Thomas H. Beagle, Riverside, Pa., in place of A. C. Gulick, retired.

Walter S. Morrison, Jr., Transfer, Pa., in place of R. D. Heile, retired.

Morris F. Good, Williamsport, Pa., in place of J. M. Good, deceased.

RHODE ISLAND

Maurice N. Valois, Manville, R.I., in place of E. J. Peloquin, retired.

TENNESSEE

John C. Shelton, Charleston, Tenn., in place of T. M. Bryant, retired.

James C. Tyner, Dunlap, Tenn., in place of V. W. Mansfield, retired.

Willis R. Byrd, Sneedville, Tenn., in place of R. C. Hopkins, transferred.

TEXAS

Fayteen Moorhouse, Benjamin, Tex., in place of T. R. West, deceased.

Glen A. McDonald, Friendswood, Tex., in place of E. D. Cline, deceased.

Milburn B. Holmes, Joaquin, Tex., in place of J. T. Holmes, retired.

Ernest J. Ohnemus, Lubbock, Tex., in place of A. H. Howard, retired.

Lloyd E. Raburn, Valley Mills, Tex., in place of D. V. Farmer, transferred.

UTAH

Gertrude B. Turner, Jensen, Utah, in place of R. P. Haslem, retired.

VERMONT

Timothy M. Donahue, Jr., Northfield, Vt., in place of T. M. Donahue, retired.

VIRGINIA

Mary C. Trainham, Beaverdam, Va., in place of S. C. Lowry, resigned.

Edward S. Hampton, Hillsville, Va., in place of Clinton Webb, Jr., deceased.

Henly C. Davis, Woodlawn, Va., in place of A. R. Brown, retired.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Gustave Frorup, Christiansted, V.I., in place of W. R. Armstrong, retired.

WASHINGTON

Ethel J. Miller, Colbert, Wash., in place of H. W. Miller, retired.

Thelma M. Erickson, Ocean City, Wash., in place of N. C. Rutherford, retired.

Asa L. Baker, Seaview, Wash., in place of Arloene Marchant, retired.

WISCONSIN

Norbert H. Hillebrand, Cross Plains, Wis., in place of J. F. Bowar, deceased.

Robert L. Seifert, Eagle River, Wis., in place of Erna Bond, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used these words of Nehemiah 2: 20: *The God of heaven, he will prosper us; therefore we his servants will arise and build.*

Almighty God, as we turn to Thee, we penitently acknowledge that we frequently suffer so much of loss in peace and power because we have not availed ourselves of the nourishing silences of meditation and prayer.

Inspire us to see our daily tasks and responsibilities in the right perspective and may we discharge them faithfully and enjoy the poise and patience which comes from taking hold of a hard task courageously and seeing it through.

Grant that the people of our beloved country may carry on with united action and effort in behalf of a more blessed spiritual life and a nobler social order.

We pray that our President, our Speaker, and all who hold positions of trust and authority may be men and women of power, of capacity, of courage, and vision as they seek to provide moral leadership in days of crises in our national history.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 11, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1496. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 42. An act for the relief of George Tilson Weed;

S. 154. An act for the relief of Luisa G. Valdez;

S. 196. An act for the relief of Georges Fraise;

S. 200. An act for the relief of Francesco Mira;

S. 243. An act for the relief of Kalliope Kostides;

S. 244. An act for the relief of Charles Chung Chi Lee and Julia Lee;

S. 262. An act for the relief of Milagros Aragon Neri;

S. 320. An act for the relief of Denis Ryan;

S. 373. An act for the relief of Dr. Victor M. Ubieta;

S. 389. An act for the relief of Teresa Marangon;

S. 394. An act for the relief of Alexa Daniel;

S. 416. An act for the relief of Sister Aurora Martin Gelado (also known as Sister Nieve);

S. 417. An act for the relief of Miss Wladyslawa Kowalczyk;

S. 446. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Konyen, his wife, Susanne Fritsch Konyen, and their children, Susanne Konyen and Willy Konyen;

S. 456. An act for the relief of Koon Chew Ho;

S. 510. An act to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes;

S. 570. An act for the relief of Frank S. Chow;

S. 571. An act for the relief of Denise Hojebane Barrood;

S. 615. An act for the relief of Andreas, Gregorios, Eleni, Nikolaos, and Anna Chingas;

S. 632. An act for the relief of Flora Romano Torre;

S. 640. An act for the relief of Zenon Zubieta;

S. 686. An act for the relief of Pietrina Del Frate;

S. 694. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Soos;

S. 719. An act for the relief of Ivanka Pekar;

S. 720. An act for the relief of Ivan Radic, his wife, Ester Radic, and their daughter, Ilivera Radic;

S. 767. An act for the relief of Gerhard Hofacker;

S. 769. An act for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku;

S. 840. An act for the relief of Christos Stratis;

S. 856. An act for the relief of the estate of R. M. Clark; and

S. 916. An act for the relief of Debra Lynne Sanders.

JOINT SESSION MARCH 15, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 352) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 352

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, March 15, 1965, at 9 o'clock postmeridian, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. With the understanding that it is confined to one purpose.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PEACEABLE ASSEMBLY OF CITIZENS IN DALLAS, TEX.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, following church services yesterday in my home city of Dallas, Tex., a large number of individuals, a biracial group, began gathering at the edge of our downtown area.

Their purpose was a procession through our city streets to be followed by a large outdoor rally in a lovely plaza only a few blocks from the spot on which John Neely Bryant built our city's first building—a small general store—more than 100 years ago.

The procession and the rally were designed as part of the nationwide demonstration spotlighting the event in another Dallas County, our sister county in Alabama, a few hundred miles to our east.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

In my city all was quiet and orderly. Marchers paraded with dignity through our downtown streets and completed their speeches at the rally without incident.

I am deeply proud of all those involved in what could have been something entirely different—our local officials who knew of the plans and participated in them; our police force which cheerfully and courteously offered protection to law-abiding citizens peaceably assembled, and those of both races who participated in the occasion either actively or as observers for their restraint and consideration.

I know that there are citizens in Dallas County, Tex., who are in deep sympathy with their friends of both races in Dallas County, Ala., during this time of strain. And I feel that I can speak for the citizens of Dallas County, Tex., when I report that the display of Sunday is a product of a great deal of understanding of many years from both sides of the fence, that it has required sacrifice and courage from individuals of both races, and that, in the end the result has been more than worth the effort.

THE SELMA, ALA., SITUATION

Mr. BARRETT. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, last week our Nation again hung its head in shame. Another life was snuffed out like a candle. It is hard to believe that such acts of violence continue in a free country. Our national image is slowly but surely being destroyed.

To be denied the right to vote is the issue. It should not be an issue because it is the God-given right of every American to vote.

The State of Alabama and the citizens of Selma certainly cannot be proud of the part they are playing in making a mockery of our democracy.

Thousands upon thousands of good, law-abiding citizens in the First Congressional District of Pennsylvania have voiced their opposition to these brutal and dastardly acts and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a telegram I received from over 7,000 members of Labors' Local Union No. 57 of the International Hod Carriers, AFL-CIO, Philadelphia:

The 7,000 members of Laborers' Local Union No. 57 of the International Hod Carriers vigorously condemn the tactics and actions of the State of Alabama and the local police authorities of Selma, Ala., in the unprovoked brutal attack upon hundreds of innocent citizens who seek merely the right to exercise their voting franchise. We join the voices of all America in condemning those racists of Alabama, and anywhere else, who resort to violence and endanger the lives and limbs of those citizens who seek merely to exercise the constitutional guarantee of civil liberties. We join the Nation and extend to the widow of Rev. James J. Reeb our sincerest condolences upon the loss of her husband, whose martyred death resulted from the violence of racists. We urge the President of the United States to exercise the fullest extent of his authority as the leader of our Nation to employ all necessary measures, including the committing of Federal troops to Selma, Ala., and elsewhere, whenever necessary to protect the lives and limbs of all citizens. We urge all of this in the name of the deceased Reverend Reeb, who gave up his life in the cause for human dignity and inalienable human rights.

LEGISLATION ASSURING THE RIGHT OF ALL TO VOTE

Mr. GRIDER. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, we are at the beginning of another season of race violence in race relations. We must head it off.

This is no time for disunity and shame at home when we face in Asia a stern test of our moral fiber and our firm high purpose.

Speaking for the South—and I believe for most southerners—I feel there are two things we must do.

As much as I detest the need for it, we must pass legislation that insures once and for all that no one will be denied the right to vote because of the color of his skin. I shall support such legislation.

Second—and equally as important—it is time for all men of good will to break their silence.

The brute in policeman's garb, the bomber, the murderer, the ludicrous white-robed redneck—all take courage from our failure to speak out. As they always have, they will slink back into the shadows if we, the great majority of moderate southerners who love our land and revere its real traditions of gallantry and fairplay, will but break our silence.

Until we do, we share the guilt.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calender day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

TOWN OF KURE BEACH, N.C.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 821) for the relief of the town of Kure Beach, N.C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 821

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the town of Kure Beach, North Carolina, the sum of $100,000, which sum was determined by the Court of Claims in congressional case numbered 2-60, decided December 11, 1964, to be the amount equitably due to the town of Kure Beach in full settlement of its claims against the United States based upon the impairment of the collateral value of bonds issued by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation caused by the taking of a buffer zone by the Army extending across the Cape Fear River and into the town of Kure Beach and the resulting partial frustration of the town's obligation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, holder of the bonds. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 5: After "bonds." insert: "The amount authorized by this Act is to be paid the town of Kure Beach, North Carolina, on the condition that it be paid to the Housing and Home Finance Agency in accordance with the stipulation entered into by the parties in the proceedings before the Court of Claims in Congressional Case No. 2-60 and referred to in the decision of the Court."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1825 OF TITLE 28 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE TO AUTHORIZE THE PAYMENT OF WITNESS' FEES IN HABEAS CORPUS CASES AND IN PROCEEDINGS TO VACATE SENTENCE UNDER SECTION 2255 OF TITLE 28 FOR PERSONS WHO ARE AUTHORIZED TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1763) to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28 for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the criteria established have not been met in this bill, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1871 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, TO INCREASE THE PER DIEM AND SUBSISTENCE, AND LIMIT MILEAGE ALLOWANCES OF GRAND AND PETIT JURORS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3990) to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not conform to the rules of the committee on the Consent Calendar, so

I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO THE SETTLEMENT OF ADMIRALTY CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3996) to amend provisions of law relating to the settlement of admiralty claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3996

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 4802(c), 4803(c), 7622(c), 7623(c), 9802(c), and 9803(c) of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking out the figure "$1,000" and inserting the figure "$10,000" in place thereof.

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.

CONSENTING TO COMPACT ON TAXATION OF MOTOR FUELS CONSUMED BY INTERSTATE BUSES AND TO AGREEMENT ON BUS TAXATION PRORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 824) granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill itself does not conform to the rules of the Consent Calendar; because it is very important legislation, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

TRANSFERRING CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3995) to transfer certain functions of the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have a brief explanation of the bill.

Does the transfer of these functions heretofore performed by the Treasury Department to the General Services Administration mean a cutback of personnel in the Treasury Department and an increase of personnel in the Department of Justice and the GSA?

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. There will be no change, in terms of the amount of cost under this bill. The bill will have no appreciable effect in terms of personnel, so far as the transfer of these functions is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. The transfer of these functions from the Treasury Department to the Attorney General and the General Services Administration will not mean an increase in personnel or a diminution in personnel; is that correct?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3995

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of section 3753 of the Revised Statutes, as affected by section 512 (b) and (c) of the Act of May 10, 1934 (40 U.S.C. 308), is amended to read as follows:

"Whenever any property owned or held by the United States, or in which the United States has or claims an interest, shall, in any judicial proceeding under the laws of any State, district, or territory, be seized, arrested, attached, or held for the security or satisfaction of any claim made against such property, the Attorney General, in his discretion, may direct the United States Attorney for the district in which the property is located, to cause a stipulation to be entered into for the discharge of such property from such seizure, arrest, attachment, or proceeding, to the effect that upon such discharge, the person asserting the claim against such property shall become entitled to all the benefits of this and the following section."

(b) The first sentence of section 3754 of the Revised Statutes (40 U.S.C. 309) is amended by substituting "Attorney General" for "Secretary of the Treasury".

SEC. 2. Section 3750 of the Revised Statutes, as affected by section 512 (b) and (c) of the Act of May 10, 1934 (40 U.S.C. 301), is amending by substituting "Administrator of General Services" for "General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury".

SEC. 3. Section 3751 of the Revised Statutes, as affected by section 512 (b) and (c) of the Act of May 10, 1934 (40 U.S.C. 306), is amended by substituting "Administrator of General Services" for "General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury".

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 3755 of the Revised Statutes (40 U.S.C. 310) is amended by substituting "Administrator of General Services" for "Secretary of the Treasury".

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 3470 of the Revised Statutes as affected by section 512 (b) and (c) of the Act of May 10, 1934 (31 U.S.C. 195), is amended to read as follows: "At every sale, on execution, at the suit of the United States, of lands or tenements of a debtor, the United States may, by such agent as the head of the department or independent agency at whose instance suit was instituted shall appoint, become the purchaser thereof; but in no case shall be agent bid in behalf of the United States a greater amount than that of the judgment for which such estate may be exposed to sale, and the costs."

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.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF THE CRASH OF A U.S. AIR FORCE AIRCRAFT AT WICHITA, KANS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3994) to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling and paying certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. aircraft at Wichita, Kans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3994

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the $5,000 limitation contained in section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to claims arising out of the crash of a United States Air Force aircraft at Wichita, Kansas, on January 16, 1965.

SEC. 2. With respect to claims filed as a result of an aircraft crash described in the first section of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall, within thirty months after the date of the enactment of this Act, report to Congress on—

(1) each claim settled and paid by him under this Act with a brief statement concerning the character and equity of each such claim, the amount claimed, and the amount approved and paid; and

(2) each claim submitted under this Act which has not been settled, with supporting papers and a statement of findings of facts and recommendations with respect to each such claim.

SEC. 3. Payments made pursuant to this Act for death, personal injury, and property loss claims shall not be subject to insurance subrogation claims in any respect. No payments made pursuant to this Act shall include any amount for reimbursement to any insurance company or compensation insurance fund for loss payments made by such company or fund.

SEC. 4. No part of the amounts awarded under this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING REMOVAL PETITIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3989) to extend to 30 days the time for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3989

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 1446 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The petition for removal of a civil action or proceeding shall be filed within thirty days after the receipt by the defendant, through service or otherwise, of a copy of the initial pleading setting forth the claim for relief upon which such action or proceeding is based, or within thirty days

after the service of summons upon the defendant if such initial pleading has then been filed in court and is not required to be served on the defendant, whichever period is shorter.

"If the case stated by the initial pleading is not removable, a petition for removal may be filed within thirty days after receipt by the defendant, through service or otherwise, of a copy of an amended pleading, motion, order or other paper from which it may first be ascertained that the case is one which is or has become removable."

The bill was ordered to be engrosesd and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSCRIPTS FURNISHED BY COURT REPORTERS FOR THE DISTRICT COURTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3992) to amend section 753(f) of title 28, United States Code, relating to transcripts furnished by court reporters for the district courts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question. Where will the revenue derived from the fees go?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. There are no fees involved.

All this bill will do, in cases of forma pauperis—that is, poor indigent defendants, who do not have the wherewithal or funds to purchase a transcript—is provide that the court reporters shall furnish a transcript at the expense of the Government.

Heretofore the reporters have been held to furnish those transcripts and they had to pay the expense out of their own pockets. The amount involved would be approximately $10,000 a year.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman this question. The reporters will now be paid, will they not?

Mr. CELLER. The reporters are paid, but they will be paid for the actual expenses of the transcript, that is, the work done with reference to the transcript, and the extra copy that has to be submitted in case of appeal.

Mr. GROSS. To whom will this money go?

Mr. CELLER. This money will be submitted to the reporter. The reporter will get it.

Mr. GROSS. The reporter will be paid. Is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. CELLER. This is only $10,000 covering the whole United States.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but I still want to know who will get the money. The gentleman says the reporter will get the money?

Mr. CELLER. The reporter will get the funds.

Mr. GROSS. While the gentleman is on his feet, he used two words a little while ago that I do not understand. I know what a pro forma session of the House is, and I do not think it deals with poverty. What does forma pauperis mean?

Mr. CELLER. A man who is indigent and cannot afford to pay for the transcript.

Mr. GROSS. Why do you say "forma pauperis"? We are not all lawyers around here. Could you not just say it that way, that it deals with those who are too poor to afford the fees or something of that kind?

Mr. CELLER. It is a legal expression.

Mr. GROSS. I understand it is, and that is why I am asking if you cannot use language that we can all understand without taking the time to ask the question on the floor.

Mr. CELLER. I did explain at the very end as to the use of the legal words. I said "indigent and/or too poor to pay."

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3992

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 753(f) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Each reporter may charge and collect fees for transcripts requested by the parties, including the United States, at rates prescribed by the court subject to the approval of the Judicial Conference. He shall not charge a fee for any copy of a transcript delivered to the clerk for the records of court. Fees for transcripts furnished in criminal or habeas corpus proceedings to persons allowed to sue, defend, or appeal in forma pauperis shall be paid by the United States out of money appropriated for that purpose. Fees for transcripts furnished in proceedings brought under section 2255 of this title to persons permitted to sue or appeal in forma pauperis shall be paid by the United States out of money appropriated for that purpose if the trial judge or a circuit judge certifies that the suit or appeal in not frivolous and that the transcript is needed to decide the issue presented by the suit or appeal. Fees for transcripts furnished in other proceedings to persons permitted to appeal in forma pauperis shall also be paid by the United States if the trial judge or a circuit judge certifies that the appeal is not frivolous (but presents a substantial question). The reporter may require any party requesting a transcript to prepay the estimated fee in advance except as to transcripts that are to be paid for by the United States."

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.

INCREASING THE FEES OF JURY COMMISSIONERS IN U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3998) to increase the fees of jury commissioners in the U.S. district courts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if someone could tell us the total gross amount paid by the Government annually for jury commissioner fees so we could have some idea of what doubling those fees would mean and entail in the way of additional cost.

Mr. CELLER. All I can say to the gentleman is we increase the fees to these jury commissioners from the present amount of $5 to $10. There has been no change in that $5 rate since 1884.

Mr. PELLY. That I know.

Mr. CELLER. I think they are entitled to a change. I do not have a record here as to the total amount paid to the jury commissioners. I do not know that figure.

Mr. PELLY. Would this cost exceed $1 million a year?

Mr. CELLER. I should think it would vary from year to year depending upon the circumstances.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I will say the rules established to qualify legislation on the Consent Calendar state that they are not to exceed $1 million a year in any one bill.

Mr. CELLER. Oh, this would not be anywhere near that.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman, since again I must confess I am not a lawyer, what is the function of a jury commissioner?

Mr. CELLER. The jury commissioner in each of these district courts, in each judicial district, has the duty of preparing panels for grand juries and petit juries. They gather the names from various sources and present them to the U.S. attorneys and the attorneys involved in litigation, and selections are made from that panel for the grand jury and the petit jury.

Mr. GROSS. And how do they get their jobs? Will the gentleman tell me that?

Mr. CELLER. They are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the courts as to appointments, and the judges appoint them.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3998

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of the third paragraph of section 1864 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "He shall receive $10 per day for each day necessarily employed in the performance of his duties."

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.

JUDGES OF U.S. DISTRICT COURT OF PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3999) to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the

proponent of the bill or a member of the committee how many years of the incumbent judge's 8-year term remain to be served; and also whether or not they are now elected officials in Puerto Rico?

Mr. CELLER. They are not elected officials, they are appointed. This applies only to the judges in Puerto Rico. I am informed that there is now only one judge involved.

Mr. HALL. There is one now, but there is a vacancy to be filled as a result of our last Judicial Increment Act, is that correct?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell me how many years of the 8-year term of the present judge remains to be served?

Mr. CELLER. I think the judge there has served pretty much a full term.

Mr. HALL. Can the gentleman advise me whether or not this judge has now the same independence, security, and retirement benefits to which other Federal judges are entitled?

Mr. CELLER. He has everything you suggest except he does not have the independence that comes from a life tenure. That, of course, is a very precious right to all judges, an absolute independence. It is supposed to give him independence from every conceivable pressure.

Mr. HALL. What is the amount of the annual salary paid to the incumbent at this time?

Mr. CELLER. This judge is paid the same salary as other U.S. district court judges, $30,000.

Mr. HALL. What is the reason for the delay, if the gentleman has that within his knowledge, in appointing a second judge in Puerto Rico? Is the work load so small that we really do not need a second judge?

Mr. CELLER. I do not know the reason for the delay. That is a matter for the White House.

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York a question. Can he tell me why the other body has consistently opposed this legislation, and has refused to approve it?

Mr. CELLER. I wish I knew, but I cannot give the answer to that question; I do not know.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

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.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

RE-REFERRAL OF A BILL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H.R. 6009, heretofore referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be re-referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4152) to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4152

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(a) by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1) of section 202(a) thereof (12 U.S.C. 1031(1)) the following: "or without collateral to the extent authorized under rules and regulations prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration";

(b) by striking out *"Provided"* and all that follows it in section 203(a) thereof (12 U.S.C. 1041) and substituting therefor the following: *"Provided,* That the aggregate amount of the outstanding debentures and similar obligations issued by the Federal intermediate credit banks shall not exceed fifteen times the surplus and paid-in capital of all such banks.";

(c) in section 205(a) thereof (12 U.S.C. 1061(a))—

(i) by substituting "one-eighth" for "one-sixth" in the ninth sentence of paragraph (1); and

(ii) by inserting the folowing as two separate paragraphs between the eleventh and twelfth sentences of paragraph (2):

"Each Federal intermediate credit bank, with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, may determine the amount of additional class B stock in the bank to be subscribed for by the production credit associations in the farm credit district served by the bank in order to provide capital to meet the credit needs of the bank. The amount so determined shall be allotted among the production credit associations in the district upon such basis that, as nearly as may be practicable, the sum of the class B stock already owned and the additional amount to be subscribed for by each association will be in the same proportion to the total amount of class B stock already owned and to be subscribed for by all of the associations in the district that the average indebtedness (loans and discounts) of each association to the bank during the immediately preceding three fiscal years is of the average of such indebtedness of all production credit associations to the bank during such three-year period. Each production credit association shall subscribe for class B stock in the bank in the amount so allotted to it. Such subscriptions shall be subject to call and payment therefor shall be made at such times and in such amounts as may be determined by the bank.

"Whenever the relative amounts of class B stock in a Federal intermediate credit bank owned by the production credit associations differ substantially from the proportion indicated in the preceding paragraph, and additional subscriptions to class B stock through which such proportion could be reestablished are not contemplated, the Federal intermediate credit bank, with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, may direct either separately or in combination such transfers, retirements, and reissuance of outstanding class B stock among the associations as will reestablish the aforesaid proportion as nearly as may be practicable. Outstanding class B stock which is transferred or retired for this purpose shall be the oldest stock held by the association and the bank shall pay the association therefor at the fair book value thereof not exceeding par and collect therefor from any production credit association to which such stock is transferred or reissued."; and

(d) in section 206 thereof (12 U.S.C. 1072)—

(i) by striking out "equal to 25 per centum of the outstanding capital stock and participation certificates of the bank" from clause (3) of the first sentence of subsection (a);

(ii) by striking out the second sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof as a separate paragraph the following:

"Amounts applied to reserve account as provided in (3) above, either heretofore or hereafter, shall be allocated on the same patronage basis and have the same tax treatment as is provided in subsection (b) of this section for patronage refunds. Such allocations of reserve account shall be subject to a first lien as additional collateral for any indebtedness of the holders thereof to the bank and in any case where such indebtedness is in default may be retired and canceled for application on such indebtedness, and, in case of liquidation or dissolution of a holder thereof, such reserve account allocations may be retired, all as is provided for capital stock and participation certificates in section 205 of this Act. At the end of any fiscal year that the reserve account of any bank exceeds 25 per centum of its outstanding capital stock and participation certificates, such excess may be distributed, oldest allocations first, in class B stock and participation certificates issued as of the date of the allocations and, whenever the bank has no class A stock outstanding, also in money."; and

(iii) by inserting immediately before the last sentence of subsection (c) the following new sentence: "Any of the reserve established pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be paid to the production credit associations and other financing institutions to which such reserve is allocated on the books of the bank.".

SEC. 2. The Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended—

(a) by adding the following at the end of subsection (b) of section 22 thereof (12 U.S.C. 1131f (b)): "When so specified in the approval by the Federal intermediate credit bank, such dividends may be paid even though the amount in the surplus account provided for in subsection (a) is less than the minimum prescribed by the bank. If the bylaws of a production credit association so provide, (1) any remaining net earnings at the end of a fiscal year may be distributed on a patronage basis in class A stock of the association and, when the United States does not hold class A stock in the association, also in money, and (2) any part of the earnings for the fiscal year, in excess of operating expenses held in the surplus account, may be allocated to borrowers on a patronage basis. With the approval of the Federal intermediate credit bank, amounts so allocated may be distributed, oldest allocations first, in class A stock of the association issued as of the date of the allocation and, when the United States does not hold class A stock in the association, also in money. As used in the second preceding sentence 'on a patronage basis' means in the

proportion that the amount of interest earned on the loans of each borrower bears to the total interest earned on the loans of all borrowers during the fiscal year."; and

(b) by adding the following as a separate paragraph at the end of section 23 thereof (12 U.S.C. 1131g):

"As a further means of providing capital, a production credit association may, upon such terms and conditions as may be provided in its bylaws, require borrowers to invest in an equity reserve in the association. Amounts so invested by each borrower shall be subject to a lien for the indebtedness of the borrower to the association, application on such indebtedness in event of default by the borrower, charges for losses of the association which are in excess of other loss reserves and surplus, and any portion of the amounts so invested which have not been so used and no longer are required for the purposes of the association may be returned to the borrower by revolving or retirement, all as may be provided in said bylaws."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second in order to assure that there will be some explanation of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a reorganization of the Federal Farm Loan and Farm Credit Act of 1933. This bill relates primarily to the intermediate credit banks and the production credit associations.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the membership may understand what is involved I should go back and point out that at the time of the organization of this credit system we created the intermediate credit banks and the production credit associations and the Federal Government advanced all the capital stock. But it contemplated then and it has been contemplated ever since that ultimately we would transfer this stock to farmers who were participating in the system—that is borrowing money from the system—to the end that ultimately this would become a complete cooperative undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the production credit associations are concerned that has almost been completed. There are only two in the United States that have any Federal capital in their structure at the present time. That total amount there is only $41,000.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the intermediate credit banks, the institutions which rediscount the loans of the production credit associations, there is a very substantial amount of Federal capital. I believe there is some $70 million of Federal money still in the intermediate credit banks.

In 1956 this Congress undertook to provide a system whereby the local associations would pay that out to the Federal Government, and that system has worked all right, except that as the increased demand for farm credit, just like the increased demand for all credit, has developed. We have found that the Federal Government had to put new capital into these banks from time to time just to hold its own as it were, in order to meet the growing demand for loans.

Mr. Speaker, this bill requires even greater participation on the part of the local borrowers and the local production credit associations. It requires they take their dividend moneys that they previously received and pay them in and buy the Government stock. Ultimately this will assure the removal of all of the Government investment in the intermediate credit banks and in the production credit associations.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other major item in this bill and it is in here for the purpose of enabling the bank to carry their present load of financing without calling for more Government capital and that is, we increase the lending authority of the intermediate credit banks from 10 times their present net worth to 15 times their net worth.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, your committee knows no more than the other Members of Congress about the workings of that procedure, but we have been assured by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and by the presidents of several of the intermediate credit banks that in their opinion this is a perfectly safe procedure. Therefore, as we see it, there cannot be any possibility of loss by doing this. It is in keeping with the general policy that has been going on over this country of making credit easier to all of the people over the country.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that the Members of the House will approve this program to transfer the ownership of these banks into the farmers' hands just as rapidly as there are earnings with which the transfer can be effected, to take these institutions out of the field of Government investment and making them 100 percent farmer owned, like our land bank system is at the present time.

For those who are not familiar with it, the land bank system was started on exactly the same basis as the intermediate credit banker. Today farmers have paid out every dollar of the Government's capital in the land bank system. That is entirely a cooperative operation with no Government money whatsoever in the system. That is what we want to make of the entire farm credit system. This bill is an important step.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, my request for time is only to supplement the remarks of the gentleman from Texas, who has very thoroughly and adequately explained the purposes of this bill.

I think it should be stated first of all this is one bill that the Committee on Agriculture brings to the floor of the House with, so far as I know, unanimous approval not only of Members on both sides of the aisle, so far as the committee is concerned, but it has the endorsement of all the major farm organizations that are interested as well.

Newer Members ask me to explain the difference between the Farm Credit Administration and the Farmers Home Administration. The Farm Credit Administration, as the gentleman from Texas explained, is almost entirely farmer owned. There are certain segments that are already entirely farmer owned.

The Farm Credit Administration is organized in somewhat similar fashion to our Federal Reserve System, so that there is not only adequate supervision, but through this system adequate capital is available.

This is not Government money. They go into the open market and sell their debentures, they furnish financing by pooling their requirements and their resources.

The Farmers Home Administration, of course, is an entirely different setup. The Farmers Home Administration is organized for the benefit of making loans from Government funds to farmers who might not otherwise have any other source of credit, either to purchase a farm or to equip a farm. They are given what we term a "soft loan." It should also be said in fairness that through the years the Farmers Home Administration has likewise a very remarkable record of repayment of loans. The losses have been virtually nil.

Through the efforts of the Farmers Home Administration many young men have been enabled to become farmers, to own a farm, and to own the farm equipment that probably they might not have been otherwise able to do. In this instance the legislation involves some minor changes in the operation of the Farm Credit Administration.

I feel that the bill is a good one. I know of no opposition to it, and I hope it will receive the complete support of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4152.

The purpose of this bill is to enable the intermediate credit banks and the production credit associations to better serve the expanded needs of farmers and ranchers while simultaneously reducing or eliminating the need for more Government capital in the Farm Credit System.

The farm credit system is an independent agency of Government apart from the Department of Agriculture. It is composed of the banks for cooperatives, 12 Federal land banks, 12 intermediate credit banks, 763 Federal land bank associations, and 487 production credit associations.

From 1923 to 1956 the Federal intermediate credit banks were owned entirely by the U.S. Government. Starting in 1957 pursuant to the Farm Credit Act of 1956, the capital stock of these banks was divided into class A stock which was held by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration for the U.S. Government and class B stock which was issued only to production credit associations.

Under the 1956 act, a complex formula was established to encourage the retirement of Government-owned capital in the intermediate credit banks. This formula has not worked as rapidly as is desirable, and in spite of substantial growth, they now have $33.2 million more

Government capital today than they did on January 1, 1957.

This bill proposes to change the 10 to 1 debt to capital ratio now permitted under the 1956 formula to 15 to 1. The effect of this change will be to allow these banks to have outstanding obligations for their benefit and account equal to 15 times their paid-in capital and surplus. Therefore it is hoped they will not have to draw as much Government capital out of the revolving fund available for that purpose.

The bill also provides for the mandatory retirement of Government capital in these banks and it provides for additional purchases of class B stock by the PCA's which are now almost entirely farmer owned.

The bill was unanimously approved by the Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit on February 17, and it received the unqualified support of all farm organizations. The full Committee on Agriculture unanimously approved the bill February 25.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4152?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE FHA LOAN FUND LIMITATION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5075) 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 of such act, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5075

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

SECTION 1. That section 308 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by striking out the figure "$200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$450,000,000".

SEC. 2. That section 308(a) of the above cited Act is amended by striking out "except that no agreement shall provide for purchase by the Secretary at a date sooner than three years from the date of the note;".

SEC. 3. That section 308(b) of the above cited Act is amended by striking out the entire subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof a new subsection (b) as follows: "(b) may retain out of payments by the borrower a charge at a rate specified in the insurance agreement applicable to the loan."

SEC. 4. That section 309(e) of the above cited Act is amended by striking out "such portion of the charge collected in connection with the insurance of loans at least equal to a rate of one-half of 1 per centum per annum on the outstanding principal obligations and the remainder of such charge" and inserting in lieu thereof "all or a portion, not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the unpaid principal balance of the loan, of any charge collected in connection with the insurance of loans; any remainder of any such charge".

SEC. 5. That section 309(f)(1) of the above cited Act is amended by striking the figure "$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$50,000,000".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this is the other part of the matter relating to the farmers' credit which the gentleman from Indiana referred to a moment ago. This relates to the Farmers Home Administration.

It happens that this relationship does not relate to the loans that are financed out of the Government Treasury. There is a loan guaranteed by the Farmers Home Administration which involves private, not Government money. In fact, the matter to which we directed our attention in this important legislation is the authority of the Farmers Home Administration to guarantee loans. At the present time that authority extends to $200 million in loans.

Those are real estate loans. Those are the loans that are made to enable a tenant to buy a home. They are the loans that are made to develop rural property that is owned by rural families. They are the loans that are made under the water facilities provision that enables the rural people to secure loans for the development of rural water facilities.

This water facilities program is one of the most rapidly expanding programs we now have. I think it has proven it is one of the best and most effective programs we have had developed since the days of REA. It is bringing thousands of rural homes the benefit of running water. But it does it at the expense of the local association, not at the expense of the Government, because these loans are all repayable and are being repaid.

These particular loans carry an interest rate which is ordinarily 4.5 percent. These loans are being made as far as they can within the limits of the $200 million on the basis of using the funds that are advanced by private lenders and guaranteed by the Farmers Home Administration. There is a charge which has been in the past one-half of 1 percent, which charge has resulted in the accumulation of a surplus or a profit of approximately $14 million in the hands of the Government.

It seems to me that this is probably the greatest bargain that the Government gets anywhere in the way of financing. Since 1948 we have been guaranteeing these loans. Now instead of costing the Government a dime we have a profit of almost $14 million on the transactions, and the people who are receiving the loans are receiving all the help they would have received had the loans been made from the U.S. Treasury. I think that is a splendid record, one which we should continue.

It is obvious that in connection with these loans which, like our other operations, rural or urban, there is a requirement for more and more capital. You cannot buy a farm today for what you could buy it in 1948, not for two or three times what you would have paid then.

You cannot build a water system for what you could build it in 1948. It would probably cost two or three times what it cost in 1948. The result is that where the $200 million seemed adequate in 1948, it is thoroughly inadequate today. What we have done under the terms of this bill is to increase from $200 million to $450 million the authority to make this kind of guaranteed loan.

Along with that we have of necessity given the Secretary the authority to make such adjustments so as to make the operation of this larger amount a practical proposition. That is what we mean when we say, we changed the figure from $25 million to $50 million. That is the revolving fund. That is the fund of loans which the FHA has made and which it has not yet placed in the hands of private borrowers. You understand that the Farmers Home Administration does not go out and simply find a farm on which a few thousand dollar loan is sought and say, "Now will somebody in the community lend $3,000 on this farm?" To do that would, of course, bog us down in interminable redtape. What they do is to take a whole group of these loans, maybe a million dollar worth and take them to some lending agency, probably a life insurance company, and say, "Here is a million dollars worth of these loans. Do you want them?" And the life insurance company says, "Yes, we will take a million dollars worth" or a million and one-half dollars worth or $500,000 worth and the FHA writes the guarantee on the entire group. It assembles large amounts of these loans before it makes these guarantees to the insurance companies. Since we are more than doubling the volume of loans, we felt that we had to at least double the amount of this revolving fund.

Then we have here too the proposition that the old law provided a specific charge of one-half of 1 percent for this, and we provide here that the Secretary may charge something less than one-half of 1 percent for this service because we believe as the volume of the servicing increases, the charge can be decreased. That is an economic law that we believe applies all across the board.

We have also provided that the Secretary is not bound by the 3-year limitation that we have had in the law. We required him to wait 3 years before he could redeem any loan. We have removed that provision to give him a little more leeway.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I would simply like to ask the gentleman from Texas one question, after first stating that I am thoroughly in favor of this bill and I am well aware that the FHA loans have a 106-percent history of repayment. At least that is the record of repayments in my State. Of course, I am well aware of the valuable work that they do. I even agree that perhaps the revolving fund should be extended in the form of insured lending authority to this amount especially

since it does not involve moneys from the Treasury.

But my question is this, I have had complaints since the last election in counties where there were only two qualified attorneys that in many instances one attorney has been removed on a patronage basis or for some such reason which I do not thoroughly understand never having been in the position of the majority in my relatively short term in the Congress. But this leads to discrimination or at least the designation of one lawyer. Of course, I am not a lawyer either and so maybe I just need to be educated in that regard. As I say, it leads to the designation of one lawyer who passes on the titles and the loans and the abstracts before the legal arrangement is made with the FHA or the local banking authority.

My question is this, If this is true, much as I eschew such action in both parties, ordinarily, will this simply give an extra $250 million worth of money to play with, in an otherwise perfectly good program, which might become a patronage bank?

Mr. POAGE. I would say that the gentleman from Missouri raises a very difficult question, and one for which I do not believe we have a perfect answer.

I do not believe this bill will affect the problem one way or another. It will neither aggravate nor diminish the problem.

It may be some comfort to the gentleman to realize that the problem exists, whether there are one or two parties in the area. It gets onto a personal basis, as well as a party basis. The same problem has developed in my State.

Mr. HALL. It even gets on a financial basis, and when the pocketbook is cut off it hurts either one or both parties.

This is an otherwise excellent program. I believe the gentleman from Texas has explained the bill adequately, and I believe the gentleman would agree the program should not be fouled up by too much of that.

Mr. POAGE. I certainly agree. I would point out what has been done by our State administrator, which I believe is along the right line.

Our State office publishes a list of qualified attorneys, which is available to anyone, wherever anyone is organizing a water facility. Most of these attorney fights are with regard to the water facilities, and we have the same problem with engineers.

Our State office has required the bar association to approve the people on the list. They put anybody on who gets that approval.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for his explanation and for yielding to me. I hope this becomes a national effort.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in furtherance of the very adequate explanation made by the gentleman from Texas, which was further enlightened by the question of the gentleman from Missouri, I wish to say that while our good chairman is correct that the Farmer's Home Administration is not directly responsible for making loans of actual treasury funds, nonetheless, such debentures as are sold or handled through the Farmers Home Administration do bear the complete and full responsibility of the U.S. Government. So they are in the form, I suppose one would say, really of Government credit. That is the interpretation I intended to put on it.

In accord with the explanation I made in connection with the prior bill, I wish to reiterate that I believe this is an excellent bill.

I have had some misgivings about the extension of the activities of the Farmer's Home Administration in the area of recreation. I feel, however, that the administrator is proceeding slowly in this area, and carefully. I hope, even though we may have a few "bloopers" in this area, that out of the experience we have acquired we will be able to determine just what areas of recreation the Farmers Home Administration can properly enter and the type of loans they can properly make, and that the fine record of the Farmer's Home Administration will not be lowered by this new field of credit.

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I merely point out that a similar bill did pass the House last year, too late for action to be taken by the other body.

I also rise in support of H.R. 5075.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to increase from $200 million to $450 million the aggregate amount of loans that may be insured each year by the Farmers Home Administration for farm ownership and soil and water conservation.

Under the insured loan program, FHA does not lend money directly; it merely guarantees or insures lenders that in case of nonpayment, the FHA stands behind the loan and is willing to meet the obligations of the defaulted lender.

Hearings on H.R. 2468, a similar bill, were held by the Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit on February 17, and the subcommittee unanimously approved the clean bill, H.R. 5075, which incorporates several technical amendments requested by the Department of Agriculture.

All farm organizations appeared before the subcommittee and supported the purposes of this legislation.

The Farm Bureau testified in favor of an adequate increase and pointed out that—

> In light of the present budgetary situation, we would be inclined to support the President's budget message recommendation of increasing the authority for insured loans by $100 million.

The subcommittee was informed that the President approved the increase to $450 million on the day our hearings were held.

Last year the House passed H.R. 7073 which also increased FHA insured loan authority from $200 million to $450 million. The bill died in the other body. The Department also recommended only a $100 million increase last year and pointed out that such an increase would entail an additional administrative cost of $5 million annually.

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5075 and to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for his excellent explanation of the bill. As stated by the gentleman from Texas, the purpose of this bill is to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which the Federal Government can insure under the provisions of subtitle A of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 from $200 million to $450 million and to facilitate the administration of the increased loan fund.

The Farmers Home Administration was created in 1937 to administer loans to farm owners and operators who were unable to secure financing from any other source. Its operation has been similar to the insured loan fund administered by the Federal Housing Administration. This program has been one of the most successful of all programs administered by the Federal Government over the years. It has enabled many thousands of individuals to own their farms or to remain on their farms when without the assistance of the Farmers Home Administration they would not have been able to do so. Of $600 million in outstanding loans as of March 31, 1964, only $1.7 million of loans had been foreclosed. This is only 0.28 percent of the outstanding loans—a remarkable record indeed. Furthermore, the insurance fund derived from the charging of one-half of 1 percent on the loans made by FHA had grown to over $14 million as shown on December 31, 1964.

Due to the ceiling imposed by Congress on FHA's authority to insure loans, it has been forced to deny loans to many deserving and qualified farmers. This has crippled the effectiveness of this program designed for the American farmers. It is proposed by this bill that the insured loan fund be raised to $450 million from the present ceiling of $200 million annually. This increased authority will provide FHA greater flexibility for a more effective program. The lending authority of FHA is presently insufficient to allow it to make loans to meet the demand from qualified applicants. For example, as of June 30, 1964, FHA had on hand 14,837 applications for farm-owners and individual soil and water loans. This number had increased to 16,324 by December 31, 1964, despite the fact that loans were being made at the rate of 1,200 per month during that 6-month period.

The need for the increase in lending authority has been heightened by the provisions of title III of the Economic Opportunity Act which authorizes the Farmers Home Administration to make grants of $1,500 and loans of $2,500 to individuals who lack a credit rating acceptable for the normal FHA loan program. Mr. Speaker, the proposed measure was passed by this House under a suspension of the rules on August 17, 1964. It died with the expiration of the 88th Congress when the Senate failed to act on it in time. There should be no

opposition to this bill, and I would join in urging passage of H.R. 5075.

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise merely to support bill H.R. 5075. I would like to point out in my own State of Wisconsin last year there were three times as many requests for loans as there was money and that the bill we have before us would only increase the amount by slightly more than double. The gentleman from Indiana has made the point that these are obligations which the U.S. Government might be obliged to repay. I am sure he would have to agree this is more a technical obligation on the part of the Federal Government than a practical one, because history has shown, as the gentleman from Texas stated, that the insurance fund, one-half of 1 percent, which is set aside from the resale of these obligations, has been more than enough to cover any losses which have accrued. In fact, during the life of the program it has shown a profit of some $14 million to the country. So while technically these may be obligations of the Federal Government, the practical effect historically is that there is no obligation because there are sufficient moneys set aside to cover any basic losses, at least so far, in the history of the program.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's statement, of course he is correct. However, we have to recognize that in the Farmers Home Administration we have an agency which has to operate not only in terms of what the present economic conditions are in agriculture but what they may be in the future. Certainly we must not ever forget in the event we would encounter a severe drop in the economic cycle as far as agriculture is concerned, that these would thereby become obligations of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5075 with committee amendments.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL LIMITS

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5874) to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, with respect to the construction of school facilities for children in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands for whom local educational agencies are unable to provide education.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5874

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 10 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 640), is amended by inserting the following sentence after the first sentence thereof: "In any case in which the Commissioner makes arrangements under this section for constructing or otherwise providing minimum school facilities situated on Federal property in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, he may also include minimum school facilities necessary for the education of children residing with a parent employed by the United States though not residing on Federal property, but only if the Commissioner determines, after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency, (1) that the construction or provision of such facilities is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, (2) that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children, and (3) that English is not the primary language of instruction in schools in the locality."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, the ranking member of the subcommittee wants to ask some questions about the legislation at this time, for that purpose, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This bill was reported without objection by the subcommittee and the full committee of the Committee on Education and Labor, but I would like to clarify a couple of points on it. One is the need for the legislation. As I understand, the purpose is to correct a defect in earlier legislation so as to permit the Commissioner of Education to count, in determining the size of the facilities of these on-base school facilities in Puerto Rico the children living off base who otherwise would be eligible for education. Am I correct in this point?

Mr. DENT. The gentleman is correct in that this is one of the twin package impact laws, 815 and 874, both passed in 1950. In 1954 the Congress decided that a need had become apparent under Public Law 874 for the training and teaching of children on base who lived off base and Public 874 was amended to take care of that particular need. However, throughout the years there has never been a real need for the same change to be made under Public Law 815 which is the construction part of the impact legislation. However, in the last few years down in Puerto Rico and particularly at Ramey Air Force Base, which is the SAC Air Force Base, there has been a problem about the number of children who live off base attending school on base under the provisions of Public Law 874.

At this time SAC forces are being increased in that area and a new wing is being put on the base. Therefore, the barracks which have been used are no longer available for teaching and educational purposes, and we either have to send the children to off-base schools where Spanish is the primary language, and where they are inadequate for the needs of children of American mainland workers down there or we must enact this legislation. Therefore we come before the House with a request, supported unanimously, as the gentleman has stated, by the members of the subcommittee and the full committee. We now recommend under Public Law 815 the construction of schools on base to train off-base children.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DENT. I yield.

Mr. FINDLEY. Am I correct in believing that Puerto Rico is the only area where this legislation is presently applicable or is likely to become applicable in the future?

Mr. DENT. Yes, because it is the only area in which Federal funds are used in any instance where the primary language taught in the public schools is not English.

Mr. FINDLEY. This authorizes Puerto Rico, Guam, Wake Island, and the Virgin Islands as the only places where off-base facilities are considered inadequate and where the primary language taught in the schools is not English?

Mr. DENT. Yes. It will affect only Ramey Air Force Base and the Antilles School District, which includes the other schools in the island.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Do the children of those who are other than American employees, U.S. nationals, have permission to attend these schools?

Mr. DENT. Only those who are on base and are the children of military personnel; in other words, Puerto Ricans who belong to the U.S. Armed Forces, not civilians.

Mr. GROSS. I understand. This does not provide education for those who are in nowise employed by the U.S. Government; is that correct?

Mr. DENT. That is correct, since these schools would not be considered adequate inasmuch as the primary language is not English, but Spanish.

Mr. GROSS. I want it absolutely clear that this bill does not propose to provide educational facilities for those other than employees of the Federal Government, military or civilian; is this correct?

Mr. DENT. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. All U.S. citizens?

Mr. DENT. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. This does not provide for the education of Puerto Rican nationals or those who are the children of Puerto Rican nationals employed by the U.S. Government?

Mr. DENT. That is exactly right.

Mr. GROSS. They are not educated in these schools?

Mr. DENT. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me, Is the growing number of U.S. nationals in Puerto Rico because of the beefing up of the Strategic Air Command or for other reasons?

Mr. DENT. No, it is strictly due to the beefing up of the SAC Air Force base in Puerto Rico and taking over the facilities that are now used by the schools on the base.

As the gentleman knows, there has been a tendency among even the Government employees to have larger families and therefore there is a larger group of children.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but it would be hard for me to assimilate a deal whereby we were spending our taxpayer's money to educate the children of U.S. citizens who were working in Puerto Rico and operating factories that are driving our people out of business in this country because they cannot compete with the low wages paid in Puerto Rico.

Mr. DENT. I assure the gentleman that this legislation does not in any way open up educational facilities to those who do not work directly for the U.S. Government in one or the other agencies on the island.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, H.R. 5874.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the first time to give my views in this Chamber with reference to pending business. The bill under consideration does not primarily affect Puerto Rico or Puerto Rican children. Rather, it is aimed mainly to help a segment of children of my fellow citizens from the 50 States.

It is my intention to participate actively in the deliberations of this forum to contribute what I can, as persuasively as I am able, in debate, in offering my views with regard to matters before the House affecting the welfare of the Nation as a whole, not Puerto Rico alone. It is in this manner that I regard my responsibilities and duties as the elected Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

In this sense, with legislation to come before the House in the months ahead, although I have no vote to give to any proposal, I hope you will indulge my participation in matters of general application, as I will welcome the participation of all of you in matters of peculiar interest to Puerto Rico.

I desire now to express my support of H.R. 5874, which would amend Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress, to the end that better school facilities may be made available for the children of our good friends from the mainland who are employed by the Federal Government in Puerto Rico and who live outside of Federal property. The bill provides also for educational facilities for the children of similar families residing under similar circumstances in Wake Island, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, but I shall direct my observations to the families living in Puerto Rico.

An explanation of H.R. 5874 reveals a flaw in Public Law 815 when it was enacted in 1950, a fault which was not corrected when Public Law 874 amended the act in 1954 to permit these children to attend schools constructed on Federal property for children living on the base, if off-base school facilities were not available. However, in determining the need for school facilities to be constructed on the bases it has not been taken into account the number of children residing outside of Federal property for whom public or private schools in the area were either not sufficient or were not available. This has resulted in overcrowding the on-base school facilities to the extent where, I understand, the situation has arrived at the point where some action is necessary. H.R. 5874 seeks to provide the remedy.

At the present time, in determining the need for school facilities on the bases, the Commissioner of Education can only take into account the number of children of Federal employees who are actually residing on the bases. Because he cannot count the children of Federal employees living outside the bases, the federally provided schools have become crowded as the number of off-station children increased. This has indeed become a serious problem for the children of Federal employees in Puerto Rico who came from the mainland. Our medium of instruction is Spanish. Our public schools are crowded. Puerto Rico has done its best to provide adequate school facilities for all children and we have devoted approximately one-third of our budget for public education, but we simply have not been able to catch up with the situation.

I am indeed in sympathy with the mainland families of Federal workers in Puerto Rico whose children do not enjoy adequate school facilities because of overcrowding. I feel that H.R. 5874 provides the key to the solution of the problem, and I express my strongest hope that H.R. 5874 will be enacted into law. This will give much-needed relief to the children of Federal employees living outside Federal property at Ramey Air Force Base, Fort Buchanan, Roosevelt Roads Naval Station, and Fort Allen in Puerto Rico.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii who is the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am especially delighted to be able to appear before this body to ask support of H.R. 5874, being its sponsor, and being extremely interested in the educational problems and needs of all our children across the country. It is my privilege to rise to ask support for the particular needs of our children in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, it has been demonstrated through the hearings and the evidence which has been accumulated by our subcommittee that the children in Puerto Rico associated with our Federal service there are not being granted the kind of education that we would consider adequate within the Continental United States. They are being housed in inadequate barracks. We are informed that many of these barracks will be closed. Not only are the conditions not conducive for the proper education of the youngsters but also I believe it hampers the activities of the military forces in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of this body to consider the urgency of the bill and the critical needs of the children and to vote favorably thereon.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5874, a bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, with respect to the construction of school facilities for children in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands for whom local educational agencies are unable to provide education.

Last year when the superintendent of schools at Ramey Air Force Base called my attention to the growing need for increased facilities for children in Puerto Rico whose parents lived or worked on that base, I introduced this bill. Since that time, the number of children needing educational facilities has greatly expanded due to the increased number of Federal installations having been added or proposed for Puerto Rico. As a result of the subcommittee investigation in Puerto Rico, greater stress was placed upon the immediacy of the need.

At the present time, Public Law 815 does not include authorization for the construction of schools for children living off Federal property when no local educational agency is able to provide the education for children in Puerto Rico, Guam, Wake Island, and the Virgin Islands. Such provisions are made on a limited basis for children in continental United States.

Public Law 81–874 was amended in 1954 to permit the children of persons employed by the United States in Puerto Rico, Guam, Wake Island, and the Virgin Islands not residing on Federal property to attend the schools constructed on base for schoolchildren living on base. However, such facilities are greatly overcrowded due to the expansion of present facilities. It is for this reason that Public Law 815 must be amended to care for children needing proper educational opportunities.

Since English is not the language generally used in the public schools of Puerto Rico, it is necessary to include the following language in the present bill—"that English is not the primary language of instruction in schools in the locality." Such language would provide the proper kind of instruction for American children of English-speaking parents.

The urgency of this measure causes me to implore you to adopt this measure as proposed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5874.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL ARTS AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4714) to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations therein.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the simplest possible bill. Members will recall that last year when this committee reported the Arts Council bill we sent it to the floor with no ceiling on appropriations.

During the debate on the floor the desirability of limiting the authorized appropriations was discussed and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] offered an amendment which was accepted placing a ceiling on the appropriation of $150,000.

We overlooked adding the words "per annum." As a result, the operating funds for the Council are limited to $150,000 for its lifetime. It was clearly the intent of Congress that we should authorize up to $150,000 for each fiscal year. The bill H.R. 4714 corrects the error in existing law. It simply adds two words to the existing law. Those words are "per annum".

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include a letter from Roger L. Stevens, Special Assistant on the Arts, directed to the Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1965.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The National Council on the Arts has the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill to provide for an annual appropriation for expenses of the National Council on the Arts.

This bill would amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, approved September 3, 1964, to authorize annual appropriations not to exceed $150,000. That act now authorizes total appropriations not to exceed $150,000. It is our understanding that this was intended to be an annual, and not a total, limitation, but that the words "per annum" were inadvertently omitted.

The justification for an annual appropriation is found in the legislation establishing the Council. The Council is established as a permanent agency of the Federal Government with ongoing functions. The Chairman is appointed for a term of 8 years. The members of the Council serve for terms of 6 years.

Further, the Congress apparently contemplated a level of activity for the Council beyond that which could be financed if no more than $150,000 could be appropriated to it. Thus the bill provided for a chairman at an annual salary of $21,000 and a small staff. It also provided that the 25-member Council meet at least twice a year, that the Council members could be reimbursed for their services at a rate not exceeding $75 per diem, and that the Council would pay travel expenses of its members. Finally, the Council is to conduct studies to determine appropriate means to encourage and promote the arts, and consult with local, State, and Federal agencies.

An initial appropriation of $50,000 was made to the Council by the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965. This amount will enable the Council to organize and permit the hiring of a small staff. For 1966, the first full year of the Council's operations, the President has approved a budget request of $150,000 in anticipation that the limitation on appropriations would be revised.

It is our desire to encourage the formation of State art councils in every State in order to promote private and local interest and initiative. At the present time there are 23 States with art councils. Preliminary investigation indicates many are inactive because of lack of coordinated information and direction. A current inventory of art needs and opportunities will be established in cooperation with the State councils.

In order to assist State and local art groups, temporarily retained specialists on a per diem basis will make site visits to advise on the organization and program of local organizations. A nationwide inventory of performing artists and groups will be made to provide a means of participation in our program in practically every town of any size. The Council will attempt to compile a reference library of periodicals in the arts fields for the use of the State art councils and other interested groups.

If the National Council on the Arts is to carry out its responsibilities under the National Arts and Cultural Development Act in fiscal year 1966 and succeeding years, the limitation on appropriations in that act must be revised to permit an adequate level of financing.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that this draft bill is consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely,

ROGER L. STEVENS,
Special Assistant on the Arts.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I would have to agree with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], in observing that the omission of the words "per annum" in the drafting of the bill last year was a technical oversight.

I was among those who last year supported the establishment of the Advisory Council on the Arts, and I did so with the expectation that the House would await a study and recommendations of the Council before proceeding to consider any other legislation. However, I should like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey: Is is not a fact that the President has only recently, within the last several weeks, appointed the members of this National Advisory Council? Is it not also a fact that your subcommittee has already begun hearings on legislation to subsidize arts even before the Advisory Council has had an opportunity to meet and provide us with any advice?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman is correct. The President very recently did appoint the members of the National Advisory Council on the Arts. They have not met as yet. They have not made recommendations. It is also a fact that the subcommittee, of which I am chairman and of which the gentleman is the ranking minority member, has had hearings on more than 100 bills to establish National Arts and Humanities.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I would like to observe, as I indicated last year when I supported the establishment of an Advisory Council, that there are ways in which the Federal Government can encourage and promote the arts without directly subsidizing the arts. It is very disturbing to me that we are already moving ahead with legislation to subsidize directly the arts even before the Advisory Council has had an opportunity to provide advice.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would like to make it perfectly clear that in the debates on the passage of the Council on the Arts legislation last year the gentleman from Michigan did express strong reservations. He did say that because the subsidy features in that legislation had been eliminated he could support the legislation, and indicated he would not support the subsidy legislation. The record will show that, I think.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey how much has been expended upon this particular promotion of culture so far?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The President has appointed a Chairman of the Council whose salary is $21,000. There has been appointed a small staff of four secretaries. That, to my knowledge, is the limit of all the expenditures.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the fact there has been no Commission until a few days ago, and the Chairman has had nothing to chair up to this point, I wonder what the expenditure has been for?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thought I just told the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What was it in terms of money? Can the gentleman state?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. For this year the total expenditure for the fiscal year will be $50,000.

Mr. GROSS. $50,000, without a Council for the Chairman to chair?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The Council does exist. Unless this legislation per annum is passed, it will meet, I suppose, a time or two. It is supposed to meet twice a year. The Chairman of the Council is appointed for an 8-year term. This legislation if now passed would carry $21,000 per year. His salary alone would exceed the total expenditure as it existed before the passage of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. What is it you propose to accomplish?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I propose to accomplish the addition of the words "per annum" to the statute.

Mr. GROSS. So that you will not have to come in and justify $150,000 every year?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Oh, no, that is not it at all. The gentleman knows perfectly well that this is merely an authorization, and in order to have the great Committee on Appropriations appropriate this money from year to year, they should and they will appear before the Committee on Appropriations to justify up to a maximum of $150,000. The House meets every year and acts on the appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but you will not come in again with an authorizing bill next year or thereafter to justify $150,000?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. This will take pretty good care of that; will it not?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Let me be perfectly candid. I am not being devious about this. The basic law is in existence. What I want to do is place on a permanent basis the expenditure of no more than $150,000 per annum.

Mr. GROSS. I understand; so that there will be ample funds to pay the consultants and contract-hire personnel up to $75 per day, plus expenses; so that there will be ample funds to pay $75 per diem and travel expenses to members of the Council.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. That is in addition to $21,000 a year for a cultural director, or whatever he is, the Chairman of the Council to promote what is called culture.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The $21,000, I might say, is included.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman by any chance take a trip overseas to find out how culture is going in some foreign countries or multifarious countries?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. This gentleman did go, and not at the Government's expense. It was in the course of regular business, which he conducted at great sacrifice. He made regular trips, but not at the Government's expense.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman agree with me that here in the District of Columbia, where you are attempting to promote all this culture at a fancy cost to all the taxpayers of the country, it might be a good idea to spend this $150,000 for some clinics or other facilities, located in the proper places, to treat and reduce the number of people infected with syphilis and gonorrhea? This city, I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey, has the dubious distinction of having the highest rate of venereal disease per capita, or close to the highest rate of any city of comparable population in the United States. How can you talk about culture and spending $150,000 on a commission and a chairman of a commission to promote culture under those circumstances?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I see no connection between social diseases and culture. The gentleman has left me completely. I am in favor of eradicating illness and poverty, but I do not think it is appropriate to try to do so under this act. Of course, if the gentleman wants to establish clinics, I will cosponsor such legislation with him.

Mr. GROSS. All I am saying is that before you help bankrupt the Treasury by spending millons of dollars on cultural centers and commissions in the District of Columbia, I would think you would want to give attention to the social afflictions that exist in this area where you want to center all of this culture, and that sort of thing. It has been suggested by one of my colleagues that you might want to have sound bodies and sound minds for an appreciation of these wonderful things of life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4714?

The question was taken.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 217, nays 113, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—217

Adams	Cameron	Edwards, Calif.
Albert	Carter	Evans, Colo.
Anderson, Tenn.	Celler	Everett
Andrews, Glenn	Chelf	Evins, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Clark	Farbstein
Annunzio	Cohelan	Farnsley
Aspinall	Corman	Farnum
Ayres	Craley	Feighan
Barrett	Cramer	Flood
Bates	Culver	Fogarty
Beckworth	Curtin	Ford, Gerald R.
Bingham	Daddario	Fraser
Boggs	Daniels	Frelinghuysen
Brademas	Davis, Wis.	Fuqua
Broomfield	Dawson	Garmatz
Brown, Calif.	de la Garza	Gathings
Broyhill, Va.	Dent	Giaimo
Burke	Denton	Gibbons
Burton, Calif.	Dingell	Gonzalez
Byrne, Pa.	Dow	Goodell
Cahill	Downing	Green, Pa.
Callan	Dulski	Greigg
	Duncan, Oreg.	Grider
	Dyal	Griffin
	Edmondson	Grover
Hagen, Calif.	Marsh	Rogers, Fla.
Halpern	Mathias	Rooney, N.Y.
Hamilton	Matsunaga	Rooney, Pa.
Hanley	Matthews	Rosenthal
Hanna	Meeds	Roush
Hansen, Iowa	Miller	Rumsfeld
Hansen, Wash.	Mills	Saylor
Hardy	Mink	Schisler
Harris	Mize	Schmidhauser
Harvey, Mich.	Moeller	Schneebeli
Hathaway	Morgan	Schweiker
Hawkins	Morris	Scott
Hechler	Morrison	Secrest
Hicks	Morse	Senner
Holifield	Morton	Slack
Horton	Mosher	Smith, Iowa
Howard	Moss	Smith, N.Y.
Hungate	Multer	Stafford
Huot	Murphy, Ill.	Stalbaum
Ichord	Natcher	Stratton
Jacobs	Nedzi	Stubblefield
Jennings	Nelsen	Sullivan
Joelson	Nix	Sweeney
Johnson, Calif.	O'Brien	Thomas
Johnson, Okla.	O'Hara, Ill.	Thompson, La.
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara, Mich.	Thompson, N.J.
Karsten	Olsen, Mont.	Thompson, Tex.
Karth	Olson, Minn.	Thomson, Wis.
Kastenmeier	Ottinger	Trimble
Kee	Patman	Tunney
Keith	Patten	Tupper
Kelly	Pelly	Udall
Keogh	Perkins	Ullman
King, Calif.	Pickle	Van Deerlin
King, Utah	Pike	Vanik
Kunkel	Poage	Vigorito
McCarthy	Price	Walker, N. Mex.
McClory	Pucinski	Watts
McDade	Quie	Weltner
McDowell	Randall	White, Idaho
McFall	Redlin	Wolff
McGrath	Reid, N.Y.	Wright
McVicker	Reifel	Wyatt
MacGregor	Reinecke	Wydler
Machen	Reuss	Yates
Mackay	Rhodes, Ariz.	Young
Madden	Rhodes, Pa.	Zablocki
Mahon	Rivers, S.C.	
Mailliard	Rivers, Alaska	

NAYS—113

Adair	Dole	Martin, Nebr.
Anderson, Ill.	Dorn	Michel
Andrews, George W.	Dowdy	Minshall
Arends	Duncan, Tenn.	Moore
Ashmore	Edwards, Ala.	Murray
Baldwin	Erlenborn	O'Konski
Baring	Findley	O'Neal, Ga.
Battin	Fisher	Passman
Belcher	Flynt	Poff
Bell	Fountain	Pool
Bennett	Gettys	Quillen
Berry	Gross	Reid, Ill.
Betts	Gubser	Roberts
Bonner	Gurney	Robison
Bow	Hagan, Ga.	Rogers, Tex.
Bray	Haley	Roudebush
Brock	Hall	Satterfield
Brown, Ohio	Halleck	Shriver
Buchanan	Hansen, Idaho	Sikes
Burleson	Harsha	Skubitz
Burton, Utah	Harvey, Ind.	Smith, Va.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hébert	Springer
Cabell	Henderson	Stanton
Callaway	Hull	Steed
Casey	Hutchinson	Stephens
Cederberg	Jarman	Talcott
Chamberlain	Johnson, Pa.	Taylor
Clancy	Jonas	Teague, Calif.
Clausen, Don H.	Jones, Mo.	Teague, Tex.
Clawson, Del	King, N.Y.	Tuck
Collier	Kornegay	Tuten
Colmer	Langen	Utt
Cooley	Latta	Waggonner
Cunningham	Lennon	Watkins
Dague	Lipscomb	White, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Long, La.	Whitener
Devine	McCulloch	Younger
	McEwen	
	Martin, Ala.	

NOT VOTING—103

Abbitt	Bolton	Corbett
Abernethy	Brooks	Curtis
Addabbo	Broyhill, N.C.	Delaney
Ashbrook	Carey	Derwinski
Ashley	Cleveland	Dickinson
Bandstra	Clevenger	Diggs
Blatnik	Conable	Donohue
Boland	Conte	Dwyer
Bolling	Conyers	Ellsworth

Fallon	Landrum	Roosevelt
Fascell	Leggett	Rostenkowski
Fino	Lindsay	Roybal
Foley	Long, Md.	Ryan
Ford, William D.	Love	St Germain
	McMillan	St. Onge
Friedel	Macdonald	Scheuer
Fulton, Pa.	Mackie	Selden
Fulton, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	Shipley
Gallagher	May	Sickles
Gilbert	Minish	Sisk
Gilligan	Monagan	Smith, Calif.
Grabowski	Moorhead	Staggers
Gray	Murphy, N.Y.	Tenzer
Green, Oreg.	O'Neill, Mass.	Todd
Griffiths	Pepper	Toll
Hays	Philbin	Vivian
Helstoski	Pirnie	Walker, Miss.
Herlong	Powell	Whalley
Holland	Purcell	Whitten
Hosmer	Race	Widnall
Irwin	Resnick	Williams
Kirwan	Rodino	Willis
Kluczynski	Rogers, Colo.	Wilson, Bob
Krebs	Ronan	Wilson, Charles H.
Laird	Roncalio	

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Lindsay and Mrs. Bolton for, with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina against.

Mr. Widnall and Mr. Pirnie for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mrs. Dwyer and Mr. Cleveland for, with Mr. Curtis against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Laird.

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Minish with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Donohue with Mrs. May.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Williams.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Roybal.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Sickles with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Ashley.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Abernethy.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Grabowski.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Selden.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. Carey with Mr. St Germain.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Ryan.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Shipley.

Mr. Boland with Mr. Krebs.

Mr. William D. Ford with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Long of Maryland with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Fascell with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Gray.

Mr. Irwin with Mr. Mackie.

Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Foley.

Mr. Race with Mr. Gilligan.

Mr. Love with Mr. Todd.

Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Roncalio.

Mr. ARENDS and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

ISRAEL AND BONN

Mrs. KELLY. 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 gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Government of Israel to accept West Germany's bid for formal diplomatic relations, announced this weekend, is welcome indeed.

This decision, when carried out, will help to normalize relations between two very important countries. It should also help to clear the international atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, it remains to be seen whether the Arab States will act in such a way as to permit this development to advance the cause of peace and stability in the world. Their initial reaction has been less than encouraging. We can only hope at this point that reason and commonsense will prevail.

It would seem to me that the normalization of relations between Israel and West Germany should not be used as a pretext for irresponsible actions injurious to the cause of peace in the world. Certainly within the community of responsible, free nations, every effort should be made to follow the Golden Rule and to maintain friendly and peaceful relations.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am deeply concerned about any and all developments which tend to impair relations within the community of free nations. Only a few weeks ago, on February 17, 1965, I took the floor to caution that the reported disagreement between Israel and West Germany on the question of assistance programs should not be allowed to disrupt relations between our two stanch allies. I said on that occasion:

I am taking the floor today to associate myself with the remarks of a number of my colleagues, including the previous speaker, the gentleman from New York, Congressman CELLER, expressing concern about the problem which has apparently arisen in the relations between West Germany and Israel.

I am not familiar with the exact provisions of the agreement which was reportedly entered into between those two countries. Neither do I know the extent to which this agreement has already been fulfilled. I am aware, however, that West Germany has provided substantial assistance to Israel to help that nation meet its security requirements.

It would seem to me that whatever agreement is involved in the instance at hand, both countries should endeavor to live up to its terms. Certainly within the community of responsible, free nations, every effort should be made to follow the Golden Rule and to keep relations on a friendly, peaceful and mutually beneficial basis.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am deeply concerned about any and all developments which tend to impair relations within the community of free nations. I believe that solidarity and mutual respect are the necessary elements of positive cooperation between all of us in the interest of world peace and security. I would be loath to see Communist efforts to divide us bear fruit.

For these reasons, I earnestly hope that the disagreement which has apparently arisen in the relations between West Germany and Israel may be resolved at the earliest possible date.

What I said then applies with equal force today. The circumstances have changed, and the issue is different, but the same rules apply; commonsense and courtesy should prevail in the conduct of relations betwen mature and responsible governments.

Mr. Speaker, this morning the New York Times carried an editorial which reflects the sentiments I have just outlined. It deals with this matter in more detail than I have been able to do in 1 minute. I, therefore, insert this editorial in the RECORD:

ISRAEL AND BONN

The Israeli decision to accept West Germany's bid for formal diplomatic relations is a constructive move that benefits both sides. It also helps clear the international atmosphere. Earlier reports of Israeli conditions for normalizing relations raised possibilities that could have adversely affected the position of Chancellor Erhard's government, while providing ammunition for Israel's enemies.

As Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir remarked last week, the West German suggestion that diplomatic relations be established produced a debate "between the head and the heart" for every Israeli. With memories of Hitler's mass murder of Jews still strong, it is understandable that there should be a carryover of emotional repugnance to the idea even two decades after Nazism's overthrow. The decision to accept Bonn's offer, therefore, represents a victory for reason over emotion. Israel's international position and its economic prospects both stand to gain materially from closer ties with West Germany, and these considerations properly proved decisive.

The confusion already reigning in Arab ranks testifies to Chancellor Erhard's wisdom in deciding to counter Egypt's welcome to Walter Ulbricht by the positive move of recognizing Israel rather than the negative one of breaking relations with Cairo. President Nasser was not serving any Arab interest when he received the East German leader, and the result of his action has already brought open criticism of him from Tunisian President Bourguiba.

Nasser's recent threats against Bonn represent a form of attempted blackmail that can only increase West German resentment. Many Arab leaders whose prestige is less personally involved than that of the Egyptian strong man can easily calculate that their countries would suffer substantially from a break in relations with Bonn. They are hardly likely to want to bear the costs of his folly.

President Nasser did not plan it that way, but at this moment Israel and West Germany appear to be the prime beneficiaries of his blundering venture into international gamesmanship.

MISSION SAFETY 70

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include a statement by the President on Mission Safety 70.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker. In the last 7 years almost 300,000 Federal civilian employees have suffered disabling injuries. That is a figure to make one ask, "Why is something not being done about it?"

Something is being done about it. President Johnson has announced the initiation of Mission Safety 70—a safety policy that is being implemented in all agencies and at all levels of the Federal Government service.

The financial cost to the Government in time lost and property damage has mounted in the last 7 years to over a billion dollars. This can be substantially reduced.

More significantly, the cost in human terms of accidental injuries and deaths can be reduced. With it, we will reduce the sorrow and suffering of thousands of Federal employees and their families.

The people who serve this Nation in the Federal Government deserve the protection of all the reasonable safety measures we can offer them. Mission Safety 70 implements such a plan.

I take pride in extending my remarks to include President Johnson's statement made on February 16 to initiate this meritorious safety program:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON MISSION SAFETY 70

Today we open another front in our war on waste—waste of human resources, productive skills, and money.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has alerted me that the incidence of injury to Federal civilian employees is no better today than it was 10 years ago and direct costs to the Government have risen nearly 50 percent.

In the last 7 years alone, over 1,200 workers have lost their lives through job injuries in the civilian service of the United States.

Nearly 300,000 disabling injuries have been sustained by Federal employees.

Over 18,500,000 man-days of potential production have been lost.

Direct costs to the Government in compensation and medical care approached a quarter of a billion dollars.

Indirect costs of property damage, replacements, and other factors are estimated as being four times as great, making the total cost at least $1¼ billion.

This is inexcusable waste because nearly all of these deaths and injuries are preventable.

As a first step in reducing these needless tragedies and this waste, I am launching Mission Safety–70.

Under this mission I am directing the Federal departments and agencies to reduce their injury frequency 30 percent by 1970.

Attainment of this goal would prevent about 45,000 injuries and save us almost a quarter of a billion dollars of direct and indirect costs.

Every life is precious and each must be safeguarded—success in this first step would save approximately 200 lives.

I have twice presented President's Safety Awards to those departments and agencies which have markedly improved their safety performance. So I know some Federal agencies have already enlisted in this war on waste. Last year I said I wanted every Federal administrator to follow their example. I meant every word.

A 30-percent reduction in the frequency of Federal work injuries is attainable. One-half of all employees now work in agencies whose injury rate frequently matches the goal which I have set for the Government as a whole. It is time for the agencies with higher than average rates to effect significant reductions and for all other agencies to improve further their present performance. No one can relax in the pursuit of safety.

I am today issuing a safety policy for the Federal Government as the Nation's largest employer. This policy will guide Government administrators in the discharge of their responsibilities and in this attainment of the objectives I have set forth.

The Secretary of Labor will report to me periodically on the progress achieved by the various Federal agencies.

LEGISLATION TO REPEAL FEDERAL RETAILERS' EXCISE TAXES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to repeal the Federal retailers' excise taxes.

I take this time to protest the retail excise tax which resembles a crazy quilt of costly regulations and exceptions.

The excise taxes which my bill seeks to repeal are those imposed at the retail level on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage, and handbags.

These taxes were first levied at the onset of World War II when revenue needs of this country were at a high peak. Other aims of these levies were to attract public investment in war bonds rather than consumer goods. It also was designed to switch production of industrial goods away from less important items to needed hardware for war.

It is clear enough in the records that these retail excise taxes were planned only as temporary taxes and they would be swept away with the end of the hostilities. However, they were not, and in fact, were continued on through the Korean war with a reduction later from 20 to 10 percent.

Unfortunately, every attempt to eliminate these unfairly distributed taxes has been turned aside.

It was in the 88th Congress that the idea of a further study on the subject was proposed. The study is now a fact and six volumes represent the testimony taken at lengthy hearings by the House Ways and Means Committee.

There are, I am certain, a myriad of definite and clear-cut reasons for the repeal of the retail excise taxes.

First, there are more excise taxes collected from low-income families than from high-income families. Statistics reveal that 18 percent of all excise revenue comes from families with income under $3,000 while only 14.3 percent of all excise revenue comes from families with income above $10,000.

Second, the retail excise tax is a costly "nuisance" tax to 1 million retailers and 100 million consumers. The estimated annual cost to retailers amounts to $300 million.

Repeal of the temporary retail excise tax, actually imposed to suppress business, would stimulate it in 1965.

The initiation of action to repeal this tax would bring much-needed relief to the American consumer—women, especially—by causing a 10-percent reduction in the price of the commodities affected.

A half billion dollars of spendable consumer dollars would be instantly released and the repeal would also have the effect of increasing employment in two areas: First, retail stores throughout the Nation; and second, industries in high unemployment areas.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the reasons I have introduced legislation to repeal the retail excise taxes. This grossly unfair tax should be repealed because it is inequitable, discriminatory, places an oppressive tax collecting burden on 1 million retailers, and is regressive in its usage.

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS BASED UPON THE SCIENTIFIC COMPLEMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL STATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, in the past several days I have been commenting on the potential dangers to the economy of the various sections of the Nation and to the educational capabilities of these same sections by the unequal geographic distribution of the Federal Government's research and development funds.

Today I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the subject of the adequate use of our Nation's scientific manpower. Much stress has been placed upon the importance of adequate scientific manpower for the conduct of our Nation's research and development programs.

Therefore it is of more than average interest when we make a comparison of the value of research and development prime contracts and grants with relation to the scientific complement of each State.

In establishing this basis of comparison, only scientists reported working for industry, educational institutions, nonprofit organizations, and other non-Federal occupations were used in the calculations. The amounts mentioned have been rounded off to the nearest $1,000.

The national average of research and development funds per scientist is $54,000. On this basis the scientific complement of only 13 States receive in excess of this average. The largest distribution of research and development funds per scientist is found in the State of Nevada. The figure is $416,000 per individual scientist. California is second with $170,000 per scientist. In fact the distribution pattern reveals the same concentration of funds we have discovered in the other methods of comparison I have mentioned. The West, the South and the east coast receive the lion's share.

In my section of the Nation we find such figures as $12,000 per scientist in Indiana, $19,000 for each member of Illinois' scientific complement, $20,000 in Michigan, $21,000 in Ohio, $29,000 in Wisconsin, $21,000 in Minnesota, and $10,000 in Iowa.

And I must add that the colleges and universities in these seven States in the decade of the fifties produced almost 25 percent of the doctorate degrees in the physical sciences and in mathematics, about one-third of the doctorate degrees in the biological sciences and approximately 30 percent of the doctorates in engineering.

It seems quite apparent the present imbalance in the geographic distribution of Federal research and development funds is creating an artificial monopoly of such activities in a few certain areas. Such a monopoly can only have a debilitating effect on the capabilities and development of scientific talent in the other sections of our Nation.

CREATION OF A NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. ANNUNZIO. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I hereby introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. This measure is an amended version of the bill I introduced earlier in the session and incorporates the modifications recommended this week by President Johnson. I am proud to join my distinguished colleagues who have raised their voices in support of the proposal to take action to promote progress and scholarship in the arts and humanities.

In his inaugural address, President Johnson quite rightly focused on the idea that the central concern of our time is going to be the quality of life to be found in this Nation.

We regard ourselves as a great Nation. We have assumed the economic, political, and military leadership of the entire free world. If we are to play out these roles with honor on the stage of history, then we must also offer the world a great civilization.

And in the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, the most lasting impact any civilization has on the world is through the ideals it fosters, the truths it holds up to mankind, and the works of beauty it produces.

In order to maintain the very highest standards of excellence in all of these areas, we must as a Nation begin to make a more concentrated effort to foster the arts and the humanities. One concrete way in which we could make a beginning would be to establish the Foundation provided for in this bill.

The original idea for such a Foundation came from the report of the National Commission on the Humanities. This Commission was composed of a group of the nation's most distinguished scholars and educators. It was established in early 1963 by several private groups in order to examine both the current state and the future prospects of the arts and the humanities in America.

During the course of their labors, the Commission reviewed detailed reports from 24 of the country's leading learned societies concerning conditions within their own area of specialization.

Without exception, the professionals in each field said that in their considered judgment not enough was being done. They were also unanimous in their feeling that a federally assisted Foundation would be enormously helpful.

The Foundation I have proposed does not aim to subsidize the Nation's intellectual life or to introduce Federal influence or control into the life of the spirit. Both would be contrary to our traditions of freedom and would stifle creativity rather than encourage it.

The purpose I have in mind is to set aside a share of our great national wealth for the development of one of our Nation's most precious natural resources—our scholars, teachers, and artists.

Working with private groups and institutions, the Humanities Foundation would provide encouragement and financial assistance to persons and projects who meet the most rigorous standards.

Such a Foundation could play a worthy role in sparking a great flame of cultural achievement throughout our nation. I hope that the Congress will move to a speedy consideration of this proposal.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION OBSERVES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the 50th anniversary of the Federal Trade Commission is being observed this week.

The FTC was organized on March 16, 1915, following the appointment of the Chairman and the first members of this important Commission by President Woodrow Wilson. The initial act creating the Commission was passed by Congress on September 16, 1914.

The broad language of the original Federal Trade Commission Act gave the Commission responsibility for deciding what methods, acts, or practices are unfair as each might develop or change in a growing economy.

The basic objective of the Commission is the maintenance of free competitive enterprise as the keystone of the American economic system. The foundation policy underlying the Commission's responsibilities is to prevent the free enterprise system from being stifled or fettered by monopoly, or corrupted by unfair or deceptive practices in commerce.

Over the years the Commission has established a record of promoting fair competition and preserving our free enterprise system—a record to which the American people can justly point with pride.

On the 50th anniversary of the Commission, I wish to congratulate this great agency of our Government. The excellent record it has achieved in the past should be but a prelude to greater accomplishments in the future.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the body of the RECORD excerpts from a news release of the Federal Trade Commission concerning its half-century anniversary. Portions of this news release follow:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION CELEBRATES ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY ON MARCH 16, 1965

Praised, condemned, starved and fed, denounced and defended, deserted and reinforced, overruled and upheld, the Federal Trade Commission has achieved 50 years of growth. It has confounded many of its critics, dimmed the starry hopes of zealous do-gooders, yet discouraged those who would corner the marketplace or fleece the people. It has failed to be the panacea its advocates had envisioned, but it has not been the pushover that profit hungry sophisticates had planned to circumvent. The FTC already has proved an indispensable safeguard for this Nation's system of free competitive enterprise in business and fair treatment for the purchasing public. While the FTC has lacked perfection, it has been tremendously useful.

The future will prove it even more so. The growth of this country's economy makes it impossible for any agency the size of the Federal Trade Commission to be an omnipresent policeman. It was never intended to be. But it serves its basic purposes to provide businessmen with explicit guidance on how to comply with the law and how to avoid deception of consumers. Moreover, the forceful actions it has taken have transformed what might have been mere pieties into meaningful and respected counsel. The result is the Commission has attained the stature necessary for its admonitions to be heeded; hence, the future could well find less emphasis on delineating boundaries of legality and more emphasis on helping reputable businessmen cope with the competition-engendered illegalities that beset them. With 50 years of hard-won experience under its belt, the Commission can be of greater use to those who believe in fair competition and honest dealing.

That the Commission's potential promise, even more than already has been achieved, does not mean that past performance has

been merely prolog. Past achievements have been monumental.

Its reports to the Congress contained sufficiently informative economic data and intelligence to support such legislation as the Export Trade Act, the Packers and Stockyards Act, the Radio Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Federal Communications Act, the Public Utilities Holding Company Act, the Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act, the Federal Power Act, and the National Gas Act. It has conducted more than 100 general investigations shedding light on the Nation's economic problems. With the broadest investigative powers of any Federal agency, the Commission has illuminated with fact many of the dark corners of our economy, and is continuing to do so.

It has taken on both the giants and would-be giants of industry in enforcing laws prohibiting restraints of trade. Pitting a handful of dedicated Government lawyers against batteries of the best attorneys in private practice, the Commission has won victories that have clarified what the law prohibits. And such battles have dissuaded others from attempting similar acts and practices. Thus has the precipice of the law been illuminated, and the light continues to probe as new practices which injure competition are used.

The same holds for deception of consumers. The Commission's efforts to halt misrepresentation have certainly fallen short of complete protection for the credulous. And deception is with us still, as it probably always will be. But the Commission's alertness aided by ever more circumspect advertising media is making it tough for those who would mislead the public. Moreover, the Commission is planning to work much closer with State authorities to prevent deception of consumers behind the barriers of State lines.

It is impossible to calculate with any precision how much good the FTC has accomplished in 50 years of halting questionable advertising and merchandising, particularly with the greater authority to attack it conveyed in 1938 by the Wheeler-Lea amendments. But it is illuminating and heartening to contrast the advertising appearing 50 years ago with that printed and broadcast today. Not only have consumers been saved millions of dollars, but reputable sellers have found that today's advertising buys a great deal more trust. The FTC has not fought alone in this accomplishment, but it has been able to strike with the force of the law when private efforts failed.

The battle can be counted, too, in human terms—products incapable of doing what was claimed for them; discriminations which injured small businessmen; make-money-at-home schemes that bilked the aged and the needy; and mislabeled fabrics and furs whose quality left their buyers with bitter disappointment. The list could go on, with other types of unfairness but certainly it can be pointed out that here particularly the FTC has fought shoulder to shoulder with the angels.

With 50 years of experience and service behind it, the Federal Trade Commission stands ready to tackle a far vaster volume of work engendered by the Nation's ever-growing economy. Old guideposts must be maintained and, if necessary, modified to meet tomorrow's needs. And new guideposts will be added as required. Particularly will greater efforts be made to encourage businessmen to comply with the law voluntarily as a faster and more equitable method of maintaining honest competition.

The first 50 years testify to the validity of the Commission's purpose.

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN PAUL RAND DIXON ON 50TH ANNIVESARY OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The history of the laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission reflects one of the law's most ancient paradoxes—that there can be no liberty without laws that themselves restrain liberty.

There is no single body of law that can rightfully claim a larger share of credit for this unprecedented liberty and prosperity than the antitrust laws of the United States. Nor can there be any real doubt that the Federal Trade Commission, in its efforts, has been one of the strongest, most persistent forces in keeping alive, during even those periods of darkest, national exigencies, this tradition of competition and thus opportunity in our economic life. Whatever its imperfections—and there are many, as its constant efforts at improvement demonstrate—the Federal Trade Commission, in this year 1965, has clearly come a long way toward realizing some of the highest hopes of those that founded it half a century ago.

DATES SURROUNDING THE ACTIVITIES OF THE FTC

Federal Trade Commission Act passed by Congress on September 26, 1914.

FTC officially organized on March 16, 1915, when President Woodrow Wilson appointed five Commissioners.

Congress approved construction of the FTC building on March 4, 1931.

Building dedicated by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on July 12, 1937.

FTC occupied its building on April 21, 1938.

First permanent Chairman of the Commission appointed by President Harry S. Truman on May 24, 1950.

ORGANIZATION OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The Federal Trade Commission is composed of five members. Each member is appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate, for a term of 7 years. Not more than three of the Commissioners may be members of the same political party. One Commissioner is designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission, and he is responsible for its administrative management.

The original five Commissioners of the FTC appointed by President Woodrow Wilson on March 16, 1915, were: Joseph E. Davies, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who served as the first Chairman; Edward N. Hurley, Democrat, of Illinois; William J. Harris, Democrat, of Georgia; Will H. Parry, Republican, of Washington; and George Rublee, Progressive Republican, of New Hampshire.

The present Commissioners are: Paul Rand Dixon, Democrat, of Tennessee, who is Chairman; Philip Elman, Independent, Maryland; A. Everette MacIntyre, Democrat, of North Carolina; John R. Reilly, Democrat, of Iowa; and Mary Gardiner Jones, Republican, of New York.

BRIEF BIOGRAPHIES OF THE PRESENT FIVE COMMISSIONERS

Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman: Born on September 29, 1913, in Nashville, Tenn. He received his A.B. degree from Vanderbilt University, and his LL.B. degree from the University of Florida. Joined the FTC in 1938 as trial attorney in antimonopoly and antideceptive practices. In 1957 he resigned to become counsel and staff director of the U.S. Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. Appointed Commissioner and Chairman of the FTC in 1961. Democrat.

Philip Elman, Commissioner: Born on March 14, 1918, in Paterson, N.J. He received his A.B. degree from the College of City of New York, and his LL.B. degree from Harvard University. He was editor of the Harvard Law Review in 1939. Also he has served as: Law clerk to the late Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter of the U.S. Supreme Court, attorney for FCC, assistant to Solicitor General, and legal adviser to Office of Military Government in Berlin, Germany. Appointed to the FTC as a Commissioner in 1961. Independent.

A. Everette MacIntyre, Commissioner; Born on February 3, 1901, in Alamance County, N.C. He received his A.B. degree from the University of North Carolina, and his LL.B. degree from George Washington Law School. He joined the FTC legal staff in 1930. When he was Chief of the Division of Antitrust Trials in 1955, he resigned to become general counsel and staff director of the U.S. House Select Committee on Small Business. He was appointed a Commissioner to the FTC in 1961. Democrat.

John R. Reilly, Commissioner; Born on June 4, 1928, in Dubuque, Iowa. Attended Loras College in Iowa, and received his J.D. degree from the College of the State University of Iowa. Also he has served as: Trial attorney with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and midwestern representative of the Council of State Governments, as well as counsel to National Association of Attorneys General and Conference of Chief Justices. He was head of the Executive Office of U.S. Attorneys when he was appointed Commissioner to the FTC in 1964. Democrat.

Mary Gardiner Jones, Commissioner: Born on December 10, 1920, in New York City, N.Y. Received her A.B. degree at Wellesley College, and her LL.B. degree from Yale Law School. Also she has served as: History teacher at George School, Newtown, Pa.; research analyst in Office of Strategic Services in charge of Swiss desk; trial attorney in Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. From 1948 to 1953 and from 1961 to 1964, when she was appointed to the FTC as a Commissioner, she practiced law in New York with leading law firms. Republican.

TREASURY SEEKS LAWS TO CURB PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the report issued recently by the Department of the Treasury on private foundations calls for the enactment of legislation to prevent them from using their resources to carry on commercial and competitive transactions found to be unfair to private taxpaying businesses.

This report reflects a yearlong study by Treasury officials and lends support to the importance of the work carried out by one of the House small business subcommittees in this field.

The investigations and hearings conducted by the subcommittee have shown that thousands of these private foundations have been formed during recent years and that many of them use their vast dollar holdings and their tax-free status to carry on commercial and financial operations in competition with small business and private enterprise in general.

Under unanimous consent, I include the Treasury announcement at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY REPORT ON PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS

The Treasury report on private foundations published today by the congressional tax committees is the result of more than a year of examination of the impact of present law on tax-exempt private foundations. In keeping with the request for the report from the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, only private foundations were studied, and the report does not involve public foundations or other types of publicly supported charities such as schools and churches.

The Treasury study—which included a detailed statistical survey of foundation activities—showed that the vast majority of private foundations do not abuse their tax privileges. However, problems were uncovered among a minority of private foundations. These problems are not subject to solution under present law and, therefore, a number of legislative measures are recommended.

The Treasury does not recommend placing a time limit on the lives of foundations nor does it feel it is necessary to set up a separate regulatory agency to oversee foundation activities.

The Treasury proposes changes in present law to solve six major problems revealed by the study. A number of less significant problems are also dealt with.

The six major problems and the proposed solutions are:

1. In order to meet the problem of "self-dealing" in which foundation assets may be diverted to private advantage, the Treasury recommends a general prohibition on financial transactions between a foundation and its contributors, officers, directors or trustees.

2. In order to meet the problem of "deferred benefits," in which there may be a substantial delay between the time a foundation or a donor receives a tax benefit—either in the form of a deduction for the donor or an exemption for the foundation—and when the foundation actually spends funds for charitable purposes, the Treasury recommends limiting the period during which a foundation may withhold its income from charity. This would be done by specifying how soon—generally 1 year—after a foundation receives net income (exclusive of income from long-term capital gains) it would be obliged to spend such income for charitable purposes. In order to impose the same obligation upon those foundations which hold investments producing little or no income, the Treasury recommends they be required to maintain expenditures for charitable purposes at approximately the same level as if they had invested their funds in income-producing assets. These rules on deferred benefits apply only to so-called nonoperating foundations—those which make gifts rather than operate an institution themselves.

3. In order to meet the problem of "business involvement" in which foundations become so involved in private business that free competition may be impaired and their charitable function hindered, the Treasury recommends that a foundation not be allowed to own 20 percent or more of any business, included businesses operated in corporate form, not related to its charitable function.

4. In order to meet the problem of "family use" of foundations as devices to transfer control of family corporations or other assets to children or other relatives in such a manner as to avoid the full impact of gift or estate taxes, the Treasury recommends that hereafter for gifts of family corporation stock, no charitable deduction would be allowed until (1) the foundation sells the stock or (2) the foundation contributes the stock to a public charity or (3) the donor's control over the corporation or asset ended. Such use of foundations as a device to maintain family control can create conflicts of interest to the detriment of charity.

5. In order to meet the problem of "unrelated financial transactions" in which a foundation engages in lending or borrowing not related to its charitable function or speculation, the Treasury recommends barring foundations from speculative practices; prohibiting all borrowing by foundations for investment purposes; and confining foundation loans to those which are clearly necessary, safe, and appropriate.

6. In order to meet the problem of "perpetual donor influence" in which a donor or his survivors continue to exercise substantial influence over the activities of the foundation indefinitely, the Treasury recommends broadening the base of foundation management after the first 25 years of a foundation's life. Under this proposal, after that time the donor or related parties could not make up more than 25 percent of the foundation's governing body.

In addition to the six major recommendations, the Treasury also recommended measures to meet four less significant problems. These problems are primarily technical in nature.

The report brings together and evaluates statistical information on the long-run growth of private foundations as well as the closely related growth of deductions for charitable contributions. It also includes the results of a statistical survey by the Treasury of the activity of private foundations in 1962.

This information indicates that the proportion of total wealth of individuals owned by foundations has increased from about 0.3 or 0.5 percent in 1930 to about .085 percent in 1962. Apparently, much of this relative growth since 1950 reflects the fact that corporate stock prices have risen faster than that of other assets. Private foundations have large holdings of corporate stock but the share of all corporate stock owned by foundations has been virtually constant since 1950.

The Treasury survey of foundations covered about 1,300 of the roughly 15,000 private foundations in the United States in 1962. The sample included all of the largest private foundations and the total assets of the foundations studied made up three-quarters of the assets of all private foundations in 1962.

The survey shows that the market value of the assets of all private foundations at the end of the tax year 1962 was $16.3 billion. The net worth, in terms of market values, was $15.5 billion. In terms of current values, two-thirds of the assets of foundations were represented by common stock. The ordinary income of foundations in their tax year ending in 1962 was $580 million. In this period aggregate net capital gains were $484 million. Contributions received were $833 million. Total grants paid out, including the cost of distributing grants, were $1,012 million.

TIMOTHY WALSH OF NEPTUNE, N.J.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 4, 9-year-old Timothy Walsh, of Neptune, N.J., was critically burned when gasoline that had been added to a trash fire in his backyard exploded. Timothy was rushed to Fitkin Hospital with gasoline burns covering 60 percent of his body. After spending an extremely difficult night at the hospital, his doctors felt that his only hope lay in a transfer to the burn treatment center at Brooke Army Medical Center in San Antonio, Tex. Brooke Army Medical Center has a worldwide reputation for the treatment of injuries of this kind.

At 11:30 a.m. on Friday, March 5, my office received a request for such transfer from Dr. Frank Zimmer, the boy's physician. At that moment the operational wheels of the Federal Government began to turn. The request was forwarded to the Air Force Congressional Liaison Office where Maj. Harry M. Funk immediately transferred it to the Pentagon to Maj. Walter Williams. Throughout the day the traditional Government redtape was bypassed and by late afternoon the request for final approval was in the office of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara. All of the current problems of that Department were stopped for a brief moment because a 9-year-old American boy, Timmy Walsh, was in great need.

Late that night the Air Force jet with a medical team aboard landed at McGuire Field, Fort Dix, N.J. With typical interservice cooperation a U.S. Navy helicopter from the base at Lakehurst, N.J., transported the medical team to a landing on the front lawn of Fitkin Hospital. Two hundred doctors and nurses had arranged their automobiles in a large circle with headlights on to provide the helicopter with enough light to make its landing. The medical team met with Dr. Zimmer and examined the boy, and a short time later he was transferred to the helicopter for transportation to the jet at McGuire which winged him toward Texas where expert help awaited him.

Mr. Speaker, today Timmy Walsh is at Brooke Army Medical Center still in extremely critical condition, fighting for his life, but he now has the best treatment the U.S. Government has available to help him in this fight. As all of us pray for his recovery, it might be well to give a prayer of gratitude for a government that is still not too big to respond to the need of a 9-year-old boy. My entire staff as well as all of the governmental agencies who had a part in this great humanitarian effort have gained a degree of stature that will enhance all of them for the rest of their lives.

Copies of newspaper accounts by Ed Reiter, of the Asbury Park Press, and Barbara Spector, of the Newark Evening News, are included to relate details:

[From the Asbury Park Press, Mar. 6, 1965]

SPECIALISTS AIRLIFT NEPTUNE BOY TO ARMY BURN CENTER

(By Ed Reiter)

NEPTUNE.—A team of U.S. Army burn specialists today airlifted 9-year-old Timothy Walsh from Fitkin Hospital to Brooke Army

Hospital, Texas, for treatment of gasoline burns covering 60 percent of his body.

A Navy helicopter from the Lakehurst Naval Air Station started the airlift at 6:30 a.m., taking the boy from a Fitkin parking lot to McGuire Air Force Base, where he is to be transferred to a specially fitted jet for the trip to San Antonio.

The arrangements for the flights were made yesterday through the office of Representative JAMES J. HOWARD, Democrat, after Timothy was burned by the explosion of a plastic bottle filled with gasoline. He and his brother, Kevin, 12, had intended to use the fuel to prime a fire in an incinerator at their home, 11 Rutgers Terrace.

PARENTS TO GO ALONG

The boy's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Francis J. Walsh, will accompany Timothy on the flight from McGuire to Texas.

"Thank you, thank you all," Mrs. Walsh said as she left the hospital this morning.

Mrs. Walsh's thanks were intended for hundreds of persons who assisted in trying to save her son's life.

There was Dr. Frank Zimmer, the boy's surgeon, who modestly admitted he hasn't had much sleep in 2 days.

There was William Larmie, aviation mechanic's mate, second class, who helped guide the UH2A Sea Sprite jet helicopter to a parking lot south of the hospital.

The 'copter was piloted by Lt. William S. Munro and copiloted by Lt. (jg.) P.G. Carroll, both of the Lakehurst Naval Air Station's Helicopter Utility Squadron 2.

There was Representative HOWARD, and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, who signed the order approving the military's role in the action.

HEADLIGHTS FORM RING

There were nurses, orderlies, police, and firemen who lit a 120-foot ring with their cars' headlights for more than 3 hours to mark a landing spot for the huge 'copter.

There was Capt. William Mills, an Army doctor, and Capt. Dora Harris, an air evacuation nurse, who flew from Texas to carry out the transfer.

There were nurses in Fitkin's intensive care unit, who described Timothy as "a lovely boy; a real darling."

There was the Reverend John J. Meehan, Catholic chaplain at the hospital and a curate at Holy Innocents Church, Timothy's parish.

LONG VIGIL

A group of about 50 nurses, first aidmen, police, firemen, reporters, and photographers waited from 3 to 5 a.m. for the airlift operation to reach the hospital. A UH2A helicopter had taken off from McGuire with Captain Wells and Harris, but it developed a hydraulic leak and was forced to land at Lakehurst, where another copter had been prepared.

At 5 a.m. the *Sea Sprite* swept low out of a dark, cloudless sky to set down on the south side of the hospital.

One hour and 25 minutes later it was airborne with Timothy for the 20-minute flight to McGuire. Mr. and Mrs. Walsh, meanwhile, were driving with a State police escort to Lakehurst, from where a helicopter took them to McGuire.

Arrangements for the boy's transfer to the Army hospital—a major military center for the treatment of burns—were approved yesterday afternoon by the Office of Defense Secretary McNamara.

OFFICIALS CONFER

The approval came after hours of telephone negotiations by Army and Air Force officials, Representative HOWARD, and the boy's father.

Timothy is in critical condition with first, second, and third degree burns over the upper half of his body.

RESCUED BY BROTHER

Kevin, who disregarded his own burns and rushed to the aid of his brother, was treated at the hospital for first- and second-degree burns of the hands and wrists, then sent home.

The Army medical team assigned to transport Timothy arrived from Texas overnight at McGuire Air Force Base, and went to Fitkin Hospital early today.

Mr. Walsh said it was his idea to send Timothy to the Army hospital.

CENTER FACILITIES NOTED

"I think Fitkin is well equipped to handle the case," he said, "but Brooke Medical Center specializes in this sort of thing, and I want the little fellow to have the best treatment available."

Timothy was conscious yesterday, he said, and able to speak. But Dr. Zimmer, the boy's attending physician at Fitkin, described his condition as "extremely critical."

Mr. Walsh, who is employed as a constable in Monmouth County District Court, may have to bear the entire expense of transporting his son to Texas. He said he isn't concerned about that right now, though.

"At this point," he said, "I just want to get my son healthy again."

FUND BEING ORGANIZED

Friends and neighbors are organizing a Timmy Walsh fund to help the family meet its expenses.

Mr. Walsh was on the telephone almost constantly yesterday seeking approval for Timothy's transfer. Representative HOWARD and Col. Frederick J. Knoblauch, commanding officer and surgeon at Patterson Army Hospital, Ft. Monmouth, were especially helpful, he said.

Representative HOWARD said it is "very unusual" for military officials to send a plane with a medical team to pick up a civilian. He said he understood Mr. Walsh's record as a World War II Army veteran was one reason the case received favorable consideration.

Mr. Walsh served with the Army Air Force for 3 years as a radio operator and gunner. He was awarded the Air Medal with four oak leaf clusters.

STAFF PRAISED

Mr. HOWARD praised his staff for its work on the case, and praised the military officials for their cooperation and prompt action.

"We hear a lot about the redtape of the Government," he said, "but this goes to show that in the human area, it can move quickly."

Timothy Sullivan, Mr. HOWARD's administrative assistant, who worked on the case most of the day, said approval had to be obtained directly from Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's office.

MOTHER TO STAY

Mr. Walsh plans to stay with Timothy for 4 or 5 days. His wife, Joan, will remain with the boy as long as he is in Texas. Relatives will care for the couple's other children in their absence.

There are six children in the family—three boys and three girls, ranging in age from 15 down to 2 years. Kevin and Timothy are the second and third eldest, respectively.

Kevin is a seventh-grader at the Ocean Grove Elementary School. Timonthy is a fourth-grader at the Green Grove Elementary School.

[From the Newark Evening News, Mar. 6, 1965]

FLIGHT FOR BOY'S LIFE—BURNED SHORE LAD TO TEXAS HOSPITAL

(By Barbara Spector)

NEPTUNE.—Nine-year-old Timothy Walsh was flown today to Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., for treatment of critical burns he received in an accident Thursday in his backyard.

The lifesaving attempt is the result of quick work by Representative JAMES J. HOWARD, Democrat, Third District; Col. Frederick Knoblauch, commander of Patterson Army Hospital at Fort Monmouth, and Army and Defense Department officials in Washington.

The decision to send the child to Brooke was based on the hospital's worldwide reputation for the treatment of burns.

HOWARD's office received the request from the Walsh family at 10:30 a.m. yesterday. "By 6 p.m. we had the approval of Secretary of Defense McNamara," said the Congressman. "The paper was hand carried to all the necessary people until the final approval was given."

The youngster, who is being treated at Fitkin Memorial Hospital, was examined there by a burn team from Brooke at 5 a.m. The team arrived at McGuire Air Force Base at 1 a.m. today from Texas.

PARENTS GRATEFUL

An Army spokesman said a Fort Monmouth ambulance transported Timothy to the post heliport. From there, he was flown to McGuire, then on to Texas. He was accompanied on the journey by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Walsh, of 11 Rutgers Place.

"Everyone acted so kindly and swiftly for us," said Walsh. "We are eternally grateful for any attempt to help our son."

Walsh, a constable for the Monmouth County district court and the father of five other children, said offers of money and blood donations for the boy's treatment have been pouring in. "Every bit counts," he said.

According to Mrs. Walsh, the accident occurred while she was burning some trash in a barrel in the backyard. An older son, Kevin, 12, was tending the fire while his mother was preparing dinner.

"I handed an empty egg carton to Timothy, who was doing his homework in the kitchen, and asked him to throw it in the fire," she said. "Then I heard the screams.

"The boys apparently threw some gasoline from the power lawnmower on to the flames and it exploded. Kevin's hands were burned trying to beat out the flames on Timothy," she said.

The boy was rushed to Fitkin by a passing motorist, where he was admitted with burns from the waist up, which encompass 52 percent of his body. Kevin was treated for second- and third-degree burns of both hands. Mrs. Walsh was burned on the left hand.

"We have spoken with Timothy and his primary concern is that we don't get angry with Kevin for what happened. It is an accident and Kevin tried very hard to help his little brother," Mrs. Walsh said.

Walsh and his family moved here in 1952 from Jersey City.

The other Walsh children are a son, Dennis, and three daughters, Catherine, Patricia, and Kerry, all at home. While their parents are in Texas, the children will stay with their grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Walsh, of Beachwood, and Mrs. Rose Glynn, of Rochelle Park.

"I'll have to return to work at the courthouse later in the week," said Walsh. "But we hope my wife will be able to stay with Timothy for a while.

"The best lesson we learned is one of human nature," he said. "We can't say enough about the considerations shown by my coworkers and our neighbors."

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. PRICE. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, like others in this House, I have followed the principle of exercising a certain self-restraint in injecting myself into specific issues that lie outside my major committee work on the Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. Like others, I feel compelled to make an exception in the light of the events in one of our sister States, where an ill-advised Governor and an ill-advised State police force have most brutally set upon, clubbed, tear-gassed, and assaulted a group of citizens seeking to demonstrate in pursuit of the right to vote.

The conscience of the country, Mr. Speaker, will not tolerate the permanent suppression of human rights. The people of this land have seen the film clips and tape clips showing the column of unarmed, peaceful, nonviolent Negroes rolled up and pursued by State police. The show of force was entirely disproportionate to what was required. And even if the Negro demonstrators had not been able to obtain a so-called permit for a so-called parade, and thus were technically "illegal," the question arises as to why the authorities would deny a parade permit to a group seeking to petition for the redress of grievances.

Two hundred and fifty thousand Negroes marched in Washington last year. They came from all over the country. There was no disorder. There was no rioting. And—I may point out—there was no denial of a parade permit.

I take it as a cardinal principle of America that citizens who feel that the law abuses them, that in its application it unjustly bars them from full participation in the duties and responsibilities of citizens, have a full-fledged and inalienable right to make a speech about it, or carry picket signs, or to make a "march" to express vividly their sense of indignation and frustration.

There is not one of us in this House who does not know exactly what is involved in Selma, Ala. Negroes seeking to register as voters are being deprived of their right to register speedily and conveniently.

The plain, ugly word, Mr. Speaker, is "discrimination." Discrimination on racial grounds. Discrimination designed to keep Negroes from the voting booths and to achieve this ignoble objective under the color of legality through distorted use of so-called literacy tests, or explain-the-constitution tests, and finally through denial of permits for Negro and white citizens to stage a peaceful demonstration to protest the fact of discrimination.

It is my assumption that here in this House we shall shortly have an opportunity to vote on a bill to establish affirmative Federal remedies for the denial of Negro voting rights, anywhere in the country.

I shall vote for that bill, Mr. Speaker, if it offers effective and constitutional remedies. If it does not, I shall vote for any other bill offering effective and constitutional remedies. And I warn my colleagues in this House that this is no time for us to be patient, deliberative, unemotional, and quiescent. Let us rise to our responsibilities, quickly, quickly, by whatever means we find best suited to produce results.

IMPROVE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have had a letter from Dr. Mark Scully, president of the Southeast Missouri State College at Cape Girardeau, Mo., in which he called attention to an Associated Press story out of Washington stating:

> Administrators of college student loans in the Washington area asked Congress Tuesday to permit them to take court action against students who are delinquent in their payments.

Dr. Scully, who, in my opinion, is one of the outstanding educators of this Nation, predicted more than 4 years ago exactly what is now happening. At that time I talked with members of the House Committee on Education and Labor suggesting that they give consideration to the statement made by Dr. Scully in which he made certain recommendations as to how this program could be improved. Unfortunately, none of his recommendations were followed, and as a consequence, we find that there is now a delinquency rate in the repayment of loans in this area ranging from a low of 7 percent at the University of Maryland to a high of 32.5 percent at Howard University. The national average is 16 percent. At the Southeast Missouri State College the present delinquency rate is about 10 percent.

I concur wholeheartedly in Dr. Scully's statement in his letter to me that—

> We are going to do a great deal of negative teaching unless we overhaul this program.

Under permission to include relevant extraneous material in these remarks, I am hereby including a letter from Dr. Scully, the Associated Press dispatch to which he refers, and, more important, his statement under date of November 18, 1960, setting forth his recommendations at that time, which, if they had been followed, would have prevented this program from getting into the shape it is at the present time:

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE COLLEGE,
Cape Girardeau, Mo., March 10, 1965.

Hon. PAUL C. JONES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JONES: This morning's paper carries a story about more trouble with the student loan program. I have written to Mrs. EDITH GREEN reiterating the suggestions which I have made to you so many times, to wit, that after these loans are made they be assigned to the student's home bank for collection and servicing. Our present delinquency rate is about 10 percent. I feel that we are going to do a great deal of negative teaching unless we overhaul this program.

With every good wish, I am,

Very sincerely,

MARK SCULLY,
President.

[From the St. Louis, Globe-Democrat, Mar. 10, 1965]

STUDENT LOAN COURT ACTION LAWS URGED—COLLEGE OFFICIALS ADVOCATE SUITS ON DELINQUENCIES

WASHINGTON.—Administrators of college student loans in the Washington area asked Congress Tuesday to permit them to take court action against students who are delinquent in their payments.

They also asked for authority to turn their bad debts over to private collection agencies, with the cost for the agency being borne by the delinquent student.

These requests by a panel of college officials from six area colleges received sympathetic attention from a House Education Subcommittee considering changes in the present program of Federal aid to college students.

POSSIBLE ANSWER

Chairman EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, said a possible answer to the collection problem of the colleges was to have all the loans administered and collected by a Federal agency after the colleges have made them.

She also said the subcommittee would write "more stringent laws" to see that the long-term, low-interest loans are repaid. Students are now given 10 years to repay the loans, starting a year after leaving college.

The panel said the major problem is keeping track of the students after they leave. There were suggestions that the Internal Revenue Service and Social Security agency be empowered to help locate students behind in their payments.

DELINQUENCY RATES

The officials told of delinquency rates ranging from a low of 7 percent at the University of Maryland to a high of 32.5 percent at Howard University. A Government auditor said Monday the national average is 16 percent.

Some students; the officials said, seem to regard the loans as a Government handout. House, car, and other private obligations are put first, they said, with the college getting what is left.

NOVEMBER 18, 1960.

To whom it may concern.

From Mark Scully, president, Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau, Mo.

Re student loan program, National Defense Education Act.

1. The college student loan program, if continued in the present manner, increases the clerical load and responsibility for collection on each participating college every year. It has already reached almost unmanageable proportions.

2. Schools and colleges have no revenue to finance the clerical work necessary in connection with this program.

3. In the average small bank, an additional note clerk is employed for every 250 to 300 notes made by the bank. A college of our size (enrollment of 2,700) will make about 300 loans a year. This would entail an additional clerk each year.

4. I believe heartily in the student loan program. It does enormous good and will benefit America tremendously. I further believe that the actual lending process should be carried on by the colleges. They can do the best job of lending.

5. I believe these loans should be assigned to acceptable banks for service and collection. These banks may be in the community where the college is located, but preferably they should be banks in the communities from which the student comes so that the task of collection may be dispersed. The collecting banks should be reimbursed about 1 percent for the collection service. If necessary, the present 3-percent rate paid by students on these notes should be increased to 4 percent.

6. Students should be required to make small annual payments on every loan from the very first. This will keep fresh in their minds that this is a loan and that it has to be repaid. It will be a way of keeping the student and the collecting bank in touch.

"VIVE LA DIFFERENCE"

Mr. HUNGATE. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, there will soon be before this body a proposal relating to congressional redistricting which I would hope and trust would receive favorable consideration. Under the recent Supreme Court one-man, one-vote ruling, applauded by some, condemned by many, most of our States have been or are under Court orders to redistrict their own legislatures in accord with that theory. I say theory because it is questionable if this rule ever has been or ever will be truly practiced. When innocence enters the political thicket strange things may occur. Any time you have more than one district you have the opportunity—indeed, have the likelihood—that the majority will be thwarted at least mildly. Let us suppose a State's population is 1 million, consisting of 600,000 from one ethnic group; that is, Transylvanians. With two congressional districts and 500,000 in each—one-man, one-vote hurrah; 400,000 Transylvanians go in one district which they control four to one. The other 200,000 go into another district which they lose three to two. You have two Representatives, one Transylvanian and one non-Transylvanian, but you do have one man, one vote.

There is another popular fallacy that to gerrymander you have to draw crooked lines. Some of the neatest and effective discrimination in our country today has been and can be done with square or rectangular districts of equal population.

A crutch is an aid to an injured limb, but it never regains its strength until the day you begin the painful process of walking upon it. So formulas are an aid to thinking but the mind will never gain strength until you reason your way through and beyond the formulas, so "let the dialogue begin until we reach a consensus on one-man, one-vote." That sort of thing may make poetry. It does not necessarily make democracy.

Richard L. Strout prepared and presented a malapportionment index in the March 12, 1965, Christian Science Monitor. It is an apparently studious article. He discusses the 22 States now seeking a constitutional amendment to permit them to have a "little Federal system" if their voters so elect. An analysis is made of the smallest percentage of votes necessary to win either house. He finds two States where less than 20 percent can elect a majority of the lower house and six States where less than 20 percent can elect a majority of the Senate. He finds "two of the petitioning States seem to be fairly apportioned, and under a reasonable one-man, one-vote system it might take around 45 percent to elect a majority." In Missouri he finds it takes 48 percent to elect a majority of the house and 49 percent to elect a majority of the senate. Oklahoma requires 49 percent to elect a majority in either house.

Underlying the Court's Colorado decision that a State cannot have a little Federal system even where a majority votes to do so is an interesting political philosophy. It might be postulated; A majority of a State's voters have no right to determine the form of government under which they will live, even if it follows the same pattern as that of the parent Federal Government. In short, a majority of the people do not know what sort of government is best for them. This may be correct, but once this was a land where the right to make your own mistakes was considered valuable, indeed indispensable. The States were allowed a measure of freedom to experiment so that which was truly best could be discovered through actual practice. It would perhaps seem ridiculous to us for someone to argue the world is flat. At one time only one man thought it was round. There is value in diversity—danger in conformity. If we all thought and acted alike what need would we have for judges, Congressmen, and newspaper editors? "Vive la difference."

PRESENTATION OF THE NAVY-MARINE CORPS MEDAL TO PETTY OFFICER THIRD CLASS JAMES R. GEORGE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend and thank the Secretary of the Navy, Paul H. Nitze, for the recognition given last Friday, March 12, to an outstanding young Georgian, James R. George. He presented the Navy and Marine Corps Medal to this young man who is a genuine peacetime hero.

This young reservist is employed at the Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service in De Kalb County, Ga.; he is a graduate of the Decatur High School; and he is a student at Georgia State College in Atlanta. He is a member of the Decatur Heights Baptist Church and is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Calvin W. George, who reside at 3354 Burke Drive, Chamblee.

In addition to this high honor he has been recognized in many other ways all of which have been fitting and appropriate.

As this young man's Congressman I congratulate him and I commend his example to young men and women everywhere. The intelligence and courage he demonstrated lifted the hearts of us all. It is not through legislation alone, but also through great qualities of character such as those demonstrated by my constituent that we can hope to build a truly Great Society.

The following remarks by Secretary of Navy and the text of the citation accompanying the Navy and Marine Corps Medal set forth the reasons for the award:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE PAUL H. NITZE, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, AT THE PRESENTATION OF THE NAVY-MARINE CORPS MEDAL TO PETTY OFFICER THIRD CLASS JAMES R. GEORGE, MARCH 12, 1965

Congressman MACKAY, ladies and gentlemen, all of us have been shocked and appalled, to hear recently of a series of incidents in which innocent persons have been assaulted, and even murdered, while witnesses stood by and did absolutely nothing.

It is therefore particularly gratifying to me to learn of the act of heroism performed by Petty Officer Third Class James George in a Philadelphia subway station last Saturday night. Once again there was an assault on a young girl and again there were witnesses who—incredibly—stood by without lifting a finger.

But in this case there was a difference. There were at least eight in the gang of assailants, but when Petty Officer George saw what was happening, he did not hesitate. He did what his upbringing, his training, and his personal courage dictated. He went immediately to the assistance of the victim. He was savagely beaten, but he was somehow able to get away and obtain police assistance. But for his actions, the girl might now be dead.

Petty Officer George, we are all extremely proud of you. Your parents have perhaps the greatest reason to be proud, because no man could have done what you did unless his early training had instilled in him great courage and a high sense of duty. The Navy, and particularly the Naval Reserve, can be proud because your actions Saturday night were in the highest traditions of the naval service. And the Nation is proud because you have demonstrated that, in these days when too many avert their eyes from tragedy and turn their backs on distress, there are still some Americans who recognize their involvement in and their duty toward their fellow citizens.

It is a great honor for me now, on behalf of the President, to present you with the Navy and Marine Corps Medal for your heroism. Captain Zumwalt, will you please read the citation?

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D.C.

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Navy and Marine

Corps Medal to James R. George, aviation antisubmarine warfare technician third class, U.S. Naval Reserve, for service as set forth in the following citation:

For heroic conduct in connection with the rescue of a 15-year-old girl who was seized and attacked by a gang of eight boys of teenage in a subway station at Philadelphia, Pa., on the night of March 6, 1965. Although several other men, who witnessed the assault, failed to take any action at all to help the screaming and terrified victim, George, a naval air reservist from Marietta, Ga., temporarily stationed at the nearby Willow Grove Naval Air Station, immediately attempted to free the girl from her attackers. Displaying exceptional courage and determination, he doggedly fought the gang of hoodlums until, savagely beaten by them, he managed to break away and summon a policeman from the street above. All eight of the attackers were quickly apprehended. By his inspiring and courageous efforts in the face of overwhelming odds, George upheld the highest traditions of the U.S. naval service.

For the President:

PAUL H. NITZE,
Secretary of the Navy.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM

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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri House of Representatives has urged that the Congress be encouraged to restore the $20 million cut in appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, U.S. Soil and Water Conservation Service, in order that Missouri may continue to provide technical assistance to landowners, who help themselves in installing planned conservation on their lands.

I join in this request in order to prevent one of the outstanding USDA programs from being undercut at the very time it is beginning to achieve significant success, and replenish for future generations our "margin of life, USA."

Following is the resolution adopted by the Missouri House of Representatives:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 113

Whereas the House of Representatives of the 73d General Assembly, resolves that the Missouri General Assembly strongly protest to the Congress of the United States, the proposed cut in funds for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget; and

Whereas the present agricultural budget for soil and water conservation has remained the same for several years while costs have been increased; and

Whereas good progress has been made in Missouri in the past 30 years, but much work is yet to be done; and

Whereas 11 million acres of cropland is subject to erosion and 4 million acres of flatland have a drainage problem; and

Whereas Missouri has 18 million acres of cropland making it one of the outstanding agricultural States in the country; and

Whereas soil and water are without a doubt the most important resources in Missouri affecting both family farms, rural communities, and urban areas; and

Whereas the reduction of funds by $20 million as recommended to be paid by landowners for technical assistance in applying practices would retard and delay the progress of soil and water conservation which is, as stated, national concern, affecting the welfare of all citizens our our State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress be encouraged to restore the proposed $20 million cut in appropriations for the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in order that Missouri may continue to provide technical assistance to landowners in installing planned conservation on their lands; and be it further

Resolved, That we also urge a continuation and expansion of this effective program which we believe is essential for maintenance of the family farm, the economic stability of the rural community and the preservation of our water resources, food supply and recreational opportunities for both rural and urban communities; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, President of the Senate, and to each member of the Missouri delegation in the Congress of the United States.

THE REAL AMERICAN TRAGEDY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, no one regrets more than I the death of the Reverend Reeb who was the victim of misguided and brutal individuals who have done great damage to our State and to the Nation. But the real tragedy is that this death need not have been. It was the result of weeks of demonstrations which were pointless.

More than a month ago I stood on the floor of this House and asked Members of Congress and the President of the United States to use their influence to stop the demonstrations in Selma. I said that they were not serving a purpose. They had won their point. The court had ordered the registrars in Selma to speed up registration and this was done. The President assured Martin Luther King that he would send a message and legislation to Congress and this he is doing tonight. So the demonstrations could have ended if their true purpose was to gain voting rights for Negroes in Selma.

This was not and has never been the purpose of these demonstrations. They were carefully planned, including provocation for arrest and violence to inflame the American people to demand Federal voting laws and tonight we will hear the President give into these demands of the mob. Congress is being asked to legislate under pressure of mob rule.

The real American tragedy will be that if the President's proposal is made into law and we turn the ballot box over to those who cannot read, write, or comprehend the responsibility of citizenship, this Republic as we have known it will cease to be. Under the President's proposed legislation it is possible and probable that we will have one-party government in the United States, an open invitation to dictatorship. The sovereign rights of the States to determine voter qualifications, guaranteed by the Constitution will be destroyed. This is indeed one of the most perilous hours we have faced and I plead for a return to reason, calm deliberation in passing legislation to insure that the rights of all qualified citizens to vote will be guaranteed without destroying the Constitution, and the Republic.

I firmly believe, and have so stated publicly many times before the demonstrations in Selma, in the right of every qualified citizens to vote. I am prepared to support and vote for a bill that will guranatee that right with sufficient teeth in the law to prevent unfair administration because of race, creed, or color. I am not willing to take away from the States the constitutional right to determine election laws or to turn over the administration of State election laws to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, law and order in Alabama has been challenged. The following editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser of March 10, 1965, reminds us of some facts we may have overlooked under the stress of the emotion of this moment in history:

U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 80

U.S. Highway No. 80 is subject to a thousand laws and regulations. No citizen or body of citizens has complete liberty upon it.

The United States and Alabama Governments specified the materials that went into its construction.

The same State troopers who intervened at Selma also intervene to stop overweight trucks.

You cannot use that highway without possessing two licenses, a car tag and a driver's license. Citizens not twice licensed are barred from the highway. And you are required to be sober as well.

You are required to render prescribed signals for turning and stopping. Tire changing is regulated. Road shoulders are for emergency use only. Littering is forbidden and you must honor detour arrangements.

In the name of public safety, these same troopers halt motorists who violate the speed limit. They stop citizens for exceeding 40 miles per hour in some zones and not stopping for school buses.

You cannot drive on U.S. 80 at night without lights. You cannot cut over a yellow line to pass on a hill.

You are required to dim your lights on meeting another car.

You cannot cruise along firing roman candles, nor proceed in a state of nakedness.

At best, a highway is a perilous situation and, in the name of public safety, there is nowhere the citizen is subject to a greater multiplicity of restraints on personal liberty.

A highway is for fast moving vehicular traffic only and there is a fence law to keep livestock off them. In not the remotest way is it a suitable arena for a demonstration.

Accordingly, the government of Alabama forbade the Selma demonstrators to clog that highway on Sunday, inconveniencing thousands of motorists and endangering their own life and limb.

In no case would 650 Ku Klux Klansmen—or Boy Scouts or Shriners—have been permitted to trudge down that highway.

Accordingly, the Negroes were forbidden to misuse the highway. They lawlessly defied the government of Alabama and were therefore stopped by the government of Alabama.

Consideration was given to sealing off the highway for the exclusive use of the Negro host, as a city block for skaters. Perhaps that would have been wiser: The matter is left to the second guessers.

In any event, that response to the Negro's defiance was rejected. It was not a privilege that would have been extended to any other group.

A crowd that size could not have kept to the highway shoulders at bridges and fills It would have been difficult to protect marchers during overnight encampments by swamp or on prairie. Therefore, wisely or unwisely, that abdication of the authority of the State was rejected.

There arises next the question of whether the State troopers acted with hasty brutality.

One wire service reporter related that the Negroes were not given the specified 2 minutes to disperse. A Birmingham reporter, eyewitness to the confrontation, flatly contradicts that. He wrote:

"I stood near the bridge with other newsmen, all in a protecting ring of State troopers. Trooper Maj. John Cloud shouted through the bullhorn:

" 'Turn around and go back to your church. You will not be allowed to march any further.'

"The Negroes did not stop.

"Cloud told the marchers they were an unlawful assembly. He added if they dispersed they would be allowed to return freely to town. 'You've got 2 minutes,' Cloud barked through his bullhorn.

"The 2 minutes crept past painfully and slowly. Then on Cloud's order, the troopers converged on the marchers."

The action against the lawless demonstrators was indeed forceful and presented a painful scene. It may have been excessive, and there was a better way to compel the obedience that was due. Such police actions, whether by club wielding New York police on horseback or State troopers at an Alabama bridge, are spectacular and ugly by nature. And they are viewed with somewhat more objectivity in the North, though there is a "police brutality" chant in every case.

The dovecote "nonviolence" of the demonstrators and its potential were exhibited with clarity when they later assailed officers with rocks, bottles, and garbage can lids.

It must be said, however, that the sheriff's cowboy posse should be corraled for the duration. These matters should be left entirely in the hands of regular, disciplined officers.

That the use of Highway 80 is properly subject to Government regulation was next seen when U.S. Judge Frank Johnson told Dr. King, as had Wallace before him, that he must not march Tuesday.

The thing long since ceased to be a matter of Negroes registering to vote. Indeed, they were marching away from, not to, the registration headquarters.

And a Federal judge had been sitting at the elbows of the Dallas registrars with minute directions on the rate and mode of registration.

King, with his booby prize of prelates waddling behind his lawless banner, announced that he would defy the Federal Government Tuesday as he had defined the Alabama government on Sunday.

King has said repeatedly that he is a lawless man, a figure above the law, a figure privileged to pick and choose which laws he will obey.

President Johnson, with his sonorous truckling to national emotions, had been talking of new legislation to soothe the Nobel swami and making a cracker barrel bromide about a man's right to walk from Selma to Montgomery.

All of a sudden the President found that King was as contemptuous of the Federal Government as of the Alabama government. And he was asking that King not march.

At this moment a defiant group of demonstrators was being ripped out of the office of the Attorney General in Washington. The chief of the NAACP, Roy Wilkins, was threatening the violence of an underground.

As it fell to at the bridge, the way was cleared for King to walk on into contempt of a Federal restraining order. He stopped short. But it had taken two governments—State and Federal—to restrain his defiance of law.

The Selma march issue is now in the bosom of the Federal court. It is an issue between King and the U.S. Government.

CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, all of us on both sides of the House are aware of the controversy stemming from the announced closing of 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals and 4 domiciliary homes.

Testimony before the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives has failed to prove that the closing will result in either economy or improved service to veterans.

Members of Congress were not consulted—were not even informed of the decision until 1 hour before it was made public. The managers of the hospitals were not consulted as to the wisdom of the order. The veterans' organizations were not consulted nor informed in advance. Somebody wanted to be sure the deed was done without benefit of advice or protests from knowledgeable pro-veteran sources.

We are now seeing the old story coming true again. When this Nation faces an emergency, nothing is too good for those who are called upon to make great sacrifices.

When the emergency is over, we forget the promises—and the further we get away from war, the more we forget.

Some of us were concerned that there was not a word in the state of the Union speech as to what the Great Society would do for veterans.

Now we know the reason for this. The administration did not intend to do anything for the veterans, but intended all along to take away some of the benefits they now have.

It is said that elimination of some 3,500 domiciliary beds will be offset in part by expanded social security coverage. But what the experts fail to consider is that less than 25 percent of the veterans in the domiciliary homes are eligible for social security income.

These supervised homes, first authorized by the Federal Government in 1865, provide the bare necessities for life and incidental medical care for veterans disabled by age and illness. With a few exceptions, they have no family ties, no skills, no hope of surviving alone. Their average income is $66 a month; their average age is 68.

We are all for medical attention and aid for the aged—the elderly, and the poor. However, I do not believe that these and the many other administration-proposed welfare programs should be supported at the expense of our disabled veterans.

It also seems asinine for the President to close the VA hospitals for a savings of approximately $15 million—a sum disputed by the Veterans' Administration—and at the same time give away billions of dollars to foreign countries that most of us had never heard of prior to the granting of the aid.

Government has begun to rely more and more upon computers for assistance in administration of its affairs. But I wish to say that all the computers in the world cannot show the heartaches and the trouble that will be placed upon the veterans of this country should this shameless proposal be adopted.

I agree with some of my colleagues who think that this action is probably a forerunner to the closing of other VA facilities in the near future.

There are those who say that there is nothing that we as Congressmen can do about this matter. I say that this is not the case at all—we can do something about this situation, and if we do not, it is time we packed our bags and headed for home. This is still the legislative branch of our Government, and it is time that we accepted our responsibility.

The time to act is now—not tomorrow—because the deadline for closing these facilities is May 1.

Under the present plan of the Veterans' Administration many of our old veterans in their twilight years would become charity cases upon some local governing body. He should not, and I will tell you why he should not. Because Congress contracted to do otherwise. Congress contracted to take care of the disabled veterans and the nonservice disabled veteran under certain conditions.

Only Congress declares war; and when Congress does declare war the veterans become the special charge of the Congress. It has been said that only Congress can make a veteran and only Congress can break a veteran.

I am today introducing a bill which I think can and will be helpful in preventing the closing of these facilities that are so sorely needed by the sick and disabled veteran.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE DOES NOT MEAN A ONE-PARTY SYSTEM

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, only a minute or two ago the Member from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] made what I consider to be an incredible and callous speech. Mr. MARTIN implies that if a Member of this body issues a warning throughout the land, that any violation of that warning serves notices on the Nation that people who wish to demonstrate peacefully or express sympathy with the cause of the Negro, that they do so at the risk of their lives. He "regrets" the death of the Reverend Reeb, but implies that it is not surprising since Reverend Reeb was warned by him. This is absurd.

The gentleman completely ignored the fact that, in January in his state of the Union message, President Johnson clearly indicated that this body would be presented with a voting rights bill. Mr. MARTIN suggests that the President clearly indicated that this body would be presented with a voting rights bill. Mr. MARTIN suggests that the President is going to recommend to the Nation that incompetents or illiterates should be given the right to vote. The President will address a joint session at 9 o'clock tonight at which time the gentleman will be shown the truth.

Mr. MARTIN's basic premise is obvious. He not only opposes giving the Negro the right to vote but fears that if they do vote he will be defeated.

The fact of the matter is that the American people have an absolute right to assemble peaceably and to demonstrate anywhere in this Union, whether it be in the North, the South, in Selma, or anywhere else. The gentleman is absolutely incorrect in his assertion that granting all of the people the right to vote means a one-party future. His premise is absurd on its face. If Mr. MARTIN's speech indicates a fear on his part that he will be defeated if Alabama's Negroes are given the right to vote then I can only say, "let them register and vote"—all but Mr. MARTIN may be pleased by the results.

PROTESTING REDUCTION OF SOIL CONSERVATION FUNDS

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include relevant extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous remarks, I include in the RECORD House Joint Memorial No. 8, Idaho State Legislature, 38th session.

Mr. Speaker, Idaho House Joint Memorial No. 8 is in protest to the recent decision of the Bureau of the Budget to reduce funds allocated to the Soil Conservation Service by $20 million and to authorize a revolving fund through which soil conservation districts, farmers, ranchers, and other cooperators would pay the Federal Government a part of the cost of technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service. It asks that the decision of the Bureau of the Budget not be implemented by the Congress. It also asks that funds appropriated to the Soil Conservation Service be increased, rather than decreased.

I support the position of the Idaho State Legislature and shall oppose any legislation designed to curtail the technical assistance program of the Soil Conservation Service and which would reduce the funds available to it. I commend this memorial to my colleagues, particularly to those having soil conservation districts within their congressional districts. For, just as the proposal of the Bureau of the Budget would be detrimental in the extreme to my rural constituents, so it would be to the rural constituents of all of my colleagues in the Congress.

The memorial follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 38th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget has proposed that the Soil Conservation Service appropriation for assisting locally organized and locally managed soil conservation districts be reduced by $20 million and that soil conservation districts and cooperating farmers, ranchers and other landowners pay the Federal Government up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished in the design, layout, and installation of planned soil and water conservation practices on their lands; and

Whereas the Federal Government has, for some 30 years, provided technical assistance to owners and operators of privately owned lands believing that it is in the total public interest, and one of the most urgent national needs to protect and improve the soil and water resources of this Nation; and

Whereas over 95 percent of Idaho privately owned land is included in its 54 soil conservation districts and nearly a third of Idaho's farmers and ranchers are annually using the technical assistance in the design, layout, and installation of planned soil and water conservation measures on their lands; and

Whereas the supervisors of Idaho's 54 soil conservation districts have continuously requested additional technical assistance to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers to accelerate the application of conservation practices; and

Whereas recent statewide storms and floods of disastrous proportions have resulted in heavy erosion and loss of valuable top soil; heavy sediment deposits in our reservoirs, lakes, streams, and rivers; and spread over valuable bottom lands and other flood damages to both public and private property together with destruction or severe damage to thousands of water control and use structures indicate a need for more rather than reduced efforts in the application of soil and water conservation practices; and

Whereas such assessments of payments to the Federal Government will discourage and seriously curtail the application of soil and water conservation measures on lands so vital to the strength and welfare of the State of Idaho and the Nation and fall harvest on family farms and small operators; and

Whereas this proposed additional burden added to the costs of farmers and ranchers already in a depressed economical condition, would limit the ability of these people to participate in the existing agricultural conservation program and similar programs which have in the past contributed substantially to the conservation development, and wise use of these soil and water resources: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to continue the long established policy of providing technical assistance to soil conservation districts and their cooperating landowners and operators without requiring that they pay the Federal Government any portion of cost of such technical assistance; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress provide the increases in technical assistance requested by the soil conservation districts in Idaho and throughout the Nation to meet the needs of landowners and operators to accelerate the planning and application of conservation measures on their privately owned lands; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

REGAIN OUR COMMONSENSE

Mr. CALLAWAY. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, a man is dead—a sincere man, an honest man, a man who should this moment be alive. No words of ours, Mr. Speaker, can undo what has been done. No words can bring him back. Yet all of us feel compelled to speak. For we must deplore, we must condemn the violent and unnecessary death of Rev. James Reeb. It is the sort of crime so unthinkable to most Americans, that our first reaction would be to say, "No, that couldn't happen here." Yet we know that it did happen, and we abhor it. Not only do we abhor it, but we are one in demanding that those responsible for this unthinkable act be brought to justice.

Yet beyond deploring the case, beyond demanding justice, it would seem that

some are blaming all Alabama white citizens for the crime. This viewpoint overlooks an important point. I rise now to make that point.

On the same day that Rev. James Reeb was beaten in Selma by four Alabama white men, a violent crime took place in my district. Bank president, Tom Woodruff was kidnaped, beaten, and shot in Unadilla, Ga., by two Negro schoolteachers.

Like James Reeb, this man was a sincere, innocent citizen. Like James Reeb he was beaten on Tuesday, March 9, and like James Reeb, he died last Thursday night.

This, Mr. Speaker, is my point. If we blame all Alabama white citizens for the death of Reverend Reeb, shall we then blame all Negroes in Georgia for the other hideous crime? Or shall we, according to our American way of justice, see that the guilty are punished without harming the innocent?

Let us all, Mr. Speaker, regain our commonsense and not make this mistake.

POSSIBILITIES FOR REPEAL OF 10-PERCENT AUTOMOBILE EXCISE TAX

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the possibilities for repeal of the 10-percent automobile tax were explored by Associated Press Reporter Sterling F. Green, in the Washington Post of Saturday, March 13, 1965. In the article he notes that the industry is the bellwether of the economy and sets forth the position of those supporting repeal, pointing out that any cut would come at a time when there may be a letdown in the 4-year-old business boom. In making reference to the bill sponsored by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], Mr. Green amplifies the need for a retroactive clause protecting those who purchase new automobiles before the effective date of any tax repeal.

As one who has urged the repeal of this tax for many years, I am pleased to note this new and broadening interest in excise tax revision. I am personally convinced that the entire economy would benefit from the stimulus of an auto excise tax repeal which, according to industry witnesses, would be directly passed on to consumers in the form of lower prices—an average saving of $225 to each new car buyer. With unanimous consent, I wish to include this article in the RECORD in order that my colleagues may note this expression of interest in efforts to repeal this unfair tax on automobiles:

INDUSTRY SEEKS REPEAL OF 10-PERCENT AUTO EXCISE TAX

(By Sterling F. Green)

Outright repeal of the 10-percent excise tax on new cars, as part of the proposed July 1 cut in excise levies, will be sought in a concentrated drive by the automobile industry.

If Congress approves, buyers of new cars would save an average of $225 each, at a total cost in revenues to the Treasury of $1.8 billion.

A major element of the industrywide effort, it was learned, will be to see that the bill includes a retroactive clause, so that persons buying cars while the tax bill is pending would get the benefit of the saving.

This is intended to reassure prospective purchasers that they need not delay buying until the tax bill becomes law. The amount of the tax would be refunded.

Such a safeguard against a temporary buyers' strike is included in a bill introduced last month by Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of Michigan, and others. Industry sources indicated that legislation along the line of Mrs. GRIFFITHS' measure is their goal.

Automotive leaders are known to be considering the organization of an industrywide committee with headquarters in Washington to press their campaign. Some announcement is expected within a week or two.

The revenue loss from autos alone, if the tax is repealed, would slightly exceed the entire $1.75 billion total of excise tax reduction proposed by President Johnson.

However, many Congress Members have talked in terms of an overall cut of $2.5 billion or more, including the repeal of what some call consumer nuisance taxes—those on cosmetics, furs, jewelry, luggage and leather goods which together generate about $550 million in excise revenues annually.

There is widespread belief among Congress Members that President Johnson would sign the excise measure even if the revenue loss is somewhat higher than he has proposed.

Auto men, who have canvassed the outlook plans at meetings in Washington, Detroit, and elsewhere, are said to be convinced that the entire economy would benefit from the stimulus of an auto excise repeal, for two reasons:

First, the industry is the undisputed bellwether of the economy, providing employment directly or indirectly for about one out of every six Americans.

Second, the cut would come at a time when many economists suspect there may be a letdown in the 4-year-old business boom—a slowdown caused by a let-up in industry's heavy inventory buying of steel, combined with the slackening of the stimulus provided by last year's $11.6 billion income tax reduction.

The auto excise tax is collected from the manufacturers and is included in the price charged for new cars. Industry witnesses gave strong pledges to the House Ways and Means Committee, in its excise hearings last summer, that any cut in the tax would be passed along to consumers in the form of lower prices.

REMARKS BY GOVERNOR DAN MOORE AT SEVEN-COUNTY DEMOCRATIC PARTY RALLY

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an address by the Governor of North Carolina.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor and pleasure to attend a large rally of enthusiastic Democrats of eastern North Carolina at Elizabeth City, N.C., on Saturday evening, March 13, 1965. The principal address was delivered by the Honorable Dan K. Moore, who was elected by an overwhelming majority in my State in the November election of last year. Governor Moore is an able, brilliant, competent, and progressive leader, and I am confident that the great State of North Carolina is in good hands and its progress will continue in every phase of life with fairness and justice to all people.

Under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks the address delivered by Governor Moore, in whose honor this rally was held:

REMARKS BY GOV. DAN MOORE

It is wonderful to be here tonight to meet again with so many old friends and to enjoy the fellowship, enthusiasm, and dedication of good North Carolina Democrats.

It is especially good to be here with Congressman BONNER. He is one of the outstanding members of North Carolina's congressional delegation in Washington. I have a great admiration for the Congressman and for his interest in and work for North Carolina, and especially for eastern North Carolina. He is a dedicated public servant and one excellent reason why the Democratic Party is the party of the people in North Carolina.

Also, it is especially good to be here with so many of the legislators who I am now working with in Raleigh. I am sorry that Representative Baker could not be present tonight. He is attending a conference at Georgia Southern College where plans are being made for summer seminars on education against communism in North Carolina and Georgia.

I certainly want to commend the people of this area of North Carolina for sending such outstanding legislators to Raleigh. They are doing an excellent job for you and they are helping me considerably with the program I have proposed. I don't know what I would do without them. After working with them in Raleigh these last two months, I can understand why the Democratic Party is so strong in this area.

This is our first rally since the fall elections. Looking back on the results of that election, I would say we have ample cause for a celebration. We won a great victory—a great victory for the Democratic Party and a great victory for the cause of good government.

We won that victory because we got out and worked. We won because the principles of the Democratic Party are principles that people can associate themselves with. We won because the Democratic Party has a record of good government and progress to look back on, and because we offered a program of good government and progress for the future. We won that victory because the Democratic Party is the party of the people. And, we have every reason to be proud of that victory.

But pride in victory, especially in North Carolina politics, must always be accompanied by humility and by an understanding of the responsibility for leadership that victory brings. North Carolina Democrats do understand this responsibility. The people of North Carolina know this and that is why they have bestowed the privilege of leadership on the Democratic Party for so many years. That is why the great majority of our people are Democrats themselves.

So even as we celebrate the recent victory, we look to the responsibility that is ours for the days ahead. Every Democrat here tonight and every Democrat throughout North Carolina shares in that responsibility. Now is the time for measuring up to the confidence that has been placed in us by

the people. Now is the time for assuring that the privilege of leadership in North Carolina remains in Democratic hands in the years to come.

The time for talk has ended. The time for action has begun. Now is the time to build the record, to fulfill the promises made, to justify the confidence that has been placed in us.

This is the job before us now. I ask each of you here to accept that responsibility. I ask each of you to join with me and the Democratic Party leadership of this State in making this year and the years to come the most progressive in North Carolina history. Do this and our party will emerge stronger than ever before. Even more important, the cause of good government will be strengthened.

This latter point is one we must always keep in mind. We are not Democrats just because we like politics, or because our fathers and grandfathers were Democrats. We are Democrats because we believe in the principles on which our party is founded. We do not campaign just to win. We campaign because we believe in something. In one sense, that something may be different with every one of us, but there are basic beliefs that hold us together as Democrats. We believe in government that is compassionate and understanding. We believe in government that glories in the past, but looks always, and with confidence, to the future.

We do not convince a person that he or she should be an active Democrat by telling him that it is more fun that being a Republican. This is true, of course, but it isn't the kind of reasoning that appeals to North Carolinians. Our people are not quick to form political loyalties. And, even when formed, such loyalties are not as binding as in the past. People are no longer Democrats in North Carolina because its the thing to do. They want good reasons. They demand good reasons. It is our job to see that those good reasons are provided.

We meet this responsibility in two ways. First, we study our party's history. We arm ourselves with the abundant truth that Democrats have given this State and this Nation the kind of leadership that has meant progress. Our record of accomplishment cannot be matched.

Here in North Carolina we have amassed a record of good, sound, progressive government that is envied across the Nation. Our fiscal stability is unquestioned. Our industrial growth has been outstanding. In agriculture we have set the pace for the South and moved to what I honestly believe to be the beginning of an exciting era of farming prosperity.

We have met difficult social challenges through the years in our own way—with reason and understanding and good will.

We have accomplished these things through Democratic leadership—the kind of leadership that is positive and, at the same time, very responsive to the will of the people—the kind of leadership that knows and respects the North Carolina tradition of independent thought and action.

When past performance in the public interest is the criterion, the Democratic Party welcomes comparison.

Know these things. Know these achievements. These are things that appeal to the person who wants a reason for accepting a political philosophy. People want to be a part of what is good for their families, their friends and neighbors, their State and Nation. If we, as Democrats, do the job we must do in the days ahead, these people will find the answers they want in the Democratic Party.

The second way we can build our party is through performance. We can continue building on the sound foundation of Democratic Party performance that exists today. We know that the weeks and months and years ahead are going to be exciting for North Carolina and its people. We know the future can yield the more abundant life we have worked so diligently for in the past. But it is our responsibility—the Democratic Party's responsibility—to make it happen.

The opportunities are there—in education, in industrial development, in agriculture, in cultural development, and in all other areas affecting the well-being of our people. Never before in the history of this State has the Democratic Party been in a more responsible position, because never before in our history have the opportunities been so obvious or so abundant.

The job cannot be done in Raleigh. All we can do there is provide the leadership and the tools with which to do the job. Progress in seizing and taking advantage of our opportunities will be registered at the local level. The record of the Democratic Party for the next 4 years will be written, not in Raleigh, but in the cities and towns and rural communities across the State. It will be written by local Democrats who make the next 4 years progressive years for North Carolina.

Toward this end I have recommended a program that I feel will insure this progress. Our Democratic general assembly is working diligently to implement this program. We are making decisions today that will affect North Carolinians for generations to come. We are confident we are making the right decision. We believe we are meeting our responsibility to the offices we hold, to all the people of North Carolina and to the Democratic Party.

There are many areas in which your help is necessary. A good example is highway safety. Last year 1,575 human beings died on North Carolina highways. Approximately 50,000 were injured in more than 80,000 accidents. The economic loss was in excess of $283 million. We must do something now to curb this death and destruction on our highways.

I am giving this problem a great deal of study at the present time and will have a special message on highway safety for the general assembly shortly. But, of course, we cannot do this job in Raleigh alone. It must be done by all of our citizens. I appeal to you for your help. Drive safely and encourage others to do so. Work for traffic safety in your communities. We must make progress in this area.

There are many other areas where we need your help: In education, both in the public schools and the colleges; in the further industrial development of our State; in improving our agricultural economy; and in the many other areas so vital to the attainment of the full potential of our State. And, one area in which we now need your help is in building more and better highways for all of North Carolina.

I have proposed a $300 million road bond issue to give us funds necessary to improve many of our existing roads and to build needed new ones. The general assembly has approved legislation authorizing issuance of these bonds. They will be submitted to the people some time later this year for their approval.

North Carolina needs this $300 million bond issue. You all know of the need for road improvements in this area and throughout North Carolina. This bond issue would allow us to go a long way toward providing the highway system which we must have. I hope you will support this highway bond issue and actively work for its passage. All North Carolina needs it.

May I conclude by saying that we are already engaged in the next campaign. Democrats who run for office 2 years from now and 4 years from now will, in many instances, win or lose on a basis of what we accomplish in the days ahead. I am dedicated to providing the kind of leadership that will enable them to win. It is a big challenge, but one that the Democrats of North Carolina are fully capable of meeting.

We are going to win in 1966 and 1968, not because it is traditional for Democrats to win in North Carolina, but because Democratic Party leadership will show once again that it represents progress for this State and its people.

Thank you.

SALUTE TO THE ORDER OF DEMOLAY ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 46TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus the attention of my colleagues on one of the outstanding organizations in our Nation for young men—the Order of DeMolay. The Governor of my State has issued a proclamation calling public attention to this group. It is indeed appropriate that we pause for a moment to congratulate these young men on their outstanding endeavors.

The idea of the DeMolay was conceived by a Scottish Rite Mason who was the director of relief for the Kansas City Scottish Rite bodies. In March 1919 Mr. Frank S. Land, together with nine boys, founded the Order of DeMolay for young men between the ages of 14 and 21. From that moment on Masonry in general across the land noted that DeMolay was an order dedicated to the morality and philosophy peculiar to Masonry itself.

Today more than 1 million youth have become its members during 46 years of existence. It is of more than passing interest to note that DeMolay has become international in scope.

Assistance in matters of community welfare is a foundation stone of its activities. One of the highest awards given by DeMolay is the Legion of Honor. It is conferred upon men who were members of DeMolay in their boyhood and youth and who have since rendered valuable service to humanity.

Masonry sponsors DeMolay because it believes it is an institution that does great service for youth in inculcating lofty principles among its members—principles of belief in God, integrity, sportsmanship, patriotism, reverence for sacred things, uprightness, and cleanliness of body and mind, love of parents and home, thrift, devotion to duty, and balancing work and play.

As we congratulate the Order of DeMolay, we note that DeMolay work puts a boy on a basis of equality with his fellow man and teaches him to work as we strive to do here, in harmony with others, and not as an individual. It inspires a boy to live better and to strive for things once thought impossible to accomplish.

The affirmative program of citizenship which is promoted by the DeMolay is certainly exemplary. We know that the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency depend on an active interest by citizens. And it is through the encouragement and growth of such youth groups that much can be done to show our concern for youth training.

We know that the vast majority of criminals "go wrong" between the ages of 15 and 19 and that a great percentage of the crimes committed in this country is, unfortunately, the work of young men.

It is difficult to visualize this situation existing if those young men had knelt at the altar of a chapter of the Order of DeMolay and pledged themselves to the teachings of love of parents, patriotism, reverence, comradeship, cleanliness, courtesy, fidelity, and toleration.

Several years ago the Honorable William R. McKay, a past grand master of the Grand Council of the Order of DeMolay and one of the judges of the criminal division of the supreme court of Los Angeles, Calif., said, in a talk before a group of DeMolays and Masons, that in his long years of service on the criminal bench he had yet to have the first DeMolay boy brought before him—a wonderful tribute to the teachings of the order, indeed.

DeMolay takes boys in the receptive stages of their lives, which will determine their future characters when they feel they are becoming men and are so likely to go "wrong." It gives them the factor in determining their futures and influencing them toward right thinking and right living.

"As the twig is bent so is the tree inclined" was never more important to the development of mankind than at the present time. With a world of turmoil, strife, and unrest, with stumbling blocks at every turn for youth to fall over, the destiny of the Nation, resting heavily on the shoulders of its young manhood, depends more than ever upon the forces that "bend the twig." By inculcating good morals and clean, upright, and honorable living into the youth of America in its most flexible stage, DeMolay renders a signal service. It is service upon which no value can be computed, and which itself is a satisfactory guarantee of good citizenship and splendid manhood.

It is indeed a privilege to extend to the Order of DeMolay hearty congratulations and best wishes and to share with you this proclamation which I am very glad to include with these remarks, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greetings:

Whereas the Arkansas State Council, Order of DeMolay is observing the 46th anniversary of the international youth movement, the order of DeMolay, on March 18, 1965; and

Whereas, DeMolay is a character-building organization dedicated to the purposes of helping young men 14 to 21 years of age to become better sons, better citizens, and better leaders; and

Whereas the youth group is well known for its charitable projects, community services, and healthy social activities, and for providing our young men with the desire for realizing greater goals and achievements; and

Whereas recognition should be given to the many contributions made by DeMolay toward this guiding influence in the molding of today's young men for a better world of peace and brotherhood tomorrow:

Now, therefore, I, Orval E. Faubus, Governor of the State of Arkansas, do hereby proclaim the week of March 14 to 21, 1965, as Arkansas DeMolay Week in honor of DeMolay's meritorious service toward the communities, State, and Nation, and by the authority vested in me, do urge all citizens of Arkansas to pay tribute.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Arkansas to be affixed. Done in office in the city of Little Rock, on this 18th day of March 1965.

REPORT OF 19TH DISTRICT ADVISORY BOARD ON MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, In view of the complexity of the many proposals being presented to provide medical care for the aged, and the vast amount of confusion the recent years of debate and hearings have produced on this matter, I felt it necessary, as a new Congressman, to seek advise and background on this legislation from informed citizens of my district, the 19th of Pennsylvania, covering Adams, Cumberland, and York Counties.

Accordingly I appointed a committee comprised of physicians, labor leaders, hospital administrators, insurance men, social agencies, and numerous other interests to study the various approaches to the issue involved. These citizens contributed many hours in deliberation and preparation of a detailed set of recommendations.

I have found their work of great value in defining the problems at hand, and I think their findings may also be of value to the committee and other interested Congressmen. I have asked permission, therefore, that the report of this committee be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of today's proceedings.

I would further like publicly to acknowledge and thank those citizens of the 19th Congressional District, whose names are signed to this report, for the contribution that they have made regarding this most important legislation.

The report is as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON ELDERCARE APPROVAL

OUTLINE OF QUESTIONS

Need for any action

1. Do you favor any changes in or additions to existing Federal laws providing health care benefits for the aged? Yes, 3; no, 1.

Means test for beneficiaries

2. Do you favor Federal laws providing health care benefits only to those aged persons who financially are unable to take care of their own health care needs? Yes, 4.

Philosophy of financing

3. What means of financing health care benefits for the aged under Federal laws do you favor?

(a) General revenue (taxes): Yes, 2.

(b) Social security (wage tax): Yes, 2.

4. What degree of use of voluntary private health insurance as the means of providing health care benefits for the aged under Federal law do you favor? Please answer only one of the following: We find question vague. None, 0; some, yes, 1; 100 percent, yes, 3.

5. Which of the following health care benefits for the aged do you favor being provided for by Federal law? Please answer each one "Yes" or "No."

(a) Hospital services:

(1) Room and board: Yes, 4.

(2) Private duty nursing: No, 4.

(3) Drugs: Yes, 4.

(4) Supplies and appliances: Yes, 4, within reason.

(b) Posthospital extended care (convalescent and rehabilitative care):

(1) Room and board: Yes, 4.

(2) Drugs: Yes, 4.

(3) Supplies and appliances: Yes, 4.

(c) Physicians' services:

(1) In hospital: Yes, 4.

(2) In posthospital extended care: Yes, 4.

(3) House calls and visits to doctor's office: Yes, 4.

(4) Outpatient diagnosis at hospital: Yes, 4.

(4) Home health care services (i.e., visiting nurses and physiotherapy): Yes, 4.

(e) Outpatient diagnostic services: Yes, 4.

Duration of benefits

6. Do you favor any of the following limitations on health care for the aged benefits provided under Federal law? Please answer each one "yes" or "no".

A maximum number of days of benefits per illness: Yes, 4.

A maximum number of days of benefits within a certain period of time: Yes, 4.

Unlimited days of benefits: No, 4.

Any other type of maximum: Reserve.

(Please explain in your report.)

Role of State and Federal Government

7. In the administration of any Federal law providing health care benefits to the aged, do you favor maximum responsibility and authority being delegated to the State governments? Yes, 4.

8. Do you favor the establishment (by State and/or Federal Government) of any minimum standards to be met in order for any institution to participate under any program of health care benefits to the aged? Yes, 4.

9. If you favor doctor bills benefits being provided for, do you favor the establishment (by State and/or Federal Government) of any minimum standards to be met in order for any doctor to participate under any program of health care benefits to the aged? Yes, 4.

REPORT OF THE "ELDERCARE" SUBCOMMITTEE OF CONGRESSMAN N. NEIMAN CRALEY'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

The group endorsing eldercare on the Hurlong-Curtis bill, H.R. 3727 met in Dean Morris L. Shafer's office, Dickinson School of Law, Carlisle, Pa., on Sunday, February 21, 1965, at 5 p.m., eastern standard time.

Attending the meeting were Dr. Roy W. Gifford, acting chairman, Dean Morris L. Shafer, and James R. Doran. Dr. William Baldwin was unable to attend due to illness, but he stated by telephone that he would support the majority opinion and was so voted. Dr. David Thompson, Jr., of Carlisle, Pa., was also absent from the meeting.

The questionnaire was first submitted, each question answered, and the results tabulated. The only significant split was on financing care, with two in favor of using general funds and two in favor of using social security funds (the two in favor of using social security funds are against the medicare bill as a whole). The group voted solidly along the lines of the Hurlong-Curtis bill.

In the general discussion, it was voiced that the proposals are being rushed unnecessarily, and it was thought wise to advise a slower, more considerate discussion, and that possibly by so doing the stronger points of all bills might be incorporated into better legislation.

Generally, it was agreed that in favor of Hurlong-Curtis, the following points be noted:

1. Aid only to those over 65 needing it.
2. Local control.
3. Matching funds and let each State decide what and how much it wishes to implement.
4. Lower costs.
5. Better benefits.
6. No new agency necessary to implement.
7. Maintain our voluntary agencies and in fact, strengthen them.
8. Provide funds only—not services.
9. May provide complete medical and hospital care, both in and out of hospital and nursing home.

Against the King-Anderson bill, H.R. 1, the following points:

1. Provides very limited care.
2. Applicable to all over 65—even those able to provide for themselves.
3. Is centralized bureaucratic control.
4. Will overload the social security funds—tax will be 9 percent by 1970 with no further additions.
5. Cost estimate not realistic—entirely too low.
6. Taxes the young wage earner too long before eligible for benefits.
7. If H.R. 1 enacted it will most likely be amended again and again until finally a complete socialized control of medicine results.

There are other pros and cons, but in the interest of brevity, this in essence outlines our position.

Dean Morris L. Shafer,
William Baldwin, Jr., D.O.,
James R. Doran,
David Thompson, Jr., M.D.,
Members of Subcommittee on Eldercare Approval.
Roy W. Gifford, M.D.,
Acting Chairman.

February 24, 1965.

Subcommittee Report on Medicare Approval

OUTLINE OF QUESTIONS

Need for any action

1. Do you favor any changes in or additions to existing Federal laws providing health care benefits for the aged? Yes.

Means test for beneficiaries

2. Do you favor Federal laws providing health care benefits only to those aged persons who financially are unable to take care of their own health care needs? No.

Philosophy of financing

3. What means of financing health care benefits for the aged under Federal laws do you favor?

(a) General revenue (taxes): Yes.
(b) Social security (wage tax): Yes.

4. What degree of use of voluntary private health insurance as the means of providing health care benefits for the aged under Federal law do you favor? Please answer only one of the following: None—; some for supplementation, yes; 100 percent—.

5. Which of the following health care benefits for the aged do you favor being provided for by Federal law? Please answer each one "Yes" or "No."

(a) Hospital services:
(1) Room and board: Yes.
(2) Private duty nursing: No.
(3) Drugs: Yes.
(4) Supplies and appliances: Yes.
(b) Post hospital extended care (convalescent and rehabilitative care):
(1) Room and board: Yes.
(2) Drugs: Yes.
(3) Supplies and appliances: Yes.
(c) Physician's services:
(1) In hospital: No.
(2) In posthospital extended care: No.
(3) House calls and visits to doctor's office: No.
(4) Outpatient diagnosis at hospital: No.
(d) Home health care services (i.e., visiting nurses and physiotherapy but not including doctor bills): Yes.
(e) Outpatient diagnostic services (but not including doctor bills): Yes.

Duration of benefits

6. Do you favor any of the following limitations on health care for the aged benefits provided under Federal law? Please answer each one "yes" or "no."

A maximum number of days of benefits per illness: Yes.

A maximum number of days of benefits within a certain period of time: Yes.

Unlimited days of benefits: No.

Any other type of maximum: No.

(Please explain in your report.)

Role of State and Federal Government

7. In the administration of any Federal law providing health care benefits to the aged, do you favor maximum responsibility and authority being delegated to the State government? No.[1]

8. Do you favor the establishment (by State and/or Federal Government) of any minimum standards to be met in order for any institution to participate under any program of health care benefits to the aged? Yes.

9. If you favor doctor bills benefits being provided for, do you favor the establishment (by State and/or Federal Government) of any minimum standards to be met in order for any doctor to participate under any program of health care benefits to the aged? Not applicable.

Report of the "Medicare" Subcommittee of Congressman N. Neiman Craley's Advisory Committee on Federal Health Care for the Aged

After many years of heated controversy concerning the need of providing medical care for the aged, it is now almost unanimously realized that our elder citizens do lack means to obtain the necessary health care that medical science can provide. Advancing medical progress has endowed many elderly couples with more life than they can afford, and medical care for the aged should be recognized as a natural obligation, such as conquest of space or the war on poverty.

At the AMA's 1917 and 1919 meetings, its committee on social insurance reported: "Blind opposition, indignant repudiation, bitter denunciations of these laws (model legislation for compulsory health insurance) is worse than useless and leaves the profession in a position of helplessness if the rising tide of social development sweeps over them. It is therefore of the utmost importance that physicians, both as individuals and organizations, abandon the attitude of unreasoning opposition and make an honest effort to study the problems involved and to arrive at conclusions which can be justified." At long last, the AMA has come to realize this need and has sponsored a bill—Eldercare Act of 1965—as its answer to this problem. Now, the impact of AMA's Madison Avenue propaganda has shifted from the case that the elderly do not need financial aid to finance the rising hospital costs of their illnesses, to the question of which method will be better for the country and for the elderly; the AMA-sponsored Eldercare Act or the social security approach exemplified in the Hospital Insurance Act of 1965 (medicare).

The Advisory Council on Social Security, a panel of citizens including two former Eisenhower appointees, calls medicare "the only practical way of making sure that almost everyone will have hospital protection in old age." The key word is "practical." The medicare bill is not perfect, because it was devised by men, but it is workable, a practical approach to the problem. Few laws written by men offer much more.

The medicare bill has been subject to more distortion than almost any other bill in the last decade.

It certainly is not socialized medicine, whatever this vague, scare term may be. We all believe that medicine should be practiced under a completely free system that is financed on a social basis. Doctors should not work for the Government and spreading the costs is not socialism. Free choice by the patient is guaranteed. Despite dire prophecies by the AMA, the Hill-Burton bill, the Kerr-Mills bill, grant-in-aid programs, aid to medical education, and many other similar measures have not regimented the practice of medicine by Government officials.

Private health insurance certainly cannot provide the type of hospital service needed. Private insurance companies take a 10- to 47-percent bite out of every premium dollar, while the social security program costs only about 2½ percent for overhead. It is very difficult for a person over 65 to obtain adequate private coverage, and the cost is prohibitive to the majority of our citizens. The financial difficulties of the present Blue Cross programs are largely due to the coverage of the elderly, who require more hospitalization days than the younger aged groups.

The propaganda against the medicare type of bill repeats over and over again that the financially competent in this age group should not be given a free ride. According to the 1963 national survey of the aging, of married couples with at least one member 65 or over, 5 percent have combined incomes of $10,000 or more. Among nonmarried persons 65 or over, less than one-half of 1 percent had incomes of $10,000 or more. It is better to provide benefits for those few in order to protect the many from the indignity of having to prove to a welfare agency that they are broke and need help.

The public and the medical profession are now being deluged by statements that the social security system approach is fiscally irresponsible and that the King bill is unreasonable and unsound. We have heard these

[1] States should share in administration.

claims applied to social legislation in the past, and the passage of years has shown these prophecies to be unsound, and politically oriented. It is indeed laughable that some economists can still contend that a rich country like the United States can afford to aid people who are starving and need medical attention all over the world, but cannot afford to help in the payment of hospital expenses to the elderly at home.

We, the undersigned members of the "medicare" subcommittee of Congressman N. NEIMAN CRALEY'S Advisory Committee on Federal Health for the Aged, believe that the Hospital Insurance Act of 1965, popularly known as the medicare bill, represents the best approach the Congress can take at this time with respect to Federal health care for the aged.

FINDINGS

First. Having passed their productive years, the incomes of elderly persons tend to be lower than incomes of younger persons. Statistics for 1959, the most recent available, show:

(a) In Pennsylvania, 30 percent of all persons, 26 percent of those 20 and over, and 19 percent of those over 65 had no income in 1959. Of those 65 and over with income, 44 percent had less than $1,000 in 1959 and 69 percent had less than $2,000. (See table 1 attached.)

(b) Table 2, attached, shows similar data for the United States, and Pennsylvania shows up about the same or slightly better than the United States.

(c) Among husband-wife families, 25 percent of those with a head 65 and over had income of less than $2,000 in 1959, as compared with 7 percent of all husband-wife families. The median income for husband-wife families with head over 65 was $3,553 as compared with $5,907 for all husband-wife families (see table 3 attached).

(d) Table 4, attached, indicates that Pennsylvania shows up better than the United States for all classifications except unrelated individuals who fared poorer in Pennsylvania than in the United States.

(e) Table 5, attached, shows data for the 19th Congressional District, each of the 3 constituent counties, and Pennsylvania. The closeness of the figures for the 19th District with those for the State is remarkable. The classifications by age and by type of family are not available for the 19th District. However, in view of the closeness of the general percentage distributions and medians for the 19th District as compared with those for Pennsylvania, it seems appropriate to use the Pennsylvania distributions and medians for the subclassifications as generally applicable to the 19th District also.

Second. Elderly persons afflicted by illness, and need for hospital care is more frequent, than are younger persons. As shown in table 6, attached, based on the national health survey:

(a) The incidence of illness as measured by restricted-activity days per person per year and bed-disability days per person per year drops sharply as family income rises.

The drop in incidence of illness with rising family income is much less marked for persons 65 and over than for persons of all ages. Thus, the restricted-activity rate for persons 65 and over drops from 50.5 for those in families with incomes under $2,000 to 27.7 for those in families with incomes $7,000 and over—a drop of 45 percent. The corresponding drop for all ages is from 29.8 to 13.0, or 56 percent.

The bed-disability rate for persons 65 and over drops from 16.9 for those in families with incomes under $2,000 to 10.2 for those in families with incomes $7,000 and over—a drop of 40 percent. The corresponding drop for all ages is from 10.4 to 4.5, or 56 percent.

(b) Despite the greater prevalence of illness with increasing family incomes, the number of hospital days per person per year shows little variation with changing family income level, considering all ages combined. Among persons 65 and over, the disparity is greater; their average days of hospital care per year is very much lower for those in families with less than $2,000 income and considerably lower for those in families with incomes from $2,000 to $3,999 than for those in families with incomes of $4,000 and over.

(c) It appears very significant to consider the ratio of days of hospital care per person per year to days of bed disability per person per year. It seems clear that the need for hospital care should increase as the days of bed disability increase. Among families with incomes under $2,000, the ratio of hospital days to bed-disability days is 9.6 percent for all ages and only 5.3 percent for persons 65 and over. Among families with incomes $7,000 and over the corresponding ratios are 15.2 percent and 23.5 percent respectively. Of greater significance of all is the very sharp correlation with income level among those 65 and over. The percentage ratio for those 65 and over in families with incomes over $7,000 (23.5 percent) is 4½ times the ratio for those in families with incomes under $2,000 (5.3 percent). Among persons of all ages the $7,000-and-over ratio (15.2 percent) is, in contrast, only 1½ times the under $2,000 ratio (9.6 percent).

(d) No part of their hospital expenses was paid by insurance for 60 percent of the persons in families with less than $2,000 income regardless of age, as contrasted with 19 percent of those in families with $7,000 and over incomes. Among hospitalized persons of all ages, as much as 75 percent or more of the hospital expenses were paid by insurance for only 26.7 percent of those in families with less than $2,000 income and for 61.2 percent of those in families with incomes $7,000 and over. Among those 65 and over the correlation with income is much less marked.

(e) The inadequacy of hospital insurance coverage among the poor is striking. Among families with incomes under $2,000 only 34 percent of persons all ages are covered by hospital insurance. Forty-three percent of those 65 to 74 are covered in this income group; and 33 percent of those 75 and over. In contrast, among persons in families with incomes over $10,000 nearly 90 percent of all ages, 80 percent of those 65 to 74, and nearly 60 percent of those 75 and over are covered.

Third. Present protections against costs of illness for those who have been under health insurance and benefit plans are most generally inadequate for persons over 65. For example, under the group health benefit arrangements now held by many employees, protection either ceases at retirement or benefits are drastically reduced. Meeting the high hospital costs of a critical illness may wipe out resources needed to carry retired workers along in independence for their remaining years, or the lack of these savings may preclude their receiving needed care.

Fourth. One of the major worries of older people is the fear of serious illness and the high cost of health care for such illness. This causes mental distress from fearful anticipation for many more individuals than may actually be caught in painful reduction or exhaustion of their resources to meet health costs. This fear afflicts many middle income as well as lower income people. This risk and worry is accentuated as persons gradually lose their mental ability to look after their own financial affairs; for example, to see that bills are paid to maintain eligibility under voluntary health insurance or health plans they may have had.

CONCLUSIONS

Believing that the evidence cited above clearly demonstrates the need for the Federal Government's taking action to provide hospital insurance for persons over 65, we also believe that the best way to do this is through the social security system as provided for in the Hospital Insurance Act of 1965 because:

First. The medicare plan would enable persons to provide for their old age hospital needs when they are young and when their income is at its peak without requiring them to become "wards of the Government" by declaring that their income is inadequate in their old age to cover their hospital requirements.

Second. Eligibility rights of individuals would be based chiefly on participation in financing the program.

Third. Use of the existing social security system would economize on administrative overhead. It would make the system of financing and eligibility to health benefits readily intelligible to the general public, minimizing dependence on personal judgments in determining eligibility for benefits.

Fourth. The social security approach would provide a uniform, nationwide system which would establish minimum hospital standards for all U.S. citizens and would not vary from State to State, as is now the case under the Kerr-Mills Act.

Fifth. The medicare bill provides the most practicable means of financing the unavoidably high cost of an equitable program of hospital and posthospital care for the elderly. Considering the meager taxable resources and absence of a graduated income tax in many States where the unmet needs for elderly health care are particularly high, the program should be fully financed by use of the Federal taxing power. The proposed payroll tax, to be shared by employees and employers, of less than 1 percent can be absorbed by the general economy without dislocation to existing Federal and State tax structures and rates.

Sixth. The Federal Government should be responsible for overseeing payment for care in order (1) to assure the broad base of benefits intended, (2) to avoid any siphoning off from the hospital insurance trust fund for private gain, and (3) to guard against other misuse of the resources held in trust. Existing organizations and the States should be utilized in administration as they can efficiently contribute.

Seventh. We do not feel that the medicare plan will be "providing the rich with free care" because eventually all in the plan will have paid for the insurance through social security payments. If the well to do desire hospital services of a more lavish nature, they will, of course, be able to afford these, but by contributing to the overall plan through social security they will also be helping to finance hospital care for their less fortunate neighbors.

Eighth. Individuals now or soon to be 65 years of age should not be deprived of health benefits, that would become available as public policy under the medicare plan, because they have not already acquired eligibility through the social security system. The temporary transitional eligibility provided for is needed to make health protection under the new public policy available to these elderly persons, not yet eligible to social security. The cost of financing care for the estimated 2 million elderly individuals now lacking social security eligibility from general Federal revenue will automatically

shrink as the persons thus entitled to health benefits die.

Ninth. We feel that the bill rightly places primary emphasis on protection against the cost of hospital care, the most costly aspect of health care. Inclusion of out-patient diagnostic services, as well as posthospital convalescence, are important to free hospital facilities for those who need inpatient hospital services. This will result in economies and in greater opportunity for a physician to arrange the best type of health services a particular patient needs.

RECOMMENDATION

In short, we believe that a clear need exists for the Federal Government to act to provide hospital insurance for those over 65, and under all of the existing circumstances, we believe that the so-called medicare program, embodied in H.R. 1, "Hospital Insurance Social Security and Public Assistance Amendment of 1965" represents the best approach for the Congress to take in meeting this need.

MILTON H. COHEN, M.D.,
WILLIAM C. SEYLER,
EDWARD B. CLINCH,
GILBERT ZEIGLER,
Members of Subcommittee on Medicare Approval.

ELIZABETH JOHNSON,
Chairman.

FEBRUARY 28, 1965.

TABLE 1.—*Persons 14 and over by sex, age, and 1959 income, Pennsylvania*

[Number in thousands]

1959 income	Persons 14 and over		Persons 20 and over		Persons 65 and over	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Male and female						
Total	8,186	100	7,221	100	1,102	100
No income	2,465	30	1,880	26	205	19
With income	5,721	100	5,341	100	897	100
Less than $1,000	1,311	23	1,051	20	396	44
Less than $2,000	2,115	37	1,794	34	619	69
Less than $3,000	2,840	50	2,491	46	730	81
$3,000 to $5,999	1,980	34	1,955	37	117	13
$6,000 to $9,999	685	12	682	13	31	4
$10,000 and over	215	4	214	4	18	2
Median income	$3,028	------	$3,254	------	$1,233	------
Male						
Total	3,914	100	3,434	100	493	100
No income	410	10	139	4	32	6
With income	3,504	100	3,295	100	461	100
Less than $1,000	418	12	271	8	105	23
Less than $2,000	786	22	607	18	246	53
Less than $3,000	1,140	33	948	29	328	71
$3,000 to $5,999	1,519	43	1,505	46	92	20
$6,000 to $9,999	641	18	639	19	26	6
$10,000 and over	204	6	203	6	15	3
Median income	$4,277	------	$4,451	------	$1,886	------
Female						
Total	4,272	100	3,787	100	609	100
No income	2,055	48	1,741	46	173	28
With income	2,217	100	2,046	100	436	100
Less than $1,000	893	40	780	38	291	67
Less than $2,000	1,329	60	1,187	58	373	86
Less than $3,000	1,700	77	1,543	75	402	92
$3,000 to $5,999	461	21	450	22	25	6
$6,000 to $9,999	44	2	43	2	5	1
$10,000 and over	11	------	11	1	3	1
Median income	$1,495	------	$1,597	------	$749	------

NOTE.—Detail may not add to total because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. U.S. Census of Population 1960, "Pennsylvania Detailed Characteristics PC (1) 40D," table 134.

TABLE 2.—*Persons 14 and over by sex, age, and 1959 income, United States*

[Number in thousands]

1959 income	Persons 14 and over		Persons 20 and over		Persons 65 and over	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Male and female						
Total	126,276	100	110,241	100	16,207	100
No income	35,822	28	26,862	24	2,658	16
With income	90,454	100	83,379	100	13,546	100
Less than $1,000	23,039	25	18,054	22	6,158	45
Less than $2,000	36,287	40	30,171	36	9,552	71
Less than $3,000	47,155	52	40,592	49	11,062	82
$3,000 to $5,999	27,735	30	27,281	33	1,671	12
$6,000 to $9,999	11,696	13	11,642	14	511	4
$10,000 and over	3,868	4	3,864	4	304	2
Median income	$2,822	------	$3,108	------	$1,181	------
Male						
Total	61,315	100	53,214	100	7,309	100
No income	6,151	10	2,150	4	433	6
With income	55,164	100	51,064	100	6,876	100
Less than $1,000	8,152	15	5,304	10	1,900	28
Less than $2,000	14,751	27	11,212	22	3,909	57
Less than $3,000	20,558	37	16,767	33	4,970	72
$3,000 to $5,999	20,164	36	19,889	39	1,242	18
$6,000 to $9,999	10 791	20	10,759	21	413	6
$10,000 and over	3,652	7	3,649	7	251	4
Median income	$4,111	------	$4,385	------	$1,765	------
Female						
Total	64,961	100	57,027	100	8,898	100
No income	29,671	46	24,712	43	2,225	25
With income	35,290	100	32,315	100	6,673	100
Less than $1,000	14,887	42	12,750	39	4,258	64
Less than $2,000	21,536	61	18,959	59	5,643	85
Less than $3,000	26,597	75	23,825	73	6,092	91
$3,000 to $5,999	7,571	21	7,392	23	429	6
$6,000 to $9,999	905	3	883	3	98	2
$10,000 and over	216	1	215	1	53	1
Median income	$1,415	------	$1,548	------	$783	------

NOTE.—Detail may not add to total because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population 1960, "U.S. Summary Detailed Characteristics PC (1) 1D," table 219.

TABLE 3.—*Families and unrelated individuals by type of family, age of head, and 1959 family income, Pennsylvania*

[Number in thousands]

1959 income	All families		Husband-wife families				Other male head families			
			Total		Head, 65 and over		Total		Head, 65 and over	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	2,903	100	2,512	100	304	100	101	100	34	100
Less than $1,000	110	4	63	3	24	8	6	6	2	6
Less than $2,000	275	9	178	7	77	25	13	13	6	18
Less than $3,000	488	17	340	14	131	43	22	22	10	29
$3,000 to $5,999	1,081	37	951	38	90	30	35	34	11	32
$6,000 to $9,999	929	32	851	34	52	17	29	29	8	24
$10,000 and over	405	14	369	14	31	10	15	15	5	15
Median income	$5,719	------	$5,907	------	$3,553	------	$5,475	------	$4,864	------

TABLE 3.—*Families and unrelated individuals by type of family, age of head, and 1959 family income, Pennsylvania*—Continued

[Number in thousands]

1959 income	Female head families				Male unrelated individuals				Female unrelated individuals			
	Total		Head, 65 and over		Total		65 and over		Total		65 and over	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	289	100	77	100	736	100	79	100	422	100	152	100
Less than $1,000	41	14	9	12	303	41	28	35	202	48	88	58
Less than $2,000	84	29	19	25	442	60	53	67	281	67	123	81
Less than $3,000	126	43	29	38	531	72	64	81	332	79	136	90
$3,000 to $5,999	94	33	25	32	158	21	10	13	72	17	11	7
$6,000 to $9,999	49	17	15	19	35	5	3	4	13	3	3	2
$10,000 and over	20	7	8	10	11	2	2	2	4	1	2	1
Median income	$3,497		$4,093		$1,467		$1,435		$1,117		$870	

NOTE.—Detail may not add to total because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population, 1960, "Pennsylvania Detailed Characteristics PC (1) 40D," table 139.

TABLE 4.—*Families and unrelated individuals by type of family, age of head, and 1959 family income, United States*

[Number in thousands]

1959 income	All families		Husband-wife families				Other male head families			
			Total		Head, 65 and over		Total		Head, 65 and over	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	45,128	100	39,641	100	4,778	100	1,294	100	360	100
Less than $1,000	2,513	6	1,628	4	508	11	108	8	40	11
Less than $2,000	5,886	13	4,165	11	1,535	32	241	19	98	27
Less than $3,000	9,650	21	7,207	18	2,361	50	368	28	143	40
$3,000 to $5,999	14,804	33	13,134	33	1,296	27	413	32	101	28
$6,000 to $9,999	13,880	31	12,933	33	684	14	329	26	71	20
$10,000 and over	6,794	15	6,366	16	437	9	183	14	45	12
Median income	$5,660		$5,898		$3,050		$5,049		$3,997	

1959 income	Female head families				Male unrelated individuals				Female unrelated individuals			
	Total		Head, 65 and over		Total		65 and over		Total		65 and over	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	4,194	100	967	100	6,186	100	1,194	100	6,990	100	2,565	100
Less than $1,000	776	19	156	16	1,821	29	469	39	3,128	45	1,401	55
Less than $2,000	1,481	35	327	34	3,214	52	844	71	4,483	64	2,055	80
Less than $3,000	2,074	49	449	46	3,986	64	986	83	5,289	76	2,274	89
$3,000 to $5,999	1,256	30	277	29	1,542	25	143	12	1,351	19	208	8
$6,000 to $9,999	617	15	159	17	501	8	41	3	274	4	52	2
$10,000 and over	246	6	82	8	157	3	24	2	77	1	31	1
Median income	$3,044		$3,332		$3,913		$1,342		$1,271		$916	

NOTE.—Detail may not add to total because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population 1960, "U.S. Summary Detailed Characteristics PC (1) 1D," table 224.

TABLE 5.—*Persons 14 and over, by sex and 1959 income, and families, by 1959 income, for the 19th Congressional District (Adams, Cumberland, and York Counties) and Pennsylvania*

[Pennsylvania number figures in thousands]

MALE AND FEMALE 14 AND OVER WITH INCOME

1959 income	19th District		Adams County		Cumberland County		York County		Pennsylvania	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	216,537	100	27,761	100	64,491	100	124,285	100	5,721	100
Less than $1,000	50,794	23	8,226	30	15,360	24	27,208	22	1,311	23
Less than $2,000	79,993	37	12,470	45	23,276	36	44,247	36	2,115	37
Less than $3,000	110,475	51	17,031	61	31,193	48	62,251	50	2,840	50
$3,000 to $5,999	76,309	35	8,553	31	22,064	34	45,692	37	1,980	34
$6,000 to $9,999	22,606	11	1,661	6	8,393	13	12,552	10	685	12
$10,000 and over	7,147	3	516	2	2,841	5	3,790	3	215	4
Median income	$2,930		$2,309		$3,179		$2,993		$3,028	

TABLE 5.—*Persons 14 and over, by sex and 1959 income, and families, by 1959 income, for the 19th Congressional District (Adams, Cumberland, and York Counties) and Pennsylvania*—Continued

[Pennsylvania number figures in thousands]

1959 income	19th District		Adams County		Cumberland County		York County		Pennsylvania	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
MALE 14 AND OVER WITH INCOME										
Total	131,013	100	16,323	100	39,575	100	75,115	100	3,504	100
Less than $1,000	16,237	12	2,947	18	5,497	14	7,793	10	418	12
Less than $2,000	28,565	22	4,846	30	8,855	22	14,864	20	786	22
Less than $3,000	41,816	32	7,124	45	12,329	31	22,363	30	1,140	33
$3,000 to $5,999	60,859	47	7,141	44	16,567	42	37,151	49	1,519	43
$6,000 to $9,999	21,454	16	1,558	10	7,924	20	11,972	16	641	18
$10,000 and over	6,884	5	500	3	2,755	7	3,629	5	204	6
Median income	$4,195		$3,323		$4,388		$4,273		$4,277	
FEMALE 14 AND OVER WITH INCOME										
Total	85,524	100	11,438	100	24,916	100	49,170	100	2,217	100
Less than $1,000	34,557	40	5,279	46	9,863	40	19,415	39	893	40
Less than $2,000	51,428	60	7,624	67	14,421	58	29,383	60	1,329	60
Less than $3,000	68,659	80	9,907	87	18,864	76	39,888	81	1,700	77
$3,000 to $5,999	15,450	18	1,412	12	5,497	22	8,541	17	460	21
$6,000 to $9,999	1,152	1	103	1	469	2	580	1	44	2
$10,000 and over	263		16		86		161		11	
Median income	$1,486		$1,157		$1,511		$1,481		$1,495	
FAMILIES										
Total	108,962	100	12,873	100	32,397	100	63,692	100	2,903	100
Less than $1,000	3,593	3	516	4	944	3	2,133	3	110	4
Less than $2,000	8,933	8	1,375	11	2,170	7	5,388	8	275	9
Less than $3,000	16,361	15	2,618	20	4,058	13	9,685	15	488	17
$3,000 to $5,999	43,243	40	5,880	46	11,963	37	25,400	40	1,081	37
$6,000 to $9,999	36,374	33	3,364	26	11,361	35	21,649	34	929	32
$10,000 and over	12,984	12	1,011	8	5,015	15	6,958	11	405	14
Median income	$5,692		$4,945		$6,046		$5,678		$5,719	

Detail may not add to total because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population, 1960, "Pennsylvania, General Social and Economic Characteristics" PC (1) 40C, table 86.

TABLE 6.—*Comparative hospital and medical statistics for persons 65 and over, by family income level, United States, July 1960 to June 1961*

Item	Family income					
	All incomes	Under $2,000	$2,000 to $3,999	$4,000 to $6,999	$7,000 and over	$10,000 and over
Restricted-activity days per person:						
All ages	16.5	29.8	17.7	13.8	13.0	
65 and over	40.1	50.5	39.1	34.5	27.7	
Bed-disability days per person:						
All ages	5.8	10.4	6.2	4.9	4.6	
65 and over	13.8	16.9	12.4	13.5	10.2	
Hospital days per person:						
All ages	.9	1.0	1.0	.8	.7	
65 and over	1.8	.9	1.9	2.6	2.4	
Ratio of line 8 to line 5 (percent)	15.5	9.6	16.1	16.3	15.2	
Ratio of line 9 to line 6 (percent)	13.0	5.3	15.3	19.3	23.5	
Average days of hospital stay:						
All ages	8.4	11.4	8.3	7.4	7.4	
65 and over	14.9	15.7	15.0	13.6	14.6	
Health expenses per person per year (July–December 1962 times 2):						
All ages	$129	$112	$116	$119	$153	
65 and over	$208	$162	$213	$210	$308	
Hospital expenses per person per year (July–December 1962 times 2):						
All ages	$30	$28	$30	$30	$31	
65 and over	$53	$40	$57	$49	$83	
Percent of hospital expenses paid by insurance (July 1962 to June 1963):						
All ages:						
No part	32.0	60.4	40.8	21.0	19.0	
Less than 75 percent	16.7	12.9	15.5	17.4	19.7	
75 percent or more	51.3	26.7	43.7	61.7	61.2	
65 and over:						
No part	48.8	57.3	40.2	36.4	48.9	
Less than 75 percent	20.9	18.4	25.1	23.2	19.8	
75 percent or more	30.3	24.3	34.7	40.2	31.3	

Item	All incomes	Under $2,000	$2,000 to $3,999	$4,000 to $6,999	$7,000 to $9,999	$10,000 and over
Percent of persons with hospital insurance:						
All ages	70.3	34.1	51.9	79.0	87.3	87.9
65 to 74	(1)	43.1	64.0	74.4	74.9	79.3
75 and over	(1)	33.2	44.2	46.7	53.2	58.2

[1] Not available.

Source: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "National Health Survey."

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON OTHER APPROACH APPROVAL

OUTLINE OF QUESTIONS

Need for any action

1. Do you favor any changes in or additions to existing Federal laws providing health care benefits for the aged? Yes.

Means test for beneficiaries

2. Do you favor Federal laws providing health care benefits only to those aged persons who financially are unable to take care of their own health care needs? Yes.

Philosophy of financing

3. What means of financing health care benefits for the aged under Federal laws do you favor?

(a) General revenue (taxes): No.

(b) Social security (wage tax): Yes.

4. What degree of use of voluntary private health insurance as the means of providing health care benefits for the aged under Federal law do you favor? Please answer only one of the following:

None, —; some, —; 100 percent, —.

5. Which of the following health care benefits for the aged do you favor being provided for by Federal law? Please answer each one "yes" or "no".

(a) Hospital services:

(1) Room and board: Yes.

(2) Private duty nursing: No.

(3) Drugs: Yes.

(4) Supplies and appliances: Yes.

(b) Post hospital extended care (convalescent and rehabilitative care):

(1) Room and board: Yes.

(2) Drugs: Yes.

(3) Supplies and appliances: Yes.

(c) Physician's services:

(1) In hospital: No.

(2) In posthospital extended care: No.

(3) House calls and visits to doctor's office: No.

(4) Outpatient diagnosis at hospital: No.

(d) Home health care services; i.e., visiting nurses and physiotherapy but not including doctor bills: Yes.

(e) Outpatient diagnostic services (but not including doctor bills): Yes.

Duration of benefits

(6) Do you favor any of the following limitations on health care for the aged benefits provided under Federal law? Please answer each one "yes" or "no."

A maximum number of days of benefits per illness: No.

A maximum number of days of benefits within a certain period of time: No.

Unlimited days of benefits: No.

Any other type of maximum: No.

(Please explain in your report.) See report.

Role of State and Federal Government

7. In the administration of any Federal law providing health care benefits to the aged, do you favor maximum responsibility and authority being delegated to the State governments? No.

8. Do you favor the establishment (by State and/or Federal Government) of any minimum standards to be met in order for any institution to participate under any program of health care benefits to the aged? Yes.

9. If you favor doctor bills benefits being provided for, do you favor the establishment (by State and/or Federal Government) of any minimum standards to be met in order for any doctor to participate under any program of health care benefits to the aged?

REPORT OF THE "OTHER APPROACH" SUBCOMMITTEE OF CONGRESSMAN N. NEIMAN CRALEY'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

To assure some common understanding as a starting point the following premises were agreed upon:

1. Concerned with population in 65 and overage category.

2. Without attempting to define the magnitude they have a health care financing problem.

3. Public funds are necessary to supplement their means.

To be realistic in our approach, the benefit structure and overall cost need to be considered together. However, this demands time and actuarial talent not available to this committee. Therefore, the following points are stated in a more or less general way:

PROGRAM

1. A broad range of benefits is desirable with program structured to encourage treatment at lowest cost level consistent with adequate care.

(a) All services (including outpatient therapeutic and preventive services) routinely provided by hospitals and billed by them should be included in the benefit pattern.

(b) As an alternative to a specific amount of coverage for each type of service, the use of equivalent "units of care" might be considered, i.e., 2 nursing home days equals 1 hospital day.

(c) Alternative to hospital admission as prerequisite to receipt of convalescent home or other care could be screening (under medical supervision) in hospital clinic or other coordinating agency in community.

(1) This same agency or another mechanism should be used to periodically appraise the patient's continuing need for care so that he is not placed in a facility and "forgotten."

2. Benefit pattern should be established on a national basis at least as a minimum to be met by States if program is operated at State rather than national level.

3. It would be necessary to set certain standards to be met by the providers of service to assure proper medical care.

4. Provision should be made for use of presently existing voluntary agencies in underwriting or administering program where practical and economical.

(a) Precedent: Servicemen's dependents medical care program.

FINANCING

1. Present flow of private funds into health care financing should be encouraged to continue—even increased if possible.

2. Certification of eligibility should be given annually at national level on basis of Internal Revenue Service report, if filed, or simple certification of income to Internal Revenue Service.

(a) Assets need not be considered since they usually produce income.

(b) Eligibility should be on a graduated scale. As an illustration, assuming $12 monthly cost:

Income and participant's contribution

	Per month
Under $2,500	0
$2,501 to $3,000	$3
$3,001 to $3,500	6
$3,501 to $4,000	9
Over $4,000	12

Those participants receiving social security or railroad retirement payments should have their contributions deducted and paid into health insurance fund; others should be required to make their payments directly to the fund.

(c) Administrative agency should issue eligibility card to each participant annually.

(1) All cards should be identical with no indication to provider of service of level of participant contribution.

(d) To avoid providers of service being confronted with indigent patients—or bad debts—participation should be compulsory.

(1) An alternative might be a mechanism whereby an eligible would show proof of equivalent private coverage.

(2) Since the program of this type will have the effect of placing all hospital patients on a paying basis, it is necessary to recognize the impact this will have on the age-old practice of utilizing indigent patients in education programs. Although such action cannot be legislated, steps should be taken to encourage a transition to the use of all patients in education programs.

(e) Source of supplemental public funds should be prerogative of Congress in consideration of overall requirements, but payroll tax is acceptable if a health insurance fund is established apart from social security retirement funds.

REV. JOSEPH H. HAGGLER, Jr.,
GARRETT P. SNYDER,
Members of Subcommittee on Other Approach Approval,
RICHARD D. RIFE,
Acting Chairman.

FEBRUARY 18, 1965.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRIVATE FOREIGN CAPITAL TO DEVELOPING NATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Raymond Saulnier, professor of economics at Barnard College and Chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, testified recently before the Joint Economic Committee that private capital outflows "are a plus, not a minus, in our balance of international payments." This is true both in terms of income received from foreign private investments and the amount of exports which direct investments abroad induce. A study entitled the "U.S. Balance of Payments in 1968," prepared by the Brookings Institution, concluded that private foreign investments: First, induce exports from the United States equal to 10.6 percent annually of the amount of such investments outstanding; and second, induce imports to the United States to the amount of 6.5 percent annually of direct foreign investments.

Dr. Saulnier pointed out that this represented a net inducement of exports from the United States of 4.1 percent of the amount of our direct investments abroad. In 1961 the value of these investments was $34.7 billion. The Brookings study estimated the total value would reach $50.1 billion by 1968. Interpolating a value of $45 billion for 1964, Dr. Saulnier concluded that the net induced trade effect for 1964 of U.S. private direct investment could be placed at a plus $1.8 billion for the balance of payments.

In view of the administration's recent program to restrict the outflow of private capital, Dr. Saulnier's testimony lends considerable weight to the position that these measures will do longrun harm to the U.S. balance-of-payments position.

Although the administration's program presumably exempts private outflows to the developing nations, there is a question whether the Government does enough to encourage such flows and whether Government aid programs themselves may act as a deterrent to private investment.

The need for private capital in the developing nations is unquestioned. The Morgan Guaranty Survey for January 1965, shows that Government loans and grants from the industrialized nations are inadequate for the needs of the developing nations. Underdeveloped nations need the equipment, machines, materials, money, and even trained manpower, which foreign business enterprises often alone can provide.

Although the need for foreign private capital is clear, it is often unwelcome in the recipient nation, whose historical distrust of private enterprise and wariness of foreigners in general present stumbling blocks to investment opportunities.

Traditionally, American investors have been interested in underdeveloped areas, rich in natural resources, such as petroleum and minerals. Preference for these so-called extractive industries is understandable since most underdeveloped nations offer little in the way of consumer markets. The Survey points out that in the least developed nations, nearly 90 percent of the people never sell or buy anything for money. Thus the manufacturer interested in local sales is likely to have little interest.

Despite this, concentration on extractive investment has recently been shifting toward greater interest in consumer

or market economies. The present lack of such markets is being offset in part by efforts at economic integration, such as attempts to establish a common market in Central and Latin America. Such multicountry markets could provide new opportunities for manufacturing industries.

The trend toward a more "balanced mix" in foreign investments would be highly pleasing to underdeveloped nations, which are anxious to reduce their dependence on primary commodities—such as oil and minerals—for their principle earnings. The opening up of consumer markets not only benefits the investing nation but also brings untold advantages to the receipt countries. To a developing nation, investments in manufacturing mean additional bites at the apple of income. If ore goes straight from mine to ship, the source country has earned at only one step in the productive process. If it can hold on for a few more steps it increases its take substantially.

In view of the great need for foreign-owned private capital on the part of the developing nation, and in view also of the advantages to be derived from foreign private investment abroad, several capital-exporting nations are attempting to encourage their nationals to put investment money into needier lands. Germany and Japan offer temporary tax credits related to direct investments in eligible countries. At least four member nations of the OECD, including the United States, have investment guarantee programs designed to alleviate risks for those who commit funds.

Under unanimous consent, I include the Morgan Guaranty Survey for January 1965 in the RECORD at this point:

WHAT KIND OF WELCOME FOR PRIVATE CAPITAL?

Some fourscore nations outside the Communist bloc have in common the designation "developing country" and are the center of a relatively new branch of human endeavor called development economies. Allowing for a broad range of degree, the term "developing" denotes a country with low per capita income, relatively little manufacturing industry, a paucity of financial resources, deficient "infrastructure" (roads, communications, electric power), and inability of a large part of the population to produce enough with the tools now at hand to yield much beyond minimum subsistence.

These are the countries where the catchphrase "rising expectations" has its most poignant meaning, and its most explosive political force. Their 1½ billion people—in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia—are the ones of whom Sir Oliver Franks has said: "They see no reason why what has been done in the [industrial] West should not be done everywhere; they want it and they want it quick."

If they are going to get it, most of these countries already realize, they are going to need more in the way of outside help than they can possibly hope to receive in loans or grants from the governments of the rich industrialized countries, or from the official international bodies which the rich countries mainly support. They are going to need machines, money, and even men, sent in by foreign business enterprises whose main purpose is not to win a friend, cement an alliance, or block communism, but to make a profit. In short, they are going to need foreign-owned private capital.

For some of the underdeveloped nations, the realization makes wry swallowing. Especially in many of the countries that only recently have become independent, there are serious reservations about privately owned foreign investment. There is a tendency to associate it with wrongs, real or fancied, from the colonial days, to see in it a threat to the new autonomy.

Besides these emotional qualms, there is in many of the developing countries a coolly calculated preference for loans from foreign governments rather than equity participation by foreign private parties. Over the long run, they feel, it will be much easier and cheaper in terms of national cost to pay interest at the modest rates carried by economic-assistance loans than to send dividends to absentee stockholders. The fact that equity owners may for some years plow a substantial portion of earnings back into the country does not alter this basic attitude, which has in it elements of social philosophy as well as of mathematics.

MARK IT PRIVATE

Yet, as they study the projections in their hopefully drawn economic development plans, the "have less" nations see sizable gaps between the funds they will need from outside and the most optimistic forecasts of aid they are likely to receive from official sources. Usually they label the intervening space private sector and start looking, sometimes reluctantly, for ways to attract business investment from abroad.

The ways that many of them adopt include such conventional investment incentives as special tax breaks, easement of import duties, protection—at least for a time—against competition, and exemption from foreign exchange restrictions in whole or in part, where they are applicable. The details vary considerably from country to country, from time to time, and—in application—from case to case.

While offering incentives to foreign investment, the capital-seeking countries let it be known they take their sovereignty seriously and intend to set the rules. The Republic of Liberia describes its policy toward foreign capital as "open door"; yet Mr. A. Romeo Horton, president of the Bank of Liberia, could tell a group of industrialists from the more advanced countries a few years ago:

"Do not forget that we in Africa, too, have reasons to be fearful and suspicious of you. Let us never forget that we, too, need certain guarantees from you. This business of guarantees and assurances is a two-way street. The peoples in Africa have had and are still having unholy experiences with members of the free enterprise system—with members of capitalism, and therefore they are justified in being fearful and in requiring certain guarantees from you."

QUALIFIED WELCOME

Distrust of private enterprise as a system runs like a thread through much of the official rhetoric of the developing countries. Combined with a rather widespread wariness of foreigners, it results in a variety of techniques by which governments of many of the emerging nations aim to "keep foreign capital in its place." One widely used is the insistence that a specified minimum portion of the equity in a venture be owned locally, either by the government or by local companies or nationals. Often the required minimum is a controlling interest of 51 percent.

For some American companies, a minority position in a foreign company is unacceptable. Some demur at holding anything less than all of the equity. Split ownership can pose difficult problems for dividend policy and in many other matters of management. On the other hand, a number of U.S. firms that have gone into such arrangements report that having local co-owners effects a remarkable improvement in relations with the local government and also can help with the sale of consumer products.

It is not only the least-developed nations that are sensitive on the score of wholly foreign ownership of enterprises. Mexico, which has made substantial progress on the road to development, from time to time flexes its "Mixicanization" law which requires sale to local partners of a majority interest in certain kinds of companies. Even Canada has taken steps to induce outside owners to share the equity in Canadian enterprise more evenly with Canadians.

In qualifying the welcome they extend to foreign capital, most underdeveloped countries require that local nationals be trained to take over managerial, professional, and technical positions. The emphasis is on the employment of as many local nationals as possible.

Developing countries need some form of exchange discipline to protect their meager reserves and husband foreign currencies for the purchase of essential imports. Currency control can be used to provide a convenient check on outward bound foreign-owned capital, and the waiving or easing of this can be a bargaining point, too.

The ambivalence which the governments of many of the underdeveloped nations display toward foreign capital is rooted partly in local political realities. Especially in newly formed countries, government is under pressure to gratify long-submerged nationalistic impulses and, at the same time, to produce rapid economic results. Often it faces this dilemma in an atmosphere of instability and uneasiness of tenure.

The unwarying experience of American companies, when they set about responding to the investment incentives of an underdeveloped country, is that the terms are subject to detailed interpretation and extensive negotiation. Only enterprises that fit neatly into the government's plans for development of the economy are likely to get the full benefit of the devised attractions. Indeed, ventures which do not fit may be invited to stay out. The negotiating process often tends to be long and tortured, but some companies have found it eventually rewarding in that the treatment finally accorded was better than it first had looked.

Reluctant as it sometimes seems, the courting of capital by underdeveloped countries is having a measure of success. Close to $2 billion of new foreign-owned private capital is estimated to be flowing into these countries yearly, nine-tenths of it in the form of direct investment. Of the total, almost half comes from U.S. sources. Britain, France, Italy, Germany, and Japan also send sizable amounts.

Tax abatements and duty exemptions aren't the only reasons—and probably never the controlling ones—that impel companies to undertake projects in far-off countries which are only beginning the long process of economic development. Much more compelling may be the rich source a country provides for one or more raw materials, the hope that abundant native labor can be trained to a degree of productivity that will permit efficient operation, the prospect of capturing an early and preferred position in a market which in time will be big and rich, the relatively high profit margins that local enterprise is achieving.

NEED FOR LARGER MARKETS

Where market potential is the dominant consideration, preference naturally is given to larger countries where some appreciable portion of the population can be considered to be in the market economy. In the least developed nations, as many as 90 percent of the people can be said literally never to sell or buy anything for money, perhaps never even to barter. Where this is true, the manufacturer bent on producing for local sales is likely to have little interest.

An exception to this is beginning to occur where developing countries are adopting the

principle of economic integration. The formation of a common market in Central America, for instance, is sparking interest on the part of outside capital in many cases where the individual countries composing it would not have been large enough to warrant going in and setting up a plant. The true formation of multicountry markets, of course, requires more than treaties and paper integration. Transportation links, often lacking betwen adjacent countries whose only flow of goods for years has been from mines, farms, or forests to the sea, have to be provided. Language and customs also can be barriers.

Historically, the attraction that most often drew American capital to the kind of area now called underdeveloped was the existence of natural resources to be pumped or mined. The extractive industries—particularly petroleum—traditionally have taken the major portion of the U.S. private money that ventured into economically retarded lands. Of $309 million of U.S. direct private investment that flowed to Asian and African countries in 1963, more than two-thirds went into petroleum.

There are signs, however, that the proportion is beginning to shift. Extractors based in the industrialized countries are still actively expanding their overseas interests, but the wave of new entrants into the field of international operation is predominantly one of manufacturers. In the extractive industries themselves, meanwhile, there is a tendency for some of the secondary processing steps to be located nearer to where the material is first taken from the earth.

These developments, still small in relation to the whole, are nevertheless highly pleasing to the developing countries. They would like to see in the foreign investment to which they are host the more balanced mix they are trying to achieve in their total economies. While they value the foreign exchange earned by petroleum and minerals, the developing nations are almost desperately eager to reduce their dependence on primary commodities for their principal earnings. The slide of world commodity prices from their Korean war peaks, while prices of industrial goods were in a period of steady rise, put a nasty squeeze on the mainly primary producers. Even a much higher level of commodity prices would not dampen their eagerness to get on with industrialization.

In the value scheme recognized by the world of economic development, mills and factories and refineries are status symbols for national economies, trophies to which governments can point with pride. But they are also something more. To a developing country they mean additional bites at the apple of income. If ore goes straight from mine to ship, the source country has earned at only one step in the productive process. If it can hold on for a few more steps, it increases its take substantially. Officials of the developing countries also see in secondary industries the hope of building up skills among their people, of upgrading the human resources.

INCENTIVES FROM HOME

The incentives offered locally are not the only bait being used to attract capital to the underdeveloped countries. Several of the capital-exporting nations, as a matter of policy, are trying to encourage their nationals to put investment money into the needier lands.

Germany and Japan both offer temporary tax credits related to direct investment in eligible countries. The Johnson administration last year proposed legislation that would give some U.S. companies (oil and mining companies are important exceptions) a tax credit equal to 30 percent of new direct investment which they make in qualifying countries.

The credit would be good against any Federal income tax liability of the parent company. A lesser credit would be allowed for reinvestment of profits earned by operations in an eligible country. Congress did not act last session, but the measure has been recommended again this month as part of the foreign aid program.

The 12 countries that make up the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development are looking for further ways to favor the flow of private capital into development areas. At least four of them have investment guarantee programs designed to ease the risks for those who commit funds. The U.S. guarantee program is administered by the Agency for International Development, which runs the foreign aid program. For a premium of 1½ percent per year, investments in more than 60 eligible countries can be protected against loss resulting from expropriation, war, or inconvertibility of currency, depending upon the country concerned.

In 1961 an extended-risk guarantee was introduced by AID. This covers, up to a maximum of 75 percent of the investment, losses from all kinds of risks, including ordinary business risks. The premium for this coverage is only 1¾ percent per year, although it is restricted to a smaller number of countries and is available only for certain kinds of business projects.

The guarantee programs have helped bring private money into the development effort; they also have earned a profit in one corner of a Government agency whose main business is giving money away. Since inception of guarantees in 1947, some $20 million has been collected in premiums and only $69,000 has been paid out in claims.

AID also offers, under certain circumstances, to go halves with a potential investor on the cost of a survey to appraise a specific investment possibility. This is encouraging a number of companies to take a closer look at opportunities off the beaten paths of overseas investment. If after the survey a company decides to follow through and commit money, AID pays nothing; if the company drops the project, AID pays half the bill and takes possession of the survey.

FOR PEACE AND ORDER

Advanced countries that are trying to stimulate the flow of development funds from the private sector see the effort as part of the same broad purpose that is back of their official grants and loans. They have a genuine interest in seeing the aspiring nations make progress toward their goals, for they see a threat to peace and order in the discontent of poor countries.

Donor governments realized even before the recipients that the available public funds would not be enough to get the job done. If private money could be induced to move in real size, the heavy burden on national treasuries to support a cause not really popular with the taxpayers would be eased.

At least in the case of the United States, there is also an ideological element in the motivation. Knowing the predisposition of many of the developing countries toward statism in the economic realm, many Americans count heavily on the power of example to win converts to free enterprise. Congress has been emphatic in directing foreign aid officials to do more to encourage private business in the countries receiving assistance. It also has created an Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid. A report by this group is expected about midyear.

In recipient countries, at least one of the official U.S. efforts has stirred resentment. This is the provision of investment guarantees. Many countries find offensive the notion that investors from abroad would think it necessary to insure their holdings against such risks as expropriation or inconvertibility of currency. Although the availability of guarantees has obviously been an attraction to American companies (more than $2 billion of coverage has been written), a number of countries refused for a long time to sign treaties authorizing the U.S. Government to act as guarantor within their borders (the United States won't issue coverage in any country which has not signed; delicate questions of sovereignty are involved when a claim arises). Some countries still are holding out, even though it presumably is costing them investment.

Psychology—not only of nations but also of investors—is a tremendously complicating factor in development economics. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in India, where ever since independence officials have been torn between a considerable suspicion of foreign capital and a recognition that it was needed. Modest incentives in the form of partial tax holidays and special depreciation allowances have long been on the books, but administrative delays and prolonged negotiations often have seemed calculated to discourage the would-be investor.

Nevertheless, India's magnetism for foreign private capital has been considerable. The amount committed there nearly tripled in the years 1948–60, rising from $537 million to $1.5 billion. Despite discouragements, more than 125 U.S. companies have made substantial investments. The total U.S. private stake in India at the end of 1963 was about $200 million.

Of late, India's attitude toward foreign private-sector capital has turned more cordial. For instance, the Government has opened an investment office in New York City, and reports from New Delhi are that investment applicants from abroad now receive attentive guidance in making the required rounds from bureau to bureau.

What chiefly attracts capital to India, however, is not tax escape incentives or reception committees. Rather it is the market potential of a country with nearly half a billion people, where depressing overall statistics on per capita income mask the existence of sizable pockets of prosperity. It also is the earnings record of American companies already there, which the U.S. Department of Commerce in 1962 gaged to average a return of 20 percent on net assets.

With inducements like those, companies seeking a foreign outlet for cash and entrepreneurship are willing to buck a good deal of redtape and take quite a lot of tough talk for the sake of getting in on livable terms. Businessmen from the capitalist nations have learned to roll with the ideological punches in mixed-economy countries. They have few illusions about changing the minds or economic mores of the people with whom they are doing business.

LESSON TO LEARN

This is fortunate, because the least persuasive approach with the developing nations—and especially with their leaders—is the sermon. The temptation is great for Americans to point to the period of their own country's economic development, still a matter of comparatively recent history, as an example for the striving nations of today to follow. Indeed there is much in that history that those nations could study with profit. But there also are chapters that clash ironically with the kind of advice often meted out to developing countries of the 20th century.

In 1811, for instance, one of the chief arguments advanced (successfully) against renewal of the charter of the first Bank of the United States was the fact that foreigners owned 70 percent of the stock. In the 1830's a number of States got into financial difficulties and blithely repudiated bonds that had been sold largely in foreign markets. Later in the century, railroad bankruptcies and reorganizations took another heavy toll of foreign investment.

On the other hand, the American record with respect to foreign capital has been generally exemplary. Private foreign funds played a large part in the early and intermediate upbuilding of this country; for the most part they were treated well and rewarded handsomely. Hopefully the nations developing today will find something to copy from that book, but it is predictable they will insist on finding it for themselves.

MEDICARE AND ITS FINANCING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star, there appeared an article concerning the unreasonable assumptions made in the proposed financing of the medicare program. The article stresses a very important fiscal fact relative to this matter; namely, that the success or failure of the medicare program depends upon future increases in the taxable wage base of the proposed payroll tax.

The article points out some of the unrealistic assumptions that have been given the chief actuary, Mr. Robert Myers by the hierarchy of the Social Security Administration, one of which is that the wage base remain at the $5,600 level. The Social Security Advisory Council pointed to the necessity of an increase in the wage base, as early as 1966 if the new program is to avoid fiscal difficulties.

Because of the timeliness, and because the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee wherein these assumptions have been shown to be unfounded under questioning, are being conducted behind closed doors without reason or justification I might say, I insert the article from the Washington Star in the RECORD at this point:

MEDICARE TIED TO RISE IN TAXABLE PAY BASE

The financial success of the administration's proposed health care for the aged program seems pegged to future increases in the taxable wage base.

If there are no boosts, the Social Security Administration's chief actuary said yesterday, the system's trust fund would be broke in 1976.

If the hikes do materialize, Robert J. Myers said, the trust fund would be self-supporting.

Myers displayed his figures during questioning by a newsman.

The taxable wage base now is $4,800 a year. Pending legislation would make it $5,600 annually beginning in 1966.

The Advisory Council on Social Security already has recommended the taxable wage base be increased to $6,000 for 1966 and 1967 and to $7,200 in 1968.

Myers said his long-range, self-supporting estimates were based "on the assumption that the taxable wage base of $5,600 now being proposed would be increased and kept up to date."

His prediction of an empty trust fund in 1976, he said, made no allowance for such increases.

When the social security tax first was imposed in 1937, it was levied on the first $3,000 of annual earnings of a covered person. This was retained through 1950, then increased to $3,600 a year for 1951–54. It went up to $4,200 for 1955–58 and has remained at $4,800 since 1959.

FARM INCOME DOWN IN ILLINOIS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Agriculture Secretary Freeman's action in dumping of massive quantities of Government grain stocks is a principal reason for the latest decline in net income for Illinois farms.

A U.S. Department of Agriculture report on farm income, released March 11, showed net income per farm in Illinois down 4 percent in 1964, compared with 1963.

Net income per farm in Illinois for the past 3 years: In 1962, $4,952; in 1963, $4,861; and in 1964, $4,676.

This continued decline in net income per farm occurred despite the fact that Illinois farms got larger in acres and fewer in total number. The 4 percent drop does not fully reflect the adverse economic trend for Illinois farmers, because it includes as farm income over $131 million in direct payments to farmers by the Federal Government. These Government payments jumped from $104 million the year before, but despite this jump, the decline in net farm income continued.

It is obvious the farm programs and policies being carried out by the Johnson administration are not enabling farmers to keep pace, incomewise, with the rest of the economy. Indeed, while the rest of the economy moves ahead, net farm income drops back.

Secretary Freeman must accept a major part of the blame for last year's drop in net income of Illinois farmers. His decision to dump more than 140 million bushels of Government wheat at the peak of the 1964 wheat harvest caused a severe price break. For the first time in history the U.S. price of wheat was even below the world price.

Another factor which hurt Illinois farm income last year was the drop in livestock prices. This too can be traced to massive dumping of Government grain by Secretary Freeman. Over 2 billion bushels of Government corn were dumped in the unprotected market in 1961–62, and this triggered overproduction of livestock causing the price break.

When legislation to extend the feed grains and wheat programs comes before the Agriculture Committee later this year, I will offer an amendment restricting the Secretary's authority to dump Government stocks. Farmers marketing their grain should not have to compete with cutthroat competition from Secretary Freeman.

JAY HAYDEN RETIRES

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 50 years Jay G. Hayden served in a most admirable manner as a newspaper correspondent in the Nation's Capital. His reporting as well as his interpretive analyses gave to his readers in the Detroit News a clearer insight into the operation of the Federal Government and a deeper appreciation for our way of life. We who have known Jay all or a part of these years salute him on his retirement and wish him well.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Will Muller entitled "Jay Hayden Retires," which appeared in the Detroit News on March 1 this year:

JAY HAYDEN RETIRES

(By Will Muller)

Jay G. Hayden, the Detroit News' political columnist in Washington, is retiring today.

He started his newspaper career 65 years ago as a $2 a week printers' devil on the weekly Vigilant in Cassopolis, Mich. He ends it as the dean of all Washington correspondents.

Jay served this newspaper in Washington for more than 49 years and under nine Presidents. He knew each of them personally as well as professionally.

To News readers and News workers, Jay has been both tradition and friend. In the world of journalism he is a legend. His own story is as unusual as any he ever pounded out on his typewriter about others.

STOOL TO SALON

At 12, Jay was sitting on a milking stool on his father's farm just outside Cassopolis. At 35, he was one of two U.S. newspaper correspondents accredited to sit in on the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, just outside Paris.

As a youngster, he was barred from the office of Detroit's Mayor Phillip Breitmeyer for writing a critical story. A few years later, he criticized the Versailles Treaty as a breeder of future wars, and Premier Georges (the Tiger) Clemenceau named him an Officer de l'Instruction Publique of France.

Jay is the last newsman to know the business from a printer's "California job case" to the White House Correspondents Association. He has forgotten where he put away the beribboned honor of France, but recalls with total clarity all the friends he made along the way he has come.

One of them was Jim Preston, then head of the Senate press gallery, whom he met at political conventions. He met Preston again at 15th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue on the morning of the day after Christmas in 1915.

CAPITAL TYRO

Jay had arrived in Washington that morning, confused as to which ends of Pennsylvania Avenue were occupied by the White House and the Capitol, but eager to get started. As he stood on the street corner, looking at shrubbed grounds across the way and chatting with his friend, he confessed his puzzlement.

"Jim," he asked, "where's the White House?"

"Right there, you damned fool, you're looking at it."

That, says Jay, was the first question he asked on what was to be a 49-year assignment in Washington. None of his later ones, he recalls, ever got such a prompt and certain answer.

Jay was born Dec. 8, 1884, in Cassopolis, to James Girt Hayden and the former Ruth Kingsbury. His father served Cass County one term as a State Senator.

When he was 6, his father bought a family farm. Jay grew up there and was willing to work at anything to get away from cows.

TURN OF CENTURY

By 1900, he was working on the Vigilant. He was graduated from Cassopolis High School 2 years later. From 1904 through 1906 he was at the University of Michigan, supporting himself as foreman of the print shop in the university's library.

"It was the most juvenile and incompetent crew of printers ever under one roof," Jay recalls. "Because I was experienced, I was made foreman at the same salary as everyone else."

Then Jay was tempted by a salary offer to become foreman of the print shop at the Escanaba Daily Mirror, now defunct. Printers were roisterous in those days, and often he found himself the only one to report for work on Monday. He quit.

He tried a job in North Dakota at the behest of a lawyer friend. The thermometer hit 40 below, and Jay fled home. He put in a short stint on a weekly at Evart, Mich., then went back to Cassopolis. There the News uncovered him.

DSR INTERVAL

For the News, Jay covered fires and robberies and occasionally politics, eventually got assigned to city hall. Politics carried him to Lansing.

At the insistence of the late James Couzens, Jay took an 18 months leave of absence to serve as secretary of the DSR Commission. Couzens was its chairman.

Returning to the News, Jay took a Washington assignment under the late George Miller in preference to the city editorship. Miller later became a News editor in chief, and Jay headed the Washington bureau.

When Jay arrived in Washington, it was a sleepy, tree-lined, semitropical city with wide avenues, late morning work routines, covered by a small and elite corps of reporters. Journalism was on a personal basis. Cabinet members were accessible and the social and governmental lives of the city blended.

He became Washington bureau chief in 1918, attended the Paris peace negotiations with President Woodrow Wilson in 1919, set up a London bureau for the News in the same year. He wrote from England, Ireland, Scotland and the Continent.

HARDING DEATH

He was with President Warren Harding on his 1923 Alaskan tour. He left the Presidential party at Seattle, where Harding appeared to be suffering a stomach upset, and started across Canada by train.

Mr. Harding went on to San Francisco and died there. His death caught Jay on the Canadian prairies. Jay and his companion, Arthur Sinnott, later editor of the Newark News, wrote furiously about Harding's career, the upset in politics and Government, tossing fragments of their stories off at every railway depot to be rushed piecemeal to their offices.

Days later when Jay got back to Detroit, his story was just coming on the wires. The Canadian telegraph company thoughtfully had waited until all the pieces were assembled before sending it.

Jay traveled to the Philippines, China, and Japan in 1926 to write from there. He covered the 1930 London Naval Conference, the 1933 London Economic Conference.

He has been long a member of the National Press Club. In 1931 he was named president of the Gridiron Club, the most exclusive of all organizations of top Washington newsmen, which entertains the President annually.

FAVORITE GUEST

His sturdy independence, his easy presence, and his genius for anecdote are coveted by Washington hosts, for the only one who considers Jay no prize is Jay himself.

A favorite gambit of Washington hostesses at small parties is to maneuver Jay into a comfortable chair, a martini in his hand and the guests around him, and tease him into telling stories. It's like a moving picture review, infinite in detail, warm with memory, and rich with humor, of all the great national dramas of a half century.

With the arrival of his retirement, those who have been close to his legend are urging him to write a book. Jay himself says he is a little tired, would like to relax with his wife, Ruth, in their home in Kensington, Md.

He is an inveterate left-handed golfer, an equally avid two-fisted poker player. And he has a long list of intended victims. If that doesn't fill all of his time, he can occupy the surplus by keeping an eye on his only youngster, Martin S. Hayden, Detroit News editor.

ACCOLADE

Twenty years ago, George Washington University conferred a Doctor of Laws degree on Jay Hayden. Dr. Cloyd H. Marvin, university president, said at the ceremony:

"He is patient, modest, steadfast to preserve high standards of journalistic interpretation, both national and international * * * a healthy curiosity against a background of real and human understanding and high purpose."

His brethren in the craft would say Jay Hayden has lived by those words all of his long career and they are still an apt accolade for him at his retirement.

THE CRISIS IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the agricultural situation in this country continues its steady deterioration, as many of us from rural America have repeatedly pointed out. We have noted that this deteriorating condition not only affects our farm population, but actually affects a much wider segment of the Nation's population and economy. We find that 3 out of every 10 jobs in private employment are related to agriculture.

All of us have been exposed to the statistics relative to food prices, the dwindling percentages going to the agricultural segment, low parity ratio figures, farm expenses, the cost-price squeeze, and the like. But few really understand just how this total picture affects the future of the Nation.

That is why I was so intrigued with the position paper on the rural economy recently submitted by the Independent Bankers Association. It is a paper that should be studied by every Member of Congress and every American citizen. It is an alarming paper that contains truths that must be considered.

With the consent of my colleagues, I hereby submit the position paper for your information:

INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE POSITION PAPER ON THE RURAL ECONOMY

The agriculture committee of the Independent Bankers Association, in Washington, D.C., sessions February 10 to 13, presented the following position paper to Vice President HUMPHREY and discussed it with the President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers. President Lee M. Stenehjem read the paper, as formal remarks, at a congressional dinner session, Hotel Statler, Thursday night, February 11.

Should the disaster of the thirties seem remote in these soaring sixties, remember that the lengthening shadow of the great depression went unnoticed as America danced its way through the roaring twenties.

Depressions have always had their beginning at a peak of prosperity, and they always are farm led and farm fed.

It is now apparent that the mistakes of the twenties are being repeated. Commercial banks are loaned up to historically high levels in ratio to available deposits. The easy money of the sixties has made us a seemingly affluent society and we are now reaching for the Great Society.

But those who see a bright future for America apparently are not aware of a new shadow that has crept over the horizon. The most significant feature of the American economy today is this: rural banks cannot much longer continue to supply the credit needs of rural America. Since 1951, farmers have been using credit as a substitute for earned income because of depressed agricultural raw material prices.

With the inception of its agricultural research program 3½ years ago, the Independent Bankers Association has warned repeatedly that such credit could not continue indefinitely. The association has urged that action be taken to revive the economy of rural America before the point of no return was reached, but the downward drift has been allowed to continue.

The association now finds it necessary to caution its member banks to be concerned with the quality of their loanable assets. Country bank loans to farmers are dangerously close to deterioration.

The Independent Bankers Association is not alone in its concern.

At the recent convention of the American Bankers Association, the association urged a retreat from easy credit. In a convention resolution the American Bankers Association said "it is difficult to find justification for the degree of ease which now prevails in credit markets."

Insurance companies and large as well as small lenders are voicing the same caution. Similar experiences are being reported by the Production Credit Associations and by the Farmers Home Administration. It has been said that unless corrective action is taken soon, the FHA will one day be known as the graveyard for bankrupt farm loans.

Firsthand experience of bankers throughout rural America show farmers holding assets of uncertain value which appear to support bank loans as collateral. The farm borrower continues to demonstrate excellent integrity. But his house falls in when his integrity and assets are measured against the profit entry on his operating statement. There just isn't enough left to make a dent in his debts.

In case after case, depreciation transfers are completely used up in paying operating expenses or providing food, clothing, and other bare essentials for the farm family.

Rural bankers believe we have been building our economic future on a weak foundation. Our facade of prosperity has been achieved at the expense of the producers of agricultural raw materials.

We have not constructed true economic wealth at all, but a will-of-the-wisp prosperity in which some segments of the economy have been fattened by feeding upon another. Since the land represents the beginning point of our country's wealth, such prosperity can only be temporary. It will eventually fall of its own weight.

In the absence of adequate profits in agriculture, essential to reduction of ever-increasing debt, the time approaches when banks will have to terminate credit availability to thousands of farmers in rural America. This will force liquidation of numerous farm units and subsequently the destruction of thousands of rural businesses that serve farmers.

One result will be the loss of a market for an important portion of our total output of goods and services. This indicates a cutback in industrial production and an increase in unemployment. Whatever gains can be made through the administration's anti-poverty program will be more than canceled out by the inability of the rural population to earn a living.

And remember—some 30 percent of the U.S. population lives in rural communities of 2,500 and under and on the farms surrounding them.

Because net farm income has declined while the income of other segments of the ecenomy has soared to record levels, the farmer has been caught in a cost-price squeeze. The result has been a drop of more than 3 million in agricultural employment since 1949. This would seem to have been the source of a large percentage of the total unemployment today. It is now contributing more to the poverty of the Nation than any other single factor.

In the face of this, the prevailing economic philosophy calls for the elimination of 2½ million additional farmers. These would not just be the little inefficient farmers. They would be a broad category of farmers—large and small alike.

We have apparently overlooked the most obvious answer to the unemployment problem. An expanded rural economy would slow down the outmigration of farmers. It would create an expanded rural labor force, both on the farm and in the rural communities.

Government figures show that the largest pocket of poverty in American today is in the rural areas.

The farmer is in a state of economic depression because he is not getting a fair price for his production. That is, farm raw-material prices are not in balance with the prices of other segments of the economy.

The situation has occurred not because of any inexorable laws of economics, but because important political and business interests have served to gain from maintaining farm raw-material prices at depressed levels.

Our profit-starved rural economy has been dependent on massive doses of credit every year since 1953. This credit will one day have to be repaid. When we do this we will deprive the market in some future years of the income necessary to consume our annual production at a profitable price level.

The farmer has been using credit to keep his head above water. His borrowing always is in anticipation of future profits, but the sad fact remains that repayment often is made from liquidation of assets accumulated in prior years.

There is a limit to the amount of credit that is available in the United States. Expanded credit cannot much longer serve as a substitute for adequate earnings in agriculture.

Ten thousand banks collapsed between 1931 and 1934 because of the necessity for rural bankers to withdraw loanable funds from agriculture. The reason the bankers were compelled to collect farm loans at an accelerated pace was severe underpayment for agicultural raw-material production.

To prevent a repetition of this catastrophe, we recommend that the Federal Government give the same attention to farm prices that it has given to civil rights, the war on poverty, tax reduction and other priority measures.

If farm prices are restored to relative balance with the rest of the economy, we can achieve a huge bonus of output and income by making full use of all of our resources and raw material, human and financial. We can provide full employment, full plant capacity, balance the budget and commence retirement of the national debt.

ADMINISTRATION ASKED TO REVIEW DECISION IN REGARD TO SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE FUNDING METHODS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, if the proposed revolving fund for the Soil Conservation Service conservation operation goes into effect it is estimated by Maine district supervisors that this procedure will have the following effects in Maine:

In three districts, conservation practice establishment would be curtailed at least 75 percent. In the remaining 13 districts, it would be curtained between 80 and 90 percent.

There was agreement that very few, if any, of the family size farms would end up receiving technical practice application help. These are the ones where technical installation assistance is needed most.

The three districts where the estimate of 75 percent was made contain the larger Maine cities. The estimates of 80 to 90 percent or more curtailment came from the more rural districts.

There was agreement that the only landowners who would pay or would be able to pay 50 percent of the installation costs, would be the very few with the large farm operations and the urban owners of rural lands.

In about half of the districts the estimate showed that although some 20 percent of the present establishment would occur this establishment would be largely vegetative practices.

It is estimated that this proposal would idle district-owned heavy equipment owned by 12 of the 16 districts in Maine. Of more significance, it would idle or partially idle heavy equipment of an estimated 50 small rural equipment contractors in the State, and put a number of equipment operators out of work.

The estimates showed that most attempts by landowners on their own to install engineering type water management or water control practices would have the following detrimental results:

First. Water control measures would be inadequate in size and on excessive grades resulting in more land and water damage than if they were not installed in the first place.

Second. Landowners would be putting their money into expensive equipment work and would not be getting a technically correct job. In other words, they would be paying the price for a sound job but would not be getting one.

Third. Many farm pond impoundments would be built that would hold for a year or so, then go out. These would likely go out during periods of heavy runoff; namely, flood time. This would result not only in considerable money loss to the landowner, but more important would cause excessive danger to life and property downstream.

Fourth. Loss of such farm ponds during periods of heavy runoff would also jeopardize flood control and other structures downstream.

It is estimated that the land treatment portion of the Public Law 566 watershed program would be curtailed to the point where siltation of flood prevention impoundments would result in the need for larger and costlier silt basins in these structures.

Collection of money for practice installation would put an added burden on district supervisors who are providing their services free in the first place. The majority of work unit conservationists believe that the districts would try to collect the money but that district supervisors would not be the least bit happy about such an arrangement.

Estimates indicate that about 16 full-time conservation aids and technicians would be lost to the Service in Maine. Only a very few of the districts in Maine are in the position or would be in the position to hire aids or technicians. This would likely be summer employment only. In most cases, the people they could hire on a short-time basis would be people who lack proper training.

Cost sharing by ACP and CCP on conservation practice installation would soon be negligible. The large farm operator would be able to pay so that his practice installation would meet standards and specifications. The family size farmowner would be almost entirely crowded out of the cost share program. Practices the average farmer might try to install without technical help would seldom meet the required standards and specifications, and therefore not qualify for cost share.

Mr. Speaker, it is earnestly hoped that the administration will review their decision in regard to Soil Conservation Service funding methods.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, another enormous chapter in the wiping out of the 50 divisions comprising the States of this vast Nation is now at its climax. The President tonight will deliver to a joint session his message having to do with voter rights and opportunities. The Alabama arena, with adroit manipulation by partisans of the destruction of the States, has produced the emotional climate to demand universal suffrage, the appropriation by the Federal Government of another State function, the setting of voter qualifications, and a further violation of the great charter of our Nation, the Constitution, in the name of political expediency. It remains to be seen whether anything spawned in this highly emotional climate can be of lasting good.

There is some justice to the alleged overall purpose of the advocates of this new chapter in centralization. It is certainly in the American ideal—and must be kept there—that all people of whatever color must be given the opportunity to develop themselves to their own fullest stature, and voting and taking a part in government is part of that development.

But the real question involved in this tragic drama is whether all ills which from time to time beset various pockets of this Nation can best be administered to by an already too heavily burdened Central Government, or whether the increasing complexities of our national life instead call for increased reliance on the States and local communities.

I for one believe that the great cohesive force of the American experiment—that alone which will make us endure as a United States—is a recognition of our vast differences within the 50 divisions or States and not the amalgamation and mixing of these differences into the straightjacket of national conformity.

If there be an ill in Alabama, we have most recently broken the back of one-partyism and its constriction for many years on freedom of thought. The rash and impetuous demand for new and irresistible Federal law on the Alabama voting scene suggests very strongly a deeper interest in whom the Negro votes for than whether or not he votes. The emerging Republican Party in the South seems to be the target for this hastily contrived and brutally managed stir of the national emotion, and this rush for remedial legislation at the height of this feverish emotional pitch.

I rise in defense of my people, the people of my district, and the people of my State. They have been maligned and vilified on the floor of this House. They have been threatened with reconstruction as severe as that administered after the war of 1860, and in the wake of and because of the death of Abraham Lincoln.

I regret that an unfortunate display of police resentment and brutality at a Selma bridge on Sunday last is the picture indelibly written on the public mind and that this picture is the catalyst for the impending seizure of additional Federal and, incidentally, political power. But if I am the last and only quiet voice in America, I charge that this one scene is an incomplete picture, and that the actors in this one scene, the police force of the State and of Dallas County, have over a period of 2 years and particularly under a 2-month barrage of demonstrations and constant harassment behaved magnificently.

The right of a people to demonstrate is a clear one. But the right of demonstration against an authority guiltless of the crime charged in the demonstrations must have its limitations.

The demonstrations in Selma were billed as demonstrations to procure for Negroes the right to vote. A month ago on February 4 a Federal court order from Judge Thomas in Mobile under the authority of the 1964 Civil Rights Act made it possible for all Negroes in Dallas County who could read and write to register and vote by the next election. The court order stipulated that if all who wished to register by July 1965 were not registered, the court would proceed to do it.

The demonstrations continued. New demonstrators were invited in from all over the Nation, and they came in an ever-increasing crescendo. Demonstrations against what? The relief had been given to the original charges, but a new cause for demonstrations was invented every day. The President, in 1 day of demonstrations in Washington, spoke of being blackjacked by pressures of pickets—and these safely and rightly beyond the iron fences surrounding the White House. The Attorney General's office closed after a day of demonstrations. But the people of Selma were supposed to endure for 8 weeks. And this they did. A 2-year record of no more serious injury than one cameraman losing his camera over his own head is a remarkable exhibition of restraint. This is the true and just picture of Alabama people.

Today, a vast new army of uninformed and misguided people move toward Selma. Some of them are sincere and dedicated—others go for their own selfish, political ends.

As the arena for this tragic drama moves tonight to the Halls of this Chamber, our people will stand out as having faced bravely and resolutely the titanic changes which the civil rights law inevitably will bring to their lives. They had thought that they were facing it so well that a month ago the local newspaper editor in Selma, Roswell Falkenberry, called on the President to throw the eyes of the Nation on the excellence of their performance. This was answered by the President with a public statement, and I quote:

> I am going to procure the rights of the Negro to vote.

When understanding was asked for, and a reasonable time for the new law to be put into effect, the answer was more and irresistible Federal law. So be it.

FROM PRESIDENT TO NEWSBOYS, THE PEOPLE MOURN LEO LERNER

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today to pay tribute to one of America's truly great citizens, who last week was taken from us through a tragic heart attack.

This illustrious American was Leo A. Lerner, publisher, author, journalist, humanitarian, civic leader, husband and father, and above all, Mr. Speaker, a sincere friend to the cause of humanity.

The untimely death of Leo Lerner leaves a painful void in the civic, social, industrial, and religious fabric of Chicago.

Mr. Lerner's death was mourned by President Johnson in a special message to his family.

Literally, Mr. Speaker, every civic and political leader in Chicago joined in this sorrowful moment to mourn Leo's passing.

He was a unique man. Unique in that in a very troubled world, Leo Lerner through his great gift of understanding people tried to show humanity a course toward better understanding among men.

He was dedicated to the whole human cause of decency throughout his life. Leo Lerner always espoused the highest standards of human conduct. He had an abiding compassion for the weakness of man and through his forceful writings tried to chart a course for all of us to be better people living in a better community.

His passing is one of those irreplaceable losses that all of us will suffer for a long time to come. I don't know of any single man who had a greater talent with the pen and putting ideas into words than Leo Lerner. He was this Nation's most gifted journalist.

He had a facility for putting thoughts into words that could not be matched. I have long advocated that his columns be syndicated nationally. I feel that strongly about his writings. Fortunately, his books will live on as a living memorial.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in my remarks today the memorial edition of the Lerner newspapers prepared by his excellent staff which describes in considerable detail the huge tribute paid to Leo Lerner, and also those numerous articles dealing with his background and his great contribution to humanity.

Leo Lerner has left an impressive legacy which shall continue to be a guiding light for generations to come.

The people of Chicago can find comfort in the fact that Mr. Lerner's family will carry on publishing the Lerner newspapers in the same spirit of human dignity that Mr. Lerner himself created.

His oldest son, Louis A. Lerner, executive vice president of the Lerner publications, has assured the entire Chicago

community that "Leo Lerner's work will be carried on."

Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the finest tributes to Leo Lerner was paid by the Chicago Daily News in its editorial of March 9, when they stated:

Leo Lerner was not a man to stand on the sidelines. His death Saturday at 58 deprives the community of one who took his dreams in hand and shaped them into deeds.

It is indeed a reflection of Chicago's profound admiration and respect for Mr. Lerner when a competing newspaper pauses to pay tribute to this great American as the Chicago Daily News did in its editorial.

Mr. Speaker, following are the many articles which were written about Leo Lerner after his death. I am including them in the body of the RECORD today so that they may become for posterity a part of America's history. By inserting these articles today in the body of this RECORD, it is my hope that scholars for generations to come will be able to draw on this great American's impressive contribution to the cause of human dignity.

Scholars of either the liberal views or the conservative view can find in Leo Lerner's conduct as a citizen a base of knowledge and a source of inspiration.

Those of us who knew him personally can only thank our Maker for this privilege. To have known Leo Lerner is to have known the real meaning of life.

He had passed by us but once, and yet in knowing that he did pass by us but once, we are all so much the richer.

To his entire family, Mrs. Pucinski and I send our most profound condolences.

Mr. Speaker, excerpts from the Lerner newspapers follow:

[From the Times, Mar. 10, 1965]

THE PEOPLE MOURN LEO LERNER

He walked with princes and little people. And the princes of the political, business, industrial and professional worlds walked by his bier to pay their last respects.

And two young newsboys, who deliver his newspapers, also came to say farewell to Leo A. Lerner.

Private services for Mr. Lerner, editor and publisher of the Lerner newspapers, were held noon Monday at Piser Memorial chapel, 5206 North Broadway.

Memorial services will be held at a later date.

Mr. Lerner died of a heart attack Saturday evening in his home, 4300 North Marine. He was 57 years old.

Although the services were private, several hundred people jammed the chapel. There were judges, Congressmen, Senators, aldermen, business leaders, professors and newspapermen, doctors and lawyers, friends and relatives.

"His peoplehood ranged from presidents to little newsboys," said Rabbi Henry Fisher, rabbi emeritus of Congregation B'nai Zion.

President Lyndon Johnson sent a telegram of condolence and Mayor Richard Daley paid his last respects.

Rabbi Fisher, a personal friend of Leo Lerner's flew from California to deliver the eulogy.

A second tribute was given by Dr. James Luther Adams, Unitarian minister, renowned theologian, author and liberal, who is professor at the Harvard Divinity School in Cambridge, Mass.

"Leo Lerner's life is like Schubert's immortal 8th Symphony—the unfinished symphony," said Rabbi Fisher.

"And therein lies our sorrow that when Mr. Lerner died, he had not finished his work. Like Schubert he never had an opportunity to finish his work. There was still so much to be done.

"However, all of us here, who have been touched by the spark of his spirit, are grateful to have known and loved him. He made the entire North Side feel like his family.

"Leo Lerner's life was filled with the joy of living. He loved the stars, the beauty of nature, books, music, good food, classic movies or westerns, and he loved the city and the country.

"He was a child of the earth and had the sense of wonder a child has upon discovery. Life for him was filled with people. He knew more people than anyone I know.

"And he never saw people as rich or poor, or white or black or Catholic, Protestant, or Jew. They were his peoplehood.

"His mind was creative and as wide as the universe. His ideas were exceeded only by his ideals. Since he enjoyed life so much, he felt no man should be denied the same right. And he began with his neighbor and his neighborhood newspaper.

"He loved this city and whatever it needed—a library, university—he was there fighting for it."

Rabbi Fisher paid tribute to Mr. Lerner's widow, Deana, saying: "Never have two people shared a more complete and happy life than Leo and Deana."

In conclusion, the rabbi said: "Leo Lerner lives in our minds, our hearts and in our memory."

Dr. Adams told the grieving audience that the letters and papers of various phases of Leo Lerner's life will be preserved in a university library so that it will be a major source for historians studying Chicago.

"I first met Leo Lerner after I returned from Germany where I spent a year studying the underground movement of the anti-Nazis.

"I vowed upon my return that I would show more responsibility as a citizen. Leo Lerner became my mentor because he was the personification of citizenship. He had a warm heart and a cool head.

"He touched a countless number of lives, giving each of us courage. No one can take away from us the precious memory of this adventuresome man."

Survivors besides his widow, Deana, include: two sons, Louis A. and Robert M.; a daughter, Mrs. Rosanne Branch; his mother, Mrs. Dora Lerner; six brothers, Allen, Edward, Michael, Herman, Herbert, and Carl; and two sisters, Mrs. Virginia Grabowsky and Mrs. Pearl Rose.

Mr. Lerner was born on September 20, 1907, at 1315 South Loomis. He was the oldest of 10 children.

His professional newspaper career began while he attended Northwestern University. In 1926 he became editor of the Lincoln-Belmont Booster, the first newspaper of the chain.

In 1943 Mr. Lerner became editor and publisher of the Myers and Johnson (Times) newspapers.

The Lerner newspapers now consist of 21 community newspapers comprising the largest chain of neighborhood newspapers in the world, with a weekly circulation in excess of 300,000.

During his 39 years as a community newspaper editor, Mr. Lerner earned many awards and accolades.

In 1937 he won first prize for the best editorial in the State of Illinois. In 1946 he received the Decalogue Society of Lawyers "Man of the Year Award." In 1953 he was named Publisher of the Year by the Controlled Circulation Newspapers of America. In 1961, Mayor Richard Daley presented the Medal of Merit to Mr. Lerner.

In 1951 he received the coveted Herrick Award presented by the National Editorial Association for the best editorial interpretation of Americanism.

There were many firsts in crusading Editor Lerner's life. He helped found the liberal Independent Voters of Illinois in 1943; he was cochairman of the National Committee for Stevenson for President.

He served as president of the Citizens Schools Committee and in 1946, he helped organize Roosevelt University.

Mr. Lerner served as chairman of the Abraham Lincoln Memorial Commission of the State of Illinois, was appointed a member of the parole board in 1962, and was named to the Citizens Advisory Board of the Community Relations Services by President Johnson.

In addition to writing the famed First Column in the Lerner newspapers, Mr. Lerner was the author of three books, "Continental Journey," "The Itch of Opinion," and "The Italics Are Mine."

LEO LERNER'S WORK WILL BE CARRIED ON

Leo A. Lerner is dead, but his spirit will live on in these newspapers. For the past decades, their pages have reflected the strength and fiber and humanitarianism that was his trademark.

His passing leaves a void that will be difficult to fill. We who are left realize the magnitude of this assignment. But we know that we must maintain his high standards in the years to come.

Leo Lerner was a newspaperman. One of the percepts by which he lived was that, no matter what happened, the newspapers must be gotten out on time. He once wrote about a parish priest who was weeding his garden when told he had only two hours to live. When asked what he would do, he replied: "Finish weeding the garden, of course."

So, despite our heavy hearts, we're going to finish weeding our garden.

He never liked people who came up to him and said "I only read the First Column." He realized that there was more to the newspaper. Our job now is to make the newspaper as good as we know how, and make people want to read it from the first page to the want ads.

The staff and organization built by Leo Lerner will continue his work. We're still in business at the same old corner, and we will be for a long time to come.

That's how he would have wanted it.

LOUIS A. LERNER,
Executive Vice President.

LEADERS PAY THEIR RESPECTS

Message from President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY were among the condolences received on the death of Leo A. Lerner.

Mrs. Juanita D. Roberts, personal secretary to the President, wired Louis A. Lerner, executive vice president of the Lerner newspapers:

"The President has asked me to express his deep regret to your family over the loss of your father."

The Vice President's press secretary quoted HUMPHREY as saying, "I am distressed at the news that one of my oldest friends has died. Leo Lerner was a force for liberal, progressive government in Illinois and the Nation. I shall miss him."

HUMPHREY and Mr. Lerner had been friends for many years.

Another longtime friend of Mr. Lerner, U.N. Ambassador and former Illinois Gov. Adlai Stevenson, said he was "shocked to hear of the death of my good friend, Leo A. Lerner.

"Few men of my acquaintance had more genuine friends and admirers. He held fast to his liberal convictions and at the same time endeared himself to his opponents.

"He was greatly beloved and I shall miss him. I extend my sincere condolences to his family."

Mayor Richard J. Daley: "With the death of Leo A. Lerner the people of Chicago have lost a great citizen, a man dedicated to serving his city, country, and community.

"A native Chicagoan, he was a vital spirit who guided the progress of the city. Leo Lerner was a champion of liberal and progressive causes. He was an understanding, compassionate man with a delightful sense of humor which was reflected in his writings. He was one of the wisest of our social commentators.

"His books and columns serve as a shining memorial. With his passing, the city has lost a great Chicagoan and I a personal friend."

Gov. Otto Kerner stated: "Leo Lerner spent a lifetime serving his fellowmen in his personal life and through his newspaper. His public service ranged from community interest to State service and included many endeavors.

"His death takes from Illinois a great citizen and one of journalism's finest crusaders.

"He was my friend of many years—a warm and understanding friend who never hesitated to join in battle when the interests of the people were involved.

"He has left a great legacy for his newspaper to follow, but there will never be another Leo Lerner. I shall miss him very much."

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, remarked: "I am desolated by the news of Leo Lerner's death. For more than 30 years, he has been one of my best and closest friends. He has been a fine, outgoing person, with a marvelous sense of humor and a real feeling for human beings. We shall miss him greatly. It is not merely Leo's many friends who suffer a great loss, it is also the city, the State and the Nation."

Congressman SIDNEY YATES, Democrat, ninth district: I am terribly shocked by Leo Lerner's death. Leo was one of my best friends—he had so many wonderful qualities—wisdom and wit, great learning and leadership and courage. He would take on any fight no matter what the odds for what he believed to be just and right. He was truly the conscience of the community.

"Leo was a profound thinker and conveyed his ideas so powerfully and sensitively in his writing and in his speeches. He did so much for so many. I will miss him tremendously and so will our community."

Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Democrat, 11th district: "He was dedicated to the whole human cause of decency throughout his life. Leo Lerner always espoused the highest standards of human conduct. He had an abiding compassion for the weakness of man and through his forceful writings tried to chart a course for all of us to be better people living in a better community.

"His passing is one of those irreplaceable losses that all of us will suffer for a long time to come. I don't know of any single man who had a greater talent with the pen and putting ideas into words than Leo Lerner. He was this Nation's most gifted journalist.

"He had a facility for putting thoughts into words that could not be matched. I always advocated that his columns should be nationally syndicated. I feel that strongly about his writings. His books will live on as a kind of a living memorial."

Seymour Simon, president, Cook County Board: "One of the most eloquent and sympathetic voices in Chicago is stilled.

"Leo Lerner was a delightful friend, bubbling with fresh ideas and enthusiasm. With his warmth and tremendous intellectual talent he was a vigorous champion of the public good."

Dan Ward, State's attorney: "Our community is diminished by the death of Leo A. Lerner. He served his profession and society with high distinction.

"He was a thoughtful and stimulating commentator on many social questions, local and larger. Mr. Lerner brought to his important work compassionate understanding, perceptiveness, a high regard for human dignity, humor and fluency. We shall sorely miss his articulate expression."

John C. Marcin, clerk, city of Chicago; "Few men knew the communities that his newspapers served better than Leo A. Lerner. He knew about their backgrounds, their way of life, and he strove to bring the best for and out of each community. Neighborhoods like mine have lost a friend."

Edward J. Barrett, Cook county clerk and 44th ward Democratic committeeman, commented:

"Leo Lerner was an old and close personal friend of mine. His passing is a distinct loss both to our community and the Nation at large, for in his time he was a living symbol of all that was fine in the field of journalism.

"I am sure that his participation in community affairs, his dedication to all charitable works, and his rare devotion to his family and friends will long be an inspiration to us who respected, admired and loved him for all these wonderful traits."

Dr. Samuel L. Andelman, city health commissioner, mourned: "In the passing of Leo A. Lerner, Chicago loses one of its truly great citizens.

"This esteemed man demonstrated how a life dedicated to public service could be richly rewarding. He has left a heritage of challenge and footprints he made in human events which can be well followed by persons who aspire to noble acts.

"Personally, I have lost a friend but his memory will always be deep rooted in my consciousness. Truly, Leo Lerner will never die because his spirit and his inspiration will be with us.

"Leo A. Lerner was the kind of unusual man who is the conscience of a city. He loved Chicago and represented everything fine and decent in our society," sadly said Marshall Korshak, Sanitary district trustee and former State senator.

Jacob M. Arvey, Democratic National Committeeman: "Leo Lerner's contributions to Chicago and its institutions constitutes a monument which will stand as an example of service to the community and to humanity. Chicago will sorely miss his dedicated participation in its problems as well as his inspiring leadership."

George Dunne, county commissioner: "Having known and worked with Leo Lerner for more than 25 years, I can honestly say that a very keen intellect and a courageous heart has been stilled. He contributed much to the advancement of man's love for man. His editorials proved to be the act of a universal mentor. Our community has lost a great citizen and many of us a great friend."

Postmaster Harry Semrow asserted: "That greatest of all architects has taken Leo Lerner from us. Chicago, and the North Side especially, has lost a great public-spirited individual. His knowledge, foresight, and deep reflection, and his sincere dedication to what was good, will long sustain his memory.

Countless civic projects were initated and completed through his good works as editor of his newspaper chain. His fairness and forthrightness were always a cardinal principle in his writings and editorial content.

"Leo Lerner will be missed by many of his friends and coworkers, but will always be remembered by a thankful Chicago. It has been a better city because of him," concluded Semrow.

Congressman DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, Democrat, Eighth District, declared: "I was deeply saddened to learn of Leo Lerner's passing. He was an outstanding newspaperman and an outstanding citizen, dedicated to the interest of his neighbors and his community. I'm sure that he is one of the real foundations of the greatness of Chicago."

State Representative Nicholas Zagone, Democrat, old ninth, noted: "This man rose from humble circumstances to become a very important man, yet he retained his humbleness. He was the nicest man you'd ever want to meet. It's a tragedy to lose outstanding men like him at any time, but especially when they pass away so young."

Alderman Jack Sperling, 50th district, asserted: "Leo was the first supporter I had when I decided to run for alderman, and we had always been good friends. No man should be given more credit for saving the Devon shopping area, because he was the one who insisted that city parking be obtained. He was a very fine force in our community, and I feel very badly about his passing. I will have trees planted in Israel in honor of Leo Lerner."

Col. Frank W. Chesrow, president of the metropolitan sanitary district, and a papal chamberlain to Pope Paul VI, stated: "I knew Mr. Lerner for many years, and his passing is a great personal loss to me. But much as I sorrow at his death, I find his passing an ever greater loss to the community and to his fellow man, whom he served so faithfully all of his life. He leaves a void which will be most difficult to fill. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family and his coworkers."

General Superintendent Erwin Weiner, of the Chicago park district: "Leo A. Lerner was one of Chicago's greatest citizens and leaders. He has been a friend to the park district and community parks in which his papers were published."

Jerome Huppert, county commissioner: "The news of the death of my good friend Leo A. Lerner was a great shock to me. He was not only a personal friend but a great civil leader whose advice was always helpful to me as an alderman of the 50th ward, and as a county commissioner. The community has suffered a great loss and I'm sure that he'll be missed by all people in Chicago. My deepest sympathy to Mrs. Lerner and to his family."

Edward T. Scholl, alderman, 41st ward: "Having known Leo A. Lerner, I know his death is a great loss to the community, the city, and the State. I know what he contributed because I am a newspaper editor myself."

William J. Cullerton, alderman, 38th ward: 'The passing of Leo A. Lerner leaves a void not easily filled. His effective contributions to our city, State, and Nation will be hard to equal. He will be missed."

Joseph Sieb, mayor of Norridge: "It was with deep regret that we learned of the passing of Leo A. Lerner. The newspaper medium has lost one of its outstanding and dedicated publishers and the people have lost a true advocate and friend."

Joseph D. Zizzo, mayor of Harwood Heights: "It was with sadness that I heard of the death of Leo A. Lerner. He contributed much wisdom, guidance, and service to the people of Illinois and especially to the residents of Chicago's northwest side. I wish to extend my sympathy to his widow and to his family."

Edward Bluthardt, mayor of Schiller Park: "I was shocked and indeed sorry to hear of his death. He had a tremendous influence in the Schiller Park area, where his newspapers were very well received. This influence will be missed by all of us."

Alderman Edwin P. Fifielski, (45th): "The death of Leo A. Lerner was a tragic shock. He was one who always advocated individualism and the rights of the individual, traditions which were the foundation of America's success. He was never a conformist, and his voice will be sorely missed."

Dr. Benedict Mayers, Leyden and Norwood Park youth commissioner: "Leo Lerner believed mainly in the dignity of all people young and old, great and small. He looked for the best in people and in the process gave his best.

"He was never a fair weather friend. When he believed in a cause or in a person or in himself he fought to the bitter end to achieve the desired result.

"He left much by way of heritage to those who knew him and worked with him. He deemed loyalty to others through his super virtue. He could depend on others to be loyal to him as he was loyal to them."

Alderman William J. Cullerton (38th), longtime friend of Leo Lerner, said, "Leo Lerner was the kind of person that I consider a high-class man. He ran the paper in the finest fashion any man could. He was really tops as an editor and as a man."

State Representative Chester Majewski (Chicago): "This community has lost one of the finest men it has had in a number of years. His newspapers have been a boon to this area.

"He took a stand in everything that he did—he set a pattern and inevitably it was the correct pattern. His insight into the national and international scene was always informing. If we had more people like him this country and the world would be a better place in which to live."

State Representative James C. Kirie (River Grove): "I considered him not only a newspaper editor but a man who had the conscience of the community.

"He always reported the news the way he saw it. He spent his life dedicated to a cause of doing away with irresponsible journalism. I consider that I have not only lost a friend but an adviser."

THE NEIGHBORS PAID THEIR RESPECTS

They paid their respects last weekend to Leo A. Lerner. "They" were the neighbors whose causes he had championed, who had been his loyal readers, and who had unwavering faith in him as a man and a newspaperman.

As soon as the news of his death was made public, messages of condolence began pouring in. Many were from names known by all. They came from local, county, State and Federal officials—even from the White House itself.

But there were many other tributes. They came from the people up and down the block. They were from those who regularly read the First Column, respected its author, had heard the sad news and just wanted to share their feeling of loss.

There were many calls Sunday, even though the office is usually closed. "He helped me once." "I remember his work for the library." "The YMCA never had a better friend." "I disliked his politics, but he was fair." "I'll miss him. He understood people." "We've lost a great man."

Many said what many had written before: "He expressed just what I thought, but he said it better."

"They" were his people, and they loved him—even if they knew him only through the insight of his writings. They mourn him.

THE FIRST COLUMN

(By Leo A. Lerner)

(The last articles Mr. Lerner had written before his death are appearing this month, as he would have wanted. The following column, the first of a series on Jamaica, continues the observations he made during his recent trip to Miami and the Caribbean.)

A JOKE ON COLUMBUS

OCHO RIOS, JAMAICA, BRITISH WEST INDIES.—As the song says, "Jamaica is my island in the sun." It is a veritable paradise for tourists, not necessarily for the natives. We flew from Puerto Rico to Kingston, Jamaica, after brief stops at Santo Domingo and Port au Prince, Haiti.

Jamaica is a separate republic since 1962 when it broke away from the West Indies federation. It is, of course, a British commonwealth, which gives it the same status as Canada and Australia.

The Jamaican Government has a parliamentary system. It elects a house of representatives and a senate, which elect the prime minister. At present he is Sir Alexander Bustamente, a vigorous politician of mixed parentage who is said to be of Spanish descent.

Jamaica vibrates with exciting history. Near us, at Golden Head Beach, is "Discovery Bay," where Columbus landed. A few miles from there is "Runaway Bay," where the Spanish ran and hid in caves just after Nelson destroyed the Spanish fleet.

Bloody Henry Morgan, the pirate, had left gold in those caves in which the Arawak Indians had lived in the 15th century. Columbus had loved St. Ann's parish. He had told his Spanish friends that "everything a man could want" was on the north shore of the island in the Caribbean Sea.

Ian Fleming, creator of James Bond, secret agent 007, owned a house near Ocho Rios, where he concocted his stories of violent mystery in Jamaican settings. Noel Coward also enjoys a hilltop home near Ocho Rios. The Queen Mother of England was his guest there recently.

In view of the fact that Columbus sailed to the "East Indies" looking for spices, it is strange that in 1494 he discovered Jamaica, which had the pimento, a most valuable spice. Finding this spice by accident turns out to be a joke on Columbus.

A main resource of Jamaica is bauxite, which is used to make aluminum. Bauxite is a red dust mined in the Jamaican hills. Near the mines the trees, the buildings and even the ships that take it away are all covered with red dust and when it is being loaded even the sky is red.

Farming and tourism are auxiliary businesses. Bananas, coconuts, and the pimento are grown for export.

The pimento tree yields a spice used for flavoring medicine, and for flavoring men's after shave lotion. When you crush the leaf in your hand it has a piquant spice flavor. The natives say if you hold a piece of leaf in your mouth till it mixes with your saliva, it will cure distress and stomach ache.

Like Hawaii, Jamaica is replete with sugarcane plantations and therefrom comes rum.

The biggest rum distiller in Jamaica is J. Wray & Nephew, Ltd., which makes assorted light and heavy rums. Rum and fresh coconut milk make an excellent drink.

At a little bar on the way to Montego Bay we ordered rum and coconut milk. The lady bartender ceremoniously gave to our driver a large green coconut which he cut with a machete. He poured out 10 ounces of fresh coconut milk. The dusky bartendress served Appleton's light rum on the side and we poured the coconut milk into the rum. You can believe me when I say we were very happy when we arrived in Montego Bay, which is on the west side of the island.

I said to myself, "This island caters to the pleasures of the flesh. They make rum, cigars, have horseracing (betting outside the track is legal) and the Playboy Hotel features "Bunnies."

Jamaica is a Negro island. The wages are very low, $9.50 a week for a maid. Waiters get $12 to $15 a week plus tips. This is why visitors detect a "sad happiness" in the natives. A woman working on the coconut plantation gets a penny for opening 100 coconuts.

The Jamaican natives appear to be happy. They speak in a strange patois that sounds like Spanish to the untutored ear, but it is actually English. The Jamaican has a singsong rhythm in his speech. It is difficult to follow.

A Jamaican calls everybody "Mon." He says "Let's go, mon," to his own wife. A Jamaican cabdriver said, "Yes, sir," to my wife, which to me was a not-so-subtle comment on who he thought was the boss in our family. For lack of a better name, I call the Jamaican language "Calypso talk."

There are a few unusual novelties to Jamaican life. The presence of Ras Tafari, people with knotted, matted, plaited and uncut hair, who believe that Haile Selassie is King of the Universe and that Ethiopia is the Center of Being, is startling. Looking at these creatures, I thought to myself, "If only members of the John Birch Society curled and plaited their uncut hair we could recognize that fanatic sect on the street.

Jamaicans do not indulge in voodoo, but in the middle of the night you are likely to encounter, in rare places, an obeah meeting, where the obeah man is supposed to marshal evil spirits to bring good or bad fortune. The obeah men visit their clients nocturnally and in secret. They have their own zombis instead of Haitian ones.

A zombi is supposed to have died and now obeys the will of a master. I must say that in our travels in Jamaica we did not encounter a single zombi, although there were a few people who looked more dead than alive in shops, hotels, and restaurants.

In the Jamaican folk tales for children there is a cat named Kisander. Kisander has a dokanoo tree. This tree has lovely puddings growing on it. Jamaican children know about Kisander and his dokanoo tree and dream of helping themselves to the puddings, which probably have a Jamaican rum flavor.

NEWSPAPERMEN EXPRESS REGRETS

Publishers, editors, and newsmen in various capacities throughout the United States have expressed their regrets on the death of Leo A. Lerner.

Following are some of these comments:

William S. Mellus, publisher of the Mellus chain of newspapers in Detroit, Mich.: "The world has lost one of the great newsmen of the era.

"Leo A. Lerner certainly can be ranked with the giants of the newspaper field and his name will go down in journalism history. His achievement in the industry was great.

"He carved a newspaper empire from a humble beginning. I had watched his progress, growth, and achievements through the years and marveled at his capacity to build the chain he headed at the same time standing firmly for the highest ideals of journalism. He was truly one of the great newspapermen of our day.

"He was the prime personality behind the Accredited Home Newspapers of America and was instrumental in making it an important force in the national news publishing picture."

Harry Volk, editor of the Cleveland Sun Press, Cleveland, Ohio: "Leo A. Lerner represented the best of Chicago.

"He was one of America's few remaining great personal journalists, one of a breed that made American journalism so powerful a few generations ago.

"We in the profession will miss him as a guiding light for better newspapers everywhere."

Lloyd Wendt, editor of Chicago's American: "The community has lost a fine civic leader and journalist. I sympathize with the people of Illinois, those in journalism, and on the staff of the Lerner newspapers.

"He was a learned newspaperman, scholar in many fields and an aggressive, responsible civic leader.

"We've all suffered a great loss in his death.'"

Sydney Harris, Chicago Daily News columnist, stated:

"I was grieved to learn of Leo's death over the weekend, especially since I had been with him and his wife on Friday night, at a friend's home, where we discussed renewed efforts on behalf of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

"He was working hard for the things he believed in right to the end. Although I did not always agree with his views, I respected them and admired his courage, his energy, his willingness not only to stand up and be counted, but to help do the counting, for causes he felt to be just, even if unpopular.

"His death leaves a large gap in the field of American journalism and public affairs."

Jacob Burck, editorial cartoonist of the Chicago Sun Times:

"Leo Lerner has left a gap in our city skyline. His memory will always be an inspiration to young men who enter life with the best capital in the world—their own abilities, integrity and energy."

Eric Smith, Accredited Home Newspapers of America, Washington, D.C.: "I was quite shocked to hear of the death of Leo A. Lerner having been with him just recently in Florida and accompanying him on the flight to Puerto Rico. He looked so well at that time.

"One of the giants of the news field has fallen. He was an outstanding member of our association and a winner of our publisher's award.

"It was a great honor and privilege to have been associated with him for 12 years. Mr. Lerner was one of the most outstanding individuals I've ever known. His loss was a great personal one to me and to our industry.

"I shall always remember Leo A. Lerner as one who placed the best interests of the Nation ahead of himself."

FROM ALL FAITHS—RELIGIOUS LEADERS MOURN EDITOR'S DEATH

The mourning of Leo A. Lerner's death is reflected in the following statements from religious leaders of Protestant, Jewish, Catholic, and Greek Orthodox faiths:

Rabbi William B. Gold, Congregation Beth Sholom of Rogers Park, 1233 Pratt, commented:

"The city of Chicago is draped in mourning today for she has lost a true native son. Leo Lerner was born in Chicago, reared in Chicago, and lived all of his life in this great city. He understood her as well as any man alive and he loved her as a child loves a parent.

"In a society where people are busy getting what they want, there is a small number of people concerned with understanding what it is that the community needs.

"It is the smallest number, however, who have the perception and the courage to dedicate itself earnestly by coming to the people, making them want what they need, and doing their utmost to aid them in achieving their goals.

"This was the life story of Leo Lerner. He knew what Chicago needed, he was its voice in each community, and he led the little people as well as the big in its endeavors to make Chicago the envy of America.

"Of him it can be said as it was of a leader of old, 'He had another spirit with him—the spirit of the people.' "

In the absence of Archbishop Bernard J. Sheil, who is out of the city, the Reverend William J. Nemmers, assistant to the archbishop, stated:

"The priests and people will mourn the loss of this very community- and ecumenical-minded citizen who has always had a personal interest in the welfare of people everywhere."

Bishop Meletios of the Greek Orthodox faith, said, "It was indeed with a sense of great loss that I learned of the sudden death of Leo A. Lerner. The city as well as the country is saddened by his passing as he is so well known for his civic-mindedness and love for humanity.

FIFTY YEARS SERVICE TO AREA

(By Valerie Long)

On Saturday, March 6, Leo A. Lerner's nearly 50 years as an editor came to an end.

He died of a heart attack at the age of 57.

His career as a newspaperman began at the age of 8.

What has happened in the interim 49 years is as much a part of the history of Chicago as Lincoln Park or the Water Tower.

The life of Leo Lerner was firmly entwined with the growth of the city's community newspapers, libraries, parks, schools, colleges and * * * but that's getting ahead of our story.

Let's go back to the chubby 8-year-old boy who made his debut in the newspaper business by helping to sell newspapers at the corner stand near his home.

Completely entranced by the newspaper profession, young Lerner was soon editing the Brainard grade school paper, which he got out on an old broken down mimeograph machine.

Even at the tender age of 10, the young editor knew that you can't publish a newspaper without becoming a part of the community.

"I remember during World War I, that we used to make wax candles out of tightly wrapped paper and I also learned to knit socks and sweaters."

The 10-year-old editor did not overlook the homefront and began his first and lifelong battle for the democratic rights of the people of his community.

"The board of education decided to annex our grade school, Brainard, to the Gladstone, which was 2 blocks down the street," recalled Mr. Lerner.

"Under this plan, our beloved principal would lose her status and become only an assistant principal.

"Our school became aroused and somehow I became one of the organizers and collectors of a huge petition against the annexation. We presented the petition to the board of education.

"I had also read about a great Chicagoan Prof. Charles E. Merriam at the University of Chicago, so I took a few of the kids from our block to ask the professors' advice. He received us cordially and treated us with great dignity.

"Our petition failed, but the work we did and our interview with Professor Merriam were never-to-be-forgotten incidents in our lives."

At the ripe old age of 12, young Lerner was well launched in his career of civic and community service and even received citywide recognition for his efforts.

"Just before graduation from grade school, the immigrant women of the neighborhood were organized into a reading and writing class, and to help them get away from home I organized a group of babysitters. I also undertook to bring homework to the women who couldn't come to class because they were sick."

In 1920, the Chicago Tribune did a full page feature which contained a picture of the rotund little worker. Under the photo was the caption: "Leo A. Lerner, age 12, the school captain who cheers up the sick."

The Lerner family, of which Leo was the oldest of 10, bustled with activity in the two-story frame house at 1315 South Loomis. It was here, on September 20, 1907, that Leo was born.

The family later moved to 2122 Washburne, which was across the street from Brainard school.

His parents, Harry and Dora Lerner, believed and worked for two things: To own their own home and to educate all their children.

To help toward this goal, young Lerner went to work the day after he was 13 years old as a messenger for a jewelry house. He was also attending Marquette high school, which was the freshman branch of Crane.

It was at Crane that freshman Lerner launched another phase of his multiple career—politics. He was elected president of the freshman class and was thereafter, successfully elected every semester for eight continuous semesters.

Running neck and neck with Student Lerner's high school political career, were his literary and oratorical efforts.

He was coeditor of the Crane High Chronicle and was an outstanding member of the Crane debating team which won the city championship.

Young Lerner's after school employment and a partial 2-year scholarship to Northwestern University made it possible for him to begin his professional journalistic career.

He worked on the staff of the Daily Northwestern as a reporter and later as night editor.

Soon after Mr. Lerner entered Northwestern, and when he was 16 years old, he got his first newspaper job. He became a reporter for the Niles Center News for $25 a week.

Reporter Lerner attended town meetings, conferred with lawyers, architects, engineers, politicians, and learned the legal methods of operating a city.

Appalled by the lack of educational facilities, he helped the people of Morton Grove, through Herb Dilg, then mayor, to get the town its first library.

As in his high school days, young Lerner spiced his reportorial and civic duties with literary talent.

In 1923, Chicago was a great theater center and the Daily Northwestern carried a column of dramatic and literary criticism which young Lerner inherited. He went to the theater almost every night, and in between his classes and reportorial job, studied history and the English dramatists.

Editor Lerner's theater experience stood him in good stead when in 1930, he wrote a sketch about Chicago for the New York Theater Guild. The sketch won first prize and was produced in the Guild's show "Garrick Gaieties" at the Blackstone theater.

The leading lady in the sketch was none other than the now famous TV star, Imogene Coca.

Although encouraged by Theresa Helburn and Lawrence Langner, of the Theater Guild, to continue writing for the theater, young Lerner was too busy being a community newspaper editor.

"The only Broadway I got to know anything about," he recalled, "is the one that runs through the North Side of Chicago."

While visiting his friend, Tom Myers, at the Myers Publishing Co., young Lerner in 1926 received a job offer—one that was the beginning of his legendary career as editor and publisher. The Lincoln-Belmont Booster was then published as a shopping news and an editor was needed to change it into a newspaper.

The Lincoln-Belmont Booster grew in circulation and size and several employees were added to the staff, including Elizabeth Bialk, who later as Elissa Bialk became the author of children's books, plays, and the movie, "The Sainted Sisters."

As depression clouds hovered, young Lerner married Deana Duskin on July 12, 1929. The saying that behind every great man is a great woman was written with Deana Lerner in mind.

The happy marriage was blessed with three children, Louis, Robert, and Rosanne, all of whom are now married, and have presented the senior Lerners with two grandchildren.

When the depression cyclone hit, Editor Lerner found himself in the middle of it. To aid families then on relief, Mr. Lerner invited political bigwigs to eat a typical relief dinner. When the politicians ate the meager meal, they were convinced the relief allotments should be increased.

The Lincoln-Belmont Booster, which was rapidly becoming a household word in the community, also conducted a free employment bureau during the depression.

Looking back, Editor Lerner said: "When I think of it, I was a prohibition baby, since one-fourth of my life was spent during a time when it was illegal to take a drink.

"I was a depression baby, for about one-fifth of my life was spent during the time when anybody with a quarter was a millionaire, and a war baby when I was actually living in peace. That is why I've always counted myself on the liberal side of politics.

"I wanted to run a newspaper for readers and I wanted the readers to have enough money in their pockets so that they could buy from the merchants who advertise.

"I don't want one particular crowd to take it all away so that the reader doesn't have anything left for anybody else. I want to see that the fellow who works for a living gets a decent living wage. I think that's fair, it's honest, it's American, and it's not radical."

A man of action as well as words, Mr. Lerner helped to found the liberal Independent Voters of Illinois in 1943 and was one of the original supporters of PAUL DOUGLAS when he ran for U.S. Senator in 1942.

He was also cochairman of the National Committee for Stevenson for President.

Looking back, it can be safely said that Mr. Lerner and his newspapers, along with the numberless citizens and neighbors, had fought for practically every North Side bridge, school, park site, and library.

Mr. Lerner served on the library board for 7 years and consistently fought to better library facilities on the North Side.

The Lake View library, one of the most outstanding branch libraries in the country, is the result of a stormy period in 1940 when Mr. Lerner persuaded the library board to build the edifice.

As president of the Citizens Schools Committee for 2 years, Editor Lerner along with civic-minded Chicagoans of all political beliefs, fought and helped to win the battle to improve Chicago schools.

"This was the biggest battle I ever got mixed up in. We fought against the corruption of the McCahey-Johnson crowd in the Chicago schools and succeeded in ousting them. The present school system, which ranks as one of the finest in the country, is the result of that battle," said Mr. Lerner.

Schools, the backbone of the community, always came first and foremost with Editor Lerner.

Perhaps it stemmed from his parents' insistence on a good education for their children and Editor Lerner was trying to do the same for the children of Chicago.

In 1946, Mr. Lerner along with Frank McCulloch and Jim Sparling helped organize the nonquota Roosevelt College, of which he had served as chairman of the board for 10 years.

It was also in 1946, that Mr. Lerner received the Decalogue Society of Lawyers Man of the Year Award.

As the fame of Editor Lerner and the Lincon-Belmont Booster grew, so did the chain of newspapers.

In 1943, Mr. Lerner became editor and publisher of the Myers and Johnson newspapers, later adding suburban editions.

The Lerner newspapers consist of 21 community newspapers comprising the largest chain of neighboring papers in the world, with a weekly circulation of 300,000.

The more dramatic aspects of Mr. Lerner's career, those of editor and publisher, civic leader, and political savant overshadow his talents as a writer but there are many who consider this talent his greatest asset.

This opinion is not only shared by a coterie of friends but, judging from the awards he had received, by the Nation as a whole.

To begin with, in 1937 he won the first prize for the best editorial in the State of Illinois.

In 1941, at the second American Congress of General Semantics held at the University of Denver, Mr. Lerner read a paper called "The Influence of General Semantics on Journalism."

In 1945 Editor Lerner was the only neighborhood newspaperman accredited by the State Department to cover the United Nations Conference in San Francisco.

The stories he wrote about the United Nations have been used for class study in universities and colleges all over the country.

In 1947, Mr. Lerner toured postwar Europe and wrote the book "Continental Journey."

In 1951, he was awarded the coveted Herrick award presented by the National Editorial Association for the best editorial interpretation of Americanism, democracy, and responsible citizenship.

In 1953, Mr. Lerner was named publisher of the year by the Controlled Circulation Newspapers of America.

Author Lerner added two more books to the list: "The Itch of Opinion" in 1956, and "The Italics Are Mine" in 1960.

Mr. Lerner's mother, Dora Lerner, is the recipient of the dedication in the latter book. It reads:

"For my mother, Dora Lerner, who, having borne 10 of us, has discovered over the years that that was the easiest part of it."

Perhaps this dedication is the sum and total of Author Lerner's writing skill. He had the ability to put a lifetime in a few words and to do it with simple humor or pathos that not only the reader can understand but can feel.

An Abraham Lincoln buff from his early editor years, Mr. Lerner is coauthor of "Lincoln of the Ages," published by Doubleday in 1960.

He also had served as chairman of the Abraham Lincoln Memorial Commission of the State of Illinois and was responsible for the erection of the statue of Lincoln in Ravenswood's Lincoln Square.

In 1961, Mayor Richard Daley presented the Medal of Merit to Publisher Lerner. The award read:

"For his courageous leadership as editor and citizen in arousing the civic consciousness of the people for better government, his effective work for academic freedom, and equal opportunity for education for all."

One can't write about Leo Lerner without mentioning his skill as a speaker. For many years, he presided over the Roosevelt College fund-raising dinners and his renowned wit brought back generous donors year after year. He spoke throughout the country before groups ranging from the PTA to college graduating classes and professional societies.

Publisher Lerner added another first to his multiple career with his appointment as a member of the parole board in 1962.

Also, in 1964, President Johnson named Mr. Lerner to the Citizens Advisory Board of the Community Relations Services.

Just as Carl Sandburg's Chicago is the city of the big shoulders—so Leo A. Lerner was the editor with the big shoulders. And on these broad shoulders he carried the fight for better neighborhoods for half a century.

On March 6 he laid down this heavy burden.

Chicago will miss him—the North Side will miss him—we will miss him.

A MAN WHO LIVED AND WROTE FOR THE PEOPLE—LEO A. LERNER, 1907–65

(Author, columnist, crusading editor, publisher, vigilant citizen, gentleman farmer, friend, neighbor, a man who loved every aspect of life and its cultural reflections—these are the varied roles Leo A. Lerner played in the city he loved. Like a benevolent father watching over his growing charges, he lavished attention and affection on the communities that his newspaper served. A zoning problem, a child needing blood, a PTA fundraising drive, a penny social or a thousand-dollar party, a good movie, play, or work of art, a visit from some reader's relatives from North Dakota—every phase of news was dear to the heart of Leo A. Lerner. "Print the accurate news about our readers—every scrap of it" was his most frequent admonition. In these pictures we glimpse him again, in farewell, as he met with the big people and the little people who made up his world. He was a man in a hurry. The race is to the swift and Leo A. Lerner was a champion.)

A MAN WHO CARED

(By Valerie Long)

Leo Lerner would not like a maudlin eulogy.

"Just report the facts," he used to say.

All right, boss, here are the facts.

We started to work for Leo Lerner more than 15 years ago as a reporter for the Lincoln-Belmont Booster.

It wasn't long before we realized that we were working for a man "who cared."

He cared about the city of Chicago, his beloved North Side, the people who worked for him, and the quality of his newspapers.

And because he cared, he insisted on quality, integrity, and incisive reporting.

Under his editorship, the Booster became a household word in the community.

Sure, he worked us hard, but soon the Booster became a training ground for some of the top newspapermen today.

Mike Royko, a columnist for the Chicago Daily News, got his start as a police reporter for the Booster.

Patricia Moore, society editor of the Daily News, and Elissa Bialk Krautter, author of children's books and screenwriter, began their careers on the Booster.

There were many others.

And under Leo Lerner's tutelage, we ourselves became editor of the Booster and his training stood us in good stead.

The Booster won awards, citywide, State, and national, and we were proud.

And so was Leo Lerner—except that he would say: "That front page makeup could use a little sharpening up."

Constant improvement was his credo.

He also used to say: "Put what you know in the paper."

So using this as a wedge we would like to write what we know, even if it's a bit more sentimental than Leo Lerner would like.

We know we have always felt privileged to work for Leo Lerner because he was a giant among men.

We know that in our personal life, when we needed him during an illness, he proved to be a kind and generous friend.

We know that both my husband and I came to love Leo Lerner so much, that we named our first-born son after him.

We know that we shall miss him.

"FIRST COLUMN" WON HERRICK AWARD

The coveted Herrick Award was presented to Leo A. Lerner by the National Editorial Association in June 1951.

He was awarded first prize for his "first column" editorials which, according to the NEA, best described democracy, Americanism, and good citizenship to the people.

A judge in the editorial competition, Edmund Arnold, said:

"The column shows a deep and understanding affection for democracy and presents its view in a highly literate manner. Here is a constant stimulation of the reader

to a newer appreciation of democracy and its functions.

"The column does an excellent job of explaining and selling democracy. The quality of writing is surprisingly high.

"If anywhere the myth persists that the weekly editor is just a hick with galley twine instead of hayseed in his hair, this contest should convince people beyond doubt that the small paper editor writes as well, thinks just as clearly, is just as well informed, and just as courageous as his big daily colleagues."

Following are the editorials that won the Herrick Award for Leo Lerner:

"Impossible"—April 30, 1950.

"All the Elements Must Be Free"—May 28, 1950.

"What Biddle Said About Jefferson"—May 31, 1950.

"The Mass Roots"—August 2, 1950.

"Living Dangerously"—October 4, 1950.

"The Churkendoose"—October 18, 1950.

"Let's Marry Prosperity to Peace"—November 8, 1950.

"Partners in a Common Dream"—December 3, 1950.

"Character Assassination"—December 20, 1950.

"The Rights and Freedoms of Others"—December 24, 1950.

"Self or Country"—December 27, 1950.

"Unemployed Wisdom"—January 3, 1951.

"We Are America"—January 31, 1951.

"A Second Look"—January 31, 1951.

"Abe Lincoln's 10th Birthday"—February 11, 1951.

"The Challenge of the Stormy Present"—February 14, 1951.

"He Chose Freedom"—February 21, 1951.

"How To Hate"—February 21, 1951.

"The $1,000 Bill"—February 28, 1951.

"Honesty Has a Future"—March 14, 1951.

CARL SANDBURG ON LEO A. LERNER: "DIOGENES WITH A PHONE"

Carl Sandburg, in his introduction to Leo A. Lerner's book, "The Itch of Opinion," said Mr. Lerner was "Diogenes without a lantern and satisfied that Diogenes might have done better with a telephone.

"Like Diogenes, he asks questions, he wants to know. What the press, radio, TV tell him is never enough. He tries to probe behind all they give to his ears and eyes.

"He tries to dig back of the known events of today and get at what the picture may be tomorrow. We have seen him imitate Montagne in being ready to publish things troubling his mind, asking questions he has no answer to.

"We have seen him trying to follow St. Paul in holding fast to what is good and true, shamelessly admitting that the going is not so good and true.

"He is hoper and seeker. When he probes his heart and mind to see what is there, and then spills it for his readers, he usually implies directly, "This is the best I can do for you now with the light I have now. I may be wrong today, and if I so find out tomorrow you can count on me to tell you.'

"He knows it is good luck and a privilege to write a column and print it in a paper he himself owns. He knows too it is a trust and a responsibility he ought never violate or betray.

"This isn't easy. So he never hesitates at getting a chuckle or laugh out of the grotesques and monkeyshines of the endless human procession.

"He can refer to himself as maybe a 'professional crab' or 'an officious hen.' He can mention 'small children who have been told in school that right always triumphs' and then add, 'It does, but people don't always live that long.'

"He can praise motels and belittle hotels in such fast style that suddenly you are saying, 'There must be a few sloppy motels and a few clean hotels.'

"Does he know baseball? Can he argue that the home run of today is a sham and a delusion and it ain't an earned run to knock a ball into the bleachers where no fielder has a chance at it while the hitter dogtrots around the bases to the home plate? He can, and if he doesn't convince you, he has you suspicious.

"He's a good teller of stories, usually anecdotes out of his own experience, pointing up lessons in human conduct.

"An editor, a traveler, a naturalist, a lover of children and trees, at home with big city slickers or small-time do-gooders, both metropolitan and country boy, Leo Lerner seems to be one of those rich Americans whose chief possessions no turn of fate can take away."

President Franklin D. Roosevelt sent this letter to Leo A. Lerner from Warm Springs, Ga., December 3, 1935:

WARM SPRINGS, GA.,
December 3, 1935.

LEO LERNER, ESQ.,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. LERNER: Your Thanksgiving poem gave me a good laugh; and I cannot restrain the impulse to tell you I am truly thankful that there are still left in a troubled world men like yourself with a sense of humor.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

CANCER PREVENTION CENTER LAUNCHES LERNER FUND

Lerner Memorial Fund has been established at the Cancer Prevention Center, 17 West Huron, and friends who wish to make contributions should make out and send their checks to the center.

At the time of his death, Leo A. Lerner was chairman of the board of the center.

In 1959 he served as president of the board.

A tireless worker for the center, his efforts helped raise $440,000 toward the $600,000 needed to build a new center.

A facility at the new center will be named after Mr. Lerner.

The new building, which will be erected at the southeast corner of Dearborn and Huron, will be started this spring.

Since the center was founded in 1943, it has examined 120,000 persons. The new facilities will make it possible to examine up to 15,000 people annually, doubling the present facilities.

The center provides at cost physical examinations in an effort to detect early cancer when treatment by a doctor is more effective.

Dr. Caesar Portes, medical director of the center, states:

"I have known Leo A. Lerner for many years, both professionally and as my friend. I respected him highly for his genius and compassion for all men. He could think clearly; he could write magnificently; he could hold an audience in the palm of his hand.

"During the past 8 years I have had a wonderful experience in working with him on the Cancer Prevention center.

"His devotion, effort, time, and his health were given to this project and the many others which were good for the community.

"Almost anything that would benefit people received his attention. I shall miss my friend and so will all whom he touched. This is a great loss to our community."

Manuel J. Segall, executive secretary of the center, said:

"A beloved and respected citizen, Leo A. Lerner did a great deal to create public awareness of the importance of early cancer detection and to make possible a new building which will be started.

"This is just one more example of his devotion to the community and to others at a time when, physically, he could little afford to give so much of himself. We shall miss him greatly."

MUNICIPAL LEAGUE HONORS LEO A. LERNER

Leyden-Norwood Municipal League at its Monday evening meeting passed a resolution praising the late Leo A. Lerner for his lifetime of newspaper and civic work and extending sympathy to the widow and family.

Elmwood Park Mayor Elmer Conti introduced the resolution stating: "The area has suffered a great loss in Leo Lerner not only in the loss of his journalism but his civic leadership.

"We extend our most sincere sympathy to the widow, Mrs. Leo A. Lerner, and the entire family."

The Leyden-Norwood Municipal League is comprised of more than 360 elected and appointed public officials representing the municipalities, unincorporated areas, school districts and other governmental subdivisions of the townships of Leyden and Norwood Park.

A REAL LOSS

The Park District commissioners (James Gately, president; William McFetridge, vice president; Jacob Arvey, John H. Levin, and Joseph L. Gill) issued this statement:

"The loss of Leo Lerner is one that will be felt by all people of the city, not merely those of the districts served by his newspapers. He made a tremendous contribution to Roosevelt University, and for many other worthwhile projects in his 'beloved city.'

"We of the Chicago Park district were beneficiaries of his civic efforts. We enjoyed much needed help from his newspapers in publicizing the activities of our local parks and community centers throughout the north and northwest sides. We enjoyed his support and cooperation in our efforts to preserve the beaches along the north side of Lake Michigan.

"We will all miss Leo Lerner and his contribution in making Chicago a better place to live."

LEO LERNER DEATH LOSS TO POLICE

From the cop on the beat to Chicago's top policemen, law enforcement officials mourn the loss of one of their best allies, Leo A. Lerner.

From all parts of the city, and in all manners, came recognition of Mr. Lerner's continuous cooperation, in placing the resources of his staff and plant at the disposal of police whenever such assistance could be of help to the community.

From Comdr. John Fahey of Town Hall, a call about funeral plans, and his reaction: "I have lost a good friend in Leo Lerner. He was behind us all the way, giving us support with editorials and his backing of Operation Crime Stop.

"This is one whom I call a good friend, one who is loyal and helpful. He understood our problems so well, and supported our work. We have lost a fine man."

From a secretary at area 6 burglary unit, answering an inquiry about an arrest:

"He was such a wonderful person; it's a terrible loss."

From Comdr. James Hackett, formerly of Albany Park and Shakespeare districts, who first met Leo Lerner in 1933 when Hackett was a patrolman in the old Sheffield district:

"He was a good friend, one who always lent the support of his paper to promote the interest of the community and the police. Nothing anyone could say about him would be too good."

And from Supt. Orlando Wilson, whose acquaintance with Mr. Lerner dates back to the early days of Wilson's administration:

"The city of Chicago is saddened by the loss of Leo Lerner. His contributions to law and order and civic betterment were im-

measurable. I extend the heartfelt condolences of the Chicago police."

STRICTLY BUSINESS

(By D. CECCHINI)

The presses are halted, business comes to a standstill and our heads are bowed in memorial recognition of one whom we shall never forget.

Leo Lerner was a man with a mission. He worked in an area of great controversy and campaigned bravely for many causes. He was a capable newsman and a leading business builder. He never shirked responsible participation in public affairs and encouraged the participation of others.

As a businessman he showed unlimited faith in the future of Rogers Park in establishing the main office of his newspaper chain at 7519 N. Ashland Avenue. He invested heavily in this home base of his business, and his newspaper offices are a real asset to business in Rogers Park. He planned further development in the proposed building of an addition to his offices and parking facilities. As a businessman he was visionary though practical.

He also looked to the future in his plan for his sons Louis and Robert to succeed him in the business. He supervised their training and brought them into active participation as officers of the Lerner Publications.

As a writer he was tireless and loved to write with a purpose. His keen enjoyment of timely topics, public affairs, people and situations, has contributed much spice to the books and articles he has authored.

We recall with gratitude that for over 2 years he has generously allowed us to beam our message to business through this column, that business might be brought to a greater unity and strength.

Leo the Lionhearted has gone to meet a final deadline and we know we will miss him, but the life he lived, so rich in accomplishment will live in the annals of Rogers Park forever.

THIS 'N' DATA

(By Al Reznik)

The sports world lost one of its most revered battlers in the passing of Leo A. Lerner.

He did not pretend to be an outstanding athlete, though there are many who can recall his days as a better-than-average left-handed softball pitcher.

The pen was his tool, love of the game as a fan his approach. He could report with and better than the best of us and he never was too busy for some byplay on this pennant race or that. His insight was remarkable.

He was a gentleman, a sportsman, a fan, and a benefactor of man.

We and our world miss him dearly.

ST. SCHOLASTICA GIRLS MOURN LEO LERNER

Sister M. Gabrielle, public relations director at St. Scholastica Academy, 7416 North Ridge issued this statement Monday:

"Students of St. Scholastica High School wish to express their sorrow on hearing of the death of Mr. Leo A. Lerner. His writings and editorial policies have ever been an inspiration to Scholasticans, especially to aspiring journalists."

VOTING RIGHTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the systematic denial to Negroes of the right to vote in Selma, in Alabama, and elsewhere in the South has been well known to Congress for a long time. This flagrant and open violation of the Constitution was before us in the 88th Congress. We should have passed legislation providing a speedy, effective, thorough means of extending the franchise to all Americans long before this.

Because we did not, we have experienced the tragic events in Selma. We have seen Americans killed, beaten, gassed, abused, and jailed for trying to assert the most fundamental right of the citizens of a democracy.

I am delighted that President Johnson has proposed his two-point program for striking down the barriers that have kept the great majority of Negroes from voting in much of the South.

I am delighted that the leaders of this House and of the other body have invited the President to address us here tonight and to describe his program in greater detail.

Within a matter of hours, then, this urgent, vital legislative proposal will be in our hands.

We cannot make up the time that has been lost or repeal the tragedy of Selma. But we can and should act with the utmost speed on the voting rights bill.

I respectfully urge the Committee on the Judiciary to give this matter the highest priority and to remain in session from morning until night until the voting rights bill is perfected and reported out. I urge that the House then schedule the bill for immediate consideration, and stay in session until it is approved.

BELOIT FREEDOM MARCH

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, Beloit to Madison, Wis., is a distance of 50 miles. Selma to Montgomery, Ala., is a distance of 50 miles. Madison and Montgomery are State capitals

So it seemed fitting that students from Beloit College, one of the great private colleges in America, would make their own march for freedom this past week.

Except for the distance involved and the ultimate destination point of the State's capital all other comparisons fail.

Those in Alabama were told they could not march. Those in Wisconsin were encouraged to do so. They were encouraged not only by spokesmen at their college but by townspeople in Beloit and along the way.

Those in Wisconsin were given food and necessary shelter, usually by church groups, along the way. Those in Alabama had been turned back by clubs and tear gas.

Law enforcement officials in Wisconsin labeled the group as "orderly" and had no trouble with them or with the traffic on the highway along their route. Alabama officials refused the march because it would—they said—be inflammatory as well as creating traffic problems on the highway.

On their arrival at Wisconsin's State capital the Beloit College group was warmly greeted by Wisconsin's Republican Governor Warren Knowles and its Democratic Lieutenant-Governor, Pat Lucey. Alabama's Governor Wallace said yesterday he would not meet with a group of demonstrators of this type.

This contrast alone should be sufficient statement of the difference in sentiment of the people in my home State of Wisconsin and of those in Alabama.

To further point out the feeling of Wisconsin people I include in the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in last Thursday's Janesville Daily Gazette and which, in outstanding manner, points out why those in Wisconsin abhor the tactics in Selma during the past week.

SECOND CLASS CITIZENS

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."

Thus reads the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Further, this amendment made the Negro not only a citizen of the United States but also of the State of his residence. It struck the word "white" from the constitutions of northern States which had limited citizenship to white males. In North and South the Negro became possessed in law of all the rights of citizenship.

This guarantee of the rights of citizenship in reality also involves the responsibilities of citizenship, for in no other country is the citizen burdened with such duties of citizenship. The whole American system of government is dependent upon the citizen's activating his rights and duties, such as voting in general elections.

These are the rights which the Negro is fighting for. In many places in the Deep South, such as in Alabama, Negroes have always been denied those rights through subterfuges and rules designed to prevent them from exercising their legal voting rights.

Deprived of those rights, these citizens are second class citizens. Yet they bear the same burdens of taxation, etc., which other citizens bear in States where citizenship is denied.

Times change, however, and today Americans are beginning to recognize that Negroes are individuals just as are all other American citizens. The North is stained by intolerance also, even though Negroes are able to vote without question.

In the South the fever of Negro unrest continues to grow. Many Southerners sympathize to a degree with the appeal of the Negro but find it impossible to reveal their feelings.

Doors everywhere, in education, business, and industry, are being opened to the Negro for the first time. Many of the color bars already are removed. But this new taste of freedom cannot be expected to satisfy citizens who find denial continuing in many other phases of their lives.

To focus public attention upon their demand for their citizen rights at the polls, the freedom march from Selma to Montgomery, Ala., was organized. They were denied the right to register to vote at the Dallas County Courthouse in Selma.

Similar to the 50-mile march to Montgomery was the Beloit College student march from Beloit to Madison—a sympathetic demonstration. The marchers plodded along at the side of paved Highway 213, peaceably and unmolested.

The marchers who started in Selma were met by State troopers, acting under orders of Gov. George Wallace, to use any means necessary to stop the march. News pictures of the marchers indicated they marched peaceably, and unarmed. They included men and women, white and black, and many of the clergy.

When they did not disperse, the troopers suddenly charged, with tear gas and flailing nightsticks. It was brutal, savage bestiality and a bloody affair. Still, the Negroes have refused to give up and are planning more rallies.

A Federal judge banned a massive right-to-vote march Tuesday. Adding to the frightful melee was the vicious beating of three white ministers who had joined the march, one of whom is in critical condition from skull fractures.

One basic element should be kept in mind as this dreadful scene widens. The right to vote is guaranteed by the Constitution to all citizens. It recognizes no first- or second-rate citizens. Before the law citizenship is indivisible. There are no fractional citizens of the United States.

Such brutality over citizen rights is incomprehensible, and the more there is, the more opposition Governor Wallace and his cohorts will generate.

Such barbarity as Wallace's men showed this week will not still the free spirit of man any more than the cowardly sheets of the Ku Klux Klan; and freedom to exercise his citizen rights cannot and should not be denied any citizen because of the color of his skin.

HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the President's Committee and Governors' Committees on Employment of the Handicapped sponsor an "ability counts" contest. Miss Karen King, who is a resident of my district, is the first-place winner of the Oklahoma contest. It is with pride that I submit for the RECORD Miss King's winning essay. I am sure all of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives will find it very interesting:

HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY

(By Karen King, age 16, Oklahoma City, Okla., Classen High School)

Our national strength and prosperity depend upon wise utilization of the skills and abilities of trained workers without prejudice to qualified workers who happen to be handicapped. This seemingly abstract commodity termed "national strength" can be compared to a fine tapestry, wherein individual threads are neither impressive nor sturdy. But, woven carefully into a fabric, they become both meaningful and durable. And the whole of the tapestry becomes all the richer for the divers colors and materials which the separate threads contribute. To be complete, the tapestry of our national strength must include the contribution of all employable citizens.

The foregoing analogy underscores the reason why America needs the skills of handicapped persons ready to assume positions commensurate with their abilities. Employers need able workers to fill their manpower demands and the handicapped workers have proven their ability by achieving equal or superior records for production, stability, concentration, and safety. A recent survey of the labor force in Oklahoma City shows a projected need for labor which may well be greater than the supply currently being trained. Particularly in the semiskilled, technical, and clerical areas, all susceptible to training among the handicapped, this need will be felt. So hiring the handicapped is and will continue to be good business.

To employ persons who are limited by some handicap enhances the individual dignity and thus assures the collective diligence of our labor force so vital to our national security. But hiring the disabled is not simply a matter of expressing humanitarianism. Because the handicapped are intent on proving their value and on providing their own livelihood without assistance, in the right job they often set standards for workmanship and production which prove that their hiring is in no sense an act of charity, but again a simple proof of good business practices. This salient fact is gradually being brought home to industry, and the number of handicapped persons on payrolls is growing every day in our community. In fact, each month in the greater Oklahoma City area, the number of handicapped members of the labor force reaches a new record.

Companies such as Sears, Roebuck & Co., and General Electric include consideration of handicapped persons for employment on the basis of their capabilities for a particular job. They give careful consideration to the health and safety of the worker, particularly if he is limited in any way by physical handicap. Because of this attitude, one will find a number of handicapped people working in these companies at their various locations in our community.

Oklahoma City numbers several rehabilitation centers, workshops, hospitals, schools, and other special facilities in its confines for counseling and training the handicapped. Many of our disabled people are restored to useful activity through these facilities. This opportunity enables them to contribute their talents and skills to the development of our community. Through the rehabilitation service the handicapped are provided with medical help, physical aids, and advice to help them to pick out the right kind of work and to prepare for entering the labor force through training for the job best suited to their abilities and limitations. During training, while undergoing rehabilitation, the trainee receives board and room. Upon completion of his training, he is assisted in finding employment, provided with tools, and licensed. Once in the employment ranks, his progress is supervised and reported to ascertain the effectiveness of the training.

Certain services of the rehabilitation service are free to all clients regardless of financial situation. These include medical examination, diagnosis, and other evaluation to determine eligibility for rehabilitation, counseling and guidance. Further, all clients receive without cost to them the training necessary for job placement service itself as well as the followup services referred to above.

For other services including medical service, artificial limbs and appliances, living expenses and travel, tools, equipment and licenses, the rehabilitation agency pays the costs of the disabled person who is not financially able to bear such expense.

The Goodwill Industry in Oklahoma City also prepares handicapped persons for normal employment. Using testing, evaluation, work conditioning, on-the-job experience and counseling, the Goodwill Industries seek to make handicapped men and women acceptable in the competitive working world. The Goodwill people are noted for collecting old or torn clothing, used toys and utensils in their familiar large collection boxes on streets scattered throughout the city. The handicapped then mend or remake these articles for the experience, receiving a modicum of pay.

Most of the businesses in our community are currently hiring the handicapped, but this has come about as a result of the efforts of the many community workers in rehabilitation centers, workshops, hospitals, and schools. Through newspapers and television, the message of "employ the handicapped" is conveyed regularly to prospective employers. These media also issue articles telling why to hire the handicapped. On the other hand, the handicapped themselves receive leaflets listing the "Do's and Don'ts" which the handicapped person should consider when applying for work. When the employer hears of the advantages of hiring handicapped people, he often arranges for an interview with a handicapped person capable of doing the job in question.

Our community is fortunate to have a public committee on employment of the handicapped, appointed by the mayor. There are plenty of public spirited citizens in Oklahoma City, also, who volunteer their time and energies in behalf of the handicapped. Working through the committee, these citizens are becoming a potent force in our community. The local citizenry is expressing still a greater effort in helping the completely disabled people. Some citizens of our city are giving virtually their entire lives to assisting the completely disabled. For example, the Oklahoma Foundation for the Disabled has established a center administered by volunteers, which helps the disabled make glassware, paint pictures, and produce ceramics. The products of these workers are sold at a bazaar held each Christmas. Public spirited citizens often donate expensive items to sell at the bazaar, as well. The money received for each of the objects is given to the disabled person who made it. Money from the donated objects is given to the foundation to pay for expenses involved in running it. The foundation also provides swimming, bowling, and similar recreational services. The pool where the disabled swim is donated by community workers. Without the community's efforts in providing such centers, these handicapped persons would be idle and nonproductive and be forced to live unhappy lives devoid of human fellowship. This recently established center has a long waiting list of people for the limited number of places available in its current space. So it is evident that the disabled are anxious to participate in the program which our community is working to provide for them. The need for expansion of services such as this one center which the foundation operates is all too evident.

Oklahoma City is noted nationally for its attention to the problems of its growing community. There is every reason to believe that it will continue to increase its efforts to provide employment for all its citizens to the end that the tapestry which is Oklahoma City will be assured the enriching strength of contribution from all its labor force without exception.

THE PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM OF THE CITY OF CORAL GABLES, FLA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, I have taken the floor of the House of Representatives to call to the attention of the membership of this body, special projects and programs conducted abroad by private American citizens.

One of the outstanding undertakings of this type is the people-to-people program of the city of Coral Gables, Fla. This program involves a variety of projects and exchanges between Coral Gables and its sister city, Cartagena, Colombia. It is a constructive, well-thought-out program which has received enthusiastic support from the citizenry and the officials of the two cities.

Just the other day, I read the status report of this program as of January 1965. And it occurred to me that the Members of this House, and other interested persons, may also like to read it and see how much can be accomplished through private efforts to build good will for the United States, and to promote self-help on the part of the people of friendly nations. For this reason, I am placing the entire text of this report in the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of the membership of this body. In doing this, I am sure my colleagues join me in extending well-deserved congratulations to R. E. Westling, president, and all other members of the committee who worked so hard to do so much.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this occasion to observe that the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has devoted considerable time and effort to the study of private participation in foreign aid. As chairman of that subcommittee, I am proud to have had a hand in starting this project, and in overseeing its progress. I believe that the information which our subcommittee has gathered will prove of great interest to the Congress and to the American people as a whole. We hope to publish our findings, and the results of a survey which we conducted among some 1,600 private organizations conducting programs abroad, within the next few weeks. This, I may add, is a part of the subcommittee's overall study of ideological operations in foreign policy, on which subject we have already published a number of hearings and reports in the 88th Congress.

The report on the people-to-people program of the city of Coral Gables reads as follows:

REPORT ON PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM, INC., CORAL GABLES, FLA., JANUARY 11, 1965

RADIO POLICE CARS

Twelve radio-equipped police cars are to be sold by the city of Coral Gables to the Rotary Club in Cartagena who in turn will transfer these cars to the city police department of Cartagena. This sale was approved by the city commissioners of Coral Gables on December 15, 1964, and formally accepted by the people in Cartagena. The price is $15,174 for the 12 units. The negotiations were handled between the people-to-people committee in Cartagena and the people-to-people committee in Coral Gables. As soon as the city of Coral Gables receives their new units these 12 units will be available for shipment to Cartagena. This project should be completed early in 1965.

This is a worthwhile project to the people of Cartagena due to various cost-saving factors. One is that it costs over $300 just to take the special police equipment (radio, lights, siren, etc.) out of one car and place it in the new car, and then plug the holes and repair the places in the first car where the special equipment had been mounted. Another economic reason is that the traded-in police cars are repainted and sold to the public. Only the door need be painted and no retail sales costs or profit are involved by the sale directly to the Cartagena group. All of the units being sold are in very good condition and not yet 2 years old, but they would have 2 years depreciation by a retailer purchasing these units. These units were inspected by the chief of police, a representative of the Rotary Club, and the president of the people-to-people committee, all from Cartagena, Colombia.

This is a good example of the type of people-to-people program we like to continue. Our sister city, Cartagena, is being helped financially and acquiring a radio-equipped police car force, which they need, with no cost to the city of Coral Gables, or any of the members of the people-to-people committee except our willing time and effort.

SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Our new scholarship program is for 5 scholarships of $200 each for 1 year, 4 to be donated by the Coral Gables committee and 1 by the Cartagena committee. The student must have had at least 1 year of college, be of good character in the upper 20 percent of the class and require the money to continue in school. The $200 is paid directly to the student at $20 per month for the 10 months of school provided he maintains his scholastic standard and good character. We have received, or have been promised, the required amount for our four scholarships. This program has been accepted by the Cartagena committee and they will receive applications from students on January 15 and announce the recipients prior to February 1.

There is a second part of the scholarship program that we plan to put into operation this summer. A student from the University of Miami will receive a 3-months scholarship to the University of Cartagena. This will consist of transportation to and from Cartagena, tuition to the University of Cartagena, and room and board similar to what a student may have in Miami. Then, next January, a student from the University of Cartagena will come to the University of Miami with the same benefits supplied by the University of Miami and the people-to-people committee of Coral Gables. Each sending committee will pay for their own student's air transportation; the receiving committee will arrange for the tuition and room and board. This program has also been approved by the Cartagena committee and the University of Cartagena. In 1965 we have to complete the arrangements with the University of Miami and establish the method of student selection.

TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS

In the fall of 1965 we sent 1,200 pounds of technical publications from the engineers and scientists committee of the people-to-people program in New York to the University of Cartagena. We arranged for a special ocean freight rate and free handling for the shipment. Coral Gables people-to-people committee paid the freight which amounted to about $65. The University of Cartagena received well over a thousand dollars worth of technical publications that will be most helpful to their engineering library. We hope to continue these shipments each 6 months.

MEDICAL PUBLICATIONS

The same type of publications of the medical profession would be most useful and several approaches have already been made to form such a program. We have been offered free air freight from Miami to Cartagena for such publications. One of our 1965 projects will be to establish a means of acquiring and sending medical journals to the Medical School of the University of Cartagena. There are 1,000 students in the 6-year course.

MEDICAL EQUIPMENT

Specific medical equipment has been requested by the Cartagena committee for the local hospitals. A request for information as to how this equipment, as well as other general medical equipment, might be obtained from decommissioned military bases has been made to the U.S. State Department's local representative. I have received a copy of this representative's letter which was sent out to locate such equipment. This should be one of our main projects for 1965—locate medical, of course, including dental, equipment that would be usable in Cartagena.

BICYCLES

We have about 60 bicycles ready for shipment to Cartagena. These are unclaimed bicycles which the city of Coral Gables makes available each year for shipment to Cartagena to be distributed by the people-to-people committee to organization and specific persons that can put them to the best use. These bicycles are to be shipped free on an ore boat going from the west coast of Florida to Cartagena. They had been scheduled to be shipped at the time of the last hurricane that hit Miami. This was impossible so the shipment is being rescheduled. This should be completed early in 1965.

BASEBALL TEAM

This year again we hope to send a baseball team to Cartagena. This team is well received and the profits of the gate receipts of the games go to needy children. Aside from the worthwhile charity aspect, this is a wonderful chance of continuing and creating interest and contact between our two cities. This one project brings more publicity before the citizens of Cartagena and Colombia, concerning Coral Gables than any other project.

BASEBALL CLINIC

The worldwide amateur baseball series takes place in Colombia this year and Cartagena will be the principal headquarters. We are now arranging for Ron Frasher, baseball coach of the University of Miami, to go to Cartagena the first week in February to conduct a baseball clinic similar to those he has conducted in Europe for the Armed Forces. This will be prior to the worldwide amateur baseball series that starts on February 12 in Colombia. The Cartagena committee is to pay Mr. Frasher's plane fare and first-class living expenses while in Cartagena.

MOVIE FESTIVAL

Each year in February the city of Cartagena conducts a movie festival and one of the important parts of this festival is a guest movie star. We have been asked by the people-to-people committee of Cartagena to help locate a star that would be willing to go to Cartagena. So far we have been unable to be of any assistance. This is something that maybe we can work on this year so as to help them out for next year. Cartagena will pay expenses.

BEAUTY CONTEST

Each year in November the city of Cartagena has a beauty contest and we have been asked by the Cartagena committee to assist in suggesting a prominent personage to be one of the judges. This would be a good way

to continue interest between our two cities, and any suggestions will be appreciated, Cartagena will pay expenses.

DREDGING ENGINEER

Last year we sent a traffic engineer to Cartagena to assist in working out their traffic program. This year we have been asked to assist in arranging with the University of Miami for a dredging engineer to go to Cartagena to assist in laying out a dredging program for the city-owned dredge. Cartagena will pay for the engineer's air passage and all local expenses.

ENGINEER BUILDING, UNIVERSITY OF CARTAGENA

This project is initially a local project to form a cadre of Spanish-speaking engineers who will work together with, or under the direction of, engineers of the University of Miami for the designing of an engineering department building for the University of Cartagena. The approved design will then be expanded to the necessary construction and engineering drawings, and in turn to the cost of material and construction estimates. If all of this work is approved to this point by all concerned, then presentation will be made to AID for funds to construct this engineering building at the University of Cartagena. This project was initiated by a U.S. State Department representative. The project has been approved by the Coral Gables committee, and the initial letter from this committee to the engineering department of the University of Miami, outlining the project, has been sent. This letter was based upon previous discussions with a member of the engineering department of the University of Miami, two members of this committee, and the State Department representative. This has also been discussed with the president of the Cartagena committee. Although it has been approved by all parties so far involved in the initial stages, it is requested that there be no newspaper publicity of this project until said project has been completely formulated.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED PROJECT

This is a subject that has actually existed and has been of mutual interest to the two committees for some time, and I think it should be put on the project level. The Cartagena committee members that visited us in 1963 were most interested in the program for employment of the handicapped that is conducted in this area. They visited workshops and expressed a sincere desire for help in conducting a similar program in Cartagena. This interest was again expressed by the president of their committee when he was here in connection with the police car project just recently.

The chairman of the committee of total employment of Florida is also an officer of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and a member of the Governor's committee for the handicapped. She is also a regular attending member of our Coral Gables people-to-people program. I propose that Mrs. Florence Fox furnish us with all available information concerning the local and national program for employment of the handicapped. We in turn will send it to the Cartagena committee. I understand that the Cartagena committee will be willing to try to locate persons that are sufficently interested to translate the material we send down, and to assist those who might be interested in establishing a workshop or training program that would prove beneficial to the handicapped in Cartagena. I feel that this is the truest form of a people-to-people project. We are assisting in making available to our sister city information of a successful operation that they can put to use in their city with moral, spiritual, and economic benefit to the people of that city. The extent to which the people wish to use this kind of assistance is entirely up to them.

MEMBERSHIP PROJECT

Paid members	35
Yet to pay 1964–65 dues	36
Honorary members	6
Commissioners' appointees	5
Total members	82

Obviously some members have forgotten that our year starts June 1, and have not paid their dues of $10 for this year which runs from June 1, 1964, to May 31, 1965. We have to collect this year's dues and interest more people in becoming members of our Coral Gables people-to-people committee.

CORAL GABLES LIBRARY PROJECT

Colombia awards an annual prize for the best written book by a Colombian. The Cartagena committee president has agreed to send us several copies each year of the winning book and other good books occasionally for the Spanish section of our city library.

All members of the Coral Gables people-to-people committee have contributed in one way or another to the various projects during the past year, however, some members should be mentioned for specific work. My apologies to anyone omitted.

Radio police car project: Joseph H. Murphy, mayor of Coral Gables; W. L. Philbrick, vice mayor; C. L. Dressel, Jr., commissioner; W. Keith Phillips, Jr., commissioner; George M. Wilson, commissioner; L. W. Robinson, Jr., city manager; Joseph Mantinan, assistant city manager; Fred Hartnett, presented proposal to commissioners.

Scholarship project committee: Ralph Boggs, chairman; Warren Blackmon, Robert Kingsley, W. Keith Wheeling.

Scholarship project contributors: Albert H. Singer, Thomas B. Shelley, David H. Prince, Coral Gables Woman's Club, Rotary Club of Coral Gables, Florida National Bank of Coral Gables, International Petroleum Co., Gulf Oil Corp., P. H. White.

Medical equipment project: John Barfield, Director, U.S. Department of State Reception Center.

Baseball team and baseball clinic project: Joseph Mantinan.

Bicycle project: Joseph Mantinan.

Employment of the handicapped project: Florence Fox.

Engineering building project: John Barfield, director, U.S. Department of State Reception Center; Hugo Nichols, Consul General of Colombia; Joe C. Morris, president, Council for International Visitors; Zacarias Bramnick, professor, Engineering Department, University of Miami.

Social arrangements: Helen Klick, Alma Montecino.

Assistance with visitors from Cartagena: Dorothy Hosken, Grace Wedemeyer, Hans Wedemeyer, Roger Mumm, Albert H. Singer, Bebee Mantinan, Joseph Mantinan, Lee Fuller, Frank Kerdyk, and Roberto Llamas.

Report on scholarship project appearing in National Town Affiliation News: Marty Rosen. Technical publications: Robert B. Lea, vice chairman, engineers and scientists committee, people-to-people program.

Appreciated cooperation: Hugo Nichols, Consul General of Colombia; John Barfield, director, U.S. Department of State Reception Center; Nellie Justice, translator and secretary.

Assistance of the board on many projects and problems: Frank Kerdyk, vice president; Irene Ball, secretary; Robert Hosken, treasurer; Robert Kingsley, historian; Warren Blackmon, Fred Hartnett, Joseph Mantinan, and W. Keith Wheeling, directors.

Yours very truly,

R. E. WESTLING,
President.

GOVERNORS GRAPPLING WITH KNOTTY STATE-LOCAL PROBLEMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee and a member of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I have long held the view that our Federal system of government under the Constitution is strengthened to the extent that States and the local governments move affirmatively to meet the problems thrust upon them by changing times, rather than standing aside and casting the problem into the doorstep of the Congress.

Consequently, I was very much encouraged to read a recent compilation put together by the staff of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations of excerpts from recent messages of State Governors to their legislatures. The compilation was made for the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which the Commission's recommendations submitted for the consideration of the several States were being noted in legislative recommendations of the Governors. I am enocuraged by this compilation on two counts. First, it shows that the types of recommendations are commanding a considerable degree of support by State officials of both parties. On a more general basis I am encouraged because so long as our States move responsibly to meet the problems of our citizens a mighty bulwark is maintained against overconcentration of power in a central government.

The compilation follows:

EXCERPTS FROM GUBERNATORIAL MESSAGES WHICH WOULD CARRY OUT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

PROPERTY TAX REFORM

Oregon: "I recommend that the Oregon Tax Court's jurisdiction be clarified and that this court be given status and authority fully comparable to that of the circuit courts." (Message of Gov. Mark O. Hatfield to the Oregon Legislature, January 11, 1965.)

California: "While we are considering our whole tax structure, we would be remiss if we did not discuss property tax reform and its place in State-local fiscal and program relationships. I intend shortly to send you a special message on this subject, outlining principles and possibilities of reform. In the interim, I would caution you that reform aiming at property tax relief can be achieved only if we recognize that revenues thus lost to local governments must be obtained in some other way, preferably at the local level." (Budget message of Gov. Edmund G. Brown to the California Legislature, January 25, 1965.)

North Dakota: "There is no clear State policy of asking all taxpayers to share in the cost of supporting equally all political subdivisions in their various desires to render government services. It is better for local government to determine for itself the level

of expenditures and the type of expenditures it chooses, using funds over which it has complete responsibility.

"It is evident we need more full-time personnel working on property assessments. I suggest that in this session we adopt a measure that would call for full-time county supervisors of assessments in all counties by July 1, 1966.

"I believe that consideration should be given to establishing a common level of assessment on all property in the State, to be achieved within a reasonable period of time. * * * Some political subdivisions are intentionally overassessing to meet local budgets under the rigid mill rate limitations. Either all local government general fund mill limitations should be removed to permit more local autonomy, or limitations should be developed on budgets rather than on mill rates.

"In order that continuing tax research be conducted, I recommend that a tax institute be established in the bureau of business research at the University of North Dakota. This institute would be the repository for tax information and data from our State and our sister States. The direction of tax research performed by the tax institute should be under the legislative research committee." (Message of Gov. William L. Guy to the North Dakota Legislature, January 1965.)

Oklahoma: "I recommend the establishment of an equitable property assessment system in and between counties." (Message of Gov. Henry Bellmon to the Oklahoma Legislature, January 5, 1965.)

Missouri: "Although Missouri now has adequate income to provide our needed services without a tax increase, however, we want to forgo the possibility of future tax increases enacted in times of crisis for other administrations. Therefore, I recommend the establishment of a permanent, continuing tax study body to bring soundness to future tax planning and revenue production." (Message of Gov. Warren E. Hearnes to the Missouri Legislature, January 13, 1965.)

COORDINATION OF NONPROPERTY TAXES

Michigan: "There is urgent need for general property tax relief. The uniform city income tax was a first step in granting such relief. Additional nonproperty tax alternatives must be made available to local units of government. State standards of uniformity and fairness should be applied to exclusive local government tax sources." (Message of Gov. George Romney to the Michigan Legislature, January 14, 1965.)

Wisconsin: "I believe that the survival of home rule and the vitality of local government depends upon the effectiveness with which local government units meet and resolve their problems. I am suggesting legislation which will permit the use of additional sources of revenue by local units of government in order to reduce local property taxes. Local governments are suffering from the twin problem of too much government and yet not enough. County seats, municipalities, town governments, school districts and literally hundreds of other special-purpose districts, each with limited resources and a geographical and legal jurisdiction, compete with each other for local controls. These artificial and often arbitrary boundaries contribute to a lack of needed coordination in treatment of common problems, as in zoning and law enforcement and fiscal planning. Some efforts have been made in solving these problems but legislation will be introduced to provide the means whereby local units of government may give consideration to the implementation of their local needs." (Message of Gov. Warren P. Knowles to the Wisconsin Legislature, Jan. 19, 1965.)

EXCHANGE OF TAX RECORDS AND INFORMATION

Iowa: "By the creation of a Governor's Commission on State and Local Government, we have broken ground in what we hope will be a new era of cooperation between State and local government and between the various units of local government. Efficiency of tax collections has been sharpened by further implementation of the agreement with the Federal Government for cross-checking of State and Federal returns and by the exchange of information between State agencies." (Message of Gov. Harold E. Hughes to the Legislature of Iowa, January 12, 1965.)

LOCAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOND FINANCING

South Carolina: "Particularly do I urge that the provisions of this act which authorizes the issuance of public obligations to aid private business be repealed. I do not believe that public credit should ever be used to support private business." (Message of Gov. Donald Russell to the General Assembly of South Carolina, January 15, 1965.)

INVESTMENT OF IDLE CASH

Kansas: "I also recommend an increase in the interest rates on inactive State funds." (Budget message of Gov. William H. Avery to the Kansas Legislature, Jan. 28, 1965.)

Michigan: "The task force (on expenditure management) has recommended modification of antiquated laws on investment of State funds that would produce about $10 million additional income each year." (Message of Gov. George Romney to the Michigan Legislature, January 14, 1965.)

Wyoming: "Provision for better investment of State funds is overdue. Greater return with little or no additional risk of loss could result from a liberalization of the constitutional limitations on these investments." (Message of Gov. Clifford P. Hansen to the Wyoming Legislature, January 13, 1965.)

FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Georgia: "The time has arrived to recognize the municipalities of our State as full partners in the operation of our government. Therefore, I propose that we increase the appropriation from $1 million to $6 million for municipalities during the first year of the biennium, and from $1 million to $9,300,000 during the second year, giving a 2-year total of $15,300,000 in direct grants." (Message of Gov. Carl E. Sanders to the Georgia Legislature, January 12, 1965.)

Michigan: "Increased support of local health departments is needed through a formula equitable to every area of the State." (Message of Gov. George Romney to the Michigan Legislature, January 14, 1965.)

New Jersey: "I recommend that the legislature give prompt attention to a program of State aid for local health services. Basic State aid for county health services would provide $25,000 for each county and would require an annual State appropriation of $525,000. State aid for local health services would be made available on the basis of local need and ability to pay * * * State aid for emergency and special services would be made available * * * to cover emergency situations and in order to stimulate the development of health services." (Message of Gov. Richard J. Hughes to the New Jersey Legislature, January 12, 1965.)

REPEAL OF SPECIAL MAJORITY REQUIREMENTS FOR BOND AND TAX REFERENDUMS

Missouri: "That the general assembly submit to the voters for their approval a constitutional amendment providing for the voting of all general obligation bonds including, of course, school bonds by a majority vote.

"That the General Assembly submit a constitutional amendment to the voters increasing significantly the maximum current levy that may be approved by majority vote in school districts." (Message of Gov. Warren E. Hearnes to the Missouri Legislature, January 13, 1965.)

California: "I urge you to call for an amendment to reduce the restrictive and archaic requirement for a two-thirds majority vote which is required for passage of local school bond issues." (Message of Gov. Edmund G. Brown to the California Legislature, January 5, 1965.)

Idaho: "In a growing State we need to keep abreast of the building needs of our public schools. This need is now met by bonding, or by a plant facilities levy. I believe in majority rule, and I think most of our people do. We have no need for arbitrary rules which permit the minority on these issues to have their way. I therefore recommend to you most strongly once again that you take steps to reduce to 50 percent the number of votes necessary to carry a bond issue for school building purposes." (Message of Gov. Robert E. Smylie of the Idaho Legislature, January 5, 1965.)

STATE UTILIZATION OF REAL PROPERTY TRANSFER TAX

Vermont: "Enact a real estate property transfer tax of one-half of 1 percent." (Budget message of Gov. Philip H. Hoff to the Vermont Legislature, 1965.)

LIBERALIZED MUNICIPAL ANNEXATION LAWS

Michigan: "Efficient local government and economic growth are being stifled through inadequate and obstructive annexation laws. The boundary commission proposals of 1964 provide a sound basis for modern annexation procedures." (Message of Gov. George Romney to Michigan Legislature, January 14, 1965.)

STATE ACTION TO SECURE AND PRESERVE OPEN SPACE

Rhode Island: "In order to permit the cities and towns to participate more fully in the Green Acres program, I shall submit to the general assembly legislation increasing the functions of the local conservation commissions, enlarging the powers of the cities and towns to acquire open spaces and encouraging through tax deferrals the preservation of forests and farms." (Inaugural massage of Gov. John H. Chafee to the Rhode Island Legislature, January 1965.)

OFFICE OF LOCAL AFFAIRS

Missouri: "I have advocated as the ultimate vehicle for solving [urban] problems, the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. * * * I propose to appoint immediately an administrative assistant for urban affairs, who shall be charged with the responsibility of inaugurating a program to meet the pressing problems of these communities by using whatever tools are available, including the use of Federal funds. I plan that this office bear the responsibility for preparing for presentation to the general assembly a comprehensive proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs, which will aid metropolitan as well as nonmetropolitan communities in their search for modern answers to our complex problems." (Message of Gov. Warren E. Hearnes to the Missouri Legislature, January 13, 1965.)

New Jersey: "The need for a Department of Community Affairs becomes more urgent almost daily. It is needed to administer the many programs and bring together for better service the various agencies whose major responsibilities are directed toward serving our local communities. I call on you to take action in 1965 for a Department of Community Affairs on behalf of improved government on the level at which it is closest to the people." (Message of Gov. Richard J. Hughes to the New Jersey Legislature, January 12, 1965.)

Pennsylvania: "We will request—as part of our plan for reorganization of State government—that you establish a separate department of community development. We

will request legislation to assist in solution of such problems as mass transit that now afflict our cities and our suburbs." (Message of Gov. William W. Scranton to the Pennsylvania Legislature, January 5, 1965.)

INTERLOCAL CONTRACTING AND JOINT ENTERPRISES

Kansas: "Earlier in this message I referred to the shifting of population in our State. Such shifting creates not only the problem of overburdening certain community facilities, but it also points up the difficulty of overlapping jurisdiction between existing political subdivisions. I have not had the opportunity to explore this problem to the extent that I am in a position to make a specific recommendation to this session of the legislature. I am taking this opportunity however, to call this problem to your attention. I would further recommend that, to the extent to which you are able, you examine possible revision of existing statutes in order to obtain greater flexibility for cooperation between governmental units. Such efforts at intergovernmental cooperation for sharing the cost and management of public services can reduce substantially the per capita cost of local government." (Message of Gov. Wm. H. Avery to the Kansas Legislature, January 18, 1965.)

Rhode Island: "Services that are becoming prohibitive for a single town to support, can be rendered through cooperation with a neighboring town. Unless such cooperation takes place, the communities will be faced with constantly rising taxes and at the same time deterioration of the quality of the services rendered. Great opportunities for joint ventures are available in such fields as police and fire protection, education, rubbish disposal, recreation, and control of pollution. Some communities are already embarked on these. This administration will continue to assist in all ways possible the furtherance of this concept." (Inaugural address of Gov. John H. Chafee to the Rhode Island Legislature, January 1965.)

Iowa: "[The Governor's Commission on State and Local Government has recommended] a law to grant broad authority to units of State and local government in Iowa to enter into contracts for joint use of facilities and services. I strongly recommend the enactment of this proposal." (Inaugural address of Gov. Harold E. Hughes to the Iowa Legislature, January 14, 1965.)

STATE WATER RESOURCES PLANNING AND COORDINATION

Arizona: "I speak at the outset of the urgency of obtaining legislation for implementing the central Arizona project—to assure adequate water for our State's expanding economy. There is little question in my mind that the legislature and the Governor acting for the people of Arizona will find it necessary in the years ahead to make vital decisions involving the utilization of the State's water supply * * * efficient utilization of its water supply for the benefit of all the citizens." (Message of Gov. Samuel P. Goddard to the Legislature of Arizona, January 1965.)

Kansas: "Two years ago the Kansas Legislature passed the State Water Plan Act which provides basic guidelines for the development of the State's water resources. The initial phase of converting these guidelines into a State water plan has been taken by the Kansas Water Resources Board and its recommendations will be placed before this legislative session. This proposal, with such amendments or modifications as the legislature may make, increases the State opportunity to manage water for the maximum benefit of its citizens." (Message of Gov. William H. Avery to the Kansas Legislature, January 18, 1965.)

Wyoming: "The natural resource board should retain its present role in water planning. We must be much more aggressive in the development of a statewide water plan if we are to secure adequate amounts of Wyoming's water for the future needs of the State." (Message of Gov. Clifford P. Hansen to the Wyoming Legislature, January 13, 1965.)

Idaho: "The water agency amendment should be implemented without delay. I hope that you will create a strong, independent action agency that can move effectively to protect, conserve, and promote in every way the utilization of both the quality and the quantity of Idaho's priceless water resources. There is little time to spare. Your agency should be adequately staffed and funded in order to be able to do the job that must be done." (Message of Gov. Robert E. Smylie to the Idaho Legislature, January 5, 1965.)

Texas: "Our cities, river authorities, and water districts have made strides toward solving the water problems which can be attacked within the limits of their own jurisdictions. In addition, the Federal Government has proposed plans for development of major regions of the State. But these plans do not encompass all our needs and resources, and they still lack the coordination which only the State can provide.

"We in State government have a constitutional duty to conserve, develop, and distribute the water resources of Texas. The effective performance of this duty requires the preparation of a State water plan, flexible enough to meet evolving long-range needs but specific enough to solve immediate water supply problems." (Message of Gov. John Connally to the Texas Legislature, January 27, 1965.)

STATE ASSISTANCE FOR ABATEMENT OF WATER POLLUTION

Connecticut: "A closely allied problem, and one that presents major difficulties in a densely populated industrial State, is eliminating pollution in our streams, rivers, and coastal waters.

"We must step up the cooperative effort to assure clean, pure water for the health, recreation, and prosperity of our people." (Message of Gov. John Dempsey to the Connecticut General Assembly, February 2, 1965.)

New Jersey: "The State department of health is convinced that, if funds could be made available on a State grant basis for feasibility studies, a great stimulant would be provided toward the planning, design, and construction of much needed regional sewerage facilities. The proposed legislation would authorize grants for the preparation of intermunicipal feasibility reports and it would provide further for loans from the State to municipal entities for planning and engineering of such projects." (Message of Gov. Richard J. Hughes to the New Jersey Legislature, January 12, 1965.)

Vermont: "Of equal importance to total development of our State is the conservation of our natural resources and the protection of our heritage of scenic beauty from the blight of uncontrolled urban sprawl. This will require increased State aid for local pollution abatement programs. It will require broadening the State's land condemnation authority for public purposes." (Message of Gov. Philip H. Hoff to the Vermont Legislature, January 7, 1965.)

New York: "The existing Federal program of grants-in-aid for municipal pollution abatement facilities is highly discriminatory against urbanized areas like New York State. Though it provides that the Federal Government can pay up to 30 percent of the cost of such facilities, it limits New York State to about 5 percent of the total funds appropriated and places a $600,000 ceiling on any one project. As a result of these limitations, a recent New York City project costing $87.6 million received only $250,000 from the Federal Government—less than 1 percent of its rightful share. If we are to recapture the true value of one of New York State's greatest assets—namely, an abundance of water—we have no choice but to give the solution of the problem of water pollution top priority. I propose that the State assume 30 percent of the cost as its share. I call on the Federal Government to pay its full 30-percent share and to stop descriminating against large cities and urbanized States." (Message of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller to the New York Legislature, January 6, 1965.)

Wisconsin: "I urge the establishment of a compact between bordering States, similar to the recommendation I have made for a compact between Wisconsin and Minnesota, for the protection and preservation of wild rivers and the prevention of polluted streams and the formulation of a program which will permit orderly industrial development.

"New legislation is necessary to continue and improve water pollution control programs with special attention to pollution, health and sanitation problems resulting from public industrial use." (Message of Gov. Warren P. Knowles to the Wisconsin Legislature, January 19, 1965.)

EARLY VESTING AND INTRASTACE TRANSFERABILITY OF RETIREMENT CREDITS

Connecticut: "To help with recruitment and tenure problems, I recommend legislation providing vested retirement rights for all State employees with 10 or more years of service. The pension which this would provide would date from the legal retirement age." (Budget message of Gov. John Dempsey to the Connecticut Legislature, 1965.)

RESIDUAL POWERS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Massachusetts: Recommends constitutional amendment to "provide for strengthened municipal home rule." (Inaugural address of Gov. John A. Volpe to the Massachusetts Legislature, January 7, 1965.)

OPTIONAL FORMS OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Arkansas: "We have a number of counties that are in effect houses divided against themselves. These counties have districts, and as a result of conflicting interest it is difficult to obtain countywide approval of new courthouses, hospitals, libraries, and industrial programs.

"The county government requirements, and particularly the quorum court, are outmoded, and do not meet the needs for efficiency in economy and in service under present-day conditions.

"Our cities are growing by leaps and bounds, but they are stifled by obsolete constitutional restrictions. The people of a city have a right, within reasonable limitations, to determine their own destiny. They should have the constitutional right to make this determination." (Inaugural address of Gov. Orval E. Faubus to the Arkansas Legislature, January 11, 1965.)

Michigan: "County home rule standards should be established on a flexible, optional basis to permit more efficient and economical government." (Message of Gov. George Romney to the Michigan Legislature, January 14, 1965.)

Missouri: "I am concerned about the inflexibility of the mandatory structure of local government * * * especially * * * third- and fourth-class county government as it affects rural counties. In general, all third- and fourth-class counties, regardless of their needs and resources, have virtually the same structure. The Constitution permits alternative forms of government to be provided. This provision needs to be implemented to permit these counties to choose among these alternatives, if they desire. Three alternatives forms of county government have been developed and I recommend that the general assembly enact permissive legislation authorizing counties to adopt one of the

alternatives." (Message of Gov. Warren E. Hearnes, to the Missouri Legislature, January 13, 1965.)

Iowa: "I believe that a home rule amendment should be adopted by this assembly to assure local communities of the self-government in local affairs they have long demanded and sorely needed." (Inaugural address of Gov. Harold E. Hughes to the Iowa Legislature, January 14, 1965.)

"The first significant legislation in this century to provide home rule for Iowa's cities and towns was adopted, and while the constitutionality of this particular measure is in doubt, there is no question in my mind that the way has now been cleared for whatever action may be required to confer upon local communities the long-needed power of self-determination in local affairs." (Message of Gov. Harold E. Hughes to the Iowa Legislature, January 12, 1965.)

Wisconsin: "I recommend the repeal of the so-called uniformity clause which requires all county governments to have the same form of government, regardles of particular needs or size of the individual counties.

"To facilitate the consolidation of smaller counties for more effective, economical, and democratic government.

"To authorize the creation of metropolitan area and intercounty agencies to meet the problems which overlap local boundary lines, as pollution control, planning and zoning, and transportation." (Message of Gov. Warren P. Knowles to the Wisconsin Legislature, January 19, 1965.)

AUTHORIZATION FOR METROPOLITAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

Vermont: "Vermont has a strong tradition of town government. Our town boundaries were drawn in colonial times roughly along lines 6 miles square. This was done arbitrarily and with the exception of major rivers, natural boundaries were frequently ignored * * * these arbitrary town lines have increasingly become barriers to efficient and effective public programs. This has been recognized and some action has been taken to cross town lines in the administration of certain public services. Our administrative units have frequently been extended and expanded largely on a haphazard basis, however, and without regard to the overall needs of the people of the State. Progress in one area of the State has not been matched in other areas. We now have the information available to organize many of these services on a regional basis so that they can be more effectively administered for all the people of Vermont. To this end, I am calling for a regional approach to education, tax assessing, planning, development, probate courts, municipal courts, State's attorneys, and ultimately to our town and State aid system of roads, although here action may have to be deferred until 1966. We aim to organize these services in districts that include the human and economic resources required to support them. This is the only feasible way for us to assure equality of educational and economic opportunity to all Vermonters regardless of the town in which they reside.

"The concept of district reorganization is also essential for us to follow if we are to promote greater effectiveness at the least cost in the field of planning and development. * * * Here again, I propose a new program of State assistance to local industrial development groups to stimulate regional planning and zoning. This will involve additional State personnel and grants to regional organizations that meet realistic standards. We must promote increased programs of research and development to assist the residents of every area in the State in reaching their maximum potential." (Message of Gov. Philip H. Hoff to the Vermont Legislature, January 7, 1965.)

Connecticut: "Another partnership effort with the Federal Government which will yield far-reaching benefits is the interregional planning program.

"In the years of growth which we are certain to experience, the success of this program will mean the difference between orderly, planned development, from which everyone gains, or haphazard, disorderly growth with all its costly dislocations.

"Connecticut's leadership in this task is demonstrated by the fact that our grant from the Federal Government for interregional planning is the largest received by any of the 50 States." (Message of Gov. John Dempsey to the Connecticut Legislature, February 2, 1965.)

AUTHORIZATION OF CONSOLIDATION, MERGER, AND DISSOLUTION OF SPECIAL DISTRICTS

California: "In 1963, we took steps to provide for more orderly growth of cities, the special districts and other agencies of government in our growing State. The coordinating council on urban policy and the local agency formation commissions will, over the years, save California taxpayers millions of dollars and at the same time promote greater efficiency of service. I will support legislation at this session to expand this effort. I recommend a law to encourage consolidation of special districts when their services duplicate one another because of overlapping boundaries; and to encourage dissolution of obsolete districts. I ask also that you move to prevent abuses of special district laws by speculators who use them to develop financially unsound subdivisions at the expense of both bond purchaser and homeowner." (Message of Gov. Edmund G. Brown to the California Legislature, January 5, 1965.)

Colorado: "The vital need to analyze, examine, strengthen, and properly finance, viable organizations of local government led to the formation of the 100-man commission. This group has worked long, hard, and effectively . . . Recommendations will be coming to the legislature from the 100-man commission for legislation which will be designed to strengthen counties, to provide control and limitation on the formation of special districts, to take new approaches to the governmental organization of metropolitan areas, to more adequately finance local government, and to otherwise deal with a multitude of problems. Also, we cannot delay longer the development of modern procedure for the orderly extension of municipal services and municipal boundaries." (Message of Gov. John A. Love to the Colorado Legislature, January 8, 1965.)

Oregon: "I am resubmitting legislation to overcome some of the deficiencies of limited or single-purpose water districts. It is important that we apply the multiple-purpose water use concept locally as well as statewide. With effective State coordination, a water conservancy district law can be of great benefit in the use and control of our most important natural resource.

"I suggest to you that because we have too many local governments we do not have enough local government. Within 50 miles of this Capitol there are seven county seats, dozens of cities and school districts, and literally hundreds of special-purpose districts. Each of these has limited resources and a geographical and legal jurisdiction that is not fully matched with the basic need for local government. The artificial and often arbitrary boundaries contribute to a lack of needed coordination in treatment of common problems—as in zoning and law enforcement and fiscal planning. * * * If there is to be the possibility of preventing the further erosion of local responsibility for local government it must begin here with the steps that will result in the reduction of the number of counties, the consolidation of city and county government where this is appropriate, the simplification of the pattern of special districts and the expansion of the taxing authority of the local governments." (Message of Gov. Mark O. Hatfield to the Oregon Legislature, January 11, 1965.)

LEGISLATIVE APPORTIONMENT PROCEDURE

New Jersey: "By order of the Court, this body soon must give way to a new legislature to be elected next November * * * the legislature has established a bipartisan commission of distinguished public officials and private citizens to formulate a plan for the apportionment of the interim legislature which must be elected this November." (Message of Gov. Richard J. Hughes to the New Jersey Legislature, January 12, 1965.)

South Carolina: "I recommend that there be established immediately a panel of distinguished legislators and citizens to consider the entire matter (apportionment) and to draft contingency plans which could be put into effect immediately if the Court's ruling is allowed to stand and if South Carolina's government is successfully challenged thereunder." (Message of Gov. Donald Russell to the South Carolina General Assembly, January 13, 1965.)

INCREASED STATE ACTIVITY IN FIELDS NOW CHARACTERIZED BY DIRECT FEDERAL-LOCAL RELATIONS

California: "Many of our citizens still lack adequate housing. Much of this lack could be met with Federal programs already in existence, but unused because they are relatively unknown. I am, therefore, again recommending the creation of a department of housing and community development with a broadly representative commission to encourage the use of these Federal programs." (Message of Gov. Edmund G. Brown to the California Legislature, January 5, 1965.)

Massachusetts: "The housing division should promote the development of public housing on scattered sites and, if possible, in low-density areas. In addition, this division should assist communities in establishing adequate and coordinated housing codes, with proper emphasis on enforcement. Attention should also be given to middle-income housing and to guaranteeing that low-cost housing will be community oriented, not a chain of islands of poverty, delinquency, and despair." (Inaugural address of Gov. John A. Volpe to the Massachusetts Legislature, January 1, 1965.)

New Jersey: "If we are to achieve the real potential of urban renewal in our State and develop the improved environment which will provide benefits for all aspects of our society—residential, commercial, and industrial—the State must be prepared to invest in the future and render direct financial assistance to our local municipalities. With new resources, the local financial burden could be eased, permitting acceleration of the program to rebuild our communities." (Message of Gov. Richard J. Hughes to the New Jersey Legislature, January 12, 1965.)

RELOCATION OF PERSONS AND BUSINESSES DISPLACED BY GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS

Massachusetts: "We will lend our full support to legislation calling for further relocation assistance to those displaced by eminent domain." (Inaugural address of Gov. John A. Volpe to the Massachusetts Legislature, January 7, 1965.)

South Carolina: "The program (land acquisition in the capitol complex) will take from 2 to 5 years to complete, including the relocation of families in the area. A not inconsiderable factor in our decision to undertake this project is the knowledge that the families who will be relocated must be placed in decent housing, improving their environment and their physical comfort." (Message of Gov. Donald Russell to the South Carolina General Assembly, January 13, 1965.)

NATIONAL TIME UNIFORMITY

Iowa: "In order to eliminate the confusion that has existed in the past, I recommend that legislation be enacted to make daylight time uniform in Iowa during the summer months." (Inaugural message of Gov. Harold E. Hughes to the Iowa Legislature, January 14, 1965.)

AMENDMENT OF THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO PROVIDE FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill, H.R. 6241, to amend the Social Security Act in order to provide more flexibility to the States in their administration of the public assistance programs.

The bill would implement recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which I have been privileged to serve as one of the three members from the House of Representatives. The gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] are also members of the Commission.

In its study of the public assistance programs, the Commission found instances of friction in Federal-State relations and expressed the belief that Federal controls associated with grant programs should be kept to the minimum necessary to assure satisfactory performance, consistent with the national purposes of the program, and to provide proper accountability for the expenditure of Federal funds. Both the Federal statutory provisions and the regulations governing a grant program should be developed with the view of strengthening State and local government administration, and should be carefully weighed against this objective before they are approved.

The Commission found that the only present recourse which a State has from a decision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the event of disagreement over administration of the public assistance programs, is to seek amendment of the law. Unlike virtually all of the many Federal grant-in-aid programs which the Congress has subsequently enacted, the Social Security Act made no provision for judicial review in the public assistance programs. This places the States at a serious disadvantage in the settlement of any differences they may have with the Federal agency, a situation which is not conducive to good Federal-State relationships.

The bill I have introduced would provide an appropriate judicial review procedure. It would also authorize the Secretary to waive or modify the so-called single State agency requirement for State administration of the public assistance programs. This Federal requirement has been applied so strictly that in some instances it has barred States from reorganizing their governmental structure in the interest of efficiency and economy.

For additional flexibility and more equitable treatment of States in the event of grant disallowances, the bill would authorize the Secretary to declare individual parts of a State plan out of conformity with Federal requirements; at present, the entire plan must be found out of conformity if any of its parts are deficient.

Finally, the bill would establish a permanent Public Assistance Advisory Council to advise the Secretary with regard to proposed legislation, administrative regulations, and related matters. This is intended to give State and local public assistance agencies a more effective voice in matters which concern them the most.

Taken together, the provisions of the bill should go a long way toward removing frictions that have arisen over the years, and thus improve the Federal-State partnership in administration of the public assistance programs.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would amend the Social Security Act in order to improve Federal-State relations in the administration of the public assistance programs under the act.

Public assistance expenditures have totaled more than $50 billion in Federal, State, and local funds since passage of the Social Security Act. In view of the size of the program and the widely varying conditions that affect the administration of public assistance among the States and local areas, it was perhaps inevitable that from time to time intergovernmental relations would be strained. The problem was of sufficient moment that the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations undertook a study of the matter and has agreed on certain recommendations for consideration by the Congress.

The bill I am introducing would carry out the Advisory Commission's principal recommendations as contained in its recent report entitled, "Statutory and Administrative Controls Associated With Federal Grants for Public Assistance." I have been privileged to serve as a member of the Commission, together with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] as appointed members from the House of Representatives.

In order to correct what the Commission found as an imbalance in the Federal-State partnership in administering the public assistance programs, the bill would provide for judicial review of certain administrative decisions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This would place the States on a more equal basis with the Federal Government in the administration of the public assistance program. As the situation now stands, the Federal agency has the upper hand in Federal-State partnership because there is no administrative remedy for the State beyond the decision of the Secretary. There is ample precedent for such judicial review in the public assistance programs, as evidenced by the fact that the Congress has provided for such procedure in virtually all the grant-in-aid programs enacted since the Social Security Act, many of which are administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Advisory Commission felt that lack of a system of judicial review tends to stifle initiative on the part of the States for fear that anything new they initiate may be declared out of conformity with the act.

Also, one of the most controversial issues in Federal-State relations under the public assistance programs, as well as others, has involved the so-called single State agency statutory requirement. A recent instance involved a proposal submitted to the legislature by Gov. Mark Hatfield, of Oregon, providing for reorganization of the executive branch of the State government. This generated a considerable amount of Federal-State correspondence, discussion, and disagreement about the single State agency concept as it applies to the public assistance programs. In the end, the Federal department questioned whether the proposed reorganization plan would comply with the single State agency requirement; the proposed State legislation was not enacted, and the Governor's plan rejected.

The Advisory Commission believes it is desirable to give the States maximum flexibility to organize the executive branch of State government to meet particular State problems and objectives as long as the objectives and requirements of the Federal act are otherwise met. Accordingly, the bill would authorize the Secretary to waive the single State agency requirement under such conditions.

The bill also would give the Secretary more discretion by permitting him to declare parts of a State plan, rather than an entire plan, out of conformity with Federal requirements, and it would establish a permanent Public Assistance Advisory Council to consult with the Secretary regarding proposed regulations and other matters.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Advisory Commission believes that implementation of its recommendations will provide the States more flexibility and more voice in improving the programs, and thus enable them to move forward in modernizing their administration of public assistance and in meeting changing needs.

THE NEXT PHASE IN SHEVCHENKO "BRIDGE BUILDING"

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President's oft-repeated call for building bridges with the peoples of Eastern Europe cannot find a better and firmer response than in the continuous Shevchenko bridge building between our country and the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe. The erection of the Taras Schevchenko freedom statue in Washington last year was only the first phase in building a bridge of understanding and mutual purpose between the American people and over 43 million Ukrainians in Eastern Europe, who, like others in that sector of the Red empire, do not enjoy a genuine independence and national freedom. We are now entering the second phase of development in this Shevchenko bridge building.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 225, 226

Two important steel suspensions in this Shevchenko bridge to the people of Ukraine are House Joint Resolution 225 and House Joint Resolution 226, which I am privileged to sponsor. The first calls for the establishment of a section in the Library of Congress to be known as the Shevchenko Freedom Library. The importance of favorably considering this resolution now cannot be too strongly emphasized. Information leaking out of the Ukraine indicates that it was far more than just an "accident" that over 600,000 books were burned and destroyed in the National Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev last year. A sharp contrast in the need for cultural preservation and richness would result from the passage of House Joint Resolution 225.

My second resolution would also extend the Schevchenko bridge to the captive people of Ukraine. House Joint Resolution 226 provides for the creation of a captive nations freedom series of postage stamps in honor of national heroes of freedom, commencing with a Taras Shevchenko freedom stamp. While we make certain approaches to Communist governments, it would be foolhardy to play down the very peoples and nations they oppress. After all, our bridges are to extend to the hearts and minds of the captive nations, and are not to terminate in the entrenchment of unrepresentative Communist regimes. The fitting approval of such a stamp series would demonstrate that our direction in building these bridges is not askewed.

THE COMING SEALING SHEVCHENKO CEREMONY

Mr. Speaker, on May 22, 1965, there will be an impressive ceremony at the Schevchenko statue, sealing into the monument various official and other documents pertaining to the erection of the statue. Preparations are now under way for this event. Needless to say, the occasion would be an excellent one for taking these two further steps in our Shevchenko bridge building with the Ukrainian nation. This coming event, on the eve of the first anniversary of the Shevchenko statue unveiling, will doubtless intensify further the steadily growing interest of our people in the Shevchenko bridge to the Ukrainian people. Much has been written to provide the necessary background for this wholesome and desirable interest; and as an important addition to this background, I request that the following article on "The Shevchenko Affair," written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, be printed at this point of my remarks:

THE SHEVCHENKO AFFAIR

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

To denigrate and destroy the Shevchenko statue project in Washington, the editor in chief of the Washington Post chose to entitle his first editorial "The Shevchenko Affair." Obviously, the title was to imply something illicit and depraved, something requiring immediate rectification according to the dictates of an uninformed but arrogant individual wielding a newspaper. The title was indeed an appropriate one to initiate a vicious campaign that lasted unremittingly for a period of 3 months. For "the affair," created and developed by this individual, stands as an indelible blemish upon the authority, judgment, and reputation of the organ.

When the Shevchenko Monument was unveiled on June 27, 1964, the day was not only one of glorious triumph for the interests of the United States in relation to the goals and tactics of the Soviet Russian totalitarians. In every respect it was also a moment for tranquil rejoicing in behalf of a free press and the victory of truth over both error and base motivation. How foolish and ignorant a supposed opinionmaker can be may be gleaned from this attack on the "Ukrainian-American sponsors" of the statue: "They are using it to advance their own peculiar notion of how to fight communism and their own implausible goal of Ukrainian nationhood."[1] Any serious high school student today, who has studied the Soviet Union, knows that the 45 million Ukrainians have and enjoy nationhood. What they haven't regained is their independent statehood. But these sophisticated, basic distinctions escape the editor, and a pathetic muddle of notions is expressed to confuse the general reader. How is the editorialist expected to understand our way of fighting what he unthinkingly calls communism?

This example of "the affair" is only a fraction of the nonsense that was published in the Post. For the critical student to assess this interesting episode, he would have to examine the whole background to the unveiling of the Shevchenko statue. He would have to investigate the way this came about and to read with care the various testimonies that were submitted in favor of the statue's erection. As pointed out in an article by this writer, the testimonies presented all the essential arguments in favor of House Joint Resolution 311, the resolution sponsored by Representative Alvin Bentley of Michigan, and their convincing character laid the grounds for speedy congressional approval.[2] Indeed, at the time, the Post reported all this; so there's been no mystery about the origin and development of the Shevchenko statue project.

SHEVCHENKO: FREEDOM'S SYMBOL

In a documentary biography of Taras Shevchenko, which this writer prepared in the summer of 1960, the type of irrational thinking reflected in the Post editorials is exactly what he had in mind when he wrote: "There is a good deal of foolishness in our thinking about the Soviet Union. Our lingering misconceptions and myths about this uneasy empire structure only contribute to the success of Moscow's worldwide propaganda of deceit and lies."[3] The Post's editorials and editorialized reports on the Shevchenko subject fit this description with precision.

What the paper's editor could not combat was the whole array of convincing arguments that were used with necessary repetition in support and defense of the project. Shevchenko's affinity to our own George Washington, the cultural and political prowess of his poetry and prose, his historical position as a powerful advocate of freedom in the very period of our own Abraham Lincoln, Poland's Mickiewicz, Hungary's Kossuth, Italy's Mazzini and other freedom fighters, the idolization of Shevchenko by every patriotic Ukrainian down to this day, the tradition of freedom he represents in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, the crucial importance of his works for the eventual liberation of all the captive nations in the present Soviet Russian empire, the need to throw Moscow off balance in its calculated attempt to distort and disfigure the Ukrainian national hero—these were only a few of the arguments advanced for the passage of the legislation. They were more than enough to mirror the puerile tirades of the Post.

The paper was correct in its assertion that the erection of the Shevchenko statue was not merely to satisfy a cultural end. We've stated this from the very beginning and repeated it openly and frankly to the time of the unveiling. Again, quite plainly, the supreme fact about the Shevchenko statue in our Nation's capital is that this permanent monument in honor of Ukraine's poet laureate is a towering political symbol of freedom. Not to comprehend this dominant fact means a failure to understand not only the prime purpose for this memorial in the capital of the free world but also the full compass of Shevchenko's works and their all-embracing message. One deludes himself if he believes the stature of this East European freedom fighter is exhausted in the narrow precinct of his cultural brilliance, poetic beauty, or philosophical humanism. For, in truth, all these real treasures in Shevchenko are integrally sublimated by his comprehensive and unifying idea of political freedom. He genuinely applied what Aristotle had wisely taught, that in his total essence man is a political animal. Thus, when after the groundbreaking ceremony in September 1963, the Post spoke of "poetic injustice" in its inept editorial comparison between Shakespeare and Shevchenko, it was evident then that its editor wrote in complete darkness.

To go a step further, the statue is truly a crowning achievement of the work and efforts of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. From the very start, this American organization properly emphasized the consummate political significance of the statue. Congress, as well as millions of Americans, saw clearly the need for maintaining the purity of Shevchenko's freedom message. In the cold war, they realized the urgency of combatting the inevitable distortion of Shevchenko and his works by colonialist Moscow and colonial Kiev. The successful action taken was a purely American phenomenon, but the Post, like the papers of Moscow and Kiev, attempted rather foolishly to print it as an emigre undertaking, as though this would have been harmful to American interests.

As was anticipated, the Russians and their Ukrainian puppets disfigured the poet in ceremonies celebrating the 150th anniversary

[1] "The Shevchenko Affair," the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1963.

[2] Dobriansky, Lev E. "Public Law 86-749 and the Shevchenko Centennial," the Ukrainian Quarterly, autumn, 1960.

[3] "Europe's Freedom Fighter, Taras Shevchenko, 1814-61," House of Representatives, Doc. No. 445, Washington, 1960, p. IV.

of his birth. They stressed his fight against czarist Russian tyranny but concealed the potency of his ideas against existing Soviet Russian tyranny and serfdom. They emphasized Shevchenko's fight for social and economic reforms but ignored his broader fight for the freedom and independence of Ukraine and of all other captive non-Russian nations in the present Soviet Russian empire. In Kiev, the freedom fighter was hailed as a revolutionary and democrat—in the twisted Russian sense, not the sound patriotic and nationalist sense.[4] In the classic Post editorials, however, these fundamental distinctions were blindly cast aside.

Briefly, then, the American statue of Shevchenko in the capital of the free world symbolizes the undisfigured Shevchenko: patriot, nationalist, freedom fighter, the soul of freedom-loving Americans and freedom-aspiring Ukrainians and millions of other captives in Europe and Asia. In sharp contrast to statues of him elsewhere, it is one of youth, vigor, and promise of the future. It was unveiled in a confident atmosphere of triumph and unprecedented performance. With the exception of inaugurals, breaking the record for all marches in the capital, 35,000 paraded down Pennsylvania Avenue to the monument; breaking another record for statue attendance, over 100,000 witnessed the unveiling itself. In its irresponsible editorials the Post constantly spoke of a "tiny group," not really knowing how many Americans of Ukrainian descent to account for. Well, this was what the supposedly tiny group produced in the annals of American history.

THE AFFAIRISTS

Now, who were the instigators of "the Shevchenko affair?" Who attempted to place this vitally important project in the mold of controversy? Without exaggeration, it is generally recognized even among those who were scarcely familiar with Shevchenko in mid-1963 that the so-called controversy over the statue engendered in significant terms a basic ratio of something like a million for and 2 against. Aside from the futile protests of the Russian Ambassador, "the affair" was created by two individuals. One was Mr. James R. Wiggins, the editor in chief of the Post, and the other was Mr. Walter C. Louchheim, Jr., a member of the National Capital Planning Commission. Needless to say, there were probably many who gullibly swallowed their fiction, but there were scores of others who didn't. Our ratio still holds.

If this is the basis of an affair or controversy, then obviously nothing in life is beyond either one. Two or more creatures can always be found objecting to God, virtue, women, and the New York Yankees. In the course of his campaign, Wiggins complained that he was entitled to his opinion. That right can be denied no one. Logically, however, it is one thing for anyone to have just an opinion, it is quite another for a person in a responsible position to advance an opinion that is grounded in fact, evidence, and rational support. In most cases, the former scarcely warrants serious consideration, the latter represents the only type of opinion capable of generating wholesome controversy. Such controversy was never inspired by the affairists. Instead, they simply indulged in the crude technique of dubbing the statue and Shevchenko himself as being controversial.

Without doubt, both Wiggins and Louchheim don't know how Lenin turned an earlier Shevchenko dispute into a real controversy, albeit to serve his sinister political ends. In 1914 the previous government of the Russian empire outrightly refused the Ukrainian people permission to observe the centennial of Shevchenko's birth. This aroused the Ukrainian nation and evoked the following from Lenin: "The denial of celebration of Shevchenko's Day was such a first class successful measure from the standpoint of agitation against the government that one cannot imagine a better one. I think that all of our best social democratic agitators against the government could never have achieved such complete success in so short a time as this measure alone has attained. After this measure, millions and millions of 'dwellers' began to turn into conscious citizens convinced in the righteousness of the saying that Russia is 'the prison of nations.'"[5]

Of course, contemporary Russian subtlety in observing "Shevchenko's Day" does not signify the nonexistence of the prison of nations. We are dealing now with a cagier and more dangerous Bear. As indicated above, one of the paramount reasons for honoring Shevchenko in this country has been the need to preserve the purity of his stature and meaning. Moscow and its puppets have disfigured Shevchenko, have painted him as a forerunner, a precursor of the Russian Bolshevik revolution; they have perverted the patriotic and nationalist freedom fighter for their own psycho-political ends. This, of course, is not new with the professional perverters in the Kremlin, Kiev and elsewhere. The honored names of Lincoln, Jefferson, Washington, Shakespeare and dozens of others have been blemished in like manner. Distortion of works and names is an old Russian trade. The pity of all this is the gullibility with which people and papers, like the Post accept these distortions in the full interest of Russian objectives.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE AFFAIR

All the details of "the affair" have been candidly set forth in a congressional publication.[6] Whereas the Post purposely suppressed hundreds of replies to its scandalous editorials, this publication accommodated both the editorials and the replies. Here, it is both impossible and unnecessary to treat every specious argument and accusation that was raised over the 3-month period. As this writer points out in the opening page of the book, "You and your colleagues know well the perversions committed by the Soviet Russians and their puppets. Their perversion of Shevchenko, whose greatness lies in his poetic teachings of universal freedom, still is little understood by a few in our country. Is is hoped that the Shevchenko monument to world freedom will in time enlighten even these few."[7] This was addressed to our legislators who also viewed with concern the naive acceptance of the Russian perversions by the Post and a few others.

In fact, although every conceivable argument was concocted against the statue and its sponsors, some being of the most malicious sort, the affairists relied ultimately on two main contentions which were repeated over and over again. Evidently, by sheer repetition they hoped to make these fallacious points appear plausible and rationally acceptable. The extremes to which Wiggins went in abusing the facilities of the Post can be seen from the editorialized report of the placement of Shevchenko's statue: "Sponsored by anti-Communist Ukrainian-American groups, the Shevchenko memorial has been opposed on the grounds that the poet was both anti-Semitic and the idol of the Communist Party."[8] Several days later, the same was repeated under a slanted caption.[9] In short, the pattern of editorial comments and supposedly objective reports was the same: "controversial," "anti-Semitic," and "the idol of the Communist Party." Significantly, the Post's campaign along these lines stirred up little interest in its favor.

We can dispense quickly with the "controversial" aspect of this pattern of attack. That the statue is allegedly controversial obviously rests on the validity or invalidity of the two main contentions—the anti-Semitic and the idol of the Communist Party. Merely to reiterate that the statue is controversial is no support of its alleged character. As we've noted earlier, the ratio of a million for and two against is not an unimpressive fact. Moreover, if one were to analyze patiently the comedy of journalistic error and bias as portrayed in the quoted congressional publication, he would be even more impressed by the apparition of controversy surrounding the statue. The technique of crying "controversial" is too obvious. But desperate as they were, the affairists were in need of some outlet for their frustrations.

Most noteworthy is the way Wiggins developed his almost hysterical assault. His self-contradictory maneuvers patently represent a full confession of ignorance—worse, ignorance mixed with bold arrogance. Thus, in his first editorial, he claimed that he stands second to none in his esteem for Shevchenko and for Ukraine. However, since the city of Washington "found precious space for the Ukraine's national poet," he laments the fact that no statue is being erected for Shakespeare.[10] Although Britain's great has been honored in so many different ways, our reaction was nevertheless sympathetic. Of course, if Wiggins were terribly impassioned by his own proposal, he should have been laboring for it ever since. Obtaining legislation for a national statue entails heavy toil and hard work, but there is no evidence to the present date that the sedentary editor of the Post has embarked on it. How he would handle the attempt of East German Communists to prostitute Shakespeare's plays for propaganda ends, much in the way that Moscow has sought to pervert Shevchenko, is a question of intriguing importance.[11]

The editor's knowledge of the fight over Shakespeare between the East German puppets and the free Germans is probably equivalent to his understanding of the Shevchenko issue. It was quite evident from the first editorial that Wiggins didn't know what the Shevchenko statue was all about. He actually admitted as much. The second editorial on October 18 confirmed all this, and the subsequent ones of November 1 and 12 proved not only his fundamental deficiency in knowledge and understanding of the subject but also his ugly motivations regarding the poet. The editorials contained every trick in the trade of journalistic smearing, even going so far as to degrade Shevchenko and alleging him to be offensive to numerous American groups. For example, after stating clearly fabricated reasons why the statue should not be erected, Wiggins wrote: "These reasons, to be sure, make one wonder why gullible Senators and Representatives should have approved such a memorial, when all of the offended minorities are among their constituents."[12]

As a true monument to ignorance, the editorial failed miserably in its endeavor to

---

[4] Shabad, Theodore, "Kiev Honors Poet Who Fought Czar," the New York Times, May 31, 1964.

[5] Lein, V. Sochineniia, vol. XX, Moscow, pp. 14–15.

[6] See "Shevchenko, A Monument to the Liberation, Freedom and Independence of All Captive Nations," U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

[7] Ibid., p. 3.

[8] "Shevchenko Statue Ready for Pedestal," the Washington Post, May 30, 1964.

[9] "Controversial Statue Placed On Its Pedestal," the Washington Post, June 4, 1964.

[10] "Poetic Injustice," the Washington Post, Sept. 23, 1963.

[11] "Germany's Split on Shakespeare," the New York Times, Jan. 11, 1964.

[12] "Monument to Ignorance," the Washington Post, Nov. 8, 1963.

evoke any response from "the offended minorities." No self-respecting group fell for this smear technique. The maneuver backfired, adding another blemish on the integrity of the newspaper. The comedy was also featured by the distinct contradiction of these editorials to the lengthy article written by one of the Post's outstanding writers, particularly on the matter of Shevchenko's alleged anti-Semitism.[13] In a most erratic fashion, the editorials contradicted themselves. For a whole array of these contradictions, the reader should scan the quoted congressional publication on Shevchenko.

Now for the anti-Semitic slander against Shevchenko. In a sense it was rather amusing to witness an ostensible Shakespearean devotee accusing Shevchenko of anti-Semitism because of a passage or two in his poems about hated Jewish tax collectors. As a poet and a perceptive observer of reality, Shevchenko recorded in these few passages the feelings of people who despised those whom they regarded as their exploiters. In the tyrannical, Russian-imposed system of serfdom it was not difficult to find a scapegoat, particularly a Jewish collector. Shakespeare bore the same poetic responsibility. Beyond his poetry, not once but several times Shevchenko helped and defended Jews at the risk of his personal safety and comfort.[14]

Actually, during the battle over the statue we were waiting for the affairists to begin quoting Shevchenko on this ugly subject. Both Wiggins and Louchheim committed a grave injustice to the poet laureate by concocting this anti-Semitic slander. Nowhere did they dare square Shevchenko out of context. The slander was perched completely on vague, verbal generality. The reference to Jewish traders in the poem "The Caucasus" wouldn't have helped them because it poetically expressed the misconception of the times. In "Yarema," the moneymaking obsessions of a Jewish innkeeper are depicted no differently from those found in Shakespeare and other world-celebrated writers. His poem on the "Confederates" yields little for the affairists since a Jew is shown being mistreated by the existing gentry. And in the foreword to "Haydamaky," Shevchenko summarizes his own feeling toward all this by saying "Thank God that it is passed. Let our sons and grandsons see that their fathers erred."

Those who know the history of anti-Semitism in the Russian Empire, both Czarist and Soviet, can well evaluate the service rendered to it by this ignorant accusation heard on these shores. Moscow couldn't have done better. It is an unforgettable credit to the objectivity and high purpose of our Jewish American institutions and organizations that they refused to be drawn into this murky business, as that initiated and sponsored by professed "liberals."

Along with the anti-Semitic slander, the spurious claim was made that Shevchenko is the idol of the Communist Party. As far back as the fall of 1962, one of the affairists, Walter Louchheim, who admitted knowing nothing about the poet, quickly made up his mind that a statue here would serve Russian interests. Even after a concise briefing was given before the National Capital Planning Commission on Shevchenko as a Ukrainian poet of universal acclaim, Louchheim still dreaded the thought of having a statue in honor of a "Russian poet." Later, when Wiggins came into the act, the Post amusingly transformed itself into a rabid anti-Communist organ, protesting Shevchenko as an "idol of the Communist Party." Many recalled that on the basis of association it was Senator McCarthy who referred to the Post as "The Washington Pravda." Under the title of "Association Again," the fair-minded editor of the other major Washington paper alluded to this experience and frankly declared, "But the fact is there is much more to the Americans than their Anglo beginnings. We are also Ukrainian."[15]

Surely enough has been said on the disfigurement of national heroes by Moscow and its puppets to indicate the pathetic character of this affairist contention. Moreover, if Wiggins were at all familiar with the literature on this battle since 1960, he would have learned that our effort has unmasked the hypocrisy and cynicism involved in Moscow's manipulation of this Ukrainian hero. Furthermore, to inform the reader that thousands of collective farms, factories, streets and what have you bear the Shevchenko name in the U.S.S.R. and that this fact proves he's a Communist idol is one of the worst forms of twisted reasoning. One would perhaps expect too much of this editor to grasp the meaning of this fact. The vast majority of these places are in Ukraine, where naturally they should be, and the Shevchenko nomer has served conspicuously to preserve the national identity of 45 million people, who even today are being subjected to Russification. For this great "anti-Communist" organ to overlook these essentials is scarcely cause for wonderment.

SALUTARY EFFECTS OF THE AFFAIR

The effects of the affair were clearly salutary, as indeed shown by the huge success of the unveiling itself. For one, the affairists contributed heavily to a popular familiarization with Shevchenko and his works. The interest of countless citizens in Washington and beyond was stirred up by "the affair." Later, the unveiling received nationwide coverage and reporting.

Another effect was the impact of our freedom of the press. This came into play to offset the irresponsible and unfounded contentions of the affairists. Substantial credit is due Mr. Robert J. Lewis, writer for the Washington Star, who instantly sensed the malicious character of the Post's editorials and articles and in the November 10 issue of his paper presented an accurate account on "The Status of a Statue." Subsequent articles in the Star upheld the sound judgment of our Congress and executive agencies. All this well demonstrated that in a democracy forces of reason and justice are always present to combat their negators. As Lewis eloquently pointed out, with the statue we "will also have cause to rejoice that human brotherhood and understanding once again have affirmed the cause of freedom."[16]

By way of an educational effect, the affair also revealed the extent to which arrogant ignorance in our midst can serve as ready fodder for Moscow and its puppets. When Wiggins foolishly began to write about askewed nationalism and the like, the perverters saw their chance of horning in on the Shevchenko project. The Ukrainian puppet in the U.N. spoke his piece and a group in Ukraine sought to intervene in the final festivities of the project. The prevalence of arrogant ignorance in positions of public responsibility is always a tool for our cold war enemies.

Then there is an effect of futural import. The erection of Shevchenko's statue is only a phase in the battle of knowledge and understanding in America with regard to Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. The affair lucidly revealed the nature and character of this battle. The absurd editorial on "The Captive Nations" in the July 11 issue of the Washington Post is an excellent example of what to expect in the future. Nevertheless the statue is a fixed monument calling for victory in this battle, which in every respect would be our victory in behalf of the basic interests of our Nation. One flays the meaning and significance of the statue if he interprets it narrowly as an end in itself. On June 10, 1964, Nikita S. Khrushchev, "the Hangman of Ukraine," didn't unveil Shevchenko's statue in Moscow out of any cultural attachment. The timing itself was suggestive.

For Khrushchev, the Shevchenko monument in Moscow stands "among monuments to such geniuses of Russian culture as Pushkin," the glorifier of Russian imperiocolonialism. For us Americans, the Shevchenko monument in Washington stands "as a second statue of liberty," with the inscription "Dedicated to the Liberation, Freedom, and Independence of All Captive Nations." This is the crucial difference in the battle of the statues. This also constituted the death of the affairs.

[13] Rosenfeld, Stephen S., "A Ukrainian Poet Gets Statue Billing," the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1963.

[14] See the very instructive article by P. Vasylenko, "Taras Shevchenko, Defender of Freedom of All Peoples," Svoboda, New Jersey, Mar. 25, 1961.

[15] "Association Again," Evening Star, Dec. 4, 1963.

[16] Lewis, Robert J. "The Status of a Statue," the Sunday Star, Nov. 10, 1963.

ECONOMISTS CITE MONEY AND CREDIT POLICIES AS THE NATION'S UNPARALLELED PROSPERITY ENTERS FIFTH YEAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, an article by M. J. Rossant on the financial page of the March 15 New York Times entitled "Autopsy of an Expansion" analyzes America's great economic expansion now entering an unprecedented fifth year of life.

Members should be aware of the incalculable contribution that adequate credit at reasonable rates of interest has made to this unparalleled prosperity most Americans enjoy.

I will quote from the article that paragraph which is unquestionably required reading for all who wish to see that prosperity continue:

> Most economists claimed monetary policy had played a major role, one that some authorities regard as even more important than fiscal policy. Despite a rise in short-term interest rates to defend the dollar, it is a matter of record that credit has been kept easier for a longer time during this expansion than in any previous upturn.

GOVERNMENT BY CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, our Federal Government was established to guarantee the inalienable rights of men.

Such rights are inalienable because they are determined by what belongs to every man as a man. It is most proper, then, that the very making of laws by which rights are to be secured should belong ultimately to the people themselves. This principle of self-government is realized in our democratic Republic by the system of representation, whereby those who actually make the laws are chosen by the people to represent their rights in the legislative process.

The right to vote is therefore the political right most essential to the realization of self-government through representative democracy. President Johnson said recently of the right to vote that:

> Nothing is more fundamental to American citizenship and to our freedom as a nation and as a people (news conference, February 4, 1965).

To vote is the essential right and duty of citizenship. To prevent any citizen from exercising this right and duty is to do violence to representative democracy itself. On the same occasion, President Johnson said that:

> All Americans should be indignant when one American is denied the right to vote. The loss of that right to a single citizen undermines the freedom of every citizen.

THE LONDON ECONOMIST ACCUSES AMERICAN BANKERS OF SEEKING PERSONAL GAIN IN LOBBYING FOR HIGHER INTEREST RATES AND TIGHTER MONEY

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes those who are not directly involved see things with clearer objectivity and better perspective than when they are themselves affected. An example is the March 6 London Economist which contains a clear warning that the push for higher interest rates by certain bankers threatens to end the great expansion of business activity in this country, now entering an unprecedented fifth straight year.

The article follows:

JUST A LITTLE TIGHTER, PLEASE

To conservative businessmen the glaring weakness in President Johnson's package of remedies for the deficit on the international accounts of the United States is the absence of any specific proposal for increasing the price of money on the American market, now the cheapest in the world, in order to keep capital at home. Bankers are particularly concerned about this; this is partly because they consider inflation to be more imminent than does either the Treasury or the Federal Reserve Board and partly because for personal reasons they would like higher interest rates. While in most cases they have plenty of money available to lend, it is costing them more since the rates paid on savings went up last November. And the demand from business borrowers is unusually heavy for the time of year, reflecting the generally high level of economic activity as well as the special needs of steel users who are building up stocks in anticipation of a strike. Here and there bankers are putting up their charges to individual borrowers and there are suggestions that the whole level may go up a notch.

It now appears that the administration might not oppose such an increase as strongly as it did last time it was tried; this was in November after the discount rate for borrowings from Federal Reserve banks had risen in order to keep up with the rise in Britain's bank rate. For the last few weeks—long enough to suggest that this is a matter of policy, not of miscalculation—the amount of money commercial banks have available for lending has been cut by the central bank through reductions in the so-called free reserves. And the Treasury bill rate, which sets the level of short-term interest rates, has been allowed to go up almost to 4 percent, the highest for 5 years. These moves have the double advantage from the point of view of the balance of international payments of reducing the amount of money available for banks to lend abroad and of making it more attractive for money to be invested in the United States.

As long as it is only short-term interest rates which are affected there is little risk that the expansion of the economy will be checked by the cost of borrowing. This expansion is now in its fifth year and its continuance is being questioned. By midsummer a downturn may seem imminent and that is also when it should be clear whether the President's medicine is stanching the international deficit. If it is not, then real restrictions on credit may be unavoidable—and with them may come the long-threatened collision between prosperity at home and solvency abroad.

FAA IRRESPONSIBILITY AND THE EASTERN AIR LINES CRASH OF FEBRUARY 8, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the wreckage of the Eastern Air Lines DC-7B, together with its doomed 84 passengers, had hardly settled on the bottom of the Atlantic, just off the coast of Long Island, New York, February 8, 1965, when Najeeb Halaby, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, began assaulting the public and the news media with his views and personal opinion on the events immediately preceding the crash. His purpose was to create the impression that the FAA bears no responsibility for this accident and that its causes will have to be sought elsewhere. Of course, under the law, the Civil Aeronautics Board has the duty of investigating and determining the cause of aircraft accidents. Congress, in passing the Federal Aviation Act, well recognized the shortcomings of allowing the FAA, which has the job of regulating air traffic, to also investigate air accidents. For then the FAA would be in the odd position of investigating its own actions, and there would be serious doubts as to the objectivity of its reports. Congress wisely provided that another agency shall investigate aviation accidents. But it is characteristic of Najeeb Halaby to ignore this separation of functions and duties, to attempt to preempt the CAB in its accident investigations, to distort the facts, to make premature and self-serving declarations, and to wash his hands of all responsibility for airplane crashes.

Shortly after 7 p.m. on February 8, Eastern Air Lines flight 663 took off from Kennedy International Airport in New York and headed in a general southerly direction over the Atlantic Ocean. At the same time a Pan American Boeing 707 jet, flight 212, coming from Puerto Rico, was traveling northeast toward Kennedy Airport. Clearly, even according to the statements released by the FAA the planes were heading toward each other from opposite directions in one of the most congested areas of air traffic in the world.

The Eastern was climbing and the Pan American descending. At approximately 6:25 p.m., according to a transcript prepared and released by the FAA, the Eastern was at an altitude of 3,700 feet and the Pan American was at 4,000 feet. At 6:26, according to the FAA transcript, one of the Pan American pilots exclaimed "Yeoh." Seconds later he reported to the Kennedy control tower, which had been guiding both planes:

> We had a close miss here * * * did you have another target in this area at this same spot where we were just a minute ago?

Of course, there had been another target at that same spot, but by the time the Pan American pilot had uttered his question that target, which was the Eastern airliner, had figuratively shot itself out of the air and into the sea.

After the tower had replied to the Pan American pilot that there had indeed been another plane at the same spot, but that it was no longer to be seen on the radar scope, the pilot replied:

> It looked like he's in the bay then, because we saw him, he looked like he winged over to miss us and we tried to avoid him and * * * we saw a bright flash about 1 minute later.

From these facts it is obvious that there is some likelihood that the two planes had a "near miss," that to avoid a collision the Eastern banked sharply away from the Pan American, and that somehow the Eastern could not emerge from the turn and it crashed into the sea.

I wish to emphasize at this time that the facts and the cause of the accident cannot be finally determined until the CAB completes its investigation. Even the so-called transcript which the FAA saw fit to release cannot be relied upon because it is the duty of the CAB to prepare a full and accurate transcript of the conversations of the pilots and the controllers at the time of the crash. The times inserted in the FAA transcript are at best rough estimates of the real times involved. These too must be determined scientifically, not by guesswork, by the CAB, and I question the

wisdom of the FAA in releasing its ersatz transcript.

But the chief instance of FAA meddling into the CAB investigation in this case, so far, came in the form of statements issued by two FAA officials, one of them Halaby himself. The crash occurred on a Monday. On the following Thursday the FAA regional administrator, in a press conference, stated that the two planes had 1,000 feet vertical separation. If there was such a vertical separation there could not have been a "near miss." In that case, presumably, there would be no FAA responsibility for the crash. For if the FAA is properly doing its job, controlling air traffic, there should be no near misses. Najeeb Halaby later the same day lengthened the vertical separation by saying in a separate press conference that the planes were from 1,200 to 1,700 feet apart from one another. His motives in lengthening the vertical separation are clear.

One other incident is illustrative of the FAA's determination to reconstruct the crash of February 8 in order to absolve itself. At the press conference held by the FAA regional director, copies of the FAA transcript were handed out. Several reporters in scanning over the lengthy document noticed the exclamation of the Pan American pilot and his statement which followed immediately afterwards that he had a near miss and that the Eastern had winged over the Pan American and then dived toward the sea. One of these reporters was Tom Del Vecchio of Aviation News. According to Mr. Del Vecchio, one FAA official interrupted him while he was phoning his story to his newspaper and tried to suppress it. The story of the near miss was not suppressed. Mr. Del Vecchio has described the FAA attempt to suppress his story, which I will insert in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, important as are the 84 lives of those who perished in the sea on February 8, there is an even greater significance to the crash and the actions of the FAA and its Administrator. I have spoken before in this House on the sloppy and mismanaged program of aviation traffic and aviation safety. I have brought before the Congress facts and figures demonstrating the laxity with which this program has been handled in terms of poor and inadequate equipment in airports and traffic control centers, crowding too much traffic into a congested area, and placing too much of a burden on overworked traffic controllers. These problems are exemplified by the high number of near misses which occur in the air traffic lanes between aircraft. Normally, these near misses do not make the newspapers. Most of the public, I venture to say, is not even familiar with the term "near miss," much less with the frequency with which they occur and the danger they present.

There are two basic reasons for this. First, usually no accident accompanies a near miss. The aircraft do not collide and they continue in their flights. Such an event is not the stuff that news stories are made of. Still, if all the near misses that do occur were reported and made known to the public, along with the figures on the number of persons whose lives were endangered, the people would be gravely concerned with the state of aviation safety. This brings us to the second reason explaining why the problem of the near miss is not fully appreciated: The practices and the policies of the FAA Administrator, Najeeb Halaby, has intimidated and frightened airline pilots into not reporting all the near misses that occur. Just as the FAA tried to suppress the story of the near miss reported by the pilot of the Pan American jet February 8, so has this Federal agency, under the leadership of Najeeb Halaby, attempted to suppress the news of all near misses. The means by which this suppression takes place are simple. If a pilot reports one, as he should, the FAA launches an investigation. Here we have the very thing which Congress tried to avoid by setting up the CAB to investigate air collisions instead of allowing the FAA to do so. That is, the FAA is allowed to investigate its own actions. For in many, if not most instances, it is the practices or the procedures of the FAA itself which has caused two planes to nearly collide. When the FAA investigates, however, the FAA is never at fault. The result is the pilot is blamed and his license and livelihood are placed in jeopardy. So pilots have learned not to report near misses to the FAA.

But they occur, and I hope in the near future to be able to produce before my colleagues in this House proof of the astonishing and frightening number of near misses that occur.

Why do so many near misses occur? Because airports are poorly equipped and underequipped. Because traffic control centers are poorly equipped. At this very moment the FAA is consolidating the number of traffic control centers. Halaby claims they are being consolidated because of economy and efficiency. The truth is exactly the opposite. The traffic control center in San Antonio is scheduled to be closed down and abandoned, consolidated with the one in New Orleans into the city of Houston. This means we will have one traffic control center doing the work of three. Efficiency? Hardly. The congested skies of New York, the badly equipped airport and control center, and the overworked controllers contributed to the collision of February 8, and these very same conditions will contribute to other tragic crashes.

The air safety record in the San Antonio area has so far been good. But I warn that when the control center is removed air traffic in this area will become endangered. The news of near misses can be suppressed. But the news of crashes and of deaths cannot.

I would like to point out that I use the commercial airlines to travel between my home district in Texas and Washington, D.C. extensively. In 1962 I made 50 round trips between San Antonio and Washington, DC. I made 61 round trips in 1963, and 63 round trips in 1964. My concern for aviation safety is therefore as a Congressman, a citizen, and a passenger who travels by air more than most people do. Further, no one has a higher respect for the U.S. commercial aviation industry and for the airline pilots than I do. From much personal experience I know of their dedication and their competence. The success of the American aviation industry is despite, not because of, the meddling and the mismanagement of the Federal Agency which is supposed to regulate it, the FAA.

It is in this light that I warn the air passenger public in my district of the great hazard when the San Antonio Air Route Traffic Control Center is removed. I hold Najeeb Halaby charged with knowledge and responsible. I pray there will be no future casualties where none have been had in the past. But, the facts are there for all of us to see, and if such should be then all I can say is Halaby's hands will show the stain of guilt.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point an article from the New York Times dated February 12, 1965, by Frederick C. Appel; an article from Aviation Daily dated February 16, 1965, entitled "Near Miss Theory Gains Momentum in Eastern Crash Investigation," and the article from Aviation News dated February 26, 1965, by Tom Del Vecchio.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 12, 1965]

FINAL SECONDS OF DC-7B: PILOTS DIFFER ON NEAR MISS—RADIO LOG RECOUNTS AIRLINER'S PLUNGING INTO OCEAN—WRECKAGE IS LOCATED BY SKINDIVERS ON FISHING BOAT

(By Fredric C. Appel)

The two Pan American World Airways pilots who witnessed Monday night's fatal plunge of Eastern Air Lines Flight 663 off Jones Beach, Long Island, apparently differed on whether the two planes were in a "close miss."

While one pilot had reported, "We had a close miss here," the second, in the same cockpit, said: "He was well over the top of us. And it looked like he went into an absolute vertical turn and kept rolling."

This dramatic description of Flight 663's final seconds emerged from recorded tapes of the pilots radio transmissions released yesterday by the Federal Aviation Agency.

In separate news conferences, however, two FAA officials expressed doubt that the aircraft had really come very close together. Both officials estimated the separation of the planes at 1,200 to 1,700 feet vertically and 3 to 4 miles laterally, well within legal limits.

Civil Aeronautics Board officials, on the other hand, declined to comment on this reconstruction, indicating they thought it was too early to try to draw any conclusions. The CAB is officially charged with investigation of the accident in which all 84 persons on the DC-7B, a propeller craft, were killed.

At the crash scene, the wreckage of the plane was located by skindivers from a private fishing vessel and then identified by an aeronautics board investigator. The first bits of wreckage were brought to the surface at about 3:15 p.m. at latitude 40°28.2′ north, longitude 73°35.8′ west, or about 6.7 miles south-southeast of Jones Inlet, the Coast Guard said.

According to the taped radio transmissions, each plane was notified of the other's presence when the two were about 6 miles apart.

Pan American World Airways Flight 212, a Boeing 707 jet inbound from San Juan, P.R., was traveling northeast, descending from 10,000 feet. At 6:24:50, Kennedy Airport radioed, "traffic at 11 o'clock, 6 miles, southeastbound, just climbing out of 3,000 feet." The traffic was Eastern Air Lines Flight 663.

Twelve seconds later, the Pan American plane replied, "We have the traffic."

At 6:25:23, Flight 633 was told, "traffic 2 o'clock, 5 miles, northeastbound, below you."

"GOODNIGHT" FROM PILOT

"OK," Eastern replied, "we have the traffic. Turning one seven zero, six six three." A few seconds later: "Goodnight."

"Goodnight, sir," said Kennedy Airport.

At 6:26:24 came the first indication of trouble. Flight 212 radioed: "We had a close miss here * * * we're turning now to * * * three six zero and * * * did you have another target in this area at this same spot where we were just a minute ago?"

"Traffic just * * * about the time you turned over?"

"That's right, southbound."

"Affirmative. However, not on my scope at present time."

"Is he still on the scope?"

"No, sir."

"It looked like he's in the bay then, because we saw him. He looked like he winged over to miss us and we tried to avoid him * * * we saw a bright flash about 1 minute later."

At a news conference at Kennedy Airport yesterday, Oscar Bakke, the Federal Aviation Agency's Director of region 1, said that from information received by the FAA on radar and radio communications, "these planes had at least 1,000 feet of vertical separation between them and 3 and 4 miles of horizontal separation."

An air traffic control official said the 1,000 feet vertical separation was calculated from the recorded tapes, Eastern's report that it was climbing above 3,700 feet on its way to 8,000, and the known altitude of the Pan American jet. The aircraft's calculated rate of a climb at that moment was about 340 feet a minute.

ACCURACY IS CHECKED

In a separate conference at the Overseas Press Club, the FAA Administrator, Najeeb Halaby, said the planes had between 1,200 and 1,700 feet vertical separation.

Observation craft of the agency also flew the calculated courses of the two planes to check the accuracy of the radar and radio transmissions. Mr. Halaby said the planes were on the radar scopes of at least eight operators who estimated the horizontal separation at 3 to 4 miles.

In his conference, Mr. Bakke admitted there was a 20-second period "in which we were in doubt as to the altitude or attitude of the Eastern plane." This was the period following Eastern's last transmission, "goodnight."

Mr. Bakke said the objective of the FAA traffic controllers was to provide either 1,000 feet vertical separation or 3 miles horizontal separation. He drew a picture of two planes having been given adequate separation guidance from the ground, which had not steered them onto a collision course.

One of the functions of the agency is to regulate aid traffic at airports. It is an arm of the executive branch of the Federal Government. The Civil Aeronautics Board, on the other hand, is an arm of Congress, charged with investigating accidents and making recommendations for better safety procedures.

THE VITAL QUESTION

Concerning the Pan American pilot's "close miss" comment, Mr. Bakke said: "Whether the miss of which he is speaking is an aircraft descending rapidly out of control or one descending normally, we have no way of knowing."

The "vital question," Mr. Bakke said, was whether the Eastern plane was already in trouble when the apparent near-miss occurred. Mr. Halaby explained that even in the absolutely vertical turn described by the Pan American pilot, a DC-7B was capable of recovering its stability within 3,500 feet or less if it was traveling at the 160- to 170-knots speed calculated for the Eastern plane.

The main wreckage of the Eastern plane was located yesterday afternoon by six skindivers from the charter fishing boat, *Jess-Lu III*. The 83-foot vessel is captained by J. Porter of 82 Quebec Road, Island Park, Long Island, and is operated out of Freeport. It is equipped with side-scanning sonar, which was used in finding the downed plane.

WRECKAGE IS RECOVERED

The boat made its first contact with fishing poles and hooks on the ends of lines, one of the divers said later. Once the contact was made, the divers went down to the wreckage in two shifts. The first piece of wreckage was brought up by Joseph Septe, 39 years old, of 23-95 First Street, East Meadow, Long Island.

[From the Aviation Daily, Feb. 16, 1965]

NEAR MISS THEORY GAINS MOMENTUM IN EASTERN CRASH INVESTIGATION

While CAB accident investigators yesterday attempted to raise the main wreckage of an Eastern Air Lines DC-7B which crashed in the Atlantic February 8 some 13 miles from the New York's Kennedy Airport, there were growing reports that the Eastern aircraft had been involved in a close, near head-on collision with a Pan Am jet.

Despite FAA statements that the Eastern aircraft and the Pan Am 707 had more than 1,000 feet vertical and 3 miles horizontal separation there is almost conclusive proof that the two airliners practically hit just seconds before the Eastern aircraft plunged into the Atlantic with 84 persons aboard, the Daily learned yesterday.

The Eastern aircraft was eastbound south of Kennedy at 3,700 feet and apparently went into a steep vertical bank to avoid the Pan Am aircraft heading into Kennedy. It is being speculated that the Eastern aircraft was unable to check its bank, rolled over and did not have sufficient altitude or horizon reference to recover. Wreckage located on the Atlantic bottom is badly broken up but in fairly large pieces in a compact area.

Following the crash FAA held a press conference on Thursday to release the ATC tapes and at that time Oscar Bakke, regional Director of the FAA, took great pains to point out to newsmen that the FAA traffic controllers had in fact kept the two aircraft at their legal separation distances. It appears now that this may not be the case. FAA Administrator Halaby in New York, later the same day, went before a luncheon meeting of the Aviation/Space Writers Association and stated that the separation was even greater than Bakke had indicated. There was no explanation at the time of the discrepancy between the two sets of figures, both of which it now appears may well be erroneous.

[From Aviation News, Feb. 26, 1965]

OVER THE AIRWAYS

(By Tom Del Vecchio)

Tension on a local story could hardly have mounted higher than during those last few minutes before the Federal Aviation Agency released the official transcript of the radio transmissions with FAA air traffic controllers before Eastern Air Lines flight 663 went into a steep bank and plummeted into the Atlantic Ocean off Jones Beach Inlet on the night of February 8.

The setting was a conference room on the second floor of the Federal Building at Kennedy Airport. Heavy TV camera and other equipment cluttered the narrow area around a huge conference table. Wires and lights blanketed the floor and every available inch.

The FAA had announced that the transcripts would be distributed at exactly 11 a.m. But that deadline passed as the cameraman sprawled all over the graphic charts which had been set up, and radio and TV sound men clustered their mikes around a speaker, from which came excerpts of the official recording, before release of the transcript.

A little press background might help. I had been assigned to the story since the evening of the crash. I picked up the story that an air traffic controller at Kennedy had been watching flight 663 on his radar scope only to see it suddenly disappear.

While he began a check, the controllers at FAA air traffic control center at MacArthur Field started their queries on the missing airliner, whose crew should have switched from the airport traffic band to the MacArthur radio.

I got wind of a Pan American pilot who reportedly had seen part of the crash. I couldn't find him at the Pan Am Terminal, where I was told he would not be available for interview. However, other newsmen reached him at a hotel and quoted him as saying he saw the Eastern Air Lines DC-7B go into a steep bank and land in the ocean, with 84 human beings aboard.

The captain of Pan Am's flight 212 gave his altitude at the time as about 3,500 feet.

Other newsmen, unaware of the 3,500-foot altitude statement, were told at an official briefing in the Federal Building on the night of the crash that flight 663 had last reported being at 3,700 feet.

Flight 663, out of Boston and Atlanta-bound, had made a routine, normal takeoff from Kennedy Airport. Pan Am's 212 was inbound to Kennedy out of San Juan with 102 aboard.

Meanwhile, FAA and Civil Aeronautics Board officials maintained a traditional silence. In the absence of an interim statement on a possible cause, the public as well as the next of kin were left with the horrifying impression that a normally flying plane had been suddenly and mysteriously stricken in flight, and had inexplicably nosed into the cold Atlantic waters, whose impact was that of concrete.

There wasn't an expert on the Government teams who didn't know more than that. There wasn't one close to the operation who didn't suspect that the hurtling of two planes toward each other while going in opposite directions, had been a factor.

But by the time newsmen were printing this and asking questions, the transcripts were being readied. The moment had come in that noisy room for their distribution. The writing press began to clamor.

Finally the newsmen would wait no longer, and the transcripts were brought in.

In the confusion we hurriedly scanned the 11-page, single-spaced, technically-worded script. Oscar Bakke, FAA regional Director; stood ready for a briefing.

He stood by the charts while the cameramen again went wild. The transmissions were all set to be played. The briefing, as it happened, would continue for an hour and a half.

The writing newsmen hit page 8 of the transcript at about the same time. There, at the top of the page, was the exclamation from the cockpit of Pan Am's jet flight 212 of a "close miss" by the Eastern Air Lines piston plane. A couple of paragraphs down was the graphic exclamation that 663 had winged over the jetliner, then had nosed down.

We disentangled ourselves from the underfoot and in-the-lap wiring and started for the telephones. The FAA officials and public relations man were aghast. I commandeered a telephone just outside the briefing room and let go with my bulletin—the first official confirmation that there had been no great mystery in the skies but a close miss before the disaster.

The story rolled, paragraph by paragraph. Just at about the time there began a care-

ful cross-checking on the other end of the line, the FAA men caught up with me. I cut off my dictation.

"What's wrong?"

"We don't want to interrupt you," one of them said, politely, but gravely, "But your story is going to be wrong."

"What? I've got the transcript right here."

"But Mr. Bakke is explaining it at the briefing right now. He's going to say that there was adequate separation between these planes."

"I'll put that in and balance the story. I'll pick up the briefing later. But I've got to move this transcript."

"You'll be wrong."

The transcript moved and it wasn't wrong. It hit every paper in the country.

Because I wasn't at the briefing, the FAA officials kept feeding me summaries of what Mr. Bakke was saying. With the aid of those charts and the timing on the transmissions, the FAA had reconstructed the fateful moments to establish that a proper 1,000 feet or more separated the planes vertically, and at least 3 miles laterally.

FAA Administrator Najeeb Halaby, even lengthened the separation in a statement that same day at the Overseas Press Club, where he addressed the Aviation/Space Writers Association.

Even in the FAA account there is a crucial interval of 20 to 40 seconds before the crash which cannot be accounted for.

Newsmen who may have worried over hitting the telephones fast found reassurance in the fact that the CAB had already made an exhaustive study of the radio transmissions as part of its overall massing of evidence before the public hearing.

Not only that, it was also carefully checking the all-important data on the recording foil of Pan Am's flight recorder. This details every maneuver of the jetliner from the time of takeoff to setdown. These will include heading, altitude, speed, banks, and turns. It was clear the CAB was making its own charts and correlating its own time intervals to fix as closely as it is humanly and scientifically possible the position of those two planes at or about the time of near collision.

It was clear, too, that the CAB wasn't being necessarily bound by the FAA charts.

Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee's Aviation Subcommittee, hit at the heart of it in an interview last Saturday. He expressed the hope the investigation would concentrate on establishing the probable cause, rather than become a field day for defense and insurance company attorneys.

That's the core of the problem. Every damaging admission made in a crash investigation ruins reputations and careers, and lays the groundwork for millions of dollars in damage suits. Whether a certain legal immunity should be established, with all parties sharing damages, might be one approach. But this is for Congress to say.

Certain it is, however, that so long as so much is at stake, the CAB's search for pure cause to prevent subsequent disasters is considerably handicapped. A witness thinking in terms of defense rather than truth isn't of much help. Often it is the dead pilot who comes under a cloud because, obviously, it's convenient, and he can't speak for himself.

(According to the official transcript, the Pan Am pilot gave his altitude as "level at 3,000 feet" at 6:26:14 p.m. He was then instructed to descend to 2,000, and maintain a heading of 360. At 6:26:21, 7 seconds later, an exclamation came from the Pan Am cockpit. Twenty-three seconds after that, Pan Am reported the near-miss. Eastern reported leaving 3,700 feet at 6:25:05, 1 minute and 16 seconds before the exclamation was heard from the Pan Am plane. Thirty-four seconds after Eastern reported 3,700 feet, Pan Am said it was leaving 3,500.—EDITOR.)

THE UNSEEN REVOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today, James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union delivered one of the finest addresses I have ever read concerning the role of America in a technological world. He speaks of our productive powers in terms of the positive good they create instead of the problems they raise.

It is this kind of creative thinking that will lead us as a nation to give the impetus needed to build a world at peace.

This speech is a practical man's approach to the Great Society. I feel it can be of great benefit to my colleagues in the development of a legislative program to undergird the President's proposals. I urge that it be read with care.

The speech is as follows:

THE UNSEEN REVOLUTION

(Excerpts from an address by James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, to the annual convention, Chicago, Ill., March 15, 1965)

Tonight I shall talk not of where we have been and what we have done, but of where we are going and what we can do.

A recent popular song begins with the words, "Whatever Lola wants, Lola gets." Listening to it, visions of sugarplums dance in our heads. Why can't we be like Lola? Fantasy? Not really.

We are living in an age where almost any goal is possible—it is simply a matter of equating the dream and the desire, and then exercising the will to achieve it.

I have a dream. It is about the future of America. What kind of future do we want? What do we want America to be? What do we want to be? Let us decide and then go after it. A pipedream? No. Ladies and gentlemen, the United States is for the first time at a place in history where she can do whatever she wants to do.

You and I have been present at an unseen revolution.

In our lifetime, a social and economic era has drawn to a close.

Its beginning in the thirties were distinguishable.

The middle of the era in the forties and fifties was covered over by war and cold war.

Then in a burst of belated activity, the "in" basket of 30 legislative years has been almost emptied—and the bottom is in sight.

Now we face the consequences of that revolution and of that era. And we face it without plans, programs, or prophets.

The prophets of the last half century have either been exposed as false or their prophecies have already come true. In any case, they are of no use to us now.

What is this unseen revolution? It is simply this—the torrential outpouring of science and technology in the past 25 years and particularly in the past decade has outlawed scarcity and want and outlawed large wars for rational human beings.

I submit to you that the problem we face is basically simple.

Science and technology have changed the rules of international power politics and of warfare. Today, peace is not merely a desirable goal, but the price of human survival. Today, force is no longer the ultimate weapon of international diplomacy because no country ever starts a war it knows it cannot win and nobody can win a new world war.

This is only a tiny planet on which we live, as my old friend Leo Szilard so frequently pointed out—and it may be that the universe would little note our passing into uninhabitable dust. But I don't think that for a moment and I know you don't either. And, for that matter, neither did Leo Szilard.

We must not merely try for peace, nor merely hope for peace. We must banish war and the very thought of war from the face of the earth. For war without victory is action without meaning and in this day when we have enough nuclear bombs to blow up everybody in the world—not once, but many, many times over—there can be no victory in a world war.

Then there is the other part of the unseen revolution.

In our life span we have escalated from the sharing of too little—the dividing of scarcity—to the stage where we can meet all human needs.

We no longer have to decide who gets enough and who gets too little. We now have the capital, the technical know-how, the human and natural resources, to permit all of us—all Americans—to live in comfort and with dignity.

And why shouldn't we do just that?

This is my dream. Peace and abundance * * * with freedom. Just what the Farmers Union has stood for—and fought for—all these years.

But my dream does not go unchallenged. There are still too many people—and too often in high places in business and Government—who are mesmerized by the outdated doctrines of scarcity economics. And these same people preach the moral virtues of work and saving and the ignobility and character undermining of leisure and of reward without labor.

I say that what the individual can offer no longer can or should determine the measure of his reward. His reward should and must be measured by his need.

Nor, in our emerging society, can we measure the value of the task performed by its immediate selling price in the market. We must not turn the farmer from his land any more than we do the artist from his canvas, the teacher from his classroom, or the musician from his instrument. We should measure the importance of the task performed by its contribution to the quality of life.

I am not concerned one iota with the fact that many of our underprivileged and underendowed citizens may take more from society than they give. This is a price that we must pay for past neglect and past mistakes. It is a price that we can easily afford if only to warn us that equal and enormously enlarged educational opportunities and across-the-board health services are needed to prevent the price being paid over and over again in the long future.

We must always think first of people and not just of what they can give, but of what they need.

Neither the concept nor the motivation is wholly new—from Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom, to Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, Harry Truman's Fair Deal, John Kennedy's New Frontier, and Lyndon Johnson's Great Society—we have been committed to an America which is "people centered."

Each of these great Presidents focused attention on segments of American life which were being exploited or were in danger of erosion.

Today, the accomplishments and the realities of the last two decades—what I call the unseen revolution—make possible a comprehensive and simultaneous approach to all the pockets of deprivation and disadvantage.

We must enter new dimensions of social thinking—no longer can scarcity economics—the division of "too small a pie"—suffice. Scarcity economics must give way to a policy and an era of abundance—to a society and a government dedicated not only to satisfying the elemental needs of man, but to enlarging his personal dignity and his cultural and social heritage.

No longer do we need to measure human needs on the yardstick of scarcity. The needs themselves must become the yardstick for what our country should produce in goods and services. Fortunately, science and technology has made it possible for us to do just that.

We must learn to live with abundance and like it.

In years past, it was considered immoral not to work a long, hard day and not to save. Now I say it is becoming immoral to overwork and oversave.

People have a right to an income and to use it and to spend it as they see fit.

We have the means to end hunger. Not only here in the United States, but worldwide. Let us do so. Our abundant foodstuffs are a blessing, not a curse.

We have the means to educate our youth through the graduate level. Let us do so—starting right now.

We have the means to live the quality life. And I think Americans are ready. Nothing shows this more than our recent decision to eradicate poverty in this country as a moral issue.

Americans have consciences and let the economists never forget it.

I would like to say a word about the war on poverty.

This is a war that we in the Farmers Union support with all our hearts. We ought to. We started it right in our Farmers Union Convention in Washington 4 years ago.

I am becoming concerned, however, that the program is developing serious shortcomings, not only in size—for it is far too small—but in nature. The emphasis has been on young people, not old people; on urban people, not rural people. Yet it is among our older citizens and in our rural areas where the incidence of poverty is the greatest and the poverty itself is most intense.

Finally, I fear that we may wind up spending too much in trying to spend too little. There seems to be something disgraceful about giving money to anyone. That is, if the Government does it. If a rich man does it, it is considered laudable charity and we name a church window after him—and give him a tax deduction at the same time. It may be, however, that some of our poverty can best be cured with dollars rather than programs—and cured at a far lesser cost to the Nation.

One measure of poverty in America is the large and constant number of unemployed. The American labor force is increasing by more than one million persons every year. We have to run very fast to stand still. Last year 1,500,000 new jobs were created by the economy. But at the end of the year the unemployment rate was still over 5 percent and far higher among the very young, the very old, minority groups, and those where the educational level is low. One of the principal reasons for this anomaly is that people are living longer than they used to. And I say that society has an obligation to take care of these senior citizens in dignity and in comfort.

With automation, American society will require less and less manual labor to produce the material goods that we need.

Therefore, more and more of our labor force can become engaged in educating our youth, in servicing our older citizens, in preventing and curing illnesses, in advancing science, and in intensifying and spreading culture among all the people.

I say that automation is a blessing for we can now utilize available labor for the clearing of our slums, the rebuilding of our cities, for reconstructing our obsolete and inadequate transportation system, and, not least, for the revitalization of rural America.

It means we can do something about eliminating water and air pollution and conserving our natural mountain, lake, seashore, and other resources for all of our people.

The Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower held hearings last year and estimated the cost of meeting our Nation's rural and urban needs.

Rural programs of just conservation, water development, and recreational development on public lands would require $12 billion a year for 10 years.

Just to keep pace with population growth during the next 20 years, the subcommittee found public and private programs costing $500 to $700 billion would be needed in urban areas. To eliminate existing blight in the cities another $100 billion to $125 billion is required.

The backlog of rural and urban needs adds up to a staggering sum of $43 billion to $53 billion a year for 10 years, then $31 billion to $41 billion a year for another decade—nearly $1 trillion.

Why do we find ourselves in this situation, in this state of starved public services? The reason is clear.

Thirty years ago we were allocating one-third of the Federal budget for welfare programs. Today, welfare's share has declined to 7 percent. The spectacular increase in Federal spending, employment and U.S. Government real estate since 1940 has been in the military sector.

Isn't it strange that those who talk the loudest and attack Washington about the dangers of Federal spending and big government have their sights on nearly every aspect of Government except military expenditures?

And military spending is actually not assisting the economy. Our annual investment in military hardware is in equipment which is never again bought or sold—and, hopefully, never used.

We must be careful not to become enamored of defense expenditures. They take much from us and give little in return. There is no way to spend a dollar that is less economically desirable than on weapons of war.

We have been hearing a lot about automation and displaced workers. I would ask a question of the manufacturing business. When you replace a number of employees with automated machines, do you ask yourself if those machines will purchase your manufactured product? And if the machines can't, who will?

This is a question that is closely related to one that we can ask about rural America. Do we want a barren rural America with 85 to 90 percent of our population living in layers of concrete slabs along the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Great Lakes and Gulf of Mexico? Do we want 1, or 2, or 3 million farmers—or, for that matter do we want no one on the land at all?

We could live adequately getting our own food from the ocean's algae if that is what we want.

So why talk numbers? Let's talk of a quality America where those who want and believe in rural America can farm there, work there and live there. Let's build our society so that farmers get full parity for their efforts and they, too, can work a 40- or 35-hour week and have a month's vacation and more leisure.

Let's reverse the trend of the countryside subsidizing the city side by billions of dollars with our underpaid labor.

We must recapitalize and revitalize rural America. We must rebuild it to reemploy those forced from the land who want to return.

We must beautify it and make it a place where young people want to stay—and where older people will be proud to spend their golden years.

Before too long, when Government and business are run by closed circuit telephone-television and the like, it will be virtually unnecessary to go to the office—so let us get rural America ready as a place to live which is not polluted by obnoxious fumes, cut to pieces by highways, overpasses and underpasses, vulgarized by neon signs and hamburger joints, denuded of trees and country beauty by land hungry real estate promoters, and where people are not packed together like sardines without adequate light or air.

Ladies and gentlemen, of one thing I am sure, there will be a return to rural America, so let us begin preparations immediately.

Our family farm concept of agriculture made this Nation great. It brought more and better food to more people at a lower cost than at any time or any place in history. But our family farmers did even more than that—they fostered the moral fiber of their children, they preserved the American family and they strengthened the national character.

Is this the time to tell our family farmers to leave the land?

I say that it is morally and socially wrong to force citizens out of the way of life of their choice. And it is not in the national interest to depopulate rural America.

And then there are our senior citizens—more and more of them each year.

We—the overwhelming majority of Americans—are currently embroiled in a fantastically ridiculous fight with some 200,000 individuals (whose profession, by the way, we subsidized by our taxes) over a weak measure called medicare, when what we vitally need is a program of adequate public health, hospital and medical care not only for our senior citizens, but for all Americans, regardless of their age, race, creed, color or economic status.

Our forgotten retirees—our seniors forced to continue to scrub for a few dollars to help their subsistence; our elders who can't pay the exorbitant price demanded for subsistence drugs; our senior citizens who have helped build this country—should they be forgotten and pushed to the edge of hopelessness and despair?

As we achieve longevity we must not neglect humanity.

What is vitally needed is a broad-gaged program of market basket social security.

Again, for our seniors as for our youth, the time is here to stop thinking in terms of economics and to think of people.

There is still the other ingredient for the fulfillment of our society. But it is the biggest "but" of all—the achievement of a lasting peace.

Americans, like any people who are not insane, will support steps toward disarmament. But, regrettably, there is no adequate peace offensive in prospect.

So I propose a marshaling of the forces all over America who want to live in peace with freedom and abundance. I call on all Americans who want to enjoy the age of abundance and live out of the shadow of war. That is a crusade worth joining.

I had one of the greatest thrills of my life last month participating in the worldwide convocation on "Pacem in Terris" convened by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in New York.

The convocation embraced nongovernment people from all countries except Communist

China—men and women from Russia, Poland, India, Pakistan, Israel, Europe, and our own country.

Pope John's encyclical spoke to all mankind, all races, all religions—and to atheists and agnostics.

He spoke of one mankind, of one human race, and of the elimination of poverty, oppression, and war. And he called for positive steps toward peace.

He saw "the unseen revolution."

There are people all over the world tonight who have joined hands with the Pope—and are eager to follow his beacon light toward peace with freedom—toward abundance and toward a lasting brotherhood of man in a world of love. Let us join in following that light.

GOVERNMENT, MILITARY, AND CIVILIAN PAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries is presently carrying on a survey in which the Panel is inviting the views of civilian and uniformed personnel to express their views on Government, military, and civilian pay.

There are thousands who might believe that this is a dangerous practice especially if the panel is interested in getting a completely unbiased viewpoint. I am happy to report, however, that there are men and women in Federal employment who are at the same time good, responsible citizens. As evidence I am presenting here for the information of my colleagues, a letter written to Mr. Marion B. Folsom, Chairman of this Panel, by Mr. Kenneth E. Glass, one of my former colleagues in the Treasury Department Savings Bond Service:

MARCH 4, 1965.

Mr. MARION B. FOLSOM,
Chairman, President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries, Executive Office of the President, Room 252 Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FOLSOM: The writer is honored by being requested to supply his views on Government military and civilian pay. It is the first time, to my knowledge, in more than 25 years of Government civilian service, that I have received a request of this nature. I thank you for this opportunity.

1. In the light of the world conditions, the high level of the public debt, and other economic factors, I would be greatly in favor of Congress not being requested to pass any pay raises for Government civilian or military employes in 1965.

2. In this connection, we strongly feel that the administration leading by example should then request the united cooperation of all labor union leaders, business leaders, and all State, county, and city governments (including school boards) to do their very best to follow this pattern. Our Nation and our elected leaders, by moving cooperatively in this direction, can thereby greatly help to avoid any further dilution of the purchasing power of our dollars, at least for the present.

3. I also strongly feel that the present freeze in grades 14 and above should be lifted immediately. All agencies should be encouraged to provide merit promotions and reclassification of positions at any level when justified and warranted. This would be a helpful tool, helping solve any of the present inequities where they exist.

Thank you for the leadership you are giving this important panel. Your efforts, and efforts of your associates, are deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

KENNETH E. CLASS.

WEST DES MOINES, IOWA.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in her family.

Mr. KIRWAN (at the request of Mr. KEOGH), March 15 through March 18, 1965, on account of death in the family.

Mr. SKUBITZ, for March 16, 1965, on account of official business.

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. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, on Wednesday and Thursday next; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana, for 60 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. CRALEY, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES, for 1 hour, on March 16, 1965.

Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS (at the request of Mr. MORTON), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HARRIS to extend his remarks under his special order today and to include a copy of a proclamation issued by the Governor of Arkansas with reference to DeMolay Week.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BENNETT.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MORTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GROVER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. FISHER in two instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. CALLAN in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 42. An act for the relief of George Tilson Weed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 154. An act for the relief of Luisa G. Valdez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 196. An act for the relief of Georges Fraise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 200. An act for the relief of Francesco Mira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 243. An act for the relief of Kalliope Kostides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 244. An act for the relief of Charles Chung Chi Lee and Julia Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 262. An act for the relief of Milagros Aragon Neri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 320. An act for the relief of Denis Ryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 373. An act for the relief of Dr. Victor M. Ubieta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 389. An act for the relief of Teresa Marangon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 394. An act for the relief of Alexa Daniel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 416. An act for the relief of Sister Aurora Martin Gelado (also known as Sister Nieve); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 417. An act for the relief of Miss Wladyslawa Kowalczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 446. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Konyen, his wife, Susanne Fritsch Konyen, and their children, Susanne Konyen and Willy Konyen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 456. An act for the relief of Koon Chew Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 510. An act to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 570. An act for the relief of Frank S. Chow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 571. An act for the relief of Denise Hojebane Barrood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 615. An act for the relief of Andreas, Gregorios, Eleni, Nikolaos, and Anna Chingas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 632. An act for the relief of Flora Romano Torre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 640. An act for the relief of Zenon Zubieta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 686. An act for the relief of Pietrina Del Frate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 694. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Soos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 719. An act for the relief of Ivanka Pekar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 720. An act for the relief of Ivan Radic, his wife, Ester Radic, and their daughter, Ilivera Radic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 767. An act for the relief of Gerhard Hofacker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 769. An act for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 840. An act for the relief of Christos Stratis; to the Committee on Judiciary.

S. 856. An act for the relief of the estate of R. M. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 916. An act for the relief of Debra Lynne Sanders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 12, 1965, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 45. An act 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.

DEDICATION OF ALBERT THOMAS GYMNASIUM IN RAYBURN OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of those a few days ago who had the honor of being present on the occasion of the dedication of the Albert Thomas Gymnasium in the Rayburn Office Building.

At that time the Speaker made a very appropriate address honoring our distinguished, beloved, and respected colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALBERT THOMAS]. I think that the Speaker's remarks should be made a part of the history of the proceedings of the House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Speaker may be inserted in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, just this morning the Architect's Office contacted me about the program and I arranged, tentatively, of course—and I believe it can be arranged, since there was a tape recording made of the entire program—that we would get a transcript of it. I would like to ask that the entire program be included in the RECORD at the same place following the Speaker's very fine and appropriate remarks and that preceding the Speaker's remarks the prayer offered by our Chaplain be included in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PRAYER BY THE CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE, REV. BERNARD BRASKAMP, D.D.

Almighty, our gracious Benefactor, we thank Thee for this gymnasium, provided for the Members of the House of Representatives, for their recreation and pleasure, for their well-being and welfare.

May we be inspired to contemplate and ponder the meaning and significance of the words of the poet Browning in his "Rabbi Ben Ezra":

"To man, propose this test—
Thy body at its best,
How far can that project Thy Soul on its lone way?"

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise and glory, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

SPEAKER JOHN W. MCCORMACK'S REMARKS DEDICATING THE ALBERT THOMAS GYMNASIUM IN THE RAYBURN OFFICE BUILDING

The event in which we are engaged today is, beyond question, a glorious tribute to two men deserving nothing less than that. One, of course, is the late Sam Rayburn, Representative from Texas and my predecessor in the Speaker's chair at the House of Representatives; the other: ALBERT THOMAS, who has served in this House for 28 years.

It is, indeed, an honor to dedicate a single part of this building—the Rayburn Building—for in so doing we place ourselves, again, on record, alongside the name of Sam Rayburn, himself—and that, may I say, is a very, very great honor, so far as I am concerned.

In dedicating this room today—our spacious new gymnasium—I can recall the remarks of Sam Rayburn, in this very regard, expressing the wish that such a place were available to Members of Congress. For, in his opinion, there was no justification in the total separation of the physical from the mental. And, as he saw it—there being a close tie between alertness of the mind and that of the body—the Congress would do well to have at its disposal facilities for use in the area of physical recreation. Construction of this gymnasium has transformed the dream to reality, and once again the leadership of Sam Rayburn has resulted in something fine.

The tribute to ALBERT THOMAS is equally deserved. As a master in the field of congressional appropriations, he made his mark in Washington, without a doubt. In the words of the late President Kennedy, it would be "impossible to exaggerate the importance of leadership Congressman THOMAS exerted in the House of Representatives."

As a friend of both Speaker Rayburn and Congressman THOMAS, over a long period of time, I came to recognize the fact that both were deeply concerned not only for the state of the Union but for the best interests of their own organization, the U.S. Congress.

In keeping with this concern, Speaker Rayburn proposed and Congress enacted the legislation leading to the construction of this great and mighty edifice. In so doing, he acted in response to a burning need for additional space, and the results are impressive, from every point of view. Mr. Rayburn would be proud to see this building, and I, as his friend, am proud to speak in its behalf.

So far as the gymnasium is concerned, I am certain it will be put to use in the expected manner, by the many Congressmen who fully recognize the interrelationship of mental and physical coordination, both of which are so vital to the vigor of our Nation.

As Speaker and also as chairman of the House Office Commission I am so pleased that it was the unanimous vote of the commission to name the gymnasium the Albert Thomas Gymnasium, for ALBERT THOMAS is truly one of God's noblemen.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that on today, the day set for a joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

The Chair is now going to declare a recess until this evening, when the two Houses will meet in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States.

The House will stand in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m., the bells to be rung at 8:25 p.m.

RECESS

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 8 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 352. Concurrent resolution providing that the two Houses of Congress assembled in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, March 15, 1965, at 9 o'clock post meridian to receive the President of the United States.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 352 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 117)

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BOGGS, the gentleman from New York, Mr. CELLER, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort for the President of the United States the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senator from Florida, Mr. SMATHERS, the Senator from Arizona, Mr. HAYDEN, the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. ELLENDER, the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. MCCLELLAN, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN, the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL, the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN, and the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. SALTONSTALL.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the ambasadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of

Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 1 minute p.m. the Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the great pleasure, the highest privilege and the distinguished—and I might also say personal—honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress, I speak tonight for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy.

I urge every member of both parties—Americans of all religions and of all colors—from every section of this country—to join me in that cause.

At times history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was a century ago at Appomattox. So it was last week in Selma, Ala.

There, long-suffering men and women peacefully protested the denial of their rights as Americans. Many were brutally assaulted. One good man—a man of God—was killed.

There was no cause for pride in what has happened in Selma.

There is no cause for self-satisfaction in the long denial of equal rights of millions of Americans.

But there is cause for hope and for faith in our democracy in what is happening here tonight.

For the cries of pain, and the hymns and protests of oppressed people, have summoned into convocation all the majesty of this great Government, the Government of the greatest Nation on earth.

Our mission is at once the oldest and most basic of this country: to right wrong, to do justice, to serve man.

In our time we have come to live with the moments of great crisis. Our lives have been marked with debate about great issues—issues of war and peace, issues of prosperity and depression. But rarely, in any time, does an issue lay bare the secret heart of America itself. Rarely are we met with the challenge, not to our growth or abundance, or our welfare or our security—but rather to the values and the purposes and the meaning of our beloved Nation.

The issue of equal rights for American Negroes is such an issue. And should we defeat every enemy, and should we double our wealth and conquer the stars and still be unequal to this issue, then we will have failed as a people and as a nation.

For with a country as with a person, "What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"

There is no Negro problem. There is no southern problem. There is no northern problem. There is only an American problem.

And we are met here tonight as Americans—not as Democrats or Republicans—we are met here as Americans to solve that problem.

This was the first nation in the history of the world to be founded with a purpose. The great phrases of that purpose still sound in every American heart, north and south: "All men are created equal"—"Government by consent of the governed"—"Give me liberty or give me death." And those are not just clever words and those are not just empty theories. In their name Americans have fought and died for two centuries and tonight around the world they stand there as guardians of our liberty risking their lives.

Those words are a promise to every citizen that he shall share in the dignity of man. This dignity cannot be found in a man's possessions. It cannot be found in his power or in his position. It really rests on his right to be treated as a man equal in opportunity to all others. It says that he shall share in freedom, he shall choose his leaders, educate his children, provide for his family according to his ability and his merits as a human being.

To apply any other test—to deny a man his hopes because of his color or race or his religion or the place of his birth—is not only to do injustice, it is to deny America and to dishonor the dead who gave their lives for American freedom.

Our fathers believed that if this noble view of the rights of man was to flourish, it must be rooted in democracy. The most basic right of all was the right to choose your own leaders. The history of this country in large measure, is the history of the expansion of that right to all of our people.

Many of the issues of civil rights are very complex and most difficult. But about this there can and should be no argument. Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which can excuse the denial of that right. There is no duty which weighs more heavily on us than the duty we have to insure that right.

Yet the harsh fact is that in many places in this country men and women are kept from voting simply because they are Negroes.

Every device of which human ingenuity is capable has been used to deny this right. The Negro citizen may go to register only to be told that the day is wrong, or the hour is late, or the official in charge is absent.

And if he persists, and if he manages to present himself to the registrar, he may be disqualified because he did not spell out his middle name or because he abbreviated a word on the application.

And if he manages to fill out an application he is given a test. The registrar is the sole judge of whether he passes this test. He may be asked to recite the entire Constitution, or explain the most complex provisions of State law and even a college degree cannot be used to prove that he can read and write.

For the fact is that the only way to pass these barriers is to show a white skin.

Experience has clearly shown that the existing process of law cannot overcome systematic and ingenious discrimination. No law that we now have on the books—and I have helped to put three of them there—can insure the right to vote when local officials are determined to deny it.

In such a case our duty must be clear to all of us. The Constitution says that no person shall be kept from voting because of his race or his color. We have all sworn an oath before God to support and to defend that Constitution.

We must now act in obedience to that oath.

Wednesday I will send to Congress a law designed to eliminate illegal barriers to the right to vote.

The broad principles of that bill will be in the hands of the Democratic and Republican leaders tomorrow. After they have reviewed it, it will come here formally as a bill.

I am grateful for this opportunity to come here tonight at the invitation of the leadership to reason with my friends, to give them my views, and to visit with my former colleagues.

I have had prepared a more comprehensive analysis of the legislation which I had intended to transmit to the Clerk tomorrow, but which I will submit to the Clerk tonight. But I want to really discuss with you now, briefly, the main proposals of this legislation.

This bill will strike down restrictions to voting in all elections—Federal, State, and local—which have been used to deny Negroes the right to vote.

This bill will establish a simple, uniform standard which cannot be used however ingenious the effort to flout our Constitution.

It will provide for citizens to be registered by officials of the U.S. Government if the State officials refuse to register them.

It will eliminate tedious, unnecessary lawsuits which delay the right to vote.

Finally, this legislation will insure that properly registered individuals are not prohibited from voting.

I will welcome the suggestions from all the Members of Congress—I have no doubt that I will get some—on ways and means to strengthen this law and to make it effective. But experience has plainly shown that this is the only path to carry out the command of the Constitution.

To those who seek to avoid action by their National Government in their home communities—who want to and who seek to maintain purely local control over elections—the answer is simple.

Open your polling places to all your people.

Allow men and women to register and vote whatever the color of their skin.

Extend the rights of citizenship to every citizen of this land.

There is no constitutional issue here. The command of the Constitution is plain.

There is no moral issue. It is wrong—deadly wrong—to deny any of your fellow Americans the right to vote in this country.

There is no issue of States rights or National rights. There is only the struggle for human rights.

I have not the slightest doubt what will be your answer.

But the last time a President sent a civil rights bill to the Congress it contained a provision to protect voting rights in Federal elections. That civil rights bill was passed after 8 long months of debate. And when that bill came to my desk from the Congress for my signature, the heart of the voting provision had been eliminated.

This time, on this issue, there must be no delay, or no hesitation, or no compromise with our purpose.

We cannot, we must not refuse to protect the right of every American to vote in every election that he may desire to participate in.

And we ought not and we cannot and we must not wait another 8 months before we get a bill. We have already waited a hundred years and more. And the time for waiting is gone.

So I ask you to join me in working long hours, nights, and weekends if necessary to pass this bill. And I do not make this request lightly, for from the window where I sit with the problems of our country I recognize that from outside this Chamber is the outraged conscience of a nation—the grave concern of many nations—and the harsh judgment of history on our acts.

But even if we pass this bill, the battle will not be over. What happened in Selma is part of a far larger movement which reaches into every section and State of America. It is the effort of American Negroes to secure for themselves the full blessings of American life.

Their cause must be our cause too, because it is not just Negroes but really it is all of us, who must overcome the crippling legacy of bigotry and injustice. And we shall overcome.

As a man whose roots go deeply into southern soil I know how agonizing racial feelings are. I know how difficult it is to reshape the attitudes and the structure of our society.

But a century has passed—more than 100 years—since the Negro was freed. And he is not fully free tonight. It was more than 100 years ago that Abraham Lincoln, a great President of another party, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. But emancipation is a proclamation and not a fact.

A century has passed—more than 100 years—since equality was promised. And yet the Negro is not equal.

A century has passed since the day of promise. And the promise is unkept.

The time of justice has now come. And I tell you that I believe sincerely that no force can hold it back. It is right—in the eyes of man and God—that it should come. And when it does, I think that day will brighten the lives of every American.

For Negroes are not the only victims. How many white children have gone uneducated and how many white families have lived in stark poverty—how many white lives have been scarred by fear because we have wasted our energy and our substance to maintain the barriers of hatred and terror.

And so I say to all of you here and to all in the Nation tonight that those who appeal to you to hold on to the past do so at the cost of denying you your future.

This great, rich, restless country can offer opportunity and education and hope to all—all black and white, all North and South, sharecropper and city dweller. These are the enemies—poverty, ignorance, disease—they are our enemies, not our fellow man, not our neighbor. And these enemies too—poverty, disease, and ignorance—we shall overcome.

Now let none of us, in any section, look with prideful righteousness on the troubles in another section or the problems of our neighbors. There is really no part of America where the promise of equality has been fully kept. In Buffalo as well as in Birmingham, in Philadelphia as well as Selma, Americans are struggling for the fruits of freedom.

This is one nation. What happens in Selma or in Cincinnati is a matter of legitimate concern to every American. But let us look within our own hearts and our own communities, and let each of us put our shoulder to the wheel to root out injustice wherever it exists.

As we meet here in this peaceful, historic Chamber tonight, men from the South, some of whom were at Iwo Jima, men from the North, who have carried Old Glory to far corners of the world and brought it back without a stain on it, men from the East and from the West, are all fighting together without regard to religion or color or region in Vietnam. Men from every region fought for us across the world 20 years ago.

And now, in these common dangers and these common sacrifices, the South made its contribution of honor and gallantry no less than any other region of the Great Republic, and in some instances—a great many of them—more.

And I have not the slightest doubt that good men from everywhere in this country—from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, from the Golden Gate to the harbors along the Atlantic—will rally now together in this cause to vindicate the freedom of all Americans. For all of us owe this duty, and I believe that all of us will respond to it.

Your President makes that request of every American.

The real hero of this struggle is the American Negro. His actions and protests—his courage to risk safety, and even to risk his life—have awakened the conscience of this Nation. His demonstrations have been designed to call attention to injustice, designed to provoke change, designed to stir reform. He has called upon us to make good the promise of America. And who among us can say that we would have made the same progress were it not for his persistent bravery and his faith in American democracy?

For at the real heart of battle for equality is a deep-seated belief in the democratic process. Equality depends not on the force of arms or tear gas, but depends upon the force of moral right—not on recourse to violence but on respect for law and order.

There have been many pressures upon your President—and there will be others as the days come and go—but I pledge you tonight that we intend to fight this battle where it should be fought, in the courts and in the Congress and in the hearts of men.

We must preserve the right of free speech and the right of free assembly. But the right of free speech does not carry with it, as has been said, the right to holler "fire" in a crowded theater. We must preserve the right to free assembly, but free assembly does not carry with it the right to block public thoroughfares to traffic.

We do have a right to protest and a right to march under conditions that do not infringe the constitutional rights of our neighbors. And I intend to protect all those rights as long as I am permitted to serve in this office.

We will guard against violence, knowing it strikes from our hands the very weapons with which we seek progress—obedience to law, and belief in American values.

In Selma, as elsewhere, we seek and pray for peace. We seek order. We seek unity.

But we will not accept the peace of stifled rights, or the order imposed by fear, or the unity that stifles protest. For peace cannot be purchased at the cost of liberty.

In Selma tonight—and we had a good day there—as in every city, we are working for a just and peaceful settlement. And we must all remember—after this speech I am making tonight, after the police and the FBI and the marshals have all gone, and after you have promptly passed this bill—the people of Selma and the other cities of the Nation must still live and work together. And when the attention of the Nation has gone elsewhere they must try to heal the wounds and to build a new community. This cannot be easily done on a battleground of violence, as the history of the South itself shows. It is in recognition of this that men of both races have shown such an outstandingly impressive responsibility in recent days—last Tuesday, and again today.

The bill that I am presenting to you will be known as a civil rights bill. But, in a larger sense, most of the program I am recommending is a civil rights program. Its object is to open the city of hope to all people of all races.

Because all Americans just must have the right to vote. And we are going to give them that right.

All Americans must have the privileges of citizenship regardless of race. And they are going to have those privileges of citizenship regardless of race.

But I would like to caution you and remind you that to exercise these privileges takes much more than legal right. It requires a trained mind and a healthy body. It requires a decent home, and the chance to find a job, and the opportunity to escape from the clutches of poverty.

Of course people cannot contribute to the Nation if they are never taught to read or write, if their bodies are stunted from hunger, if their sickness goes untended, if their life is spent in hopeless poverty just drawing a welfare check.

So we want to open the gates to opportunity. But we are also going to give all our people—black and white—the help that they need to walk through those gates.

My first job after college was as a teacher in Cotulla, Tex., in a small Mexican-American school. Few of them could speak English and I could not speak much Spanish. My students were poor and they often came to class without breakfast—hungry. And they knew, even in their youth the pain of prejudice. They never seemed to know why people disliked them, but they knew it was so because I saw it in their eyes.

I often walked home late in the afternoon after the classes were finished wishing there was more that I could do. But all I knew was to teach them the little that I knew—hoping that it might help them against the hardships that lay ahead.

Somehow you never forget what poverty and hatred can do when you see its scars on the hopeful face of a young child.

I never thought then in 1928 that I would be standing here in 1965. It never even occurred to me in my fondest dreams that I might have the chance to help the sons and daughters of those students—and to help people like them all over this country.

But now I do have that chance and I will let you in on a secret—I mean to use it.

And I hope that you will use it with me.

This is the richest and most powerful country which ever occupied this globe. The might of past empires is little compared to ours.

But I do not want to be the President who built empires, or sought grandeur, or extended dominion.

I want to be the President who educated young children to the wonders of their world.

I want to be the President who helped to feed the hungry and to prepare them to be taxpayers instead of tax-eaters.

I want to be the President who helped the poor to find their own way and who protected the right of every citizen to vote in every election.

I want to be the President who helped to end hatred among his fellow men and who promoted love among the people of all races and all regions and all parties.

I want to be the President who helped to end war among the brothers of this earth.

And so at the request of your beloved Speaker and the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, Mr. MANSFIELD, and the Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. McCULLOCH and others, Members of both parties, I come here tonight not as President Roosevelt came down one time in person to veto a bonus bill; not as President Truman came down one time to urge the passage of a railroad bill. But I come here to ask you to share this task with me and to share it with the people we both work for.

I want this to be the Congress—Republicans and Democrats alike—which did all these things for all these people.

Beyond this great Chamber—out yonder in the 50 States are the people we serve. Who can tell what deep and unspoken hopes are in their hearts tonight as they sit there and listen? We all can guess, from our own lives, how difficult they often find their own pursuit of happiness; how many problems each little family has. They look most of all to themselves for their future.

But I think that they also look to each of us.

Above the pyramid on the great seal of the United States it says in Latin, "God has favored our undertaking."

God will not favor everything that we do. It is rather our duty to divine His will. I cannot help but believe that He truly understands and that He really favors the undertaking that we begin here tonight.

At 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, escorted the guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses dissolved.

Accordingly, at 9 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

RIGHT TO VOTE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 117)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In this same month 95 years ago—on March 30, 1870—the Constitution of the United States was amended for the 15th time to guarantee that no citizen of our land should be denied the right to vote because of race or color.

The command of the 15th amendment is unequivocal and its equal force upon State governments and the Federal Government is unarguable.

Section 1 of this amendment provides:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

By the oath I have taken "to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States," duty directs—and strong personal conviction impels—that I advise the Congress that action is necessary, and necessary now, if the Constitution is to be upheld and the rights of all citizens are not to be mocked, abused, and denied.

I must regretfully report to the Congress the following facts:

1. That the 15th amendment of our Constitution is today being systematically and willfully circumvented in certain State and local jurisdictions of our Nation.

2. That representatives of such State and local governments acting "under the color of law," are denying American citizens the right to vote on the sole basis of race or color.

3. That, as a result of these practices, in some areas of our country today no significant number of American citizens of the Negro race can be registered to vote except upon the intervention and order of a Federal court.

4. That the remedies available under law to citizens thus denied their constitutional rights—and the authority presently available to the Federal Government to act in their behalf—are clearly inadequate.

5. That the denial of these rights and the frustration of efforts to obtain meaningful relief from such denial without undue delay is contributing to the creation of conditions which are both inimical to our domestic order and tranquillity and incompatible with the standards of equal justice and individual dignity on which our society stands.

I am, therefore, calling upon the Congress to discharge the duty authorized in section 2 of the 15th amendment "to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

I

It could never be a welcome duty for any President to place before Congress such a report of the willful failure and refusal of public officials to honor, respect, and abide by any provision of the Constitution of the United States. It is especially repugnant to report such disregard directed against the 15th amendment by officials at the State and local levels.

The essence of our American tradition of State and local governments is the belief expressed by Thomas Jefferson that government is best which is closest to the people. Yet that belief is betrayed by those State and local officials who engage in denying the right of citizens to

vote. Their actions serve only to assure that their State governments and local governments shall be remote from the people, least representative of the people's will and least responsive to the people's wishes.

If there were no other reasons, the strengthening and protection of the vital role of State and local governments would be reasons enough to act against the denial of the right to vote for any of our citizens.

But there are other reasons to act—clear, compelling, and present reasons.

1. The challenge now presented is more than a challenge to our Constitution—it is a blatant affront to the conscience of this generation of Americans. Discrimination based on race or color is reprehensible and intolerable to the great American majority. In every national forum, where they have chosen to test popular sentiment, defenders of discrimination have met resounding rejection. Americans now are not willing that the acid of the few shall be allowed to corrode the souls of the many.

The Congress, the courts, and the Executive, acting together in clear response to the will of the people and the mandate of the Constitution, have achieved more progress toward equality of rights in recent years than in all the years gone before. This tide will not be turned. The purposeful many need not and will not bow to the willful few.

2. In our system, the first right and most vital of all our rights is the right to vote. Jefferson described the elective franchise as "the ark of our safety." It is from the exercise of this right that the guarantee of all our other rights flows.

Unless the right to vote be secure and undenied, all other rights are insecure and subject to denial for all our citizens. The challenge to this right is a challenge to America itself. We must meet this challenge as decisively as we would meet a challenge mounted against our land from enemies abroad.

3. In the world, America stands for—and works for—the right of all men to govern themselves through free, uninhibited elections. An ink bottle broken against an American Embassy, a fire set in an American library, an insult committed against our American flag, anywhere in the world, does far less injury to our country and our cause than the discriminatory denial of the right of any American citizen at home to vote on the basis of race or color.

The issue presented by the present challenge to our Constitution and our conscience transcends legalism, although it does not transcend the law itself. We are challenged to demonstrate that there are no sanctuaries within our law for those who flaunt it. We are challenged, also, to demonstrate by our prompt, fitting, and adequate response now that the hope of our system is not force, not arms, not the might of militia, or marshals—but the law itself.

II

The problem of discriminatory denial of the right to vote has been with us ever since colonial times.

The test of real property ownership was universal among the colonies and religious qualifications were numerous. Race, color, sex, age, employment, and residence were all used as the basis for qualifying voters. Such restrictions continued to flourish among the States even after formation of the Union.

The first literacy tests were legislated in Northern States in an effort to exclude immigrants—especially Irish—from the franchise. When the 15th amendment was adopted, there were only six States which had never discriminated against voting by Negroes.

If discrimination has been a prevalent practice in our history of voting rights, the struggle against discrimination has been our consistent purpose generation after generation.

Since the adoption of the Bill of Rights, no other right has been strengthened and fortified so often by constitutional amendment as the right to vote. As early as 1804—and as recently as 1964—the Constitution of the United States has been amended on at least six occasions to prohibit discrimination against the right to vote, to enlarge the franchise, and to assure the expression of the people's will as registered by them at the polls.

The challenge facing us today is not a challenge of what the Constitution of the United States shall say—but of what it shall mean.

What the 15th amendment says is unmistakable. What the 15th amendment actually means for some Americans in some jurisdictions is diametrically opposite to the clear intent of the language.

By the device of equal laws, unequally applied, Negro Americans are being denied the right and opportunity to vote and discrimination is given sanction under color of law. Varieties of techniques are infinite. Three are most commonplace.

1. THE TECHNIQUE OF TECHNICAL "ERROR"

Negro applicants for registration are disqualified on grounds of technical "errors" in their registration forms. Instances of record show Negroes disqualified for "errors" such as failure to write out middle names, abbreviating the words "street" and "avenue" in addresses, or failing to compute age exactly to the day. Where this technique is employed, "errors" are found in substantially all applications filed by Negroes, but few or none in applications filed by whites.

2. THE TECHNIQUE OF NONCOOPERATION

A technique commonly used in conjunction with the "error" technique involves simple noncooperation by the registrar. Thus, he may be "out" for most of the day during registration periods. Registration may be possible only on certain days each month. Limits may be imposed upon the number of applicants processed each registration day. The variety of circumventions possible by this device is endless.

3. THE TECHNIQUE OF SUBJECTIVE TESTS

By far the common technique by which Negro citizens are prevented from exercising their right to register and to vote is the use of subjective tests, unfairly administered literacy tests, tests of "understanding," and tests of "character." The only standard used is the whim of the registrar. Such devices are used as vehicles for the rejection of untold thousands of voters—solely on the basis of race and color.

Whatever the technique, the intended purpose of such device is effectively served.

In one State 10 years ago, 59.6 percent of voting age white persons were registered to vote. Only 4.3 percent of eligible Negroes were registered to vote. The changes since then are negligible.

In several States, there are counties with sizable Negro populations where not a single Negro is registered to vote.

In scores of other counties where discrimination is not so blatant, it remains far more difficult for Negroes to register than for whites.

Too frequently discrimination is the aim and intent of such device—and discrimination is the result.

III

The Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government have recognized—and sought to meet—these challenges to the authority of the Constitution of the United States. I am proud to have been closely associated with the succession of Federal enactments, beginning in 1957 with the first civil rights law in more than 80 years.

The major steps taken have been these:

1. The Civil Rights Act of 1957: The approach of this statute was to challenge through litigation the discriminatory use of vote tests.

2. The Civil Rights Act of 1960: This statute, pursuing the same approach, sought to simplify such litigation.

3. The Civil Rights Act of 1964: Still following the same approach, sought to expedite litigation.

In some areas litigation has been effective. But 8 years of litigation has made it clear that the prompt and fair registration of qualified Negro citizens cannot be achieved under present legislation in the face of consistent defiance of the laws of Congress or the command of the Constitution.

IV

The challenge facing us is clear and immediate—it is also profound.

The Constitution is being flouted.

The intent of Congress expressed three times in the last 7 years is being frustrated.

The national will is being denied.

The integrity of our Federal system is in contest.

Unless we act anew, with dispatch and resolution, we shall sanction a sad and sorrowful course for the future. For if the 15th amendment is successfully flouted today, tomorrow the 1st amendment, the 4th amendment, the 5th amendment, the 6th, and 8th—indeed, all the provisions of the Constitution on which our system stands—will be subject to disregard and erosion. Our essential strength as a society governed by the rule of law will be crippled and corrupted

and the unity of our system hollowed out and left meaningless.

For these reasons, therefore, I ask the Congress under the power clearly granted by the 15th amendment to enact legislation which would:

1. Strike down restrictions to voting in all elections—Federal, State, and local—which have been used to deny Negroes the right to vote.

2. Establish in all States and counties where the right to vote has been denied on account of race a simple standard of voter registration which will make it impossible to thwart the 15th amendment.

3. Prohibit the use of new tests and devices wherever they may be used for discriminatory purposes.

4. Provide adequate power to insure, if necessary, that Federal officials can perform functions essential to the right to vote whenever State officials deny that right.

5. Eliminate the opportunity to delay the right to vote by resort to tedious and unnecessary lawsuits.

6. Provide authority to insure that properly registered individuals will not be prohibited from voting.

Our purpose is not—and shall never be—either the quest for power or the desire to punish. We seek to increase the power of the people over all their governments, not to enhance the power of the Federal Government over any of the people.

For the life of this Republic, our people have zealously guarded their liberty against abuses of power by their governments. The one weapon they have used is the mightiest weapon in the arsenal of democracy—the vote. This has been enough, for as Woodrow Wilson said, "The instrument of all reform in America is the ballot."

Yet today, in areas of America, segments of our populace must live in just that involuntary condition—policed by forces they have no voice in choosing and forced to abide by laws they have no vote in adopting.

A people divided over the right to vote can never build a Nation united.

I am determined that these years shall be devoted to perfecting our unity so that we may pursue more successfully the fulfillment of our high purposes at home and in the world. While I have proposed to you other measures to serve the strengthening of our free society and the happiness of our free people, I regard action on the measures proposed in this message to be first in priority. We cannot have government for all the people until we first make certain it is government of and by all the people.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 15, 1965.*

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 16, 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:

734. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report indicating the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations for various agencies for the fiscal year 1965 to finance the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (H. Doc. No. 110); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

735. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a report indicating the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations for various departments for fiscal year 1965 and amendments to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1966 (H. Doc. No. 111); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

736. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a report indicating the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Inter-American Development Bank for fiscal year 1965 (H. Doc. No. 112); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

737. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a report indicating the necessity for a supplemental appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws (H. Doc. No. 113); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

738. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a report indicating the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1965, and amendments to the budget for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1966 (H. Doc. No. 114); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

739. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 3, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a beach erosion study of that portion of the south shore of Long Island, N.Y., from Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet prepared in response to an item in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962, approved October 23, 1962 (Public Law 87-874), and in cooperation with the Long Island State Park Commission under the provisions of section 2 of the river and harbor act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 115); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 49 illustrations.

740. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize, under certain conditions and at the expense of the United States, transportation by commercial air carrier for members of the uniformed services in connection with emergency leave"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

741. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

742. A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), Office of Naval Material, Department of the Navy, transmitting the semiannual report of research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over for period July 1 through December 31, 1964, pursuant to title 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

743. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

744. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia and to supplement the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia in order to provide for the indemnification of persons sustaining injuries or damages as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by financially irresponsible persons, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

745. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting publications titled "Typical Electric Bills, 1964," and "Hydroelectric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1962-63"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

746. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the first progress report of the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization for the period ending December 31, 1964, pursuant to Public Law 87-846; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

747. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting copy of the report of the court's opinion and findings on March 12, 1965, in the case of *Harvey-Whipple, Inc.* v. *The United States*, Cong. No. 1-58, which had been referred to the court pursuant to House Resolution 487 of the 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

748. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

749. A letter from the Chief Scout Executive, National Council, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting the 55th annual report on the activities and developments of the Boy Scouts of America for 1964 (H. Doc. No. 116); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

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. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report on master planning of NASA installations; without amendment (Rept. No. 167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 168. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1111. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin

commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; with amendments (Rept. No. 169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 4257. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3044. A bill to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the fight deck of an aircraft carrier; without amendment (Rept. No. 171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5571. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders; without amendment (Rept. No. 172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution No. 95. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by Sanford Dam, Canadian River project, Tex., as "Lake Meredith"; without amendment (Rept. No. 173). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 6241. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide for judicial review of certain administrative decisions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to enable the Secretary to waive the "single State agency" requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 6242. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide for judicial review of certain administrative decisions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to enable the Secretary to waive the "single State agency" requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 6243. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 6244. A bill to provide for retirement to be based on a new formula; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6245. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 6246. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 6247. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 6248. 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. 6249. A bill to make the provisions of Public Law 82-253, as amended, inapplicable to the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6250. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 6251. A bill to exempt physicians from liability for emergency care given at the scene of an emergency in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 6252. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 6253. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for refreshment, service, and merchandise at roof gardens, cabarets, and similar places; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 6254. 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. 6255. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to encourage the use by volume mailers of ZIP code through postage rate concessions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 6256. A bill to provide for the designation of that portion of U.S. Highway No. 6 between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6257. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 6258. A bill to create a bipartisan Commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 6259. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 6260. A bill to repeal the retailers excise taxes on toilet preparations, jewelry and related items, ladies' handbags, luggage, and the like, and furs and fur-trimmed coats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 6261. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 6262. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Pima and Maricopa Counties, Ariz., and to the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., of certain lands for recreational purposes under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 6263. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 6264. A bill to implement the provisions of section 2 of article XIV of the Constitution of the United States and section 22 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 6) which require that the basis of representation of each of the several States in the House of Representatives shall be reduced in proportion to the number of adult citizen inhabitants of such State whose right to vote is denied or abridged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 6265. A bill to provide for an Administrative Counsel of the Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 6266. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain forms of nickel be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 6267. A bill to confirm in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6268. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Golden Spike National Monument in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 6269. A bill to repeal the retailers excise taxes on toilet preparations, jewelry, and related items, ladies' handbags, luggage, and the like, and furs and fur-trimmed coats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 6270. 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. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 6271. A bill to authorize release on a personal recognizance of persons otherwise eligible for bail, to credit time spent in custody for lack of bail toward service of sentence, and to further implement the constitutional right to bail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 6272. A bill to amend the coastwise laws, to protect the traveling public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 6273. 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 extrahazardous duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 6274. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces serving in Vietnam and other combat zones designated by the President; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6275. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deduction of certain education expenses of teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 6276. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 6277. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 6278. A bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 6279. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 6280. A bill authorizing the establishment of the Golden Spike National Monument in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6281. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 6282. A bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 6283. A bill to provide for the issuance of a series of special postage stamps in honor of the American Indian; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 6284. A bill 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; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 6285. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 6286. A bill to correct inequities in the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act, and in other laws governing civil service retirement benefits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6287. 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 survivor 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. 6288. 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.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 6289. A bill to eliminate the requirement for medical examination of unmarried employees electing survivor-annuity benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 6290. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit individuals to deduct flood losses over a 3-year period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 6291. A bill to authorize a comprehensive program for the maintenance of a healthy mining industry in the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 6292. A bill to strengthen intergovernmental relations by improving cooperation and the coordination of federally aided activities between the Federal, State, and local levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 6293. A bill to provide for a survey by the Secretary of the Interior to establish the route of the Chisholm Trail and for the establishment of markers to identify such route, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 6294. A bill to authorize Secret Service agents to make arrests without warrant for offenses committed in their presence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 6295. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 6296. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6297. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 6298. A bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to increase the permissible State and local matching of Federal funds used for construction of facilities for public community colleges and public technical institutes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 6299. A bill to make the provisions of Public Law 82–253, as amended, inapplicable to the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 6300. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 6301. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.J. Res. 378. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through May 21, 1966; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.J. Res. 379. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.J. Res. 380. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.J. Res. 381. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H.J. Res. 382. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.J. Res. 383. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.J. Res. 384. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.J. Res. 385. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America providing for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H. Con. Res. 353. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to obtaining the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

100. By Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana requesting that certain provisions of Public Law 566 be enlarged to fit the needs of the State of Montana and other Western States by raising the flood control allowance to 12,500 acre-feet, the reservoir limitation to 40,000 acre-feet, and the watershed drainage area to 400,000 acres; to the Committee on Agriculture.

101. Also a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana questioning and protesting the announced closure of the Glasgow Air Force Base located at Glasgow, Mont.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

102. Also a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana requesting that the 1968 National Boy Scout Jamboree be held in Glacier National Park; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

103. Also a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana asking Congress to acquire Fort Union, N. Dak., as a national historic site and a national park under the administration of the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

104. Also a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana asking that the scenic beauty of Montana be given full consideration by Federal agencies when other natural resources are being developed; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

105. Also a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana requesting the reduction of costs of transporting Montana wheat for export; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

106. Also a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana asking that the Federal Government locate a regional medical center in Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

107. Also a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana urging development of the Upper Missouri River as outlined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers modified plan IV; to the Committee on Public Works.

108. Also a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana urging the Federal Government to construct the proposed multipurpose Glacier View Dam on the North Fork of the Flathead River with proper emphasis on flood control, giving persons and firms in Montana first priority for electric power resulting from development of water resources in the State; to the Committee on Public Works.

109. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting approval of a proposal for a study of disaster insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

110. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the Federal Government to initiate and effectuate studies and measures to restore and preserve the scenic beauty of the American Falls of the Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

111. Also a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to continuing the policy of providing technical assistance to soil conservation district and cooperating land owners and operators without requiring payment to the Federal Government for such services; to the Committee on Agriculture.

112. Also a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to supporting legislation to shorten the continuous working hours of railroad employees for the purpose of safeguarding their health and safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

113. Also a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support legislation requiring that cigarettes be labeled as hazardous to health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

114. Also a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to designating the fourth Friday of September of every year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

115. Also a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to construction of Eel River levees and flood control dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 6302. A bill for the relief of Panorea G. Vourletsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 6303. A bill for the relief of Yee Sik Quoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 6304. A bill for the relief of Franco Corso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 6305. A bill for the relief of lessees of a certain tract of land in Logtown, Miss.; to the Committeee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6306. A bill authorizing the presentation of the Bronze Star Medal to Sidney Clinton Stern; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6307. A bill for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Navy Band; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 6308. A bill for the relief of Berch Khachadourian (also known as Bertch Antranik Hadjadourian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6309. A bill for the relief of Antonio Liburdi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6310. A bill for the relief of Stavros Serassis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 6311. A bill for the relief of Elpidio and Natividad Damazo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6312. A bill for the relief of Mario Menna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 6313. A bill for the relief of Elpidio and Natividad Damazo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 6314. A bill for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Miclat, his wife, Alegria Abalos Miclat, and their two minor children, Blanche Miclat and Darryl Mark Miclat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 6315. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ferdows Maddahi, her daughter Ruth (Fahimeh), and her son Fred (Faramars); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 6316. A bill for the relief of Petros Magemeneas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6317. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angeliki Maroutsos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 6318. A bill for the relief of Lee R. Smith and Lee R. Smith III, his son; 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:

126. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting legislation preventing official State organizations from wearing certain types of uniforms; to the Committee on Armed Services.

127. Also petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting Congress to require its Committee on the Judiciary to publish certain reports, relative to reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

128. Also petition of W. Pearl B. Phiney, R.N., New York, N.Y., petitioning consideration of her resolution relative to impeachment of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

129. Also petition of mayor, city of North Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting Congress to give serious consideration and support to the medicare bill as modified by the late President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Way and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Medicare Under Social Security Is Very Unpopular at Grassroots Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will soon be called upon to vote for or against a highly controversial proposal to provide hospital and nursing care aid for elderly people, to be financed by an increase in social security taxes.

There is good reason to believe this is a dreamchild of politicians and selfish interests. It would not accomplish what the people have been led to believe. And it would be very burdensome by increasing the taxload our citizens have to pay.

The people at the grassroots level are becoming aware of this, and vast numbers of them want no part of it. I recently sent a questionnaire to every registered voter in the district I represent. One question submitted was as follows:

Do you favor the President's compulsory plan for hospital and nursing home care for persons 65 or older, to be financed by an increase in tax on payrolls, under the social security system, at a cost of $2 billion the first year?

The responses to the questionnaire have been tremendous, and this provides a fairly accurate cross section of public opinion on the issues covered. On this medicare question, 83 out of every 100 are opposed to the compulsory approach of financing under social security. Another question was submitted on Kerr-Mills, and 80 percent favored that approach over the administration's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, before Members of Congress act hastily on this medicare issue, they would be well advised to consult with their constituents. We already have, in operation in many States, a workable, feasible program under the Kerr-Mills plan. In Texas it has been