has gone as far as to offer to buy up the bank's portion of the loan on 24 hours' notice, again giving the bank almost complete protection. Even with these ironclad guarantees, the banks have not fulfilled their obligation to small business.

Recently in correspondence to SBA I asked them to evaluate banks' role in SBA's guaranteed lending program. This is the answer I received:

Very few banks have indicated any interest in the loan guarantee plan. For the first 4 months of fiscal 1964, there were 206 loans under the guarantee plan or about 5 percent of the total of 4,117 loans participated in or made directly by the Agency. The dollar volume was less than 5 percent of the total dollar volume of SBA's loans made in the financial assistance division.

For clarity, let me state again the two types of loan transactions that are involved here. The guarantee phase involves loans that are made directly to small businesses by banks with repayment guaranteed by SBA. In addition, loans that are made by both banks and SBA as partners are considered in this category. The other type operation we are talking about are loans that are made by SBA directly to small business and then sold to banks. I reported earlier that until this year only about \$8 million worth of these loans had been sold annually to banks. During the current fiscal year banks have purchased some \$22 million worth of loans from SBA. This increase was brought about by SBA's hiring of retired bankers to interest banks in the purchase plan. While this increase in loan purchases on the bank's part is admirable, it is still only a scratch on the surface of the \$700 million loan pool that SBA has outstanding. With a 90-percent guarantee on both principal and interest, there is no reason why banks should not buy up large pools of these loans. This, in turn, would free new funds for lending to small business by SBA. If this were done, it would not be necessary, as is the present case, for SBA to tell a small businessman that "we can only loan you \$15,000 because we are short of funds." In the event of a disaster, what little loan funds that remain in SBA would soon be depleted, even with the \$15,000 limitation.

There are nearly 14,000 commercial banks in the United States. But, on the other hand, there are less than 800 SBIC's. Commercial banks have billions of dollars to lend while the average SBIC has only some \$300,000 in beginning capital with which to make investments. Despite the dollar limitations and the limited number of SBIC's, this industry, as I reported before, has made more than 15,000 investments totaling \$715 million. A majority of these investments were

made in companies who turned to SBIC's because the local banker would not help them, and had it not been for the SBIC, many of these companies would not be in operation today. I need not tell you of the countless jobs that have been saved by this industry and the thousands of dollars in taxes that this industry has brought in both directly and indirectly.

I do not know what small businessmen have been telling banks about their experiences with SBIC's, but I assure you that for every small businessman who has a complaint against the SBIC program there are thousands who would strongly back the program to the fullest. I would like to cite an example to prove my point. In a small southern city an employee of a construction company decided that he would like to open his own construction firm. He had an engineering degree and several years' experience in the construction field. He went to numerous banks in his locality trying to borrow money with which to begin operations. He was turned down at every bank. But an SBIC in his area was willing to help. It invested \$50,000 in the new company, but that was only the beginning of the SBIC's assistance to this new firm. Because it was a new construction company, the president of the SBIC placed his personal guarantee, backed with his entire assets, including his home, as collateral for the bond. How many banks or bank presidents would have taken this step to help a small businessman?

This construction company is now in its third year of operation. At the end of the first year it was \$742.84 in the red; at the end of the second year, it had a before-tax profit of \$48,884; and this year it is anticipated that the company will turn a profit of some \$100,000. The company has 40 employees and during its 3-year period has had a payroll of \$375,000.

This construction company, which only 3 years ago was denied a bond and was unable to bid on certain projects because it had no previous construction record, is now actively solicited to bid on jobs all over the United States. Had it been up to the banks this company would not be in existence now. But, fortunately, the SBIC industry provided the happy ending to this tale.

The story of this construction company, I assure you, is not an isolated incident among SBIC's. I urge every Member of Congress to consult SBIC's in their States to find out how they are helping to aid small business. Listen to their success stories. You will find that there are numerous Cinderella stories in your own States and districts. After you have done this, then reconsider the American Bankers Association's position that SBIC's are not helping small business.

EDUCATION INCENTIVE BILL

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, this is my 15th year in the House of Representatives and my voting record will show that I was never one to cast a vote for opposition's sake.

I am of the firm conviction that we can reach the President's avowed educational objectives by the passage of the education incentive bill that we propose.

Federal aid to education is not a new departure for Republican Members of Congress.

President Johnson reminded us of this in his education program message to the Congress. In support of his program he quoted the late Senator Robert A. Taft. I repeat the quotation that he used: "Education is primarily a State function, but in the field of education as in the fields of health, relief and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States."

I would call your attention to the clear-cut demand of the late Ohioan for a "basic floor." Knowing the late Senator so well, I know that his concern was with those with the greatest basic need. This was the provision that his original bill would have provided. This is definitely what our bill will do—provide a basic floor in education.

Incidentally, I hope that the President will continue to read the statements of the late Senator Taft—but in their entirety.

Further proof of our nonpartisan attitude should be evident to all. We took the Ribicoff bill in its entirety and added it to our measure. Though the idea for tax aid for parents did not originate with Senator RIBICOFF, we found that his bill carried the best thoughts on the subject. We did not make any effort to rewrite these proposals but give the Connecticut Senator full credit for them.

This bill that we offer has not one loophole that would permit Federal encroachment.

I am a firm believer in our school system. Our school administrators, the Governors of our States do a good job. They are under the constant surveillance of parents who are quick to spot any deficiencies in administration or education. Every successful man is a product of a dedicated teacher.

Today we are suffering from the penalty of steamrollered legislation. The Republicans on this committee strived to correct the administrative errors that were evident to us, last session, in the antipoverty bill. We wanted to make a good bill out of it—one that would be of real assistance to the impoverished. I exposed a letter on the floor of the House that showed the administration was not prepared to effectively put this program into existence. This admission by a leading member of the Government did not deter the bill's passage. Now what do we see. Some of the leading proponents of the antipoverty program have become the greatest critics of it.

Some of the present administrators of the program seem to have peculiar ideas of a poverty level. They believe that it

is a charity program—and that charity begins at home. They forget that President Johnson said that \$3,000 in earnings by a family put that family in a poverty level. They first set their own level of poverty at \$25,000 a year and voted themselves salaries of that amount.

No wonder that the President found it necessary to increase his budget demands for this new agency by 50 percent.

I would remind the Director of this agency that he has well gone overboard with his overhead. Maybe it is time for him to come to the decision that this billion-dollar bureau might be entitled to a full time administrator.

Just this morning while reading the New York Daily News, I noticed that three New York television stations have started a series of telecasts to teach people to read and write. Estimates show, the newspaper declared that there are more than one-half million people in New York City who are functional illiterates—unable to even read street signs. While a good proportion are foreign born, a shocking number are of American birth. I wish to commend television stations WPIX, WNDT, and WNYC for inaugurating such a very important program. By the bill that we advocate here today, we hope that this work can be eliminated for the next generation.

This same paper carried a story about the work of the New York City antipoverty organization called mobilization for youth. In that story, the MFY Director, Bertram Beck, stated that his organization "has had more failures than successes in the 3 years of its existence." He pointed to job training as one of the failures. He said that most of the jobs secured for its trainees proved to be dead ends. He states that he is now turning to a program of improving such basic skills as reading and writing. I do note that Director Beck defends the mobilization for youth's activities in social action programs such as rent strikes but he does say that he is starting a program of screening personnel that should eliminate Communist infiltration.

I am a full supporter of giving every child in America every educational opportunity. By doing this, and only by doing this, can we have a true democracy. Technological advances of our own generation are showing the way by which American families of the future can enjoy the greatest standard of living known to man.

Every American child should be given the opportunity in sharing in this great future. This can only be done if we raise the potentials of those on the bottom of the economic level.

The 88th Congress, through the work of this committee, came to the aid of our institutions of higher learning by giving them funds for improved facilities. We created more loans and fellowships for these institutional scholars. We, also, made certain that medical, dental, and nursing students received improved training. We increased the opportunities for vocational training. The present budget has a request of \$1.1 billion to finance these programs. As you can

see, we firmly believe in full educational opportunities.

But, let us not forget those with the greatest need. We still have illiterates and semi-illiterates. What good are the great schools of the Nation unless we prepare all children with the proper learning habits.

Many fields are open today for the nonprofessional that will bring him a level of wages by which he can live well and enjoy not only the essentials, but the luxuries of modern day living.

Let us give priority to those with the greatest need. Far too many are unable to take advantage of the fine training programs that we have established because we have failed to form proper learning habits in children at the necessary early age level.

Let us indoctrinate our children with the established fact that if they learn well, they will earn well.

President Johnson, in his education program message to this Congress, pointed out the major educational tasks that confronted us. No. 1 was "to bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most." In our measure we would really give priority to this great deficiency.

Let us not forget the effect that this action of ours can have on the morale of the educationally and socially deprived children. Most of them feel that no one has a real concern for their future. Our deep interest in them can give them the necessary incentive to improve their status in life.

The proposed Education Incentive Act is designed particularly to that area of the educational field that authorities state is most needful. This measure would see that Federal funds would be given directly to the States for distribution to school districts with the greatest concentration of educationally deprived children. The age range affected would be from 3 to 7 years, inclusive.

Other sections of the bill would give tax relief to those who now pay school taxes or who give financial assistance to college students.

I am indeed indebted to the most able Member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], for the excellent ideas that he developed for this act.

Mr. Speaker, certainly all of us who believe in equality of opportunity through education can realize that this bill would be a truly long stride toward that most desirous objective.

MASSACHUSETTS ATTORNEY GENERAL EDWARD W. BROOKE

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, last week the Washington Star carried an interesting article by David S. Broder on the attorney general of Massachusetts,

Edward W. Brooke. The career of this outstanding Negro attorney is becoming one of national significance. For that reason, I include the article in full at the conclusion of these remarks:

GOP INTEREST CENTERS ON BROOKE

(By David S. Broder)

More often than not, the solution to the most intractable-looking political problem is found, not through any agonizing ideological wrestle, but through the happenstance of an individual personality.

In the 1960 campaign, for example, the late John F. Kennedy—a liberal, labor-backed, Roman Catholic—appeared to have insoluble political problems in holding the solid South. But the availability of Lyndon B. Johnson as his running-mate immediately reduced them to manageable proportions.

At the moment, the thorniest of the Republicans' many difficulties is the Negro vote. Everyone in the party—from Dean Burch to Hugh Scott—has said the GOP must regain its traditional share of that vote, both North and South, if it hopes to win any future elections. But how do you convince Negroes the GOP is their friend, when the Democrats are in a position to claim the political credit for any civil rights legislation that passes Congress and any appointments of Negroes to Federal posts?

The answer for the GOP may lie in the obvious political availability of the distinguished Republican attorney general of Massachusetts, Edward W. Brooke. Brooke is identified—with a regularity that has become a little painful to him personally—as the highest-ranking elected Negro official in this country.

He is willing, not to say eager, to campaign next year for the seat now held by Republican Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, should that splendid Yankee wish to close his political career at the age of 74.

At the moment, the odds are against Brooke's having that opportunity. SALTONSTALL gives no indication of quitting; on the contrary, he and his principal aids have been touring the State, repairing old political alliances.

Brooke has made it plain he will not challenge SALTONSTALL in a primary. And even if SALTONSTALL should retire, Gov. John Volpe, another Republican, might assert a claim to the Senate nomination that Brooke would feel honorbound to respect.

But national GOP leaders cannot help but daydream about the political dividends they could reap should Brooke wind up as their Senate candidate. On his record—he was the only Republican to win statewide office in 1962 and he led the ticket in 1964 with a record GOP plurality of almost 800,000 votes—Brooke would rate as a strong candidate against anyone the quarrelsome Massachusetts Democrats nominated. If elected, he would be the first Negro Senator since Mississippi sent Hiram Revels and Blanche K. Bruce to the Senate in the 1870's under the unrealistic politics of Reconstruction.

The symbolism of Brooke succeeding SALTONSTALL, the very embodiment of traditional upper-class Republicanism, would do more than a dozen manifestoes to dramatize the new doctrine of a Republican Party with its doors wide open to all.

Even as State attorney general, Brooke has become an asset to the national GOP. He has spoken recently in Washington, Baltimore, and Cleveland and has unfilled requests from Republicans in a dozen other cities—including Atlanta and Dallas. As a Senator, his usefulness to the party would, of course, be magnified.

SALTONSTALL has had a long and honorable political career, from his start as a Newton alderman in 1920 through three terms as Governor and more than 20 years in the Senate. No one is going to suggest—much less urge—that he retire.

But if Brooke is frozen into his present job for another 4 years, a good many Republicans will regard it as a magnificent opportunity lost.

ARMED FORCES EFFICIENCY?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson in his state of the Union message said that in the last 4 years "we have built a military power strong enough to meet any threat and destroy any adversary. And that superiority will continue to grow so long as this office is mine—and you sit on Capitol Hill."

I have personally many times listened to Secretary of Defense McNamara repeat with computer-like precision the statistics which are used by this administration to support its frequent contention that it has brought America's Armed Forces to peak efficiency. Particularly, in the area of so-called counterinsurgency forces, this administration has repeatedly endeavored to convey the impression that the alleged prior neglect of the Eisenhower administration has been remedied. It must therefore come as a shock to the American public to read in the language of Peter Arnett, an associated press staff writer, in a story datelined Saigon, South Vietnam, that:

A flurry of new complaints came yesterday from U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam that they are fighting with shoddy weapons, shortages of ammunition, and a lack of equipment—although, they said, some items are for sale on Saigon's black market. One U.S. Army adviser said Soviet-made ammunition clips taken from the Vietcong are better quality than those sent from the United States. The American ones jam the U.S.-made weapon, he said.

Americans will perhaps recall that it has only been a few months ago that other reports filled the American press—reports that B-26 airplanes of World War II vintage were falling apart in combat in South Vietnam, and that there were other serious shortages of materiel.

The Defense Department in response to these latest reports of shoddy weapons in Vietnam said that "the complaints would be looked into."

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that these allegations of defective weapons and a shortage of defense materiel require more than a casual "looking into" by the Defense Department. The press has reported that a very secret Senate subcommittee hearing some months ago established the truth of earlier allegations of both a shortage of equipment and defective weapons in South Vietnam. The hearings must, indeed, have been very secret because I doubt that very many Members of the House of Representatives are even aware that such an investigation was made.

Mr. Speaker, I would publicly call upon the House Armed Services Committee to undertake a full and complete investigation of all of these charges. Particularly at a time when the United States has dispatched an additional two battalions of 3,500 U.S. marines to Vietnam, these troops and the American public are entitled to know that they are equipped with the very best weapons that money can buy. This Congress which in recent years has appropriated in excess of \$50 billion annually and more than 50 percent of our total budget for defense will be derelict in its duty if it does not promptly proceed without fear or favoritism to get to the root of these charges.

Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest any action that would jeopardize the security of our country. However, I do suggest that it would be false security for this administration or any other administration to hide behind secret hearings if the purpose is to avoid disclosure of past failures and past mistakes in the defense field. The security of our country is not a partisan matter, and in a free and open society the people are entitled to know the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee will promptly consider calling hearings on the subject matter of my remarks today, and to that end I have addressed a letter to him suggesting such a course of action as being in the best interest and welfare of our country.

BRUTAL USE OF FORCE IN ALABAMA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today's newspaper accounts of the brutal use of force in Alabama are difficult to read. They are difficult because the events in Alabama yesterday make us realize that the freedom which we believed was guaranteed by the Constitution can be continuously assaulted by a policeman's club.

Mr. Speaker, let us make no mistake about the nature of yesterday's violence. This was a planned attack under the orders of a Governor of a State in the United States. This was nothing less than an official assault upon the Constitution. American citizens exercising their right to peaceful assembly and free speech were clubbed, tear gassed, and whipped. The Federal Government has an obligation to protect its citizens in the exercise of their constitutional rights. Yesterday it failed to fulfill its responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Wallace's orders to the Alabama State police to break up the march from Selma to Montgomery were publicized in advance of the march. When I learned of these orders, I telegraphed the President of the United States yesterday urging that the Federal Government provide protection

through the presence of U.S. marshals or troops. The text of my telegram follows:

MARCH 7, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

The Constitution guarantees rights of free speech and peaceful assembly. Citizens seek to exercise these rights in a march from Selma to Montgomery. I understand Governor Wallace has ordered State police to prevent this peaceful march. I strongly urge that U.S. marshals or soldiers if necessary be sent immediately to protect citizens not only in their right to free speech and assembly but also in their right to register and vote.

WILLIAM F. RYAN,
Member of Congress.

If Federal marshals or troops had been in Selma yesterday I doubt that this peaceful march would have been violently broken up; and American citizens who did nothing more than exercise their constitutional rights would not be in the hospital today.

The tragic events of yesterday cannot be undone. However, a recurrence can be prevented tomorrow when Dr. Martin Luther King plans another march from Selma to Montgomery.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the President to order Federal marshals or, if necessary, Federal troops to protect those who will be marching tomorrow. The Constitution of the United States must be applied with equal force and effect in all the States of the Union. Nothing less than this principle is in question.

Mr. Speaker, we must also realize that underlying the struggle in Selma and other areas of the South is the question of the right to vote. Tomorrow I intend to introduce a new voting rights bill which will provide authority to the Federal Government to enforce the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution. We can wait no longer, Mr. Speaker, to secure liberty for all our citizens.

CRITICISM BY NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE OF VOTE ON FUNDS FOR HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a news release of the so-called national Republican congressional committee apparently written by the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON], chairman, or a Mr. Paul A. Theis, public relations director.

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

There was no objection.

The news release follows:

The Republican Congressional Committee charged that Representative TENO RONCALIO tried to cripple the House Un-American Activities Committee by voting to withhold

funds from the committee pending public "hearings" to "justify" its budget request.

The GOP committee noted that the House voted 332 to 58 on February 25 against a motion supported by the Congressman which would have held up \$370,000 in funds for the Un-American Activities Committee's work. The GOP group pointed out that HUAC members estimated that the so-called hearings would have delayed their investigation into subversive activities in this country at least 6 months.

"Fortunately," the Republican committee said, "the Congressman's vote was not decisive because the vast majority of House Members realized the importance of having a committee of Congress with powers to investigate subversive activities, whether they come from the far left or the far right. [The vote, however, was highly indicative of the type of Congressman now representing this district.]

"As Democratic Congressman EDWIN E. WILLIS, of Louisiana, chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, stated on the House floor, the basic drive to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee comes from the Communist Party and from Communist-front organizations. Unfortunately, Congressman RONCALIO's vote has lined him up with every subversive organization in the country which is trying to abolish the committee."

Noting that some Democratic Congressmen have protested against the Republican Congressional Committee calling attention to their House votes, the committee said: "When a man runs for Congress, he must expect to be held accountable for his votes in the Congress. That record should—and must be—available to the people of his district so they can judge his performance. That's the reason we are calling attention to just how the Congressman from this district votes on some of these controversial issues."

Mr. RONCALIO. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been reading the New York City dailies with more than usual care to see if my Republican colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], who voted as I did on this issue, received from this Republican committee this same alliance with subversion which it gave me in the papers of Wyoming.

I fail to find the above release in the New York area.

Can it be, Mr. Speaker, that an "aye" vote herein if cast by a Republican is an act of courageous leadership or of economy? But when cast by a Democrat it becomes an alliance with subversion? Surely not.

Could it be, Mr. Speaker, that all that has emerged from the great winter of discontent is a GOP advocacy of guilt by association? Surely not. Advocating a double standard? Anonymity to escape actionable libel? Surely not.

This release says my vote aligned me with subversion. My vote also aligned me with my Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]; with the President of the United States when a Member of this body; with the majority leader of the Senate [Mr. MANSFIELD].

My vote aligned me on this issue with the senior Senator from New York, Mr. JAVRS, and with other Republicans of the non-Goldwater stripe.

The Republican minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], I note by press items in the Wyoming papers, is to be a guest in my State for political meetings next week. I take this

opportunity to welcome the minority leader to Wyoming. I feel honored to be singled out so early in my term for such a visit.

In Wyoming, the minority leader will find Democrats and Republicans, but Americans all, who believe in fairplay and who fight hard, but fight fair, in the great arena of American political action.

I know that the minority leader believes in Americanism practiced, as well as Americanism mouthed—something that cannot be said for the authors of the above release.

THE ISSUE OF WAR OR PEACE SHOULD BE DISCUSSED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with reluctance as a freshman Member of the Congress that I rise to speak on this issue. The United States today is faced with a question of war or peace. But I have been disturbed as a Member of this body by the lack of debate on this vital question since the Congress is vested with the responsibility of declaring war.

There seems to be a climate of conformity and silence; that when there is an issue of war or peace, the only safe and patriotic course is to suspend debate and rally around the President. I seriously doubt if a debate would have any serious impact on the actions of Hanoi and Peiping. They will be influenced by other factors. But if this is a deterrent, perhaps the congressional debate on the issue of war and peace should be held in a closed session to which all members would be invited.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Members to an incisive editorial by Mr. Walter Lippmann on this issue in the March 15 issue of Newsweek magazine.

The article is as follows:

CAN THE QUESTION OF WAR BE DEBATED? (By Walter Lippmann)

On March 1 at a meeting concerned with the education of scientists, the President interpolated a few remarks about Americans here at home who are debating his policy in Vietnam. The President showed himself so much annoyed at the "folks who don't understand" that he just barely stopped short of denying their right to disagree with him. He did go as far as to say that the wars of this century were "brought about" because the noninterventionists led the Kaiser, Hitler, and the Japanese to believe that they could move without American interference. If the President's version of history is correct, it follows that when there is an issue of war and peace, the only safe and patriotic course is to suspend all debate and rally around the President.

On a number of counts, I find this attitude very disturbing. For one thing, it amounts to saying that debate on the vital issues of war and peace gives aid and comfort to the enemy. Under such a rule, the American people would have had no right to debate the momentous question of whether in 1917 and in 1939 they should emerge from the isolationism which they had practiced since

Washington's Farewell Address and the declaration of the Monroe Doctrine.

This is an impossible rule of conduct for a free people. Today there is an issue in Indochina which cannot be left undebated, and it cannot be entrusted blindly to the President and Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara. In Indochina for the first time in our history we are waging a unilateral war against Asians on the mainland of Asia. In the Korean war, let us remember, we were the agents of the United Nations and were supported on the battlefields by contingents drawn from Europe and Asia. But what is going on now is a radical innovation in U.S. foreign policy.

How else but by debate are the great questions of war and peace—of isolation and intervention, and of military expansion onto the Asian continent to be decided?

A MAJOR FALLACY

There is an even more seriously disturbing aspect of the President's remarks. There is a major fallacy in the notion that conformity and silence will convince our adversaries that the United States will prevail and that they must yield. The fallacy is that the issues of war and peace are determined by the state of American opinion at home rather than by the balance of forces abroad. I realize perfectly well that in Hanoi or Peiping they may like to read Senator Church's speeches or even the dissents of an occasional journalist. But it is a great delusion to think that this has any decisive effect on what they do in Hanoi or Peiping. What they do will be determined by the realities as they see them in Asia and not by how they read the Gallup poll in the United States.

The state of American opinion at home, and the balance of dissent and consent within it, is very important. But assessing opinion must not be mistaken for the conduct of foreign policy. I sometimes wonder whether this mistake is not now being made, and if the reports of the polls are not being treated as more important than the hard intelligence we may have about southeast Asia.

A DANGEROUS SELF-DELUSION

There is a difference not only of degree, but a difference in kind, between the conduct of domestic American affairs and the conduct of foreign affairs. In domestic affairs, when a consensus of Americans has been worked out, the legislation will pass and the country will accept it. But in foreign affairs, a consensus of Americans does not settle anything. The adversary, the reluctant allies, the neutrals, do not participate in the American consensus, and it is, therefore, a dangerous self-delusion to suppose that because we at home are all agreed we can compel all the others to agree with us.

At the bottom of this self-delusion, if we search deeply enough, we shall find a visceral feeling that, as compared with foreigners, we are always right and never wrong. If therefore we are agreed among ourselves, none can withstand us because none should withstand us, and we shall and must prevail. This same visceral feeling has engendered the demand, which made a botch of the settlement of both World Wars, for unconditional surrender as the only victory which Americans can accept.

In expecting conformity and silence at this stage—when the great decisions of war or peace in Asia are still in the making—the President may evoke those visceral feelings which, if they are sufficiently excited, will make the whole business before him unmanageable.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON APPORTIONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the

House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this opportunity to address the House to present my views on a most controversial question and one on which I sincerely believe that the Congress should take some action. This regards the apportionment of our State legislatures on a strictly population basis, as the Supreme Court has ruled.

There are two major questions in my mind. No. 1, will the Congress allow the judiciary to usurp its constitutional power to make the law? No. 2, will the people of the individual and sovereign States be allowed to determine for themselves the form of State government that they will have? These are serious questions, and I believe they are basic constitutional questions which we have a duty to resolve.

Let me state emphatically that I recognize there are inequities. I do not stand here today to plead for gross malapportionment. I recognize that some States have not attempted to meet their own particular problems. However, it seems to me to be just as serious a problem to allow the judiciary to dictate the form of government each State must have and even to assume the power to apportion State legislatures as it sees fit, if the States adopt apportionment plans with which the Court does not agree.

We are proposing a constitutional amendment. It is my opinion that such an amendment is necessary and that the Congress has a duty to present such an amendment to the American people.

The amendment to which I refer is very simple. We state that one house of our State legislatures must be based on population, but in the other house other factors may be considered, providing the people so approve.

The provision, which I consider to be vital and fair to this proposal, is that the people of the individual States must approve in a referendum any such plan for that particular State. I think in this plan we have incorporated the checks and balances, the fairness which meets the problem squarely.

I would call to your attention that the general assembly of the States approved a resolution in December that called for an amendment which would permit one house of a bicameral State legislature to apportion on geography or other non-population base, providing this arrangement was approved by the people of the State in a referendum. This proposal has been endorsed by the American Bar Association.

Seventeen of our States were on record, as of March 2, calling for a constitutional convention to write a constitutional amendment on this line. The action of these States brought to 21 the total of States which, since 1962, have petitioned for a constitutional convention to

write some type of new amendment on the apportionment problem.

In addition, to this, the Senates of Alaska, California, Colorado, Maryland, North Dakota, Oregon, and Wyoming, and the House in Vermont, have asked for a constitutional amendment along these lines. The California Assembly memorialized Congress to submit an amendment along these lines.

This points to the concern which these State legislatures have for this question. It is a serious one, and one on which the Congress needs to take action.

This Nation was founded on the principle of self-government. It was founded on a system of checks and balances. If we do less than this amendment proposes, both of these principles suffer.

The decisions of the Supreme Court relative to the apportionment of State legislatures is the assumption of a new role of authority which strikes at the very heart of our system of separation of powers. When the Court first determined to undertake settlement of the legislative apportionment disputes of the States, some of the Court's own members warned against entering this "political thicket."

My purpose in speaking today is not to castigate the courts, nor its members. I have an honest difference of opinion with their decisions, and in making this determination, they left themselves open to criticism from the Congress.

Ours is the responsibility for making the laws which govern the land, and it is the responsibility of the judiciary to interpret them and pass upon their constitutionality. In this decision, it is my opinion that the Court has made law. This is not their proper place in our system of government.

In its decision, the Court has asserted a new and novel judicial power under which the Federal courts are encouraged to intervene in what is essentially a political question, heretofore uniformly entrusted to the States; and this right has been recognized time after time by the Court.

In reaching this decision, the Court found it necessary and expedient to ignore and reverse a long line of decisions holding that it had no such power as it now presumes to exercise.

In my opinion, dubious grounds were necessary to make this determination. It was necessary to ignore the 10th amendment which reads:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

For many years now the Supreme Court has been encroaching upon the powers of the States, without mention of the 10th amendment, which is just as binding on the law of the land as any other provision. It was established to set the limits of power of the Federal Government, and such decisions as this ignore this provision.

In arriving at its conclusion, the Supreme Court has virtually dictated the form of government which shall govern our States. No longer will the people of the individual States be able to look at

their own particular problems and determine the proper course of action. That decision has been made for them.

No matter whether it be Hawaii or New York, Arkansas, or Idaho, every State must be the same—its legislature apportioned by a new law promulgated by the courts and not the Congress.

The one-man, one-vote theory sounds good to the tongue, but it does not take into consideration very real and severe problems. There are economic factors; there are distance problems; there are ethnic factors and many more which go into the makeup of true representative government.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to my distinguished colleague from California, who I might add has been very interested in this subject we have been talking about today.

Mr. BALDWIN. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this subject before the House today, and congratulate him on his learned presentation.

On the thought of a one-man, one-vote proposition, is it not true that the bill would be brought before the House by the discharge petition now pending, as amended by the amendment agreed to by the author of the bill, would say that the apportionment would be approved by the people of the State, and that actually would be a more true application of the one-man, one-vote rule than any court decision as to any reapportionment because the Supreme Court is not elected by the people, whereas the bill proposed would actually provide that the people of the State would have the opportunity to determine how their State should be reapportioned?

Mr. FUQUA. The gentleman is correct.

I might add further to the gentleman's remarks that this does carry out the principle that the people must approve any reapportionment made by the State legislature and provides all the checks and balances to provide for majority rule in the State. No one State can necessarily act at the expense of another. This provides, I think, adequate protection in a democratic way. Our Founding Fathers intended that the people of the legislature are responsible to the people. The Court is not responsible to any electorate. I want to commend the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. WAGGONER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and express my appreciation to the gentleman from Florida for bringing again to the attention of the House the matter of the apportionment and reapportionment of State legislatures. It is controversial, and has been, as it should be, the subject of much discussion in recent months here in Congress. At the outset you raised the question as to whether or not the Congress was going to sit idly by and allow the courts to usurp its powers. It is plainly evident that by its inaction the Congress is allowing this to happen.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] has just complimented the gentleman, and asked the question about the true intent of this constitutional amendment, and commented on the fact that the one-man, one-vote principle could be fairer under this proposed constitutional amendment than it is under the Court decision.

I should like to point out something that has been pointed out many times here before, that there are some here in Congress and some in the State legislatures all over this land who are being lulled to sleep by thinking that if they live in highly populated urban areas they are going to be the beneficiaries of increased power in local and Federal Government. Such is not the case, because if this one-man one-vote principle is applied to every elective office at every level of the government, State as well as Federal Government, we are going to find there will be no political office which is elective that will escape the application of this principle.

No matter how high the office might be or how small that office might be, in time if this rule is made to apply, people will lose their proportionate voice in government in that they will no longer have the right to rule their local government for themselves or even dictate its form.

But over and above this, I think everybody ought to be aware of the fact that the people who actually advocate and propose going along with the Court and oppose this amendment the loudest or the longest are those who in the end hope to destroy the Constitution of the United States and the U.S. Senate. Now you say it cannot happen because the Constitution provides that each State will have two Senators. That is true. But what is to keep one State from having more than two Senators or having weighted values placed on each Senator's vote so that the protection that the Constitution provides will in the end be destroyed so that some 15 urban areas in these United States will control every segment of government at every level.

The Congress by its inaction is letting the Court usurp its power. It is a deplorable thing that we are allowing the tripartite government that our Constitution provides for to be so disturbed and destroyed in the balance provided for by the Constitution as to the three branches of Government.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana for his contribution.

I might add that there are two basic questions involved. One is whether the Congress is going to assume the responsibility it has to make law instead of having that responsibility being usurped by the Supreme Court.

The second basic question is whether the people are going to have the opportunity to decide the type of representation they choose to have.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate my colleague from Florida. The gentleman is

rendering the Members of the House of Representatives a great service by presenting to us today the very excellent and outstanding address he has made on behalf of constitutional government. I also want to thank, along with my colleague from Florida [Mr. FUQUA], the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], and those many others of our colleagues who are day by day bringing to the attention of this House the fact that we ought to take some action to hold to these principles of constitutional government.

Again I thank my colleague and associate myself with the views he has expressed. I certainly join with him and our other colleagues in this fight for constitutional government.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank my colleague very much for his contribution and also for his support and encouragement in this fight to preserve some type of constitutional government and to have the opportunity for the principle of bicameral legislatures to continue working.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment my distinguished and able friend, the gentleman from Florida, for this timely presentation he has made to the House today. This is something which if the Supreme Court is allowed to get by with will destroy the very foundation stones upon which our government—local, State, and National—is based.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MORTON. I want to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, also on this very fine presentation.

I want to associate myself entirely with his remarks. There is one point, I think, that might be added to this whole thing, that is relevant. That point is that there are many legislatures and general assemblies in America that predate the Congress of the United States and predate the Constitution of the United States. I refer to the State of Maryland. We have had a bicameral legislature and had it in effect nearly a century prior to the establishment of this Congress. Yet recently one of the Members of the other body referred to the one-man, one-vote principle as a traditional principle in America. I take the position exactly opposite to that. I feel that the tradition has been that factors other than the population factor have governed the apportionment of our general assemblies and State legislatures.

These other factors have contributed to the greatness of America just as much as has the population factor, when used as devices for apportioning our legislatures.

I agree with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], who has pointed out that our entire system of government is well challenged by this

particular principle. We shall find that our natural resources will be managed by those people who know the least about them. We shall find that the areas into which America must grow will not be adequately managed, if we follow the course of one-man, one-vote.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his contribution, and particularly for pointing out the fact that his great State has contributed so greatly to this principle, even before the founding of this great Republic of ours. I appreciate his contribution in bringing this to the attention of the House.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY].

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the gentleman from Florida for bringing this matter up today. He has made a fine, an excellent, speech on the subject of apportionment and reapportionment.

This is a matter which is of great concern to me, as a student of the Constitution. I find myself in total disagreement with the decision of the Supreme Court rendered on June 15, and I certainly wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Florida.

Again I commend the gentleman for his timely and appropriate speech on the floor of the House today.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina and particularly so because of the fact that he represents one of the great metropolitan areas of North Carolina—and, I might add, he represents his district very well. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in preserving a very fundamental belief which he has, which he shares with all of us—the need to preserve our constitutional form of government and the separation of powers among the three branches of our Federal Government.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I am, of course, very grateful to the gentleman for his kind remarks. It is true that my district is the most urban in my State of North Carolina. About 69 or 70 percent of my constituents are city dwellers. But they are also great believers in the wonderful Constitution of the United States of America. They realize there is much to be said for and great merit in our system and the fact that those who wrote the Constitution as well as those who framed the constitutions of the several States believed it not only proper but also wise, to provide, in a bicameral legislature, that one house could be based on factors other than strictly population.

There are many other factors which are important in the government of our people and in this Republic, such as geographical location, size, municipal and local governments—which are separate entities in themselves—various industries, agriculture and various other areas of human endeavor, which, while they may not be composed of people themselves, are entities deserving of consideration and which of necessity must be considered if we are to continue to operate as a democracy.

These are factors which should be taken into consideration in determining the districts which representatives, not only in State legislatures, but also, I remind the House, on school boards, city councils and all local boards and agencies, should represent.

There is just no telling, Mr. Speaker, where this theory or principle of one man, one vote will end. If this Congress does not do something to correct that tragic mistake made by the Court in June of last year we know not where it will lead. I am hopeful that something will be done because it must be done. The salvation of the country and the Constitution rest here in this body and the other body, the Congress of the United States.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I commend the gentleman from Florida. I wish to point out an important fact, that this is not a partisan issue, this is not a sectional issue, this is not a philosophical issue. It is however the greatest domestic issue facing the 89th Congress.

I recognize and respect the right of the Court to its opinions. Certainly, their decisions of last June 15 represent, whether we like it or not, the law of the land.

However, the Constitution also provides certain remedies and ways to offset Supreme Court decisions. It is within this context that I would comment along with the gentleman from Florida. This is a highly important issue and a highly explosive issue in rural America, and again, a most important issue.

The Supreme Court's decision is based on the one-man, one-vote principle. This sounds good and, is difficult to argue with in some respects. Many States, including the State of Kansas, now have balanced representation in their State legislative bodies. We have in Kansas a State senate apportioned on a strict population basis. In our State house of representatives every one of our 105 counties has 1 representative and 20 additional seats are apportioned to more populous counties. So we have—and by and large most people in Kansas feel we have—a well-balanced State legislative system. We would like to keep it that way. That is why we are so concerned with the Supreme Court decision of last June 15. The Court states in effect that we cannot debase a man's vote. Each man's vote is entitled to the same weight as another man's vote. To carry this one ridiculous step further, perhaps the Supreme Court could choose the candidates, because some candidates are more effective than others, and members of the majority party or the minority party, as it may be, have more or less voice after their elections.

The one-man, one-vote argument holds little weight. Particularly in view of the Patman resolution—there will be an amendment to the Patman bill—it will provide the electorate must approve

any plan of apportionment. I certainly know of no better judge than the people of each State, and think their opinion would be far better than that of the Supreme Court, the only nonpolitical body within the American system.

The Court has gotten into a political thicket, a matter for political decisions, not Republican or Democrat decisions, but a matter of political decisions to be decided by each State. Again it is most important we recognize this is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue or a liberal issue or a conservative issue but an issue which will ultimately affect everyone.

Let me say to the Members who indicate some reluctance in signing discharge petition No. 1 that once those who now are pushing the one-man, one-vote theory and support the Supreme Court's decision of last June 15 control our legislature, these same people, the urban dominated legislatures, will be redrawing congressional district lines. The point is that we do have a real interest in what happens on a State level. As was pointed out by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY], it will not only work down the ladder but up the ladder.

Last week I appeared before a subcommittee in the other body and my closing remark was that by the action they take in the other body the seat they save may be their own. If we review the history of article V of the Constitution and the 14th amendment, it is reasonable to conclude for some that the U.S. Senate should be apportioned on a strict population basis and many people may have this already in mind. We can talk about the Federal system and the State's consent in article V, but the 14th amendment came long after article V in the Constitution. We all have a very direct interest in apportionment, and again I commend the gentleman from Florida for his statement.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Kansas making the point that it is not a party issue but an issue for those of us who believe sincerely in trying to do something that will preserve for the people themselves the right to determine the type of government and representation they should have in their State legislatures and, for that matter, in the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for his lucid and forceful presentation and associate myself with his remarks and the remarks of the others who have spoken. Like the gentleman from North Carolina, I represent an urban area, the major urban area in my State, notwithstanding which I feel because of the constitutional principles at stake it would be wrong for our country for the Supreme Court to remain unchecked in this area and that it would be right for our country for the sovereign States to be permitted to have bicameral legislatures if that should be the choosing of the people of those several States.

I feel nothing can be right for my country which is wrong for our country.

I feel further that the interest of the people who live in rural areas in my State and in other States is important to all of us. I am concerned that our rural areas shall be properly represented in the State legislature, that their voice be heard and their interests be protected, and that all elements of our American public should be properly represented both at the State and Federal levels. Therefore I concur in the gentleman's comments and congratulate him on them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Alabama and his interest in this very important subject.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman on an excellent presentation and to associate myself with his remarks.

The district I represent contains the second largest city in Utah, Ogden. During the campaign and since the campaign I have taken a strong stand that an amendment or legislation which would effectuate the wishes of the gentleman now in the well should be passed. Quite frankly there have been no demonstrators in the streets in Ogden, there have been no mass meetings calling for my scalp, to underscore the fact that this is not a political consideration.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the other Representative, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING], who is not of my political faith, and who represents the largest city in Utah, Salt Lake City, has joined with me as I have with him and we have both introduced bills to effectuate this purpose. We have both signed the discharge petition that would effectuate this and as has been stressed already I think there is not any doubt in the minds of most Members that there are considerations other than people; and while people might be the most important element that should be represented, it is an accepted fact, at least it has been up to this point in American history, that there are regional and geographical considerations, there are economic and social considerations that need representation in legislative bodies, as well as people. If this were not the case how could the continued existence of the U.S. Senate be accepted?

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution to the discussion today, and I appreciate his interest in trying to help preserve the existence of the bicameral legislature.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri who has been, likewise, very much interested in this subject and who only last week made some very interesting and penetrating

remarks on this floor on this same matter.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding. I want to commend him for taking this special order to discuss what I believe to be the greatest constitutional issue facing the American people in this century. The gentleman from Florida has long been interested in this cause and has made many valuable contributions to the fight for a constitutional amendment.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida whether any Member of the House—I should like to point out to the gentleman from Florida that I was absent on other business and was not able to hear the first part of the discussion this afternoon—referred to or read the editorial in today's Washington Post. Has this editorial been brought to the attention of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. FUQUA. In reply to the gentleman, no, it has not been mentioned on the floor today.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity, then, to read this editorial from the Washington Post to the gentleman. To me it is very, very amusing. I read:

PERILOUS AMENDMENT ROUTE

Maryland's petition to Congress for a convention to amend the U.S. Constitution would scarcely be noticed if it stood by itself. But this is the 22d petition of this kind to be passed by State legislatures in connection with the politically explosive reapportionment issue. In six additional States the petition has been passed by one house of the legislature. If action is completed in these six States and six other States follow suit, Congress will presumably be under obligation to call a constitutional convention.

The Constitution is very specific on this point. Article V says that Congress "on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments." This amendment procedure has never been used, but once two-thirds of the States have taken the initial step Congress could call a convention by a majority vote, and it could propose amendments without limit—amendments which might or might not be subsequently ratified by three-fourths of the States without any direct approval by Federal authorities.

It seems inconceivable that Congress would let this happen. Yet the States are rushing toward the convention idea at a frantic pace. Of the 22 now on record, 18 have acted since last December. The remaining four had previously passed a stiffer resolution designed to summon a convention that would completely bar the courts from any decisions in the sphere of reapportionment.

In the circumstances Congress may be virtually compelled to offer a constitutional amendment of its own to allow the States some leeway in apportioning their senates along geographical and historical as well as population lines. Certainly that would be preferable to calling a wide-open constitutional convention. We are glad to note that the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee is conducting hearings on the problem and that the House Judiciary Committee intends to do so next month.

The chief difficulty arises from the fact that most of the amendments that have been offered are much too sweeping. If an amendment is to be adopted, in our opinion it should permit the States with bicameral systems to have only one house deviating from a strict apportionment according to

population. It should leave the door wide open to apportionment of both houses on the basis of population if the States want it that way. It should strictly limit the deviations that might be made from the one-man, one-vote formula in the interests of geography and adherence to county lines and it should require specific approval of such apportionment plans by the voters of the State.

Such a carefully limited plan would not amount to going back to the "rotten-borough system" which Senator DOUGLAS so vigorously deplored. Rather, it would merely allow the States some of the discretion that they have always exercised in shaping their own governments.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the gentleman from Florida that it appears the Washington Post, which has always been a great enemy of the constitutional amendment along the lines recommended by the gentleman from Florida, is having a change of heart. Perhaps they are becoming aware of just how moderate most of the proposals pending are.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Florida that there are many people within this body and outside of the House of Representatives and the Senate who really do not know just how far the Supreme Court went in the Colorado case. The Supreme Court in the Colorado case violated its own one-man, one-vote principle, because it said there that even though the people of Colorado had chosen to have one of its Houses based upon geography, even though they had voted by a vote of almost 3 to 1 in statewide voting to have one of its Houses based upon factors other than population, they could not do so.

I would like it to be reemphasized to the Members of the House that most of the proposals which have been on file here in the Congress and which are now pending before the Judiciary Committee are indeed very mild. It is true that some of them are quite sweeping.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida is working toward a constitutional amendment which will permit the people of Florida, the people of Missouri, the people of Illinois, the people of California, the people of New York to choose by a majority vote the form of government that they want; is that not correct, I will ask the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. FUQUA. The gentleman is very correct, and I appreciate his contributions, particularly the point of bringing to the attention of the House the fairness which this contains. To me this is democracy in action when you give the people the constitutional right they thought they had for so many years to determine for themselves the type of legislative body they wish and feel they want in their own individual States.

I very much appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I too want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman. I think it is fine that he should take this time to bring to the attention of the American people one of the greatest problems we have today. I, too, was

amazed when the Supreme Court took jurisdiction of this matter.

Recently I was in Williamsburg, and saw a historical movie there in which it shows the Governor of the new Virginia colony with a stroke of the pen dissolve the Legislature of Virginia because they were remonstrating against an edict of the King. That is what the Supreme Court of the United States did when it entered into this apportionment case. They in effect said they had the right to dissolve Parliament. When a court can dissolve our legislative assemblies, it is one of the worst things to happen in my time.

In Pennsylvania we have a constitution which says each county shall be entitled to one member of the legislature. The small counties that have one member of the General Assembly have problems born of scarcity of population, they pay their share of taxes and, because of the smallness of their population, they need that voice in the Pennsylvania legislature.

The Supreme Court has said the Pennsylvania reapportionment rule is unconstitutional within the meaning of the Federal Constitution, which of course is preposterous. In 1774 the people of Pennsylvania voted for that State constitution wherein they provided for one member from each county in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives.

I therefore think that the constitutional amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] should move. I would like to have it move faster. I would not like to see the referendum feature attached to it. If that is put through requiring a referendum of the people, the big cities like Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and the large urban centers, will out-vote us, and those who represent rural Pennsylvania will be out, as we are today.

Here is another admonition: The State under the reapportionment law should have a self-executing penalty. What has brought on our problems is this: We, the members of the State legislatures, and I was there for 17 years, closed our eyes to reapportionment laws because there were no teeth in them. The court took jurisdiction. We brought it on ourselves, and I say now that if we pass new reapportionment laws we should build into those laws a self-executing penalty.

I have studied the laws of all 48 States, and I think California has the best State reapportionment law of all. If the Legislature of California fails to reapportion every 10 years, as required, a commission is organized and it does the job. The courts do not do it. The commission is set up to reapportion if the legislature does not do it.

As I say, let us have this amendment the way it is, submit it to the States, then each State should put in a penalty clause so that every 10 years the job will be done and the courts will not take jurisdiction.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks made by my distinguished colleague from Florida. Unless the Congress of the United States takes some action to stop the writing of laws and overriding of the Constitution by this alleged Supreme Court that we have, we are going to see gradually the entire concept of government as we have known it disappear. This alleged Supreme Court rules. I do not think it is a Supreme Court. I do not think there are enough legal brains over there from the standpoint of writing law to fill a pen with ink enough to dot an "i". I do not think we have enough people on that Court who are practical or who know anything about law.

This conclusion that with some strange reasoning they arrived at over there of one-man, one-vote only tells me and should tell this Congress, we must wake up and assert our responsibility. The one-worlders want to do one thing and one thing alone, they want to redefine, so to speak, the Senate of the United States.

If we are going to have one-man, one-vote based on representation, as they say we must, then why would the great State of New York have only two Senators and the States small in population, such as Alaska, have two.

I wonder how this Court would rule if it had the opportunity to rule on the apportionment of votes within the United Nations. Within the United Nations, there are member nations with a population smaller than the population of my congressional district; and yet, these nations have the same vote that the United States has with its population of some 192 million people.

These things were written into our Constitution by our Founding Fathers for good reasons. They were written into the Constitution to protect minorities. Yet here this bunch of fumbling, bungling, so-called lawyers come along and rule to change what the Founding Fathers really intended to do and what our Constitution plainly states. If a State has no right to apportion one of its legislative branches on the basis of other than population, why is the Senate of the United States not supposed to follow that particular theory of reasoning?

I tell you that the Congress has sat here and allowed this bunch of people who call themselves Justices of the Supreme Court to write the laws, to rewrite the Constitution of the United States, and reach out for the power that really belongs to the people through this Congress. Unless you do something about reasserting the rights of the Congress—very soon, and I see one of my friends smiling—I predict that in a short time this will come true: you will have no power here in the Congress. When this happens you might as well be elected and stay home and send your vote up here with a rubberstamp and pass the various appropriation bills, because apparently that is all you will ever have a right to do.

That is what is going to happen in this country. Congress has allowed the Supreme Court to usurp powers given you, and today is telling you what today is the law of the land, against what we

have been following for nearly 200 years as basic law and philosophy of government in the United States.

I thank my colleagues for yielding.

Mr. FUQUA. I appreciate the gentleman's sentiments.

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

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I appreciate the gentleman's comments and the opportunity he has given the House to discuss this important matter at this time. Certainly, there is nothing more fundamental than the problem of the apportionment of Representatives. Certainly, there is a very great urgency upon this Congress to take action at this time. The people of the several States, almost every time they have themselves had the opportunity to vote on this issue, have decided against the principle of so-called one-man, one-vote. On every occasion when they have amended their own State constitutions, and a good many States have amended their State constitutions through the initiative and referendum, they have recognized the soundness of the principle of a balanced legislation.

That is the history of Michigan—my State. On every occasion the people have turned down at the ballot box the one-man, one-vote principle. Still the Supreme Court of the United States now says that any other considerations are unconstitutional. It is shocking and I cannot think of a stronger word to use—it is shocking that the Supreme Court of the United States should assert unto itself the power to determine the structure of the legislative branch of Government. Because if the Court has the power to determine the structure of the legislative body, why stop there? Perhaps it can also determine the structure of the executive branch.

The Supreme Court of the United States is uniquely the one branch in our Government of separated powers that is not politically answerable. There is not anything more fundamentally political than the structure of the representative branch of government in the States—our State legislatures. If the Supreme Court of the United States, which is not elected by the people and not answerable to them, has the power, as it says it has, to determine the very structure of the State legislative bodies, it follows that it will have the power and can assert the power to determine the structure of subordinate legislative bodies like city commissions and county boards of supervisors and the like. If that is the case, where does the political power of the United States then lie? Not in the people, but in the Supreme Court.

I might say to the gentleman that in a survey of the people of my district within the last month, I asked my constituency whether in view of the political powers now being asserted by the Supreme Court of the United States there ought to be some consideration given to a restructuring of the Supreme Court itself—perhaps by providing for the appointment of Supreme Court justices for fixed terms—maybe 12 years. I will state

on the record that my constituency, according to the returns in this poll, overwhelmingly supports the proposition that if the Supreme Court of the United States is going to continue to assert this great political power then the terms of office of its own membership should be limited as to time.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and for his very pointed remarks.

Mr. Speaker, now, I would be the first to admit that inequities exist. However, the Federal judiciary was never intended to be an instrument of political power. It is a branch of the Government not chosen by the people, nor at any time is it answerable to them.

It is a fact, and a basic fact, that political power in our system was to be vested in the people and their elected representatives. Federal judges are not those representatives. Resolving of political questions is not their prerogative nor is it in their rightful power.

Judges, appointed for life, not answerable to the people, can mold the American political system. Who are these men? Just like you and I they are prone to make mistakes. They are subject to the same greatness and good, the same error in judgment that any other man is subject to. While I have the greatest of respect for our judiciary, I believe and feel they would agree that they are subject to human error.

Nothing would prevent a politically oriented court from "gerrymandering" districts to suit the ends of its party. The court might be sincere in believing this was a wise course of action; it might use all of the faculties at its command and still arrive at what could be an erroneous decision.

I do not believe that the Congress should leave in the hands of the judiciary the authority to determine legislative districts. We owe it to the people of the United States to place this power in their hands.

As I noted before, I realize that inequities exist, but what we are heading into is far worse than that of malproportioned legislatures. The courts must not be allowed to make the law.

We should not neglect every other single factor in determining our legislative apportionment, save population. This was not the basic premise in establishing our Federal Congress. It was not the intention of the founders of this land.

Only today have we suddenly discovered that basing one house on factors other than population is unconstitutional, arriving at the decision after one and three-quarter centuries. To arrive at this decision, we had to completely disregard other parts of the Constitution which are just as germane and just as important as those which the Court has strained in order to reach this decision.

This is not an idle question.

Those of us who believe that Congress should act do so with the sincere feeling that this is a basic and very profound constitutional question.

In our bicameral system of State legislatures, adopted by all but one of our States, one house is based on population and the other on factors other than pop-

ulation. There is another factor in the legislative process I would mention—the Governors of the States.

The Governor participates in the legislative process by veto or by threat of veto. He, too, is elected by a majority of the people and is in fact a third arm of the legislative process, working in concert with the House and the Senate.

Out of this consensus comes the law of our land. This has been our tradition, our heritage, and until now, our law.

As has been pointed out in this Chamber, the late Justice Frankfurter sounded the alarm in one of the initial cases when he pointed out in his dissenting opinion:

The Court today reversed a uniform course of decisions established by a dozen cases, including one by which the very claim now sustained was unanimously rejected only five years ago. * * * Such a massive repudiation of the experience of our past in asserting destructively novel judicial power demands a detailed analysis of the role of this Court in our constitutional scheme. Disregard of inherent limits in the effective exercise of the Court's "judicial power" not only presages the futility of judicial intervention in the essentially political conflict of forces by which the relation between population and representation has time out of mind been and is now determined. It may well impair the Court's position as the ultimate organ of the supreme law of the land.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD], spoke on this same issue here last Monday. He pointed out a speech by the then Governor of California, who now serves as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, in which the Governor said:

Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting their representation to the State senate to a strictly population basis. It is for the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the Union, equal representation in one House and proportionate representation in the other. Moves have been made to upset the balanced representation in our State even though it has served us well and is strictly in accord with the American tradition and the pattern of our National Government.

The reapportionment decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court have had an impact on virtually every State in the Union. The flow of court and legislative action begun by the Court's precedent shattering decision in Baker against Carr in 1962 was sharply accelerated by a group of June 1964 decisions in which the Court ruled that the one-man, one-vote principle must apply to each house in every State legislature.

During 1964, State and Federal courts declared the apportionment plans of 32 States to be unconstitutional. State legislatures reapportioned themselves in 10 States and the courts did the job for them in another 4 States. At the start of 1965, 24 States were under court order to reapportion before the next State legislature elections.

The State of Colorado presents an interesting study. Colorado voters approved a plan in 1962 which provided for house districts to be based on population and the senate on factors other than population, the same political system which

governs these United States. However, despite its overwhelming approval by the people of Colorado, the Supreme Court ruled this plan invalid. Here we find the people of a sovereign State overruled by the Court—a body not elected by them, not answerable to any body of electors.

There are those of us in this House who sincerely believe that a great constitutional question is at stake. Will the Supreme Court make the laws for this land or will it be the Congress? That is the question, the basic question, with which we are faced.

We seek to present to the people of the United States a constitutional amendment. We seek to allow them to determine the form of government which they desire. Certainly nothing could be more democratic.

We seek not to condone malapportionment. We recognize the problems which we are faced with. However, we feel that we have a right, and a duty, to provide the American people a choice of the type of legislature by which they will be governed.

It is our feeling that one house should be based strictly on population and the other house based on factors other than strictly population. This would preserve what has been a historic concept, one which we cling to in our Federal Government.

This is not an idle question. It is a basic question, one which will determine the course of our Government. This question should be clarified beyond reasonable doubt. If the people of this Nation want and believe in a government where one house of their State legislature is not based strictly on population, they should have that right. Conversely, if they do not want that type of State legislature, they have that right also.

It is not for the courts to make that determination. It is for the Congress, and other elected officials, answerable to the people, who have that right.

Let me again emphasize the amendment which we propose. It would allow for an individual State to pattern its government on the sound basis which forms the basis for our Federal structure. While one house would have to be based on population, as is our own U.S. House of Representatives, the other house could consider other factors.

The elected representatives of the people would have to come up with a plan. They know their State best; they know its problems. They would be checked by the Governor, elected by all of the people who could veto their proposal and thus generally would have a voice in the decision.

Then the plan would have to go to the people. Only after the people of the particular State had acted would it become the law.

It seems to me that this is the fair solution. We are placing this question squarely where it should be—with the people.

As you well know, Congress cannot pass a constitutional amendment. We can only propose. Then it will be up to the

individual States to either adopt or reject this amendment.

I urge that we give the American people this right. I urge that we bring this matter to the floor of the House. Let us debate the issue. Then let us make a decision based on the merits of the case. It is my feeling that this is our duty, for if the law of the land determining the makeup of our State legislatures is to be changed, let Congress make that change.

Let us not shirk this duty.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPTURE OF REMAGEN BRIDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROUSH). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1945, a small band of American armored infantrymen and tankers surprised German defenders of a bridge across the Rhine River at Remagen, and crossed the bridge before it could be blown up.

In celebrating the 20th anniversary of this dramatic event, Mr. Speaker, I would like to underline the fact that the capture of this vital bridge crossing saved thousands of American lives and shortened the war in Europe by several months. Truly, it was a moment for history.

What occurred at Remagen bridge on March 7, 1945, is incredible, as we review the events today. By all odds, the bridge should have been destroyed, and in fact, the German defenders did make every effort to destroy it. When they fired the demolition charge, the bridge seemed to lift up from its foundations, and then miraculously fell back—severely damaged, shaken, but still standing. At this point, not knowing whether the bridge would hold them, the first American troops dashed across to establish a toehold east of the Rhine. On the night of March 7, we sent tanks across the shaky bridge.

Within 24 hours of the first crossing, 8,000 American troops and vehicles had crossed the bridge, which was worth its weight in gold. Then pontoon and trestle bridges were built by the engineers, while repairs were being made to the main bridge. The main bridge collapsed without warning on March 17, 1945, carrying to their deaths 28 American engineers who were working feverishly to strengthen the structure. But by this time, the pontoon bridges had been completed and were carrying traffic.

Mr. Speaker, the capture of the Remagen bridge is an epic of American courage and initiative. As several German generals remarked to me after the war, "It could have happened in no army but the American Army."

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

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to compliment my colleague,

the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] for calling the attention of the House and of the Nation to the fact that this day, or approximately this day does commemorate the crossing of the Rhine over the Remagen Bridge. The gentleman has distinguished himself by his book "The Bridge at Remagen," which accurately and colorfully records this historic event which was so instrumental in hastening the defeat of the powerful German army. The commander of that first tank which crossed the Remagen Bridge on that black night was Sgt. William J. Goodson, who resides in my district. It is in the recalling of the exploits of the few that we realize the extent of the contribution of so many during the years of World War II.

One extraordinary exploit took place 20 years ago this past Sunday. It was on that March 7 of 1945 that a handful of men captured the Remagen Bridge across the Rhine River. In so doing they eliminated the need for an assault crossing which would have cost thousands in casualties.

The backgrounds of the individuals who made up this handful blended into those of their fellow soldiers. The war years over they again blended into the background of their fellow citizens. One of these was employed in a furniture plant in his hometown. He returned from the war to pick up his peacetime operations. He married. He became the father of twins. He now works in a large industrial plant.

There are not many of his fellow workers, neighbors, and friends who realize William J. Goodson, of Pendleton, Ind., was one of this small group who were awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for the bravery they exhibited in this single act which contributed so much to shortening the war. There are few who know he was the commander of the first tank to cross the Remagen Bridge to establish that vital bridgehead.

There were 15 million Americans who were members of our Armed Forces during World War II. In recalling this one single hour in the life of one member of this citizens Army we realize again what extraordinary soldiers they were.

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

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend my distinguished colleague for calling to the attention of the House the anniversary of this great military event in the history of our country—the capture of the Remagen Bridge across the Rhine. I want to also thank my distinguished and able colleague for bringing this remarkable feat to our attention and also for writing an outstanding book on the Remagen Bridge, titled "The Bridge at Remagen." I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and to all those interested in true military history.

I would like to remind the House that one of the first to cross the Remagen Bridge was John Grimball, from Columbia, S.C., who is now a distinguished and able judge of the South Carolina circuit

court, whom we all love and admire. He was awarded the Silver Star Medal, Presidential Unit Citation, and the Distinguished Service Cross for taking a leading role in the crossing of the Remagen. Judge Grimbail is married to the former Caroline Gordon Belser, of Columbia, S.C., and is the father of five children. He was a member of the House of Representatives of the South Carolina General Assembly prior to his election as circuit judge in early 1960.

On the 10th anniversary of the Remagen crossing a group including Judge Grimbail met at the White House with former President Eisenhower. At that time it was generally agreed that one of the most stirring moments of World War II occurred during the crossing of the Remagen. The tanks were braced for the initial crossing and each man waited for the order. Suddenly the radio was heard amid complete silence in each tank. The order from the commanding officer was clear and to the point—"Lieutenant Grimbail, get to the bridge." For a moment there was a pause and Lieutenant Grimbail replied in a rich southern accent that could be mistaken by no one, "Sir, I'm already at the bridge."

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina as well as those of the gentleman from Indian [Mr. ROUSH]. There were 13 individuals who were awarded Distinguished Service Crosses, members of the combat engineers, the armored infantry, and tankers for this exploit on the 7th of March 1945.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago yesterday, on March 7, 1945, a small but valiant group of American soldiers took action to prevent the Germans from blowing up the strategic bridge at Remagen. That action, in the considered opinion of our top military leaders, saved the lives of many American soldiers.

For that heroic action under enemy fire 13 men were awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. One of the men taking part in that memorable action and winner of the DSC is Mr. Joseph Petrencsik, 12547 Firsby Avenue, Cleveland, who I am proud to say is one of my constituents.

Twenty years have passed since that battle at the bridge of Remagen. Two of the men who were honored for bravery there have passed on to their reward. We have not forgotten them, or those who are still with us. By recalling this day, we honor the memory of all those Americans who demonstrated outstanding bravery under fire and remind this generation of young Americans that our priceless heritage of freedom requires men of strong heart and courage to defend it. This has been true in every generation and today we see the truth of its meaning in the organized assault against human freedom which grips the world.

I commend our colleague, KEN HECHLER, who himself was one of the

small group of courageous Americans at Remagen, for keeping alive the memory of his comrades in arms on that day when bold and resolute action by a few spared the lives of many.

RECENT VISIT OF ITALIAN ARTISTS TO WHITE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was highly privileged to be present when President Lyndon B. Johnson met with a group of visiting Italian artists in the White House on Friday, February 26, 1965.

The President's generous act of inviting the 120 visiting artists is indicative of both his great friendship for the Italian people and his warm regard for their sustained contribution to the art and culture of the world.

These artists arrived in New York City on February 25 on a good will tour, sponsored by the Italian-American Labor Council of which Luigi Antonini is president. Among the better known members of the group are Lucio Fontana, Aldo Matteotti, Gianni Dova, Countess Rossella Rossi Scotti, Adriana Zanoletti, Agemore Fabbri, and Bruno Rossi. While in New York the group will assist in a benefit for the Italian Hospital and the Polyclinic of New York. The group is comprised of the following artists:

Aimone Nino, Torino; Ajolfi Elia, Bergamo; Albertoni Filippo, Bologna; Ardigo Alessandro, Cremona; Arrigoni Sergio, Milano; Barscigliè Raffaele, Sorrento; Bartolini Dullio, Milano; Bergamo Renzo, Milano; Balansino Giovanni, Rescalda (Milano).

Benedini Gabriella, Milano; Bittanti Lidia, Cremona; Bianchi Luigi, Bologna; Boccato Angelo, Milano; Bocchini Mario, Cesena; Bollini Dino, Gallarate; Bonetti Antonio, Ferrara; Bosisio Carla, Milano; Boveri Fiorella, Biella; Budigna Luciano, Milano.

Cuglioni Ernesto, Roma; Calandri Mario, Torino; Callegari Ducci, Milano; Calvi Aldo, Milano; Carlino Silvana, Biella; Cappello Carmelo, Milano; Chicco Riccardo, Torino; Chiarelli Luigi, Milano; Ciucci Giovanni, Pisa; Colonna Ezio, Torino.

D'Anzi Giovanni, Milano; De Valle Beppe, Torino; Di Prata Oscar, Brescia; Dova Gianni, Milano; Dova, moglie di Gianni; Dobrodzek James, Roma; Ercole Marcello, Avezzano; Di Leo Adri, Roma; Falzoni Giulio, Milano; Fantuzzi Eliano, Roma; Fedeli Angela, Milano.

Felcini Egle, Roma; Flarer Franco, Padova; Fontana Teresita; Francesconi Giancarlo, Ravenna; Frattini Angelo, Varese; Frattini Vittore, Varese; Fabbri Agnere, Milano; Fabbri Caterina, Milano; Garino Piero, Torino.

Gastini Marco, Torino; Gastaldelli Giuseppe, Milano; G'ampstone-Giovanni Pistone, Roma; Giangradi Gaetano, Ravenna; Greco Aldo, Torino; Guerrini Mario, Milano; Hoehs Liselotte, Vene-

zia; Lando Landix; Lisimberti Idelbene, Milano; Longaretti Trento, Bergamo.

Guidotti Ferruccio, Bergamo; Ludovisi Felice, Roma; Mazaroli Ricciotti, Ravenna; Masetti Germano, Ronchi dei Legionari; Macciani Buti Ada, Milano; Monti Augusto, Milano; Magnani Luigi, Roma; Malerba Aldo, Milano; Maderni Giuseppe, Bergamo; Matteotti Aldo, Milano.

Marussi Garibaldo, Milano; Milani Milena, Milano; Mirabella Saro, Roma; Monty Nancy, Roma; Monti Rolando, Roma; Miele Franco, Roma; Nastasio Alessandro, Milano; Onofri Guido, Ravenna; Origgi Roberto, Como; Morello Vittorio, Padova.

Panigati Amalia, Milano; Paulucci delle Roncole Enrico, Torino; Pallozzi Gaetano, Sulmona; Poggiali Giulio Vito, Roma; Pozzi Pippo, Biella; Ranzi Angelo, Ravenna.

Ramella Giorgio, Torino; Rigamonti Luigi, Milano; Robaudi Mario, Milano; Rock Adami Tomaso, Firenze; Rosal Bruno, Firenze.

Rosa Peter, Milano; Rossello Mario, Milano; Rossello Anna, Milano; Rossi-Scotti Luigi, Montepetriolo, Perugia; Rossi-Scotti Rossella, Montepetriolo, Perugia (nata Pietra Giovanna); Russo Antonio, Roma; Russo Giuseppe, Torino; Rufini Inga, Perugia; Ricci Dante, Roma.

Sambonet Roberto, Milano; Salvietti Antonio, Varese; Spigai Max, Roma; Scuderi Riccardo, Milano; Sidoli Arnoldo, Milano; Scanavino Emilio, Genova; Soffiantino Giacomo, Torino; Sarri Sergio, Torino; Sodo Francesco Vittorio, Lecce; Santi Armando, B'ella.

Sgarzi Umberto, Bologna; Salvatore Anna, Roma; Sarra Manlio, Roma; Simone Dante, Roma; Tanzi Gaetano, Roma; Tirinnanzi Nino, Roma; Tresich-Maderni Erminia, Bergamo; Siniscalco Mario, Roma (Sinisca); Tarantino Giuseppe, Torino.

Tenconi Sandra, Milano; Stella Maria, Milano; Marzorati/Volonté Rosanna, Como; Platinetti Fulvio, Biella; Flora Attilio, Milano; Giorcelli Cecilia, Casale Monferrato; Villa Anita, Sesto S. Giovanni, Milano; Liuzzo Bepi, Udine; Semeraro Piero, Pisa.

Pirovano Ernesto, Milano; Gajani Giovanni, Milano; Ruggeri Giovanni, Milano; Pin Giuseppe (Giupin in arte), Milano; Vivaldi Italo, Roma; Vangelli Antonio, Roma; Viano Luigi, Torino; Zanoletti Adriana, Milano; Zanoletti Guido, Genova; Ghita Hussar, Milano; Riso Ventura, Milano.

I was particularly gratified that the President in welcoming the group stressed the magnificent contribution which the Italian people and Americans of Italian descent have made continuously to the artistic and cultural life of mankind. I think it was most fitting that these visitors should hear from our President the degree of importance which he and the American people attach to the contribution which Italian artists have made in all fields of art and culture.

Mr. Speaker, I include the President's remarks on this occasion.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO A GROUP OF ITALIAN ARTISTS IN THE DIPLOMATIC RECEPTION ROOM, FEBRUARY 26, 1965

The President: Mr. Ambassador, Congressman ROONEY, ladies and gentlemen: I am so pleased to welcome you to the White House this morning. I am so happy that you could come and visit our people and our country. I have had many memorable visits in Italy. I have been there some half dozen times and the thing that I could wish most for you would be that you would be received in America with the friendship and hospitality equivalent to that given me when I visited your country.

Your country and mine are fortunate to have the relationship between the United States and Italy in the able and distinguished hands of your great Ambassador.

He told you of the many great and constructive accomplishments and contributions of Americans of Italian descent.

I hope that all of you have observed and have had a chance to meet one of my good friends who is an Italian of American descent—Mr. Jack Valenti. And if you don't think he is familiar with all the attributes and good qualities of the Italians, why you just don't know Valenti.

So we welcome you this morning as a trusted ally and great friend of the American Nation. But as artists I also welcome you as citizens of our common civilization and as men and women trying to express the common experience of the human race.

Before my country was ever born the great artists of your country were creating works which had a profound impact on the life of Western civilization. The modern world was born in Italy and much of American accomplishment is based on the ideas and the creations which have come to us from Italy.

So I am always very glad to meet with and to visit with and to talk with the artists. Two of my favorite paintings which hang in my bedroom at the ranch are by Antonini and are paintings of the "Italian Farm Boy" and "Italian Farm Girl."

It is only the freeman who can dare to strike away the bonds of conventions and the claims of the ideology in order to express the world as he sees it. It is only when men and women are free can they shape the intensely personal vision which is the heart of the artistic enterprise. So I am sure that you would agree with me that the artists have a very high personal stake in the defense of freedom.

And so I would remind you that all the rest of us have a very high stake in seeing that you remain free so that we may learn and so we may receive pleasure and so we may be greatly enriched by all you do.

The rebuilding of postwar Italy has truly been a miracle. But it would have been equally a miracle if the arts had not flourished in modern Italy. For your country in good times and in bad has always been among the leaders in creativity and in thought and I want each of you to know how very grateful we are for the rich inheritance that we have received from Italy and how glad we are to see you here, knowing that Italy will continue to enrich the life of man in the future as it has in the past.

I am so happy that Congressman ROONEY, who has visited your country many times too could be here with me this morning to receive you, because we hope that this trip of yours will be only one of many of your countrymen who come to see our country.

We truly believe that if we can learn to know each other better we are more likely to live in peace together.

CRISIS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the President laid before the House his message on cities—a philosophical discourse on the degradation, cruelty, and misery found to exist in our urban areas. Many ill-defined problems and even more vague solutions were set forth. The task is described as putting—and I quote—"the highest concerns of our people at the center of urban growth and activity." The problems we are told—and again I quote—"call for beauty and nature, recreation, and an end to racial discrimination."

Mr. Speaker, it is all very well to talk of the good life, and the need to revitalize our cities. One understands the political amenities of these things. Quite obviously, however, the President has failed to recognize or appreciate the critical problems of one of the most vital segments of our metropolitan areas. To have omitted, utterly, what surely is one of the central problems of urban life—the crisis of small business—is shocking. I am appalled at the total omission of all reference to the problems of businesses—and particularly small businesses—in our cities.

Four and one-half million small businesses, representing 95 percent of America's total business population, are today faced with a multitude of vexing problems which challenge their very existence. These small businesses are the very heart of urban vitality. They provide revenue, they provide employment, to mention only two contributions, without which no city can exist. Yet, these businesses disappear in ever-increasing numbers before the onslaught of neighborhood decay, urban renewal, shopping center construction, and other equally disruptive forces, or destructive changes in urban areas.

The House Small Business Committee, recognizing the seriousness of the situation, began in the last Congress a series of hearings to study these critical problems. Some of us recall that as recently as last November, the Honorable Eugene B. Foley, SBA Administrator, had some very cogent words on this subject. He described the small businessman in the central city as being caught in a "pattern of urban deterioration and revolution, a revolution in population, a revolution in merchandising, a revolution in shopping habits, a revolution in transportation."

Apparently, Mr. Johnson is unaware of, or indifferent to this situation. It would be expected that he would have shown himself cognizant of this deterioration and revolution, even if he did not choose to propose specific remedies. But, I have searched his message in vain for any consideration or mention of the "forgotten man"—Mr. Small Business.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that the Republican members of the House Small Business Committee—and I can speak only for them—will continue, with

even greater dedication, their efforts in behalf of the Nation's small businessmen. I hope the indifference of the President will not deter or debar my colleagues of the majority from joining us in these efforts.

THERE'S GOOD NEWS TONIGHT

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, most of us, I am sure, recall with keen satisfaction and delight one of the great commentators of our country, Mr. Gabriel Heatter. Who can ever forget that inimitable voice of his, his warm spirit, and his dramatic presentation of the news and that expression of his we heard so often, "There's good news tonight."

I am proud to say he is now, and has for some years been a resident of my district. He is a distinguished citizen of the Greater Miami area, still a dramatic and inspiring commentator now on television.

He is a man of warm heart, brilliant mind, deep humanitarian interest, great vision, and great faith. He is, indeed, a great American and a charming gentleman. I am pleased to offer one of his recent broadcasts about the Great Society to which President Johnson has dedicated himself and our Government. I believe all who read this RECORD will not only be delighted but inspired by it:

If you meet a man coming down the street talking to himself loud enough for you to hear—please don't be alarmed. It's only me. One of my bad habits is to keep up a running argument with a man I call Mr. History. He is always telling me how many things can't be done—and I am telling him he can be as wrong as I can.

Right now we are arguing about Lyndon Johnson's Great Society. I am saying it can and will and must happen. And that impudent fellow, Mr. History, keeps telling me I am a dreamer. Only a few hours ago I seemed to hear him say there has never been a Great Society; no one ever won a war on poverty; he is giving me that old cliché, about the rich getting richer and the poor getting children.

And I am telling him, do you remember the day a man named Franklin Roosevelt said we have nothing to fear but fear itself? Tell me, Mr. History, have you ever known a few words to electrify people so much—to new hope; you thought they were just words just as you think Johnson's Great Society is nothing but words—you were wrong in F.D.R.'s time—you are just as wrong now.

Of course, I will admit there are times when history's facts and figures overwhelm me. As when I claim Johnson will not be rushed or pushed into a major war and history replies, you have a short memory. Woodrow Wilson had the same determination to keep out of war. It was his ticket when he ran for reelection. But Germany forced his hand and he had to fight. What makes you think it can't happen to Johnson.

And then he argues with me at night—when I am trying to sleep—only last night he said do you remember F.D.R.'s promise—no

American boys would be sent to fight on foreign soil—and how soon after we were on our way to fighting World War II on foreign soil? He certainly has his facts and figures, but I said you overlook one very important fact—there was no atomic bomb when either Wilson or F.D.R. had to go to war. There is one today and its just about the most powerful argument peace ever had, so just hold your horses, Mr. History, before you decide about Johnson. The bomb can make all the difference.

After all, what is a Great Society. A war to end poverty, a war to provide equal opportunity for all children for an education; a job for everyone willing to work. Why should that sound impossible? The fact that we have a President who dares to dream it and believe it is a good sign it can happen.

I remember a day in Washington in 1929 when a man was pointed out to me and someone said, "There goes a millionaire; take a good look at him, you may never see another before long." I don't know of any computer smart enough to count all we have today. Nor do I know of any computer who would ever dare predict today's figures on employment, on personal income, on cars, on the number of people forced to diet because we have too much food. How about that, Mr. History, and one thing more, how many people would have wagered cash on a civil rights bill coming when it did?

I don't know how long it will take to bring about a Great Society but every dream must have a beginning. The beginning has come. I may not be around to see it, but the fact that we dare to plan for it, work on it, gives me my great hope. I would rather lose out relying on hope than on what cynics and it-can-never-be-done boys call being realistic.

And so a man named Lyndon Johnson sets out on a long, lonely road where no man has traveled before, carrying a banner with a strange device—the Great Society. As Lincoln traveled that same road with his Emancipation Proclamation. As Woodrow Wilson did with his banner marked peace. As Franklin Roosevelt did with his reading, "we have nothing to fear but fear itself." As John F. Kennedy did with his marked no atomic testing. Now it's Lyndon Johnson.

It's a long, hard climb. The days are short, the nights are long. The road is rough and hard and the climb is always up. They pass landmarks of others who tried and failed. There is very little encouragement along the way. There is always someone to tell you, "Remember others tried; they never made it; better turn back." But Johnson is a humble man. I expect he will keep going.

For while he will climb for himself and millions of fellow human beings, there will be one other who will walk beside him.

The spirit of a man who was—John F. Kennedy. He and Johnson must have talked often about Kennedy's dream. He didn't call it a great society—he called it peace. And Lyndon Johnson must have known how John Kennedy set the hearts of millions on fire with his banner—"peace in a world made dark by atom bombs." Lyndon Johnson was there when blind fate struck Kennedy down—the youth who dared.

So he will be marching for him; for all his unrealized dreams and as he climbs and suffers, somewhere along the road I am certain he will pause and say this is for the world; for all living men and one who will not see it but one who somewhere will know about it, just as all who pass on, I am certain, know what we the living have done with the legacy they gave us.

There is a wonderful song which goes, "It's a good day." All around me I hear about the danger of war; the mess we are all in. I remember worse—much worse—and I remember much which never happened. It's a good day to know you have a heart filled with hope and if you can't feel hope, broth-

ers and sisters, what can you feel and what are you waiting for?

The poor ye always shall have with you is not a promise of doom but rather a reminder to those of us who can help and must not forget. When in all the history of time was there enough of everything which goes to make up living that it was possible to do away with poverty as it is now—and when was it more possible for the Government to take over the fight on cancer, stroke, and heart disease. It never happened before? Many things never happened before. When did tens of millions of Americans have what they have now?

THE ENVIRONMENT AND MAN

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring to the attention of this House a fine and outstanding speech which has been brought to my attention by the Honorable John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce. This is a speech delivered by Dr. J. Herbert Hollomon, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology, at the dedication of the computing center at the University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla., January 25, 1965. I feel that the university is taking a great stride forward in developing such facilities on its campus and I also enclose copies of my letter to Dr. Hollomon and his remarks for their insertion in the RECORD:

MARCH 1, 1965.

Dr. J. HERBERT HOLLOMON,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOLLOMON: You will please accept my regrets for my tardiness in thanking you for your letter of January 22 enclosing copy of your address at the dedication of the new computing center at the University of Miami on "The Environment and Man."

This is an excellent address and I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I hope you can visit Miami often.

Believe me,

Very sincerely yours,

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress.

THE ENVIRONMENT AND MAN

They say a fish is unaware of the water, that it lives its life cycle out in total ignorance of the environment which sustains it. To a certain extent, this is also true of the human species. We are unaware of our physical environment, unless it prevents us from doing something, or unless it threatens our present way of life.

It is obvious that the environment is crucial to man's existence. One might ask, then, what value there is in making such an observation. There is value to the extent that it encourages us to examine the implications of this truth. As an individual, man is completely dependent upon his physical environment. It determines, first of all, that life is possible, in the sense that life as we know it is not possible on most other planets. The environment also affects man's health, his safety, and his sense of well-being. When we deleteriously alter the balance of the environment, through poor sanitary practices,

industrial usage, or weapons testing, for example, this can redound to our detriment. Fortunately, we also have the capacity to effect beneficial changes in the environment.

Society is also greatly influenced by the environment. It has determined, to a large extent, the places on the globe where man would live. It has determined the type of economy, the type of society he would have. The evolution of societies from an economy based on the gathering of food, to an economy based on agriculture and to one based on trade is largely influenced by the physical environment. Today, when we would like to think that man is the master of his destiny, the economy of the most technologically sophisticated nation is significantly affected by the environment. In a complex, interdependent society such as ours, farming, fishing, recreation, transportation, construction, marketing—activities that represent significant portions of our total national output—are all extremely dependent upon environmental forces.

The environment, of course, is a single entity, a unified system. Yet, in some respects, we act as though it consisted of a number of very distinct and separate areas, with only a slight relationship between them. Our classification of scientific disciplines reflects the fragmented approach we sometimes take toward study of the environment. There is meteorology, aeronomy, oceanography, space physics, geodesy, hydrology, geophysics, and many others. The overall approach is reflected in the name of your school here, the School of Environmental and Planetary Sciences. This approach is absolutely necessary if we are ever to achieve full understanding and some degree of control over environmental processes.

The technical problems in the space program have awakened us to the need for studying the atmosphere from the ground all the way up to near space. There really are no arbitrary, limiting levels in between. The pesticide problem which we are now moving to face, has shown us the inherent dangers of treating one aspect of the physical environment in isolation, without regard for consequences in other parts. The challenge of producing long-range weather predictions has brought us up against many interdisciplinary problems, such as the air-sea interaction. We need the knowledge of several fields if we are to obtain a better understanding of the ocean as a great heat engine, driving our atmospheric circulation all over the world, storing heat from the sun in one location, then moving with the currents, and releasing it to the atmosphere somewhere else. Our concern for natural resources forces us to look at many aspects of the environment. For example, water resources affect agriculture, forestry, mining, reclamation, river transportation, electrical power, flood control, etc. Management of water resources requires knowledge of the structure of the earth, the water cycle, weather conditions, and many other areas.

Because of the complex and interdependent relationship between the environment and society, still other frames of reference must be used. The solution of the air pollution problem, for example, involves economic, social, political, and legal considerations. These are all over and above the purely technical elements in the problem. In fact, it is almost a certainty that once a determination is made to keep air pollution below a certain level, the technical aspects of the problem will soon give way before a concentrated research assault. The really difficult part of these problems involves trading off such values as the need of a community to have an industrial base in its economy, the harmful physical and social effects of pollution, the high cost of abating these effects, the level of pollution that might be tolerated, and obtaining a broad

consensus which will permit effective regulations to be enacted.

To deal successfully with the environment as a whole, there are a number of things we must do. First, we must recognize that many Federal agencies need information on the environment. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for example, has a public health interest in clear air and in water pollution. It recently announced plans to establish a major research laboratory to deal with environmental health problems. NASA has needs coming out of its space programs. The Departments of Agriculture and Interior are concerned with social and economic benefits which are dependent upon the environment. The Department of Defense has a great interest in the environment, particularly as a factor in global military systems. The Department of Commerce has extensive environmental research and service programs in the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards. We are presently looking at ways to make our total activities in this field more effective, incidentally.

Yet, in spite of the broad involvement of the Federal Government with all aspects of the environment, there is no national focus to provide support for the information needs of Federal agencies. There are interdepartmental committees dealing with oceanography and with atmospheric sciences, for example, but a broader view of the entire problem is lacking.

Technologically, there have been two developments in recent times which should permit great strides in further understanding of the environment. High-speed, large-capacity computers now enable us to tackle such problems as simulation of the entire atmosphere. The use of space satellites now gives us a truly global view of world weather. As these tools are extended in capability, we should expect marked progress in analyzing and interpreting global weather data.

The use of satellites is a constant reminder that the environment does not pay any attention to national boundaries. Pollution, radioactive fallout, drought, flooding are subject to the laws of nature as much as to the efforts of man. The world weather system will demonstrate that a global approach to weather forecasting is to the advantage of all nations that participate. An approach based on the premise that there is an American atmosphere or a Soviet atmosphere or a Danish atmosphere, is both unrealistic and ineffective.

As a consequence, we have been forced to develop new mechanisms for international cooperation in the collection and exchange of data. These mechanisms benefit the technically sophisticated nations by giving them more complete coverage of the world's atmosphere. They benefit the less developed nations by making available to them some of the techniques and facilities of the industrialized countries. Inevitably, this type of exchange leads to cooperation in other areas, and thus becomes an instrument of our foreign policy, serving the national objective of increased cooperation among all nations at all levels of endeavor.

There is a different kind of challenge involved in educating people to the need for equitable and effective regulation of industrial, commercial, and urban practices which contaminate the air we breathe and the water we use. If this concept is accepted by the public, I am convinced that there will be little problem in winning public support for the basic research which is needed to backstop regulatory policy.

Research aimed at a better understanding of the environment can be amply justified in terms of man's intellectual need to learn more about the world he inhabits. On a more practical level, however, we can look

forward to real benefits for the economy and for human safety and well-being. Hurricanes offer an excellent illustration of this idea. This time and this occasion are particularly appropriate for some mention of what we may expect in hurricane work. The time is right, because we are at the end of a year which saw more hurricanes strike the U.S. mainland than any time since 1933.

The occasion is very appropriate because the building housing the computing center of the university also houses the Weather Bureau's hurricane research laboratory, and its principal hurricane warning center. The State of Florida was struck by three hurricanes last year, in addition to receiving the end effects of a fourth hurricane and one other severe tropical storm. Thus, your interest in hurricanes is well grounded, both intellectually and practically.

What may we reasonably expect to get out of an increased effort on hurricanes? One way of approaching this question is to look at the losses caused by tropical storms. During the period 1955 to 1962 an average of 100 lives were lost each year due to tropical storms. Property damage in the first 5 years of the 1950's averaged more than \$200 million per year. Last year, a very severe year, property damage in the United States totaled more than a half billion dollars.

It is probably completely unrealistic to hope that these losses can all be eliminated someday. However, there is every reason to believe that loss of life can be reduced. Hurricane Audrey, in 1957, took more than 500 lives when it struck the Gulf coast. Hurricane Hilda, in 1964, hitting the same general area, took 36 lives, and this was the worst killer storm of the year. A combination of improved warning services by local authorities, and improved forecasting and tracking through better technology, can be credited with helping to avert what might have been a major human disaster. Property is perhaps less susceptible of protection than human life. It is clear, nevertheless, that improved warnings and better forecasting and tracking will reduce property losses when protective measures are taken.

We should take all possible action to perfect the communications and educational system by which we utilize our capability for tracking and predicting the course of hurricanes, and for warning people of danger. This is a basic step, and I do not see how it would fail to achieve beneficial results.

Significant improvements have been made in recent years, in both the accuracy and the timeliness of hurricane warnings. This has been due, partly, to the use of powerful coastal radars, giving continuous coverage for about 200 miles out to sea. In addition, more effective use of reconnaissance aircraft to track and observe the movement of the hurricane eye, and to measure changes in wind velocity has greatly added to the data on which forecasts are based.

We now have reached the point, in my view, where it is reasonable to anticipate a major improvement in our ability to predict the course of hurricanes, if a determined and adequately supported effort is made in the field. I further believe that this could come about within the next 5 years, even if there is no dramatic improvement in theory or in technology.

To do this, we need a great deal more data than we are now obtaining, both geographically and in terms of the characteristics of the hurricanes themselves. Large, important areas of the Atlantic Ocean are blind regions to us during the important summer and fall seasons. In addition, we need more data on the actual state of being of a hurricane: air temperature, wind velocity, humidity, ocean temperature, etc. In short, we must be able to obtain almost as much data as we would have if we were making laboratory studies.

Our ability to predict the course of hurricanes must be based on knowledge of the basic physics of hurricanes and severe storms. Improved mathematical models of hurricanes must be available if we are to simulate the behavior of hurricanes. Improved models, of course, will require more and better data.

Ultimately, any discussion of this type comes to the question of modification of hurricanes. As you know, we are engaged in some joint experiments with the naval weather service involving the seeding of hurricanes. We have been testing certain physical hypotheses on the nature of the energetics of hurricanes. New techniques of massive pyrotechnic seeding, developed by the Navy, may put us in a position to effect significant changes in the energy release of hurricanes. Because of the natural variability of hurricanes, the results of two such experiments on hurricanes have been inconclusive. On the other hand, similar experiments on small tropical cumulus clouds have yielded encouraging results. In the long run, a much larger research and development effort would be required to make a serious attack on this problem. If we are ever to modify the course of hurricanes in a controlled manner, it will be necessary to understand the causes of motions of hurricanes. It will be necessary to be able to model them. It will also be necessary to be able to predict their courses accurately, so that any attempts at modification can be isolated in terms of the specific actions we take to change the behavior of the course of the storm.

Putting aside, for the moment, this particular problem, I believe that the short-term prospects for major advances in prediction and warning are excellent at this time.

We have entered an age in this country, perhaps without being fully aware of it, when massive scientific and technical programs are undertaken in order to achieve some social benefit. The atomic energy program, the research programs in public health, the space exploration effort, are examples of what I have in mind. I suggest that the next great technical undertaking by the United States may be in the field of the physical environment. It is an area in which the frontiers of the unknown are constantly expanding. It is a field in which we must have a vital interest in order to protect our health and well-being. It is also a field in which the economic potential is almost limitless.

Finally, it is a field in which the States can play a particularly significant role. Cooperation with other States in the regulation of harmful practices, and the funding of research are both fruitful areas for consideration by State governments. This would be a healthy development in the political life of the country.

Fortunately, there is more than enough for everyone to do. This summer, two bureaus in the Department of Commerce—the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau—will join with MIT, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, the University of Rhode Island, and the University of Miami in research studies of the Gulf Stream.

This same community of interest, uniting Federal and local institutions, is seen in the computing center which we are dedicating today. This type of cooperative quest for knowledge reflects great credit upon science and upon the Nation.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF IOWA ON CLOSING OF CERTAIN VETERANS HOSPITALS

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a large number of my constituents in the Seventh Iowa District have communicated to me their concern about the proposed closing of certain veterans' hospitals. In support of these good people I have received House Concurrent Resolution 4 passed by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa. I ask that each of my colleagues scrutinize its content as it reflects the general feelings of the people of the State of Iowa and the Seventh District.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

Whereas there is an immediate and continuing need for caring for veterans; and

Whereas there is an existing facility known as the Veterans' Administration domiciliary, located at Clinton, Iowa; and

Whereas this existing facility has been maintained properly and is at present housing more than 600 veterans; and

Whereas said facility could be continued and even expanded at minimum costs to meet the needs for veteran care; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has announced plans to close the said domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the Veterans' Administration is respectfully requested to continue the operation of the domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa, with its suitable facilities and desirable location for the permanent care of veterans; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, the Iowa Members of the U.S. Senate, the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the Veterans' Administration.

We, Vincent B. Steffen, speaker of the House of Iowa, and William R. Kendrick, chief clerk of the house, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the house and senate of the 61st general assembly.

WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.
VINCENT B. STEFFEN,
Speaker of the House.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DORN, for 60 minutes, on Thursday, March 11.

Mr. HARRIS, on March 15, for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER, for 45 minutes, on Thursday, March 11.

Mr. DOLE (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ), for 1 hour, on March 10; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN on the 25th anniversary ceremony of the Katyn Forest massacre, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS and to include a speech by Mr. McCORMACK.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to revise and extend remarks made under special order today and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HUTCHINSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHISLER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRADEMAs.

Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. ULLMAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 9, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

704. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 4, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Waikiki Beach, Oahu, Hawaii, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 104); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

705. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of plans for works of improvement which have been prepared under the provisions of section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, as follows: Big Slough, Ark.; Minersville, Utah; Rock Creek, Kans.; Rock Creek, Nebr.; Spring Creek, Nebr.; Vanar Wash., N. Mex. and Ariz.; Willow Creek-Park River, N. Dak.; pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1005; to the Committee on Agriculture.

706. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a report on the legislative program of the Commissioners for the year 1965; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

707. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the Agency's reply to the Comptroller General relative to a report transmitted November 24, 1964, on loss of interest on U.S.-owned foreign currencies in the Republic of China (Taiwan); to the Committee on Government Operations.

708. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

709. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting

a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 214 and subsection (c) (1) of section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, in order to substitute the Secretary of Defense (rather than the Secretaries of the Army and the Navy) as the person entitled to receive official notice of the filing of certain applications in the common carrier service"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

710. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act with respect to the interconnection of electric facilities"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

711. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

712. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

713. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove tax barriers to foreign investment in the United States, to make certain technical amendments, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

714. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of plans for works of improvement which have been prepared under the provisions of section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, as follows: Badger Creek (supplemental), Iowa; Ketchepedra Creek, Ala.; South Anna River, Va.; Twin-Rush Creek, Ind.; Walter's Creek, Iowa; pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1005; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 2362. A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; with amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 5916. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove tax barriers to foreign investment in the United States, to make certain technical amendments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 5917. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to prescribe the number of hospital beds which must be operated by the Veterans' Administration; and to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to give public notice 6 months in advance of any proposed closing or relocation

of any veterans facility; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5918. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to make it unlawful for any employer to require any employee to agree to assign patents to him as a condition of employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 5919. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 5920. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that for estate and gift tax purposes the value of stock in an open-end investment company shall be its redemption price; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 5922. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the University of Kansas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 5923. 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code in order to provide the death penalty for the sale of narcotics to children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY (by request):

H.R. 5925. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederated Tribes of Colville Indians located in the State of Washington and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5926. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5927. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the unmarried child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may continue to receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 21 if he is a full-time student; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 5928. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide medical care for certain members of the Armed Forces who are entitled to retired or retainer pay, or equivalent pay, and who served on active duty for at least 90 days during time of war or conflict, and their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5929. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code with respect to military retired or retainer pay and to deductions therefrom for the provision of survivor annuities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 5930. A bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5931. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5932. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of sur-

vivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5933. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the tax on club dues for non-profit hunting and fishing clubs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 5934. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide uniform provisions for crop liens, interest on unpaid marketing quota penalties and the persons liable for such penalties for all commodities for which a marketing quota program is in effect; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide increased tax incentives for individuals and corporations that manufacture or produce goods for export; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 5936. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 5937. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 5938. A bill to repeal the provisions of law relating to the fixing by the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of rates of postage on fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5939. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize retirement without reduction in annuity of employees with 20 years of service involuntarily separated from the service by reason of the abolition or relocation of their employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 5940. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the membership of Members of Congress in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5941. A bill to limit the use of temporary employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5942. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide parking space for the automobiles of patrons and postal employees at postal installations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5943. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the refund to States of certain taxes on distilled spirits and wine destroyed by fire, casualty, or act of God; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 5944. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 5945. A bill to grant civil service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5946. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5947. A bill to amend the Annual Sick Leave Act of 1951 to prevent loss of annual leave by employees in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5948. A bill to prevent the use of stop-watches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5949. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees in the postal field service required to qualify on scheme examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5950. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide for the duty-free entry of limestone, when imported, to be used in the manufacture of cement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUITE:

H.R. 5951. A bill to amend the act authorizing association of producers of agricultural products, approved February 18, 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5952. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 5953. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 5954. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 5955. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 5956. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5957. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 5958. A bill relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 5959. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a program of death indemnification for persons serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5960. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to eliminate the differential between the wartime and peacetime rates of disability and death compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5961. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a program of insurance for members of the Armed Forces who are unable to obtain commercial insurance at standard rates because of being assigned to duty in a combat zone or performing extra hazardous duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5962. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to extend to certain veterans who served in the Mexican border conflict the benefits enjoyed by veterans who served during periods of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 5963. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the rate of duty on buckles and buckle slides specifically de-

signed for use with ski bindings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 367. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.J. Res. 368. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Con. Res. 345. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. Con. Res. 346. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet and a Joint Task Force for Peace in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 257. Resolution authorizing the printing of certain matter as an addendum to House Document No. 39 of the 89th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

75. By Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana calling for an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act to abolish that part of said act dealing with right-to-work laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

76. Also, resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana expressing support for the U.S. commitment of assistance to the Republic of Vietnam and further expressing support for recent U.S. military action against bases in North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

77. Also, resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana requesting the Congress of the United States to study the need to regulate forecasting of election results on election day by news media; to the committee on House Administration.

78. Also, resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana requesting the Federal Government to construct an air facility near Glacier National Park which would be capable of accommodating the most modern aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

79. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging passage of legislation extending the Sugar Act, to

protect the future economic stability of our domestic beet sugar industry and to allow an immediate increase in domestic quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

80. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the study of the need to regulate forecasting of election results on election day by news media; to the Committee on House Administration.

81. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 5964. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sonia Pinto Querub and her minor son, Isaac Alberto Pinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5965. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Piscitelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 5966. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Rallis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 5967. A bill for the relief of Antonio Di Cesare; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5968. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosa Maddalena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 5969. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raul R. Morfi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 5970. A bill for the relief of Marjorie and Norman Knight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 5971. A bill for the relief of Mildred L. Becker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 5972. A bill for the relief of Demetre Drokolpuolos and his wife, Irene Drokolpuolos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5973. A bill for the relief of Edwin F. Hower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 5974. A bill for the relief of Irene Mitchakes (also known as Irene Mitsakis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5975. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hala Cervonogura Wolfe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 5976. A bill for the relief of Efstathios Gazis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 5977. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luz Quilano Maynard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5978. A bill for the relief of Rexy L. Barrato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5979. A bill for the relief of Araceli Fuerte Ocampo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 5980. A bill for the relief of Dudley Fitzroy Findlay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5981. A bill for the relief of Ena Gill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5982. A bill for the relief of Obert Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL (by request):

H.R. 5983. A bill for the relief of Antonio Firetto (also known as Frank Menfi and Paul Manfi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

122. By Mr. HOSMER: Petition of Howard W. Heber, Lakewood, Calif., requesting enactment by Congress of legislation to establish the qualifications of voters by prohibiting any citizen who has not paid at least \$1,000 in Federal individual income tax for the year prior to an election of President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, and Members of Congress, from voting in an election of the above-named officials; to the Committee on House Administration.

123. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors, County of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Congress continuing to maintain the operation of the Kilauea Military Camp; to the Committee on Armed Services.

124. Also, petition of the vice president, United Irish Societies of San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

125. Also, petition of Forty-Niner Young Republicans of California State College, Long Beach, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expunging the proceedings of impeachment against Andrew Johnson, 17th President of the United States, from the permanent Record of the Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Products of Progress Exposition To Be Held in South Bend, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Council of

Engineering and Technical Services of St. Joseph Valley in my Indiana congressional district for its initiative in sponsoring an exhibition of our local products and services.

The Products of Progress Exposition, to be held from March 12 to 14, represents an effort to promote a greater awareness of the technical excellence of industries and organizations in north central Indiana and southwestern Michigan. The exposition will feature exhibits by local firms and will emphasize the vast scope

of engineering and technical activity in that area of the country. The exposition, which will be held on the campus of the University of Notre Dame, is expected to attract from 25,000 to 30,000 people.

In addition to displays of products manufactured by and technical services available from individual firms and organizations, the exposition will offer exhibits by technical societies and educational institutions. Products of Progress will thus present a concentrated picture of the range and excellence of local technical and engineering skills and products.

The Council of Engineering and Technical Services was established last summer as a nonprofit organization. Its stated purpose is "to promote the effectiveness of member societies and to serve the community as a united technical group." By offering area firms and organizations an opportunity to display their industrial-technical achievements, and by providing the public with the opportunity to learn more about science and technology in our area, the council is capably fulfilling both its objectives.

I Feel Better Being President, Knowing That Speaker McCormack Is by My Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Texans celebrating the 129th anniversary of Texas independence on March 2, 1965, in Washington, honored Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, as a national leader whose career and steadfast adherence to the Democratic traditions and principles have helped make this a great nation.

The traditional observance was held in the National Press Club by the Washington chapter of the ex-students of the University of Texas. Speaker McCORMACK in his speech commended "our courageous President, for the policies of President Johnson is the leadership for peace, the leadership of strength and not weakness or appeasement."

President Johnson, arriving unexpectedly at the affair paid high tribute to Speaker McCORMACK in his remarks and in a short letter which read:

From the first time I entered the House of Representatives as a young Congressman to this very hour, I have known few men whose courage and compassion, decency of character, and honorable objectives matched those of Speaker McCORMACK.

He is my friend and my counselor. I feel better being President, knowing that Speaker McCORMACK is by my side.

Under unanimous consent, I include the speech of Speaker McCORMACK here-with in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed and are as follows:

REMARKS OF SPEAKER McCORMACK

Mrs. McCormack and I are deeply grateful for your invitation to be with you this evening at the annual dinner of the Washington chapter of the University of Texas Ex-Students Association, which is held this year in connection with the anniversary of Texas Independence Day.

I am particularly touched by the honor conferred upon me, which I understand has been reserved in the past for former students of your great university.

The University of Texas, established in 1883, is one of the great higher institutions of learning in the United States. Its grad-

uates in all fields have, in time of war and peace, added to the prestige, glory and strength of your great State and our beloved country.

For whether we come from the South, the North, the East or the West—above all, we are Americans.

In my service in the House of Representatives, the two Members who played a very important part in my career are the former Vice President, John Nance Garner, and the late Speaker Sam Rayburn. For it was both of them who were instrumental in my being elected a member of the Ways and Means Committee after only 2 years of service in the House—the first time that any Democratic Member with only 2 years' service was elected to this important committee. I have always been indebted to the both of them for what they did for me many years ago. As you know, Sam Rayburn and I occupied close leadership relationship in the Democratic Party in the House for many years. But above that, we were close friends to one another. The relationship that existed between the late Speaker and myself is one that I shall always treasure.

And another friendship that developed a little over 30 years ago was between President Johnson and myself, starting from the time when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, and continuing throughout the years.

Our great Chief Executive, President Johnson, has coined the phrase, "From Austin to Boston." How true, in a few words, does this express the close ties that exist between the people of Texas and the people of Massachusetts.

When the Texas Declaration of Independence was signed on March 2, 1836, a son of Massachusetts, Asa Brigham, was one of the signers. He was later named auditor by the interim President, David G. Burnet; and later Treasurer of the Republic by President Sam Houston. He was later reappointed by President Lamar, and holding at the same time the position of alderman of Houston, and later mayor of Austin.

There were at least four sons of Massachusetts at the Alamo: John Flanders, William D. Howell, William Linn, and Amos Pollard.

We are fortunate in having in the White House a great President, who is a son of Texas—but over and above, the leader of our country during this trying period of the world's history. President Johnson is seeking to unify our people in the eyes of the world, in which effort we should all cooperate.

President Johnson represents ability, vision, sound judgment, and above all, courage. He makes his own decisions as President, and will continue to do so.

President Johnson possesses all of the qualities necessary to fill that great office, and particularly during this period of crisis.

The Communist leaders and regimes must accept the fact that they do not scare or put fear into the mind of President Johnson, and the free world breathes easier because of this fact.

In their policies in the Communist part of the world, they would be wise to analyze President Johnson correctly.

He did not assume the office of President to have America and the free world be on the defensive, or through fear to be driven underground.

President Johnson is a man of peace—ardently seeking peace—but not peace at any price.

And the President knows that the calculated risk of inaction can be more dangerous at times than the calculated risk of action.

President Johnson served in both branches of the Congress before and after World War II, and he knows that fear or cowardice has brought about more wars than action well considered and well timed.

For President Johnson saw that appeasement before World War II was the road that led to that terrible conflict, and he knows that action at the right time by certain European nations might have stopped Hitler in his mad dreams, and thereby averted World War II.

There will be no appeasement under President Lyndon B. Johnson. For he knows that the dictator, meaning international communism, interprets appeasement as fear, inciting him to greater and greater demands.

President Johnson well knows by events of recent years that appeasement is the road to war.

And the leadership of and the actions by President Johnson are for future peace—of following the policy of peace through strength.

And I might observe that President Johnson well knows that he is the man whose judgment, policies, and leadership future historians will judge and interpret during his period as President of the United States.

And all Americans should rally around and support the leadership of our courageous President, for the policies of President Johnson are the leadership for peace; the leadership of strength and not weakness or appeasement.

Why Is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Against Our Veterans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce sent telegrams to its members urging them to support the consolidation of VA regional offices in their areas. The telegram sent to the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce is as follows:

JOHN LATSHAW,

President, Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City, Care of E. F. Hutton & Co., Inc., Kansas City, Mo.:

In support of the national chamber's campaign for the prudent use of taxpayers' dollars and the efficient operations of government, I urge your most serious and favorable consideration of plans to consolidate regional veterans' administrative offices in your area. Political considerations should be secondary to governmental efficiency and economy. The business community can make a significant and statesmanlike contribution to sound governmental fiscal policies as well as to improved care of our war veterans by communicating such views to Members of the Congress.

WALTER F. CAREY,

President, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

One of the first inquiries that comes to mind is whether this might be an unauthorized, personal act of President Carey and whether the telegram would have actually gone forward if it had required prior approval from a majority of the membership. Whether the telegram was issued under proper authority or not I am sure that many Members share my experience over the years that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has been notorious in favoring everything that will be for the benefit of big business and have

found themselves too busy to do anything for small business or the individual. Most of us know that almost every Government expenditure has been at one time or another a target of our U.S. Chamber of Commerce. In the case of the present telegram, in their great zeal for economy, they decided to shoot from the hip without selection of a proper target.

Thousands of members of the chamber across the United States will be disappointed that their U.S. Chamber of Commerce had the audacity to cite "improved care to our war veterans" as a major reason why the local chambers should support the consolidations despite the public admission from VA officials that these consolidations will in fact run up the personal or individual expenses to thousands of deserving veterans. An equally great number of members of the chamber will be angered and embittered at the chamber's suggestion there are political considerations involved. Since when has adequate veterans' care become a political consideration?

The Johnson administration is deserving of commendation for its vigorous efforts to reduce unnecessary Federal expenditures. No motto could be more appropriate for our President than his stated objective of receiving a full dollar for every dollar spent.

But because the ideal of economy and efficiency is so much with us, we must exercise particular care not to cheapen it by misapplying it for devious purposes. Perhaps the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has yielded to the temptation to charge that the veterans program is inefficient, when it really means it disapproves of the purposes of the program.

If the proposed closing of VA regional offices is typical of what the U.S. Chamber of Commerce chooses to label as "prudent use of the taxpayers' dollar," then I must dissent sharply from their position, despite my agreement with their professed objective. All we need are a few more economies such as this one and the chamber's program of efficiency will have the same effect as the controversial neutron bomb. It will only harm people, but obligingly leave property intact.

I do not recall hearing any repeated approval or sustained applause from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce during the past several years when billions of dollars were being saved through more efficient procurement procedures in the Department of Defense. Can it possibly be that the philosophy of the U.S. chamber is that in the field of large-scale Government procurement of goods and services a penny not saved by the Government is a penny earned by business? Yet, when another area of Government spending not affecting the direct financial interests of big business is found such as the Government's program of special medical attention and care for millions of needy veterans, their widows, and their children, one hears a roar of applause that is almost deafening.

But thank goodness the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, through its president, could not stomach the telegram

from Mr. Carey, and not only would not subscribe to his urgings, but in dissent fired back the following telegram:

MR. WALTER F. CAREY,
President, Chamber of Commerce of the
United States, Washington, D.C.:

We are fully in accord with prudent use of taxpayers' dollars and efficient operation of Government. We wholeheartedly concur that political considerations should be secondary to governmental efficiency and economy. Our intensive studies show that Kansas City office of VA at present has higher operating efficiency and better economy rating than others. Such efficiency and economy would be enhanced by retention and consolidation of VA regional office here. We consider this a contribution to sound governmental fiscal policies and improved care of veterans. Such views with supporting data, have already been communicated to Members of Congress and are being mailed to you today.

JOHN LATSHAW,
President, Chamber of Commerce of
Greater Kansas City.

The Kansas City Star, in commenting on Mr. Latshaw's telegram, pointed out that the local chamber had compiled a fact sheet supporting the view that the VA office should be retained in Kansas City because of a higher operating efficiency and a better economy rating than many others that were left open. Mr. Latshaw has furnished a valid and factual refutation to Mr. Carey's broadside or scattergun approach against all the veterans of America.

If the U.S. Chamber of Commerce wants to reduce the special consideration now given to veterans as a result of sacrifices made to this country in time of war, let them say so. But let us not let the chamber get away with a sneak attack on the welfare of veterans and their dependents in the disguise of economy and efficiency of Government and then have the gall and effrontery to suggest that the veterans' closings all across the country will result in "improved care."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce declined the request of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to support the Government's plan to eliminate veterans' facilities. They have chosen to recognize as critically relevant the human values at stake in the closing of the VA regional office in Kansas City and to reject completely the pleas of its parent body. It recognized the premise of economy in Government, but rejected the false conclusion. Let us hope that other chambers across America will have similar fortitude and good judgment.

The 25th Anniversary Ceremony of the Katyn Forest Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the New York City Division of

the Polish-American Congress, at a mass meeting at the Polish Veteran Hall, rendered a 25th anniversary ceremonial tribute to the Polish patriots who were massacred by the Soviet Communist in the Katyn Forest in the spring of 1940.

On September 18, 1951, in the 82d Congress, the House of Representatives unanimously adopted House Resolution 390 which established a select committee to conduct a full and complete investigation of an international crime committed against leaders, soldiers, and citizens of Poland at the beginning of World War II.

Hearings were conducted by this special committee in this country, England, and Europe. The final report was made to the Congress in December 1952, which unanimously condemned the Communist leaders of Russia for this greatest of all international crimes in world history.

Membership of the special congressional committee was as follows:

RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana, chairman; DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; Foster Furcolo, of Massachusetts; Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, of Michigan; George A. Dondero, of Michigan; ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin; and Timothy P. Sheehan, of Illinois.

Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, now one of our colleagues, contributed greatly to the success of this committee by serving as chief investigator.

I am hereby submitting remarks which I made at the memorial ceremony in New York City on yesterday:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN, BEFORE THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, NEW YORK DIVISION, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 7, 1965, 25TH ANNIVERSARY—THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

I wish to commend the downstate New York Division of the Polish-American Congress for this 25th anniversary ceremonial remembrance in honor of the approximately 15,000 departed Polish leaders who were massacred and murdered by the Soviet Communist tyrants in the spring of 1940.

The Katyn massacre was, no doubt, one of the most barbarous international crimes in world history. Of the Polish leaders who were executed from 3 widely separated Soviet prison camps, the bodies of 4,253 were discovered in the mass graves of the Katyn Forest located near Smolensk, U.S.S.R., by the Nazi troops in April 1943. This was approximately 3 years after the Katyn massacre. The Stalin tyrants immediately blamed the Germans for the crime. They charged that the Polish prisoners fell into the Nazi hands when Germany invaded Russia in the summer of 1941. The medical commission investigation consisting of leading doctors from various European nations, including neutral Switzerland, met at Katyn in April of 1943, and unanimously determined that the Polish victims were massacred in the spring of 1940. At that time the Katyn area was under the complete domination of the Soviets.

KATYN DUPLICITY

The Katyn massacre cannot be classified as a world war atrocity. It will be recorded in history as one of the most malicious and brutal acts of genocide in the annals of international crime. The Katyn massacre has been the only international crime in the world's history where the leaders of one nation (the Soviets) accused the leaders of another nation (the German Nazis) of guilt in the commission thereof and vice versa. The Nazi leaders accused the Soviets of guilt for the identical crime.

For almost 10 years after the discovery of the Katyn bodies, the Soviets poured out misleading propaganda declaring their innocence of any connection with the Katyn massacre or the murder of 15-odd-thousand Polish leaders who disappeared from 3 Soviet prison camps in the spring of 1940.

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS

It was by reason of the concentrated efforts and insistence by the members and leaders of the Polish-American Congress of the United States that public opinion not only in America but throughout the globe, desired an official determination and investigation of the true facts concerning guilt of the Katyn murderers.

In 1951 I filed a resolution asking Congress to approve a special investigating committee to determine for posterity and future generations the guilt of the Katyn international crime. On September 18, 1951, House Resolution 390 was enacted by the Congress. This resolution called for a complete congressional investigation in order to determine officially the guilt for this atrocity against humanity.

HEARINGS AND TESTIMONY

Our committee held hearings not only in the United States but also in England and Europe. During the progress of these hearings, over 250 witnesses testified. This number included government officials of various nations, military leaders, physicians, international lawyers and persons from various nations, including Russia, who had direct and personal information on the international crime. Special invitations were sent to Stalin and other leaders of the Soviet Republic to appear at our hearings in London or Frankfurt, Germany. The Soviet leaders ignored and failed to respond to our invitations to testify and clear up the misinformation concerning the Katyn murders. During our hearings in Europe, the Soviet leaders, through radio, television, Pravda and other propaganda sources, continued a barrage of lies and false charges against the work of our congressional committee. A group of European newspaper experts stated at the time of our Frankfurt, Germany hearings that the Katyn Congressional Committee for the first time placed the Soviet propaganda machine on the defensive. They had no answer to the testimony and the factual revelation of the evidence that the Soviet Communists were guilty of the Katyn Forest massacres.

STALIN, KHRUSHCHEV, HITLER, MUSSOLINI

Our committee publicly announced that the hearings should not take the spotlight away from the barbarous mass murders and pogroms committed by the Hitler Nazis during and before the period of World War II. Our committee found that the Communist atrocities committed on other captive nations such as Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, the Balkan States, and Korea, all had a striking similarity to the crimes committed against the Poles at Katyn.

COMMUNIST BARBARITY NEVER CHANGES

Although the Katyn massacre occurred 25 years ago, the evidence obtained by our committee revealed that the methods followed by the Communists has not changed in violence or barbarity whether it is southeast Asia, Korea, Africa, or any locality on the globe where Communist aggression exists.

There is no doubt, in my mind, that the worldwide publicity given the testimony secured by our committee concerning the methods, strategy, and barbarity of the Communist tyrants alarmed millions of people of all nations as to the true facts of Communist enslavement. Our testimony, exhibits, and the facts and knowledge it gave the world contributed greatly to building up re-

sistance by many nations and races against Communist aggression.

Since the congressional Katyn Committee filed its final report in December 1952, hundreds of thousands of copies of this factual verdict and our official Katyn report of Communist methods and criminal acts have been requested by all non-Communist nations on the face of the globe. Thousands of organizations and individuals all over the world have, during the last 13 years, written to Congress and my office for the facts on the Katyn massacre. Hardly a week passes but requests come to my office in Washington, up to the present time, from folks living in different parts of the world asking for information and copies of the final report of the congressional Katyn Forest Massacre Committee.

Oftentimes I think that it would be, indeed, a worthwhile and valuable project if our Government or the United Nations would foster the expense of reprinting the Katyn congressional report exposing the Communists brutality, barbarity, and methods of enslaving peoples under its domination. These reports could be printed in various languages and placed in the homes of all peoples in nations threatened with Communist domination and subjection.

SOVIETS COULD NOT HIDE GUILT

Throughout all our entire hearings proceedings there was not one scintilla of proof or even any substantial evidence presented that could remotely indict any other nation but Soviet Russia for this deplorable international Katyn crime. The Soviets, in order to clear themselves in world opinion, refused to allow the International Committee of the Red Cross to make a neutral investigation of the Katyn massacre.

The overwhelming testimony of prisoners, formerly interned at the slave camp near the Katyn Forest, and of medical experts who performed autopsies on the massacred bodies and also of observers taken at the scene of the crime, conclusively confirmed our committee findings. Stalin, Molotov, Beria (the NKVD chief) could not answer the Polish Government leaders and military men when in 1941 and 1942 they demanded the whereabouts of the disappeared Polish prisoners. Complete proof was presented that the Soviets purposely misled the Poles in denying any knowledge of the whereabouts of their officers when, in fact, Stalin and his murderous conspirators already knew the Poles were buried in mass graves at Katyn.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA ON DEFENSIVE

The Soviet leaders made every effort through their highly organized propaganda machine to hide from the Polish people and the people of the world the real truth about Katyn. Evidence brought out by our investigation convinced the members of the committee that the Katyn massacre barely scratched the surface of the numerous crimes against humanity perpetrated by the totalitarian powers.

I know of no organization on either side of the Atlantic that has done more to keep the fight against aggression and expose Communist barbarity and enslavement more than the Polish-American Congress. Your great national organization was responsible for the Katyn congressional investigations in the 82d Congress. By reason of the work and great success of this special Katyn Committee, the following 83rd Congress, in 1953 and 1954, created a special congressional committee to investigate Communist aggression. I was appointed a member of this committee under the chairmanship of Congressman Kersten of Wisconsin. This committee held hearings not only in the United States but in Europe during the following 2 years and took testimony concerning Soviet crimes and

Communist barbarity involving other captive countries including the Balkan nations. The evidence of Communist enslavement of captive nations through slave labor camps, mass murder, and tortures were recorded by this committee and testimonial reports sent throughout the world. There is no doubt that the creation of this second committee in the succeeding Congress was authorized because of the success of the Katyn Committee in exposing communism and its barbarous and tyrannical methods.

Vietnam, Korea, captive nations

If the free nations of the world would only join in concentrating the fight to expose the true facts against communism and educate the so-called backward nations concerning the criminality of Communist enslavement methods, and the true living conditions under their domination, there is no doubt but what the collapse of the Communist goal of world enslavement would take place in a short time. Too many of the new and backward nations have been victims of Communist misrepresentation and also of the false propaganda circulated concerning the government of the so-called free world.

Communism has been one of the greatest, most powerful, well-organized international threats to human freedom in world history. Our Government has spent billions of dollars fighting this international menace. There is no doubt in my mind that the Communist threat today is not as dangerous and as imminent as it was 20 or 30 years ago. The greatest evidence of this fact is that their economic system has been a total failure.

Stalin's government was an economic failure and at his death great discontent was rampant in not only the Soviet realm but the satellite nations. He was succeeded by Khrushchev, and his economic government was a total failure as was evidenced by his overthrow and collapse from forces within his own government. If the present opposition to Communist aggression continues by the free nations, the rulers of today's Soviet tyranny will be overthrown and that will end the Communist myth of world domination. Communist China's economy has always been a failure and millions of its population are existing in starvation conditions at the present time. The free nations have the ability, the education, the defense machinery, and the assets to curtail the further spread of the Communist menace and we must continue our fight.

History has revealed over the centuries that dictators cannot stay in power long when they must rule their people by the sword, guns, slave-labor camps, and mass murders. The Communist dictators will meet the same end as Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, and their predecessors since time began.

Two generations have passed since Katyn and the many other organized mass murders, tortures, slave-labor camps, and organized starvation inflicted by Communist tyrants on helpless millions. The Communist youths who are attacking our Embassies in other nations, possess no knowledge of the methods used by their masters to take over free governments. Their education and information of outside world conditions is limited to such information as their dictators allow them to receive. These same Communist youths someday will rebel against their own enslavement and they will meet the same fate the Polish patriots met at Katyn 25 years ago.

Education and presentation of facts on Communist enslavement to the world's uninformed are the greatest weapons democracy possesses against the destruction of the Communist menace.

The free world must continue this fight. Someday this victory will be won and the Communist enslavers will become extinct. Poland and other captive nations will regain free and independent government.

Resources and Conservation Council Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post for Friday, March 5, President Johnson was quoted as telling the Cabinet that there are entirely too many interagency committees. I endorse the President's objectives of correcting this situation.

Of particular concern to me has been the proliferation of interagency activity in the field of natural resource administration. According to my research with the four major natural resource agencies—Interior, Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce—and the Bureau of the Budget, there are over 50 major interdepartmental or interagency committees dealing with natural resources and literally hundreds of special committees and task forces concerned with regional, river basin, or special-subject resource areas.

I realize, of course, that many of these are necessary to coordinate Federal action, but I suggest to the President and the Members of the Congress that a great many of these—particularly in the policy area—would be unnecessary if there were established a Resources and Conservation Council within the Executive Office of the President focusing its attention upon the integration, development, promotion, and utilization of our natural resources in the national interest.

I have introduced legislation to accomplish this objective in H.R. 4430. In the other body, a similar measure has been introduced by Senator McGovern, S. 938.

In behalf of this legislation I have furnished the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the following statement which outlines my views on this important subject.

The text of this statement follows:

STATEMENT OF AL ULLMAN, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE SECOND DISTRICT OF OREGON, WITH REFERENCE TO H.R. 4430, FEBRUARY 24, 1965

The Nation has striven for over three decades to find the leadership and coordination required for its proliferated natural resource policies and programs. In this time the need for leadership has never diminished only increased as a more complex life and ever burgeoning population has demanded more and more of our national, natural resource base.

A historic review of the efforts to develop a national resource and conservation policy and/or the machinery to implement such policy is not necessary here. We are all familiar with such valiant, albeit frequently segmented, efforts as the Natural Resources Planning Board in the early years of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission and Material Policy Commission, the Second Hoover Commission, President Eisenhower's Cabinet Committee on Water Resources Policy, the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and others.

All these efforts have been merely partial reflections of our country's continued search for natural resource leadership.

Finally in recent years we have seen high support given to the thesis that a real need exists for natural resource leadership. The report of the Kennedy-Johnson Natural Resources Advisory Committee, approved January 17, 1961, took the position:

"Existing Federal agencies can do the necessary work for a meaningful conservation program. But conflicts between agencies can only serve to delay and defeat achievement of natural resources programs. Policy guidance can come from the President and a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers in the Office of the President."

Most important of all endorsements for resource leadership and the need for executive coordination of Federal resource programs came from President Kennedy himself, both before and after the 1960 election. In his Helena, Mont., address of June 27, 1960, he said:

"We need a whole new concept of resource development. The days when our natural wealth was so plentiful that a little effort brought great rewards—those days have passed. Nor can we any longer look upon each resource need as a separate and individual item, requiring separate planning and separate administration."

"Today's resource needs are closely interrelated. The development of our water supplies affects the irrigation of our land and even our stocks of fish. Forest development influences power development, and our power development can only be carried out with a careful eye to the need for flood protection and the needs of navigation. Soil conservation affects water supply, game supplies for our hunters, as well as our continued ability to meet our food and fiber needs."

"As our needs mount and our population grows, it will become increasingly essential that we consider all our resources in light of their relationship to each other—as well as to the economy as a whole, and the needs of our people."

"That is why I support efforts to establish a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers in the Office of the President—a council which will engage in overall resources planning and policy, which will assess our national needs, and recommend national programs to meet them."

"With such a Council, working in cooperation with a joint congressional committee, we can have a continuous appraisal of our resource needs, an up-to-date inventory of our resource potential, and a resource development program which can be shaped to fit all the needs of a growing economy and an expanding population."

Senator Kennedy repeated these ideas several times during the campaign.

At Redding, Calif., on September 8, he said:

"I think it would be most useful to establish for the Office of the President himself a

Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers to survey the whole scope of our natural resources for 1970 and 1980."

Then at the Western Water and Power Consumers Conference at Billings, Mont., on September 23, he again proclaimed:

"We will establish a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers in the Office of the President to coordinate planning in this field. We have had many short-term, limited, piecemeal studies. We have not had enough long-range continuing and comprehensive surveys to determine the needs of our country, the increases in our population, the available resources and how they can be fitted together to build a strong and vital country. We need a permanent inventory of where we stand now and where we want to be tomorrow in water, power, timber, recreation, and other resources."

And at Phoenix, Ariz., on November 3, he said:

"We must recognize the increasing interdependence of all of our resource needs by establishing in the Office of the President a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers, to conduct a continuous appraisal of resource needs, inventory our resource potential, and formulate a resources program to meet the needs of a growing population and an expanding economy."

Finally in his great natural resources message to the Congress on February 23, 1961, President Kennedy presented a stirring challenge to the people and to the Congress. He said:

"This statement is designed to bring together in one message the widely scattered resource policies of the Federal Government. In the past these policies have overlapped and often conflicted. Funds were wasted on competing efforts. Widely differing standards were applied to measure the Federal contribution to similar projects. Funds and attention devoted to annual appropriation or immediate pressures diverted energies away from long-range planning for national economic growth."

The President thus pointed out that all of our divergent programs, involving numerous Federal agencies, require coordination by the Executive. To this, I subscribe most heartily and to accomplish this end emphasize that the President needs high-level professional assistance.

The 88th Congress brought to fruition natural resource legislation of great magnitude. The work of this historic "Conservation Congress" is now being boldly advanced in the 89th Congress as both the Congress and President Johnson further the ideals of a Great Society founded on fundamental environmental precepts of: pollutant control in the air, water, and soil; the restoration of beauty, tranquillity, and space to city and countryside; the preservation of wilderness and scenic and historic sites and waterways; the enhancement of recreational opportunity on public lands and the encouragement of State, local, and private recreational resource effort and the transformation of depressed regional areas into productive economic assets.

These great and important programs for America must go forward—but they bring into even greater focus than ever before the tremendous proliferation of new and existing resource programs in the executive agencies and the competition of the agencies for their place in the favored light. This is obvious in water pollution control, pesticide review, recreational enhancement, rural water development, river basin planning, water storage for flood control, power and irrigation, the dedication of our public lands, urban land planning and development, and regional economic and resource development efforts.

Beyond these individual or group program areas, I am deeply concerned with their interrelations and the priority of Federal fund allocations for resource projects.

In this latter aspect I am particularly concerned with budgetary denials to natural resource needs predicated not on resource or economic evaluation but rather upon arbitrary agency ceilings and pressures favoring particular units of the executive branch.

The Bureau of the Budget has not acted on resource appropriations with a view to coordinating and furthering the Nation's future economic well-being by considering the relationship between this desirable objective and the development of our natural resources. The record is replete with hundreds of examples to prove this assertion. Further it is obvious that the Bureau of the Budget is incapable of changing its role as an integrating force whose main concern is bookkeeping and budget to one of resource development. It should be equally apparent that the many agencies in the resource field will continue to follow Parkinson's law and that the Council of Economic Advisers is without expertise in the resource area.

Thus, I find invalid arguments advanced to the effect that the Bureau of the Budget, with the several resource agencies, and an occasional review by the Council of Economic Advisers can in themselves coordinate and further natural resource policy.

To me the only way we may proceed with practicality is to have a resource advisory council directly responsible to the President, which is focused on one thing and one thing only—the integration, development, promotion, and utilization of our natural resources in the national interest.

The bill I have introduced, H.R. 4430, is identical with S. 938, introduced by Senator McGovern. It is similar to S. 2549 of the 86th Congress and S. 239 and S. 1415 of the 87th Congress upon which the Senate held lengthy hearings.

My intent in introducing this measure in the House in this session is to focus the attention of this body and its deliberations on this matter. This I regard as most important. The House should not sidestep the issue of natural resource leadership by leaving it up to Senate resolution first or to possible Executive action which may or may not develop.

In examining this measure, and indeed this entire thesis, one cannot escape several facts. First, that Presidential prerogative is involved to a high degree in the establishment of any White House Advisory Council. It is obvious that the President's position must be ascertained. This, I suggest, might well be done by the Members of the House most deeply concerned with natural resource matters.

Second, this bill concerns itself with an annual "Resources and Conservation Report of the President." The intent here is not to secure a voluminous annual report covering every facet of natural resources endeavor each year. Rather, it is to focus the detailed analysis and professional thought of the Council and the President's recommendations on the salient resource problems of priority concern to the Nation. I would envision a report one year perhaps emphasizing water development needs, development criteria and legislative and administrative implementation; another year a report centering on irrigation policy with regard to surplus crop production or public land user policy, etc.

Third, that the establishment of any special committees in the Congress such as this bill proposes namely the "Conference Committee on the Resources and Conservation Report" is a delicate undertaking at best and perhaps not the most workable solution, particularly within the House of Representatives. Nevertheless, again the Congress must come to grips with the problem within the legislative sphere just as we must

expect the Executive to face up to the Nation's needs for natural resource leadership.

Finally, in closing let me only emphasize again that proliferation of our natural resource effort grows greater across a broad sphere despite such excellent efforts as H.R. 1111, the Water Resources Planning Act; that piecemeal solutions are simply not enough; that a progressive natural resource policy predicated on development and wise use is the foundation for our future national growth; and that all of us concerned with these problems must act in concert, with provincial views set aside, for the national good.

**"Trends in Transportation"—Address by
Hon. Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia,
Before Convention of National
Limestone Institute, Inc.**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting and searching speech on the subject "Trends in Transportation" delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], before the 20th annual convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., held at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington, D.C., January 18, 1965.

Senators who have the honor to serve with the Senator from West Virginia on the Committee on Public Works, which has jurisdiction of the Federal aid highway program, are aware that his views are of great interest to the committee and certainly to the millions of people throughout the country who are vitally interested in transportation.

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

**"TRENDS IN TRANSPORTATION"—AN ADDRESS
BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT,
OF WEST VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE 20TH
ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL
LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC., WASHINGTON,
D.C., STATLER HILTON, JANUARY 18, 1965**

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm very happy tonight to be with you, your president, Mr. Koch, the chairman of the board, Mr. Meshberger, Members of the Congress, and, of course, with all of you who are intensely interested in the future of America.

Sitting at my right is Richard Raese, of Morgantown, W. Va. I refer to Mr. Raese that I may in a sense refer to all of you who are the policymakers in this vital industry. He is a director of this effective organization and is one of the business leaders in our State, just as you are in your State, as well as in the Republic.

We were talking about the number of people who are employed in West Virginia directly in the limestone and associated industries. Mr. Raese told me that it was perhaps 4,000. And then we began to think of the processes in which lime participates, and we counted another 30,000 employees in our State. So approximately 34,000 or more persons, directly and indirectly, and their families are dependent, at least in large degree on this important enterprise in our State. Our State—and I must not be provincial—pro-

vides, of course, this product which goes into steel, into glass, into chemicals, into mining as rock dust, into cement, into agriculture, and importantly, into highways.

I remember some 30 years ago when I first came to the Congress, there was being conducted in the district I was privileged to represent, a survey on the so-called standard of living index. The interviews were concerned with such matters as the ownership of radios, bathtubs, and refrigerators, and the consumer plans in purchasing and acquiring these products in the future. One interviewer became puzzled when he encountered an elderly lady who, though she owned not one of these products, stated that she planned to buy an automobile. He questioned further: "Why would you buy an automobile, when you don't even own a bathtub?" "Sonny," she replied, "you can't go to town in a bathtub."

This incident reflects a fundamental fact about American society—that "going to town" when you choose and in the way you choose is as vital a part of our style of life as indoor plumbing. The right to select is an important right in our democratic society. This is a precious freedom. We must not lose it.

When I mention indoor plumbing, I recall that there are many areas in our country where the needs are still very intense, where the Congress regardless of political preference is attempting, I hope valdly and realistically, as I know it is, to contribute to programs that are not necessarily inspired from Washington, but are projects that spring from the heartbeats and the needs of the American people.

American people possess a mobility that is characteristic of this country and of our frontiers. There was the barrier, of course, of the Allegheny Mountains in the latter part of the 18th century. It was no rarity for the family records after that time to reveal that each child—in a family of seven or eight—was born in a different State. For as the frontier moved westward so did hundreds and thousands of families pack their belongings and move with it.

There are Members of Congress here as your guests who will recall, from a study of the history of legislation in this country, the enactment by the Congress of the Union Pacific bill in 1862. And then the Conestoga wagons began to give way to the railroads as the principal means of transporting the western settlers. Thus, before the end of the 19th century, the western frontier as we knew it—the physical frontier at least—had disappeared, and the railroad had become the chief instrument for extending American civilization and the scope of the U.S. Government—I would not call it power of the U.S. Government because I do not like that choice of language—the scope of the U.S. Government crossed the land to the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

In a like manner, ladies and gentlemen, the automobile and our Federal highway system have been the main forces in this century for breaking down regional barriers and consolidating the national unity for which the American people labored in the 18th and 19th centuries. The history of transportation in America—from the canals of the 18th century through the transcontinental railroads of the 19th century to the highways and air transport of the 20th century—is the parallel in the history of American civilization itself.

I do not have pat answers, and in the presence of my colleagues of the Congress, naturally, I speak not with authority but as a student of these trends of transportation.

We cannot be concerned, ladies and gentlemen, with only technical improvements in our transport system. On the contrary, future developments in transportation will be woven into the very fabric of our existence, and will, as in the past, have a fundamental and a positive influence on the tone

and the lives of all the people of the United States, and even the people of the other parts of the world.

Now if we are to assure that our present and future transportation facilities truly serve the broader purposes of our society, actually in the breadth and scope of our future, we must perceive how new technologies permeate other aspects of our national life. Even today, for example, we have not fully corrected the early errors of omission in planning for the utilization of the automobile in our communities and cities.

Do you remember the early automobile? I recall in West Virginia we had a mountain called Tunnel Hill, and if you could go up in high gear it was an achievement. You remember some hills in your countryside, perhaps, where if you didn't have to throw the motor into second or low gear you came back home and boasted to your neighbors. And if you made a trip of 1 day without a puncture to a tire, didn't you talk about that? You certainly did.

But we do realize that the utilization of our automobiles into the community life—into the metropolitan life of America—is something that, very frankly, called for a belated effort—and it is that—in the development of the Interstate System of highways and defense roads in the United States.

We've had mistakes in our prior highway systems. But by 1972 we will have completed, we believe, a network of 41,000 miles in this Interstate System. In doing so we will have completed not only highways, but what I call "townless highways." And by the same time we shall be well along in the development of towns without highways. And certainly there is a distinct difference.

The cost of the national system of our interstate and defense highways will be at least \$5.8 billion more than had previously been estimated. The anticipated total cost of the network will be \$46.8 billion.

We're now beginning to digest these estimates of the able Highway Administrator of the United States, Rex M. Whitton. And I think it is important for us to realize one statement that he made. Mr. Whitton said "the largest part of the increased costs results from improvement in the Interstate System made to meet the public's need for safer and better highway transportation." I believe this is the essence of what the Congress itself has been doing.

Members of Congress here will recall that in 1963 we believed that we must project our traffic needs 20 years beyond the project approval date. And this was done. Prior to that time we had indicated that we were building our roads for the traffic of 1975. And so the Congress believed that we needed to build better highways—highways which more nearly serve the people of the United States.

Therefore, on the congressional agenda this year, I think, will be the question of providing for an increase through some type of taxes (I'll not attempt to be definitive tonight) to take care of the increased cost of the Interstate System. Of course, this will require extensive committee hearings, and I have a feeling that we may have raised deep-seated differences concerning methods of highway financing. Also, the Congress must act this year or the next, and I believe the earlier the better, on recommended changes in weights and measures on trucks operating on the Interstate System. I hope we will explore what we conceive to be the purpose of this system and its increasing role in our overall economy. As Walter Belson of the American Trucking Association recently remarked in a perceptive commentary on our highway program, "We have never in our history had a viewpoint such as that of the Romans." He was talking, of course, of the Romans who built the roads—the roads that as Rex Whitton today, in other language said, will meet increased needs and

will have a longer and better life to serve a growing and developing America.

Senator KARL MUNDT—with us this evening—I remember so well when I had the privilege of being with you and your gracious wife at an interparliamentary union meeting in Paris. We were talking about roads even as we flew above the Atlantic. You told me about a constituent who had conceived a poem which told of the strength and the durability of those Roman roads. You repeated to me those lines:

"Great roads the Romans built that men might meet,
And walls to keep strong men apart—secure.
Now centuries have gone, and in defeat
The walls are fallen, but the roads endure."

And so, fellow builders of this era, in a very real way we cannot be frightened—although this is a problem and the Members of the Congress recognize it and you recognize it—of how we shall meet the financing, the increased cost of the construction of the Interstate System before 1972. We are building, not for a day or a year; we are building for the future.

Dramatic figures were recently released by our Bureau of Census. When I think of the Bureau of the Census I recall that today there are 50 statisticians in the Bureau of Census doing the job that 4,200 employees did 15 years ago. Senator FRANK CARLSON, my esteemed colleague of our Post Office and Civil Service Committee, has been studying with me some of the computer methods which have been brought into government itself. He knows, as well as others in this audience, that we are spending in this fiscal year in 1965, approximately \$165 million on computers for the U.S. Government. And so, this is a different time in which we are living—a time of dramatic transition.

The machine not only is a process of building or constructing, but the machine is a decisionmaker. That's why we realize that we are in this period of change. We cannot overlook it in the discussion of our highway system. A lady wrote me recently. She said simply this: "I don't want no change." But she, as well as all Americans, must accept change, and we will be the better if we understand it.

The Bureau of the Census has released figures for 100 standard metropolitan areas with over a 250,000 population. The data shows that slightly less than half the workers in a typical metropolitan area live and work in the central city. Approximately one-fourth live, and work in the suburbs. Of the remainder who commute, 16 percent commute from the central city. This represents, in fact, a vastly different pattern of urban movement than that implied by what we've had as a traditional concept of our urban-suburban movement in the United States. President Lyndon Johnson recognizes this change and he has a new concept of the magnitude of the job to be done.

These centrifugal forces will continue to operate at an accelerated pace. The population in the central cities of the United States will increase from 58 million in 1960, to 78 million persons by 1980, and our suburban population during the same period will skyrocket from 55 to 105 million. And urban motor vehicle travel will disclose an even greater percentage increase—from 332 billion vehicle-miles in 1960 to 859 billion vehicle-miles in 1980.

Thus, a major challenge after completion of this system will be, I believe, the necessity to provide adequate facilities for the non-radial metropolitan automobile travel. This will require 16,000 miles of urban freeways, of which only slightly more than half will be provided by the present Interstate System.

Of the 41,000 miles of this network, we have already completed and opened to traffic approximately 19,000 miles. The other mileage is in the process of right-of-way,

engineering, and construction. And so this program is not completed, and there is a very definite challenge and there are many problems arising almost daily, but we can complete the construction by the target date of the act of 1956.

I know there is a genuine desire in your business, and among roadbuilders and certainly in the State highway departments, for official congressional expression as to what direction our highway program is to take in 1972. Are we doing this job and then summarily drop it? This is something to ponder. I believe, of course, that we must move forward with the development not only in one sphere of our national life, but certainly in this sphere, though we must in no ways be timid. We must make an all-out continuing frontal attack on the problem of moving our people safely throughout America—for recreation, for jobs, for life itself.

My friend with whom I served in the House of Representatives, GEORGE FALLON, chairman of the Public Works Committee, is present. Mr. FALLON and an equally good Member of the Congress, Senator PAT McNAMARA, of Michigan, who heads the Senate Public Works Committee, do not agree. Representative FALLON believes that we need Congress to spell out the intent of a study beyond 1972. Senator McNAMARA is of the view that such legislation is unnecessary in light of the specific and general statutory authority of the Department of Commerce (Bureau of Public Roads) to conduct this type of cooperative study with the States.

Though I appreciate the psychological and symbolic significance of having the Congress on record in this matter, Senator McNAMARA's view is sustained by a reading of title 23 of the United States Code.

A post-1972 study is being conducted and no doubt will be continued even though we have no congressional sanction for the study to go forward. I would further add that a congressional request, at least with respect to reporting deadlines for the executive branch, does not necessarily carry a magical effect.

In the 1956 Highway Act, for example, the Congress directed the Secretary of Commerce to report on vehicle weights and measures not later than March 1, 1959. Last August—5½ years late—the Department of Commerce got around to reporting to the Hill. And so there's no magic, is there, in the Congress sanctioning the study, with a report to be made by a certain time?

The fact is—as I draw to a conclusion—the realities of the population growth and the economic and social needs of our Nation will largely govern our highway program after 1972. Congress will, I am convinced, meet responsibly this challenge in accordance with the national needs when the data are supplied.

We live in a world of mushrooming population. Communist China with 670 million persons; India with 430 million persons; Communist Russia with 235 million; the United States with 192 million persons; Indonesia with 175 million and on and on mount the figures. And the world rate of an increase in population moves ahead 65 million persons a year.

Yes, this is a world of people. We must accelerate, therefore, the rate of construction of the Interstate System of highways in the United States. We must give more attention to the impact on esthetic values and the conservation of land and water resources. And our cities of over 50,000 must, in accordance with this Highway Act of 1962, develop those continuous and comprehensive planning programs by the middle of 1965, if they are to receive Federal funds.

Our urban interstate program offers an unparalleled opportunity for remodeling large portions of our cities. The value of urban freeways in conjunction with slum clearance and urban renewal has already

been demonstrated in Winston-Salem, N.C.; Jacksonville, Fla.; and Chattanooga, Tenn. There are other cities where the programs move forward as well.

Equally important, however, is our unfulfilled responsibility to stimulate low-income rental housing for slum residents displaced by urban renewal and freeway construction programs. It is my hope that the Members of Congress, in both House and Senate, will act affirmatively to meet this challenge in the present 89th Congress.

I am convinced that our national view, as presently expressed does not adequately embrace the full potentialities of the highway program and its impact on the economic, the social, the recreational, and the esthetic considerations which are so necessary in our times. As we study in committee how to meet the increased costs of the Interstate System we're going to come to grips with these needs which I have mentioned. And so in the light of the projected growth of our population, the constantly increasing standards of living in America, and the critical role that automotive transportation occupies in our national concept and in our national economy, it is imperative, I believe—and the Congress recognizes it—that there is an area of activity and leadership for the Federal Government—in cooperation with State governments and with many segments of private industry as well.

Now I close with this expression of thanks to Bob Koch and his staff. I think that you have the right to know, ladies and gentlemen, that the membership of the Congress of the United States is appreciative of the counsel

of trained persons who understand your problems and the problems of other segments of industry and who come to the Congress and talk to us and counsel with us. I will say to you, President Koch, that you and your associates have never pressured the Congress of the United States.

Those of you in this industry—individually as well as through an excellent and adequate staff—come to your Congress. Let us hear from you. I think I have at least a right and responsibility tonight to say for all Members of Congress, that we want you to come to us before the fact, not after the fact. Give us the information which you have before hearings have gone too far—or at least until a bill has been reported from subcommittee or committee and then brought to the Senate or House floors for actual voting up or down—perhaps the adoption of sometimes hastily conceived amendments. You have done this, President Koch.

Chairman Meshberger, and to all you who are here, this isn't a pleasantry. I believe it's vitally important that you continue to give us earlier, rather than later, your counsel and guidance, as well as your support when you believe the cause is in the national interest.

As we move forward in these days and months and years ahead, workers in factory and field and farm—workers, yes, in Government—let us realize that tomorrow will be a good tomorrow as today has been a good today and yesterday was also good. And tomorrow will be a good tomorrow if we but know how to use it. And represented in this meeting are the leaders, as I have said, in

your industry who will help the Congress of the United States in its proper role to build a better America. Working together the task will be easier and surer of accomplishment.

Public Issues Poll Results, Fourth District, Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, in February I polled the people of Michigan's Fourth Congressional District on several current issues, including medicare, Federal aid to education, the one-man, one-vote principle of apportionment, foreign aid, and our course in Vietnam. In round numbers, 140,000 questionnaires were distributed and 18,000 were returned—an unusually large percentage of response.

Replies were tabulated and compiled by an independent data processing firm in the Washington area. In order that the results may be known I include them at this point in the RECORD:

Survey results

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No answer
1. Should Congress enact a compulsory system of hospital insurance (medicare) under the social security system?	25.2	71.9	2.9
2. Should the Federal Government furnish massive financial aid to primary and secondary schools?	33.2	63.4	3.4
3. If Federal aid to primary and secondary education is provided, do you feel that it should be given to parochial as well as public schools?	37.5	59.2	3.3
4. Do you favor repeal of excise taxes on furs, jewelry, and cosmetics?	32.2	64.6	3.2
5. Should the Federal excise tax on new cars (presently 10 percent of the purchase price) be repealed?	57.7	37.6	4.7
6. Due to the death of President Kennedy, the United States was without a Vice President from Nov. 22, 1963, to Jan. 20, 1965. Do you believe the President should be empowered to nominate a citizen to fill the vacancy, subject to approval of Congress?	69.9	26.9	3.2
7. After appointment by the President—and with approval of the Senate—Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court now serve "for good behavior"—in effect, a life term. In view of the increased political power being exercised by the Court, would you favor a constitutional change establishing a 12-year term for Justices?	77.6	19.5	2.9
8. In view of the present coin shortage and the comparative scarcity of silver, would you favor coinage of money from other metals, such as steel and aluminum?	34.2	59.9	5.9
9. Would you favor an increase in the Federal minimum wage (currently \$1.25 per hour) to \$2 per hour?	26.6	70.8	2.6
10. Would you favor a reduction in the standard workweek, from 40 to 35 hours?	26.7	70.7	2.6
11. Should the Federal Government require States to apportion both houses of their legislatures on a strict population basis?	32.2	62.3	5.5
12. Should the city and county governing boards (city councils and commissions, county boards of supervisors) be apportioned on the same, strict population basis?	33.3	58.9	7.8
13. Should our immigration laws be changed to provide for admission of aliens on the basis of their skills rather than the country from which they come?	51.2	40.4	8.4
14. In Vietnam which course do you advocate:	Percent		
Withdrawal of present military support?	17.5		
Advise the South Vietnam Government to seek a negotiated peace with the Vietcong?	41.9		
Further commitment of American men and materiel to an all-out campaign to rid South Vietnam of Communists?	24.8		
No answer	15.8		
15. Would you favor elimination of gold backing for U.S. currency?	10.9	80.4	8.7
16. This year we will be spending about \$3.25 billion on foreign aid. Do you feel this is—			
Too much?	78.6		
About right?	13.9		
Not enough?	1.3		
No answer	6.2		

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted this verse of Scripture: Mark 6: 34: *And Jesus saw much people, and was moved with compassion toward them.*

Let us pray.

Most merciful and gracious God, grant that this Lenten season, in which there is so much internal and international

struggle and strife, we may center our thoughts upon our blessed Lord whose healing compassion alone is equal to our temporal needs and our immortal longings.

We thank Thee for our Master and Saviour who never looked upon the vast multitude with contempt or mere curiosity but with a tide of moving compassion as He thought of their aching hearts and bewildered minds.

The record of His life shows that He always sought to create within mankind a new spirit which would blossom and bear fruits in new desires and aspirations

in new endeavors and enthusiasms for the more abundant life.

Help us to receive the Lenten blessing that will cool our feverish anxiety and encourage us to carry on with those burdens and needs which perhaps no other mortal knows about and which are exclusively our own.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.