way to give the children a chance. Mechanization of agriculture is increasing at a rapid rate, and "Today's migrant child will be tomorrow's displaced person because of mechanization unless something is done now."

Here on the west coast, there are many new programs planned or starting.

I can tell you that the Office of Economic Opportunity will soon make grants of over $1 million to local agencies in California and other States for new services to migrant workers. In addition to education, there will be programs for job retraining and better health.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is also having considerable success in its efforts to reverse the school dropout trend through the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs. The Stockton school district is sponsoring one such program.

One of the biggest programs of this kind in the country is in Los Angeles, where the Youth Opportunity Board was given a grant of $2.7 million to encourage the retraining and further education of disadvantaged teenage boys.

So you can see that we are making progress. Politically, Spanish-speaking Americans are finally awakening to the power of the ballot in asserting their rights.

My own State of New Mexico was for many years the only one where Spanish-speaking Americans had real political influence. But great strides have been made in both California and Texas in recent years.

Here in San Francisco, your citizen's foundation—and other groups, I am sure—are attacking the problems of the Spanish-speaking American on many fronts.

Night schools to teach English to adults have been established, and a free job service has been founded. The foundation is working with dropouts and in education of youth.

I commend their programs to your attention and your support. They are moving ahead in the finest tradition of American social action. With your support, they will show the way to a better life for many of your fellow citizens.

I thank you.

Do Not Free the Monsters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I would urge Members of this honorable body who have not already done so to sign the petition suggesting to the Federal Republic of Germany that a legal device not be permitted to give freedom to unpunished Nazi war criminals.

This rather unusual action, designed to encourage members of the German Parliament to carry through a bill to achieve this end, is warranted, I believe, by most unusual circumstances.

Reports are current that mass murderers wait patiently for the day when the statute of limitations will allow them to crawl out of their hiding places to taunt decency with their public presence.

Ordinarily, I believe in the end sought by the statute of limitations. But there is nothing ordinary about mass murder, about human torture, about degradation of human beings, about fiendish experiments conducted for sadistic pleasure.

All with a shred of decency must cry out for punishment for the fiends and monsters responsible.

As noted, unusual circumstances excuse unusual actions, and I wish to commend to others the action I have taken in signing the petition now being circulated among us.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1965

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

The Most Reverend Archbishop Vasili of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church in America offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost: Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we, Thy children, humbly bow our heads before Thee, and offer our profound gratitude for the abundant blessings Thou hast bestowed upon America and her people.

O Lord and Redeemer, we ask Your assistance, that a constant spirit of wisdom, strength, and love may direct our esteemed President of the United States, and that Your blessings of counsel and guidance may remain abundantly with this august body, the honorable Senate of the United States, this temple of peace, freedom, and justice. Merciful Father, we recommend to Thy grace the souls of the heroic dead of our Armed Forces, and the countless defenders of freedom throughout the world. Grant them eternal rest in Thy kingdom in heaven.

Eternal God and Saviour, we pray today for Thy divine mercy and judgment for the welfare of the Byelorussian nation, whose proclamation of independence, as the Byelorussian National Republic, was observed 47 years ago, and whose people have striven during these years to free themselves from the tyranny of an atheistic oppression, in the hope of enjoying the liberties and freedom, under God, as is the way in the United States. We pray today that the benefits of freedom granted to democracies all over the world may serve as an infallible encouragement to the people of Byelorussia, for the vision of everlasting freedom is not lost among them, but burns as a torch deep in their hearts with the desire to be a member in the worldwide family of the free and God-fearing nations.

We humbly bow our heads before Thee, our God and Redeemer, and faithfully implore Thee: Accept this, our prayer, and bless the United States of America and Byelorussia.

May Thy glorious name, our God and Saviour, reign and shine in our hearts and be blessed now and forever. Amen.

JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 11, 1965, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 11, 1965,

The following report of a committee was submitted on March 12, 1965:

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 974. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes; with supplemental, individual, and additional views (Rept. No. 123); which was printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 12, 1965, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 301) to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, 89th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MADDEN of Indiana, Mr. BROOKS of Texas, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFIN of Michigan, and Mr. HALL of Missouri as members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; and

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Peter Marshall in the Senate during the 80th and 81st Congresses.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 103 of the 86th Congress;

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, of Texas;

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?";

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of inaugural addresses from President Washington to President Johnson, and providing for additional copies;

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill;

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document No. 103 of the 88th Congress;

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a study of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs; and

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution authorizing the publication as a House document of the Department of State white paper relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (Department of State Publication 7839).

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions of the House were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 103 of the 86th Congress.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed an additional thirteen thousand five hundred and fifty copies of House Document Numbered 103 of the Eighty-sixth Congress in the style and format directed by the Joint Committee on Printing; two thousand five hundred and seventy-five of such copies shall be for the use of the Senate and ten thousand nine hundred and seventy-five of such copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms.

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, of Texas.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of Sam Rayburn, presented by the Texas State Society in the Rayburn Building, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a House document. The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of such House document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate and nine thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, to be prorated for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms.

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) with the permission of the copyright owner of the book "Our American Government—1001 Questions on How It Works," with answers by Wright Patman, published by Scholastic Magazines, Incorporated, there shall be printed as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"; and that there shall be printed one million eighty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which two hundred and six thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and eight hundred and seventy-eight thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms.

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of inaugural addresses from President Washington to President Johnson, and providing for additional copies.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a collection of inaugural addresses, from President George Washington to President Lyndon B. Johnson, compiled from research volumes and State papers by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed with illustrations as a House document; and that sixteen thousand one hundred and twenty-five additional copies be printed, of which ten thousand nine hundred and seventy-five copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and five thousand one hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate.

SEC. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms.

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a House document all remarks by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in the Halls of Congress which constitute tributes to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill. The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed five thousand eight hundred and sixty additional copies of such House document, of which one thousand and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and four thousand three hundred and sixty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document No. 103 of the 88th Congress.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made", by Doctor Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, as set out in House Document 103 of the Eighty-eighth Congress, be printed as a House document, with emendations by the author and with a foreword by Honorable Edwin E. Willis; and that there be printed one hundred thirty-two thousand additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of sixty days after which the unused balance shall revert to the House Document Room.

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a study of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, one thousand additional copies of a study made by that committee of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs.

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution authorizing the publication as a House document of the Department of State white paper relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (Department of State Publication 7839).

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) there be printed as a House document the Department of State white paper, issued February 17, 1965, relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (Department of State Publication 7839). The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed sixty-three thousand six hundred additional copies of such House document of which twenty thousand shall be for the use of the Senate, and forty-three thousand six hundred for the use of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

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

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

RESUMÉ OF SENATE LEGISLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during this past week the Senate cleared for the White House another Presidential recommendation providing for a $750 million increase in the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank—over a 3-year period at the rate of $250 million a year. The leadership

is very grateful to the distinguished chairman of Foreign Relations, Senator FULBRIGHT, for his expertise in handling both the bill and the conference report which was so ably opposed by Senators GRUENING and MORSE.

Thanks again go to Senator FULBRIGHT for his handling of H.R. 2998 which was returned to the House amended. This measure, another Presidential recommendation, authorized an appropriation of $20 million for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the Disarmament Agency. Recognition for an extremely interesting and informative debate is due Senators CLARK, MORSE, PROXMIRE, JAVITS, AIKEN, TYDINGS, ELLENDER, DODD, PASTORE, HARTKE, HICKENLOOPER, and BASS.

The Senate also sent to the House the Monroney resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 2—establishing a 12-member bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of Congress and to recommend improvements. The resolution was guided through the Senate under the capable management of Senator MONRONEY, the original sponsor and negotiator of the 1946 Reorganization Act. Much credit must also be given Senators CLARK, MORSE, JAVITS, and CASE for their participation in the debate. Action has also been completed by the House on this resolution and the Monroney committee membership has been selected.

Under the capable management of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, LISTER HILL, the Senate cleared for the House S. 510, a bill extending four existing grant-in-aid programs authorized by the Public Health Service to provide assistance to the States and their communities in financing essential public health services. This, too, was a Presidential recommendation and makes the 13th one the Senate has passed this year.

Thanks to Senator SYMINGTON, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Stockpiling, the Senate amended and returned to the House H.R. 1496, a bill providing for the disposal of 150,000 tons of lead and zinc each, and the sale of 100,000 short tons of copper to domestic producers.

This week the Senate will consider another Presidential recommendation, S. 974, amendments to the Manpower Training Act.

Committee activity scheduled for the week of March 15–20 as indicated below shows quite clearly the committees are moving as rapidly as is feasible:

Senate Agriculture has scheduled an executive session on S. 821, a Presidential recommendation relating to tobacco acreage, poundage, and marketing quotas.

Senate Appropriations has concluded its hearings on the Interior Department and related agencies. Agriculture, Defense, Labor-HEW are still in progress with Treasury-Post Office scheduled to begin on March 16.

Senate Banking will continue its balance-of-payments hearings through March 18.

Senate Commerce is continuing hearings March 16 on a bill establishing a National Oceanographic Council and on the same day will hold hearings on walnut logging exports. S. 558 will be the subject of hearings on March 17-19, a bill relating to foreign markets for U.S. products. Hearings have been concluded on the annual authorization for the Coast Guard, rail transportation service in the northeastern seaboard area, and the status of helicopter service.

Senate District Committee has concluded hearings on its home rule bill.

Senate Foreign Relations is continuing its hearings on economic foreign aid.

Senate Interior will hold hearings March 17–19 on the Assateague Island National Seashore.

Senate Judiciary is continuing its hearings on immigration legislation and the Antitrust Subcommittee will consider concentration on March 16 through the 18th.

Senate Labor is starting hearings March 16 on S. 600, the higher education bill.

Senate Public Works is having a subcommittee markup March 17 on S. 560, water pollution control at Federal installations.

Senate Space Committee will continue its hearings March 15 on its annual authorization bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a résumé of Senate legislative activity through March 11, 1965, prepared by the Senate Democratic policy committee.

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

SENATE LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY THROUGH MARCH 11, 1965, SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

The tally sheet so far ((PR)—Presidential recommendation):

Senate activity:

Days in session	35
Hours in session	148:13
Total measures passed	116
Confirmations	25,023
Public Laws	4

APPROPRIATIONS

Agricultural supplemental: Appropriated $1.6 billion for Commodity Credit Corporation, allowed the President final discretion in shipping surplus food to Egypt, and suspended until May 1 the planned closing of 11 VA hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and the merger of 17 regional offices. Public Law 89–2. (PR.)

CONGRESS

Joint Committee on the Budget: Established a 14-member Joint Committee on the Budget composed of 7 members from each Appropriations Committee, 4 to 3 ratio. The purpose of the Joint Committee is to serve the Appropriations Committees year round with the same expertise as the Bureau of Budget for the Executive. S. 2 passed Senate January 27.

Joint Committee on Organization of Congress: Established a 12-member bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of Congress and to recommend improvements. Rules changes are eliminated from the study. Authorizes $150,000 through January 31, 1966, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. First report to be submitted 120 days following effective date of the resolution. Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 passed Senate, March 9, 1965; passed House, March 11, 1965.

DEFENSE

Zinc, lead, and copper: Authorized the disposal of 150,000 tons each of zinc and lead and the sale of 100,000 short tons of copper to producers and processors. H.R. 1496 passed Senate, amended, March 11.

Stockpile Act: Provides more statutory guidance on the purpose for which materials would be stockpiled; provides for disclosure to Congress and the public, pertinent information on the management; permits disposals of surplus material without requiring congressional action on each while retaining in Congress the power to disapprove proposed disposals; and makes contracts for furnishing materials to the stockpile subject to the Renegotiation Act. S. 28 passed Senate, February 9. (PR.)

ECONOMY

Aid to Appalachia: Authorized $1,092.4 million in aid to the 11-State Appalachian region. $840 million of this amount will be in the form of Federal grants for a 5-year highway construction program and a 2-year authorization of $252.4 million for a variety of economic development projects. Public Law 89–4. (PR.)

Disaster victims: Directs the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make an immediate study of alternative programs which could be established to help provide financial assistance to those suffering property losses in flood, earthquake, and other natural disasters, including alternative methods of Federal insurance as well as the existing flood insurance program. S. 408 passed Senate January 28.

Gold cover: Repeals the requirement of 25 percent gold backing of commercial bank deposits held by the Federal Reserve banks, but retains the 25-percent requirement against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation. Public Law 89–3. (PR.)

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Goddard Day: Designate March 16, 1965, as Goddard Day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern-day rocketry. S. 301. Public Law 89–5.

HEALTH

Community health services extension: Extended four existing grant-in-aid programs authorized by the Public Health Service to provide assistance to the States and their communities in financing essential public health services. S. 510 passed Senate March 11. (PR.)

Loan cancellation: Permits cancellations of a portion of the unpaid balance of a student loan awarded to a physician or dentist who practices in a shortage area. S. 576 passed Senate January 28.

Water pollution control: Vests authority to establish purity standards for interstate water and authorizes $80 million in new grants to help States and localities develop new methods of separating combined stormwater and sewage-carrying sewer systems; increase the dollar ceiling limitations on individual grants for construction of waste treatment works from $600,000 to $1 million for a single project and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a joint project involving two or more communities. S. 4 passed Senate January 28. (PR.)

HOUSING

Distressed homeowners: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to extend aid to distressed homeowners who, after relying on VA or FHA construction standards and inspections, find structural or other major defects in their properties purchased with GI mortgage loans which affect the livability of the property. S. 507 passed Senate January 27. (PR.)

INTERNATIONAL

Coffee implementation: This bill implements the International Coffee Agreement ratified in 1963, and authorizes the President to require all coffee entering U.S. markets and all exports of coffee to accompanied by a certificate of origin or a certificate of reexport. Limits imports of coffee from countries which have not joined in the agreement; and requires certain recordkeeping. S. 701 passed Senate February 2. (PR.)

Disarmament Act amendments: Authorizes an appropriation of $20 million for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the Disarmament Agency, thus continuing the authorization on the same basis as fiscal years 1964 and 1965. H.R. 2998 passed Senate amended March 9. (PR.)

Inter-American Development Bank: Provides for a $750 million increase in the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank—over a 3-year period at the rate of $250 million a year. This represents the U.S. share of a planned $900 million increase in the fund which will serve to strengthen multinational aid and the Alliance for Progress. (PR.) Public Law 89–6.

PRESIDENCY

Presidential succession: Proposed an amendment to the Constitution that will totally replace article II, section I, clause 5, relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency. Senate Joint Resolution 1 passed Senate February 19. (PR.)

RESOURCE AND RECREATION BUILDUP

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area: Authorizes $355,000 for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Montana and Wyoming to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of the proposed Yellowtail Reservoir, and for the preservation of the scenic, scientific, and historic features of the area. S. 491 passed Senate February 10. (PR.)

Kaniksu National Forest: Authorizes up to $500,000 from the Land and Water Conservation Fund to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest to include lands necessary for the protection and conservation of the scenic values and natural environment of Upper Priest Lake in Idaho. S. 435 passed Senate March 4.

Manson irrigation unit, Washington: Authorizes $12.3 million for the construction and operation of the Manson unit of the Chief Joseph Dam project. The Manson unit has an irrigation potential of 5,770 acres of land, with half of the costs reimbursable. S. 490 passed Senate February 10.

Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho: Authorizes $630,000 for the purchase of 1,500 acres of land to establish the Nez Perce National Historical Park to commemorate, preserve, and interpret the historic values in the early Nez Perce Indian culture, the tribe's war of 1877 with U.S. cavalry troops, the Lewis and Clark expedition through the area early in the 19th century, subsequent fur trading, gold mining, logging, and missionary activity. S. 60 passed Senate February 10.

River basin planning: Authorizes Federal grants of $5 million a year in matching funds to States for State project planning over a 10-year period; sets up a Cabinet-level water resources council to coordinate river basin planning; and authorizes creation of river basin commissions for regional planning. S. 21 passed Senate February 25. H.R. 1111, House Calendar. (PR.)

Yakima project, Washington: Authorizes $5.1 million for the extension, construction, and operation of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project with an irrigation potential of 7,000 additional acres (present irrigated acreage is 19,000). All but approximately $135,000 is reimbursable. S. 794 passed Senate February 10.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Star, issue of March 13, there appeared an article by Gould Lincoln entitled "Amazing, Incomparable DIRKSEN." I ask unanimous consent that the article, which does full credit to the distinguished minority leader—credit well deserved—be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I had prepared for insertion in the RECORD a statement commending Gould Lincoln, political news analyst of the Washington Evening Star, for his article laudatory of our distinguished minority leader, the amazing and incomparable EVERETT DIRKSEN. The distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], in his usual gracious manner has already placed the article in the RECORD, so I shall, instead, join him in that action.

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

AMAZING, INCOMPARABLE DIRKSEN

(By Gould Lincoln)

When a showdown comes, the architect of Republican policy on Capitol Hill is Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, minority leader. He is more than that. Despite the fact his Senate constituency is one less than a third of that body, DIRKSEN is a dominant figure. He is and has been necessary to the Democrats as well as to the Republicans. Like President Johnson when he was Democratic leader of the Senate, DIRKSEN has a great awareness of the possible. And like Johnson, he is a master tactician, with an ability to get things done.

The Republican record, on which the party must run in the 1966 congressional and gubernatorial election will be made at the Capitol. DIRKSEN is in position to speak for the Republican party. He is more likely to exercise leadership through action rather than words—though he can be hard hitting whenever he wishes to speak.

The Illinois Senator does not maintain his leadership through dictatorial and arm-twisting practices. Rather his strength lies in bringing together other Republicans in the Senate, conservative, moderate, and liberal, through persuasion and reason.

DIRKSEN took over the Republican leader's job in the Senate in 1958. He was for 2 years a strong right arm for President Eisenhower in the Senate. Two Democratic Presidents, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, have looked to him for support in foreign relations and in civil rights legislation, and had it.

It was DIRKSEN's stand in the fight for ratification of the atomic test ban treaty and later in the drive to pass the 1964 Civil Rights Act that helped put those measures across. DIRKSEN delivered the votes which made it possible to break the Democratic filibuster against the civil rights bill. He is expected to play an important role in the passage of the new voting rights bill demanded by the President and which is expected to be sponsored by DIRKSEN and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, majority leader. DIRKSEN did much to simplify and shorten the bill before it was introduced.

He hopes to get it through the Senate without a filibuster, believing that popular demand for the legislation, aroused by the denial of voting rights to Negroes, accompanied by violence against civil rights workers seeking to register Negroes as voters in those States will be effective, and because another filibuster by the conservatives will strengthen the hands of the progressives on both sides of the Senate aisle in their effort to force a majority rule for ending debate in the Senate.

Cloture now can only be invoked by a two-thirds vote of all Senators present and voting. DIRKSEN himself believes the cloture should remain as it is—the only protection against a majority running roughshod over a minority.

It was DIRKSEN who recently rallied all the Republican Party leaders, Senate and House, to issue a strong statement upholding President Johnson's Vietnam policy, including the air strikes at Communist North Vietnam. He does not believe that the U.S. Commander in Chief should have a divided Nation back of him in matters affecting the safety of the United States, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican.

DIRKSEN was 37 years old when he first came to Congress in 1933. He served eight terms in the House, where he made a reputation for independence and as an orator who quoted the scriptures, used sarcasm, humor, and the lash on occasion. In January 1949 he voluntarily retired from the House because he feared he was going blind. Recovered, he ran for the Senate in 1950, defeating Scott Lucas, Democratic leader of the Senate.

In the House, DIRKSEN supported President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's foreign policy in 1941, saying, "To oppose that policy now could only weaken the President's position, impair our prestige, and imperil the Nation," but opposed Roosevelt's New Deal.

He once described himself as "just an old-fashioned or garden variety of Republican who believes in the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and Abraham Lincoln." It is still his creed.

SENATOR CHURCH AND THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the March 13 issue of the Washington Star there appeared an article by Max Freedman entitled "Senator CHURCH Defends President." I ask unanimous consent that that article, which I believe is a true analysis of the situation described, and which does credit to one of the steadiest Senators in this Chamber, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR CHURCH DEFENDS PRESIDENT

(By Max Freedman)

Among the Senators who have expressed doubts about U.S. policy in Vietnam and in southeast Asia, a position of leadership belongs to Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho. He began to express those doubts many months ago, long before the present troubles took shape.

In recent weeks he has received a very large number of requests to speak in various parts of the country. He has wisely declined most of these invitations for two reasons. He does not wish to give the impression that he is engaged in a personal campaign against the administration. And he believes that his main criticisms should be delivered from his place in the Senate.

Neither his motives nor his objectives have always been understood. As a result of this misunderstanding, CHURCH often has been cruelly attacked in the press. He has been accused of dividing the country in a time of crisis. It must be added that none of this personal criticism is reflected in the Senate where CHURCH is respected even by those who disagree with him.

The other day CHURCH took the floor of the Senate to protest against one cynical and misleading story that has been given wide currency in the press. He avoided all

references to any story critical of his own record. He was anxious to defend not himself but President Johnson against a deliberate and shameful injustice. This basic point is central to the whole argument.

According to the published story, the President had an angry encounter with CHURCH in the White House after a recent briefing of congressional members on Vietnam.

The President is said to have upbraided the Senator, and in the process to have made a slighting remark about Walter Lippmann, who also has been critical of our policies in Vietnam.

Lippmann is invulnerable to this kind of newspaper gossip and criticism. He needs no defense here. In point of fact, however, no slighting reference was either made or intended by the President. He has the greatest respect for Lippmann. He is also too experienced, too civilized, and too wise to expect Lippmann to agree with him on all issues. During his conversation with CHURCH, the President did indeed make one reference to Lippmann. But he praised Lippmann and certainly avoided any word of derision. This can be confirmed by another Senator and by a member of the White House staff, who both overheard the President's reference.

But Lippmann is a side issue. The real story concerns the two principal figures.

The President and the Senator engaged in an earnest and far-ranging conversation. There was a conversation, not a confrontation nor a clash. CHURCH was not rebuked. He was not threatened with reprisals by the President. He was not promised more patronage for Idaho if he would change his opinions about Vietnam. The two men talked over the situation, failed to agree, and parted as friends.

If CHURCH had considered only his own political interests, he would not have corrected the inaccurate stories. He would have been a popular figure in Idaho, regardless of Vietnam, if the notion had spread that he refused to be bullied by the White House. To his credit, he refused to purchase political advantage at the price of injuring the President. He refused to let a story stand uncorrected when it suggested that the President tried to crush honest dissent by the methods of intimidation and personal hostility. Hence his protest in the Senate.

After the White House meeting, CHURCH wrote to Johnson thanking him for the long conversation which had given him a new insight into the President's objectives.

In a most cordial and eloquent reply, the President commended CHURCH for his courage and independence in the debate on Vietnam. He expressed his admiration for CHURCH'S willingness to testify to his convictions without thinking of immediate popularity. It was a letter worthy in every respect of a great product of the Senate who appreciates the Senate's role in the development of foreign policy and who knows that unity of action does not depend on uniformity of opinion.

Mark Twain said a half-truth can go round the world while the truth is still putting on its boots. The truth has even less chance of overtaking a complete lie. But these are the facts. They do honor both to Johnson and CHURCH, and they deserve to be set down plainly and candidly for the record.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the agricultural conservation program, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 24

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas there is now before Congress S. 408, which includes a provision for a study by the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the cost of a Federal earthquake insurance program; and

"Whereas the Agency study would include all actuarial factors which would be involved in the enactment of a comprehensive Federal natural disaster insurance program; and

"Whereas the State of Alaska and its citizens are particularly aware of the desperate need for the study and program in view of the experience last year with a disastrous earthquake; and

"Whereas with the results of the Alaska earthquake and other natural disasters affecting all areas of the Nation each in mind, there is an obvious need for an insurance program to cover the aftereffects in both the private and public sectors of the economies so damaged: Be it

"Resolved, That Congress is urgently requested to give its approval to S. 408 and the natural disaster insurance program study it provides for; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee; the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee; the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"NICHE GRAVEL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"NADENE WILLIAMS,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"———— ————,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas there exists on the Federal wildlife reservation on the Pribilof Islands of Alaska a form of bondage of American citizens contrary to constitutional concepts of government; and

"Whereas this federally sponsored bondage involves the freedom of assembly, movement, and property of American citizens under a bureaucratic paternalism incompatible with the rights of man; and

"Whereas this situation has its basis in law (sec. 6, Public Law 78–237) as administered by the Department of the Interior; and

"Whereas a citizen may not visit other citizens on the islands without bureaucratic permission in advance and is kept under surveillance while there if he is allowed to visit at all; and

"Whereas a candidate for and now a member of the Alaska State Legislature was denied access to the voters of the islands under these prohibitions; and

"Whereas these and other deprivations of rights warrant investigation and action on the part of Congress; be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States and the Department of the Interior are respectfully and earnestly requested to amend the law and rules and regulations pursuant thereto governing control of the islands and the citizen residents thereof to insure that they receive and enjoy the same civil rights and opportunities the Constitution guarantees to all citizens; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Philleo Nash, Commissioner of Indian Affairs; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"MIKE GRAVEL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"NADINE WILLIAMS,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"———— ————,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 23

"Whereas the Nebraska Legislature, in 1947, unanimously approved the Nebraska Reclamation Act which permitted the formation and organization of the 550,000-acre Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District in Buffalo, Hall, and Merrick Counties, to further develop proposals of the multipurpose Mid-State project to utilize a portion of the water of the Platte River, now flowing unused to the Gulf of Mexico; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the 89th Congress, Senate file 303 and House roll 499, which provide for authorization of construction of the Mid-State project by the Secretary of the Interior, under Federal reclamation law, as a unit of the Missouri River Basin project; and

"Whereas legislation for this purpose has been introduced in the Congress of the United States for several sessions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled,

"1. That the legislature memorializes the 89th Congress and the respective interior committees thereof to support the proposals of the Bureau of Reclamation for the $84 million Mid-State project and approve the

above legislation for its authorization and construction.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, of the 89th Congress, to Hon. HENRY JACKSON, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee and Hon. WAYNE ASPINALL, chairman of the House Interior Committee and to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

"PHILIP C. SORENSEN,
"President of the Legislature.
"HUGO F. SRB,
"Clerk of the Legislature."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 21

"Whereas discrimination based upon race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry destroys the rights of citizens to register and vote in local, State, and Federal elections; and

"Whereas such discrimination threatens the rights of all citizens and weakens the foundations of democratic government; and

"Whereas such discrimination requires acts of intimidation, evasion, and equivocation by those who practice it; and

"Whereas such acts violate the spirit and the letter of the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled:

"1. That the Congress of the United States enact legislation which will forthwith cause voting discrimination to cease and desist.

"2. That the clerk of the legislature be directed to transmit a suitable engrossed copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"PHILIP C. SORENSEN,
"President of the Legislature.
"HUGO F. SRB,
"Clerk of the Legislature."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in regard to legislation pertaining to national transportation problems

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

"Whereas a strong, efficient transportation system is essential to the well-being and defense of our Nation; and the economic stability and growth of the Nation is threatened unless satisfactory, long-range solutions to problems of competition and rates can be found; and

"Whereas regulation of freight rates by all carriers engaged in commercial transportation is necessary to protect the public interest; and it is a matter of national transportation policy that all shippers should be protected from unfair rate discrimination, place discrimination, and size discrimination; and

"Whereas it is desirable and practical to limit the application of the agricultural commodity exemptions and provide the producer the unrestricted right to haul his own produce to market; and

"Whereas to meet nonregulated competition, regulated carriers have disrupted and deviated from the historical wheat-flour rate parity and it is further proposed to cease regulation of rail rates on agricultural commodities—all of which is unjustifiable and discriminatory in its effects on industry in South Dakota and the entire Great Plains area; and

"Whereas it is recognized and attention is directed to the extreme importance of the wheat flour milling industry to the South Dakota economy and as a preferred market for South Dakota wheat producers, providing a ready market for wheat grown in South Dakota each year; and

"Whereas South Dakota produces the finest hard milling wheat and wheat flour in this area and more than 1,800 country elevators and flour milling companies in South Dakota and adjacent thereto contribute materially to the economy of the State of South Dakota; and

"Whereas it is evident that a discriminatory differential in wheat and flour rates threatens the Great Plains area with the loss and relocation of the flour milling industry and associated industries as well; and such changes would be disruptive of a simplified rate structure adapted to the best interests of producers, consumers, railroads, and millers; and

"Whereas the Governor of South Dakota has recognized the threat to industry in South Dakota and the Great Plains area, and has appointed Mr. Lem Overpeck, Lieutenant Governor of South Dakota, as a member of a 10-State committee to promote rate parity on grain and grain products, prevent the effects of deregulation which would be detrimental to industry in the wheat growing area of our Nation, and preserve the flour milling industry in South Dakota and the surrounding States; and

"Whereas in connection with the flour milling industry as a byproduct and by reason thereof, there is available and there is produced large amounts of livestock feed out of the byproducts of said flour milling industry, the loss of which would increase the costs to livestock growers in the State of South Dakota: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we respectfully submit that the effects of deregulation of commodity traffic and the chaos which would result from this action would cause serious dislocation of industry from the Great Plains area and irreparable harm to the economy of our Nation; and that we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for fair and equitable regulation of all modes of commercial transportation and provide the Interstate Commerce Commission with the greater authority needed for full enforcement; and that such legislation should provide for the protection of the interests of the primary producer; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the chairman of the Committee on Commerce in the Senate of the United States, the Governors of Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Nebraska, Colorado, Missouri, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Texas, and to each member of the South Dakota delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"CHARLES DROZ,
"Speaker of the House.
"Attest:
"WALTER J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk.
"LEM OVERPECK,
"President of the Senate.
"Attest:
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7

"A concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend to veterans of the undeclared war in Vietnam the Federal benefits that were granted to veterans of the undeclared police action or war in Korea

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

"Whereas American forces are now engaged in actual conflict in the area of Vietnam which equals in hazard to life, limb, and health of those there engaged with any conflict in which American troops have ever undertaken; and

"Whereas members of the American Armed Forces are carrying out their dangerous assignments as bravely and honorably as those who have fought under the flag of the United States in the great wars, and their hardships and sacrifices, and the hardships and sacrifices of their families, are comparable to those in other major conflicts: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and is, memorialized to extend to veterans of the Vietnam action the educational, retraining, insurance, medical, compensation, and burial benefits and all other benefits under Federal law that were extended to veterans of the action in Korea; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the members of the congressional delegation from South Dakota, and to the President of the U.S. Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"LEM OVERPECK,
"President of the Senate.
"Attest:
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"CHARLES DROZ,
"Speaker of the House.
"Attest:
"WALTER J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION W–1

"A concurrent resolution opposing proposed charges by the Federal Government for technical assistance to landowners in the field of soil and water conservation

"Whereas the Bureau of the Budget has proposed that soil conservation districts charge farmers, ranchers, and other landowners up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished to help design, lay out, and install soil and water conservation practices on their land; and

"Whereas seventy locally governed soil conservation districts in North Dakota which cover the total land area have over a period of years made a most valuable contribution to the agricultural welfare of the state; and

"Whereas the burden of such payments to Federal Government will fall heaviest on our family farms and small operators; and

"Whereas such assessment of payment to the Federal Government will discourage the application of soil and water conservation measures on land so vital to the strength and welfare of North Dakota and the Nation; and

"Whereas requiring farmers and ranchers to pay the Federal Government for such services would place an added drain on the resources of rural America and force more people off the land; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has for some 30 years provided technical help to owners and operators of privately owned lands because it is in the total public interest, and because one of the most urgent national needs is to protect and improve soil and water resources on the privately owned and operated land of America: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota vigorously opposes any reduction in the Federal participation in such program and the adoption by the Congress of the United States of any system of charging farmers and ranchers for technical help for the application of soil and water conservation work on the privately owned and operated lands in North Dakota and the Nation; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be sent to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation, the President of the U.S. Senate, and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

"ARTHUR A. LINK,
"Speaker of the House.
"DONNELL HAUGEN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"CHARLES TIGHE,
"President of the Senate.
"GERALD F. STAIR,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in regard to legislation pertaining to national transportation problems

"Whereas a strong, efficient transportation system is essential to the well-being and defense of our Nation; and the economic stability and growth of the Nation is threatened unless satisfactory, long-range solutions to problems of competition and rates can be found; and

"Whereas regulation of freight rates by all carriers engaged in commercial transportation is necessary to protect the public interest; and it is a matter of national transportation policy that all shippers should be protected from unfair rate discrimination, place discrimination, and size discrimination; and

"Whereas it is desirable and practical to limit the application of the agricultural commodity exemptions and provide the producer the unrestricted right to haul his own products to market; and

"Whereas to meet nonregulated competition, regulated carriers have disrupted and deviated from the historical wheat-flour rate parity and it is further proposed to deregulate rail rates on agricultural commodities—all of which is unjustifiable and discriminatory in its effects on industry in Oklahoma and the entire Great Plains area; and

"Whereas it is recognized and attention is directed to the extreme importance of the wheat-flour milling industry to the Oklahoma economy and as a preferred market for Oklahoma wheat producers, providing a desirable market for a substantial part of the wheat growing area of our Nation, and

"Whereas it is evident that a discriminatory differential in wheat and flour rates threatens the Great Plains area with the loss and relocation of the flour milling industry and associated industries as well; and such changes would be disruptive of a simplified rate structure adapted to the best interests of producers, consumers, railroads, and millers; and

"Whereas the Governor of Oklahoma has recognized the threat to industry in Oklahoma and the Great Plains area and has joined with the Governors of the other ten States comprising the Great Plains to promote rate parity on grain and grain products, prevent the effects of deregulation which would be detrimental to industry in the wheat growing area of our Nation, and preserve the flour milling industry in Oklahoma: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Oklahoma Legislature (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That we respectfully submit that the effects of deregulation of commodity traffic and the chaos which would result from this action would cause a serious dislocation of industry from the Great Plains area and irreparable harm to the economy of our Nation; and that we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for fair and equitable regulation of all modes of commercial transportation and provide the Interstate Commerce Commission with the greater authority needed for full enforcement; and that such legislation should provide for the protection of the interests of the primary producer.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit an authenticated copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the chairman of the Committee on Commerce in the Senate of the United States, the Governors of Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, Missouri, Kansas, and Texas, and to each member of the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"BOYD COWDEN,
"Acting President of the Senate.
"J. D. MCCARTY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE GOVERNOR OF ALABAMA TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENS OF ALABAMA TO ASSEMBLE AND TO VOTE

"Whereas the constitutional rights of certain citizens of Alabama to vote and to peaceably assemble are being forcibly repressed by that State, in a violent manner intolerable to freemen; and

"Whereas such forcible repression is in violation of the oaths of office of the Governor of that State, and the public officials acting under him, to support, and defend the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas it is the duty of government to protect the rights of the citizen against abuse and oppression, no matter what its source; and

"Whereas the public authorities of Alabama have been unwilling to assume that duty, and instead appear to be harassing and injuring those who assert their rights, in a manner befitting a totalitarian police state; and

"Whereas the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 makes it clear that the voting rights of our people and their freedom to assemble peaceably shall not be abridged: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, That the public authorities of Alabama be urged to recognize the civil rights of all their citizens, that they subordinate their fears and intolerance to the truth of Christian ethics and precepts and that they take the steps necessary to protect their citizens and preserve their rights before it becomes immediately necessary to interpose further Federal force, and lacking immediate State action, that the President be urged to instruct the Attorney General to take immediate steps to implement the powers of the Federal Government to protect the rights of American citizens, through the use of U.S. marshals and such other law enforcement agents as are legally and properly required to carry out the law and to secure the rights of Americans who find themselves deprived of their basic freedom; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Nicholas Katzenbach, the Attorney General of the United States and the Honorable George C. Wallace, the Governor of Alabama.

"L. L. DUXBURY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Whereas history, science, and the demonstrated individual worth of immigrants from all countries of the world establish that our immigration laws are obsolete. The discriminatory National Origins Act should be repealed and corrective legislation enacted by Congress. To exclude a skilled or gifted person because the country of his birth has a small quota is both undemocratic and wasteful; and

"Whereas this is a nation of immigrants in which citizens of many cultures and ethnic origins live and work side by side to make the American ideal of equality for all men a reality; and

"Whereas immigrants represent less than 25 percent of the total work force. Those entering the labor force have talents and skills which are in short supply in our economy: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to repeal the National Origins Act and that it pass corrective immigration legislation to demonstrate to the world that we believe all men to be equal under law; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Members of Congress from Pennsylvania, and the chairman of the Committee on Immigration.

"ROBERT K. HAMILTON,
"Speaker of the House.
"ANTHONY J. PETROSKY,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas the Bureau of the Budget has proposed that the Soil Conservation Service appropriation for assisting locally organized and locally managed soil and water conservation districts be reduced by $20 million and that soil and water conservation districts and cooperating farmers, ranchers, and other landowners shall 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 96 percent of Washington privately owned land is included in its 68 soil and water conservation districts, and nearly a third of Washington'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 such 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 topsoil, in heavy sediment deposits in our reservoirs, lakes, streams, and rivers, which also have spread over valuable bottom lands and in other flood damage to both public and private property together with destruction or severe damage to thousands of water control and use structures, requiring greater, 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 Washington and the Nation and will seriously affect the fall harvest on family farms and the holdings of small operators; and

"Whereas this proposed additional burden added to the costs of farmers and ranchers already in a depressed economic 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 the prudent use of these soil and water resources: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, That we respectfully make application to the Congress of the United States to continue the long-established policy of providing technical assistance to soil and water conservation districts and their cooperating landowners and operators without requiring them to 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 and water conservation districts in Washington 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 copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chief of the Soil and Conservation Service, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington.

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas, the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, in cooperation with the University of Washington, has maintained for 40 years a coal research laboratory and a nonmetallics research laboratory on the campus of the university; and

"Whereas, the Washington State Legislature in 1961 appropriated the sum of $500,000 for a building addition for this facility, which was constructed and in fact just occupied in the fall of 1964, with the understanding that it would remain on the campus of the university; and

"Whereas, the U.S. Bureau of Mines has expressed its intention to move these facilities to Pittsburgh, Pa.; Albany, Oreg., or elsewhere; and

"Whereas, these facilities as now developed, constructed, and installed represent the finest and most advanced research installation of its kind in the United States; and

"Whereas, these facilities and equipment are permanently installed, are extremely bulky and heavy, and do not lend themselves to dismantling and moving, with the obvious end result that a substantial portion of these fine facilities and equipment would be abandoned and lost and, therefore, present capacity to conduct full and meaningful research into future uses of coal and nonmetallics would be lost to this area forever; and

"Whereas, it is extremely vital that at this time when the use of coal as fuel has declined in importance, that research in its future uses be maintained at the highest possible level; and

"Whereas, the uprooting, dismantling, and movement of these permanently installed nonmetallic facilities from an industrial area to the agricultural community of Albany, Oreg., and at the same time moving the also permanently installed coal-research facilities from the Pacific Coast, with 95 percent of these coal reserves occurring in the State of Washington, to faraway Pittsburgh, Pa., with poor access, communication and availability of research for use by industry in Washington, Alaska, or the whole West, will result in tremendous loss to industry and economic development in this State, the Pacific Northwest, and the Nation; and

"Whereas the proposed movement of these facilities following the recent investment made by the State of Washington of $500,000 with the understanding that the facilities would remain on the University of Washington campus would be a breach of faith on the part of the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines; and

"Whereas the closure of the Bureau's facilities on the university campus is presented as being a part of the President's economy program, the fact is that the work cannot be done more cheaply elsewhere, because of the substantial contribution made by the State of Washington through the university and thus the closure would save the Federal Government nothing, but would cost the State a great deal—including a payroll of over $100,000 a year: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, By the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Washington, that the U.S. Bureau of Mines be requested to review and rescind its decision to move its Coal Research Laboratory and Nonmetallic Research Laboratory from the University of Washington campus; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State immediately transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the Douglas County Pomona Grange, of Palisades, Wash., relating to the proposed Budget Bureau cut in the agricultural budget; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the American Legion, southeast district, department of Alaska, protesting against the closing of the Veterans' Administration regional office at Juneau, Alaska; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition, signed by Arthur C. Friss, and sundry other citizens of the United States, favoring the adoption of House bill 3727, the eldercare bill; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Marian E. Molander, of Mount Pleasant, Mich., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"A joint memorial memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States and the congressional delegation of the State of Wyoming in connection with the issuance of a postage stamp commemorating Wyoming's 75th anniversary

"Whereas the government of the State of Wyoming was the first in the world to grant equality to women; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming has played a significant role in the development of the West; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming is justly famed throughout the world for its recreational facilities, including Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming will enjoy the 75th anniversary of its statehood during the year 1965: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 38th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring), That it is the desire of the State of Wyoming that a U.S. postage stamp be issued commemorating its 75th anniversary and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the Postmaster General of the United States, U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress TENO RONCALIO.

"WALTER B. PHELAN,
"Speaker of the House.
"ANDREW MCMASTER,
"President of the Senate."

"JOINT MEMORIAL 4

"A joint memorial, memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States and the congressional delegation of the State of Wyoming in favor of the issuance of a postage stamp commemorating Grand Teton National Park

"Whereas there was commenced a series of U.S. postage stamps commemorating each of the several national parks; and

"Whereas the series was completed with the exception of a stamp commemorating Grand Teton National Park; and

"Whereas the issuance of such stamp would complete the series and would focus worldwide attention on the beauties of Grand Teton National Park: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 38th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring), That it is the wish of the people of Wyoming that a postage stamp be issued commemorating Grand Teton National Park; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the Postmaster General of the United States, to U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, to U.S. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON and to Representative in Congress TENO RONCALIO.

"WALTER B. PHELAN,
"Speaker of the House.
"ANDREW MCMASTER,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Works:

"JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"A joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to the scenic road from Rawlins, Wyo., to the Little Snake River Valley in Carbon County, Wyo.

"Whereas the U.S. Government by and through the Bureau of Public Roads in

the Department of Commerce has authorized a scenic roads and parkway study; and

"Whereas the Wyoming State Highway Department is submitting prior to January 25, 1965, a detailed proposal for a scenic road connecting Rawlins, Wyo., and the Little Snake River Valley which passes through some of the most outstanding scenic country in the United States; and

"Whereas this route will direct itself to the general area of the Savery Pothook Dam recently approved by Congress and will provide access to an outstanding recreation area of many thousand acres and provides an outstanding scenic route for those Americans traveling east and west and north and south across this great continent: Now, therefore, it is

"Resolved by the Senate of the 38th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring), That we hereby strongly urge the consideration of this project as the primary project in the intermountain West because of its scenic and utilitarian values during the construction of the Savery Pothcok Dam; it is further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the U.S. Senators from Wyoming, Wyoming's Member of Congress, the Bureau of Public Roads, Commerce Department, and the Wyoming State Highway Department.

"WALTER B. PHELAN,
"Speaker of the House.
"ANDREW MCMASTER,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; ordered to lie on the table:

"JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"A joint memorial, memorializing the 100th anniversary of the heroic death of 1st Lt. Caspar Collins, a member of the 11th Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, who was killed by hostile Indians, July 26, 1865, at the Battle of Platte Bridge Station, later renamed Fort Caspar by the War Department in his honor, 25 years before his name was perpetuated as the name of the city of Casper

"Whereas, 1st Lt. Caspar Collins, age 20, of the 11th Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, was killed in a heroic attempt to save a fellow trooper from approximately 3,000 hostile Indians on July 26, 1865, at Platte Bridge Station; and

"Whereas the city of Casper is required by law to honor this important date in Wyoming history with appropriate services; and

"Whereas July 26, 1965, is the 100th anniversary date of his death, when a diorama depicting the actual battle scene will be dedicated; and

"Whereas the citizens of Casper with all due respect cherish the traditions upon which the city was founded, and do hereby call attention to their city's heroic namesake; and

"Whereas the great State of Wyoming is celebrating its 75th anniversary of statehood; and

"Whereas this anniversary date will add to the history of our State: Now, therefore, it is

"Resolved, by the 38th Legislature of the State of Wyoming, That we acknowledge and express our deep interest in this historic occasion; be it further

"Resolved, That attested true copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Fort Caspar Commission, the city of Casper, our Senators, and Representative in Congress.

"PETER E. MADSEN,
"President of the Senate.
"WALTER B. PHELAN,
"Speaker of the House."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Michael Greenebaum, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1965; and

Michael Greenebaum, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1969.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 1504. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Marco Ujkic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 1505. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide uniform Federal participation and eligibility standards for benefits payable as medical assistance for the aged; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1506. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize grants under the act for community action programs in the field of consumer credit education and consumer debt counseling; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1507. A bill to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; and

S. 1508. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide uniform provisions for crop liens, interest on unpaid marketing quota penalties and the persons liable for such penalties for all commodities for which a marketing quota program is in effect; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 1509. A bill for the relief of lessees of a certain tract of land in Logtown, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1510. A bill for the relief of June J. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1511. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS:

S. 1512. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that World War II and Korean conflict veterans entitled to educational benefits under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration who did not utilize their entitlement may transfer their entitlement to their children; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1513. A bill to amend the Tucker Act, section 1346(a)(2) of title 28, United States Code, to increase from $10,000 to $30,000, the limitation on the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts in suits against the United States for breach of contract or for compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1514. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. James R. Hoy, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1515. A bill to include the construction of an additional span as part of the authorized reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi at Rock Island, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1516. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HART, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1517. A bill to protect the right of individuals to register and to vote in State and Federal elections without discrimination because of race or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MCCLELLAN:

S. 1518. A bill to promote an orderly arrangement between the United States and the States with respect to certain regulatory authority involving intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1519. A bill for the relief of Robert Dalby;

S. 1520. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan;

S. 1521. A bill for the relief of Lloyd L. Ward, Jr.;

S. 1522. A bill to remove arbitrary limitations upon attorneys' fees for services rendered in proceedings before administrative agencies of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 1523. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to permit parties to, and persons required to appear in, agency proceedings to be represented by attorneys at law or other duly qualified representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1524. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1525. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1526. A bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS):

S.J. Res. 63. 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 Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. SIMPSON):

S.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the qualifications of Members of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CERTAIN CHANGES IN OPERATING FREQUENCY IN STANDARD BROADCAST BAND

Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 88) to express the sense of the Senate on certain changes in operating frequency in standard broadcast band, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN), which appears under a separate heading.)

CONSUMER CREDIT REGULATION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the recent hearings and discussions of the role of the Federal Government in the field of consumer credit regulation have generated great disagreement. I feel sure, however, that there is one aspect of the problem on which all concerned can agree. This is the need for greater understanding by consumers of what credit is, where it is available, its costs, and how to use it wisely?

Since most of the serious consumer credit problems involve the segment of our citizenry whom the President's antipoverty program is designed to help, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to make available under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, grants for consumer credit education and consumer debt counseling to low-income families and ask that it lie on the table for 1 week for cosponsors.

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

The bill (S. 1506) to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize grants under the act for community action programs in the field of consumer credit education and consumer debt counseling, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 now provides in section 205(a) that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity may authorize grants to public or private nonprofit agencies for community action programs focused on the needs of low-income families.

This bill would add two new items to the fields in which such programs may he conducted: Consumer credit education and consumer debt counseling.

Consumer credit outstanding at the end of 1964 was just under $77 billion. This credit stems from a variety of sources including banks, credit unions, sales finance companies, consumer finance companies, savings and loan institutions, and various retail stores and dealers. In a society where merchants and lenders are quick to offer new products and methods of financing if they find that consumers desire them, it is to be expected that there would be a great many different consumer credit types. Not only are these types different in their desirability of use for different transactions but they are necessarily different in cost to the consumer. One can not expect to get credit for a $3 purchase in a retail establishment at the same rate of charge as he can get a $20,000 mortgage loan for a home or a $3,000 time payment contract for an automobile. These are not comparable in use, availability, credit charge, or method of credit charge statement, nor need they be.

The important thing is that prospective credit users be familiar with the advantages and costs of each of the various credit types and the sources which are available and most desirable for various purposes.

During the lengthy hearings over the past 4 years on credit legislation on a Federal level, several things have become evident. The most important of these, in my opinion, is the lack of knowledge which was shown by individuals who had difficulties with their use of credit. Repeatedly, those who felt that they had been mistreated admitted that they didn't shop around either for the merchandise purchased or for the most reasonable financing. Indeed few realized that there are a variety of alternative credit sources available. They also admitted readily that they were unaware of any legal protection or of any action that could be taken if they thought that they had been cheated. In most cases, legal action could have been taken if the consumer had known what to do.

Let me not be misunderstood. I do not claim that there is no need for additional legislation. Many States have very good credit statutes. Others have need for a great deal of improvement. Due to the complexity of credit laws and regulations that have evolved over the years, it is not simple to develop legislation which will assist consumers in their choices, but which at the same time will not rip asunder the whole credit fabric on which a major part of our prosperity and standard of living rests. Because the field is so complex, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws has undertaken a 3-year study at an estimated cost of $750,000. The study, which has been supported and contributed to by virtually all types of financial institutions, will consider all aspects of consumer credit. It is the goal of the conference to develop feasible methods of disclosing credit costs and provide full complete and workable protection for consumers. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the March 2 issue of the American Banker regarding this study be included at this point.

I am convinced that this study can result in uniform State legislation which will give full protection to consumers while at the same time avoid undue burdens on legitimate business interests.

Improved legislation alone, however, will not be the answer to credit problems in the absence of education. The final conclusion of David Kaplovitz's intensive study of credit problems published in his book, "The Poor Pay More," is that the problem lies not so much in inadequate legal means establishing consumer rights, but rather in the lack of understanding by the consumer and thus his inability to take advantage of his legal rights. It is this deeper and more fundamental aspect of the problem toward which the bill I introduce today is directed.

As one would expect, legitimate lenders and merchants have a great stake in this effort. Perhaps theirs is not an entirely unselfish motive. They know that a customer who thinks he has been dealt with unjustly is not a repeat customer and neither are his friends and acquaintances. Through greater information, consumers will have a natural tendency to avoid gyp operators and patronize reputable merchandising and lending institutions.

Education must be provided for two separate groups. Those who are now in school who will soon be making major credit purchases must be made aware of credit sources, the differences in types of credit, the advantages and disadvantages of each type, and how to make the most effective use of each. Education for these students can be provided in the classroom. Secondly, and equally important, education must be provided for those who are now engaged in purchasing on credit and doing so unwisely. This can be provided in the form of counseling services in each community to assist with present problems and instruction that will assist in the future.

A start has already been made in the education of both of these important groups. Nearly 2,500 cities in the United States and Canada, and some districts in England now have credit education in their secondary schools. This is in addition to the colleges and universities which also have courses. Most of the educational material used in the secondary schools has been provided at the expense of the business community as part of an effort to inform prospective customers of proper credit use.

In addition to the programs in schools for those now attending, the adult population has also been provided with some assistance. In city after city, business and community leaders have initiated programs of consumer counseling. In

most instances, broad community support has been obtained for these counseling services.

As an example of the typical support, in Cleveland, the counseling service board of trustees includes representatives from finance companies, retailing, banking, savings and loan institutions, the trustee division of the municipal court, the AFL–CIO, Family Service Association, and Legal Aid Society.

In Charleston, W. Va., trustees include the legal profession, legal aid, referee in bankruptcy, the press, community council, and labor federation.

In Salt Lake City, credit counseling service trustees include the Salt Lake Credit Bureau, the Utah Credit Union League, medical society, community services council, family service society, better business bureau, legal aid society, and a university professor, in addition to the retailers, financial institutions, and legal profession.

The cooperation of interested parties can result in substantial benefit to the distressed debtor as well as those contemplating credit purchases. The counseling service gives them the guidance and tools required to achieve a level of responsible and manageable debt.

These programs are valuable to the consumer in helping him to more properly use credit if it is desirable for him to use it at all, they will strengthen financial stability in the community, stimulate improvement of business conditions and foster better relationships between the public generally and the private enterprise system of the country.

Consumer counseling services have begun to spread throughout the country after a relatively slow start. In areas where no counseling services yet exist, many business and banking executives are personally handling the cases of individuals who request help.

In addition to this effort, there are thousands of financial and retail establishments which have counseling services for the assistance of present and prospective borrowers.

Despite this organized and individual effort on the part of the business community, there yet remains a great task ahead. Many individuals who are most in need of assistance do not frequent the types of institutions which are providing counseling. Thus they may be unaware of the services available. Even if they were aware of the assistance possibility, they may be reluctant to approach an unfamiliar office.

It is for this reason that I have introduced this bill to make grants available under the Economic Opportunity Act so that the Federal Government may supplement the efforts made by private enterprise and the community in areas where the Federal Government has decided to concentrate its efforts in the war on poverty.

In communities where counseling services are now available, I would wish only to strengthen their programs and provide additional resources to make them more effective and more readily available to those outside the normal channels of assistance.

In communities which do not have consumer credit education and counseling, funds could be available for their support.

Benefits can be immediate for those who are now having difficulty managing their finances, and in the long run, we will have given others the knowledge and ability to handle their affairs without additional assistance. It is also likely that the experience gained will contribute to the work of the National Commissioners of Uniform State Laws in their efforts to analyze needs and draft uniform credit statutes.

This approach will help consumers to help themselves in credit transactions. It will increase their knowledge, and, in the words of the President, it will make them more able to "pursue the excellent and reject the tawdry—in every phase and in every aspect of American life."

TRANSFER OF UNUSED EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS OF VETERANS TO THEIR CHILDREN

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill which would allow World War II and Korean war veterans to transfer any unused educational benefits they might have to their children.

I have been annoyed for some time by the discriminatory treatment some veterans receive under what is commonly referred to as the GI bills because they either completed their education prior to entering the service or they were not in a position to continue it when they were released. Veterans in this category deserved these benefits fully as much as those who were able to take advantage of the education program, yet due to circumstances they usually had no control over, it was impossible for them to receive their just deserts. The bill I am introducing is designed to alleviate this discrimination and enable these veterans to receive the benefits their former comrades-in-arms have long enjoyed. It recognizes and acknowledges the contribution these veterans made in a time of great need. It is also in a spirit of justice that this bill recognizes that the veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict gave up an economically highly productive period in their lives while they served their country. It seems only fair, then, to pass this on to their children.

The demand for higher education in the United States today is unprecedented. Yet neither the schools nor many young people interested in higher education can take advantage of this demand without financial assistance. We live in an age of increasing specialization and technical know-how, both of which promise progress. Yet with an average family annual income of less than $5,500 and a population that has increased 18.4 percent since 1950, financing education becomes a major problem for families. Schools of higher education must be ready for a 1970 student population almost double that of 1960. In 1960 the average number of school years completed by persons 25 years of age or over was 10.6; by 1980 that figure is projected to be 12.2 years. It is the institutions of higher learning which will be noticeably affected. The bill I propose will help the families of over 4 million students and will assist to a significant extent professional, scientific, business, private vocational, junior colleges—a wide variety of institutions of higher education.

President Johnson tells us that the cost of one pupil to attend a private college is $2,400 per year and $1,600 for a public college. This cost is expected to rise by one-third during the next decade. The burden this places on the average family is obviously substantial, particularly when it is realized that there are, statistically, 2½ children in each family.

Under the provisions of the bill I am introducing, each child enrolled in a full-time program of instruction would receive $110 per month as an educational assistance allowance. While this will probably not pay the entire cost it will certainly go a considerable way toward this and will relieve the burdened family's share by about two-thirds. While based on the number of months of education or training the veteran was entitled to receive but did not use, the program of benefits is the same as those set out in the War Orphans Act. This will provide for uniform administration of the program by the Veterans' Administration and will enable it to be effectuated with a minimum issuance of new regulation and establishment of new procedures. It also prevents students from receiving allowances for wives and children. The benefits are limited to programs of instruction, conducted by educational instructions, which are generally accepted as necessary to fulfill the requirements for the attainment of an educational, professional, or vocational objective. This will prevent many of the abuses found in the earlier acts which resulted from the loose practices allowed in these acts because of the failure to limit sufficiently the type programs or schools which could be attended. Educational institution, as used in the bill, is defined as "any public or private vocational school, business school, junior college, teachers' college, college, normal school, professional school, university, or scientific or technical institution, or any other institution if it furnishes education above the secondary school level and is approved by the Administrator."

It will be noted that the child may receive these benefits until he attains the age of 31. This differs from the War Orphans Act which states that the child must have begun the program by his 21st birthday and have completed it by his 23d. This latter act does allow the child to continue until he reaches the age of 31 under certain conditions and in the discretion of the Administrator. I have deliberately omitted the limitations contained in the War Orphans Act. I did so in order to enable the child to utilize the benefits for professional training such as law or medicine or to attend graduate school if he so chooses. These schools are usually more expensive than undergraduate schools. In many cases it is possible for the student to live at home and attend a nearby college for his undergraduate training but he is forced to go away to attend a professional or graduate school because of the

inaccessibility of such a school in close proximity to his home. If this is the case, then, of course, the expense is increased manifold. Another reason for omitting the age limitation is that in many cases a child just out of high school is not mature enough to really know what he or she wants to do, but within 2 or 3 years will realize that he wants and needs to attend college. In this instance the child would probably be a much better student, but would be prohibited because of his age from receiving the benefits which might be the deciding factor in his return to college.

There are approximately 1.9 million veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict who did not use any or who only used part of their educational entitlement. A rough projection of this, based on the census report, shows that about 4.7 million children would be eligible to receive benefits under this bill. I am informed by the Veterans' Administration that there are some 52.9 million months of unused educational benefits remaining. This would mean educational assistance for an average of 11 months for each veteran's child who takes advantage of the program.

Mr. President, the entire blueprint of the Great Society is aimed at raising the economic and educational level of our society to a more equitable plane. Under this blueprint, new methods are being sought to provide more people with the wherewithal to attain a college education. This bill would contribute materially to this end by providing some 52.9 million months of education to almost 5 million young people.

Finally, of less importance perhaps, but of real value is the fact that this legislation would serve to remind and impress the younger generation with the great efforts expended by our Armed Forces these last 25 years, our indebtedness to them, and the appreciation of their country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a section-by-section analysis of the bill, and also that the bill may lie at the desk for 10 days to enable other Senators to become cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the requests of the Senator from Tennessee are granted.

The bill (S. 1512) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that World War II and Korean conflict veterans entitled to educational benefits under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration who did not utilize their entitlement may transfer their entitlement to their children, introduced by Mr. BASS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. BASS is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF BILL TO ALLOW VETERANS TO TRANSFER UNUSED EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO THEIR CHILDREN

This bill would amend title 38 of the United States Code to include chapter 45, entitled "Transfer of Educational Benefits."

Section 2201: Provides that World War II and the Korean conflict veterans who were eligible for education and training under any VA administered law may transfer unused portion of their entitlement to any of his children in any amounts he desires and allows him to modify or revoke the transfer. In case the veteran is incompetent or deceased the other parent or guardian may transfer the benefits.

Section 2202: Limits the benefits to programs conducted by educational institutions with a predetermined educational, professional, or vocational objective. Defines "educational institution" as the usual college, business or vocational school, or professional, technical, or scientific institution.

Section 2203: Reduces the period of entitlement by the number of months that a veteran received vocational rehabilitation from the VA.

Section 2204: Provides that the child may receive the benefits from age 18 or when he finishes secondary education until age 31 with the exception that if he is above compulsory school attendance age then in the discretion of the administrator he may begin earlier.

Section 2205: Insures that no child shall be eligible for benefits of this nature under two VA programs.

Section 2206: Provides that the Administrator shall pay to the parent or guardian of each eligible person applying an educational assistance allowance, but limits it to the period of enrollment and prohibits any allowance from being paid where the student is not pursuing his course in accordance with the rules and regulations of the educational institution he is attending. Prohibits also the payment when the absences exceed 30 days in a 12-month period while the institution is in session. Requires that the Administrator receive certification of enrollment and attendance. Provides that the allowance be paid within 20 days after certification if practicable.

Section 2207: Allows $110 per month if student is enrolled full time; $80 per month if enrolled three-quarters time; and $50 per month for half-time enrollment. No benefits are payable for less than half time study. If it is an alternate work-study program of enrollment then the allowance is $90 per month, in which case the student must be enrolled full time.

Section 2208: Allows the benefits to be transferred without regard to the expiration of time limitations.

Section 2: Technical amendment relating to numbering.

Section 3: Effective date is the 1st day of the 2d month following enactment.

RELIEF OF 1ST LT. JAMES R. HOY, U.S. AIR FORCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to relieve 1st Lt. James R. Hoy, U.S. Air Force, from all liability for repayment to the United States the sum of $1,167.73, representing the amount of overpayments of basic pay received by him for the period from January 2, 1962, through January 30, 1965.

This indebtedness was incurred as a result of erroneous information supplied to him by personnel of the Financial Services Division at Larson Air Force Base, Wash., and on two occasions by the Accounting and Finance Center at Denver, Colo. This information led him to believe that his previous 3 years and 10 months of active duty in the U.S. Naval Reserve placed him in a category of a commissioned officer, credited with over 4 years active enlisted service, and entitled him to additional monthly pay. Based upon this information, he accepted additional monthly pay during the period mentioned above.

Lieutenant Hoy received his Air Force Reserve Commission on November 22, 1961, and was processed to active duty on January 2, 1962. He was paid in accordance to the pay scale of second lieutenant with over 6 years creditable longevity.

Upon his arrival at Larson Air Force Base on June 13, 1963, the personnel of the Financial Services Division informed Lieutenant Hoy after a review of his record that he was to be reimbursed $410 for underpayment backdated to January 2, 1962. He then requested that his records be sent to the Air Force Accounting and Finance Center at Denver, Colo., to be computed and a judgment rendered before he would accept payment. This was returned approximately 2 weeks later, and as no error was discovered he accepted the back payment and his records were adjusted to the correct pay scale. Due to a feeling of caution, he again requested a record check by Denver on November 20, 1964, the results of which were negative.

The error in payment was later discovered by personnel at Larson after the second record check by Denver had been returned. The Chief of the Financial Services Division at Larson has since been advised by Denver of the overpayment, and instructions were issued to take collection action.

If Lieutenant Hoy is required to reimburse the United States for this error, which was caused by no fault of his own, it will create a serious hardship financially on him, his wife, and five children.

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

The bill (S. 1514) for the relief of 1st Lt. James R. Hoy, U.S. Air Force, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ROCK ISLAND CENTENNIAL BRIDGE, ILLINOIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to include the construction of an additional span as part of the authorized reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.

The purpose of this bill is to further amend the act approved March 18, 1938, which authorized the city of Rock Island, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island. Under the provisions of the bill the improvements shall be commenced not later than April 1, 1970, and shall be completed within 3 years after such date.

The act of March 18, 1938, was further amended by Public Law 682, 84th Congress, approved July 11, 1956, and Public Law 85–629, approved August 14, 1958.

The act of March 18, 1938, authorized the city of Rock Island to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River from Rock

Island, Ill., to Davenport, Iowa, in accordance with the provisions of an act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters, approved March 26, 1906.

The Rock Island Centennial Bridge was completed in 1940, and since that time the average daily traffic over the bridge has increased from 4,000 to nearly 15,000 vehicles per day.

The metropolitan area of Rock Island and Moline, Ill., Davenport, Iowa, and adjacent cities, has a total population of over 200,000. The area is highly industrialized, with an estimated 130 industries and about 30,000 employees on the Illinois side, and 180 industries with about 15,000 employes on the Iowa side. Being one metropolitan area, the traffic across the river produced by this employment is extremely heavy on the bridge.

Steps should be taken now to permit the Centennial Bridge to be utilized to its designed capacity to relieve the existing and anticipated traffic conditions. If this is not done, the economy of the area will be adversely affected and the movement of the highway traffic impaired.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a report of the Rock Island Centennial Bridge Commission setting forth the annual traffic over the bridge from 1960 through December 1964 and the net receipts during the same period from tolls collected.

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

The bill (S. 1515) to include the construction of an additional span as part of the authorized reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi at Rock Island, Ill., introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The report presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

Yearend report for the Rock Island Centennial Bridge Commission ending Dec. 31, 1964

	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Vehicles:					
Passenger cars-trucks	4,485,121	4,233,066	4,500,470	4,767,193	5,248,358
Buses (city lines)	52,101	48,039	47,347	46,673	48,692
Total vehicles	4,537,222	4,281,104	4,547,917	4,813,871	5,297,050
Revenue:					
Gross receipts	$522,995.20	$494,609.27	$527,393.55	$558,506.55	$616,951.79
Maintenance costs	210,551.41	201,071.23	218,372.41	231,500.17	244,299.54
Net receipts	312,443.79	290,538.04	309,021.14	327,006.38	392,652.25
Bonds outstanding as of Dec. 1 [1]	4,536,000.00	4,486,000.00	4,604,000.00	4,501,000.00	4,388,000.00
A and B bonds due to be called Apr. 1, 1965					50,000.00
Annual interest to Mar. 31, 1965	191,675.00	186,901.00	197,431.50	193,989.00	185,228.50
Cash on hand as of Dec. 1 at the Rock Island Bank & Trust Co. as deposited by the Rock Island Centennial Bridge Commission	265,599.49	234,679.80	259,614.73	274,883.81	303,536.19

[1] $250,000 additional bonds sold in March 1962, revising total of outstanding bonds to $4,736,000. Bonds retired during the year 1962, $132,000; balance outstanding, $4,604,000. Retired in 1963, $103,000; balance outstanding, $4,501,000. Bonds retired during 1964, $113,000 and balance of bonds outstanding is $4,388,000.

NOTE.—The above figures include an estimated figure for the month of December 1964, as we do not as yet have these figures available. However, they are estimated on past year's business and will be well in line.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes. It is being introduced at the request of the Acting Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1965.

According to the Acting Administrator, the purpose of this bill is to permit greater economy, safety, and efficiency in the maintenance and operation of Federal buildings by authorizing the General Services Administration to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years. An identical bill (S. 1233) was introduced in the 88th Congress, reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations. It passed the Senate, but failed to be acted upon in the House.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Acting Administrator of General Services, dated February 5, 1965, which sets forth additional justification and background on the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1516) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith for referral to the appropriate committee is a draft bill prepared by the General Services Administration to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes.

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for the 89th Congress, 1st session.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to permit greater economy, safety, and efficiency in the maintenance and operation of Federal buildings by authorizing the General Services Administration to enter into contracts necessary for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years .

The fixed equipment systems intended to be covered by the proposed legislation together with comments justifying enactment of the proposal are set forth in more detail in the attachment hereto.

With respect to the fiscal effects of the enactment of this proposal, it is believed that substantial savings would inure to the benefit of the Government. However, the extent of these savings cannot be measured at this time because long-term contracts for such services have not been consummated in the past.

For the reasons stated above, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
LAWSON B. KNOTT, Jr.,
Acting Administrator.

ATTACHMENT

The fixed equipment systems intended to be covered by this measure include heating, refrigeration, ventilating, air conditioning, electrical, vertical transportation, plumbing, fire protection, watchman, fuel, and pneumatic tube systems installed in Federal buildings. Typical items common to these systems are the following: boilers, stokers and oil burners; compressors, chillers, and cooling towers; fans, airhandlers, and induction units; transformers, motors, generators, high-voltage switchgear and interior distribution wiring; pumps, piping, and water tanks; fire alarms and watchman central recorders; fuel tanks, and lines; blowers and tube stations; and elevators and escalators. Such systems are relatively complex and costly and require continuous inspection, maintenance, and repair (when necessary) of such a character that they can be operated efficiently, with the greatest possible safety, with a minimum of service interruption, for the longest possible time economically justifiable.

A substantial part of the servicing of this equipment is subject to being performed for the Government by contracting with firms which specialize in the various aspects thereof. It would be very advantageous to the Government if more of this servicing could be contracted out. There are several reasons for this. For one thing, the Government in

many localities has been unable to employ, or to retain for any length of time those employed, the necessary number of specially trained skilled craftsmen, and supervisors with know-how, to perform the work because of local labor market conditions. For another, by contracting for this work the Government is relieved of the added costs and difficulties inherent in purchasing, transporting, and storing innumerable spare parts and other supplies which would otherwise be necessary, as well as arranging for the availability of such spare parts and other supplies promptly when and where needed in the many Federal buildings throughout the country, not infrequently on an emergency basis. For a third, even assuming that the Government could obtain and retain the necessary skilled craftsmen at all locations, the amount of such service work required at any given time for any given Federal building varies to such an extent that it would be most difficult, if not impossible, in many small isolated locations, to schedule the work so that the skilled craftsmen employed by the Government would be fully employed on the one hand, or that, on the other hand, there are sufficient skilled craftsmen available to handle the work on other occasions when unpredictable and urgent heavy demands for their services may arise to service particular buildings. For these reasons and because of other problems, some of which are indicated hereinafter, the usual practice of private industry is to enter into long-term contracts with specialty firms for such services.

Under present law, Government contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of such equipment may be entered into for only 1 year. It is believed that authority to contract for a longer period will yield lower costs and more efficient and satisfactory service and operations.

It has been our experience that many contractors do not fully carry out their obligations under 1-year contracts with us for equipment inspection, maintenance, and repair, as hidden deficiencies in such maintenance show up later, often after the contract has expired and a new contractor is on the job. Because of their inherently latent nature, it is most difficult to prove whether the deficiencies in performance under such contracts are attributable to one short-term contractor or to another, at least to the extent that the Government can obtain appropriate damages or other relief in a court of law, or before an administrative tribunal, for the failure of a contractor to properly perform such a maintenance contract. As one consequence, the Government has had to bear the cost of remedying such deficiencies. Another consequence has been that our equipment has not been operable, because of shutdown time for repairs, more frequently and for longer periods than it should be. Thus, we have been handicapped in properly protecting the Government's interests.

Another somewhat different type of situation which has confronted us is that contractors will refrain from bidding on a 1-year contract when they have knowledge under an existing contract that abnormal maintenance will probably be required during the ensuing year.

It is considered that authority to enter into contracts to service this equipment for a maximum of 5 years will do much to alleviate this type of situation, as most major defects in maintenance will show up in a 5-year period. Under a 5-year contract, the contractor will have a much greater incentive to perform proper maintenance during the early years of the life of equipment than under a 1-year contract. And, under a 5-year contract, even if a contractor neglects the maintenance during the early years, his neglect can much more easily be charged against him than it could be under a 1-year contract, as such a contractor could not sit back with the thought that the Government would have great difficulty in proving that he, rather than his successor contractor, was responsible therefor.

Another benefit to the Government which would flow from the grant of authority to enter into such 5-year contracts is that, in many cases, lower prices could be obtained under one contract for 5 years as contrasted with those obtainable under five contracts for 1 year each.

Under the longer term contract, contractors would be able to arrange for longer range, bigger volume purchasing of supplies and spare parts, and otherwise more economical operations. An important fringe benefit would be the greater time a contractor's personnel would have to become acquainted with the characteristics of the particular pieces of equipment which were being serviced, including the relationship of such equipment to the structural and other characteristics of the buildings in which it is located, or in connection with which it is used, and the detailed nature of the circumstances under which it must be operated. Each new contractor under an annual contract arrangement has to organize for the job and train his employees for the particular tasks required by the contract, thus sacrificing to some extent the efficiency that results from experience in actually performing the work.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia.

This bill is the same measure that was reported to the Senate by the District of Columbia Committee on July 8, 1964. As we all know, that measure languished on the Senate Calendar until the adjournment of the 2d session of the 88th Congress. After being reported, it never again saw the light of day.

Within the last several days, the FBI has released the Uniform Crime Report for 1964. It shows that the number of serious crimes in the District during 1964 increased 25 percent. This was reported by the Washington Star on March 10, 1965. I ask unanimous consent to insert the entire article at this point in the RECORD.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME UP 25 PERCENT; U.S. LIST ALSO RISES

The number of serious crimes in Washington last year increased 25 percent, according to nationwide crime statistics released today by the FBI.

The FBI's Uniform Crime Report for 1964, issued by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, showed that serious crime in seven major categories was 13 percent higher last year than in 1963 throughout the Nation.

In Washington, serious offenses totaled 22,932 in calendar 1964, 4,603 higher than the 1963 total.

Only one category of crime recorded by the FBI dropped in the Washington area in 1964. This was aggravated assault, with 2,605 recorded cases, against 2,851 reported the previous year.

Other categories of crime in the Washington area, compared with 1963, are: murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, 132 against 95; forcible rape, 96 against 87; robbery, 2,279 against 1,707; burglary, breaking or entering, 8,910 against 6,984; larceny of $50 or more, 3,518 against 3,140, and auto theft, 5,392 against 3,465.

A Washington police official noted that Washington ranked fourth in crime rate among 16 American cities in the 500,000-to-1-million population group in 1964.

According to the FBI Crime Index, Washington's crime rate—the ratio of total offenses to population—was exceed by only three cities: St. Louis, which had the highest rate, San Francisco, and New Orleans.

In the robbery-by-force-and-violence category, Washington had the highest rate among the 16 cities.

Monthly crime reports issued by Washington police show reported crimes under a part I (serious crime) heading. Unlike the FBI Uniform Crime Report, the part 1 offenses include petty larceny (involving sums under $50), purse snatchings, and statutory rape.

Using these part I crime categories, crime summaries issued by police here resulted in a larger number of total offenses for calendar 1964 (30,660 offenses) but a smaller percentile increase than that reflected in the FBI report. Crime in the District last year—according to the District summaries—increased by 17.5 percent over 1963.

Across the Nation, in crimes of violence, there was a 9-percent rise in murder, 18 percent in aggravated assault, 19 percent in forcible rape, and 12 percent in robbery.

Auto thefts rose 16 percent, larceny of $50 or more increased 13 percent, and burglary 12 percent.

Also released today was the Metropolitan Police Department's latest crime summary, for last month. The report showed the number of part I offenses in the District was 1.5 percent higher last month than the total for February 1964—the 33d consecutive month in which such increases were reported.

A total of 2,421 part I offenses were recorded during the report month, 36 more than in the corresponding month last year.

Police officials noted in passing that there were 29 days in February 1964—a leap year—while this year, February contained 28 days. Therefore, based on a comparison of daily averages, last month's crime exceeded the crime incidence in February 1964, by 4.9 percent.

Last month, the report stated, increases were reported in four crime categories in comparison with February 1964, as follows: rape, up one offense (an increase of 9 percent); robbery, up 26 (8.7 percent); housebreaking, up 134 (20.1 percent); auto theft, up 64 (15.1 percent).

The following decreases were reported: aggravated assault, down 63 (28 percent); grand larceny, down 19 (6.9 percent); petty larceny, down 107 (17.4 percent).

Ten homicides were reported in the District last month—the same number recorded in February 1964.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the article points out that, according to the FBI crime index, the District's crime rate is exceeded by only three American cities of comparable size. This is distressing news, indeed, but it only bears out the fears of the Senate District Committee in its report on this same bill last July.

The bill contains six titles and is the product of much study, analysis, and deliberation by the committee. A section-by-section analysis of the bill is contained in Senate Report No. 1172 of last year on pages 25 through 28, and I ask unanimous consent to have that analysis reprinted at this point.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

TITLE I

Section 101 is a brief restatement of existing law with respect to the admissibility of voluntary confessions and statements made by an accused.

Section 102 restates existing law and excludes statements made by an accused after a period of unnecessary delay and prior to an appearance before a U.S. Commissioner.

Section 103 provides that under section 102 of this title, delay alone shall not cause the exclusion of any statement obtained by interrogation of the accused, if (1) the accused was warned that he need not make a statement and was told that any statement made could be used against him; and (2) the accused was told of his right to notify a relative or friend and consult with any attorney and he, in fact, was given an opportunity to contact a relative or friend and talk with a lawyer of his choice; and (3) the statement was completed within not more than 6 hours after his arrest; and (4) all of these warnings whenever reasonably possible and any questioning of the accused were witnessed by a third party or transcribed or recorded verbatim.

Section 104 requires the trial judge who admits any statement in evidence pursuant to section 103 of this title to make findings of fact concerning the existence of the conditions set out in section 103.

Section 105 authorizes and directs the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate regulations including necessary disciplinary measures to assure that police officers comply with requirements of law set out in this title and with the regulations made pursuant to it.

TITLE II

Section 201 of the bill amends section 24–301 of the District of Columbia Code relating to insane criminals by adding a new subsection (i). This subsection provides that insanity shall not be a defense in any criminal proceeding in the U.S. district court or District of Columbia court of general sessions, unless the accused or his attorney in such proceeding files with the court and serves upon the prosecuting attorney, written notice of his intention to rely on such defense.

The notice is required to be filed at the time of entering a plea of not guilty, or within 15 days thereafter, or at such time thereafter as the court may for good cause permit.

TITLE III

Section 301 amends section 4–144 of the District of Columbia Code relating to detention of material witnesses.

The section provides that members of the Metropolitan Police Force and the Federal law enforcement officers are authorized, without unnecessary delay, to take before a judge, or U.S. commissioner of the District of Columbia, any person whom the officer has reasonable grounds to believe is a material and necessary witness to the commission of a crime punishable by imprisonment for 1 year or more, and when there is a reasonable probability that such person will not be available to testify at the trial of the person charged with the offense.

Immediately upon being taken before a judge or commissioner, such person shall be advised of his constitutional rights and shall be allowed reasonable opportunity to consult counsel. After a hearing is afforded, and pursuant thereto, a person is determined to be a material and necessary witness, such person will be required to post bond or collateral as security that he will appear and testify at such trial. Upon his failure to post bond or collateral, the judge or commissioner may order his further detention in suitable quarters that are separate and apart from those used for the confinement of persons charged with crime. Under the section, the judge or commissioner retains authority to release any person detained for an unreasonable period of time whether or not he has discharged his duties as a material witness.

Also the section affords the prosecution the same right with respect to the taking of a deposition of a material witness as is afforded to the defendant. In those instances of where a person, through financial inability, cannot post bond or collateral, the court may discharge such person where the deposition of the person has been taken.

TITLE IV

Section 401 of this title amends section 22–3201 of the District of Columbia Code which defines crimes of violence. This section adds the crime of robbery to the abovementioned section of the District of Columbia Code.

TITLE V

Section 501: Section 501 of this title amends District of Columbia Code, section 22–501, to provide a minimum sentence of not less than 2 years for assault with intent to commit crimes of violence.

Section 502: Section 502 of this title amends the District of Columbia Code, section 22–1801, which defines and provides penalties for the crime of housebreaking. This section establishes or defines the crime of burglary, in two degrees, and the punishment to be applied.

Subsection (a) of this amendment defines burglary in the first degree as a breaking and entering, or entering without breaking, any actually occupied dwelling or room used as a sleeping apartment in any building with the intent to take property or commit any criminal offense. Burglary in the first degree shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 2 years nor more than 20 years.

Burglary in the second degree is defined in subsection (b) as breaking and entering or entering without breaking into other enumerated premises with the intent to take property or commit any other crime. The penalty for burglary in the second degree shall be imprisonment for not less than 1 year nor more than 15 years.

Section 503: Section 503 of this title amends the provisions of District of Columbia Code, section 22–2901, by increasing the minimum penalty for crimes of robbery from a minimum of 6 months to a minimum of 2 years.

Section 504: Section 504 of this title amends District of Columbia Code, section 22–3202.

Under existing law, permissive additional penalties are provided for where an accused is armed with a firearm when committing a crime of violence. Thus a person armed when committing a crime of violence would be subject on conviction, to an additional sentence for a term of not more than 5 years; for second convictions an additional sentence of not more than 10 years; for a third conviction an additional sentence of not more than 15 years; and for a fourth and subsequent conviction an additional sentence of not more than 30 years.

The amendment to this section adds certain other dangerous or deadly weapons, other than a firearm, for which a person may be given an additional penalty if he commits a crime of violence while armed with any such weapon.

Section 505: Section 505 of this title amends District of Columbia Code, section 22–2001, relating to indecent materials.

Subsection (a) of the amendment provides that whoever sells, offers to sell, or gives away or has possession with intent to sell, give away, or exhibit indecent materials, or who advertises such materials or drugs or instruments intended to produce abortion or gives or participates in or advertises any indecent public exhibition, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Subsection (b) of this amendment provides that whoever with knowledge engages in the production of obscene materials which are to be disseminated shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Subsection (c) of this amendment provides that the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia may petition the U.S. district court for a preliminary injunction and a permanent injunction to restrain the sale, dissemination, distribution, and production of obscene matter prohibited in this section. A hearing will be provided prior to the issuance of any preliminary injunction which will remain in effect for no more than 30 days.

Subsection (d) of this amendment provides that after trial of the issues the court may issue a permanent injunction and that such injunction shall include a provision for the immediate seizure and impounding of the obscene matter. There is provision for final disposition of such obscene matter in such way as the court may determine. However, in no event shall the matter be destroyed until after finality of appeal.

Subsection (e) provides that proceedings shall be governed by Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, except as they may be inconsistent with the provisions of this section.

Subsection (f) provides an exemption to the provisions of section 505 to those licensed under the provisions of the Federal Communications Act while engaged in activities regulated pursuant to such act.

Section 506: This section of title V amends District of Columbia Code, section 22–3105, which provides penalties for the use of explosives with intent to destroy or damage property. The amendment to this section provides a minimum sentence of not less than 3 years and leaves the existing maximum sentence at 10 years.

Section 507: This section of title V adds a new section to the District of Columbia Code relating to the making of false or fictitious reports to the police department. This section codifies the substance of existing regulations of the Metropolitan Police Department relating to such offenses and provides that the penalty shall be a fine not exceeding $300 or imprisonment not exceeding 30 days.

TITLE VI

The purpose of this title is to make clear that the bill has no retroactive effect.

Offenses committed prior to its enactment are not intended to be affected in any way by any amendment to existing law made by the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it is the middle of March and we have not yet received proposed legislation dealing specifically with crime in the District of Columbia. I do not contend that this bill is the whole answer to the District's crime problems, but it seems to me that it is an excellent proposal to begin with. Time is growing short and we know that the House has already reported a District of Columbia crime bill. I think we ought to get started on a bill of our own and get some action at the earliest opportunity.

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

The bill (S. 1526) relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM EXPOSITION TO BE HELD IN TULSA, OKLA., IN 1966

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Oklahoma, a 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 in Tulsa, Okla., from May 12 through May 21, 1966.

Tulsa, Okla., is the oil capital of the world. The International Petroleum Exposition which it has sponsored over the past two decades has contributed much to the dissemination of information and products developed in this country to foreign nations with undeveloped oil and gas resources. The exposition has been attended in the past by representatives from over 50 nations throughout the world.

The exposition is a place where leaders of the oil industry from every continent can gather to discuss their common problems, exchange useful information and ideas, and evaluate the latest developments in technology and equipment. I am confident the exposition to be held next year will prove even more successful and beneficial than those in the past.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 63) 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, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF SENATE ON CERTAIN CHANGES IN OPERATING FREQUENCY IN STANDARD BROADCAST BAND

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I submit, for myself and the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee [Mr. SPARKMAN], a resolution which expresses the sense of the Senate that the Federal Communications Commission should not adopt or promulgate rules to permit any radio station operating on a frequency in the standard broadcast band to operate on a regular or other basis with power in excess of 50,000 watts.

Mr. President, this resolution is, in effect, a reaffirmation by the Senate of Senate Resolution 294, 75th Congress, 3d session, which the Senate passed in 1938. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that resolution be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. RES. 88

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that the operation of radio-broadcast stations in the standard broadcast band (five hundred and fifty to one thousand six hundred kilocycles) with power in excess of fifty kilowatts is definitely against the public interest, in that such operation would tend to concentrate political, social, and economic power and influence in the hands of a very small group, and is against the public interest for the further reason that the operation of broadcast stations with power in excess of fifty kilowatts has been demonstrated to have adverse and injurious economic effects on other stations operating with less power, in depriving such stations of revenue and in limiting the ability of such stations to adequately or efficiently serve the social, religious, educational, civic, and other like organizations and institutions in the communities in which such stations are located and which must and do depend on such stations for the carrying on of community welfare work generally; and be it further

Resolved, That it is therefore the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that the Federal Communications Commission should not adopt or promulgate rules to permit or otherwise allow any station operating on a frequency in the standard broadcast band (five hundred and fifty to one thousand six hundred kilocycles) to operate on a regular or other basis with power in excess of fifty kilowatts.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there appear at this point in the RECORD a copy of House Resolution 714, 87th Congress, 2d session, dated June 27, 1962, which states that, notwithstanding the Senate resolution of 1938, it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the FCC may authorize the use of power in excess of 50,000 watts on any one of the 25 class I–A clear-channel frequencies in the standard broadcasting band, if the Commission finds that such action will serve the public interest, convenience, or necessity.

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

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Communications Commission—

(1) may, notwithstanding Senate Resolution 294, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, adopted June 7, 1938, authorize the use of power in excess of fifty kilowatts on any of the twenty-five class I–A clear channel frequencies in the standard broadcast band (five hundred and forty to sixteen hundred kilocycles) which are specified in the rules of the Commission, if, after consideration of all pertinent factors, including the objective of providing improved nighttime radio service to substantial areas and populations presently receiving inadequate nighttime radio service, the Commission finds that operation on such frequencies with power in excess of fifty kilowatts will serve the public interest, convenience, or necessity; and

(2) should not authorize, for a period of one year from the date of adoption of this resolution, the construction for nighttime operation, or the nighttime operation, of any station on any of the twenty-five class I–A clear channel frequencies in the standard broadcast band (five hundred and forty to sixteen hundred kilocycles) which are specified in the rules of the Commission, unless such station was or could have been authorized consistent with the rules of the Commission then in effect, to operate on such a frequency on July 1, 1961.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, there are now pending before the Federal Communications Commission several applications by so-called class I–A clear-channel stations to increase their power from the present 50,000 watts output to 750,000 watts. There are several reasons why the Federal Communications Commission should not authorize such a great increase in power for these stations.

For example, the United States has treaties with such countries as Canada and Mexico to protect their radio channels from interference by U.S. stations. If the FCC should increase certain stations to 750,000 watts, it would not be possible, I am told, to protect these foreign channels from interference, and thus we would be unable to honor our treaties with neighboring countries.

Additionally, and most importantly, authorization of higher power by the FCC would result in an undesirable concentration of economic control in the hands of a few stations. These superpower stations would be in a position to attract national advertisers away from the smaller radio stations around the country. As a member of the Senate Small Business Committee, I am seriously concerned about the very likely adverse economic impact that would be felt by the smaller stations.

On November 14, 1964, the Florida Association of Broadcasters adopted a resolution which reads, in part, and I quote:

Resolved, That the Florida Association of Broadcasters joins many other State associations, independent industry groups (the Association of Broadcasting Standards, Daytime Broadcasters Association, etc.) in registering unconditional opposition to this proposed granting of "superpower" by FCC.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Florida Association of Broadcasters resolution dated November 14, 1964, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission is now considering the granting of power as high as 500,000 watts for the 12 remaining class I clear channel stations; and

Whereas seven radio stations that presently operate with the maximum of 50,000 watts have requested licenses to operate with as much as 750,000 watts; and

Whereas the granting of superpower of this order to these stations, or to any clear channel station, would give them a dominant voice in the radio medium in dissemination of news, information and viewpoints, and an overall competitive advantage in coverage, listeners, and potential advertising revenues; and

Whereas this action would result in widespread interference with the signals of smaller stations, and in severe adverse impact on the income and local public service potential of smaller stations everywhere; and

Whereas under the existing radio allocations system which has provided diverse media in medium and smaller sized communities in all areas of the country, this action is unnecessary and unwarranted, even for purposes of emergency defense communications: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Florida Association of Broadcasters joins many other State associations, independent industry groups (Association of Broadcasting Standards, Daytime Broadcasters' Association, etc.) in registering unconditional opposition to this pro-

posed granting of "superpower" by FCC; and further be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Federal Communications Commission, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the Committee on Commerce of the U.S. Senate, to the Members of Congress from the State of Florida, and to any other appointed or elected officials or groups interested in this action.

Done at Clearwater, Fla., Saturday, November 14, 1964, by the board of directors, Florida Association of Broadcasters, Inc.

BERNARD E. NEARY,
President.

Attest:

KENNETH F. SMALL,
Secretary.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I submit my resolution in support of the Florida broadcasting industry, and in support of all radio stations around the country whose economic interests are vitally at stake in the proceedings now before the Federal Communications Commission. I hope the Senate will favorably consider this resolution.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 88) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Whereas on June 7, 1938, the Senate adopted S. Res. 294, Seventy-fifth Congress, which stated that for reasons listed in such resolution it was the sense of the Senate that the Federal Communications Commission should not adopt or promulgate rules to permit or otherwise allow any radio station operating on a frequency in the standard broadcast band (five hundred and fifty to one thousand six hundred kilocycles) to operate on a regular or other basis with power in excess of fifty thousand watts; and

Whereas events since the date of adoption of such resolution have not changed the reasons for such resolution, and any such operation with power in excess of fifty thousand watts would not be in the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it continues to be the sense of the Senate that the Federal Communications Commission should not adopt or promulgate rules to permit or otherwise allow any radio station operating on a frequency in the standard broadcast band to operate on a regular or other basis with power in excess of fifty thousand watts.

AMENDMENT TO EDUCATION BILL TO CORRECT EDUCATION AID WEAKNESSES (AMENDMENT NO. 53)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and myself, an amendment to the pending primary and secondary school education-aid bill, S. 370, which bill is now pending before the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member.

The measure would amend title I of the bill to increase the number of children receiving educational opportunity under the act by about 60 percent in the second and third years after enactment, under a matching fund formula, by directing aid to children from families with an annual income between $2,000 and $3,000.

The amendment is designed to meet three principal objections to title I. These objections were pointed out by witnesses during the recent hearings before the Education Subcommittee.

The objections are: First, the aid formula for the second and third years is open, leaving the determination of how funds are to be distributed up to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, rather than to the Congress; second, there is no matching provision; and, third, under the inadequate poverty "yardstick" of $2,000 annual family income, only about 11 percent of all school-age children are reached.

I send the amendment to the desk, ask that it be printed, and appropriately referred.

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

The amendment (No. 53) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

On page 3, line 7, strike out "KINDS AND".

On page 3, line 12, beginning with the comma after "1968" strike out all to the period in line 15.

On page 6, beginning with line 18, strike out all through line 2 on page 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the 'Federal percentage' and the 'low-income factor' shall be 50 per centum and $2,000, respectively, and

"(2) for each of such two succeeding fiscal years, an additional amount shall be determined using a 'Federal percentage' of 25 per centum and a 'low-income factor' of $3,000 but more than $2,000, and added to the basic grant, if such amount is matched by State or local funds, or both, to be used for the same purpose as such basic grant.

Any amount contributed by a State for the purpose of clause (2) shall be in addition to regular payments of State aid made by such State, and any amount made available by a local educational agency for the purpose of such clause with respect to any fiscal year shall represent an increase in such year in current expenditures of local funds for elementary and secondary school education by such agency over the amount of such expenditures in the previous fiscal year."

On page 7, beginning with line 15, strike out all through line 5 on page 8, and redesignate sections 205 on page 8 through section 212 on page 16, and cross references thereto, accordingly.

On page 8, line 8, strike out "or a special incentive grant".

On page 12, line 20, beginning with "plus the maximum" strike out all to the period in line 22.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, under the administration proposal, the educational program is carefully outlined for the first year after enactment, but becomes cloudy for the second and third years. This presents budgeting and planning problems to local educators. This poses problems to the Congress which, in undertaking this great new program, should not be restricted to looking only 1 year ahead.

Under the amendment we are introducing today, the formula for the first year would stand as presently written, with each State receiving a Federal grant equal to 50 percent of the current average annual per pupil expenditure, multiplied by the number of children from families of under $2,000 annual income. This formula would continue to apply for the second and third years for the under-$2,000 income children. However, during the second and third years, children from families in the $2,000 to $3,000 annual income category would be brought in under a matching formula providing for a Federal contribution of 25 percent of the average annual per pupil expenditure, where this is matched by an equal amount from State and/or local funds.

Under our amendment, therefore, the number of children directly affected would be increased by about 60 percent—from some 5 million to some 8 million children—with a great improvement in educational opportunity, while Federal cost for title I would be raised only about one-third. In this way the bill could much more effectively serve its purpose of fighting poverty and aiding a substantial added number of the school population who need it badly.

To illustrate how our amendment would work, consider a State with an average annual per pupil expenditure of $450—the national average is $455. For each of the 3 years authorized for S. 370, that State would receive a Federal grant of $225 for every child between 5 and 17 from a family with an income of $2,000 or less. In addition, for each of the second and third years of the operation of the education bill the State would receive a Federal grant of $112.50 for each child from a family with an income of from $2,000 to $3,000, providing that amount is matched from State and/or local funds. Thus, an additional $225 a year would be directed to the child from the $2,000 to $3,000 income family, as well as to the child from the under $2,000 income family.

Our amendment substitutes a matching program for the incentive provision contained in S. 370. Special comment at this point is necessary with respect to this incentive provision. What is not generally realized is that this provision, as the administration intends to enforce it, turns the education bill for its second and third years into a measure which may work out to give first priority to the more financially able school district and to give secondary priority to funds for the educationally deprived and the poverty ridden. The incentive section provides that where a school district increases its expenditures over the previous year, the Federal Government would match that increase up to 5 percent. Thus, the available appropriation would go first to the school districts which had increased spending; then what is left over would be distributed to those school districts with poverty-related children.

Our amendment would not be affected should the Senate adopt the amendment added by the House Education and Labor Committee to include some 250,000 children from families with over $2,000 annual income who are receiving aid-to-dependent-children payments. As a

matter of fact, our proposal would be more beneficial to the States with lower per capita income than the House proposal because only in the more affluent areas are there substantial numbers of families with over $2,000 annual incomes who receive ADC benefits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table which indicates the amount that could be received by each State under this amendment.

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

Distribution of funds under proposed amendment to title I, S. 370

	Estimated total amounts, fiscal year 1967	Estimated basic amounts [1]	Estimated additional amounts [2]
50 States and District of Columbia	$1,399,412,576	$1,035,045,502	$364,367,074
Alabama	39,465,644	31,397,950	8,067,694
Alaska	2,237,338	1,707,842	529,496
Arizona	12,631,270	9,560,000	3,071,270
Arkansas	28,102,209	22,142,767	5,959,442
California	88,028,978	64,129,478	23,899,500
Colorado	11,479,633	8,130,765	3,348,868
Connecticut	,330,450	6,690,300	2,640,150
Delaware	2,923,805	2,128,780	795,025
Florida	42,197,658	29,621,770	1 ,575,888
Georgia	49,401,083	37,240,335	12,160,748
Hawaii	2,898,308	1,980,484	917,824
Idaho	3,478,115	2,352,730	1,125,385
Illinois	58,610,972	42,893,697	15,717,275
Indiana	26,914,108	19,331,480	7,582,628
Iowa	23,024,028	16,633,008	6,391,020
Kansas	14,695,956	10,130,574	4,565,382
Kentucky	37,891,638	30,472,362	7,419,276
Louisiana	51,695,105	39,709,164	11,985,941
Maine	5,750,407	3,710,000	2,040,407
Maryland	19,931,878	14,134,803	5,797,075
Massachusetts	19,351,464	13,252,800	6,098,664
Michigan	45,260,842	33,607,470	11,653,372
Minnesota	27,966,514	20,210,298	7,756,216
Mississippi	37,797,396	31,750,310	6,047,086
Missouri	37,369,036	27,816,224	9,552,812
Montana	5,928,000	4,275,000	1,653,000
50 States and District of Columbia—Continued			
Nebraska	$10,641,828	$7,324,982	$3,316,846
Nevada	1,261,797	895,136	366,661
New Hampshire	2,254,560	1,495,780	758,780
New Jersey	26,646,542	18,998,190	7,648,352
New Mexico	12,041,013	9,024,525	3,016,488
New York	121,581,395	84,214,395	37,367,000
North Carolina	62,557,677	48,800,066	13,757,611
North Dakota	6,880,142	4,919,036	1,961,106
Ohio	49,919,261	36,736,395	13,182,866
Oklahoma	21,018,191	15,427,449	5,590,742
Oregon	10,241,432	7,226,016	3,015,416
Pennsylvania	63,155,432	44,354,682	18,800,750
Rhode Island	4,805,643	3,494,943	1,310,700
South Carolina	34,037,116	27,348,774	6,688,342
South Dakota	8,935,722	6,815,622	2,120,100
Tennessee	41,144,025	32,054,100	9,089,925
Texas	102,890,403	76,546,602	26,343,801
Utah	3,672,463	2,583,636	1,088,827
Vermont	3,183,939	2,009,700	1,174,239
Virginia	42,092,980	31,842,860	10,250,120
Washington	14,431,751	9,986,067	4,445,684
West Virginia	21,139,732	16,954,132	4,185,600
Wisconsin	22,969,036	15,801,300	7,167,736
Wyoming	2,257,411	1,495,523	761,888
District of Columbia	5,291,250	3,685,200	1,606,050

[1] Distribution estimated on the basis of the 5–17 population in families with incomes of less than $2,000 per annum (1959) and 50 percent of the estimated 1964–65 current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance (ADA).

[2] Distribution estimated on the basis of the estimated 5–17 population in families with incomes of $2,000 to $2,999 per annum (1959) and 25 percent of the estimated 1964–65 current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance (ADA).

AMENDMENT OF RULES RELATING TO CLOTURE—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NOS. 54 AND 55)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I submit two amendments, one to Senate Resolution 6 and the other to Senate Resolution 8, which I understand have been reported to the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I ask that the amendments be printed and that they also be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The amendments were ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 54

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MILLER to the resolution (S. Res. 6) to amend the cloture rule of the Senate (rule XXII), by striking lines 23–25 inclusive on page 2 and lines 1–2 inclusive on page 3 of said S. Res. 6 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by three-fifths of the Senators present and voting and also by a majority of the Senators affiliated with each of the two major political parties present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of."

AMENDMENT No. 55

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MILLER to the resolution (S. Res. 8) to amend the cloture rule of the Senate (rule XXII), by striking lines 8–13 inclusive on page 2 of said S. Res. 8 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn and also by a majority of the Senators affiliated with each of the two major political parties present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of."

QUALITY STABILIZATION ACT—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON DESK

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1484, the Quality Stabilization Act which I introduced on March 10, be permitted to remain at the desk until March 24.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have added to S. 309, a bill which has twice before passed the Senate, to establish a Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matter and Materials, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have added as a cosponsor of S. 1232, the so-called Freedom Academy bill, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY].

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and resolution:

Authority of March 4, 1965:

S. 1364. A bill to amend section 4005 of title 39, United States Code, relating to fraudulent, false, or misleading and lottery mail matter, and for other purposes: Mr. FONG.

S. 1377. A bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. MUNDT.

S. 1380. A bill to provide for the control of obnoxious aquatic plants in navigable and allied waters: Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 1382. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 with respect to wages paid for certain types of work pursuant to such act: Mr. THURMOND.

S. 1383. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 with respect to certain political activities thereunder: Mr. THURMOND.

Authority of March 1, 1965:

S. Res. 83. Resolution to create a select committee to study gold production in the United States: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. RANDOLPH.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON CLOSING OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL FACILITIES

Mr. HOLLAND. The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, of which

I am chairman, will meet again on Friday, March 19, in room 1114 in the New Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m., to hear Members of Congress, representatives of organizations, and other interested persons, in regard to the proposals made by the Secretary of Agriculture to eliminate lines of research and to close various agricultural research stations.

The committee has already conducted extensive hearings on each research station and line of research proposed to be eliminated in the announcement of Secretary Freeman of last December 31. The hearing record of 519 pages has been issued in committee print and copies are available at the Committee on Appropriations. Following the further hearings on March 19, the complete hearing record will be reissued in one volume, but I thought it advisable to have the record of the hearings to date made available because of the widespread interest on this subject.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 290 AND S. 291

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, for myself, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that hearings will be held by the subcommittee on S. 290, to protect the integrity of the court and jury functions in criminal cases and S. 291, to effectuate the provisions of the sixth amendment of the U.S. Constitution requiring that defendants in criminal cases be given the right to a speedy trial.

The hearings are scheduled for March 29, at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building, and for March 30, in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit statements pertaining to these measures should communicate with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1446, TO RESERVE CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS FOR A NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce for the information of the Senate that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled a hearing for April 13 and 14 on S. 1446. This is the bill to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System.

This legislation was submitted to the Congress by the executive branch of the Government in a message from the Secretary of the Interior on March 3. In his February 8 message on natural beauty, the President recommended the establishment of a national wild rivers system. He included it as an important part of his effort to protect and preserve the beauty of America, as outlined in his message.

The hearings will begin at 10 a.m. on April 13 in room 3110, New Senate Office Building. This announcement is made for the purpose of giving notice to Members of the Senate and all others who may wish to testify at our hearing.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HAROLD LEVENTHAL TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, March 22, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Harold Leventhal, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. circuit judge, District of Columbia circuit, vice Wilbur K. Miller, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

REVIEW OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE EFFORTS TO REDUCE BARRIERS AND EXPAND BEEF EXPORTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Small Business Committee has been studying ways of expanding exports of U.S. beef and beef products, and I believe a brief summary of our activities is in order at this time.

Since the committee first became interested in this subject in late 1963, a threefold approach has been taken. First, we have sought to identify and analyze the barriers standing in the way of our small and large businessmen seeking to enter this trade. Second, the committee sought to bring the representatives of interested industries and Government agencies together in a cooperative atmosphere conducive to resolving such problems. Third, we hoped to foster among these parties arrangements for broadening American participation in the long-term commercial market possibilities for beef abroad.

As this body is aware, the Small Business Committee has devoted consistent effort over the past 5 years to small business opportunities in international trade. It has been clear that this was a field of golden opportunity for the American business community—during the past 15 years, while our gross national product doubled, world trade almost tripled—from $57 to $154 billion in merchandise alone, exclusive of services. As a result of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the Foreign Credit Insurance Act, the Mobile Trade Fair Act, the creation of an Export Expansion Council and other legislative and administrative action supported by the members of our committee, the United States should be in a position to participate fully in the new surge of world trade which promises to be even greater over the next 15 years.

Yet, as a nation, I do not believe that we have been as export minded as our competitors. It might surprise many people to know that while the United States exports 5½ percent of our gross national product, Great Britain exports 20 percent, Canada exports 31 percent, and Belgium exports 34 percent of their GNP's. It might thus be said that the United States has been in the "minor leagues" of international trade.

Our committee found that this inferior status applied with particular force to beef and beef products. The importance of this commodity was underscored by President Johnson's farm message on February 4, 1965, which pointed out that one-third of all farm income results from the sale of meat animals. Most of our ranchers and farmers, as well as 70 percent of our meatpackers, are small, independent businessmen. Domestically, the beef industry is a small business success story—the United States is the world leader, with approximately 40 percent of total production. In my State, for instance, the cattle industry is a $100 million a year industry, and could reach $200 million yearly by 1970. Alabama ranks 20th in the Nation in the total production of beef cattle with over 1,400,000 head, valued at $150 million. As an exporter of meat, however, we face the fact that the country ranks only 12th.

The committee thus began its research into barriers which might be artificially frustrating this trade. In the area of ocean freight costs we found that rates from the United States to Europe were twice, and more, what they were from meat producing countries in South America to Europe. This was despite the fact that distances from South America to Europe are 2,000 to 3,000 miles longer.

With this background, the committee convened public hearings on ocean freight rate and other possible barriers to beef exports on February 24 and 25. We received testimony from Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman; the Chairman of the Presidential Beef Commission to Europe, Mr. Jay Taylor; and the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, Adm. John Harllee, as well as numerous representatives of the beef, shipping, and other transportation industries.

As one of the immediate results of the hearing, I am pleased to announce today that the American steamship companies and major international conferences—which are associations of steamship lines—servicing Western Europe have initiated rate reductions on beef and beef products. The reductions becoming valid today on the gulf coast complete a series of rate reductions during the past 25 days, which average over 20 percent, and cover most of the categories of beef which move by sea to the European market.

As this is a matter of considerable interest to the beef industry, I will, in the interest of clarity, describe these reductions in some detail.

First. Rates on boxed beef going to Britain were reduced by gulf shipping lines by 13 percent—from $76.25 to $66.50—for the period February 18 until March 31.

Second. Boxed boneless beef destined for the Continent was reduced by two of the major conferences in the North Atlantic by 12 percent—from $75 per ton to $66—and 27 percent—from $96 per ton to $66—effective February 24.

Third. Gulf port rates on boneless, bone-in, and ground beef were cut between 20 and 32 percent—from $76.25 or $94 per ton to $63.75—on March 3, with no termination date.

Fourth. The French-Atlantic conference reduced the rate on hanging, chilled beef by 25 percent—from $190 per ton to $142.50—effective March 4.

Fifth. On March 4, also, the North Atlantic-Continental conference voted similar action on the rates from the United States to Antwerp—a 19-percent reduction—from $180 per ton to $142.50—and from the United States to German ports—21 percent—from $198 per ton to $156.50—effective March 10.

Sixth. Today, March 15, rates from the gulf ports followed suit, being reduced on chilled, hanging beef to all French and German ports by 18 percent—from $190 to $156.50.

As we are aware, it is often necessary in Congress to wait for a considerable period before the effects of a committee inquiry become apparent. In this case, the Senate Small Business Committee is gratified at the timely efforts of our American-flag steamship companies in proposing these reductions and in securing their adoption by the conferences. This has been a responsive and responsible course of action.

The significance of a breakthrough in an export areas such as beef is indicated by the fact that more than one-half of our States border on seacoasts or the seaways, and can benefit directly from increased maritime trade.

For information, I would like to include the following list of the 20 largest U.S. ports, and the current volume of their shipping activity:

Tonnage shipped through 20 major U.S. ports[1]

[Calendar year 1963: Short tons (2,000 pounds)]

	Million tons
Port of New York and New Jersey	154.7
New Orleans, La	79.1
Houston, Tex	55.8
Philadelphia, Pa	46.6
Norfolk, Va	44.1
Baltimore, Md	43.1
Duluth, Minn	41.5
Toledo, Ohio	40.3
Chicago, Ill	37.3
Beaumont, Tex	30.9
Baton Rouge, La	30.2
Detroit, Mich	29.2
Port Arthur, Tex	28.7
Los Angeles, Calif	20.3
Boston, Mass	19.7
Corpus Christi, Tex	19.2
Indiana Harbor, Ind	19.1
Mobile, Ala	19.0
Texas City, Tex	19.0
Portland, Maine	18.7

[1] Source: Waterborne Commerce of the United States, United States Army Corps of Engineers, calendar year 1963.

For ports that stand at the apex of fine river systems, such as New Orleans and Mobile, the future seems especially bright with promise.

As to the value of these cargos, a ton of general cargo in export averages in the neighborhood of $1,000. A ton of beef, for example, is worth about $850. For the quantity of beef needed to supply the present estimated shortage in Europe, 50,000 to 200,000 tons, the total price would be between $45 million and $170 million.

Plainly, movement of 100,000 or 200,000 tons of beef a year would generate a good deal of healthy economic activity and jobs in the fields of shipping, insurance, finance, warehousing, and transportation, as well as in the various segments of the beef and livestock industries.

There is little question that our balance of payments would be favorably affected, particularly to the extent that the U.S. merchant marine becomes the carrier of this commodity.

It is true that the new ocean freight rate reductions now in effect constitute only a first step in this direction. We are constrained to view this step with caution. Some of the reductions are temporary and others are tentative, in the sense that little or no beef cargos have yet moved over these routes. The maritime industry has many cost pressures upon it, and we will have to follow the future course of these new levels very carefully. Whether such reductions are effective must be tested by the impersonal laws of Western European marketplaces—it will be proved ultimately only by whether more U.S. beef is sold in Europe.

Of course, this standard also involves other potential barrier areas such as market development, tariffs, nontariff procedures, regulations, port facilities, which were raised at the hearing. These factors remain to be explored and will be explored. However, I believe that this round of freight rate reductions constitutes a necessary and helpful first step toward fully competitive conditions for the beef industry and for the Nation.

It indicates a recognition by our steamship companies of the benefits to be gained by cooperating with American exporters in developing the profit opportunities presented by export markets.

In the words of John H. Griffith, who represented the 21 companies of the American Steamship Traffic Executives' Committee:

> We believe that considerably more beef can be exported than at present; we also believe that the American steamship industry can be a partner (in this expansion).

In this case, the emphasis is upon beef and beef products moving to Western Europe. However, if this approach proves successful, there might be wider implications.

A glimpse of this potential is indicated by the fact that Western Europe alone contains 366 million people—including 176 million in the increasingly prosperous Common Market. By 1980, this total is expected to grow to 420 million. The per capita consumption of meat in these areas is just about one-half the U.S. figure.

Of course, developing this market, and supplying it with American beef, will not be short or easy work. However, the committee's approach to the task was, I believe, aptly reflected by Commentator Durward Shields in the March issue of Livestock Market Digest. He wrote:

> Now would be the time to do these things, while Europe has a meat shortage. * * * The Government-industry team in an export program of such vast potential requires recognition and mutual helpfulness (as to the respective roles of Government and industry).

Our committee believes that the work will be made shorter and easier, and that the job can be done, with all of U.S. industry and Government working together in this way.

A beginning of the breakthrough has, it would seem, been made. The committee commends all of those whose cooperation and hard work have brought us to this point. We hope that American teamwork will consolidate and advance this breakthrough, and can translate it into a substantial expansion of beef exports in the months ahead.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 8:25 P.M. TONIGHT AND THEN ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in recess until 8:25 p.m. this evening.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. At that time, the Senate will meet, and, in a body, will proceed to the floor of the House of Representatives, where the President will address a joint session of Congress concerning the need for voting legislation. I understand that those in authority would like to have us in the Chamber of the House of the Representatives by 8:40 p.m.

I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the President's statement to the joint session of Congress, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

MINORITY VIEWS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the minority report of the Special Committee on Aging being submitted to the Senate today deserves careful attention.

I submit a summary of some of its recommendations so that all Members of the Congress can be aware of its contents and the desirability of giving serious consideration to its conclusions.

Senators FRANK CARLSON, WINSTON L. PROUTY, GORDON ALLOTT, JACK MILLER, and JAMES B. PEARSON join me as members of the committee responsible for its minority report.

Challenging the trend toward public welfare treatment of senior citizens, the minority report of the Senate Special Committee on Aging proposes an 11-point approach to needs of older Americans.

Emphasizing the importance of income for older persons as the basis for independence and dignity, the minority views recommend that appropriate legislative committees of the Congress give productive consideration to proposals which would amend the Social Security Act so as to—

First. Increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, especially minimums.

Second. Extend OASI benefits to persons past 72 who are not now covered.

Third. Eliminate or liberalize the restriction on how much a social security beneficiary may earn without penalty.

Fourth. Assure adequacy of old-age assistance programs.

Fifth. Increase social security's flexibility by providing for actuarially sound increases in monthly benefits to persons choosing deferment of participation until an age subsequent to 65.

It also urges that rapidly growing private pension plans be given every encouragement.

The minority statement emphasizes the importance of protecting those on fixed incomes from "the erosion of purchasing power which accompanies inflation created by excessive spending and manipulation of the tax structure."

Recognizing special problems encountered by a number of older people, the minority report proposes:

First. Study of changes in elderly housing administration to assure reduced rents envisioned by Congress when it authorized low-interest direct loans.

Second. Simplification of the medical-assistance-for-the-aging program.

Third. Careful evaluation of additional health proposals with emphasis on "values in State administration, private enterprise, and voluntary efforts."

Fourth. Encouragement of States to make full use of Federal assistance available for them to help older people.

Fifth. Immediate steps to help finance adequately the costs of "sheltered care" for those whose infirmities require such service.

The minority statement gives particular attention to dangers in Government-operated programs. It cites specific instances in housing and medical assistance programs of disregard of congressional intent by staff of the Federal executive branch charged with implementing them.

Assignment by the present administration of Health, Education, and Welfare Department responsibilities for aging activities to its Welfare Commissioner is criticized.

The minority statement recommends, further, that the Senate Special Committee on Aging undertake study of older persons' budgetary requirements under varying living situations as a base for public policy development.

TRIBUTE TO DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, SENATE CHAPLAIN

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, many articles are written about Congress, but one of the most gratifying was written by Jack Anderson and appeared in the Sunday newspaper magazine, Parade, issue of March 14.

The article is about our honored and revered Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris and his wife, Helen, and is entitled, "Man of God on Capitol Hill."

Dr. Harris is more than a Chaplain of the U.S. Senate; he is a true friend, a counselor, and is beloved by all.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appear at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

MAN OF GOD ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Though the Bobby Baker affair has left a blot on the Senate, there is one man eager to testify in defense of its Members and morals. For two decades, he has shared their daily lives. No one has a deeper insight into their secret lives.

He is the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the gray, craggy Senate Chaplain, who is worried that sensational headlines have given the public the wrong impression of the Senate. Interviewed by Parade, he knitted his shaggy brows and spoke with deep feeling: "No other group of men has higher ethical standards. I mingle with them. I hear their confidences. They don't deserve most of the attacks made on them."

Though Dr. Harris doesn't deny that there are black sheep in his famous flock, he declares defiantly that the majority give more devoted service, work longer hours, and adhere to higher standards than their constituents.

To to the public, the Chaplain is a dignified, dark-clad figure who opens the Senate session with a daily noontime prayer. But to the 100 members of his unique parish, Dr. Harris is more than a functionary. Into his tiny, cluttered office, the Nation's mighty come to discuss their ethical and spiritual problems.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, after leaving the Senate, wrote the Chaplain: "You have provided a source of strength, courage, and comfort to me for more years than I care to remember. Remember I do, however, and the memory is a fond one that shall never die."

Barry Goldwater recently wrote him: "I think by far the most satisfying experience of my 12 years in the U.S. Senate was the rare opportunity to meet and know you. You were not only brilliant in your presentation of prayer, but you carry out the thoughts in the way you live."

CAMPAIGN ISSUE

The Chaplain's deep-set eyes flashed fire as these treasured letters brought to mind the bombshell that the Very Reverend Francis Sayre, dean of Washington Cathedral, let fly from the pulpit during the recent presidential campaign. The dean declared that the voters had a choice between stupidity and immorality, insinuating that President Johnson lacked moral fiber and that Goldwater lacked depth. Dr. Harris was incensed.

Most Senators have strong spiritual values, says Dr. Harris. They consult him about the propriety of Senate measures. They consider his daily prayers as much a part of the legislative process as the passing of bills. Some not only heed his prayers but read them aloud to their families.

Pointing at random, Dr. Harris scattered his praise over the Senators whose pictures cover the walls of his cubicle. "There," he said, indicating an autographed picture of Alabama Democrat JOHN SPARKMAN, "is a fine and fair man." In quick succession, the Chaplain also called Kansas Republican FRANK CARLSON the salt of the earth, spoke of Virginia Democrat WILLIS ROBERTSON'S strong spiritual undergirding, described Ohio Democrat FRANK LAUSCHE and Wyoming Republican MILWARD SIMPSON as men of strong convictions. He admired Illinois Democrat PAUL DOUGLAS and New Jersey Republican CLIFFORD CASE.

The Chaplain even had a good word for Bobby Baker. Though Dr. Harris expects to be criticized for saying so, he pleaded that the much maligned wheeler-dealer is not as bad as portrayed. "I wrote Bobby a note in the midst of his troubles to let him know I had not lost confidence in him."

British-born Dr. Harris, son of a minister, married Helen Louise Streeter, daughter of a minister, in Brooklyn 50 years ago. Together, they served Methodist congregations in Long Branch, N.J., and New York City. In 1924, they were assigned here to historic Foundry Methodist Church. Dr. Harris was elected Senate Caplain during the Roosevelt years, has served continuously in the post except for 2 years in the late forties, when the late Peter Marshall replaced him.

Great moments in history are routine for Dr. Harris. The most memorable came in late November 1963 when he received a midday call that President Kennedy had been shot. The Chaplain was asked to come to the Capitol immediately. "The place was in an uproar," Dr. Harris recalls. "Senate leaders MIKE MANSFIELD and EVERETT DIRKSEN asked me to offer a prayer. I called upon the Senators to rise for a minute of silence, partly because of the gravity of the tragedy but partly to give me a minute more time to think of something to say."

A LORDLY CEDAR

He selected as the theme a few lines from friend and poet Edwin Markham: "And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down as when a lordly cedar, green with boughs, goes down with a great shout upon the hills, and leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

Like the Senators he serves, Dr. Harris does not hesitate to speak his convictions. Sometimes they find expression even in his prayers. Recently, he sounded a bold warning for the benefit of his friend, the President. Referring to the Great Society, the Chaplain wrote: "A fatal fallacy of so many rose-tinted social schemes is to regard Government as a sort of escalator upon which even the indolent may be carried up to desired levels whether they personally exert themselves or not. Far too many people are perfectly willing just to recline on the moving stairway while they, themselves, do little but enjoy the sensation and the scenery."

Dr. Harris is ready with wit as well as wisdom. The late Vice President Alben Barkley once asked the Chaplain for a story and was given an anecdote about a young minister preaching his first funeral. Flustered, he forgot to invite friends to pass the coffin for a last look, but remembered at the end of the ceremony and blurted: "The congregation can now pass around the bier." Barkley loved that one and told it often.

Humor is only one of the ways the lawmakers reveal themselves to their Chaplain. Few are better equipped to judge their moral integrity. No one has been more eloquent in their defense.

Mr. CARLSON. Every week Dr. Harris writes an article, under the byline "Spires of the Spirit," which appears in the Washington Sunday Star and other newspapers. Last Sunday his article was entitled "Tomorrow Will Be Too Late." It stressed the devoted and dedicated service of the late Peter Howard, who was truly a world leader in the moral rearmament movement.

Dr. Howard's untimely death recently in Lima, Peru, was mourned by millions of citizens in every country on the globe. He was truly a great religious leader.

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

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

TOMORROW WILL BE TOO LATE

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

Last fall, with a message that burned like fire in his bones as a flaming meteor, Peter

Howard, world leader of the moral rearmament movement, swept across America's spiritual skies. From mid-November to mid-December he spoke at 17 universities and colleges, pouring out his message in all parts of the United States and Canada. Long before the end of this itinerary 53 other colleges were clamoring for him to come to their campuses. There came also the urgent call from yeasty South America, "Come over and help us." The decision was to go south. In that crucial valley of decision during these first months of 1965 he has been holding high the blazing torch. Now the almost unbelievable news has stunned millions that Peter Howard's lips are forever silent. Death has claimed him. Under all skies there is lamentation and a sense of unutterable loss because of the sudden passing of this dynamic prophet who was captured by a cause, who was the herald of an idea whose time has come.

This English-born ambassador of the inner life and of the changed individual was truly a citizen of the world. As his still body lay in state in the city hall of Lima, Peru, the window-filtered sunshine flooded the black mahogany casket surrounded by banks of floral tributes. For 13 grief-packed hours, awed crowds passed by. To their country and to the outside world a stirring message was broadcast from a group of students from the university and the high school. In that poignant hour this was the message of these young people: "The world has lost a great man. His message reached the depths of humanity. His light will not go out. It will still shine in his plays, his writings, and in the innumerable lives he changed."

On all the continents Peter Howard, with his burning zeal, became the pattern of manhood at its best. He fought to cure corruption, injustice, bitterness, and oppression. He died in the battle to create a world in which no one suffers hunger, where each has a decent dwelling place and the opportunity for an adequate education. These students of Peru declared in their message to their own country and to the outside world: "The whole history of humanity will be upturned because we of the young generation vow to take on the task of Peter Howard and make it our own." We feel, because of the steeples of faith that this dedicated man reared in all parts of this revolutionary world, that this message should be a megaphone to broadcast some of his exact words. In this spire, he being dead yet speaketh. Hear ye him in his recorded words which he entitled "Tomorrow Will Be Too Late":

"My interest is a revolution involving not just the West, but the world and everybody in it. It will not be accompanied by moral platitudes which are scattered so lavishly at election time. It will not be accomplished by atomic force which, if it spreads and is unleashed, must destroy civilization as we know it on this planet. It will be accomplished by an explosion, a thunderstorm of the human heart, created by men and women who realize that the modernization of man is the great task of our time.

"You cannot change society by beginning with a superstructure. You have to begin with the foundation. The foundation of society and of civilization is men.

"Unless we face the fundamental challenge of our times, unless we decide once and for all that Almighty God and His absolute morality are to reign on this earth, rather than almighty man and his relative amorality, our children's children will certainly be Red and we shall experience a totalitarian tyranny across the earth that will make Hitler's mass butchery look like a picnic in a park.

"There is nobody more reactionary than the individual who wishes to see the world or the country different but is unwilling to change himself.

"Let me tell you what I mean by the ideological battle. I mean a battle to win men—win them, not buy them. I mean a battle which depends not on what we say, but what we do, how we live, and what we live for. This is ideology. A man living such a life breathes, talks, works, fights 24 hours a day to win men to the idea which motivates him. Most of us in the West consider that this is standard operating procedure for a Communist; but if a Christian or a Jew does it we often call him a fanatic or an extremist.

"Without the success of this revolution liberty will be expunged from the annals of history, perhaps for a thousand years. Indeed, man may destroy himself because his moral and spiritual growth failed to match the giant tools of destruction which his intellectual and mental growth have created."

And now the great heart who uttered these words is gone. Greatheart is dead. But

"His name
Shall kindle many a heart to equal flame,
The fire he kindled shall burn on and on,
Till all the darkness of the lands be gone
And all the kingdoms of the earth be won,
And one!
A soul so fiery sweet can never die.
But lives and loves and works through all eternity."

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, at the request of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NO "HEAD TAX ON FOREIGN TRAVEL," PLEASE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is very difficult for me to justify the pronouncements of administration leaders saying to American citizens in substance "Stay home and do not spend any money overseas" at a time when the same administration is proposing to continue sending billions of dollars overseas for economic and military aid for foreign countries. Personally, I cannot arrive at any conclusion that it is wrong for Americans to travel abroad and spend money they have saved for trips overseas for recreational and cultural purposes.

Americans spend on foreign travel more than $1 billion a year more than foreigners spend in this country. The Congress appropriates money to promote tourism in the United States. Railroad and bus lines cooperate by offering special rates for foreign visitors. We simplified visa application forms, but one of the forms infuriated foreigners. It was a requirement that an alien state that he or she was not coming to our country for immoral purposes. This was insulting. Now some dimwit in the State Department, apparently seeking to close the gap on what Americans spend abroad and what foreigners spend here, proposes a direct tax of $100 a trip on Americans leaving our country for a foreign destination. Whether or not Canada, Mexico, and the Bahamas would be excluded, no one knows. I do not take this too seriously. Of all shortsighted, harebrained schemes, this one is fantastically outrageous. Perhaps this is a trial balloon. If so, the person who inflated it should deflate that brain child or brainless child without delay. We should do everything we may properly do to encourage foreigners to visit us. It would be ruinous to us throughout the world were we to restrict travel of our citizens at a time when we are sending Peace Corps representatives the world over, and when more and more Americans are saving money looking forward to vacations in foreign lands. Let us instead ask railroad and bus line officials to favor American vacationers with the same low rates they offer foreigners.

GREAT SOCIETY GOING FOR BROKE?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Columnist Jenkin Lloyd Jones in a recent article referred to Senate Joint Resolution 30, introduced jointly by my colleague, Senator CURTIS, and me, as a "snowball-in-hell bill."

Obviously, Mr. Jones believes our measure to restore fiscal integrity to our Government has less chance of withstanding the heat of the congressional crucible than does the proverbial snowball. He may be right.

I am convinced he is right in his suggestion that "all the talk about a richer and fuller life for the common man" in the Great Society is "meaningless without a high degree of fiscal honesty and integrity."

Mr. Jones' column is a sobering one. It will be of little comfort to the holders of what he calls the "new think" which "has it that the national debt may be ignored, that 'controlled inflation' is necessary to provide maximum employment, and that as long as the gross national product in terms of dollars keeps rising, everything is hunky-dory."

Mr. Jones' column is a challenging one. We are dared to contemplate the time when we approach what he terms the "point of no return":

Things begin to happen fast. Prices rise faster than wages. Investors flee from bonds or demand fantastic interest rates. Common stock prices go into orbit and people rush to buy tangible things like land and jewels. All who lent money in good faith are ruined.

No one suggests, Mr. President, that we are now at such a point of no return. But the signs are ominous. The cost of living index, a reliable barometer of inflation, is at an alltime high. More Americans lost their homes through foreclosures last year than at any time since before World War II. Gold continues to move abroad. Again last year our adverse balance of international payments exceeded $3 billion.

It is not, I repeat, not too late. We in the Congress have it within our power at least to curb the sharp upward trend in Government spending.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, it will be my purpose to do all I can toward this goal.

But it is not enough to reduce the appropriations requests of the agencies.

We must think in fiscal terms when we consider the grandiose schemes of the Great Society.

Else we run the ruinous risk so graphically portrayed by Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the column by Mr. Jones from the Washington Evening Star, entitled "Great Society Going for Broke?"

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I, too, was taken with the Jenkin Lloyd Jones column and wish to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Nebraska.

I commend a close and thoughtful reading of the column to my colleagues and I am delighted that Senator HRUSKA has brought it to our attention.

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

GREAT SOCIETY GOING FOR BROKE?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Can a nation that boasts about its prosperity tolerate endless deficits?

Can a Great Society go bust and remain great? Can it continue to deliver more education, more social services, more pensions, more job security by out-shoveling baloney dollars?

Or is all the talk about a richer and fuller life for the common man meaningless without a high degree of fiscal honesty and integrity?

Last month Senators ROMAN HRUSKA and CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, introduced a snowball-in-hell bill. It calls for a constitutional amendment that would require Congress each year to collect as much money as it appropriates, except in case of war or other dire emergency.

In addition, the Senators want half a billion dollars in collections over expenditures so that it may be applied to the national debt. At the rate of half a billion dollars a year the national debt could be paid off in some 540 years.

This bill will be lucky if it even gets a laugh. The new-think has it that the national debt may be ignored, that "controlled inflation" is necessary to provide maximum employment, and that as long as the gross national product in terms of dollars keeps rising everything is hunky-dory.

There is, fortunately, a brave minority of Congressmen who doubt this. Obviously, they are out of the "main stream," but they stubbornly wonder if the economic laws that have busted every other nation that practiced perpetual deficit financing have been repealed.

In a Senate debate last month on the deepening crisis over the American balance of payments, caused by our continued insistence on spending more abroad than we earn abroad, Senator PETER DOMINICK, of Colorado, called attention to a speech by Prof. Karl Brandt, economist of Stanford University.

Professor Brandt asserted that if we eliminate the last of the gold backing for the dollar, which has been seriously proposed, we will buy a little time, but unless we return to a balanced budget, devaluation of the dollar will be inevitable. He said:

"What is needed is a sober, deadly earnest and courageous weighing of the moral issues that are at stake when inflation moves continually and persistently.

"Inflation is one of the serious social and political diseases of the human economy. Its causes have their roots in human nature. The appetite for substantial benefits without a share in the costs is a human trait which is being exploited by politicians everywhere."

In time of war, man can hardly be blamed for borrowing against his future in an effort to save his skin. But what can we say about a nation borrowing against its future at a time when its political leaders are pointing with pride to unexampled prosperity?

The last American balanced budget occurred in the final fiscal year of the Eisenhower administration—a surplus of $1.2 billion in 1960. Since then the annual deficits have run $3.8 billion, $6.3 billion, $6.2 billion and, last year, $8.2 billion.

Each additional billion adds to the debt service, the amount of money that must be allocated to the interest on Government obligations before a penny can be spent for the operation of the Government, national defense, and additional social services and public works.

Down this line, where do we go? Where has every other country gone that took this road?

An ever-easier money supply, created by an outpouring of public funds unrelated to the ingathering of taxes, creates a boom cycle. Powerful pressure by business and labor joins the overwhelming inclination of politicians to fuel the roaring flames. The cry arises that "deflation," meaning debt reduction or even a balanced budget, would create unemployment and misery.

At the point of no return things begin to happen fast. Prices rise faster than wages. Investors flee from bonds or demand fantastic interest rates. Common stock prices go into orbit and people rush to buy tangible things like land and jewels. All who lent money in good faith are ruined.

Citizens holding Government securities or life insurance policies, and those who depend on fixed pensions and annuities find themselves holding nothing. The Government, unable to finance itself through the sale of low-interest obligations, is forced to resort to seizure and confiscation.

There goes the "Great Society," "the war on poverty," "the New Frontiers." All that's left is the last chapter of borrow, boom and bust.

No promised land will be reached by broken promises. No security is to be achieved by national dishonesty. No man's future is safe in the hands of a political philosophy that is willing to buy today's popularity with tomorrow's agony.

THE 47TH BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite attention to the 47th independence day of Byelorussia. This has just been referred to by the distinguished, Most Reverend Archbishop Vasili of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church in America, with the gracious permission of our Chaplain, Dr. Harris. The archbishop has indeed made an eloquent plea for help to these people who have been held in tyranny and subjection for so many decades.

AMERICA SHOULD SUPPORT THE GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I emphasize that we should give support to the Government of the German Federal Republic which is now engaged in making a very hard decision concerning temporal relations with Israel, under threat of blackmail by the other Arab States, excluding a number of Arab States which are led by President Bourguiba of Tunisia.

What we are all seeking in this area of the world is not a continuance of hate, blackmail, and bellicosity. We are seeking peace. It is symbolic that the nation which has so much on its conscience with respect to the killing of 6 million Jews in World War II should now be seeking diplomatic ties with Israel, a country in which so many Jews sought refuge.

That is a fine thing for peace in the world. We can only hope and pray that the Arab States would also see that this is a fine thing for world peace. But if they do not, there is no reason why the U.S. Government should not let the German Federal Republic Government know that they will have our moral backing and support for the act they are performing. That support should also go to other countries who help to seek peace in the Middle East, instead of the continuance of the dangerous tinderbox situation. In the Middle East we face probably the most dangerous foreign crisis immediately after that of Vietnam.

Mr. President, I urge the President to express to the German Federal Republic the support of the United States in this very serious issue which affects our foreign policy.

FIRST MEETING OF REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, an event unique in American political history occurred Wednesday in Washington, D.C., when the Republican Coordinating Committee held its first meeting. It was unique because the organization includes five former presidential nominees of our party, 5 Governors representing the Republican Governors Association, 5 top officers of the Republican National Committee and the 11 Senate and House Republican leaders. Even more noteworthy was the ability of this group to meet and produce a statement on party policy that has already gained widespread attention in television, radio, and the press, and marks a real step forward for the Republican Party.

It is with pride and pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to include the adopted statement as a part of my remarks and to include the list of coordinating committee members who were in attendance for the meeting.

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

DECLARATION FOR THE REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 10, 1965

PURPOSE

The Republican coordinating committee was created (1) to broaden the advisory base on national party policy; (2) to set up task forces to study and make recommendations for dealing with the problems that confront the people of our Nation; and (3) to stimulate communication among the members of the party and others in developing a common approach to the Nation's problems.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Recent denials to Negro citizens of their basic constitutional right to vote have aroused the conscience of every American. In some areas these rights have been denied by

force and fraud and we are outraged that in the year 1965 these conditions should exist.

For more than 100 years the Republican Party has fought to protect the rights of every minority group and we urge all citizens to join us in this cause. We urgently favor Federal action to assure all citizens of the United States of their constitutional rights without discrimination on account of race or color.

The goal of the Republican Party is that by the 1966 elections every American citizen shall be assured of his constitutional right to vote.

FOREIGN POLICY

Republicans, in their role as the loyal opposition, have consistently advocated, and now support, the administration's announced policy in defending free South Vietnam against Communist aggression. We deplore the disruptive voices of appeasement in the Democratic Party which undercut the President in his conduct of foreign affairs, at a time of national crisis.

The President can always count on Republican support where the administration's foreign policy is firm and decisive on the side of freedom. By the same taken we owe a duty to the Nation to point up those areas where the administration's policy has failed and to offer constructive alternative proposals. Our task force on foreign policy shall have as one of its major objectives the examination of some of the most massive failures in foreign policy in recent American history—the consolidation of the Communist beachhead in Cuba, the expansion of Communist influence and control in Africa and the Near East, the deterioration of the Atlantic Alliance.

America's voice in the world, once strong and clear, now with rare exceptions is mute, indecisive, and inconsistent. It will be the Republican goal to fill this vacuum of international leadership not merely by criticising what we believe is wrong, but by proposing those policies we believe are right.

TASK FORCES

The Republican coordinating committee today established the following task force assignments and requested the Republican National chairman, Dean Burch, and his elected successor as of April 1, Ray Bliss, to appoint the members of the task forces after appropriate consultation with the members of the coordinating committee:

1. On human rights and responsibilities.
2. On the conduct of foreign relations.
3. On the functions of the Federal, State, and local governments.
4. On job opportunity.
5. On Federal fiscal and monetary policies.

Other task force assignments are still in the discussion stage and will be announced.

The committee enthusiastically endorses the statement delivered by President Eisenhower as a guideline for future action. He has suggested basic problems and goals on which Republicans are agreed.

Members present:

LESLIE C. ARENDS, House minority whip.

Ray C. Bliss, vice chairman, Republican National Committee.

CLARENCE J. BROWN, House ranking member of Rules Committee.

Dean Burch, chairman, Republican National Committee.

Thomas E. Dewey, former presidential nominee (1944–48).

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Senate minority leader.

GERALD R. FORD, House minority leader.

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, chairman, Senate Republican policy committee.

Mrs. Patricia Hutar, assistant chairman, Republican National Committee (substituting for vacant vice chairmanship of the Republican National Committee).

THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Senate minority whip.

MELVIN R. LAIRD, chairman, House Republican conference.

John A. Love, Governor of Colorado.

Mrs. Collis P. Moore, vice chairman, Republican National Committee.

THRUSTON B. MORTON, chairman, Republican senatorial campaign committee.

Richard M. Nixon, former presidential nominee (1960).

JOHN J. RHODES, chairman, House Republican policy committee.

Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York.

George W. Romney, Governor of Michigan.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, chairman, Senate Republican conference.

William W. Scranton, Governor of Pennsylvania.

BOB WILSON, chairman, Republican congressional campaign committee.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, from his winter home in Palm Desert, Calif., telephoned his fellow members of the coordinating committee the following message which was received with warm applause from those present:

Good morning to you, my friends on the newly created Republican coordinating committee. I regret that I cannot be with you but I am complimented by the invitation from your chairman to greet you briefly by telephone.

I congratulate the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership and Dean Burch for initiating this effort to widen participation in the formulation of party policy and programs. We all understand that the party's current record is made by our Members of Congress and by Republican officials at other echelons, but I think it is a healthy and progressive step to bring into the consultative process those who have been honored with the party's presidential nomination, those who represent the Republican Governors Association, and those who serve as the principal officers of the Republican National Committee. Possibly you may later decide to add a few others.

In such a body will be reflected the courage, the dedication, the self-reliance and the initiative of the millions of loyal citizens who make up the United States of America.

Second, I applaud the proposal to set up task forces on great public questions so that our party can benefit from the advice and recommendations of those who are especially knowledgeable in the complex field in which modern government must participate.

Life today commands our attention on many fronts. So the Republican coordinating committee, if it is to do its job, must address itself to those problems which are the proper concern of government.

Foremost among these are the fields of foreign operation and national defense. Here our Government is in fact dealing with the world's safety. It is an awesome task and one in which a minimum of partisanship should be injected.

Of course, we, as Republicans—and in a minority position in government—have no direct part in policymaking in international relations. But that does not excuse us from responsibility for representing sound views in the matter, nor should it.

I know the coordinating committee intends, as one of its first moves, to establish a task force on foreign policy. For the time is certainly ripe for a maximum of constructive thought on the difficulties we encounter in the world. I hope that the finest minds available can participate in this effort.

The entire complex of American objectives, of strategy, and the continued enlistment of free nations in the cause of peace needs reexamination. In this area we have a real opportunity to make a constructive, stimulating, and influential contribution to public knowledge and thinking.

On the domestic scene, we are witnessing a great increase in Federal assumption of the functions of State and local governments. Apparently there is a belief in Washington that every problem affecting our society requires Federal funds and Federal supervision to attack it effectively.

Local problems of every description—training police, kindergarten attendance, sewage disposal, junked automobiles, zoning, and even payment of apartment rents, to name a mere fraction of such problems—are to come under the watchful Federal eye. Each item of course will require Federal funds and additional Federal bureaucrats. Just why a bureau in Washington will know better how to solve a local problem than those who live with it is not explained. Indeed, just what is going to happen to our traditional Federal, State, and local relationship is not even discussed.

But the Democratic Party has apparently adopted the doctrine that the role of the Federal Government—and its costs—are unlimited and without boundaries. If such theories are to prevail, then the entire concept of a limited Federal establishment—acting only where the State and local government cannot—is about to vanish. With such a result will go the freedom, the initiative, and ingenuity of the American people, the very qualities that our Constitution seeks to preserve and strengthen.

As one who believes that the citizen's commonsense, personal responsibility, and freedom of action are the backbone of our national greatness, I think the whole question needs the most penetrating review. To do this another task force is unquestionably needed.

Another matter of the utmost importance is that of avoiding deterioration in the value of our currency and of maintaining respect for the dollar abroad. Here again a task force of competence can do much to help us fight inflation, clarify our thinking, and help the Nation.

Clearly, we have much to explore, much to do, and every reason, as a great political party, to undertake these tasks promptly and energetically. We must make an effective beginning now. I have every confidence we will do so. I share your conviction that our party must have an ever-increasing influence on the future of our country. The importance of our role will be measured by the intensity of our dedication and effort. Today we begin anew with full adherence to our principles and with complete devotion to the greatest society ever established—the America of our Founding Fathers.

NINETY-NINE PERCENT OF AMERICANS WANT THEIR CHILDREN TO GO TO COLLEGE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with hearings beginning tomorrow on the higher education bill, I would like to call attention to a very timely article appearing in this morning's Washington Post. While we all know that going to college is very important to Americans and that it is becoming more important every year, the Harris Survey has attempted to measure this importance in statistical terms. They report that 99 percent of all parents with children 18 years old or younger want to see them go to college. Moreover, 82 percent say it is "extremely important" for their children to get there.

These are facts to remember as we open hearings on a bill to provide university extension, continuing education, college library assistance, library training and research, student assistance, and support for developing institutions.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the March 15, 1965, Washington Post entitled "College Training Held Vital Today," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COLLEGE TRAINING HELD VITAL TODAY

(By Louis Harris)

If the dreams of most American families are realized, the current explosion in college enrollments is only a bubble compared to what is coming in the future. Today, 99 percent of all parents with children 18 years old or younger want to see them go to college. What is more, 82 percent say it is "extremely important" for their children to get there.

The impact such dreams may have on higher educational institutions becomes clear in one statistic. In 1963, when American colleges were crowded with almost 4.5 million students, only 40.4 percent of all youngsters of college age were enrolled in school.

An in-depth survey of a cross section of parents of precollege children reveals that college is now looked on in the same way people once viewed a high school education. A basic part of the new American creed is that a young person will not be able to find a good job without a college degree.

Typical of the views people now express about college was the sweeping statement of the wife of a lawyer in Bloomington, Ind.: "A college education has now become the very foundation for life."

But three out of four people are even more specific about the economic benefits of going to college. A mother in Jim Thorpe, Pa., said: "My kids will have a feeling of job security all their lives from that diploma. No diploma and no security; it's as simple as that." A civil servant in Sudbury, Mass., added, "There just won't be any kind of decent job in 10 years without that college degree. There's no sense denying it."

Such answers emerged in overwhelming volume when parents were asked why they feel that a college education is important for their children:

Why college is important

	Total parents (percent)
To get a job, 74 percent:	
Can't get any kind of job without it	69
Machines replacing unskilled labor	5
Noneconomic benefits, 23 percent:	
Way to get ahead socially	7
Makes for better society	5
College now same as high school used to be	4
To develop full potential	3
Broadening, improves thinking	3
I suffered for not going	1
College not important, 2 percent:	
College not for everyone	1
Not so much for girls	1
Not sure, 1 percent.	

The career motivation is fortified by the growing realization that machines are eliminating jobs once filled by unskilled labor. A 38-year-old flood control maintenance man in Brea, Calif., put it this way: "There's getting to be too many people and too many machines in this world and not enough jobs. Only good jobs will be left. College will get them for you."

Accompanying the job advantages are powerful overtones that going to college can be a vehicle for improving one's social standing. Parents who are college graduates particularly point out these social benefits. But only a minority of people talk about the ways in which a college education can stimulate and develop a young person's intellect.

Parents, of course, are the older generation, and most of them feel that they have learned the value of an education the hard way. Fully 75 percent say they wish they had gone further in their own education. Easily the top loss people feel they have suffered from not having a better education is economic and parents are bound and determined not to see their children make the same mistakes.

High on the list of major mistakes is not having gone further in school to prepare for a better job:

What missed most in education

	Total parents (percent)
Chance to prepare for good job, 83 percent:	
Never got trained for good job	54
Wanted to be professional	13
Wanted to learn skill	9
Wanted to be a teacher	5
Wanted to be a nurse	2
Nonjob benefits, 17 percent:	
Can't understand what people talk about	6
Could have helped my children more	4
More basic knowledge and culture	3
How to express myself	2
Learn self-confidence	2

UNITED BUSINESS SCHOOLS ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during the hearings on the cold war GI bill, Mr. Harry E. Ryan, president of the New Kensington Commercial School, and a member of the board of directors of the United Business Schools Association, testified before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs.

The cold war GIs are the most educationally discriminated against of all the veterans of our generation. The greatest educational need facing all Congress is for a cold war GI bill.

It is important to remember that of the veterans who utilized the World War II GI bill, only 29 percent used it for college training, and only 51 percent of those who used the Korean GI bill. This statistic reveals the importance of vocational, high school, and training other than college for our veteran population.

The United Business Schools Association represents almost 500 independent business schools and colleges in this country who have played an important and major part in the complex educational programs of our Nation. It is through the contributions of these schools that countless thousands have been better educated and have become productive citizens.

Because of the emphasis which Mr. Ryan's testimony places on this part of our educational needs, I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY HARRY E. RYAN, PRESIDENT, NEW KENSINGTON COMMERCIAL SCHOOL, NEW KENSINGTON, PA., TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, U.S. SENATE, CONCURRING S. 9, COLD WAR GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Harry E. Ryan. I am president of New Kensington Commercial School of New Kensington, Pa., which is accredited as a 2-year school of business by the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools.

By way of background, I also serve as a member of the board of directors of United Business Schools Association which is the one educational association in which nearly 500 of the quality independent business schools and colleges of the Nation hold membership. The roots of UBSA go back more than 50 years to 1912. However, many member institutions have been in existence for more than 100 years.

For nearly 20 years I have been associated with business education including the training of veterans under programs subsequent to World War II and the Korean war. I hold memberships in the Pennsylvania Society of Public Accountants and the National Association of Accountants. I have also served two terms as President of the Pennsylvania Association of Private Business Schools.

It is a privilege to appear before you today and express our support for the continuation of a program of veterans education along the lines of the successful Korean GI bill. The position of the United Business Schools Association is the result of association committee analysis, consideration by our board of directors and discussion at past conventions. This, of course, refers not only to S. 9 but also to S. 5 of the 88th Congress; S. 349 of the 87th Congress and similar measures introduced in the 86th Congress.

IMPORTANT GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the development of the position of the United Business Schools Association on S. 9, we believe that the following general considerations are entitled to great weight as they are considered by your committee:

1. Conditions today are such that thousands of young men are required by the compulsory draft law to serve on active duty in the Armed Forces for a specific period of time. If there should be any question in the mind as to safety and lack of risk in the military service today, we need only to mention Vietnam, Berlin, Congo, Formosa, Korea, Greenland, and numerous satellite areas and other hot spots in the world. These serve as reminders that we must maintain a constant state of preparedness and must continue to expose our servicemen to the hazards of potentially explosive military incidents. Following this active duty, these young people are further compelled to perform additional services in the Active Reserve and later, the Standby Reserve. Their total obligation, once entered upon active duty, generally extends for 6 years.

If these cold war conditions were not present, the majority of these men would not be entering military service but would be pursuing their own individual goals in civilian life. At the present time our Federal Government does not offer these young people any help in coping with the problems created for them by the cold war and their compulsory military service. They need the help of this legislation to catch up with those contemporaries who were not asked to serve in the Armed Forces.

2. Educational assistance to these young people is only fair based upon the student deferment policy. Many students were deferred due to the Government's recognition of the importance of education and it is inconsistent to deny educational benefits to those who have already served. If education is considered important enough to warrant deferment, by the same token, it is of comparable importance to justify postservice educational assistance.

It is also true that the student deferment policy placed college education in a highly preferred status. Persons who wish to pursue trade or other postsecondary education are not generally eligible for student deferment under selective service regulations. Students attending our private business schools or colleges are not eligible for deferment, as a general rule, under these regulations. Our goals as a nation require that our young people obtain as much advance training as possible, college or otherwise, and therefore educational assistance is desirable.

3. The relatively low educational attainment of veterans affected by this bill shows clearly the need for this legislation. A Veterans' Administration survey dated May 29, 1959, states:

"At the time of their separation from the Armed Forces, 6 percent had not completed elementary school; 10 percent had completed elementary school but had had no further schooling; 29 percent had had some high school education but had not graduated; 35 percent had graduated from high school but had had no college training; 8 percent had completed 1, 2, or 3 years of college work; and 12 percent had completed 4 or more years of college."

The final report of the Bradley commission concluded that the interruption of education of post-Korean veterans would be their main handicap. They stated:

"The commission recognized that the main handicap which may be incurred by the peacetime ex-serviceman, other than service-connected disabilities elsewhere discussed is the effect that a period of 2 year's mandatory service at an early age may have upon education. At the age of entrance into military service, schooling is the occupation of many, and military service will delay some young men from advancing their formal education and will perhaps cause some to drop their plans forever because marriage and other pursuits may interfere with their return to school or college."

4. An educational assistance bill will provide America with professional, technical and vocational skills that otherwise might be irreplacably lost. Our present critical shortages in certain essential occupations would be even more catastrophic except for the passage of the previous GI bills.

5. We have already recognized GI bills in the past; namely, in the World War II GI bill and the Korean GI bill, and the need to furnish our servicemen with opportunities to overcome in part the years lost from civilian life and to establish themselves in productive and useful occupations. In a press release issued on June 22, 1954, the 10th anniversary of the World War II bill, the Veterans' Administration stated:

"Through the GI bill, the World War II veterans have become the best educated group of people in the history of the United States.

"Because of their training they have raised their income level to the point where they now are paying an extra billion dollars a year in income taxes to Uncle Sam. At this rate, GI bill trained veterans alone will pay off the entire $15 billion cost of the GI education and training program within the next 15 years."

This means that the educational assistance given to the young servicemen will be self-liquidating. The Federal Government will be paid back the cost of the education through increased taxes on higher earnings resulting from the students' education. Therefore, ultimately the investment the Government makes in educational assistance will be completely repaid.

6. Actual hostilities in Korea ceased on July 27, 1953. The Korean conflict, for the purposes of educational assistance, was officially terminated by Presidential declaration of January 31, 1955. This arbitrary date cut off many men who are entitled to these educational benefits equally with those who were in service prior to January 31, 1955. It would not be fair to exclude these men from educational benefits as a result of this arbitrary cutoff date.

This is only a brief summary of some of the major considerations which we feel are important to your committee. There are undoubtedly many other considerations which we have overlooked but it is apparent that there is a need for this legislation now.

WICHITA, KANS., NEWSPAPER ENDORSES GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, few things please a Texan more than to have the natural beauty of his State praised by residents of other areas. An area of beauty in Texas that is currently drawing much praise and recognition is the Guadalupe Mountain Range in far western Texas. This unique area has been recommended for national park status by the Department of the Interior and President Johnson, and the merit of this proposal is becoming widely recognized.

As author of the pending bill, S. 295, that would create this national park, I am very pleased to see a fine description and endorsement of the plan appearing in the press of Wichita, Kans., where it is suggested that many Kansans will enjoy a visit to this magnificent area when the park is established. I ask unanimous consent that the article titled "Park Would Add to Enjoyment of Visitors to Carlsbad Area," by Bob Tonsing, Sr., travel editor of the Wichita, Kans., Eagle and Beacon Sunday magazine, published February 21, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle and Beacon, Feb. 21, 1965]

PARK WOULD ADD TO ENJOYMENT OF VISITORS TO CARLSBAD AREA

(By Bob Tonsing, Sr.)

Carlsbad Caverns National Park, usually rated as New Mexico's greatest tourist attraction, for many years has been a magnet for Kansas honeymooners, Boy Scout troops, chamber of commerce good will groups, and the numerous clan-labeled tourists. Less than 700 miles from Wichita by good highways, it can be visited on a hurried weekend auto trip.

Most persons, however, prefer a more leisurely experience, with time to wander off the main routes into scenic localities. Many families now use camping vehicles, haul trailers, or carry tents and sleeping bags. These find that a major drawback of the Carlsbad region is lack of suitable facilities in the desert terrain.

A solution seems near. About 25 miles from the caverns' entrance, as a plane flies—some 55 by road—is an area that seems desolate, yet possesses a beauty and tranquillity that satisfies the needs of nerve-jarred city dwellers. The southern extremity of the Guadalupe Range juts from New Mexico into Texas. It comes to an abrupt end in El Capitan, an 8,200-feet-high, sheer-faced mountain that has served as a landmark for travelers since the days of Coronado. It towers above Kansas traveling on U.S. 62–180 to El Paso.

Just north of El Capitan is Guadalupe Peak, rising to 8,751 feet above sea level—the highest point in Texas.

This part of the seemingly barren range has a pine-covered, rolling highland slashed by deep canyons. One of the most beautiful is McKittrick Canyon, with an area of some 6,000 acres. It is part of a region totaling 71,790 acres which may be the Nation's next national park.

Nearly all of it now belongs to J. C. Hunter, Jr., of Abilene, Tex., a businessman with a lifelong interest in conservation. He operates the Guadalupe Mountain Ranch on land which his father acquired. The son has added considerably to the original holdings.

Recently this writer and some 30 others from over the Nation visited Hunter's mountain home on a State-sponsored tour of west Texas. He told the group that he has had several tempting offers from developers wanting to subdivide the area for commercial purposes, but has rejected them. He believes that regions of outstanding natural beauty should be saved in their primitive state for enjoyment of the American people. It belongs to them, Hunter said, even though he holds title to the land.

"How can anyone consider himself owner of this magnificent land, when these mountains have been here for several million years, and I'll be lucky to be here for 70?"

To carry out this purpose, Representative JOE POOL, of Texas, is introducing a bill this session which would establish the Guadalupe National Park. He submitted such a proposal last session, but it did not reach the floor for action. Before offering the measure, Representative POOL asked for an investigation of the region by the Interior Department to assess its possibilities as a national park.

After the study's completion, Interior Secretary Stewart Udall urged Congress to pass the bill with these comments:

"The area set aside for the park contains a combination of scenic and scientific attributes that qualify it as an outstanding addition to the national park system. It contains the most diversified and beautiful scenery in Texas, some of the most beautiful landscape in the entire southwestern part of the United States, and its Permian marine limestone mountains contain the most extensive and significant fossil reefs in the world."

His final phrase refers to the Guadalupe Mountains exposure of the famous Capitan barrier reef, formed in the millions of years when central North America was a shallow sea. The same geological period resulted in the vast Carlsbad Caverns.

The travel writers' jaunts along foot trails of McKittrick Canyon and an all-day horseback ride up narrow paths to a lush basin atop the range confirmed Udall's description of the area. The visitors found trees varying from scrub juniper to towering Douglas-fir, ponderosa and limber pine aspen and maple.

Texas' only trout stream ripples 4 miles down the canyon, then disappears underground. The State's lone herd of wild elk—now numbering more than 200 head—and a flock of wild turkeys are a part of the ranch's carefully protected and highly varied animal life.

McKittricks' temperatures in summer range well below those of the nearby desert, and its situation on the southeast slope pro-

tects from winter winds. Snowfall is infrequent.

Not much is known of the region's history, but some studies indicate human occupancy at least 6,000 years ago. Mescalero Apaches lived in the area when white men first arrived, and Spanish conquistadores referred to it in their writings. The Indians were little disturbed until 1849, when the U.S. Army sent in an exploring party. White men and Indians both used El Capitan as a signal peak.

The famed Butterfield Overland Stage route, reaching the area in 1858, crossed the range at McKittrick Canyon.

Wallace E. Pratt in 1959 gave 6,000 acres of McKittrick Canyon to the National Park Service and suggested that it obtain title to the rest if the public ever was to benefit from its scenic and educational values. He suggested a mountain highway—similar to Skyline Drive in Shenandoah National Park—that he said "could be built along the crest of the Guadalupes, starting at the present terminus of the mountain highway at Carlsbad Caverns, continuing to the southwest to the ridges above McKittrick on Guadalupe Peak, then descending 4,000 feet to El Paso Gap."

Whether or not this dream can come true, Federal and State agencies are cooperating in a study of scenic highway development to provide access to outdoor recreational resources.

Only congressional approval of Representative POOL'S bill is necessary to start road work that will open Guadalupe's unseen wonders to the Nation's travelers and supplement the drawing power of neighboring Carlsbad Caverns. It has been estimated that a new national park in the Guadalupe area has a potential of 900,000 visitors a year. And Kansas is counted on to supply a strong percentage of that number.

CONGRESSMAN HENRY B. GONZALEZ CALLS FOR TIGHTER CONTROL ON FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, no matter is of more vital concern to the economy of my State than the oil import control program. No matter is more important than revising the present oil import control program to allow domestic oil producers a reasonable share in the growth of the domestic market. The present program is not working; our domestic industry is still declining. In a recent 4-year period, over 25,000 Texans lost their jobs in the oil industry, because Texas producers are not allowed a fairer share of the domestic market.

It does not make sense, in a period when we are desperately worried about our balance-of-payments problem, to continue to be such a large importer of unneeded foreign oil. If an administrative remedy is not forthcoming, Congress must take action to further protect our national security and domestic economy by reducing the foreign oil flood.

In hearings before Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall last week, many persons outlined this need with great vigor, but none more persuasively than the very able Congressman from the 20th Congressional District of Texas, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, of San Antonio. Congressman GONZALEZ can always be found standing up for the public interest and the needs of his constituents, and his testimony in favor of more positive oil import controls is convincing indeed. I ask unanimous consent that the complete statement presented by Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ at the Department of the Interior oil import hearings on March 11, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS SHOULD BE FROZEN

(By HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Member of Congress)

Mr. Chairman, first I want to express my gratitude for being given the opportunity to testify today.

Second, in view of the crowded schedule and the many distinguished persons who are due to testify at this hearing, I would like to come right to the point. As an American and an elected official from the State of Texas, I feel I would be negligent if I did not voice my views on foreign oil imports and their effects on the domestic industry, particularly in my home State.

In 1950, oil imports constituted 13 percent of total U.S. consumption. Today, imports supply more than 20 percent of consumption. Further, and even more indicative of the stagnant domestic industry, the expansion in domestic demand is being taken up each year one-third by increased imports, one-third by activity in the southern Louisiana offshore and onshore area, and the remaining one-third is being shared inequitably by the same companies that do the importing and the rest of the industry. A stagnant industry is an unhealthy industry. The symptoms are reduced activity, reduced profits, reduced jobs. These are the symptoms easily seen in the national and the Texas petroleum industry.

It is not enough to say that "It is only natural that oil should figure strongly in any consideration of national security." That is understating the case. Seventy-five percent of the total energy consumed by the United States is produced by oil and gas. We are not simply an incidental user of oil and gas. We are an habitual user, an addict, if you will. Cut us off from our normal supply and we would go into national withdrawal symptoms that would quickly produce a national crisis.

Yet, through the mandatory oil import control program we are following a policy that will lead us one day to be totally dependent on foreign imports for our oil needs. For the vicious cycle of increased imports, reduced domestic activity, increased imports, has already set in. This cycle, if we continue to encourage it through the import quota system, will eventually lead to the complete decay of the domestic petroleum industry and to our dependence on foreign sources of oil.

For this Nation to become dependent on foreign oil imports for its energy needs would be as safe and sane a policy as for us to depend on any army mercenaries for our defense needs. Oil does not merely figure strongly in any consideration of national security. It figures preeminently.

I have spoken with a number of persons representing all elements of the petroleum industry, as well as persons outside of the industry but deeply concerned with it. Most of then will admit, privately at least, that the present program of mandatory import quotas should not continue. In fact, I do not believe any person familiar with the operation of the program can fail to see its shortcomings. The reason is simple. No program based on an unsound and unfair premise can succeed or continue to operate without becoming disruptive in an area as important and vital as the petroleum industry. The present program is both unsound and unfair. Its effect has been to enrich a few at the expense of the many in the oil and gas industry. Even such a harsh result might be tolerable if done for reasons of efficiency, economy, progress, and the national welfare. But none of these ends are being served by the mandatory import quotas and the arbitrary manner by which these quotas are allocated.

The cold and hard facts are that under the mandatory import quota program oil and gas producing activity in the United States has steadily declined and conditions have deteriorated for the domestic industry as a whole. One cannot examine the statistical evidence of this without becoming alarmed. According to figures that appeared in the December 1964 issue of the Independent Petroleum Monthly, using 1957–59 as the base period, and summarizing the trends for the year 1963, a decrease in activity is noted in every key area:

	Percent
Geophysical activity was down	32.9
Active rotary rigs were down	29.7
Exploratory wells were down	17.8
Total wells were down	16.5
Crude oil found was down	25.0
Total oil found was down	11.9
Employment was down	12.1
Crude oil price was down	3.7

It is no wonder then, that in a speech given to the American Petroleum Institute on November 11, 1964, Assistant Secretary of the Interior John M. Kelly said: "It is clear to me that the rate of exploratory activity must be increased unless this Nation is to run grave risks from the standpoint of the security of its petroleum supplies."

It serves no useful or constructive purpose to gloss over the truth about the oil import program, to minimize its weaknesses or to exaggerate its strong points. It would be shortsighted, for example, to ignore the part played by the oil trade in our foreign relations. But it is myopic to stress this role of oil imports beyond its actual significance, or to dismiss the danger of becoming dependent on foreign oil on the grounds that most of it originates in this hemisphere.

The Department of the Interior's recent appraisal of the petroleum industry in the United States places some emphasis on the fact that 97 percent of U.S. oil imports originate in the Western Hemisphere. I find this sort of explanation or palliation to the fact that imports have soared from 1.8 million barrels per day in 1959 when the mandatory program went into effect to 2.3 million barrels per day in 1964, totally unsatisfactory.

It is true that of the 2.3 million barrels per day imported in 1963, 1.32 million barrels per day came from Venezuela and 175,000 barrels per day came from other South American sources, and that only 300,000 barrels per day came from the Middle East. But first let us reverse these figures momentarily. I think it is safe to say that if these figures and percentages were reversed, and 97 percent of our oil imports were coming from the Middle East, there would be immediate cause for alarm, a clear and present danger, you might say, that in light of recent history a significant portion of our oil supply could be cut off quickly, without notice, and indefinitely. This, of course, is what happened to Europe during the 1956 Suez crisis

In other words, our present sense of security in connection with our foreign imports stems in large measure from the fact that most of these imports are coming from Venezuela and other South American countries. This is a false sense of security.

Now, no one in Congress is more concerned and interested in the stability of the countries in South America, their progress and prosperity, and our relations with them, than I am. I have been a consistent supporter of the Alliance for Progress and of the goal of better United States-Latin American relations. But helping a nation stabilize its one-crop economy, or an economy almost totally dependent on the export of one commodity, by importing its product is one thing. Making ourselves dependent on the

import of this product is another. To view Venezuela or any South American country as our private gas pump on the Caribbean is wrong and ignores political reality.

I do not advocate cutting off or even cutting back our oil imports from Venezuela. I do propose to look at the facts as the facts, however. The United States cannot afford to allow the trend of higher and higher imports to continue.

My point is that for us to rely on foreign oil imports is dangerous to our national security, and that danger exists whether the country of origin is in the Eastern Hemisphere or the Western Hemisphere.

OIL IMPORTS AND THEIR IMPACT ON TEXAS

Texas, of course, is the leading oil-producing State. The stereotyped Texas oil tycoon, wildcatting his way to fame and fortune, is practically a folk hero in our culture. It may be comforting and pleasant to think of the Texas oilman as some sort of combination Clark Gable-Spencer Tracy and to impute his virility to the Texas oil industry. The truth is that if the national domestic industry is wobbly and staggering, and it is, then the Texas industry is already bedridden.

Since the mandatory program began, Texas oil producers have been unable to share equitably in the domestic demand increase. This has cost them 449 million barrels in crude production and a monetary loss of $1.3 billion. This combined with the decline in Texas crude prices has caused a loss in State tax revenues of $112.9 million.

Texas independents are producing less crude oil today than in 1959. At the same time the 13 integrated companies operating in the State have increased their share of the State's crude output both in terms of percentage of production and absolute numbers. They have gone from 48.8 percent of the State's production in 1959 to 54.3 percent in 1964. From 474.2 millions of barrels to 538.4 millions of barrels. In the same period the rest of the Texas industry has gone from 497.8 million barrels to 453.5 million.

This is a sad picture, one that should concern everyone and particularly those in Federal Government, and one that cannot be whitewashed. The Texas picture reflects the national picture. Everyone knows that the independent oil producers historically have been the backbone of the oil and gas industry. They have done the exploratory work and they have found and developed most of American oil.

The decline of the Texas industry is demonstrated by the following figures comparing 1959 and 1963:

Texas well completions have dropped from 19,386 to 16,298.

Texas wildcats have dropped from 4,101 to 3,623.

Texas oil completions have dropped from 11,411 to 8,586.

Texas active rotary rigs have dropped from 784 to 474.

Texas oil reserves have declined by approximately 300 million barrels.

Texas employment in the oil and gas industry has dropped by 25,900.

Twenty-five thousand nine hundred Texans formerly working in the petroleum industry have had to go elsewhere for employment. Earlier I quoted figures showing a decline nationwide of employment in the petroleum industry of 12.1 percent.

In my first year as a U.S. Congressman, I joined the fight to end the bracero program. The similarities between the mandatory oil import quota program and the bracero program are, to me, striking. The bracero program, which Congress finally eliminated last year, was both unfair and harmful to our economy. Specifically, we were importing foreign manpower through a semifeudal system. The effect was not only to depress the wage market in the United States but also to deprive American citizens of jobs. The program was being supported and perpetuated by a relative handful of powerful importers who were causing 10,000 Americans to remain unemployed.

The foreign oil import program is as unjustified, unwarranted, unhealthy, and unhappy as was the foreign worker import program, with the additional factor of the danger to national security that the present program represents.

H.R. 2977: THE DEMOCRATIC INDUSTRIES ACT OF 1965

I introduced H.R. 2977 on January 18, 1965 for the purpose of offering an alternative program to the present mandatory oil import quotas. Briefly, the bill calls for a freeze of the present overall import level until domestic production has been able to share in some of the domestic market growth and for a bidding system to allocate future imports.

I am particularly gratified that several distinguished persons who have already testified at this hearing have endorsed a freeze-bidding plan to replace the present program. It is also pleasing to know that the Texas Legislature has also endorsed such a plan. Copies of the Texas resolutions endorsing this plan were introduced in the record of these proceedings by Gov. John Connally yesterday. I intend to make a series of speeches to the House of Representatives on this subject in the near future and to continue to urge my colleagues to consider my proposals contained in H.R. 2977.

Actually, the changes I am calling for can be brought about with an Executive order and without legislation. The Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1958 contains ample authority for the adoption by Executive order of my proposed program. In fact, the legislative history of this clause shows that Congress intended to empower President Eisenhower to use a quota-bidding procedure. So there is nothing new about quota bidding except that it has not been invoked. By the way, revenues that would go into the Department of the Treasury as the proceeds from the bidding would approximate $400 million each year, conservatively estimated.

The freezing of overall import levels would represent a radical departure from previous practices in the sense that the steady growth of oil imports would be halted for the first time in many years. But this is a departure that would be warranted by the present dangerous situation and the growing tendency to become more and more dependent on foreign oil.

The Department of the Interior should by its very nature be the champion of the full and proper use and development of our natural resources including gas and oil. It is my hope that the Department will take immediate action to halt the further deterioration of the domestic industry, without which our oil and gas resources cannot be fully developed, and without which our national security is endangered.

Thank you very much.

INTERNATIONAL DeMOLAY WEEK

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the week of March 14 through 21, 1965, has been designated as International DeMolay Week. During this period of time, members of the Order of DeMolay will engage in activities designed to bring the story of DeMolay and its aims and achievements before the public.

I take this occasion to congratulate the Order of DeMolay and especially the DeMolays of Arkansas upon their many worthwhile activities. This organization helps young men to become better citizens, while at the same time engaging in projects which are useful to their community and State.

We in Arkansas are proud of the fact that Arkansas placed first last year in the International DeMolay Week contest.

Gov. Orval E. Faubus has proclaimed the week of March 14–21, 1965, as Arkansas DeMolay Week, and I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's proclamation be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

PROCLAMATION OF 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 14-21, 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.

_____, *Governor.*

THE NAMESAKE OF THE ORDER

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it was 651 years ago on March 18 that Jacques DeMolay, the last grand master of the medieval Knights Templar, died as a martyr to truth and fidelity, but today the ideals for which he gave his life are being perpetuated by young men the world over who are members of the Order of DeMolay.

Nearly 9 million youths that have been inducted into the order since its founding have added new luster and meaning to DeMolay's name by dedicating themselves, as he did, to the virtues of reverence, loyalty, and chivalry.

Jacques DeMolay has provided a historic heritage for the youth organization. In the 14th century as the Knights Templar grew in might, prestige, and wealth, and the popularity of the crusades declined, the order incurred the jealousy and enmity of Phillip the Fair, King of France.

Phillip ordered the arrest of DeMolay and the other Templars and had their properties and riches confiscated. Failing through torture to get DeMolay to reveal the identity of other leaders and the location of supposedly hidden treasures, Phillip had him burned at the stake

in Paris when DeMolay refused to denounce the order.

Proving that fate sometimes has a hand in many things, some 605 years later, on the anniversary of the death of DeMolay, nine Kansas City, Mo., boys met in the office of Frank S. Land, urging him on in his idea of forming a new youth group. The young boys liked the idea of organizing a club that would give them the inspiration and guidance that no other organization offered.

As they discussed their desires and needs, it was mentioned that a name must be selected. Whereupon, the boys asked Mr. Land to recite some names that would be in keeping with their ideals.

When Mr. Land mentioned DeMolay and who he was, the name was like magic to the boys. They like the sound of it and what it stood for, and they immediately clamored for its adoption. Mr. Land, being prudent and thoughtful, suggested that they think it over for a few days along with all the other names mentioned.

A few days later, the enthusiasm for the name DeMolay was still apparent in each boy, and thus it was that the new youth group was named the Order of DeMolay.

Little did this beginning nucleus know that their organization would soon spread like wildlife throughout the world. It now numbers nearly 3 million active and senior DeMolays and more than 2,500 chapters operate in the United States, its territories, and foreign countries.

This week, the Order of DeMolay is observing its 46th birthday, and we can be thankful that such a fine youth organization is teaching the young men of our country to adopt traits of character in their formative years of manhood that will remain with them and sustain them in the paths of right for the rest of their lives.

Many of the organization's senior DeMolays are found high in the ranks of leadership, serving as fellow Senators, Congressmen, Cabinet members, Governors, generals, and business leaders in general.

The age bracket for belonging to the Order of DeMolay is 14 to 21 years, with those passing 21 becoming senior DeMolays. The order is open to any boy who meets the conditions of being a normal, upright young citizen.

Activities of the Order of DeMolay range in scope from athletic endeavors to conducting traffic safety campaigns, church services, and performing charitable and community service projects.

At the altar of DeMolay, members promise among other things to be better sons, better men, better citizens.

It is with humble and modest pride that DeMolay members can point to the thousands of leaders today in all walks of life who started up the ladder of success in a DeMolay chapter room.

We, the Government leaders of the United States, can also point with pride to this record of achievement by the Order of DeMolay, and we say "Happy birthday, DeMolay"—may you continue to mold the character of our young men to an even greater degree in the future than you have in the past.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND CONGRATULATING SENATOR PELL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the future of the railroads in the economy of our great east coast is of paramount concern to this thickly populated area where so much of our industry, finance, and Government is concentrated.

This has been most evident in the hearings that our Commerce Committee has been holding on New England problems of transportation—hearings of which I have been privileged to be chairman.

The railroad problems are both immediate and long range. There is little purpose in salvaging the present without a blueprint of restoring the railroad to a level of competitive transportation service. It must match rival transit systems in speed, comfort, and cost.

Attention has been focused on the Boston to Washington corridor by the ideas and urging of my colleague, Senator PELL.

The vision of Senator PELL has been reinforced by diligent research and supported by detailed suggestions. They have been important enough to enlist the interest of the White House.

That the interest is not superficial is indicated by the allocation of Federal funds to make the deeper study that Senator PELL's idea warrants.

You may be certain that our State government in Rhode Island is appreciative of this national consideration achieved by Senator PELL. Indeed, the Rhode Island General Assembly has passed formal resolutions of congratulation to my colleague.

I am proud to add my own plaudits to Senator PELL and to ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

Resolution extending congratulations to Senator PELL for his championship of high-speed rail service in the Boston to Washington corridor, and to President Johnson for including in his budget funds to research the project

Whereas Senator CLAIBORNE PELL has long been interested in the problem of surface transportation; and

Whereas this interest has been intensely focused on high-speed rail service in the Boston to Washington corridor; and

Whereas President Johnson has recognized the need to encourage long-overdue improvement in surface transportation, and particularly in the northeast corridor of the Nation, by including in his budget $20 million to fund research and demonstrations of high-speed rail service, in this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations extends hearty congratulations to Senator PELL for his championship of high-speed rail service in the Boston to Washington corridor; and to President Johnson for including in his budget necessary funds to research the project; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to Senator PELL and President Johnson.

Attest:

AUGUST P. LA FRANCE,
Secretary of State.

OKLAHOMA SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a serious situation has developed in the Wheat Belt of this country. The Great Plains area has for many decades been the breadbasket of the Nation, producing more wheat and milling more flour than any other area.

As a result of recent wheat rate reductions made by the railroads, without a corresponding reduction in flour rates, many of the flour mills located in the Great Plains area are faced with elimination or relocation, which would disrupt the economy of the areas affected.

The Oklahoma State Legislature has taken cognizance of this problem and on February 24 adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 23. The resolution suggests a possible solution to the problem.

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

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES IN REGARD TO LEGISLATION PERTAINING TO NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

Whereas a strong, efficient transportation system is essential to the well-being and defense of our Nation; and the economic stability and growth of the Nation is threatened unless satisfactory, long-range solutions to problems of competition and rates can be found; and

Whereas regulation of freight rates by all carriers engaged in commercial transportation is necessary to protect the public interest; and it is a matter of national transportation policy that all shippers should be protected from unfair rate discrimination, place discrimination, and size discrimination; and

Whereas it is desirable and practical to limit the application of the agricultural commodity exemptions and provide the producer the unrestricted right to haul his own products to market; and

Whereas to meet nonregulated competition, regulated carriers have disrupted and deviated from the historical wheat-flour rate parity and it is further proposed to deregulate rail rates on agricultural commodities—all of which is unjustifiable and discriminatory in its effects on industry in Oklahoma and the entire Great Plains area; and

Whereas it is recognized and attention is directed to the extreme importance of the wheat-flour milling industry to the Oklahoma economy and as a preferred market for Oklahoma wheat producers, providing a desirable market for a substantial part of the wheat grown in Oklahoma each year; and

Whereas it is evident that a discriminatory differential in wheat and flour rates threatens the Great Plains area with the loss

and relocation of the flour milling industry and associated industries as well; and such changes would be disruptive of a simplified rate structure adapted to the best interests of producers, consumers, railroads, and millers; and

Whereas the Governor of Oklahoma has recognized the threat to industry in Oklahoma and the Great Plains area and has joined with the Governors of the other 10 States comprising the Great Plains to promote rate parity on grain and grain products, prevent the effects of deregulation which would be detrimental to industry in the wheat growing area of our Nation, and preserve the flour milling industry in Oklahoma: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Oklahoma Legislature (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That we respectfully submit that the effects of deregulation of commodity traffic and the chaos which would result from this action would cause a serious dislocation of industry from the Great Plains area and irreparable harm to the economy of our Nation; and that we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for fair and equitable regulation of all modes of commercial transportation and provide the Interstate Commerce Commission with the greater authority needed for full enforcement; and that such legislation should provide for the protection of the interests of the primary producer.

SEC. 2. That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit an authenticated copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce of the United States, the chairman of the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the chairman of the Committee on Commerce in the Senate of the United States, the Governors of Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, Missouri, Kansas, and Texas, and to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the senate the 24th day of February, 1965.

BOYD COWDEN,
Acting President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 2d day of March 1965.

J. D. MCCARTY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

BASIL R. WILSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I concur with my honored colleague the senior Senator from Oklahoma, in pointing up the seriousness of the situation, as outlined in the joint resolution which he has just presented as passed by the Oklahoma Legislature.

The imbalance in the ratio between rates charged on the transportation of wheat, as compared to flour, is a serious threat to the continuing operation of the milling industry in the Midwest. The milling industry, one of the oldest industries in the Midwest, is in jeopardy due to the recent freight rate reduction on wheat by the railroads, without a comparable reduction in rates on flour.

This imbalance of rates is causing many of the mills located in the center of the Nation's breadbasket to close down, or relocate closer to the market.

The loss of this milling industry threatens the economy of the entire Midwest.

I would, therefore, like to urge the careful study of this situation by the milling industry, the railroads, the regulatory agency, and the appropriate Senate committee, in order that a solution might be reached which would best benefit all those involved.

PROPOSED FOREIGN AID LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader. I have waited until the time used during the morning hour was taken advantage of by Senators who wished to speak, because I wished to speak for 10 minutes in regard to the introduction of a major bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President. I speak from my desk today in regard to the parliamentary strategy being followed by the administration and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in connection with the handling of foreign aid legislation this year.

For the first time since the beginning of foreign aid, we find ourselves in the parliamentary situation that the administration sends up its major message on foreign aid, but it does not contain what the American people are entitled to receive from the President—namely, his recommendation as to the legislative form to be used in carrying out his recommendations.

I am disappointed that the President has not seen fit to do so, because it goes along with the responsibilities of executive leadership. In order to evaluate the alternatives, the American people are entitled to know how the President believes foreign aid should be handled legislatively. Heretofore, major foreign aid bills have been recommended by the administration, leaving it to Congress to exercise its right of check in modifying bills, or separating them, if it sees fit.

In the past, we have always had the administration bill. This year, we do not have an official administration bill. We have an interesting set of hybrids, which I will explain in a moment.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], announced some weeks ago that if an omnibus bill were sent to Congress, he would not handle it on the floor of the Senate. That is his privilege and right. However, the handling of foreign aid legislation should not be determined for the American people by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Congress has the responsibility to determine in what format it should be handled.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee introduced what is known as the Fulbright bill, limited entirely to economic aid, separating it entirely from military aid. The administration is responding by testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee on the Fulbright bill only.

There was no meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee, held by the chairman of the committee, for a decision as to what procedure should be followed. That is within the right and the prerogative of the chairman, if he wishes to follow it. This morning, I said to him in the committee that I thoroughly disapproved of having the chairman drop the Fulbright foreign aid bill into the legislative hopper, and then proceed to schedule hearings on it without at least discussing in committee what the procedure should be in respect to the issue: Should military aid in foreign aid be separated by having the Committee on Foreign Relations handle the economic aid part, and having the Armed Services Committee of the Senate handle the military aid part?

This raises a fundamental question that I would have the American people keep in mind; namely, that foreign aid of any substance in any country determines American foreign policy. The Secretary of Defense has, in effect, become the Secretary of State in too many areas of the world, including especially certain underdeveloped countries.

The senior Senator from Oregon believes that this is more than a matter of procedure. This is a matter of substance, and I publicly express my complete disapproval of the way President Johnson has handled foreign aid procedurally this year. I ask him publicly from my desk today: "Mr. President, do you wish foreign aid in an omnibus bill, or do you wish foreign aid in a series of bills, one on economic aid and one on military aid?"

I believe that the President is going to discover that there are millions of people in this country who recognize that this question does not raise merely a procedural issue but fundamental, substantive issues.

The strategy of the administration seems to be that it knows foreign aid is in trouble, it knows there is shocking waste and inefficiency involving hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in the administering of foreign aid, and it knows full well that the Comptroller General—in report after report of a confidential nature to the Congress—has found many inefficiencies. The weaknesses in foreign aid are findings which cannot stand public analysis and discussion.

Therefore, I ask the President: "Why do you not lift the top secret label from the reports of the Comptroller General?" Why conceal from the American people the facts they are entitled to know about the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars in the administration of foreign aid?

Why, Mr. President, can we not stop this march down the highway toward a government of ever-increasing execu-

tive power which is naught but a way of saying "government by concealment"?

In this session of Congress, an interesting parliamentary strategy is being followed by the President in connection with foreign aid. The executive branch offers to make its drafting services available to Congress. Heretofore, the drafting service has been rendered to the President of the United States, and after his experts and advisers in the various departments of Government connected with foreign aid had reached their policy consensus, the President then sent up a bill.

What we are seeing this year is a buck-passing performance. In times of great crisis in this country, we should stop brushing responsibilities under the rug, we should stop passing the buck under the separation of powers doctrine. The American people have a right to say to President Johnson: "What do you recommend?" The executive branch should stand up to it and tell the American people what the President will recommend—either an omnibus bill or a series of separate bills.

Of course, as a part of the strategy to get separate bills, I am satisfied that the policymakers downtown believe they will get more if they administer a series of "doses" of foreign aid, rather than to present a total bill, as has been done in the past, calling it an omnibus bill and having hearings on the entire subject matter.

In my judgment, from the standpoint of foreign policy, President Johnson cannot justify the separation of economic aid from military aid. We are entitled to look at the totality of the package in a single record made in years gone by.

I, for one, do not believe in subordinating the Department of State at any time to the Department of Defense. Although it is said that the Secretary of State has the power to veto recommendations of the Pentagon, subject to the approval of the President, in practice the Secretary of State has delegated that authority to underlings in the State Department concerned with foreign aid.

Thus, Mr. President, I do not intend to sit by and not give Congress a bill on which it can at least consider both military aid and economic aid in the Foreign Relations Committee.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning I asked Mr. Bell in committee if they intended to testify in connection with the Fulbright bill in regard to military aid.

Since military aid is not involved in the Fulbright bill, they said they did not intend to testify unless they were requested by the committee to testify.

Then I raised a procedural point in committee. I have great respect for the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I said, "Mr. Chairman, I am very much disappointed that before we got started with these hearings you did not hold a meeting on procedure, to decide what our procedure was to be in the handling of foreign aid legislation this year."

He said he had no objection to that, if I wanted to ask for such a meeting.

I said, "I should not have to ask for it. I do ask for it."

I am assured that such a meeting will be scheduled later this week.

Mr. President, I said the administration offered to Congress the drafting service of its experts downtown. They sent up, not with the recommendation that they be introduced, but merely sent up, three drafts, one an omnibus bill, one an economic aid bill, and a bill limited to military aid.

We have here an interesting combination in the form of the Fulbright bill, which is a modification of the proposed draft of the experts of the administration on economic aid. We also have a modification of the omnibus bill introduced in the House, under the leadership of the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

The bills constitute, in their totality, an interesting procedure.

I now ask unanimous consent that there may be published, at the close of my remarks, the two drafts on economic aid and on military aid, prepared by the drafting experts of the administration, and sent to Congress, but without the recommendation of the White House, that any one of the three bills be introduced.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, also the Fulbright bill and the bill that has been introduced in the House and has become known as the Morgan bill.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now introduce, in my behalf, the third bill of the so-called drafting experts of the White House. It is their omnibus bill combining all regular forms of aid in one bill. I ask that it be appropriately referred. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1524) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1524

An Act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes

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

PART I—ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

SEC. 101. Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is designated "Economic Assistance".

Chapter 1—Policy

SEC. 102. Section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the statement of policy, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend the tenth paragraph by striking out "this Act" and substituting "this part".

(b) Amend the thirteenth paragraph by inserting after the second full sentence thereof the following:

"Congress further urges that the United States and other free world nations place an increasing portion of their assistance programs on a multilateral basis and that the United States continue its efforts to improve coordination among programs of assistance carried out on a bilateral basis by free-world nations".

Chapter 2—Development assistance

Title I—Development Loan Fund

SEC. 103. Title I of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the development loan fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 201(c), which relates to general authority, by striking out "section 610" and "section 614(a)" and substituting "section 510" and "section 514(a)", respectively.

(b) Amend section 202(a), which relates to authorization, by striking out "601, and 602" and substituting "501, and 502".

(c) Amend section 205, relating to the use of the facilities of the International Development Association, by striking out "section 619" and substituting "section 519".

Title II—Technical Cooperation and Development Grants

SEC. 104. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 212, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$215,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$210,000,000", respectively.

(b) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is hereby repealed effective July 1, 1966.

(2) Amend subsection (c) by striking out "1965, $18,000,000" and substituting "1966, $7,000,000".

Title III—Investment Guaranties

SEC. 105. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) Amend the introductory clause to read as follows: "The President may issue guaranties to eligible United States investors—".

(2) In paragraph (1) strike out "$2,500,000,000" and substitute "$5,000,000,000".

(3) Amend paragraph (2) as follows:

(A) In the first proviso, strike out ", and no such guaranty in the case of a loan shall exceed $25,000,000 and no other such guaranty shall exceed $10,000,000".

(B) In the fourth proviso, strike out "1966" and substitute "1967".

(b) Amend section 221(c), which relates to general authority, by inserting after the word "guaranty" the third time it appears, the words "of an equity investment".

(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by inserting after "(exclusive of informational media guaranties)," the words "and to pay the costs of investigating and adjusting (including costs of arbitration) claims under such guaranties,".

(d) Amend section 223, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "and" at the end thereof and in subsection (b), strike out the period and substitute "; and".

(2) Add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) the term 'eligible United States investors' means United States citizens, or corporations, partnerships or other associations created under the laws of the United States or any State or territory and substantially beneficially owned by United States citizens, as well as foreign corporations, partnerships or other associations wholly-owned by one or more such United States citizens, corporations, partnerships or other associations: *Provided*, That the eligibility of a foreign corporation shall be determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the United States owners."

(e) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, to read as follows:

"SEC. 224. HOUSING PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES—(a) It is the sense of Congress that in order to stimulate private home ownership and assist in the development of stable economies in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating pilot housing projects, the development of institutions engaged in Alliance for Progress programs, with particular emphasis on cooperatives, free labor unions, savings and loan and other institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, the construction of homes for lower income persons and families, the increased mobilization of savings and the improvement of housing conditions in Latin America.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the President is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as he shall determine, to eligible United States investors as defined in section 223 assuring against loss of loan investments made by such investors in—

"(1) pilot or demonstration private housing projects in Latin America of types similar to those insured by the Federal Housing Administration and suitable for conditions in Latin America;

"(2) credit institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, such as savings and loan institutions;

"(3) housing projects in Latin America for lower income families and persons, which projects shall be constructed in accordance with maximum unit costs established by the President for families and persons whose incomes meet the limitations prescribed by the President;

"(4) housing projects in Latin America which will promote the development of institutions important to the success of the Alliance for Progress, such as free labor unions and cooperatives; or

"(5) housing projects in Latin America 25 per centum or more of the aggregate of the mortgage financing for which is made available from sources within Latin America and has not derived from sources outside Latin America, which projects shall, to the maximum extent practicable, have a unit cost of not more than $6,500.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $350,000,000: *Provided*, That the total face amount of guaranties issued under subsection (b)(1) outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $250,000,000: *Provided further*, That no payment may be made under this section for any loss arising out of fraud or misconduct for which the investor is responsible: *Provided further*, That this authority shall continue until June 30, 1967."

Title VI—Alliance for Progress

SEC. 106. Title VI of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 251, which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) In subsection (c), strike out "section 614(a)" and "section 610" and substitute "section 514(a)" and "section 510", respectively.

(2) In subsection (d), strike out "this Act" and substitute "this part".

(3) In subsection (f), strike out "section 601(b)(4) of this Act" and substitute "section 501(b)(4) of this part".

(4) In subsection (g), strike out "this Act" and substitute "this part".

(b) Amend section 252, which relates to authorization, as follows:

(1) In the first sentence, strike out all after the words "until expended" and substitute the following: ": *Provided*, That any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropriated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such subsequent fiscal year. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section, except for not to exceed $100,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1963 and 1964 and $85,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in each such fiscal year, shall be available only for loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars."

(2) In the third sentence, strike out "601, and 602" and substitute "501, and 502".

Chapter 3—International organizations and programs

SEC. 107. Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend the first sentence by striking out "1965" and "$134,272,400" and substituting "1966" and "$155,455,000", respectively.

(b) Strike out the second sentence.

Chapter 4—Supporting assistance

SEC. 108. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out "1965" and "$405,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$369,200,000", respectively.

Chapter 5—Contingency fund

SEC. 109. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(1) Strike out "1965" and "$150,000,000" and substitute "1966" and "$50,000,000", respectively.

(2) Add the following new sentence:

"In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in Vietnam such sums as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized by parts I and II of this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to such programs if he determines such use to be important to the national interest: *Provided*, That the President shall present to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives the programs to be carried out from funds requested by the President to be appropriated under authority of this sentence.

(b) Amend subsection (b) by striking out "this section" and substituting "the first sentence of subsection (a)".

Chapter 7—General, administrative and miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 110. Part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is redesignated chapter 7 of part I, "General, Administrative and Miscellaneous Provisions".

Title I—General Provisions

SEC. 111. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is redesignated title I of chapter 7 of part I and is amended as follows:

(a) Redesignate section 601, which relates to encouragement of free enterprise and private participation, as section 501 and strike out "this Act" wherever it appears in subsections (a), (b) and (d) and the first and last times it appears in subsection (c) and substitute "this part".

(b) Redesignate section 602, which relates to small business, as section 502 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(B) In the introductory clause, strike out ", defense articles," and "(including defense services)".

(C) In paragraphs (2) and (3), strike out ", articles,".

(2) Strike out subsection (c).

(c) Redesignate section 603, which relates to shipping on United States vessels, as section 503 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "and defense articles".

(2) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(d) Redesignate section 604, which relates to procurement, as section 504 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) Amend subsection (d) as follows:

(A) In the introductory clause, after "assistance" insert "under this part".

(B) In the proviso, strike out "hereunder" and substitute "under this part".

(e) Redesignate section 605, which relates to retention and use of items, as section 505, and amend said section as follows:

(1) In the section heading, insert "and Refunds" after "Items".

(2) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(3) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) In the first sentence, strike out "and defense articles".

(B) In the second and third sentences, strike out "or defense articles" wherever it appears.

(4) Add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Funds realized as a result of any failure of a transaction financed under authority of this part to conform to the requirements of this part, or to applicable rules and regulations of the United States Government, or to the terms of any agreement or contract entered into under authority of this part, shall revert to the respective appropriations, fund, or account used to finance such transaction or to the appropriation, fund or account currently available for the same general purpose."

(f) Redesignate sections 606 and 607, which relate respectively to patents and tech-

nical information and the furnishing of services and commodities, as sections 506 and 507, respectively, and amend said sections by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears and substituting "this part".

(g) Redesignate section 608, which relates to advance acquisition of property, as section 508, and amend said section by striking out "section 607" wherever it appears and substituting "section 507".

(h) Redesignate section 609, which relates to the special account, as section 509.

(i) Redesignate section 610, which relates to transfer between accounts, as section 510 and amend subsection (b) of said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "510, and 614" and substitute "514, 804(a) and 902".

(2) Strike out "sections 636(g)(1) and 637" and substitute "section 536 and 925 (a) (1) and (2)".

(j) Redesignate sections 611, 612 and 613, which relate respectively to completion of plans and cost estimates, use of foreign currencies and accounting, valuation and reporting of foreign currencies, as sections 511, 512 and 513, respectively, and in redesignated section 512 redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(k) Redesignate section 614, which relates to special authorities, as section 514 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) Strike out "this Act" the first and third time it appears and substitute "this part".

(B) Strike out "and the furnishing of assistance under section 510 in a total amount not to exceed $250,000,000".

(C) Strike out the last sentence and substitute the following:

"Not more than $250,000,000 may be used under authority of this subsection and section 902(a) of this Act in any one fiscal year and not more than $50,000,000 of the funds made available under this subsection and section 902(a) may be allocated to any one country in any fiscal year."

(2) Amend subsection (c) as follows:

(A) Strike out "this Act" and substitute "this part".

(B) Strike out "amounts not to exceed $50,000,000 of the" and insert after "amounts" the following: ": *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000,000 may be used under authority of this subsection and section 902(c) of this Act."

(l) Redesignate section 615, which relates to contract authority, as section 515 and amend said section by striking out "this Act" and substituting "this part".

(m) Redesignate sections 616 and 617, which relate respectively to the availability of funds and termination of assistance, as sections 516 and 517, respectively, and amend said sections by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears and substituting "this part".

(n) Redesignate sections 618 and 619, which relate respectively to the use of settlement receipts and assistance to newly independent countries, as sections 518 and 519, respectively.

(o) Redesignate section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba and certain other countries, as section 520 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears, except in subsection (d), and substitute "this part".

(2) In subsection (e)(1) (the introductory clause), after "under this" insert "part".

(3) In subsection (h), after "foreign aid" insert "under this part".

(4) In subsection (i), after "under this" wherever it appears insert "part".

(5) In subsection (m), strike out "(1)" and all after "1963".

Title II—Administrative Provisions

SEC. 112. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is redesignated title II of chapter 7 of part I and is amended as follows:

(a) Redesignate section 621, which relates to exercise of functions, as section 521 and amend said section by striking out "this Act" whenever it appears and substituting "this part".

(b) Redesignate section 622, which relates to coordination with foreign policy, as section 522 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "military assistance" and "economic" and substitute "economic assistance" and "military", respectively.

(3) Amend subsection (c) as follows:

(A) Strike out "a military assistance" and substitute "an economic assistance".

(B) After "abroad" insert "with programs of military assistance and sales".

(c) Section 623, which relates to the Secretary of Defense, is repealed.

(d) Redesignate section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as section 523 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "paragraph (3) of" and "of the officers provided for in paragraphs (1) and (2) of that subsection", and substitute for the latter "of one or more of said officers".

(2) Subsection (c) is repealed and subsection (d) is redesignated subsection (c).

(3) Amend redesignated subsection (c) as follows:

(A) Strike out "Public Law 86–735" wherever it appears and substitute "the Latin American Development Act, as amended".

(B) Amend paragraph (7) as follows:

(i) Strike out "this Act" the second time it appears and substitute "this part".

(ii) In the first full sentence following the proviso, strike out "section 614(a) of this Act and the provisions of section 634(c)" and substitute "sections 514(a) and 902(a) of this Act and the provisions of sections 533(c) and 926(c)".

(e) Redesignate section 625, which relates to the employment of personnel, as section 524 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) Redesignate subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i) and (j) as (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) and (i), respectively.

(3) In redesignated subsection (c) (introductory clause), strike out "outside the United States" and in paragraph (2) strike out all after "prescribe".

(4) In redesignated subsection (d), strike out "(d)" and substitute "(c)".

(5) In redesignated subsection (e), strike out "agencies" the second time it appears and substitute "agency", and strike out "part I or part II of".

(f) Redesignate sections 626, 627 and 628, relating respectively to experts, consultants and retired officers, detail of personnel to foreign governments, detail of personnel to international organizations, as sections 525, 526, and 527, respectively, and amend said sections by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears and substituting "this part".

(g) Redesignate section 629, which relates to status of personnel detailed, as section 528 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) In subsection (a), strike out "section 627 or 628" and substitute "section 526 or 527".

(3) In subsection (b), strike out "section 627, 628, 631 or 624(d)" and substitute "section 523(c), 526, 527 or 530".

(h) Redesignate section 630, which relates to terms of detail or assignment, as section 529 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) In the introductory clause, strike out "section 627 or 628" and substitute "section 526 or 527".

(3) In paragraph (2), after "travel expenses," insert "benefits".

(4) In paragraph (4), after "travel expenses," insert "benefits" and strike out "section 629" and substitute "section 528".

(i) Redesignate section 631, which relates to missions and staffs abroad, as section 530 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "section 625(d)" and substitute "section 524(c)".

(j) Redesignate section 632, which relates to allocation and reimbursement among agencies, as section 531 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) In subsection (a), strike out ", defense articles," and "(including defense services)".

(3) In subsection (b), strike out "(including defense services)" and "and defense articles".

(4) Subsection (d) is repealed and subsections (e), (f), and (g) are redesignated (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

(5) In redesignated subsection (d), strike out "defense articles," and "(including defense services),".

(6) In redesignated subsection (f), strike out "section 637(a)" and substitute "section 536(a)".

(k) Redesignate section 633, which relates to waivers of certain laws, as section 532 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) Subsection (b) is repealed and subsection (c) redesignated subsection (b).

(l) Redesignate section 634, which relates to reports and information, as section 533 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) In subsection (d), strike out "section 303, 610, 614(a) or 614(b)" and substitute "section 303, 510, 514(a) or 514(b)".

(m) Redesignate section 635, which relates to general authorities, as section 534 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) Amend subsection (h) to read as follows:

"(h) A contract or agreement which entails commitments for the expenditure of funds available under titles II and V of chapter 2 of part I and available under title VI of said chapter, to the extent such contract or agreement relates to funds not required to be made available on a dollar repayable loan basis, may, subject to any future action of the Congress, extend at any time for not more than five years."

(3) Add the following new subsection (1):

"(1) The President, when he finds it to be in the interest of the United States, is authorized to sell buildings and grounds in foreign countries acquired in connection with carrying out activities under this part, and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the proceeds of such sale may be applied toward the purchase and construction, furnishing, improvement, and preservation of other properties or held for such later use: *Provided, however*, That the President shall report all such transactions annually to the Congress with the Budget estimates of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I."

(n) Redesignate section 636, which relates to provisions on uses of funds, as section 535 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) In the introductory clause, strike out "(except for part II)".

(B) In paragraph (2), strike out "section 626" and substitute "section 525".

(C) In paragraph (5), strike out "section 631" and substitute "section 530".

(3) In subsections (c) and (d), strike out "of part I" wherever it appears.

(4) In subsection (e), strike out "of part I" and "section 625(d)(2)" and substitute for the latter "section 524(c)(2)".

(5) Amend subsection (f) as follows:

(A) Strike out "section 637(a)" and substitute "section 536(a)".

(B) Strike out "Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes" and substitute "Latin American Development Act".

(6) Subsection (g) is hereby repealed and subsection (h) redesignated subsection (g).

(o) Redesignate section 637, which relates to administrative expenses, as section 536 and amend subsection (a) of said section by striking out "1965" and "$52,500,000" and substituting "1966" and "$55,240,000", respectively.

(p) Redesignate section 638, which relates to peace corps assistance, as section 537 and amend said section by striking out all beginning with "; or famine".

(q) Add the following new section 538:

"SEC. 538. "FAMINE AND DISASTER RELIEF.— No provision of this Act shall be construed to prohibit assistance to any country for famine or disaster relief."

Title III—Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 113. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to miscellaneous provisions, is redesignated title III of chapter 7 of part I and is amended as follows:

(a) Redesignate section 641, which relates to effective date and identification of programs, as section 541.

(b) Redesignate section 642, which relates to statutes repealed, as section 542 and amend subsection (a)(2) of said section by striking out "143," and all beginning with "*: Provided,*".

(c) Redesignate section 643, which relates to savings provisions, as section 543 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" wherever it appears and substitute "this part".

(2) Strike out "section 642(a)" wherever it appears and substitute "section 542(a)".

(d) Redesignate section 644, which relates to definitions, as section 544 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In the introductory clause, strike out "this Act" and substitute "this part".

(2) Subsections (b), (d), (e), (f), (g), (i) and (m) are repealed and subsections (c), (h), (j), (k) and (l) are redesignated subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

(e) Redesignate section 645, which relates to unexpended balances, as section 545 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "this Act" and substitute "this part".

(2) Strike out "Public Law 86–735" and substitute "the Latin American Development Act".

(f) Redesignate sections 646, 647 and 648, which relate respectively to construction, dependable fuel supply and special authorization for use of foreign currencies, as sections 546, 547 and 548, respectively; amend redesignated section 546 by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears and substituting "this part"; and amend redesignated section 548 by inserting "part" after "under this".

PART II—MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND SALES

SEC. 201. Part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is designated "Military Assistance and Sales" and is amended by striking out all of said part and substituting the following:

Chapter 1—Objectives and definitions

SEC. 600. OBJECTIVES.—It is the policy of the United States to assist friendly countries in their individual and collective self-defense efforts by making it possible for them to acquire defense articles, services, and training. This policy is based upon the principles of effective self-help and mutual aid. It is the sense of Congress that grants of defense articles should not be made to any country having sufficient resources to enable it to maintain and equip its own military forces at adequate strength without undue burden to its economy.

The Congress recognizes that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered so long as the Soviet Union and Communist China and their allies continue by threat of military action by use of economic pressure, and by internal subversion or other means, to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent, and continue to deny the rights of freedom and self-government to peoples and countries once free but now subject to such domination.

It continues to be the intention of the United States to seek to achieve international peace and security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations so that armed force shall not be used except for individual and collective self-defense.

The Congress reaffirms its belief in the importance of regional organizations of free people for mutual assistance, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Organization of American States, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the Central Treaty Organization, and others, and expresses its hope that such organizations may be strengthened and broadened, and their programs of self-help and mutual cooperation may be made more effective in the protection of the independence and security of free peoples, in the development of their economic and social well-being, and the safeguarding of their basic rights and liberties. The Congress welcomes, in particular, steps which have been taken to integrate and coordinate procurement, research, development, production, and logistics support of defense articles by the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

It is the sense of the Congress that an important contribution toward peace would be made by the establishment of earmarked military units under the Organization of American States for peacekeeping missions in the Western Hemisphere. Similar units in other areas should be encouraged where appropriate.

In enacting this part, it is therefore the intention of Congress to promote the peace of the world and the security, foreign policy, and general welfare of the United States by fostering an improved climate of political independence and individual liberty, improving the ability of friendly countries and international organizations to deter or if necessary defeat Communist or Communist supported aggression, facilitating arrangements for individual and collective security, assisting friendly countries to maintain internal security, and creating an environment of security and stability in developing friendly countries through civic action and other programs essential to their more rapid social, economic, and political progress. The Congress urges that all other countries able to contribute join in the common undertaking to meet these goals.

SEC. 601. DEFINITIONS.—As used in this part—

(a) "Armed Forces" of the United States means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

(b) "Defense article" includes any—

(1) weapon, weapons system, munition, aircraft, vessel, boat, or other implement of war;

(2) property, installation, commodity, material, equipment, supply, or goods used for the purposes of this part;

(3) machinery, facility, tool, material, supply, or other item necessary for the manufacture, production, processing, repair, servicing, storage, construction, transportation, operation, or use of any article listed in this subsection; and

(4) component or part of any article listed in this subsection; but shall not include merchant vessels or, as defined by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; as amended (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), source material, byproduct material, special nuclear material, or atomic weapons.

(c) "Defense information" includes any document, writing, sketch, photograph, plan, model, specification, design, prototype, drawing, technical manual, publication, or other recorded or oral information relating to any defense article or defense service, but shall not include restricted data as defined by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and data removed from the restricted data category under section 142(d) of that Act.

(d) "Defense service" includes packing, crating, handling, transportation, and any service, test, inspection, repair, rehabilitation, technical assistance, or defense information used for the purposes of this part.

(e) "Excess defense articles" means the quantity of defense articles owned by the United States Government and not procured in anticipation of military assistance or sales requirements, or pursuant to a military assistance or sales order, which is in excess of the mobilization reserve at the time such articles are dropped from inventory by the supplying agency for delivery to countries or international organizations under this part.

(f) "Mobilization reserve" means the quantity of defense articles determined to be required, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, to support mobilization of the Armed Forces of the United States Government in the event of war or national emergency.

(g) "Officer or employee" means civilian personnel and members of the Armed Forces of the United States Government.

(h) "Training" includes—

(1) formal or informal instruction of foreign students in the United States or overseas by officers or employees of the United States, contract technicians, contractors (including instruction at civilian institutions), or by correspondence courses and technical, educational, or informational publications and media of all kinds;

(2) orientation;

(3) training exercise;

(4) defense information;

(5) training aid;

(6) military advice to foreign military units and forces; and

(7) the transfer of limited quantities of defense articles for test, evaluation, or standardization purposes.

(i) "Value" means—

(1) with respect to excess defense articles, the gross cost incurred by the United States in repairing, rehabilitating, or modifying such articles;

(2) with respect to nonexcess defense articles delivered from inventory to countries or international organizations under this part, the standard price in effect at the time such articles are dropped from inventory by the supplying agency. Such standard price shall be the same price (including authorized reduced prices) used for transfers or sales of such articles in or between the Armed Forces of the United States Government, or, where such articles are not transferred or sold in or between the Armed Forces of the United States, the gross cost to the United States Government adjusted as appropriate for condition and market value; and

(3) with respect to nonexcess defense articles delivered from new procurement to countries or international organizations under this part, the contract or production costs of such articles.

(j) "United States Government Agency" includes any agency, department, board, wholly or partly owned corporation, instrumentality, commission, or establishment of the United States Government.

Chapter 2—Military assistance

Title I—Grants of Defense Articles and Defense Services for Individual and Collective Security

SEC. 610. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The President may acquire from any source and make grants of defense articles and defense services, on such terms and conditions as he may determine (including loans), to any friendly country or international organization, the assisting of which the President finds will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace.

SEC. 61. PURPOSES OF GRANTS.—(a) Grants of defense articles and defense services under this title to any country may be made solely for internal security, for legitimate self-defense, to permit the recipient country to participate in regional or collective arrangements or measures consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, or otherwise to permit the recipient country to participate in collective measures requested by the United Nations for the purpose of maintaining or restoring international peace and security.

(b) To the extent feasible and consistent with the purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the use of defense articles and defense services granted under this title for such purposes by the recipient country for civic action activities authorized by title II of this chapter shall be encouraged.

SEC. 612. GENERAL CONDITIONS OF ELIGIBILITY.—(a) In addition to such other provisions as the President may require, no defense articles shall be granted under this title to any country unless it shall have agreed that:

(1) it will not, without the consent of the President—

(A) permit any use of such articles by anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of that country,

(B) transfer, or permit any officer, employee, or agent of that country to transfer such articles by gift, sale, or otherwise, or

(C) use or permit the use of such articles for purposes other than those for which furnished;

(2) it will maintain the security of such articles, and will provide substantially the same degree of security protection afforded such articles by the United States Government;

(3) it will, as the President may require, permit continuous observation and review by, and furnish necessary information to, representatives of the United States Government with regard to the use of such articles; and

(4) unless the President consents to other disposition, it will return to the United States Government for such use or disposition as the President considers in the best interest of the United States, such articles which are no longer needed for the purpose for which furnished.

(b) No defense articles shall be granted under this title to any country of a value in excess of $3,000,000 in any fiscal year unless the President determines—

(1) that such country conforms to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations;

(2) that such defense articles will be utilized by such country for the maintenance of its own defensive strength; and the defensive strength of the free world; and

(3) that such country is taking all reasonable measures, consistent with its political and economic stability, which may be needed to develop its defense capacities.

Title II—Civic Action Assistance

SEC. 615. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The President may acquire from any source and make grants of defense articles and defense services, on such terms and conditions as he may determine (including loans), to any developing friendly country otherwise eligible under sections 610 and 612, for the purpose of assisting the military forces of that country (or the voluntary efforts of personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States) to construct public works and to engage in other activities helpful to the economic and social development of that country. It is the sense of the Congress that, insofar as practicable, such foreign military forces should not be maintained or established solely for civic action activities and that such civic action activities not significantly detract from the capability of the military forces to perform their military missions and be coordinated with and form part of the total economic and social development effort.

Title III—Training and Detail of Personnel

SEC. 620. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The President may furnish training, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, to any friendly country or international organization, eligible under section 610.

(b) Members of the Armed Forces of the United States and other personnel of the Department of Defense may be assigned or detailed under this part only to perform duties of a non-combatant nature.

SEC. 621. DETAIL OF PERSONNEL TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this part, any officer or employee of the Department of Defense may be detailed or assigned—

(1) to any office or position with any foreign government or governmental agency, where acceptance of such office or position does not involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government or the acceptance of compensation or other benefits from such foreign country by such officer or employee; or

(2) to any international organization to serve with, or as a member of, the international staff of such international organization, or to render any technical, scientific, or professional advice or services to, or in cooperation with, such organization.

SEC. 622. STATUS OF PERSONNEL ASSIGNED OR DETAILED.—(a) Any officer or employee, while assigned or detailed under section 621 of this part, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his allowances, privileges, rights, seniority, and other benefits as such, an officer or employee of the United States Government and of the activity of the Department of Defense from which detailed or assigned, and he shall continue to receive compensation, allowances, and benefits from funds appropriated for that activity.

(b) Any officer or employee assigned, detailed, or appointed under section 621 of this part may receive under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1131). The authorization of such allowances and other benefits and the payment thereof out of any appropriations available therefor shall be considered as meeting all of the requirements of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 70).

SEC. 623. TERMS OF DETAIL OR ASSIGNMENT.—Details or assignment may be made under section 621 of this part—

(1) without reimbursement to the United States Government by the foreign government or international organization;

(2) upon agreement by the foreign government or international organization, to reimburse the United States Government for compensation, travel expenses, allowances, and benefits, or any part thereof, payable to the officer or employee concerned during the period of assignment or detail; and such reimbursements (including foreign currencies) shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized for paying such compensation, travel expenses, allowances, or benefits, or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for such purposes;

(3) upon an advance of funds, property, or services, by the foreign government or international organization to the United States Government accepted with the approval of the President for specified uses in furtherance of the purposes of this part; and funds so advanced may be established as a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States Government, to be available for the specified uses, and to be used for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditures subject to the provisions of this part, any unexpended balance of such account to be returned to the foreign government or international organization; or

(4) subject to the receipt by the United States Government of a credit to be applied against the payment by the United States Government of its share of the expenses of the international organization to which the officer or employee is detailed or assigned, such credit to be based upon the compensation, travel expenses, allowances, and benefits, or any part thereof, payable to such officer or employee during the period of detail or assignment in accordance with section 621 of this part.

Title IV—Collective Defense Activities

SEC. 631. INFRASTRUCTURE AND JOINT USE FACILITIES.—The President may enter into bilateral or multilateral arrangements with any friendly foreign country or international organization eligible under sections 610 and 612, on such terms and conditions as he may determine (including financial contributions of funds made available under this part), for the acquisition or construction of facilities for collective defense or which are to be jointly utilized by the Armed Forces of the United States and friendly foreign military forces or which may be utilized by the Armed Forces of the United States upon the implementation of contingency plans of the United States.

SEC. 632. INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS.—The President may use funds made available under this part to enter into bilateral or multilateral arrangements, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for sharing the costs of constructing, operating and maintaining international military headquarters and organizations in which the Department of Defense participates.

Title V—Restrictions on Assistance

SEC. 641. SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF ELIGIBILITY.—(a) (1) No assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any economically developed nation capable of sustaining its own defense burden and economic growth, except (1) to fulfill firm commitments made prior to July 1, 1963, or (2) additional orientation and training expenses under this chapter during each fiscal year in an amount not to exceed $500,000.

(2) The President shall regularly reduce and, with such deliberate speed as orderly procedure and other relevent considerations, including prior commitments, will permit, shall terminate all further grants of defense articles to any country having sufficient resources to enable it, in the judgment of the President, to maintain and equip its own military forces at adequate strength, without undue burden to its economy.

(b) Any country which hereafter uses defense articles or defense services furnished such country under this part or any predecessor foreign assistance Act, in substantial violation of the provisions of this part or any agreement entered into pursuant to any of such Acts shall be immediately ineligible for further assistance.

(c) No assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any country which furnishes assistance to the present government of Cuba unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States.

(d) No funds authorized to be made available under this part shall be used to furnish assistance under this chapter to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—

(1) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to Cuba (other than to United States installations in Cuba)—

(A) any item of economic assistance.

(B) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

(C) any other equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime; and

(2) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.

(e) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter to the government of any country which is indebted to any United States citizen or person for goods or services furnished to or ordered where (i) such citizen or person has exhausted available legal remedies, which shall include arbitration, or (ii) the debt is not denied or contested by such government, or (iii) such indebtedness arises under an unconditional guaranty of payment given by such government, or any predecessor government, directly or indirectly, through any controlled entity: *Provided*, That the President does not find such action contrary to the national security.

(f) The President shall suspend assistance under this chapter to the government of any country when the government of such country or any government agency or subdivision within such country on or after January 1, 1962—

(1) has nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

(2) has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

(3) has imposed or enforced discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned,

and such country, government agency, or government subdivision fails within a reasonable time (not more than six months after such action, or, in the event of a referral to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States within such period as provided herein, not more than twenty days after the report of the Commission is received) to take appropriate steps, which may include arbitration, to discharge its obligations under international law toward such citizen or entity, including speedy compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange, equivalent to the full value thereof, as required by international law, or fails to take steps designed to provide relief from such taxes, exactions, or conditions, as the case may be; and such suspension shall continue until the President is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken, and no other provision of this part shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.

Upon request of the President (within seventy days after such action referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States (established pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1954, 68 Stat. 1279) is hereby authorized to evaluate expropriated property, determining the full value of any property nationalized, expropriated, or seized, or subject to discriminatory or other actions as aforesaid, for purposes of this subsection and to render an advisory report to the President within ninety days after such request. Unless authorized by the President, the Commission shall not publish its advisory report except to the citizen or entity owning such property. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amount, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary from time to time to enable the Commission to carry out expeditiously its functions under this subsection.

(g) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—

(1) the United States,

(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954,

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this part.

(h) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter after December 31, 1965, to the government of any less developed country which has failed to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guaranty program under section 221 (b) (1) of this Act, providing protection against the specific risks of inconvertibility under subparagraph (A), and expropriation or confiscation under subparagraph (B), of such section 221(b) (1).

SEC. 642. COUNTRIES SPECIFICALLY INELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE.—(a) Except as may be deemed necessary by the President in the interest of the United States, no assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any government of Cuba, until the President determines that such government has taken appropriate steps according to international law standards to return to United States citizens, and to entities not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or to provide equitable compensation to such citizens and entities for property taken from such citizens and entities on or after January 1, 1959, by the Government of Cuba.

(b) No assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any Communist country. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this part unless the President finds and promptly reports to Congress that : (1) such assistance is vital to the security of the United States; (2) the recipient country is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy; and (3) such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international communism. For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase "Communist country" shall include specifically, but not be limited to, the following countries:

Peoples Republic of Albania,
Peoples Republic of Bulgaria,
Peoples Republic of China,
Czechoslovak Socialist Republic,
German Democratic Republic (East Germany),
Estonia,
Hungarian Peoples Republic,
Latvia,
Lithuania,
North Korean Peoples Republic,
North Vietnam,
Outer Mongolia-Mongolian Peoples Republic,
Polish Peoples Republic,
Rumanian Peoples Republic,
Tibet,
Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia,
Cuba, and
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (including its captive constituent republics).

(c) No assistance under this chapter shall be furnished to Indonesia unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States. The President shall keep the Congress fully and currently informed of any assistance furnished to Indonesia under this chapter.

SEC. 643. REGIONAL RESTRICTIONS.—(a) The value of defense articles granted to American Republics (including defense articles granted in implementing a feasible plan for regional defense) under this chapter in each Fiscal Year shall not exceed $55,000,000. Except for civic action assistance, defense articles shall be granted under this chapter to any American Republic only to the extent that the President determines that such defense articles are necessary to safeguard the security of the United States, or to safeguard the security of a country associated with the United States in the Alliance for Progress against overthrow of a duly constituted government.

(b) The value of defense articles granted under this chapter to African countries in each Fiscal Year shall not exceed $25,000,000. No defense articles shall be granted under this chapter to any country in Africa except

for internal security requirements or for civic action assistance unless the President determines otherwise.

(c) Determinations under this section shall be promptly reported to the Congress.

SEC. 644. CERTIFICATION OF RECIPIENT'S CAPABILITY.—Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no defense article having a value in excess of $100,000 shall hereafter be delivered to any country or international organization under the authority of this chapter unless the chief of the appropriate military assistance advisory group representing the United States with respect to defense articles used by such country or international organization, or the head of any other group representing the United States with respect to defense articles used by such country or international organization, has certified in writing within six months prior to delivery that the country or international organization has the capability to utilize effectively such article in carrying out the purposes of this chapter.

(b) Defense articles included in approved military assistance programs may be delivered to any country or international organization for which the certification required by subsection (a) of this section cannot be made when determined necessary and specifically approved in advance by the Secretary of State (or, upon appropriate delegation of authority by an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary of State) and the Secretary of Defense (or, upon appropriate delegation of authority by the Deputy Secretary or an Assistant Secretary of Defense). The Secretary of State, or his delegate, shall make a complete report to the Congress of each determination and approval and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 645. COMMINGLING OF ASSISTANCE.—The President shall adopt regulations and establish procedures to insure that assistance under this chapter is not used in a manner which, contrary to the best interests of the United States, promotes or assists the foreign aid projects or activities of the Communist-bloc countries.

Chapter 3.—Sales, barter transactions and leases

SEC. 700. OBJECTIVES.—The aim of this chapter is to advance the overall objectives of this part set forth in section 600 by facilitating the acquisition on a reimbursable basis of defense articles, defense services, and training by friendly countries having sufficient wealth to maintain and equip their own military forces wholly or in part without grant assistance. The Congress urges that, consistent with section 600, treaties and other international obligations, emphasis be given to transactions authorized by this chapter in order to promote the defensive strength of the free world. The Congress further declares that, in the administration of this chapter, participation by private enterprise should be encouraged to the maximum extent practical.

Title I—Cash Sales

SEC. 701. SALES FROM STOCK.—(a) The President may sell for United States dollars defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense and defense services and training to any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 610, without reimbursement from funds available for use under this part, on terms of payment of not less than the value thereof in advance or within 120 days after the delivery of the defense articles or the provision of the defense services or training. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 601(1)(2), nonexcess defense articles may be sold under this subsection at the standard price in effect at the time such articles are offered for sale to the purchasing country or international organization. For the purpose of this subsection, the value of excess defense articles shall not be less than—

(1) the value specified in section 601(i)(1) plus the scrap value, or

(2) the market value, if ascertainable, whichever is greater.

(b) Payments received under subsection (a) of this section shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account funding the cost of the defense articles, defense services, or training sold, or to any appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

SEC. 702. PROCUREMENT FOR SALE.—(a) The President may, without requirement for any charge to any appropriation or contract authorization otherwise provided, enter into contracts for the procurement of defense articles, defense services and training for sale for United States dollars to any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 610 if such country or international organization—

(1) provides the United States Government with a dependable undertaking which will assure the United States Government against any loss on the contracts, and

(2) agrees to make funds available in such amounts and at such times as may be required to meet the payments required by the contracts, and any damages and costs that may accrue from the cancellation of such contracts, in advance of the time such payments, damages or costs are due: *Provided*, That the President may, when he determines it to be in the national interest, accept a dependable undertaking to make full payment within 120 days after delivery of the defense articles, or the provision of the defense services or training, and appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used to meet the payments required by the contracts and shall be reimbursed by the amounts subsequently received from the country or international organization: *Provided further*, That the President may, when he determines it to be in the national interest, enter into sales agreements with purchasing countries or international organizations which fix the prices to be paid by the purchasing countries or international organizations for the defense articles, defense services, or training ordered. Funds available under this part for financing credit sales shall be used to reimburse the applicable appropriations in the amounts required by the contracts which exceed the price so fixed, except that such reimbursement shall not be required upon determination by the President that the continued production of the defense article being sold is advantageous to the Armed Forces of the United States. Payments by purchasing countries or international organizations which exceed the amounts required by such contracts shall be credited to the account established under section 712.

(b) No sales of unclassified defense articles shall be made to the government of any economically developed country under the provisions of this section unless such articles are not generally available for purchase by such countries from commercial sources in the United States. The Secretary of Defense may waive the provisions of this subsection when he determines that the waiver of such provisions is in the national interest.

Title II—Credit Sales and Guarantees

SEC. 710. GENERAL AUTHORITY FOR CREDIT SALES.—(a) The President may use funds available under this part to finance credit sales of defense articles, defense services, and training to friendly foreign countries and international organizations eligible under section 610 on such terms as he may determine, including the prices to be paid by the purchasing countries or international organizations. Reimbursement to supplying agencies shall be governed by section 802.

(b) In addition, when the President determines it to be in the national interest, sales under section 701 may be made on terms of payment of not more than three years after the delivery of the defense article or the provision of the defense service or training.

SEC. 711. GUARANTEES.—(a) The President may guaranty, insure, coinsure, and reinsure any individual, corporation, partnership, or other association doing business in the United States against political and credit risks of nonpayment arising in connection with sales financed by such individual, corporation, partnership or other association of defense articles, defense services, and training procured in the United States by friendly countries and international organizations eligible under section 610.

(b) In issuing guaranties, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance, the President may enter into contracts with exporters, insurance companies, financial institutions, or others, or groups thereof, and where appropriate may employ any of the same to act as agent in the issuance and servicing of such guaranties, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance, and the adjustment of claims arising thereunder.

(c) Fees and premiums shall be charged in connection with such contracts of guaranty, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance (excluding contracts with United States Government agencies), and such fees and premiums may be utilized to meet liabilities resulting from such contracts.

(d) Obligations shall be recorded against the funds available for credit sales in an amount not less than 25 per centum of the contractual liability related to any guaranty, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance issued pursuant to this section, and the funds so obligated, together with fees and premiums, shall constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims under such contracts. Any guaranties, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance issued pursuant to this section shall be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

SEC. 712. REIMBURSEMENTS.—(a) Whenever funds available under this part are used to finance credit sales, repayments in United States dollars (including dollar proceeds derived from the sale of foreign currency repayments), receipts received from the disposition of evidences of indebtedness, and charges (including fees and premiums) or interest collected shall be credited to a separate fund account, and shall be available until expended solely for the purpose of financing credit sales, including the overhead costs thereof.

(b) All assets and obligations of the military sales credit account administratively established on the books of the Treasury pursuant to section 508 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, including proceeds receivable from previous credit sales transactions, and such amounts of the appropriations authorized under this part as may be determined by the President, shall be transferred or credited to the separate fund account established under section 712(a) and shall be available until expended solely for the purpose of financing credit sales, including the overhead costs thereof.

SEC. 713. FOREIGN CURRENCIES.—Sales financed under this title may provide for payment in foreign currencies only to the extent that the Secretary of the Treasury determines at the time of each such sale that the existing or anticipated requirements for such foreign currencies for payment of United States obligations abroad are such that an excess of United States Government holdings of any particular foreign currency is not likely to result.

SEC. 714. COLLECTIONS.—In carrying out this title, the President—

(1) may acquire and dispose of, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine, any evidence of indebtedness; and

(2) may collect or compromise any indebtedness owed to the Department of Defense by foreign countries or international organizations.

Title III—Barter Transactions

SEC. 720. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The President may, without reimbursement from funds available for use under this part, barter defense articles which are in the stocks of the Department of Defense or which the Department of Defense is authorized to procure under other provisions of law, defense services, and training with any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 610 in exchange for other defense articles, defense services, and training of approximately equal or equivalent value for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States.

(b) The President may, subject to the provisions of section 802, also use funds available to carry out this part to acquire defense articles, defense services, and training from any source and barter such defense articles, defense services, or training with any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 610 in exchange for other defense articles, defense services, or training.

SEC. 721. DISPOSITION OF DEFENSE ARTICLES, DEFENSE SERVICES, AND TRAINING RECEIVED IN EXCHANGE UNDER SECTION 720(b).—Defense articles, defense services, and training received by the United States Government from a country or international organization in exchange for defense articles, defense services, and training bartered by the United States Government under section 720(b) may be used to carry out this part, may be sold (on cash or credit terms, including payment in foreign currencies) to any friendly country or international organization, or may be transferred to any United States Government Agency for stockpiling or other purposes. If such disposal or transfer is made subject to reimbursement, the funds so received shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account which funded the cost of the defense articles, defense services, or training bartered to the country or international organization, or to any appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purposes.

Title IV—Leases

SEC. 731. LEASES.—(a) The President may, subject to section 802, use funds available to carry out this part to acquire defense articles from any source and lease such defense articles, on such terms and conditions of payment as he may determine, to any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 610.

(b) Payments received under this section shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account funding the cost of the defense articles leased, or to any appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

Title V—General Provisions

SEC. 741. PURPOSES.—Defense articles, defense services, and training may be sold, bartered, or leased under this chapter to eligible countries solely for the purposes specified in sections 611 and 615.

Chapter 4—Fiscal provisions

SEC. 801. ALLOCATIONS.—The President may allocate to any United States Government Agency any part of any funds available for carrying out the purposes of this part, including any advance to the United States Government by any country or international organization, for the procurement of defense articles, defense services, and training. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure for the purposes for which authorized, in accordance with authority granted in this part or under authority governing the activities of the United States Government Agencies to which such funds are allocated.

SEC. 802. REIMBURSEMENTS.—(a) Except as otherwise provided in this part, reimbursement shall be made to any activity of the Department of Defense and to any other United States Government Agency, from funds available for use under this part for defense articles, defense services, and training furnished to foreign countries and international organizations by, or through, such activity or agency under this part. Such reimbursement shall be in an amount equal to the value (as defined in section 601) of the defense articles, defense services, and training furnished, plus expenses arising from or incident to operations under this part (other than pay and allowances of members of the Armed Forces). The amount of such reimbursement shall be credited to the current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts of such activity.

(b) Orders to a supplying agency under this part shall be based upon the best estimates of stock status and prevailing prices; reimbursements to the supplying agency shall be made on the basis of the stock status and prices determined pursuant to section 601(i). Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Secretary of Defense may prescribe regulations authorizing reimbursements to the supplying agency based on negotiated prices for aircraft, vessels, plant equipment, and such other major items as he may specify: *Provided,* That such articles are not excess at the time such prices are negotiated: *Provided further,* That such prices are negotiated at the time firm orders are placed with the supplying agency.

SEC. 203. APPROPRIATIONS.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Part not to exceed $1,170,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1966, which shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 804. SPECIAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The President may, if he determines it to be vital to the security of the United States, order defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense and defense services and training for the purpose of this part without reimbursement therefor from appropriations available for military assistance. The value of such orders shall not exceed $300,000,000 during each fiscal year. Prompt notice of action taken under this subsection shall be given to the Congress.

(b) The Department of Defense is authorized to incur, in applicable appropriations, obligations in amounts equivalent to orders under subsection (a) of this section. Appropriations of such sums as may be necessary to liquidate the obligations so incurred are hereby authorized.

SEC. 805. LETTERS OF COMMITMENT.—In carrying out this part, accounts may be established on the books of the Department of Defense (1) against which letters of commitment may be issued which shall constitute recordable obligations of the United States Government and moneys due or to become due under such letters of commitment shall be assignable under the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, as amended (second and third paragraphs of 31 U.S.C. 203 and 41 U.S.C. 15), and (2) from which disbursements may be made to recipient countries or agencies, organizations, or persons upon presentation of contracts, invoices, or other appropriate documentation. Expenditures of funds which have been made available through accounts so established shall be accounted for on standard documentation required for expenditure of funds of the United States Government: *Provided,* That such expenditures for defense articles, defense services, and training procured outside the United States shall be accounted for exclusively on such certification as may be prescribed in regulations approved by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Chapter 5—General, administrative, and miscellaneous provisions

Title I—General Provisions

SEC. 901. GENERAL AUTHORITIES.—(a) The President may make and perform agreements and contracts with, or enter into other transactions with, any individual, corporation, or other body of persons, or government agency, whether within or without the United States, and international organization in furtherance of the purposes, and within the limitations, of this part.

(b) A contract under this part may, subject to future action of the Congress, extend at any time for not more than five years.

(c) The President may accept and use in furtherance of the purposes of this part, money, funds, property, and services of any kind made available by gift, devise, bequest, grant, or otherwise for such purposes.

(d) Any officer of the United States Government carrying out functions under this part may utilize the services and facilities of, or procure defense articles from, any United States Government agency with the consent of the head of such agency, or as the President shall direct, and funds allocated pursuant to this subsection to any such agency may be established in separate transfer appropriation accounts on the books of the Treasury.

SEC. 902. WAIVER AUTHORITIES.—(a) The President may authorize in each fiscal year the use of funds made available for use under this part and the furnishing of assistance under section 804 without regard to the provisions of this part, any Act appropriating funds for use under this Act, or the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, in furtherance of any of the purposes of this part and such Acts, when he determines that such authorization is important to the security of the United States. Not more than $250,000,000 may be used under authority of this subsection and section 514(a) of this Act in any one fiscal year and not more than $50,000,000 of the funds made available under this subsection and section 514(a) may be allocated to any one country in any fiscal year. Each determination shall be reported promptly to the Congress.

(b) Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this part, the functions authorized under this part may be performed without regard to such provisions of law (other than the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1211 et seq.)) regulating the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts and the expenditure of funds of the United States Government as the President may specify.

(c) The President is authorized to use funds available for use under this part pursuant to his certification that it is inadvisable to specify the nature of the use of such funds, which certification shall be deemed to be a sufficient voucher for such amounts: *Provided,* That not to exceed $50,000,000 may be used under authority of this subsection and section 514(c) of this Act.

(d) The functions authorized under this part may be performed without regard to such provisions as the President may specify of the joint resolution of November 4, 1939 (54 Stat. 4), as amended.

(e) The provisions of section 955 of title 18 of the United States Code shall not apply

to prevent any person, including any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, from acting for, or participating in, any operation or transaction arising under this part or from acquiring new obligations issued in connection with any operation or transaction arising under this part.

SEC. 903. RETENTION AND USE OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.—(a) Any defense articles procured to carry out this part may be retained by, or transferred to, and for the use of, such United States Government Agency as the Presidency may determine in lieu of being disposed of to a foreign country or international organization, whenever in the judgment of the President the best interests of the United States will be served thereby. Any defense articles so retained may be disposed of without regard to provisions of law relating to the disposal of property owned by the United States Government, when necessary to prevent spoilage or wastage of such defense articles or to conserve the usefulness thereof. Funds realized from any transfer or disposal shall revert to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to procure such defense articles or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

(b) Funds realized by the United States Government from the sale, transfer, or disposal of defense articles returned to the United States Government by a recipient country or international organization as no longer needed for the purpose for which furnished shall be credited to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to procure such defense articles or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

SEC. 904. ORDERLY TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—Funds made available under this part shall remain available for a period of not to exceed twelve months from the date of termination of assistance or related activities to or with a foreign country or international organization for the necessary expenses of winding up programs related thereto.

SEC. 905. PATENTS AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION.—(a) Whenever, in connection with the performance of functions under this part—

(1) an invention or discovery covered by a patent issued by the United States Government is practiced within the United States without the authorization of the owner, or

(2) information, which is (A) protected by law, and (B) held by the United States Government subject to restrictions imposed by the owner, is disclosed by the United States Government or any of its officers, employees, or agents in violation of such restrictions, the exclusive remedy of the owner, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, is to sue the United States Government for reasonable and entire compensation for such practice or disclosure in the district court of the United States for the district in which such owner is a resident, or in the Court of Claims, within six years after the cause of action arises. Any period during which the United States Government is in possession of a written claim under subsection (b) of this section before mailing a notice of denial of that claim does not count in computing the six years. In any such suit, the United States Government may plead any defense that may be pleaded by a private person in such an action. A Government employee shall have the right to bring suit against the Government under this section except where he was in a position to order, influence, or induce use of the invention by the Government. This section shall not confer a right of action on any patentee or any assignee of such patentee with respect to any invention discovered or invented by a person while in the employment or service of the United States, where the invention was related to the official functions of the employee, in cases in which such functions included research and development, or in the making of which Government time, materials or facilities were used.

(b) Before suit against the United States Government has been instituted, the head of the agency of the United States Government concerned may settle and pay any claim arising under the circumstances described in subsection (a) of this section. No claim may be paid under this subsection unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction.

SEC. 906. SHIPPING ON UNITED STATES VESSELS.—The ocean transportation between foreign countries of defense articles purchased with foreign currencies made available or derived from funds available under this part or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.), shall not be governed by the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1241), or any other law relating to the ocean transportation of defense articles on United States vessels.

Sec. 907. PROCUREMENT OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Funds available under this part may be used for procurement of defense articles outside the United States only if the President determines that such procurement will not result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States or the industrial mobilization base, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus or to the net position of the United States in its balance of payments with the rest of the world, which outweigh the economic or other advantages to the United States of less costly procurement outside the United States.

Title II—Administrative Provisions

SEC. 920. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise any functions conferred upon him by this part through such agency or officer of the United States Government as he shall direct. The head of any such agency or such officer may from time to time promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out such functions, and may delegate authority to perform any such functions, including if he shall so specify, the authority successively to redelegate any of such functions to any of his subordinates.

SEC. 921. THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—(a) With respect to programs authorized by this part, the Secretary of Defense shall have primary responsibility for—

(1) the determination of military end-item requirements;

(2) the procurement of military equipment in a manner which permits its integration with service programs;

(3) the supervision of end-item use by the recipient countries;

(4) the supervision of the training of foreign military personnel;

(5) the movement and delivery of military end-items; and

(6) within the Department of Defense, the performance of any other functions with respect to programs authorized by this part.

(b) The establishment of priorities in the procurement, delivery, and allocation of military equipment shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 922. COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY.—(a) Nothing contained in this part shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State.

(b) The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among representatives of the United States Government in each country, under the leadership of the chief of the United States diplomatic mission. The chief of the diplomatic mission shall make sure that recommendations of such representatives pertaining to military assistance and sales are coordinated with political and economic considerations, and his comments shall accompany such recommendations if he so desires.

(c) Under the direction of the President, the Secretary of State shall be responsible for the continuous supervision and general direction of the programs authorized by this part, including but not limited to determining whether there shall be a military assistance or sales program for a country and the value thereof, to the end that such programs are effectively integrated both at home and abroad with programs of economic assistance and the foreign policy of the United States is best served thereby.

SEC. 923. MISSIONS AND STAFFS ABROAD.—The President may maintain special missions or staffs outside the United States in such countries and for such periods of time as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part.

SEC. 924. EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL.—(a) For the purposes of performing functions under this part outside the United States the President may employ or assign persons compensated at any of the rates provided for the Foreign Service Reserve and Staff by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), together with allowances and benefits thereunder. Persons so employed or assigned shall be entitled, except to the extent that the President may specify otherwise in cases in which the period of employment or assignment exceeds thirty months, to the same benefits as are provided by section 528 of that Act for persons appointed to the Foreign Service Reserve, and the provisions of section 1005 of that Act shall apply in the case of such persons, except that policymaking officials shall not be subject to that part of section 1005 of that Act which prohibits political tests.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 3544(b) and 8544(b) of title 10 of the United States Code, personnel of the Department of Defense may be assigned or detailed to any civil office to carry out this part.

SEC. 925. EXPENSES.—(a) Funds made available for the purpose of this part shall be available for—

(1) administrative and operating expenses;

(2) extraordinary expenses of not to exceed $300,000 in any fiscal year; and

(3) constructing or otherwise acquiring outside the United States essential living quarters, office space, and necessary supporting facilities for use of personnel carrying out activities authorized by this part.

(b) Actual expenses incurred by military officers detailed or assigned as tour directors in connection with orientation visits of foreign military personnel may be reimbursed in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 836), applicable to civilian officers and employees.

SEC. 926. REPORTS AND INFORMATION.—The President shall, while funds made available for the purposes of this part remain available for obligation, transmit to the Congress after the close of each fiscal year a report concerning operations in that fiscal year under this part.

(b) The President shall, in the reports required by subsection (a) of this section, and in response to requests from Members of the Congress or inquiries from the public, make public all information concerning operations under this part not deemed by him to be incompatible with the security of the United States.

(c) None of the funds made available pursuant to the provisions of this part shall be used to carry out any provision of this

part in any country or with respect to any project or activity, after the expiration of the thirty-five-day period which begins on the date the General Accounting Office or any committee of the Congress charged with considering legislation, appropriations or expenditures under this part, has delivered to the office of the head of any agency carrying out such provision, a written request that it be furnished any document, paper, communication, audit, review, finding, recommendation, report, or other material in its custody or control relating to the administration of such provision in such country or with respect to such project or activity, unless and until there has been furnished to the General Accounting Office, or to such committee, as the case may be, (1) the document, paper, communication, audit, review, finding, recommendation, report, or other material so requested, or (2) a certification by the President that he has forbidden the furnishing thereof pursuant to request and his reason for so doing.

(b) At the end of each fiscal year, the President shall notify each committee of the Congress charged with considering legislation or appropriations under this part of all actions taken during the fiscal year under this part which resulted in furnishing assistance of a kind, for a purpose, or to an area, substantially different from that included in the presentation to the Congress during its consideration of this part or any Act appropriating funds pursuant to authorizations contained in this part, or which resulted in obligations or reservations greater by 50 per centum or more than the proposed obligations or reservations included in such presentation for the program concerned, and in his notification the President shall state the justification for such changes. There shall also be included in the presentation material submitted to the Congress during its consideration of amendments to this part, or of any Act appropriating funds pursuant to authorizations contained in this part, a comparison of the current fiscal year programs and activities with those presented to the Congress in the previous year and an explanation of any substantial changes.

Title III—Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 940. PROVISIONS OF LAW REPEALED AND AMENDED.—(a) References to the statutory provisions of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, contained in other Acts shall hereafter be considered to be references to the appropriate provisions of this part.

(b) Section 625(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is redesignated as section 927 of this part.

SEC. 941. SAVING PROVISIONS.—(a) Except as may be expressly provided to the contrary in this part, all determinations, authorizations, regulations, orders, contracts, agreements, and other actions issued, undertaken, or entered into under authority of any provision of law repealed by this part or Acts superseded by those provisions, shall continue in full force and effect until modified by appropriate authority.

(b) Wherever provisions of this part establish conditions which must be complied with before use may be made of authority contained in, or funds authorized by, this part, compliance with, or satisfaction of, substantially similar conditions under provisions of law repealed by this part, or Acts superseded by those provisions, shall be deemed to constitute compliance with the conditions established by this part.

(c) Funds made available pursuant to provisions of law repealed by this part shall, unless otherwise authorized or provided by law, remain available for their original purposes in accordance with the provisions of law currently applicable to those purposes.

SEC. 942. UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—Unexpended balances of funds made available pursuant to this part are hereby authorized to be continued available for the general purposes for which appropriated.

SEC. 943. CONSTRUCTION.—If any provisions of this part or the application of any provision to any circumstances or persons shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this part, and of the applicability of such provision to other circumstances or persons, shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say that I do this to draw the issue. The administration cannot now say that there has not been introduced in the Senate a bill covering both military and economic aid.

I would vote against the bill in this form, as I voted against its major provisions in the past 2 years.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I do not intend to abdicate to the Armed Services Committee of the Senate the responsibility of the Foreign Relations Committee over foreign affairs. The Armed Services Committee of the Senate has primary jurisdiction in regard to legislation which involves the defenses of this country. However, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate should not be given authority over the foreign affairs of this country in respect to the direct relationship between foreign relations and military aid. Military aid is basically and primarily foreign affairs. I do not intend to help make the Secretary of Defense in any particular the Secretary of State in respect to foreign affairs.

I shall introduce a second bill, before the week is over. We are going to get a very limited hearing in the Foreign Relations Committe if we stand with the Fulbright bill alone, with nothing but hearings on economic aid. So in addition to the omnibus bill I have just offered, I shall introduce a foreign aid bill of my own, seeking to carry out the recommendations that many Senators have voted for in the past 3 years. Interestingly enough, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has stated for 2 years in the reports that he has written and filed with the Senate that the recommendations involve proposals having great merit; and for the past 2 years he has recommended that the administration take action.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I have said for 2 years, we should not pass the buck to the administration. Under our separation-of-powers doctrine, we have the responsibility of passing a foreign aid bill that we think ought to be the foreign aid policy of this Republic. The President has his checking right to veto it if he thinks it should be vetoed, and to see whether Congress wishes to override his veto. However, to say, as a majority of the Foreign Relations Committee have said for the past 2 years, "You ought to do something about the criticisms of foreign aid and come forward with a program that eliminates the abuses," and not do something itself, as a committee, is a failure of the committee to do its job.

The legislation which I shall introduce later this week, on which I shall ask for hearings, seeks to correct the abuses and the mistakes, the inefficiency and waste and, in some instances, the corruption that foreign aid has caused in too many countries of the world, where it has resulted in corrupting local politicians to the great detriment of the country concerned. In some areas, it has been one of the greatest boons to the spread of communism, although its intention was not that.

The military aspect of much of our foreign aid in some of the underdeveloped areas of the world has been of great assistance to the Communists, because they have been able to use it to stir up opposition to the United States and to their local government.

Lastly, as I said in the Foreign Relations Committee this morning, I shall not permit steamroller tactics to speed the foreign aid legislation through either the committee or the Senate.

It may be that in the committee the majority will have the votes to prevent thorough hearings on the Fulbright bill, the administration omnibus bill, which I have now introduced, and the Morse bill. However, as I said in committee this morning, I shall make my record, step by step, calling for thorough hearings on each of these bills, and on each segment of each bill.

As I said in committee this morning, I shall not in any way seek to use dilatory tactics, but in the consideration of the foreign aid bill I intend to have a full discussion and consideration of each segment of foreign aid, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate.

I owe it to the people I represent. I owe it, in my judgment, to the people of the country. This is the year in which we ought to carry out the promises that have been made in the past 3 years, to do something about cleaning up foreign aid.

As I listened to the Secretary of State and to Mr. Bell and his assistants, I could not see any change or improvement in the administration of foreign aid, either procedurally or in correcting the substantive weaknesses of foreign aid.

I close by saying, as I said before, that I am sorry that the administration did not see fit to hold a series of informal conferences, which were promised last year to those of us in opposition to foreign aid, to see if we could not narrow our areas of disagreement, because in many respects in foreign aid the senior Senator from Oregon would vote for more money than the administration recommends.

For example, the economic aspects of the Alliance for Progress; for example, some of the economic aspects of the great needs in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, before I can vote for that sort of bill, I must do what I can to eliminate from the administration's program the waste and inefficiency that has existed for too long in American foreign aid—the waste of hundreds of millions of dollars over the years of foreign aid, in

a foreign aid program that since 1946 has run in the neighborhood of $110 billion.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. MORSE. When the President talks about a bare bones program this year of $3,380 million, he forgets to tell the American people that the total foreign assistance program is closer to $7 billion. It is labels that make the difference. But it is taxpayers' money in each instance, and the total foreign assistance program in this Republic to the various countries of the world is nearer, may I say, $7 billion than the President's figure of $3,380 million is near $4 billion.

EXHIBIT 1

ECONOMIC

An act to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by furnishing economic assistance to friendly countries and areas and to international organizations, and for other purposes

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

SEC. 101. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is further amended by striking out "PART I" after the enacting clause.

CHAPTER 1—POLICY

SEC. 102. Chapter 1 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to policy, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 102, which relates to the statement of policy, as follows:

(1) Amend the fifth, seventh, twelfth, and thirteenth paragraphs by striking out "this part" wherever it appears and substituting "this Act".

(2) Amend the sixth paragraph by striking out "of all parts" in the last sentence thereof.

(3) Amend the thirteenth paragraph by inserting after the second full sentence thereof the following: "Congress further urges that the United States and other free-world nations place an increasing portion of their assistance programs on a multilateral basis and that the United States continue its efforts to improve coordination among programs of assistance carried out on a bilateral basis by free-world nations".

(b) Add a new section 103 as follows:

"SEC. 103. COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY.—(a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State.

"(b) The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among representatives of the United States Government in each country, under the leadership of the chief of the United States diplomatic mission. The chief of the diplomatic mission shall make sure that recommendations of such representatives pertaining to programs under this Act are coordinated with recommendations pertaining to programs under the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965 and are coordinated with political considerations, and his comments shall accompany such recommendations if he so desires.

"(c) Under the direction of the President, the Secretary of State shall be responsible for the continuous supervision and general direction of assistance programs authorized by this Act and of programs authorized under the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965, including but not limited to determining whether there shall be an economic assistance or a military assistance or sales program for a country and the value thereof, to the end that such programs are effectively integrated both at home and abroad and the foreign policy of the United States is best served thereby."

CHAPTER 2—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Title I—Development Loan Fund

SEC. 103. Title I of chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Development Loan Fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 201(c), which relates to general authority, by striking out "section 610" and "section 614(a)" and substituting "section 510" and "section 514(a)", respectively.

(b) Amend section 202, which relates to authorization, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "601, and 602" and substitute "501, and 502".

(2) In subsection (d), strike out "this part" and substitute "this Act".

(c) Amend section 205, relating to the use of the facilities of the International Development Association, by striking out "section 619" and substituting "section 519".

Title II—Technical cooperation and development grants

SEC. 104. Title II of chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 212, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$215,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$210,000,000", respectively.

(b) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is hereby repealed effective July 1, 1966.

(2) Amend subsection (c) by striking out "1965, $18,000,000" and substituting "1966, $7,000,000".

Title III—Investment guaranties

SEC. 105. Title III of chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) Amend the introductory clause to read as follows: "The President may issue guaranties to eligible United States investors—".

(2) In paragraph (1), strike out "$2,500,000,000" and substitute "$5,000,000,000".

(3) Amend paragraph (2) as follows:

(A) In the first proviso, strike out ", and no such guaranty in the case of a loan shall exceed $25,000,000 and no other such guaranty shall exceed $10,000,000".

(B) In the fourth proviso, strike out "1966" and substitute "1967".

(b) Amend section 221(c), which relates to general authority, by inserting after the word "guaranty" the third time it appears, the words "of an equity investment".

(c) Amend section 222, which relates to general provisions, as follows:

(1) Strike out "this part" wherever it appears and substitute "this Act".

(2) Insert after "(exclusive of informational media guaranties)," the words "and to pay the costs of investigating and adjusting (including costs of arbitration) claims under such guaranties".

(d) Amend section 223, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "and" at the end thereof and in subsection (b), strike out the period and substitute "; and".

(2) Add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) the term 'eligible United States investors' means United States citizens, or corporations, partnerships or other associations created under the laws of the United States or any State or territory and substantially beneficially owned by United States citizens, as well as foreign corporations, partnerships or other associations wholly owned by one or more such United States citizens, corporations, partnerships or other associations: *Provided,* That the eligibility of a foreign corporation shall be determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the United States owners."

(e) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, to read as follows:

"SEC. 224. HOUSING PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES.—(a) It is the sense of the Congress that in order to stimulate private home ownership and assist in the development of stable economies in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating pilot housing projects, the development of institutions engaged in Alliance for Progress programs, with particular emphasis on cooperatives, free labor unions, savings and loan and other institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, the construction of homes for lower income persons and families, the increased mobilization of savings and the improvement of housing conditions in Latin America.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the President is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as he shall determine, to eligible United States investors as defined in section 223 assuring against loss of loan investments made by such investors in—

"(1) pilot or demonstration private housing projects in Latin America of types similar to those insured by the Federal Housing Administration and suitable for conditions in Latin America;

"(2) credit institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, such as savings and loan institutions;

"(3) housing projects in Latin America for lower income families and persons, which projects shall be constructed in accordance with maximum unit costs established by the President for families and persons whose incomes meet the limitations prescribed by the President;

"(4) housing projects in Latin America which will promote the development of institutions important to the success of the Alliance for Progress, such as free labor unions and cooperatives; or

"(5) housing projects in Latin America 25 per centum or more of the aggregate of the mortgage financing for which is made available from sources within Latin America and has not been derived from sources outside Latin America, which projects shall, to the maximum extent practicable, have a unit cost of not more than $6,500.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $350,000,000: *Provided,* That the total face amount of guaranties issued under subsection (b)(1) outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $250,000,000: *Provided further,* That no payment may be made under this section for any loss arising out of fraud or misconduct for which the investor is responsible: *Provided further,* That this authority shall continue until June 30, 1967."

Title V—Development research

SEC. 106. Title V of chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development research, is

amended by striking out "this part" and substituting "this Act".

Title VI—Alliance for Progress

SEC. 107. Title VI of chapter 2 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 251, which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (c) as follows:

(A) Strike out "section 614(a)" and "section 610" and substitute "section 514(a)" and "section 510", respectively.

(B) Strike out "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(2) In subsection (f), strike out "section 601(b)(4)" and "part I" and substitute "section 501(b)(4)" and "this Act", respectively.

(b) Amend section 252, which relates to authorization, as follows:

(1) In the first sentence strike out all after the words "until expended" and substitute the following: ": *Provided*, That any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropirated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropirated for such subsequent fiscal year. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section, except for not to exceed $100,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1963 and 1964 and $85,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in each such fiscal year, shall be available only for loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars."

(2) In the last sentence, strike out "601, and 602" and substitute "501, and 502".

(c) Amend section 253, which relates to fiscal provisions by striking out "of part I".

CHAPTER 3—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 108. Chapter 3 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 301, which relates to general authority, by striking out "this part" and substituting "this Act".

(b) Amend section 302, which relates to authorization, as follows:

(1) In the first sentence strike out "1965" and "$134,272,400" and substitute "1966" and "$155,455,000", respectively.

(2) Strike out the second sentence.

(c) Amend section 303, which relates to Indus Basin development, by striking out "(other than part II)".

CHAPTER 4—SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 109. Chapter 4 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 401, which relates to general authority, by striking out "this part" and substituting "this Act".

(b) Amend section 402, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$405,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$369,200,000," respectively.

CHAPTER 5—CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 110. Chapter 5 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(1) Strike out "1965" and "$150,000,000" and substitute "1966" and "$50,000,000", respectively.

(2) Strike out "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(3) Add the following new sentence:

"In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in Vietnam such sums as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized by this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to such programs if he determines such use to be important to the national interest: *Provided*, That the President shall present to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives the programs to be carried out from funds requested by the President to be appropriated under authority of this sentence."

(b) Amend subsection (b) by striking out "this section" and substituting "the first sentence of subsection (a)".

CHAPTER 7—GENERAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 111. Part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is redesignated chapter 7, "General, Administrative, and Miscellaneous Provisions".

Title I—General Provisions

SEC. 112. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is redesignated title I of chapter 7 and is amended as follows:

(a) Redesignate section 601, which relates to encouragement of free enterprise and private participation, as section 501 and, in subsection (c)(1), strike out "part I of".

(b) Redesignate section 602, which relates to small business, as section 502 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) In the introductory clause, strike out ", defense articles," and "(including defense services)".

(B) In paragraphs (2) and (3), strike out ", articles,".

(2) Strike out subsection (c).

(c) Redesignate section 603, which relates to shipping on United States vessels, as section 503 and amend said section by striking out "and defense articles".

(d) Redesignate section 604, which relates to procurement, as section 504.

(e) Redesignate section 605, which relates to retention and use of items, as section 505, and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) In the first sentence strike out "and defense articles".

(B) In the second and third sentences, strike out "or defense articles" wherever it appears.

(2) Add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Funds realized as a result of any failure of a transaction financed under authority of this Act to conform to the requirements of this Act, or to applicable rules and regulations of the United States Government, or to the terms of any agreement or contract entered into under authority of this Act, shall revert to the respective appropriations, fund or account used to finance such transaction or to the appropriation, fund or account currently available for the same general purpose."

(f) Redesignate sections 606 and 607, which relate respectively to patents and technical information and furnishing of services and commodities, as sections 506 and 507, respectively, and amend redesignated section 507 by striking out "of part I".

(g) Redesignate section 608, which relates to advance acquisition of property, as section 508, and amend said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "section 607" wherever it appears and substitute "section 507".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "to the provisions of part I or" and substitute "to the provisions of this Act for which funds are authorized for the furnishing of assistance or pursuant to".

(3) Strike out "part I" wherever it appears and substitute "this Act".

(h) Redesignate section 609, which relates to the special account, as section 509, and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) In the introductory clause, strike "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(B) In paragraph (3), insert "or the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965" after "this Act".

(2) Amend subsection (b), by striking out "under this Act".

(i) Redesignate section 610, which relates to transfer between accounts, as section 510 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) After "this Act" the first time it appears insert "and the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965."

(B) Strike out "this Act" the second and third time it appears and substitute "said Acts".

(2) Amend subsection (b) as follows:

(A) Strike out "510 and 614" and substitute "and 514".

(B) Strike out "sections 636(g)(1) and 637" and substitute "section 535".

(j) Redesignate sections 611 and 612, which relate respectively to completion of plans and cost estimates and to the use of foreign currencies, as sections 511 and 512, respectively, and amend said sections as follows:

(1) Strike out "part I" wherever it appears and substitute "this Act".

(2) In redesignated section 512, redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(k) Redesignate section 613, which relates to the accounting, valuation, and reporting of foreign currencies, as section 513.

(l) Redesignate section 614, which relates to special authorities, as section 514 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "and the furnishing of assistance under section 510" and "$250,000,000" and substitute for the latter "$125,000,000".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(3) In subsection (c), strike out "$50,000,000" and substitute "$25,000,000".

(m) Redesignate sections 615, 616, and 617, which relate respectively to contract authority, to availability of funds and to termination of assistance, as sections 515, 516, and 517, respectively.

(n) Redesignate section 618, which relates to use of settlement receipts, as section 518, and strike out "of part I" and "that part" and substitute for the latter "this Act".

(o) Redesignate section 619, which relates to assistance to newly independent countries, as section 519, and amend said section by striking out "part I of".

(p) Redesignate section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba and certain other countries, as section 520 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (h), strike out "foreign aid" and substitute "assistance under this Act".

(2) In subsection (m), strike out "(1)" and all after "1963".

Title II—Administrative provisions

SEC. 113. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is redesignated title II of chapter 7 and is amended as follows:

(a) Redesignate section 621, which relates to exercise of functions, as section 521.

(b) Sections 622 and 623, which relate respectively to coordination with foreign policy, and to the Secretary of Defense, are repealed.

(c) Redesignate section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as section 522 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "paragraph (3) of" and "of the officers provided for in paragraphs (1) and (2) of that subsection", and substitute for the latter "of one or more of said officers".

(3) Subsection (c) is hereby repealed and subsection (d) is redesignated subsection (c).

(4) Amend redesignated subsection (c) as follows:

(A) Strike out "Public Law 86–735" wherever it appears and substitute "the Latin American Development Act, as amended".

(B) In paragraph (2)(A), strike out "part I of".

(C) Amend paragraph (2)(B) as follows:

(i) Strike out "of assistance being carried out under part II of this Act and" and substitute "being carried out under the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965 and programs of assistance being carried out under".

(ii) After "objectives of this Act" insert "and the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965".

(iii) Strike out all after "audits" and substitute "of such programs as he considers necessary".

(D) In paragraph (4), strike out "this Act" and substitute "paragraph (2) of this subsection."

(E) Amend paragraph (5) as follows:

(i) Strike out "under this Act" and substitute "under paragraph (2) of this subsection".

(ii) Strike out "part I or part II of this Act," and substitute "this Act, the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965,".

(F) In paragraph (6), strike out "part II of this Act," and substitute "the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965".

(G) Amend paragraph (7), as follows:

(i) Strike out "part I or part II of this Act," and substitute "this Act, the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965,".

(ii) In the proviso, strike out "the Act" and substitute "this Act or the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965."

(iii) In the first full sentence following the proviso, strike out "section 614(a) of this Act and the provisions of section 634(c) of this Act" and substitute "section 514(a) of this Act and in section 132(a) of the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965 and the provisions of section 532(c) of this Act and section 147(c) of the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965."

(d) Redesignate section 625, which relates to the employment of personnel, as section 523 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "part I or coordinate part I and II" and substitute "this Act or coordinate this Act and the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1965".

(2) Redesignate subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) as (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) and (i), respectively.

(3) In redesignated subsection (c) (introductory clause), strike out "outside the United States" and in paragraph (2) strike out all after "prescribe".

(4) In redesignated subsection (d), strike out "(d)" and substitute "(c)".

(5) In redesignated subsection (e), strike out "agencies" the second time it appears and substitute "agency" and strike out "part I or part II of".

(e) Redesignate section 626, 627, and 628, relating respectively to experts, consultants, and retired officers, to detail of personnel to foreign governments, and to detail of personnel to international organizations, as sections 524, 525, and 526, respectively.

(f) Redesignate section 629, which relates to status of personnel detailed, as section 527 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "section 627 or 628" and substitute "section 525 or 526".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "section 627, 628, 631, or 624(d)" and substitute "section 522(c), 525, 526, or 529".

(g) Redesignate section 630, which relates to terms of detail or assignment, as section 528 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In the introductory clause, strike out "section 627 or 628" and substitute "section 525 or 526".

(2) In paragraph (2), after "travel expenses," insert "benefits".

(3) In paragraph (4), after "travel expenses," insert "benefits" and strike out "section 629" and substitute "section 527".

(h) Redesignate section 631, which relates to missions and staffs abroad, as section 529, and amend subsection (b) of said section as follows:

(1) Strike out "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(2) Strike out "section 625(d)" and substitute "section 523(c)".

(i) Redesignate section 632, which relates to allocation and reimbursement among agencies, as section 530 and amend said section as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out ", defense articles," and "(including defense services)".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "(including defense services)" and "and defense articles".

(3) In subsection (c), strike out "part I" and "such part" and substitute "this Act".

(4) Subsection (d) is repealed and subsections (e), (f), and (g) are redesignated (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

(5) In redesignated subsection (d), strike out "defense articles," and "(including defense services),".

(6) Amend redesignated subsection (f) as follows:

(A) Strike out "part I" wherever it appears and substitute "this Act".

(B) Strike out "section 637(a)" and substitute "section 535(a)".

(j) Redesignate section 633, which relates to waivers of certain laws, as section 531 and repeal subsection (b) of said section and redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(k) Redesignate section 634, which relates to reports and information, as section 532 and amend subsection (d) of said section by striking out "section 303, 610, 614(a) or 614(b)" and substituting "section 303, 510, 514(a) or 514(b)".

(l) Redesignate section 635, which relates to general authorities, as section 533 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (h) to read as follows: "(h) A contract or agreement which entails commitments for the expenditure of funds available under titles II and V of chapter 2 and available under title VI of said chapter, to the extent such contract or agreement relates to funds not required to be made available on a dollar repayable loan basis, may, subject to any future action of the Congress, extend at any time for not more than five years."

(2) In subsection (k), strike out "part I" and substitute "this Act".

(3) Add the following new subsection (l):

"(l) The President, when he finds it to be in the interest of the United States, is authorized to sell buildings and grounds in foreign countries acquired in connection with carrying out activities under this Act, and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the proceeds of such sale may be applied toward the purchase and construction, furnishing, improvement, and preservation of other properties or held for such later use: *Provided, however,* That the President shall report all such transactions annually to the Congress with the budget estimates of the agency primarily responsible for administering this Act."

(m) Redesignate section 636, which relates to provisions on uses of funds, as section 534 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(A) Strike out "part I" wherever it appears and substitute "this Act".

(B) In the introductory clause, strike out "(except for part II)".

(C) In paragraph (2), strike out "section 626" and substitute "section 524".

(D) In paragraph (5), strike out "section 631" and substitute "section 529".

(2) In subsections (c) and (d), strike out "of part I" wherever it appears.

(3) In subsection (e), strike out "of part I" and "section 625(d)(2)" and substitute for the latter "section 523(c)(2)".

(4) Amend subsection (f) as follows:

(A) Strike out "section 637(a)" and substitute "section 535(a)".

(B) Strike out "part I" wherever it appears and substitute "this Act".

(C) Strike out "Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes" and substitute "Latin American Development Act".

(6) Subsection (g) is repealed and subsection (h) redesignated subsection (g).

(n) Redesignate section 637, which relates to administrative expenses, as section 535 and amend subsection (a) of said section by striking out "1965" and "$52,500,000" and substituting "1966" and "$55,240,000", respectively, and by striking out "part I" and substituting "this Act".

(o) Redesignate section 638, which relates to Peace Corps assistance, as section 536 and amend said section by striking out all beginning with "; or famine".

(p) Add the following new section 537:

"SEC. 537. Famine and disaster relief.—No provision of this Act shall be construed to prohibit assistance to any country for famine or disaster relief."

Title III—Miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 114. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to miscellaneous provisions, is redesignated title III of chapter 7 and is amended as follows:

(a) Redesignate section 641, which relates to effective date and identification of programs, as section 541.

(b) Dedesignate section 642, which relates to statutes repealed, as section 542 and amend subsection (a)(2) of said section by striking out "143," and all beginning with "*: Provided,*".

(c) Redesignate section 643, which relates to savings provisions, as section 543 and amend said section by striking out "section 642(a)" wherever it appears and substituting "section 542(a)".

(d) Redesignate section 644, which relates to definitions, as section 544 and amend said section as follows:

(1) Subsections (b), (d), (e), (f), (g), (i), and (m) are repealed.

(2) Subsections (c), (h), (j), (k), and (l) are designated subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

(e) Redesignate sections 645, 646, 647, and 648, which relate respectively to unexpended balances, construction, dependable fuel supply and special authorization for use of foreign currencies, as sections 545, 546, 547, and 548, respectively, and amend redesignated section 545 by striking out "Public Law 86–735" and substituting "the Latin American Development Act".

MILITARY

An act to promote the foreign policy and provide for the security and general welfare of the United States by furnishing defense articles, services, and training to friendly countries and international organizations,

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

CHAPTER 1—OBJECTIVES AND DEFINITIONS

SEC. 1. OBJECTIVES.—It is the policy of the United States to assist friendly countries in their individual and collective self-defense efforts by making it possible for them to acquire defense articles, services, and training.

This policy is based upon the principles of effective self-help and mutual aid. It is the sense of Congress that grants of defense articles should not be made to any country having sufficient resources to enable it to maintain and equip its own military forces at adequate strength without undue burden to its economy.

The Congress recognizes that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered so long as the Soviet Union and Communist China and their allies continue by threat of military action, by use of economic pressure, and by internal subversion or other means, to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent, and continue to deny the rights of freedom and self-government to peoples and countries once free but now subject to such domination.

It continues to be the intention of the United States to seek to achieve international peace and security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations so that armed force shall not be used except for individual and collective self defense.

The Congress reaffirms its belief in the importance of regional organizations of free people for mutual assistance, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Organization of American States, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the Central Treaty Organization, and others, and expresses its hope that such organizations may be strengthened and broadened, and their programs of self-help and mutual cooperation may be made more effective in the protection of the independence and security of free peoples, in the development of their economic and social well-being, and the safeguarding of their basic rights and liberties. The Congress welcomes, in particular, steps which have been taken to integrate and coordinate procurement, research, development, production, and logistics support of defense articles by the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

It is the sense of the Congress that an important contribution toward peace would be made by the establishment of earmarked military units under the Organization of the American States for peacekeeping missions in the Western Hemisphere. Similar units in other areas should be encouraged where appropriate.

In enacting this legislation, it is therefore the intention of Congress to promote the peace of the world and the security, foreign policy, and general welfare of the United States by fostering an improved climate of political independence and individual liberty, improving the ability of friendly countries and international organizations to deter or if necessary defeat Communist or Communist supported aggression, facilitating arrangements for individual and collective security, assisting friendly countries to maintain internal security, and creating an environment of security and stability in developing friendly countries through civic action and other programs essential to their more rapid social, economic, and political progress. The Congress urges that all other countries able to contribute join in the common undertaking to meet these goals.

SEC. 2. COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY.—(a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State.

(b) The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among representatives of the United States Government in each country, under the leadership of the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission. The Chief of the Diplomatic Mission shall make sure that recommendations of such representatives pertaining to military assistance and sales are coordinated with political and economic considerations, and his comments shall accompany such recommendations if he so desires.

(c) Under the direction of the President, the Secretary of State shall be responsible for the continuous supervision and general direction of the programs authorized by this Act, including but not limited to determining whether there shall be a military assistance or sales program for a country and the value thereof, to the end that such programs are effectively integrated both at home and abroad with programs of economic assistance and the foreign policy of the United States is best served thereby.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.—As used in this Act—

(a) "Armed Forces" of the United States means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

(b) "Defense article" includes any—

(1) weapon, weapons system, munition, aircraft, vessel, boat, or other implement of war;

(2) property, installation, commodity, material, equipment, supply, or goods used for the purposes of this Act;

(3) machinery, facility, tool, material, supply, or other item necessary for the manufacture, production, processing, repair, servicing, storage, construction, transportation, operation, or use of any article listed in this subsection; and

(4) component or part of any article listed in this subsection; but shall not include merchant vessels or, as defined by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), source material, by-product material, special nuclear material, or atomic weapons.

(c) "Defense information" includes any document, writing, sketch, photograph, plan, model, specification, design, prototype, drawing, technical manual, publication, or other recorded or oral information relating to any defense article or defense service, but shall not include restricted data as defined by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and data removed from the restricted data category under section 142(d) of that Act.

(d) "Defense service" includes packing, crating, handling, transportation, and any service, test, inspection, repair, rehabilitation, technical assistance, or defense information used for the purposes of this Act.

(e) "Excess defense articles" means the quantity of defense articles owned by the United States Government and not procured in anticipation of military assistance or sales requirements, or pursuant to a military assistance or sales order, which is in excess of the mobilization reserve at this time such articles are dropped from inventory by the supplying agency for delivery to countries or international organizations under this Act.

(f) "Mobilization reserve" means the quantity of defense articles determined to be required, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, to support mobilization of the Armed Forces of the United States Government in the event of war or national emergency.

(g) "Officer or employee" means civilian personnel and members of the Armed Forces of the United States Government.

(h) "Training" includes—

(1) formal or informal instruction of foreign students in the United States or overseas by officers or employees of the United States, contract technicians, contractors (including instruction at civilian institutions), or by correspondence courses and technical, educational, or informational publications and media of all kinds;

(2) orientation;

(3) training exercise;

(4) defense information;

(5) training aid;

(6) military advice to foreign military units and forces; and

(7) the transfer of limited quantities of defense articles for test, evaluation, or standardization purposes.

(i) "Value" means—

(1) with respect to excess defense articles, the gross cost incurred by the United States in repairing, rehabilitating, or modifying such articles;

(2) with respect to nonexcess defense articles delivered from inventory to countries or international organizations under this Act, the standard price in effect at the time such articles are dropped from inventory by the supplying agency. Such standard price shall be the same price (including authorized reduced prices) used for transfers or sales of such articles in or between the Armed Forces of the United States Government, or, where such articles are not transferred or sold in or between the Armed Forces of the United States, the gross cost to the United States Government adjusted as appropriate for condition and market value; and

(3) with respect to nonexcess defense articles delivered from new procurement to countries or international organizations under this Act, the contract or production costs of such articles.

(j) "United States Government Agency" includes any agency, department, board, wholly or partly owned corporation, instrumentality, commission, or establishment of the United States Government.

CHAPTER 2—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Title I—Grants of defense articles and defense services for individual and collective security

SEC. 11. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The President may acquire from any source and make grants of defense articles and defense services, on such terms and conditions as he may determine (including loans) to any friendly country or international organization, the assisting of which the President finds will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace.

SEC. 12. PURPOSES OF GRANTS.—(a) Grants of defense articles and defense services under this title to any country may be made solely for internal security, for legitimate self-defense, to permit the recipient country to participate in regional or collective arrangements or measures consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, or otherwise to permit the recipient country to participate in collective measures requested by the United Nations for the purpose of maintaining or restoring international peace and security.

(b) To the extent feasible and consistent with the purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the use of defense articles and defense services granted under this title for such purposes by the recipient country for civic action activities authorized by title II of this chapter shall be encouraged.

SEC. 13. GENERAL CONDITIONS OF ELIGIBILITY.—(a) In addition to such other provisions as the President may require, no defense articles shall be granted under this title to any country unless it shall have agreed that:

(1) it will not, without the consent of the President—

(A) permit any use of such articles by anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of that country,

(B) transfer, or permit any officer, employee, or agent of that country to transfer such articles by gift, sale, or otherwise, or

(C) use or permit the use of such articles for purposes other than those for which furnished;

(2) it will maintain the security of such articles, and will provide substantially the same degree of security protection afforded such articles by the United States Government;

(3) it will, as the President may require, permit continuous observation and review by, and furnish necessary information to, representatives of the United State Government with regard to the use of such articles; and

(4) unless the President consents to other disposition, it will return to the United States Government for such use or disposition as the President considers in the best interest of the United States, such articles which are no longer needed for the purpose for which furnished.

(b) No defense articles shall be granted under this title to any country of a value in excess of $3,000,000 in any fiscal year unless the President determines—

(1) That such country conforms to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations;

(2) that such defense articles will be utilized by such country for the maintenance of its own defensive strength, and the defensive strength of the free world; and

(3) that such country is taking all reasonable measures, consistent with its political and economic stability, which may be needed to develop its defense capacities.

Title II—Civic action assistance

SEC. 21. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The President may acquire from any source and make grants of defense articles and defense services, on such terms and conditions as he may determine (including loans), to any developing friendly country otherwise eligible under sections 11 and 13, for the purpose of assisting the military forces of that country (or the voluntary efforts of personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States) to construct public works and to engage in other activities helpful to the economic and social development of that country. It is the sense of the Congress that, insofar as practicable, such foreign military forces should not be maintained or established solely for civic action activities and that such civic action activities not significantly detract from the capability of the military forces to perform their military missions and be coordinated with and form part of the total economic and social development effort.

Title III—Training and detail of personnel

SEC. 31. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The President may furnish training, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, to any friendly country or international organization, eligibile under section 11.

(b) Members of the Armed Forces of the United States and other personnel of the Department of Defense may be assigned or detailed under this Act only to perform duties of a non-combatant nature.

SEC. 32. DETAIL OF PERSONNEL TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, any officer or employee of the Department of Defense may be detailed or assigned—

(1) to any office or position with any foreign government or governmental agency, where acceptance of such office or position does not involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government on the acceptance of compensation or other benefits from such foreign country by such officer or employee; or

(2) to any international organization to serve with, or as a member of, the international staff of such international organization, or to render any technical, scientific, or professional advice or services to, or in cooperation with, such organization.

SEC. 33. STATUS OF PERSONNEL ASSIGNED OR DETAILED.—(a) Any officer or employee, while assigned or detailed under section 32 of this Act, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his allowances, privileges, rights, seniority, and other benefits as such, an officer or employee of the United States Government and of the activity of the Department of Defense from which detailed or assigned, and he shall continue to receive compensation, allowances, and benefits from funds appropriated for that activity.

(b) Any officer or employee assigned, detailed, or appointed under section 32 of this Act may receive under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1131). The authorization of such allowances and other benefits and the payment thereof out of any appropriations available therefor shall be considered as meeting all of the requirements of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 70).

SEC. 34. TERMS OF DETAIL OR ASSIGNMENT.—Details or assignment may be made under section 32 of this Act—

(1) without reimbursement to the United States Government by the foreign government or international organization;

(2) upon agreement by the foreign government or international organization, to reimburse the United States Government for compensation, travel expenses, allowances, and benefits, or any part thereof, payable to the officer or employee concerned during the period of assignment or detail; and such reimbursements (including foreign currencies) shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized for paying such compensation, travel expenses, allowances, or benefits, or to the appropriation fund, or account currently available for such purposes;

(3) upon an advance of funds, property, or services by the foreign government or international organization to the United States Government accepted with the approval of the President for specified uses in furtherance of the purposes of this Act; and funds so advanced may be established as a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States Government, to be available for the specified uses, and to be used for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditure subject to the provisions of this Act, any unexpended balance of such account to be returned to the foreign government or international organization; or

(4) subject to the receipt by the United States Government of a credit to be applied against the payment by the United States Government of its share of the expenses of the international organization to which the officer or employee is detailed or assigned, such credit to be based upon the compensation, travel expenses, allowances, and benefits, or any part thereof, payable to such officer or employee during the period of detail or assignment in accordance with section 32 of this Act.

Title IV—Collective defense activities

SEC. 41. INFRASTRUCTURE AND JOINT USE FACILITIES.—The President may enter into bilateral or multilateral arrangements with any friendly foreign country or international organization eligible under sections 11 and 13, on such terms and conditions as he may determine (including financial contributions of funds made available under this Act) for the acquisition or construction of facilities for collective defense or which are to be jointly utilized by the Armed Forces of the United States and friendly foreign military forces or which may be utilized by the Armed Forces of the United States upon the implementation of contingency plans of the United States.

SEC. 42. INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS.—The President may use funds made available under this Act to enter into bilateral or multilateral arrangements, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for sharing the costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining international military headquarters and organizations in which the Department of Defense participates.

Title V—Restrictions on assistance

SEC. 51. SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF ELIGIBILITY.—(a) (1) No assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any economically developed nation capable of sustaining its own defense burden and economic growth, except (1) to fulfill firm commitments made prior to July 1, 1963, or (2) additional orientation and training expenses under this chapter during each fiscal year in an amount not to exceed $500,000.

(2) The President shall regularly reduce and, with such deliberate speed as orderly procedure and other relevant considerations, including prior commitments, will permit, shall terminate all further grants of defense articles to any country having sufficient resources to enable it, in the judgment of the President, to maintain and equip its own military forces at adequate strength, without undue burden to its economy.

(b) Any country which hereafter uses defense articles or defense services furnished such country under this Act or any predecessor foreign assistance Act, in substantial violation of the provisions of this Act or any agreement entered into pursuant to any of such Acts shall be immediately ineligible for further assistance.

(c) No assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any country which furnishes assistance to the present Government of Cuba unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States.

(d) No funds authorized to be made available under this Act shall be used to furnish assistance under this chapter to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than sixty days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—

(A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to Cuba (other than to United States installations in Cuba)—

(i) any items of economic assistance.

(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

(iii) any other equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime; and

(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.

(e) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter to the government of any country which is indebted to any United States citizen or person for goods or services furnished to or ordered where (i) such citizen or person has exhausted available legal remedies, which shall include arbitration, or (ii) the debt is not denied or contested by such government, or (iii) such indebtedness arises under an unconditional guaranty of payment given by such government, or any predecessor government, directly or indirectly, through any controlled entity: *Provided,* That the President does not find such action contrary to the national security.

(f) The President shall suspend assistance under this chapter to the government of any country when the government of such country or any government agency or subdivision

within such country on or after January 1, 1962—

(A) has nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

(B) has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

(C) has imposed or enforced discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned,

and such country, government agency, or government subdivision fails within a reasonable time (not more than six months after such action, or, in the event of a referral to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States within such period as provided herein, not more than twenty days after the report of the Commission is received) to take appropriate steps, which may include arbitration, to discharge its obligations under international law toward such citizen or entity, including speedy compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange, equivalent to the full value thereof, as required by international law, or fails to take steps designed to provide relief from such taxes, exactions, or conditions, as the case may be; and such suspension shall continue until the President is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken, and no other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.

Upon request of the President (within seventy days after such action referred to in subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1) of this subsection), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States (established pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1954, 68 Stat. 1279) is hereby authorized to evaluate expropriated property, determining the full value of any property nationalized, expropriated, or seized, or subject to discriminatory or other actions as aforesaid, for purposes of this subsection and to render an advisory report to the President within ninety days after such request. Unless authorized by the President, the Commission shall not publish its advisory report except to the citizen or entity owning such property. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amount, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary from time to time to enable the Commission to carry out expeditiously its functions under this subsection.

(g) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—

(1) the United States,

(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954,

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act.

(h) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter after December 31, 1965, to the government of any less developed country which has failed to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guaranty program under section 221(b)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, providing protection against the specific risks of inconvertibility under subparagraph (A), and expropriation or confiscation under subparagraph (B), of such section 221(b)(1).

SEC. 52. COUNTRIES SPECIFICALLY INELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE.—(a) Except as may be deemed by the President in the interest of the United States, no assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any government of Cuba, until the President determines that such government has taken appropriate steps according to international law standards to return to United States citizens, and to entities not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or to provide equitable compensation to such citizens and entities for property taken from such citizens and entities on or after January 1, 1959, by the Government of Cuba.

(b) No assistance shall be furnished under this chapter to any Communist country. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act unless the President finds and promptly reports to Congress that: (1) such assistance is vital to the security of the United States; (2) the recipient country is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy; and (3) such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international communism. For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase "Communist country" shall include specifically, but not be limited to, the following countries:

Peoples Republic of Albania,
Peoples Republic of Bulgaria,
Peoples Republic of China,
Czechoslovak Socialist Republic,
German Democratic Republic (East Germany),
Estonia,
Hungarian Peoples Republic,
Latvia,
Lithuania,
North Korean Peoples Republic,
North Vietnam,
Outer Mongolia-Mongolian Peoples Republic,
Polish Peoples Republic,
Rumanian Peoples Republic,
Tibet,
Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia,
Cuba, and
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (including its captive constituent republics).

(c) No assistance under this chapter shall be furnished to Indonesia unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States. The President shall keep the Congress fully and currently informed of any assistance furnished to Indonesia under this chapter.

SEC. 53. REGIONAL RESTRICTIONS.—(a) The value of defense articles granted to American Republics (including defense articles granted in implementing a feasible plan for regional defense) under this chapter in each fiscal year shall not exceed $55,000,000. Except for civic action assistance, defense articles shall be granted under this chapter to any American Republic only to the extent that the President determines that such defense articles are necessary to safeguard the security of the United States, or to safeguard the security of a country associated with the United States in the Alliance for Progress against overthrow of a duly constituted government.

(b) The value of defense articles granted under this chapter to African countries in each fiscal year shall not exceed $25,000,000. No defense articles shall be granted under this chapter to any country in Africa except for internal security requirements or for civic action assistance unless the President determines otherwise.

(c) Determinations under this section shall be promptly reported to the Congress.

SEC. 54. CERTIFICATION OF RECIPIENT'S CAPABILITY.—(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no defense article having a value in excess of $100,000 shall hereafter be delivered to any country or international organization under the authority of this chapter unless the chief of the appropriate military assistance advisory group representing the United States with respect to defense articles used by such country or international organization, or the head of any other group representing the United States with respect to defense articles used by such country or international organization, has certified in writing within six months prior to delivery that the country or international organization has the capability to utilize effectively such article in carrying out the purposes of this chapter.

(b) Defense articles included in approved military assistance programs may be delivered to any country or international organization for which the certification required by subsection (a) of this section cannot be made when determined necessary and specifically approved in advance by the Secretary of State (or, upon appropriate delegation of authority by an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary of State) and the Secretary of Defense (or, upon appropriate delegation of authority by the Deputy Secretary or an Assistant Secretary of Defense). The Secretary of State, or his delegate, shall make a complete report to the Congress of each determination and approval and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 55. COMMINGLING OF ASSISTANCE.—The President shall adopt regulations and establish procedures to insure that assistance under this chapter is not used in a manner which, contrary to the best interests of the United States, promotes or assists the foreign aid projects or activities of the Communist-bloc countries.

CHAPTER 3—SALES, BARTER TRANSACTIONS AND LEASES

SEC. 70. OBJECTIVES.—The aim of this chapter is to advance the overall objectives of this Act set forth in section 1 by facilitating the acquisition on a reimbursable basis of defense articles, defense services, and training by friendly countries having sufficient wealth to maintain and equip their own military forces wholly or in part without grant assistance. The Congress urges that, consistent with section 1, treaties and other international obligations, emphasis be given to transactions authorized by this chapter in order to promote the defensive strength of the free world. The Congress further declares that, in the administration of this chapter, participation by private enterprise should be encouraged to the maximum extent practical.

Title I—Cash sales

SEC. 71. SALES FROM STOCK.—(a) The President may sell for United States dollars defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense and defense services and training to any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 11, without reimbursement from funds available for use under this Act, on terms of payment of not less than the value thereof in advance or within 120 days after the delivery of the defense articles or the provision of the defense services or training. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3(1)(2), nonexcess defense articles may be sold under this subsection at the standard price in effect at the time such articles are offered for sale to the purchasing country or international organization. For the purpose of this subsection, the value of excess defense articles shall not be less than—

(1) the value specified in section 3(i)(1) plus the scrap value, or

(2) the market value, if ascertainable, whichever is greater.

(b) Payments received under subsection (a) of this section shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account funding the cost of the defense articles, defense services, or training sold, or to any appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

SEC. 72. PROCUREMENT FOR SALE.—(a) The President may, without requirement for any charge to any appropriation or contract authorization otherwise provided, enter into contracts for the procurement of defense articles, defense services, and training for sale for United States dollars to any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 11 if such country or international organization—

(1) provides the United States Government with a dependable undertaking which will assure the United States Government against any loss on the contracts, and

(2) agrees to make funds available in such amounts and at such times as may be required to meet the payments required by the contracts, and any damages and costs that may accrue from the cancellation of such contracts, in advance of the time such payments, damages, or costs are due: *Provided*, That the President may, when he determines it to be in the national interest, accept a dependable undertaking to make full payment within 120 days after delivery of the defense articles, or the provision of the defense services or training, and appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used to meet the payments required by the contracts and shall be reimbursed by the amounts subsequently received from the country or international organization: *Provided further*, That the President may, when he determines it to be in the national interest, enter into sales agreements with purchasing countries or international organizations which fix the prices to be paid by the purchasing countries or international organizations for the defense articles, defense services, or training ordered. Funds available under this Act for financing credit sales shall be used to reimburse the applicable appropriations in the amounts required by the contracts which exceed the price so fixed, except that such reimbursement shall not be required upon determination by the President that the continued production of the defense article being sold is advantageous to the Armed Forces of the United States. Payments by purchasing countries of international organizations which exceed the amounts required by such contracts shall be credited to the account established under section 83.

(b) No sales of unclassified defense articles shall be made to the government of any economically developed country under the provisions of this section unless such articles are not generally available for purchase by such countries from commercial sources in the United States. The Secretary of Defense may waive the provisions of this subsection when he determines that the waiver of such provisions is in the national interest.

Title II—Credit sales and guarantees

SEC. 81. GENERAL AUTHORITY FOR CREDIT SALES.—(a) The President may use funds available under this Act to finance credit sales of defense articles, defense services, and training to friendly foreign countries and international organizations eligible under section 11 on such terms as he may determine, including the prices to be paid by the purchasing countries or international organizations. Reimbursement to supplying agencies shall be governed by section 122.

(b) In addition, when the President determines it to be in the national interest, sales under section 71 may be made on terms of payment of not more than three years after the delivery of the defense article or the provision of the defense service or training.

SEC. 82. GUARANTEES.—(a) The President may guarantee, insure, coinsure, and reinsure any individual, corporation, partnership, or other association doing business in the United States against political and credit risks of nonpayment arising in connection with sales financed by such individual, corporation, partnership or other association of defense articles, defense services, and training procured in the United States by friendly countries and international organizations eligible under section 11.

(b) In issuing guarantees, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance, the President may enter into contracts with exporters, insurance companies, financial institutions, or others, or groups thereof, and where appropriate may employ any of the same to act as agent in the issuance and servicing of such guarantees, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance, and the adjustment of claims arising thereunder.

(c) Fees and premiums shall be charged in connection with such contracts of guaranty insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance (excluding contracts with United States Government Agencies), and such fees and premiums may be utilized to meet liabilities resulting from such contracts.

(d) Obligations shall be recorded against the funds available for credit sales in an amount not less than 25 per centum of the contractual liability related to any guarantee, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance issued pursuant to this section, and the funds so obligated, together with fees and premiums, shall constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims under such contracts. Any guarantees, insurance, coinsurance, and reinsurance issued pursuant to this section shall be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

SEC. 83. REIMBURSEMENTS.—(a) Whenever funds available under this Act are used to finance credit sales, repayments in United States dollars (including dollar proceeds derived from the sale of foreign currency repayments), receipts received from the disposition of evidences of indebtedness, and charges (including fees and premiums) or interest collected shall be credited to a separate fund account, and shall be available until expended solely for the purpose of financing further credit sales, including the overhead costs thereof.

(b) All assets and obligations of the military sales credit account administratively established on the books of the Treasury pursuant to section 508 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, including proceeds receivable from previous credit sales transactions, and such amounts of the appropriations authorized under this Act as may be determined by the President shall be transferred or credited to the separate fund account established under section 83(a) and shall be available until expended solely for the purpose of financing credit sales, including the overhead costs thereof.

SEC. 84. FOREIGN CURRENCIES.—Sales financed under this title may provide for payment in foreign currencies only to the extent that the Secretary of the Treasury determines at the time of each such sale that the existing or anticipated requirements for such foreign currencies for payment of United States obligations abroad are such that an excess of United States Government holdings of any particular foreign currency is not likely to result.

SEC. 85. COLLECTIONS.—In carrying out this title, the President—

(1) may acquire and dispose of, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine, any evidence of indebtedness; and

(2) may collect or compromise any indebtedness owed to the Department of Defense by foreign countries or international organizations.

Title III—Barter transactions

SEC. 91. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The President may, without reimbursement from funds available for use under this Act, barter defense articles which are in the stocks of the Department of Defense or which the Department of Defense is authorized to procure under other provisions of law, defense services, and training with any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 11 in exchange for other defense articles, defense services, and training of approximately equal or equivalent value for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States.

(b) The President may, subject to the provisions of section 122, also use funds available to carry out this Act to acquire defense articles, defense services, and training from any source and barter such defense articles, defense services, or training with any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 11 in exchange for other defense articles, defense services, or training.

SEC. 92. DISPOSITION OF DEFENSE ARTICLES, DEFENSE SERVICES, AND TRAINING RECEIVED IN EXCHANGE UNDER SECTION 91(b).—Defense articles, defense services, and training received by the United States Government from a country or international organization in exchange for defense articles, defense services, and training bartered by the United States Government under section 91(b) may be used to carry out this Act, may be sold (on cash or credit terms, including payment in foreign currencies) to any friendly country or international organization, or may be transferred to any United States Government agency for stockpiling or other purposes. If such disposal or transfer is made subject to reimbursement, the funds so received shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account which funded the cost of the defense articles, defense services, or training bartered to the country or international organization, or to any appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purposes.

Title IV—Leases

SEC. 101. LEASES.—(a) The President may, subject to section 122, use funds available to carry out this Act to acquire defense articles from any source and lease such defense articles, on such terms and conditions of payment as he may determine, to any friendly country or international organization eligible under section 11.

(b) Payments received under this section shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account funding the cost of the defense articles leased, or to any appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

Title V—General provisions

SEC. 111. PURPOSES.—Defense articles, defense services, and training may be sold, bartered, or leased under this chapter to eligible countries solely for the purposes specified in sections 12 and 21.

CHAPTER 4—FISCAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 121. ALLOCATIONS.—The President may allocate to any United States Government agency any part of any funds available for carrying out the purposes of this Act, including any advance to the United States Government by any country or international organization, for the procurement of defense articles, defense services, and training. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure for the purposes for which authorized, in accordance with authority granted in this Act or under authority governing the activities of the United States Government agencies to which such funds are allocated.

SEC. 122. REIMBURSEMENTS.—(a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, reimbursement shall be made to any activity of the Department of Defense and to any other United States Government agency, from

funds available for use under this Act for defense articles, defense services, and training furnished to foreign countries and international organizations by, or through, such activity or agency under this Act. Such reimbursement shall be in an amount equal to the value as defined in section 3 of the defense articles, defense services, and training furnished, plus expenses arising from or incident to operations under this Act (other than pay and allowances of members of the Armed Forces). The amount of such reimbursement shall be credited to the current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts of such activity.

(b) Orders to a supplying agency under this Act shall be based upon the best estimates of stock status and prevailing prices; reimbursements to the supplying agency shall be made on the basis of the stock status and prices determined pursuant to section 3(1). Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Secretary of Defense may prescribe regulations authorizing reimbursements to the supplying agency based on negotiated prices for aircraft, vessels, plant equipment, and such other major items as he may specify: *Provided,* That such articles are not excess at the time such prices are negotiated: *Provided further,* That such prices are negotiated at the time firm orders are placed with the supplying agency.

SEC. 123. APPROPRIATIONS.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act not to exceed $1,170,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1966, which shall remain available until expended. In addition, there is hereby authorized to be authorized to the President for use in Vietnam such sums as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized by this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to such programs, if he determines such use to be important to the national interest: *Provided,* That the President shall present to each committee of the Congress charged with considering legislation under this Act, the programs to be carried out from funds requested by the President to be appropriated under authority of this sentence, such presentation to be in the manner and to the extent determined by said committee.

SEC. 124. SPECIAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The President may, if he determines it to be vital to the security of the United States, order defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense and defense services and training for the purpose of this Act without reimbursement therefor from appropriations available for military assistance. The value of such orders shall not exceed $300,000,000 during each fiscal year. Prompt notice of action taken under this subsection shall be given to the Congress.

(b) The Department of Defense is authorized to incur, in applicable appropriations, obligations in amounts equivalent to such orders under subsection (a) of this section. Appropriations of such sums as may be necessary to liquidate the obligations so incurred are hereby authorized.

SEC. 125. LETTERS OF COMMITMENT.—In carrying out this Act accounts may be established on the books of the Department of Defense (1) against which letter of commitment may be issued which shall constitute recordable obligations of the United States Government and moneys due or to become due under such letters of commitment shall be assignable under the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, as amended (second and third paragraphs of 31 U.S.C. 203 and 41 U.S.C. 15), and (2) from which disbursements may be made to recipient countries or agencies, organizations, or persons upon presentation of contracts, invoices, or other appropriate documentation. Expenditures of funds which have been made available through accounts so established shall be accounted for on standard documentation required for expenditure of funds of the United States Government: *Provided,* That such expenditures for defense articles, defense services, and training procured outside the United States shall be accounted for exclusively on such certification as may be prescribed in regulations approved by the Comptroller General of the United States.

CHAPTER 5—GENERAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Title I—General Provisions

SEC. 131. GENERAL AUTHORITIES.—(a) The President may make and perform agreements and contracts with, or enter into other transactions with, any individual, corporation, or other body of persons, or Government agency, whether within or without the United States, and international organization in furtherance of the purposes, and within the limitations, of this Act.

(b) A contract under this Act may, subject to future action of the Congress, extend at any time for not more than five (5) years.

(c) The President may accept and use in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, money, funds, property, and services of any kind made available by gift, devise, bequest, grant, or otherwise for such purposes.

(d) Any officer of the United States Government carrying out functions under this Act may utilize the services and facilities of or procure defense articles from, any United States Government agency with the consent of the head of such agency, or as the President shall direct, and funds allocated pursuant to this subsection to any such agency may be established in separate transfer appropriation accounts on the books of the Treasury.

SEC. 132. WAIVER AUTHORITIES.—(a) The President may authorize in each fiscal year the use of funds made available for use under this Act and the furnishing of assistance under section 124 in a total amount not to exceed $125,000,000, without regard to the provisions of this Act, any Act appropriating funds for use under this Act, or the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, in furtherance of any of the purposes of such Acts, when he determines that such authorization is important to the security of the United States. Not more than $50,000,000 of the funds available under this subsection may be allocated to any one country in any fiscal year. Each determination shall be reported promptly to the Congress.

(b) Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the functions authorized under this Act may be performed without regard to such provisions of law (other than the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1211 et seq.)) regulating the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts and the expenditure of funds of the United States Government as the President may specify.

(c) The President is authorized to use amounts not to exceed $25,000,000 of the funds available for use under this Act pursuant to his certification that it is inadvisable to specify the nature of the use of such funds, which certification shall be deemed to be a sufficient voucher for such amounts.

(d) The functions authorized under this Act may be performed without regard to such provisions as the President may specify of the joint resolution of November 4, 1939 (54 Stat. 4), as amended.

(e) The provisions of section 955 of title 18 of the United States Code shall not apply to prevent any person, including any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, from acting for, or participating in, any operation or transaction arising under this part or from acquiring new obligations issued in connection with any operation or transaction arising under this Act.

SEC. 133. RETENTION AND USE OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.—(a) Any defense articles procured to carry out this Act may be retained by, or transferred to, and for the use of, such United States Government agency as the President may determine in lieu of being disposed of to a foreign country or international organization, whenever in the judgment of the President the best interests of the United States will be served thereby. Any defense articles so retained may be disposed of without regard to provisions of law relating to the disposal of property owned by the United States Government, when necessary to prevent spoilage or wastage of such defense articles or to conserve the usefulness thereof. Funds realized from any transfer or disposal shall revert to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to procure such defense articles or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

(b) Funds realized by the United States Government from the sale, transfer, or disposal of defense articles returned to the United States Government by a recipient country or international organization as no longer needed for the purpose for which furnished shall be credited to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to procure such defense articles or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

SEC. 134. ORDERLY TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—Funds made available under this Act shall remain available for a period not to exceed twelve months from the date of termination of assistance or related activities to or with a foreign country or international organization for the necessary expenses of winding up programs related thereto.

SEC. 135. PATENTS AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION.—(a) Whenever, in connection with the performance of functions under this Act—

(1) an invention or discovery covered by a patent issued by the United States Government is practiced within the United States without the authorization of the owner, or

(2) information, which is (A) protected by law, and (B) held by the United States Government subject to restrictions imposed by the owner, is disclosed by the United States Government or any of its officers, employees, or agents in violation of such restrictions,

the exclusive remedy of the owner, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, is to sue the United States Government for reasonable and entire compensation for such practice or disclosure in the district court of the United States for the district in which such owner is a resident, or in the Court of Claims, within six years after the cause of action arises. Any period during which the United States Government is in possession of a written claim under section (b) of this section before mailing a notice of denial of that claim does not count in computing the six years. In any such suit, the United States Government may plead any defense that may be pleaded by a private person in such an action. A Government employee shall have the right to bring suit against the Government under this section except where he was in a position to order, influence, or induce use of the invention by the Government. This section shall not confer a right of action on any patentee or any assignee of such patentee with respect to any invention discovered or invented by a person while in the employment or service of the United States, where the invention was related to the official functions of the employee, in cases in which such functions included research and development, or in the making of which

Government time, materials or facilities were used.

(b) Before suit against the United States Government has been instituted, the head of the agency of the United States Government concerned may settle and pay any claim arising under the circumstances described in subsection (a) of this section. No claim may be paid under this subsection unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction.

SEC. 136. SHIPPING ON UNITED STATES VESSELS.—The ocean transportation between foreign countries of defense articles purchased with foreign currencies made available or derived from funds available under this Act or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.), shall not be governed by the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1241), or any other law relating to the ocean transportation of defense articles on United States vessels.

SEC. 137. PROCUREMENT OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Funds available under this Act may be used for procurement of defense articles outside the United States only if the President determines that such procurement will not result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States or the industrial mobilization base, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus or to the net position of the United States in its balance of payments with the rest of the world, which outweigh the economic or other advantages to the United States of less costly procurement outside the United States.

Title II—Administrative provisions

SEC. 141. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise any functions conferred upon him by this Act through such agency or officer of the United States Government as he shall direct. The head of any such agency or such officer may from time to time promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out such functions, and may delegate authority to perform any such functions, including if he shall so specify, the authority successively to redelegate any of such functions to any of his subordinates.

SEC. 142. THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—(a) With respect to programs authorized by this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall have primary responsibility for—

(1) the determination of military end-item requirements;

(2) the procurement of military equipment in a manner which permits its integration with service programs;

(3) the supervision of end-item use by the recipient countries;

(4) the supervision of the training of foreign military personnel;

(5) the movement and delivery of military end-items; and

(6) within the Department of Defense, the performance of any other functions with respect to programs authorized by this Act.

(b) The establishment of priorities in the procurement, delivery, and allocation of military equipment shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 143. MISSIONS AND STAFFS ABROAD.—The President may maintain special missions or staffs outside the United States in such countries and for such periods of time as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 144. EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL.—(a) For the purposes of performing functions under this Act outside the United States the President may employ or assign persons compensated at any of the rates provided for the Foreign Service Reserve and Staff by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), together with allowances and benefits thereunder. Persons so employed or assigned shall be entitled, except to the extent that the President may specify otherwise in cases in which the period of employment or assignment exceeds thirty months, to the same benefits as are provided by section 528 of that Act for persons appointed to the Foreign Service Reserve, and the provisions of section 1005 of that Act shall apply in the case of such persons, except that policymaking officials shall not be subject to that part of section 1005 of that Act which prohibits political tests.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 3544(b) and 8544(b) of title 10 of the United States Code, personnel of the Department of Defense may be assigned or detailed to any civil office to carry out this Act.

SEC. 145. EXPENSES.—(a) Funds made available for the purpose of this Act shall be available for—

(1) administrative and operating expenses;

(2) extraordinary expenses of not to exceed $300,000 in any fiscal year; and

(3) constructing or otherwise acquiring outside the United States essential living quarters, office space, and necessary supporting facilities for use of personnel carrying out activities authorized by this Act.

(b) Actual expenses incurred by military officers detailed or assigned as tour directors in connection with orientation visits of foreign military personnel may be reimbursed in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 836), applicable to civilian officers and employees.

SEC. 146. REPORTS AND INFORMATION.—(a) The President shall, while funds made available for the purpose of this Act remain available for obligation, transmit to the Congress after the close of each fiscal year a report concerning operations in that fiscal year under this Act.

(b) The President shall, in the reports required by subsection (a) of this section, and in response to requests from Members of the Congress or inquiries from the public, make public all information concerning operations under this Act not deemed by him to be incompatible with the security of the United States.

(c) None of the funds made available pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be used to carry out any provision of this Act in any country or with respect to any project or activity, after the expiration of the thirty-five-day period which begins on the date the General Accounting Office or any committee of the Congress charged with considering legislation, appropriations or expenditures under this Act, has delivered to the office of the head of any agency carrying out such provision, a written request that it be furnished any document, paper, communication, audit, review, finding, recommendation, report, or other material in its custody or control relating to the administration of such provision in such country or with respect to such project or activity, unless and until there has been furnished to the General Accounting Office, or to such committee, as the case may be, (1) the document paper, communication, audit, review, finding, recommendation, report, or other material so requested, or (2) a certification by the President that he has forbidden the furnishing thereof pursuant to request and his reason for so doing.

(d) At the end of each fiscal year, the President shall notify each committee of the Congress charged with considering legislation or appropriations under this Act of all actions taken during the fiscal year under this Act which resulted in furnishing assistance of a kind, for a purpose, or to an area, substantially different from that included in the presentation to the Congress during its consideration of this Act or any Act appropriating funds pursuant to authorizations contained in this Act, or which resulted in obligations or reservations greater by 50 per centum or more than the proposed obligations or reservations included in such presentation for the program concerned, and in his notification the President shall state the justification for such changes. There shall also be included in the presentation material submitted to the Congress during its consideration of amendments to this Act, or of any Act appropriating funds pursuant to authorizations contained in this Act, a comparison of the current fiscal year programs and activities with those presented to the Congress in the previous year and an explanation of any substantial changes.

Title III—Miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 151. PROVISIONS OF LAW REPEALED AND AMENDED.—(a) Part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is hereby repealed.

(b) References to the statutory provisions of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, contained in other Acts shall hereafter be considered to be references to the appropriate provisions of this Act.

(c) Section 625(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is redesignated as section 147 of this Act.

SEC. 152. SAVING PROVISIONS.—(a) Except as may be expressly provided to the contrary in this Act all determinations, authorizations, regulations, orders, contracts, agreements, and other actions issued, undertaken, or entered into under authority of any provision of law repealed by this Act or Acts superseded by those provisions, shall continue in full force and effect until modified by appropriate authority.

(b) Wherever provisions of this Act establish conditions which must be complied with before use may be made of authority contained in, or funds authorized by, this Act, compliance with, or satisfaction of, substantially similar conditions under provisions of law repealed by this Act, or Acts superseded by those provisions shall be deemed to constitute compliance with the conditions established by this Act.

(c) Funds made available pursuant to provisions of law repealed by this Act shall, unless otherwise authorized or provided by law, remain available for their original purposes in accordance with the provision of law currently applicable to those purposes.

SEC. 153. UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—Unexpended balances of funds made available pursuant to this Act hereby authorized to be continued available for the general purposes for which appropriated.

SEC. 154. CONSTRUCTION.—If any provisions of this Act or the application of any provision to any circumstances or persons shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act, and of the applicability of such provision to other circumstances or persons, shall not be affected thereby.

EXHIBIT 2

H.R. —

A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes

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

PART I: CHAPTER 1—POLICY

SEC. 101. Section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the statement of policy, is amended by inserting after the second full sentence in the thirteenth paragraph thereof the following: "Congress further urges that the United States and other free world nations place an increasing portion of their assistance programs on a multilateral basis and that the

United States continue its efforts to improve coordination among programs of assistance carried out on a bilateral basis by free world nations".

CHAPTER 2—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Title II—Technical cooperation and development grants

SEC. 102. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 212, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$215,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$210,000,000", respectively.

(b) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is hereby repealed effective July 1, 1966.

(2) Amend subsection (c) by striking out "1965, $18,000,000" and substituting "1966, $7,000,000".

Title III—Investment guaranties

SEC. 103. Title III of chapter 2 of part 1 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) Amend the introductory clause to read as follows: "The President may issue guaranties to eligible United States investors—".

(2) In paragraph (1), strike out "$2,500,000,000" and substitute "$5,000,000,000".

(3) Amend paragraph (2) as follows:

(A) In the first proviso, strike out ", and no such guaranty in the case of a loan shall exceed $25,000,000 and no other such guaranty shall exceed $10,000,000".

(B) In the fourth proviso, strike out "1966" and substitute "1967".

(b) Amend section 221(c), which relates to general authority, by inserting after the word "guaranty" the third time it appears, the words "of an equity investment".

(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by inserting after "(exclusive of informational media guaranties)," the words "and to pay the costs of investigating and adjusting (including costs of arbitration) claims under such guaranties,".

(d) Amend section 223, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "and" at the end thereof and in subsection (b) strike out the period and substitute "; and".

(2) And the following new subsection (c):

"(c) the term 'eligible United States investors' means United States citizens, or corporations, partnerships, or other associations created under the laws of the United States or any State or territory and substantially beneficially owned by United States citizens, as well as foreign corporations, partnerships, or other associations wholly owned by one or more such United States citizens, corporations, partnerships, or other associations: *Provided*, That the eligibility of a foreign corporation shall be determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the United States owners."

(e) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, to read as follows:

"SEC. 224. HOUSING PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES.—(a) It is the sense of Congress that in order to stimulate private home ownership and assist in the development of stable economies in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating pilot housing projects, the development of institutions engaged in Alliance for Progress programs, with particular emphasis on cooperatives, free labor unions, savings and loan and other institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, the construction of homes for lower income persons and families, the increased mobilization of savings and the improvement of housing conditions in Latin America.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the President is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as he shall determine, to eligible United States investors as defined in section 223 assuring against loss of loan investments made by such investors in—

"(1) pilot or demonstration private housing projects in Latin America of types similar to those insured by the Federal Housing Administration and suitable for conditions in Latin America;

"(2) credit institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, such as savings and loan institutions;

"(3) housing projects in Latin America for lower income families and persons, which projects shall be constructed in accordance with maximum unit costs established by the President for families and persons whose incomes meet the limitations prescribed by the President;

"(4) housing projects in Latin America which will promote the development of institutions important to the success of the Alliance for Progress, such as free labor unions and cooperatives; or

"(5) housing projects in Latin America 25 per centum or more of the aggregate of the mortgage financing for which is made available from sources within Latin America and is not derived from sources outside Latin America, which projects shall, to the maximum extent practicable, have a unit cost of not more than $6,500.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $350,000,000: *Provided*, That the total face amount of guaranties issued under subsection (b)(1) outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $250,000,000: *Provided further*, That no payment may be made under this section for any loss arising out of fraud or misconduct for which the investor is responsible: *Provided further*, That this authority shall continue until June 30, 1967."

Title VI—Alliance for Progress

SEC. 106. Section 252 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended, by striking out, in the first sentence thereof, all after the words "until expended" and substituting the following: "*Provided*, That any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropriated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such subsequent fiscal year. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section, except for not to exceed $100,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1963 and 1964 and $85,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in each such fiscal year, shall be available only for loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars."

CHAPTER 3—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 104. Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend the first sentence by striking out "1965" and "$134,272,400" and substituting "1966" and "$155,455,000", respectively.

(b) Strike out the second sentence.

CHAPTER 4—SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 105. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out in the first sentence "1965" and "$405,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$369,200,000", respectively.

CHAPTER 5—CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 106. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(1) Strike out "1965" and $150,000,000" and substitute "1966" and "$50,000,000", respectively.

(2) Add the following new sentence: "In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in Vietnam such sums as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized by parts I and II of this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to such programs if he determines such use to be important to the national interest: *Provided*, That the President shall present to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives the programs to be carried out from funds requested by the President to be appropriated under authority of this sentence."

(b) Amend subsection (b) by striking out "this section" and substituting "the first sentence of subsection (a)".

PART II: CHAPTER 2—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 503(b), which relates to general authority, by striking out the words "in foreign countries".

(b) Amend section 504, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$1,055,000,000" in the first sentence and substituting "1966" and "$1,170,000,000", respectively.

(c) Amend section 505, which relates to utilization of assistance, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out the colon and add the following: ", or for the purpose of assisting foreign military forces (or the voluntary efforts of personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States) to construct public works and to engage in other activities helpful to the economic and social development of friendly countries. It is the sense of the Congress that, insofar as practicable, such foreign military forces should not be maintained or established solely for civic action activities and that such civic action activities not significantly detract from the capability of the military forces to perform their military missions and be coordinated with and form part of the total economic and social development effort."

(2) Strike out subsection (b) and redesignate the proviso of subsection (a) as subsection (b).

(3) In redesignated subsection (b), strike out "*Provided*, That except" and substitute "Except"; strike out "or (2)" and substitute ", or (2) for civic action assistance, or (3)".

(d) Amend section 507, which relates to sales, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), insert the following new sentence between the second and third sentences: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 644(m)(2), nonexcess de-

fense articles may be sold under this subsection at the standard price in effect at the time such articles are offered for sale to the purchasing country or international organization."

(2) In subsection (b), strike out the period at the end of the first proviso, substitute a colon and add the following: *"Provided further,* That the President may, when he determines it to be in the national interest, enter into sales agreements with purchasing countries or international organizations which fix prices to be paid by the purchasing countries or international organizations for the defense articles or defense services ordered. Funds available under this part for financing sales shall be used to reimburse the applicable appropriations in the amounts required by the contracts which exceed the price so fixed, except that such reimbursement shall not be required upon determination by the President that the continued production of the defense article being sold is advantageous to the Armed Forces of the United States. Payments by purchasing countries or international organizations which exceed the amounts required by such contracts shall be credited to the account established under section 508."

(e) Amend section 508, which relates to reimbursement as follows:

(1) After "United States Government," the first time it appears insert "receipts received from the disposition of evidences of indebtedness and charges (including fees and premiums) or interest collected".

(2) Strike out "the current applicable appropriation" and substitute "a separate fund account".

(3) Strike out "furnishing further military assistance on cash or credit terms" and substitute "financing sales and guaranties, including the overhead costs thereof".

(f) Amend section 509(b), which relates to exchanges and guaranties, by inserting "(excluding contracts with any agency of the United States Government)" in the second sentence between the last word thereof and the period.

(g) Amend section 510, which relates to special authority, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "During the fiscal year 1965" and "in the fiscal year 1965" and substitute "During each fiscal year" and "in each fiscal year", respectively.

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "to the President".

(h) Amend section 512, which relates to restrictions on military aid to Africa, as follows:

(1) Strike out "programs described in section 505(b) of this chapter" and substitute "civic action requirements".

(2) Strike out "1965" and substitute "1966".

PART III: CHAPTER 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 605, which relates to retention and use of items, as follows:

(1) In the section heading strike out "Items" and substitute "Certain Items and Funds".

(2) Add the following new subsections:

"(c) Funds realized as a result of any failure of a transaction financed under authority of part I of this Act to conform to the requirements of this Act, or to applicable rules and regulations of the United States Government, or to the terms of any agreement or contract entered into under authority of part I of this Act, shall revert to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to finance such transaction or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

"(d) Funds realized by the United States Government from the sale, transfer, or disposal of defense articles returned to the United States Government by a recipient country or international organization as no longer needed for the purpose for which furnished shall be credited to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to procure such defense articles or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose."

(b) Amend section 612, which relates to use of foreign currencies, by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

CHAPTER 2—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 302. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "paragraph (3) of" and "of the officers provided for in paragraphs (1) and (2) of that subsection", and substitute for the latter "of one or more of said officers".

(2) In subsection (d), strike out "Public Law 86–735" wherever it appears and substitute "the Latin American Development Act, as amended".

(b) Amend section 625(d), which relates to the employment of personnel, as follows:

(1) In the introductory clause, strike out "outside the United States".

(2) In paragraph (2), strike out all after "prescribe" and substitute a period.

(c) Amend section 630, which relates to terms of detail or assignment, by inserting "benefits" after "travel expenses", in paragraphs (2) and (4).

(d) Amend section 635, which relates to general authorities, as follows:

(1) In subsection (g) (introductory clause), insert "and sales" after "loans".

(2) Add the following new subsection (1):

"(1) The President, when he finds it to be in the interest of the United States, is authorized to sell buildings and grounds in foreign countries acquired in connection with carrying out activities under part I of this Act, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the proceeds of such sale may be applied toward the purchase and construction, furnishing, improvement, and preservation of other properties or held for such later use: *Provided,* That the President shall report all such transactions annually to the Congress with the budget estimates of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I."

(e) Amend section 636(f), which relates to provisions on uses of funds, by striking out "Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes" and substituting "Latin American Development Act".

(f) Amend section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, by striking out "1965" and "$52,500,000" and substituting "1966" and "$55,240,000", respectively.

(g) Amend section 638, which relates to Peace Corps assistance, by striking out all beginning with "; or famine" and substituting a period.

(h) Add the following new section 639:

"SEC. 639. FAMINE AND DISASTER RELIEF.—No provision of this Act shall be construed to prohibit assistance to any country for famine or disaster relief."

CHAPTER 3—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 303. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to miscellaneous provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 642(a)(2), which relates to statutes repealed, by striking out "143," and all beginning with ": *Provided,*" up to the semicolon.

(b) Amend section 644, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (g), insert ", and not procured in anticipation of military assistance or sales requirements, or pursuant to a military assistance or sales order," after "United States Government" and strike out "as grant assistance".

(2) In subsection (m)(2), strike out "Such price shall be the same standard price" and substitute "Such standard price shall be the same price (including authorized reduced prices)".

(3) Amend the paragraph following the numbered paragraph (3) in subsection (m) as follows:

(A) In the first sentence, insert "and sales" after "Military assistance".

(B) In the second proviso, strike out "by the military assistance program".

(c) Amend section 645, which relates to unexpended balances, by striking out "Public Law 86–735" and substituting "the Latin American Development Act".

S. 1367

A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes

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

CHAPTER 1—POLICY

SEC. 101. Section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the statement of policy, is amended by inserting after the second full sentence in the thirteenth paragraph thereof the following: "Congress further urges that the United States and other free world nations place an increasing portion of their assistance programs on a multilateral basis and that the United States continue its efforts to improve coordination among programs of assistance carried out on a bilateral basis by free world nations".

CHAPTER 2—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Title II—Technical cooperation and development grants

SEC. 102. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 212, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$215,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$210,000,000", respectively.

(b) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is hereby repealed effective July 1, 1966.

(2) Amend subsection (c) by striking out "1965, $18,000,000" and substituting "1966, $7,000,000".

Title III—Investment guaranties

SEC. 103. Title III of chapter 2 of part 1 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) Amend the introductory clause to read as follows:

"The President may issue guaranties to eligible United States investors—."

(2) In paragraph (1), strike out "$2,500,000,000" and substitute "$5,000,000,000."

(3) Amend paragraph (2) as follows:

(A) In the first proviso, strike out ", and no such guaranty in the case of a loan shall

exceed $25,000,000 and no other such guaranty shall exceed $10,000,000."

(B) In the fourth proviso, strike out "1966" and substitute "1967."

(b) Amend section 221(c), which relates to general authority, by inserting after the word "guaranty," the third time it appears, the words "of an equity investment."

(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by inserting after "(exclusive of informational media guaranties)," the words "and to pay the costs of investigating and adjusting (including costs of arbitration) claims under such guaranties,".

(d) Amend section 223, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "and" at the end thereof and in subsection (b) strike out the period and substitute "; and".

(2) Add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) the term 'eligible United States investors' means United States citizens, or corporations, partnerships, or other associations created under the laws of the United States or any State or territory and substantially beneficially owned by United States citizens, as well as foreign corporations, partnerships, or other associations wholly owned by one or more such United States citizens, corporations, partnerships, or other associations: *Provided,* That the eligibility of a foreign corporation shall be determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the United States owners."

(e) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, to read as follows:

"SEC. 224. HOUSING PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES.—(a) It is the sense of Congress that in order to stimulate private home ownership and assist in the development of stable economies in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating pilot housing projects, the development of institutions engaged in Alliance for Progress programs, with particular emphasis on cooperatives, free labor unions, savings and loan and other institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, the construction of homes for lower income persons and families, the increased mobilization of savings and the improvement of housing conditions in Latin America.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the President is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as he shall determine, to eligible United States investors as defined in section 223 assuring against loss of loan investments made by such investors in—

"(1) pilot or demonstration private housing projects in Latin America of types similar to those insured by the Federal Housing Administration and suitable for conditions in Latin America;

"(2) credit institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, such as savings and loan institutions;

"(3) housing projects in Latin America for lower income families and persons, which projects shall be constructed in accordance with maximum unit costs established by the President for families and persons whose incomes meet the limitations prescribed by the President;

"(4) housing projects in Latin America which will promote the development of institutions important to the success of the Alliance for Progress, such as free labor unions and cooperatives; or

"(5) housing projects in Latin America 25 per centum or more of the aggregate of the mortgage financing for which is made available from sources within Latin America and has not derived from sources outside Latin America, which projects shall, to the maximum extent practicable, have a unit cost of not more than $6,500.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $350,000,000: *Provided,* That the total face amount of guaranties issued under subsection (b)(1) outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $250,000,000: *Provided further,* That no payment may be made under this section for any loss arising out of fraud or misconduct for which the investor is responsible: *Provided further,* That this authority shall continue until June 30, 1967."

Title VI—Alliance for Progress

SEC. 106. Section 252 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended by striking out, in the first sentence thereof, all after the words "until expended" and substituting the following: "*Provided,* That any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropriated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such subsequent fiscal year. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section, except for not to exceed $100,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1963 and 1964 and $85,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in each such fiscal year, shall be available only for loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars."

CHAPTER 3—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 104. Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend the first sentence by striking out "1965" and "$134,272,400" and substituting "1966" and "$155,455,000", respectively.

(b) Strike out the second sentence.

CHAPTER 4—SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 105. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out in the first sentence "1965" and "$405,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$369,200,000", respectively.

CHAPTER 5—CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 106. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(1) Strike out "1965" and "$150,000,000" and substitute "1966" and "$50,000,000", respectively.

(2) Add the following new sentence: "In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in Vietnam such sums as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized by parts I and II of this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to such programs if he determines such use to be important to the national interest: *Provided,* That the President shall present to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives the programs to be carried out from funds requested by the President to be appropriated under authority of this sentence."

(b) Amend subsection (b) by striking out "this section" and substituting "the first sentence of subsection (a)".

PART III: CHAPTER 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 605, which relates to retention and use of items, as follows:

(1) In the section heading strike out "Items" and substitute "Certain Items and Funds".

(2) Add the following new subsection:

"(c) Funds realized as a result of any failure of a transaction financed under authority of part I of this Act to conform to the requirements of this Act, or to applicable rules and regulations of the United States Government, or to the terms of any agreement or contract entered into under authority of part I of this Act, shall revert to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to finance such transaction or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose."

(b) Amend section 612, which relates to use of foreign currencies, by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

CHAPTER 2—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 202. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "paragraph (3) of" and "of the officers provided for in paragraphs (1) and (2) of that subsection", and substitute for the latter "of one or more of said officers".

(2) In subsection (d), strike out "Public Law 86–735" wherever it appears and substitute "the Latin American Development Act, as amended".

(b) Amend section 625(d), which relates to the employment of personnel, as follows:

(1) In the introductory clause, strike out "outside the United States".

(2) In paragraph (2), strike out all after "prescribe" and substitute a period.

(c) Amend section 630, which relates to terms of detail or assignment, by inserting "benefits" after "travel expenses," in paragraphs (2) and (4).

(d) Amend section 635, which relates to general authorities, by adding the following new subsection (1):

"(1) The President, when he finds it to be in the interest of the United States, is authorized to sell buildings and grounds in foreign countries acquired in connection with carrying out activities under part I of this Act, and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the proceeds of such sale may be applied toward the purchase and construction, furnishing, improvement, and preservation of other properties or held for such later use: *Provided,* That the President shall report all such transactions annually to the Congress with the budget estimates of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I."

(e) Amend section 636(f), which relates to provisions on uses of funds, by striking out "Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes" and substituting "Latin American Development Act".

(f) Amend section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, by striking out "1965" and "$52,500,000" and substituting "1966" and "$55,240,000", respectively.

(g) Amend section 638, which relates to Peace Corps assistance, by striking out all beginning with "; or famine" and substituting a period.

(h) Add the following new section 639:

"SEC. 639. FAMINE AND DISASTER RELIEF.—No provision of this Act shall be construed to prohibit assistance to any country for famine or disaster relief."

CHAPTER 3—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 203. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended,

which relates to miscellaneous provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 642(a)(2), which relates to statutes repealed, by striking out "143," and all beginning with ": *Provided,*" up to the semicolon.

(b) Amend section 645, which relates to unexpended balances, by striking out "Public Law 86–735" and substituting "the Latin American Development Act".

DELEGATION REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS CONCERNING FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS UTILIZED BY THE COMMITTEE IN 1964 IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two additional delegation reports of the Committee on Foreign Relations concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by the committee in 1964 in connection with foreign travel.

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

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the American Group, 53d Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Copenhagen, Denmark, Aug. 14 to Sept. 1, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John Sparkman: Denmark	Kroner	1,242.00	180.00	956.55	138.63			422.75	61.25	2,621.30	[1] 379.88
A. Willis Robertson:											
Denmark	do	1,127.00	163.33	838.80	121.55			378.50	54.85	2,344.30	[2] 339.73
Ireland	Pound							17/10/0	49.98	17/10/0	49.98
John Stennis: Denmark	Kroner	966.00	140.00	423.90	61.42			63.00	9.13	1,992.90	210.55
Herman Talmadge:											
Denmark	do	966.00	440.00	770.40	111.64			307.10	44.50	2,043.50	296.14
Ireland	Pound			4/12/0	12.88					4/12/0	92.88
Do	U.S. dollar								10.00		10.00
Maurine Neuberger: Denmark	Kroner	966.00	140.00	447.75	64.88			722.10	104.64	2,135.85	309.52
Bourke B. Hickenlooper:											
Norway	do	230.00	32.25	233.75	32.78			30.00	4.20	493.75	69.23
Sweden	Kronor	270.00	52.63	155.20	30.25					425.20	82.88
Denmark	Kroner	2,277.00	330.00	1,523.70	220.82	20.00	2.89	211.60	30.66	4,032.30	584.37
Do	U.S. dollar				28.00				22.00		50.00
Thomas Kuchel: Denmark	Kroner	966.00	140.00	418.40	60.63			219.75	31.84	1,604.15	232.47
Gordon Allott:											
Denmark	do	1,104.00	160.00	551.80	79.96			173.75	25.17	1,829.55	265.13
Ireland	Pound			1/17/6	5.25					1/17/6	5.25
John S. Cooper: Denmark	Kroner	1,242.00	180.00	648.95	99.26			99.00	14.34	2,025.95	[3] 293.60
Wallace Bennett: Denmark	do	1,242.00	180.00	450.95	65.35			150.50	21.80	1,843.45	267.15
Strom Thurmond: Denmark	do	1,722.50	249.63	644.00	93.32			71.00	10.28	2,437.50	353.23
Milrae Jensen:											
Norway	do	202.50	28.40	14.65	2.05					17.15	30.45
Sweden	Kronor	110.00	21.44	289.05	56.34			60.00	11.69	459.05	89.47
Denmark	Kroner	1,518.00	220.00	493.1	71.47			290.75	42.13	2,301.90	[4] 333.60
Mary McFall:											
Norway	do	202.50	28.40	14.65	2.05			80.00	11.22	297.15	41.67
Sweden	Kronor	110.00	21.44	166.65	32.48			75.00	14.62	351.65	68.54
Denmark	Kroner	1,050.00	152.17	419.75	60.83			72.50	10.51	1,542.25	223.51
Darrell St. Claire: Norway	do	288.00	31.88	51.70	7.22			27.55	3.84	307.25	42.94
Delegation expenses, Norway:											
Receptions, dinners	do			3,442.50	482.70					3,442.50	482.70
Guide services	Kroner							199.00	27.81	199.00	27.81
Baggage truck	do					415.00	58.04			415.00	58.04
Chauffeur hire	do					7,560.00	1,059.34			7,560.00	1,059.34
Photographs	do							491.16	68.69	491.16	68.69
Gratuities, miscellaneous	do							1,796.89	254.03	1,796.89	[5] 254.03
Gratuities	U.S. dollars								23.60		23.60
Darrell St. Claire: Sweden	Kronor	170.00	33.13	106.05	20.67			72.00	14.03	348.05	67.83
Delegation expenses, Sweden:											
Receptions, dinners	do			1,785.05	347.96					1,785.05	347.96
Guide services	do							990.00	192.98	990.00	192.98
Baggage trucks	do					799.40	155.82			799.40	155.82
Chauffeur hire	do					1,131.84	220.63			1,131.84	220.63
Car rentals	do					3,070.00	598.44			3,070.00	598.44
Gratuities, miscellaneous	do							1,146.45	221.56	1,146.45	[5] 221.56
Gratuities, commissary	U.S. dollars								59.65		59.65
Darrell St. Claire: Denmark	Kroner	1,610.00	233.33	291.30	42.21	15.00	2.17	242.25	35.10	2,158.55	312.81
Delegation expenses, Denmark:											
Receptions, dinners	do			13,287.65	1,925.74					13,287.65	1,925.74
Airport tax	do					1,000.00	144.92			1,000.00	144.92
Hotel offices	do							5,758.45	834.55	5,758.45	834.55
Transportation	do					27,597.00	3,999.65			27,597.00	3,999.65
Gratuities	do							437.00	63.33	437.00	63.33
Miscellaneous	do							503.65	72.99	503.65	72.99
Gratuities, commissary	U.S. dollars				122.51				94.05		[5] 216.56
Communications	Kroner							910.00	131.88	910.00	131.88
Darrell St. Claire:											
Delegation expenses:											
Germany	Deutsche mark							50.00	12.59	50.00	12.59
Ireland	Pound			274/14/—	766.42	52/4/3	145.67	48/1/2	134.08	374/19/5	1,046.17
United States	U.S. dollars				1.90		10.95				12.85
Total			2,858.03		5,169.17		6,398.52		2,829.57		17,255.29

[1] $98.04 of this sum reimbursed by Senator Sparkman to the U.S. Treasury for personal expenses.

[2] $59.80 of this sum reimbursed by Senator Robertson to the U.S. Treasury for personal expenses.

[3] $90.81 of this sum reimbursed by Senator Cooper to the U.S. Treasury for personal expenses.

[4] $22.30 of this sum reimbursed by Milrae Jensen to the U.S. Treasury for personal expenses.

[5] $108.19 of these sums reimbursed by Darrell St. Claire to the U.S. Treasury for personal expenses.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$6,775.96
Appropriated funds:	
Other (22 U.S.C.A. 276)	10,478.61
Department of the Army	1,836.45
Total	19,091.02

KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Chairman, American Group.
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the American delegation to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference, Kingston, Jamaica, Nov. 9–22, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John Sparkman: Jamaica	Pound							11/ 9/—	31.96	11/ 9/—	31.96
Gaylord Nelson: Jamaica	do							10/—/—	27.89	10/—/—	27.89
J. Caleb Boggs: Jamaica	do							4/ 2/—	11.47	4/—/—	11.47
Jack Miller: Jamaica	do							10/—/—	27.89	10/—/—	27.89
Norvill Jones; Jamaica	do	46/11/—	132.24	19/18/ 6	57.67			12/14/ 7	35.78	79/ 4/ 1	225.69
Octa Raby Watson: Jamaica	do	46/11/—	132.24	19/ 7/ 6	55.51			17/ 6/—	48.37	83/ 4/ 6	236.12
Darrell St. Claire; Jamaica	do	74/17/ 3	214.28	28/ 1/10	80.13			6/ 5/ 9	17.80	109/ 4/10	[1] 312.21
Do	U.S. dollar								10.05		10.05
Delegation expenses, Jamaica:											
Car hire	Pound					318/ 8/ 4	887.98			318/ 8/ 4	887.98
Dinners, luncheons	do			36/15/—	102.18					36/15/ 0	102.18
Embassy expenses	do							10/ 2/—	28.03	10/ 2/—	28.03
Gratuities	do							20/ 8/ 3	56.75	20/ 8/ 3	56.75
Taxis, meals, travelers checks, photographs, gratuities											
Delegation expenses, United States	U.S. dollar				81.95		5.55		27.31		114.81
Total			478.76		377.44		893.53		323.30		2,073.03

[1] $78.89 of this sum reimbursed to U.S. Treasury by Darrell St. Clair.

NOTE.—$263.10 in personal hotel bills not shown in this report were reimbursed to the U.S. Treasury.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$1,948.17
Appropriated funds: S. Res. 339, 88th Cong	124.86
Total	2,073.00

MARCH 11, 1965.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, American Delegation.

EULOGY OF LATE SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, with the death of Clair Engle on July 30, 1964, the country lost an able and dedicated legislator.

As a member of the House of Representatives, in which he served as the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, his leadership was a constructive force for the development and the use of the resources of America. His interest covered the whole field: water rights, electric power, the use of public lands, land reclamation, conservation, and development.

He carried to his work in the Congress—both in the House and in the Senate—a deep sense of reverence for the natural beauty and for the gifts of nature which are a part of the heritage of America. His actions in the Congress reflected the strength of the land which he represented. In all of his efforts he demonstrated his belief that the natural resources of America were meant to serve its people—not just for one generation, but indefinitely.

His death was not just a loss to the Congress, to his State, to the Nation, to the Democratic Party, but it was a great personal loss to everyone who had known him and his wife.

I, therefore, join in paying tribute to him for all of his achievements—as a Member of Congress, as a public servant—but also to pay personal tribute to him as a man of great courage and great integrity and one with a great capacity for friendship and for the sacrifices and understanding that go with the title of friend.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Clair Engle was a courageous man and a compassionate public servant. I know that his death has affected all the Members of the Congress with whom he served, both in the Senate and the House of Representatives, with a profound feeling of tragedy. To have this vigorous and vital man cut off in the prime of his life and the zenith of his public career, represents a great loss to all the people of the United States.

Clair Engle began his career of public service at an early age in his home State of California. From 1943 to 1958 he served with great distinction in the House of Representatives where he became chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He achieved much value for his own State and for the country as a whole. He helped build up a system of mighty dams throughout the great State of California, but he was always willing to help work for worthwhile projects for other areas as well.

Clair Engle was always willing to stand up and be counted for causes he knew to be just. We all remember when he came into the Senate in his wheelchair on June 10, 1964, to cast his vote to shut off debate on the civil rights bill. We also remember when he came here again on June 19, despite his desperate illness, to cast his affirmative vote in favor of the civil rights bill. No one would have blamed him for not coming for these votes, but Clair Engle remained true to himself by voting his convictions. He always placed the demands of his conscience first and foremost in his fulfillment of his public responsibilities.

We deeply regret the fading of his great light. The sympathies of my wife Bethine and myself will always be with his courageous and devoted wife, Lu. We who served with him in the Congress sorely miss him.

RECREATION FEES PURSUANT TO LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the regulations covering the recreation fees established pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965. These regulations are prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

RECREATION FEES: REGULATIONS PROVIDING CRITERIA AND FEE SCHEDULES TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHMENT OF FEES PURSUANT TO LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1965

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897) authorizes the President to provide for the establishment of entrance, admission, and user fees at designated Federal recreation areas. Executive Order 11200 provided for the designation of areas at which such fees shall be charged and directed the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe a schedule of fees which may be collected at those areas. A new part 18 making provision for the establishment of recreation fees at designated areas is published below.

Although it is the policy of the Department of the Interior that whenever practicable the rulemaking requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act (5 U.S.C. 1003) be observed, it is imperative that this part take effect immediately because the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 became effective on January 1, 1965, and a delay in the estab-

lishment of recreation fees pursuant to the act will result in a loss of revenues to the Fund. In order to avoid such loss, this part shall become effective on the date of this regulation.

Subtitle A of title 43 is amended by the addition of a new part 18:

SEC.
18.1 Application.
18.2 Types of fees.
18.3 Annual fee.
18.4 Optional short-term fees.
18.5 Other entrance or admission fees.
18.6 User fees.
18.7 Continuation of current fees.
18.8 Exceptions, exclusions, and exemptions.

Authority: Sections 18.1 to 18.8 issued under section 2, 78 Stat. 897; Executive Order 11200.

Section 18.1. Application.

This part is promulgated pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, 78 Stat. 897, and Executive Order 11200. Any recreation fee which may be charged by the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the U.S. section of the International Boundary and Water Commission (United States and Mexico) shall be selected from the schedule of fees according to the criteria set forth in this part.

Section 18.2. Types of fees.

There shall be two general types of fees: entrance or admission fees and user fees. There shall be three types of entrance or admission fees: an annual fee, a fee for single visit or series of visits which may be paid in lieu of the annual fee, and a fee for a visit payable at areas to which the annual fee does not apply.

Section 18.3. Annual fee.

(a) Payment of the annual fee shall admit, without further payment during the year for which it was paid, the individual paying such fee and all those who accompany him in a private noncommercial automobile to all designated areas, except those areas which are specifically excluded from the coverage of the annual fee by the respective heads of the agencies and departments administering such areas. Individuals who choose not to pay the annual fee shall pay a fee for a single visit or series of visits. The annual fee for the period April 1, 1965, through March 31, 1966, and each 12-month period thereafter, shall be $7.

(b) The heads of the administering agencies and departments shall make the annual fee applicable to at least all those designated areas which (1) have a variety of recreation opportunities, and (2) which are commonly entered by automobile, unless exception to such application is made by the head of such agency. Examples of such areas include parks, water resource projects, forest areas, refuges, national recreation areas, and parts thereof.

Section 18.4. Optional short-term fees.

(a) The fee for a single visit or series of visits payable in lieu of the annual fee shall be paid by each individual who has reached his 16th birthday and shall be the option provided for in section 2(a)(ii) of Public Law 88-578. It shall be payable by persons who choose not to pay the annual fee, including all persons riding in automobiles, and all persons entering by any means other than private noncommercial automobile.

(b) This fee shall be applicable at all areas within the coverage of the annual fee. The fee shall be 25, 50, 75 cents or $1 per person per day at the discretion of the administering agency or department, provided that such agency or department head shall use the following criteria in selecting the exact fee:

1. The direct and indirect cost of the United States of establishing and maintaining the area.

2. The quality and variety of recreation opportunities offered in the area.

3. The amount charged for admission to or the use of comparable Federal, State, local, and private areas.

4. The impact of the fee on potential development of other outdoor recreation areas and facilities in the locality by State and local governments and by private investors.

5. The contributions of State and local governments and private organizations to the maintenance and development of the area.

(c) A weekly rate for 7 consecutive days of continuous or intermittent use shall be established at five times the daily rate.

Section 18.5. Other entrance or admission fees.

(a) The fee for a single visit payable at designated areas to which the annual fee does not apply shall be paid by each individual who has reached his 16th birthday. This fee shall be charged at designated areas which are not commonly entered by automobile. Such areas include, but are not limited to, certain historic sites, historic buildings, and monuments.

(b) This fee shall be $0.25, $0.50, $0.75, or $1 per person per visit, at the discretion of the head of the administering agency or department. The criteria mentioned in section 18.4 shall be used in selecting the exact fee.

Section 18.6. User fees.

(a) User fees are payable for the use of sites, facilities, equipment or services provided by the United States especially for recreationists in designated areas, which include, but are not limited to, well developed campsites, picnic areas, bathhouses, lockers, boat launching facilities, boats, other marine equipment, guide services, firewood, and winter sport facilities. User fees may be charged at designated areas singly or in addition to entrance or admission fees.

(b) User fees shall be selected from within the range of fees set forth below, and such selection shall be made only after consideration of the criteria set forth in section 18.4. User fees may be charged for additional types of sites, facilities, equipment and services not listed below, in such amounts as are recommended by the Secretary of the Interior.

RANGE OF USER FEES

Sites

Camp and trailer sites (for overnight use), $1 to $3.

Picnic sites (per site per day), $0.50 to $0.75.

Boat launching sites (daily fee), $0.50 to $1.50.

No such site shall be the subject of a user fee unless it contains or is within a reasonable distance of the following facilities:

Basic facility required	Camp and trailer sites	Picnic sites	Boat-launching sites
Access and circulatory roads [1]	X	X	X
Parking [1]	X	X	X
Drinking water	X	X	
Toilet facilities	X	X	X
Refuse containers	X	X	X
Picnic tables [2]	X	X	
Fire grates [2] or fireplaces	X	X	
Adequate tent or trailer spaces	X		
Boat launching ramps or facilities			X

[1] Except at campsites accessible only by boat.
[2] Not applicable to trailer sites.

Facilities

Lockers: $0.25 per locker daily.

Boat storage and handling: to be established at a daily, weekly, monthly, or annual rate in accord with the criteria set forth in section 18.4.

Elevators: at least 0.10 per person per round trip.

Ferries or other means of transportation: to be established at a rate in accord with the criteria set forth in section 18.4.

Bathhouses: $0.25–$0.50 per day per person, 6 years and over.

Swimming pools: to be established at a daily rate in accord with the criteria set forth in section 18.4.

Equipment

Boats, row: a minimum of $1 per poat per day or fraction thereof.

Boats, motorized: a minimum of $5 per boat per day or fraction thereof.

Services

Firewood: to be established at a rate in accord with the criteria set forth in section 18.4.

Guided tours: to be established at a rate in accord with the criteria set forth in section 18.4.

Section 18.7. Continuation of current fees

All recreation fees in effect on December 31, 1964, or on the last day when a charge was payable for public visitor use at the respective recreation areas, shall continue in effect for the period beginning the effective date of this part through March 31, 1965, except those fees which heretofore would permit entrance, admission or use for a period in excess of fifteen (15) days. Effective April 1, 1965, only the fees described in this part may be charged at designated areas.

Section 18.8. Exceptions, exclusions, and exemptions

In the application of the provisions of this part, the following exemptions, exclusions, and exemptions shall apply:

(a) Nothing contained herein shall authorize Federal hunting and fishing licenses or fees;

(b) No fee shall be charged for the use of any waters;

(c) No fee shall be charged for travel by private noncommercial vehicle over any national parkway, any road or highway established as part of the national Federal-aid system, or any road within the National Forest System, or a public land area, which, although it is part of a larger area, is commonly used by the public as means of travel between two places either or both of which are outside the area;

(d) No fee shall be charged any person in the exercise of a right of access to privately owned lands;

(e) No short-term entrance or admission fee shall be charged at any area where more than 50 percent of the land within such area has been donated to the United States by a State, unless the Governor of such State or his designee has been advised of such fee at least 60 days prior to its establishment and unless any recommendation of such Governor and all legal and other obligations of the United States to such State with respect to such areas have been taken into consideration;

(f) No fee shall be charged for access to waters or shorelines by those classes of persons which have rights thereto under treaty or law;

(g) No fee shall be charged for commercial or other activities not related to recreation;

(h) No entrance or admission fee shall be charged any person conducting State, local, or Federal Government business;

(1) No entrance or admission fee shall be charged at any entrance to Great Smoky Mountains National Park unless such fees are charged at main highway and thoroughfare entrances.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

AN ALASKAN VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, each year we in Congress look forward to reading the essays prepared by high school students across the country for the Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The statewide winner in Alaska this year is Miss Virginia Mann Rohr, a 16-year-old junior at Eielson High School. She is the daughter of Col. and Mrs. Louis W. Rohr, wing commander at Eielson Air Force Base. Because I believe Virginia's essay is a moving, well-written call to patriotism, I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Virginia Mann Rohr)

Facing all Americans today is a tremendously-important challenge that must be met with unfaltering determination—and it must be met now. That challenge is to keep America free.

No one sentence or lengthy paragraph can summarize the responsibilities of the citizen as well as our own Pledge of Allegiance. Let us examine this oath phrase by phrase, word for word, and see just what message it holds for each of us as citizens.

With hand over heart we recite, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America." Just what is this allegiance that we so freely pledge? "Webster's New World Dictionary" describes it as "the duty of being loyal to one's ruler, government, or country." When we utter this pledge, we are promising our loyalty and devotion to our flag.

Old Glory symbolizes, in its kaleidoscope of stars and stripes and brilliant hues of red, white, and blue, the hardiness and courage of the men who fought and still continue to fight for our liberty; the purity and innocence of those men and their fellow countrymen; the vigilance, perseverance, and justice which have been recognized as trademarks of our country.

With due reverence we say, "* * * * one nation under God." In this modern era of technological wonders too many people become engulfed in the material aspects of life. As the prodrome warns the physician of the onset of a disease, so the symptoms of selfishness, prejudice, and greed warn us of the materialism which grips our society today. As Christians and as Americans, we must prevent this cancer of hatred from becoming malignant and destroying the very ideals for which this country stands.

The United States was originally founded for want of a place to worship God, so let us be ever mindful of His presence and act accordingly.

On our national currency is stamped the phrase "In God We Trust." In respect to this phrase, may we look to Him for guidance and leadership in every decision we make—no matter how small or how momentous.

Then, with pride, we add, "* * * indivisible. * * *" We remain undivided in the face of such political poison as communism. As a dose of arsenic, once administered into the body, will rapidly stiffen the joints and suffocate its victim, so, communism, equally lethal, administered into the free world can and does stifle the representative voice of the people in the Government and eventually strangles democracy.

Even more startling, however, is the apathetic nature displayed by too many Americans toward this gradual pollution of free societies when they shirk the responsibilities of voting and obeying the law.

In conclusion, we say, "* * * with liberty and justice for all." Is the liberty and justice that we as a nation share, equal for all? No, it is not. In our daily lives we must strive to extend the wonderful blessing of freedom to all peoples of the world. First, however, such good intentions must be met at home. Let us all, regardless of race, religion, or creed, join into a brotherhood that will keep us unified and strong.

Now I will join these vital words and phrases into their original form: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Are we as citizens strong enough to honor this pledge to the fullest? With an eye to God, who blessed us with the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and with a hand on the shoulder of our fellow man, we shall be.

OPERATION POLAR STRIKE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Exercise Polar Strike, the largest military exercise ever held in Alaska, has just been completed. The joint-combined exercise, under the direction of the Alaskan Command, involved Army and Air Force units from Alaska, 11 other States, and Canada. In addition, the exercise involved National Guard units from Alaska, Washington, and Minnesota.

Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, USAF, commander in chief, Alaska, said he is convinced that Polar Strike was one of the most important and valuable exercises ever held by the U.S. military forces.

The objectives of Exercise Polar Strike were peculiar to the northern latitudes; and while they are still under careful study, it appears that all were successfully met.

First of the objectives was to evaluate plans for the reinforcement of the Alaskan Command by the U.S. Strike Command and for continued operations in Alaska. The reinforcements included a reinforced Infantry brigade from Fort Lewis, Wash., supporting units from such widespread points as Fort Meade, Md.; Fort Bragg, N.C.; and, Fort Huachuca, Ariz.; and Air Force units from Dyess Air Force Base, Tex.; Hamilton Air Force Base, Calif.; and Sewart Air Force Base, Tenn. Men and equipment poured into Alaska, to form fighting elements that proved they could live, move, and operate under the extremes of the Alaskan winter.

Thus, they met a second objective—to provide participating forces with training in cold-weather operations. Temperatures in the exercise area dropped to well below 40° below zero; yet the forces continued to operate.

Another objective was to continue development of independent-brigade doctrines for operations in a cold-weather environment. To further this study, Exercise Polar Strike employed two strikingly different brigade organizations. The friendly force—made up of troops from Fort Lewis, Wash.; Fort Wainwright, Alaska; and, the Alaska National Guard—was a heavily mechanized force depending principally on ground movement by tracked vehicle, backed up by trucks. The aggressor force—composed of troops from Fort Richardson, Alaska, and a battalion of the Royal Canadian regiment—was a light air-mobile force, and included two companies of parachute troops. It was entirely supported by air. Thus, two separate types of brigade organizations faced each other in the exercise.

Yet another objective was to field test and evaluate equipment in cold-weather operations. Under test were vehicles and a number of items, ranging from cold-weather clothing to aviation control and safety aids. These tests are still being evaluated; and many of the items will continue to be tested under other conditions through the winter. But it is interesting to note that such testing goes on continually in Alaska; and, from it, some valuable changes have been made in the equipment of military units operating in the north.

A fifth objective was to evaluate and further develop procedures for the command and control of joint forces. In this area, too, Exercise Polar Strike saw some "firsts" for Alaska, as all three major headquarters—the Alaskan command; U.S. Army, Alaska; and the Alaskan air command—moved to the field for the maneuver. It was the first time the Alaskan air command had ever established a field headquarters for an Alaskan military exercise.

The sixth objective of Polar Strike was to provide the U.S. strike command with information to assist the determination of the desired ratio of fixed-wing—Army and troop carrier—to rotary-wing aircraft necessary to support a ROAD brigade operating independently in northern areas. There was heavier Air Force participation in Exercise Polar Strike than in any previous Alaskan combat test; and the results are still being studied carefully. However, the exercise did reinforce the knowledge that our military men in Alaska have had for many years—that combat activities in the North require greater air support than do those in other climates or more developed areas.

The final objective of the exercise was to refine and evaluate established procedures for logistical support of combat operations of ground and air forces under cold-weather conditions and to develop new logistical techniques and record requirement data. This, again, is a continuing area of study in Alaska. However, Polar Strike did reinforce the proof of the value of the support battalion, organic to infantry brigades, operating separately in the northern latitudes. This concept was tested in the ALCOM Alaskan exercise a year ago, and proved of such value that such battalions were formed, organic to the infantry brigades stationed in Alaska. Polar Strike was their first test as organic units, and com-

manders were unanimous in their praise of the support battalions.

Aside from these seven specific objectives, Exercise Polar Strike reinforced the rapidly widening belief that Alaska is the finest training ground available today to the U.S. military forces.

One example of such training was the guerrilla activity of special forces men working with Eskimos of the Alaska Army National Scout battalions. The special forces teams from Fort Bragg, N.C., trained with the Eskimos in villages on the periphery of Alaska for several days before Exercise Polar Strike, and then the special forces and Scouts were infiltrated into the exercise area. They formed guerrilla bands—half on the side of the friendly forces, and half on the side of the aggressors; and, throughout the exercise, they struck against the rear areas of their enemy. Such training for the special forces, the Scouts, and the regular forces who were forced to protect themselves against the guerrilla action, is invaluable for such operations as our Nation faces today in Vietnam.

The Canadian forces were able to provide their experience in cold-weather operations to United States forces. Pilots of the Canadian air arm, flying T–33 jet trainers, operated as tactical fighter pilots, flying in support of ground forces, making strikes against ground equipment and troops. These missions provided the Canadian flyers with excellent training and experience in providing air support for ground forces an area in which the RCAF has only recently begun serious study. Their air arm has been oriented primarily toward transport and continental air defense, in the past. The integration of tactics equipment and personnel of the two nations contributed immeasurably to the interplay of knowledge and to the overall success of the operation.

The Alaska Air National Guard played a significant role in the logistical support area of Exercise Polar Strike, ferrying cargo and personnel between points within Alaska and the main exercise area—a role the guard would certainly play during an actual emergency. Initial movement of troops and equipment from the mainland of the United States was carried out by the Military Air Transport Service—MATS. During the course of the exercise, MATS also transported equipment, especially outsize cargo, within Alaska and the exercise area. According to General Reeves, the MATS operations were most successful.

A number of other "firsts" were established during Polar Strike. This was the first winter exercise planned and directed fully by Alaskan command headquarters. For the first time, Tactical Air Command's C–130 aircraft used frozen lakes as assault landing fields, delivering troops to the combat zone. F–104 fighters provided the first aerial delivery of simulated chemical and bacteriological agents to the battle area by high-performance jet aircraft. This was the first time a reinforced Army brigade was delivered into the Arctic exercise area, supplied during the exercise, and withdrawn from the area—completely by air.

Polar Strike was the first exercise to use a readily recognizable mark for distinguishing between friendly and enemy aircraft. During the exercise, all planes flying missions in support of the enemy forces carried a red fuselage-mounted tank. Friendly aircraft flew without this marking. As a result, aircraft were readily identified by player forces.

The exercise area was a virtual wilderness of some 8,000 square miles—larger than the State of Massachusetts. It encompassed all kinds of terrain found in the North, except glaciers, and faced the troops with the problems of operating in a region where there are virtually no roads, no installed communications, and almost no population. Alaska is the only place in the United States where such realistic training conditions may be found.

Aside from the ruggedness of the terrain, exercise Polar Strike was carried out during a long period of extreme cold. This offered an excellent opportunity not only to test equipment, but also to observe and evaluate the effect of extended activity in subzero climate on the men in the field. Using exercise Polar Strike as a laboratory, medical officers studied all facets of cold-weather effects on the ability of the men to live and fight in northern environments. Such observations are a continuing effort on the part of our military forces in Alaska.

Despite the obstacles presented by such a training area, morale and professional interest were high at all levels during exercise Polar Strike.

Lieutenant General Reeves said the exercise proved again that the Army and the Air Force can work together as a complete team under the most adverse conditions, as they did during the exercise.

Mr. President, last fall, General Reeves extended to me a verbal invitation, while I was visiting him at Alaskan command headquarters at Elmendorf Air Force Base, to attend the winter exercise. Later, a written invitation followed. From the time when the invitation was first extended, I hoped that the stars would be in a favorable position and that I would be able to go. I did go.

Arriving at Fort Greely, south of Fairbanks, just a few days before the exercise was completed, I had the great privilege of going out to the field with General Reeves, General Carver, and others, to witness the maneuvers. Mr. President, the performance of the officers and men was magnificient. Some of them had been in the field, living under rugged conditions, for as long as 3 weeks, with the temperature sometimes dropping to below minus 50° F. It was my observation that morale was high. Many Alaskans and many soldiers from other States participated in the exercise. Additionally, Lt. Col. Bernard J. B. Archambault, commanding officer, 2d Battalion, of the Royal Canadian Regiment, and officers and men of that regiment participated.

As has been mentioned, this was the first occasion of the many similar maneuvers in which the exercise director was the commander in chief of the Alaskan Command. Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves was at Fort Greely from the time when the exercise commenced until it was concluded, as were Maj. Gen. George A. Carver, commanding general, U.S. Army, Alaska; Maj. Gen. James C. Jensen, commander, Alaskan Air Command; and Brig. Gen. Andy A. Lipscomb, commanding general, the Yukon Command. General Lipscomb served as chief umpire.

As one high officer told me, "Any man trained to fight in these Arctic conditions is trained to fight anywhere in the world." The job of airlifting troops to the maneuver areas was a tremendous one. The job of supply and resupply was almost herculean. The job of keeping mechanical equipment in operation in subzero temperatures was one which I did not believe could be accomplished; but it was. It was interesting to me to learn that until the time when I left, only 13 cases of frostbite had required hospitalization.

For my part, I want to thank General Reeves and all of those of his command who made it possible for me to be with them, and who assuredly furthered my education and gave me renewed confidence in the ability and endurance and morale of our officers and men in the armed services. Col. George T. Adair, commanding officer, Fort Greely, was a kind and thoughtful host. It was an exhilarating and worthwhile experience for me.

Polar Strike was a tremendous success.

THE HOSPITAL SHIP "HOPE"

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Lowell (Mass.) Sun has eloquently summarized the achievements of the SS *Hope*, the great, white hospital ship that brings modern medical knowledge and health to millions all over the world.

As the editorial points out, the good ship *Hope* has sailed to three continents: Asia, South America, and Africa. In 4 years, she has trained hundreds of doctors and nurses in Indonesia, South Vietnam, Peru, Ecuador, and Guinea.

Hundreds of thousands have directly benefited from treatments by *Hope* doctors. Many thousands more have received their first vaccinations or their first pints of milk from *Hope*.

Most important, however, the education of the medical personnel in these developing nations is being dispersed throughout the countries, and the knowledge will benefit many generations to come.

This flow of education, Mr. President, is the outstanding achievement of the American men and women in white who volunteer their time and talents with *Hope* that the Lowell Sun editorial salutes; and I ask that the editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

"HOPE" AFLOAT

American programs of assistance to friendly peoples the world over take many forms. One with magnificent potential for lasting good, although less well publicized than some, is called simply Project Hope.

The word stands for Health Opportunity for People Everywhere, and the program's

principal activity is the dispatch of a hospital ship, the SS *Hope*, to areas in need for higher standards of medical care.

The ship's major function is that of teaching, although in the course of instructing doctors and medical assistants in modern techniques it renders treatment to hundreds of men, women, and children. The *Hope* carries a full complement of medically trained personnel and is especially equipped with operating theaters, laboratories, and libraries, for postgraduate courses for native doctors.

Already in its 3 years afloat, the *Hope* has visited Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It is operated by the People-to-People Health Foundation, a nonprofit organization which receives some Government support but exists principally on contributions from business and private sources. Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson all have heartily endorsed its work.

"OPINION IN THE CAPITAL"—INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR DODD

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on Sunday, March 14, 1965, the regular "Opinion in the Capital" program, originating on channel 5, in Washington, D.C., carried an interview with the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], by Mark Evans, vice president for public affairs for Metromedia, Inc., and Jack Bell, chief Senate correspondent of the Associated Press.

I watched the program, personally, and was once again impressed by the calm and knowledgeable manner in which the Senator from Connecticut dispenses common sense on many of the major issues of our day, particularly the situation in Vietnam, concerning which the Senator from Connecticut has spoken so eloquently and wisely on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

For those who may not have had an opportunity to view this program, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the interview be printed in the RECORD.

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

OPINION IN THE CAPITAL

(Produced by Florence Lowe, a Metropolitan Broadcasting television production, 8 p.m., March 14, 1965)

Guest: Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Reporters: Mark Evans, vice president for public affairs for Metromedia, Inc., Jack Bell, chief Senate correspondent, Associated Press.

Mr. EVANS. Jack, with a man with as many varied interests as Senator DODD, I'm sure we're in for a windfall. Why don't you begin?

FIREARMS

Mr. BELL. Senator, are you prepared to go as far as the President as suggested in his message on crime in dealing with this gun situation?

Senator DODD. Yes, I am now. I started out with just handguns. That's what I originally proposed. I then amended it to include the long gun: the rifle, the shotgun. I'm now prepared to say "Let's bar all mail-order traffic in guns." Because the situation has worsened progressively. I say we're at a point where we ought to put an end to all of it.

Mr. EVANS. You've been a "John the Baptist" sort of fellow, crying in the wilderness for a long time, Senator. Did you sell the President on the idea?

Senator DODD. No, no. I wish I could take credit for that. I do feel that our committee did some educational work generally with the public: we held hearings: we conducted investigations: the staff did a great amount of work, and all of this, I hope, contributed to the President's better understanding of the menace we're facing.

Mr. BELL. Senator, you're a hunter. Is this going to affect hunters materially?

Senator DODD. No. You're quite right, I've been a hunter, I own guns. I'm not against legitimate sports activity, I'm for it. But I see nothing in this proposal or the bill which I've introduced, which will in any way, impair the legitimate sportsman.

NARCOTICS

Mr. EVANS. Many of these bills that you've been fostering for a long time now Senator are coming to the floor and it looks as though something might happen. The House, last week, passed a unanimous decision on the "goofball" bill which has been very much in your mind. Are you expecting success on this too?

Senator DODD. Oh sure. The Senate passed that bill last year unanimously. It was the bill I introduced in the Senate, Congressman HARRIS took it up in the House, did a good job with it. No one deserves any particular credit. These things only needed emphasis, education, as far as the public was concerned. They needed to be done, and they are getting done.

Mr. EVANS. There has been much said in the past, of the British system in allocating narcotics. I know that you've studied this long and hard. Do you have any feelings on the British system? Does it have anything in its favor?

Senator DODD. I have this feeling. I think that we should really take the approach that they do with respect to the narcotic addict. I think he's truly a sick man. Some of them get into criminal activities and this has to be dealt with separately. But, generally they ought to be viewed as ill people.

Mr. BELL. What about the problem of marihuana as far as young people are concerned?

Senator DODD. I think we're right about marihuana. There's a big argument about this I know. There are those who say there is nothing really addictive about it. That it's just a step beyond tobacco or something of that sort. The best information I get is that this is not so. That it is addictive, that it is damaging, that it leads to other addictions—more serious. Like heroin.

Mr. BELL. Is there anything about marihuana that's been official—that we need it in a "drug" sense?

Senator DODD. Not that I know of. I don't know of any.

Mr. EVANS. You said that these people are sick, Senator. Do you mean by that that these people should be able to go to the drug store with a doctor's prescription and be——

Senator DODD. That's what the British do. I have some misgivings about that in our society. There are differences in our society and the British—the British police officer doesn't carry a gun. I can't imagine what would happen in this country if we took guns away from all our police officers. They seem to do better with some things—maybe they can do better with—for some reasons I can't describe. I don't know.

But, it seems for us, anyway, unwise to me to allow the narcotic addict to get a prescription, go in and take care of his habit in that way. I'd rather see them hospitalized, treated, eased back into life through the use of stopover houses. I think there are a lot of things we can do short of allowing them to get drugs freely.

VIETNAM

Mr. BELL. Senator, I'd like to get into Vietnam at this point: You've recently made a strong statement in the Senate in favor of President Johnson's course there. Since you made that statement that war has been even more escalated. Do you favor a continuation of the escalation of that war?

Senator DODD. I said on other occasions, Jack, and I'll repeat it here. I'm not a military man. It's difficult for me to answer a question of that kind. I think that really is a question that the President can answer after consulting with his top military technicians and strategists. I think it's fair to point out that the escalation hasn't been initiated by us. It's the Communists that have escalated the war. What do we do to cause them to withdraw from their aggression in Vietnam? Well, the President obviously feels that we have got to give them some of the same medicine they've been dishing out to the free Vietnamese. How much—how far? I truly don't know the answer to that. I suppose the President would say as much as it takes to get them to cease and desist from their aggression, subversion, infiltration.

Mr. EVANS. From your speech, Senator, I get the feeling you feel the Red Chinese will not come to the aid of the North Vietnamese with troops. You also pointed out that they are too vulnerable on the coast with their industrial cities.

Senator DODD. This is a risked judgment. Who can say? It seems that way to me from all I can learn about their situation—their geographical situation, their economic situation, their differences with the Moscow Communists, all add up to me, to an unlikelihood that they would take us on if I may put it that way in an all-out struggle. I don't think that will happen, but I could be proved wrong in the next minute. You've got to take risks in life—you've got to take risks to protect freedom. We can't just sit back and worry all the time. "If we do this, that will happen to us"—get into a state of do-nothingism. I think all of life is risks—freedom and we've got to take some of those risks.

Mr. BELL. You made the point in your speech that our intelligence is not very good in South Vietnam. How are we going to know when the point has been reached where the Communists are about to give up, or are at least in retreat?

Senator DODD. I guess again, that we would hear through so-called neutral sources, friends, I assume. I'm confident that those channels are open. When they are ready to say "uncle" we'll hear it loud and clear. Will we see it in the military sense? I suppose so. I think we ought to know the result of their reprisals on our attacks—economic centers, military centers. I think we ought to know that. I think we ought to hear—I hope our intelligence improves and I think it is improving. I think it's better than it was, from what I'm told.

Mr. EVANS. I think one of the most enlightened statements in your speech is where you indicated that one of our problems has been a rotation of our own leadership and you also pointed out that in the 5 years, there have been 10 or 12 topflight men who have made real inroads, friendshipwise, with the political leaders, religious leaders, and military leaders and you're going to write a letter to the President urging that these 10 or 12 men be sent back there to see if we could bind all the forces together. Have you done that?

Senator DODD. Yes, I wrote to the President—I have also talked to some of his top staff people. The President has written back and answered my letter. He said in effect, he thought there was something to it. He was looking into it and so on. I think it

received consideration and is receiving consideration. In the letter, I don't think I mentioned any names but in personal conversation I did. I don't want to do that here because it won't be fair to those individuals. Sometimes I find that there are personality conflicts and this is the most regrettable thing of all. It seems to me that the stakes are so high that we can't afford to dwell on personalities and their difficulties. If there are more than two involved it seems to me they ought to be able to submerge what personal differences they have. If competence of an unusual character is involved and it is in some of these people, they ought to go back, and they want to go back, and they could be helpful if they went back.

Mr. BELL. One of your colleagues, Senator Young of Ohio, called for the replacement of General Taylor as our ambassador. Are you satisfied with Taylor operations there?

Senator DODD. Yes, I have a very high opinion of General Taylor. I think he's a wonderful man. I don't know him well really, but I've observed him at committee hearings and I've had a few contacts with him. He's made a topflight impression on me. His record is outstanding. I'm sure he has some personality defects. Who doesn't? I think he's good and I think he's well balanced and I think he's a good man on the job.

Mr. BELL. One of Senator Young's objections to General Taylor is that he has a military viewpoint. Do you think that is true? We're stressing too much the military?

Senator DODD. No, I don't think that's true. Of course, as you and I know, he does have a military viewpoint. He should have, and I'm glad he does have because the big problem right now in Vietnam is military. I have found that these good military people are the best advocates of peace. You show me a good soldier that's been through a war and I'll show you the fellow that's really for peace. So, I don't worry about that in the case of Taylor. There is something to the argument that this or that military man is so militaristic that he can't handle a civilian problem, but this—you and I could cite classic examples of outstanding soldiers like Eisenhower, for example, who became great civilian leaders.

Mr. EVANS. Senator, I don't think I've ever done this on TV before, but I can't commend you highly enough for this speech you made on the Senate floor. I would like to offer people who are watching this program, the availability of this speech, if you write to Senator THOMAS DODD, or the station to which you are now listening, or viewing, I would be very happy to see that you get a copy of this speech. It's probably the most articulate, well-rounded and definitive story of the Vietnamese problem that has ever come down the pike. Jack, I hope you agree with that.

Senator DODD. I don't know whether Jack agrees or not, but I sure do.

Mr. EVANS. One of the points you make Senator, is that we have done a bad job in political war—we have failed to fight back—we have failed to take the initiative. We're always on the reaction instead of the action side. I think you pointed out that we should infiltrate the North Vietnamese with guerrillas.

Senator DODD. I think we should. Guerrillas and infiltrators.

Mr. EVANS. You pointed this out some years ago and nothing happened.

Senator DODD. I've been talking about it for a long time. I was over there about 4 years ago—I wasn't there very long and I don't pose as any expert on it but I was there and I got a look. I got some feel, better than I had before I went anyway. It's not only true in Vietnam, it's true in all these trouble spots. I think it is a failure in our policy. I think we ought to give back to them what they give to us. Anyway, it's a new technique in the struggles of the world. Why shouldn't we have free world infiltrators and free world conspirators among the Communists? There is nothing more effective than a conspiracy of truth.

Mr. EVANS. Have you had any encouragement on this?

Senator DODD. Yes, oh, Yes. I'm quite confident, that the administration, if I may put it that way, thinks that this is right. I think they have been thinking about it anyway. I am not suggesting this is any original idea. It has been talked about by a number of people.

Mr. BELL. What's the CIA doing in there? If it isn't doing something of this sort?

Senator DODD. I hope it is. I don't think it has done it well enough and I don't think it has been effective enough. There responsibility however, is a little different from what I had in mind. As I understand it, they are supposed to get information which will be helpful to us. My idea, I'm sure I didn't make it clear enough, is that the free world infiltrator would get in and propagandize among the people, the average "Joe" if I may put it that way, in North Vietnam * * * get him actively engaged in one way or another in impeding the government, harassing the Communist government.

Mr. EVANS. Build his hopes on what the free world would offer?

Senator DODD. Sure. I don't know if the CIA does that or not.

Mr. BELL. Wouldn't that go against the gram of our being nonaggressive?

Senator DODD. Well, I suppose if you want to be real technical about it you could say so. But that brings me to a point: I think that freedom requires a kind of aggression. I want to be, and I think you do too, want to be aggressive about liberty and about decency, this is what religion is all about. It's kind of aggression. Religious people don't take up clubs and stones, but they are morally aggressive. That's what I mean. They denonuce sin and evil and wrong and I think we should.

Mr. EVANS. One of the greatest arguments used against our negotiations in Vietnam is that the French, with a sizeable army, got clobbered in that part of the world, and that we, with only advisors, can hope to do no better. In your speech you touch on this and I wish you would elaborate.

Senator DODD. Well, what my view is, and I think it is sound, there is not any real likeness between the problem the French had with Vietnam and the South Vietnamese have which we are trying to help them solve. The French were there as colonialists. They were exploiting the country. They were taking out of it * * * they were putting very little into it. They were hated, literally, by most Vietnamese. There were many people in Vietnam who fought with the Communists against the French, who are now fighting against the Communists. They were first doing that because they wanted their country free of French imperialism. So no wonder the French lost. So will anybody else if they try to hold the people under the thumb of imperial government.

Mr. EVANS. What I wanted to bring out was, that you suggested that SEATO should bounce Mr. De Gaulle and France because of their lack of interest and influence.

Senator DODD. I don't think France has any proper place in the SEATO organization. The South East Asia Treaty Organization, like NATO, was set up to help defend freedom in that part of the world. France has no proper place there. She's trying to hang on. My own fear is that De Gaulle thinks he may get some trade or economic advantage out of the Communists if they win the struggle. I think he's that shortsighted. I don't mean that he's a Communist, of course, I don't. But he's moving around in strange ways, hard to understand and his shortsightedness reveals itself in this area as well as in several others. I think France ought to get out of SEATO, resign, or get thrown out.

Mr. BELL. Senator, that brings us to the point of what do we do if a neutralist government should take over and we are asked to get out. Our objectives there are to keep these people in South Vietnam free, but also we are there, according to the President, because we have been asked to be there. So, what do we do if a neutralist takes over?

Senator DODD. Well, if a true neutralist takes over with the protection that a neutralist government should have, I don't think we would have any real problem. I suppose that's all we are trying to do anyway. Should be and I'm sure it is. But, when the Communists use the word, "Neutralism" they don't really mean neutralism, they mean neutralism for our side. So, that I think would be a different situation. I have been asked this question before. I don't think it would happen. If and what we would do if an "untrue neutralist government" took over, that is, one partial to the Communists, I suppose it would be opposed by elements in Vietnam that were devoted to freedom and anti-Communists, so I think perhaps we would carry on the struggle with the anti-Communist neutralist. This word, "neutralist" has taken on a connotation that's ugly. It has a good meaning in its legitimate use. I find myself always arguing against neutralism but I think I fail to point out each time, that I am for neutralism, I'm against Communist neutralism.

NUREMBERG TRIALS

Mr. EVANS. Senator, you having been on the Nuremberg Trials, we are about to see the expiration of the statute of limitations. How do you feel about that? Do you think they should expire?

Senator DODD. No, no, I don't think so at all and I don't think it is going to either, from what I hear and read. My view is very simple—as long as there is any one person in Germany or beyond its boundaries, who has had any part in the dreadful crimes committed by the Nazi regime, he should be brought to book.

RAILROADS

Mr. EVANS. The New Haven Railroad is in trouble too. It's in your bailiwick. Do you have any prescriptions or panaceas for the line?

Senator DODD. I offered a bill that would call for the Federal Government to put up matching funds, matching State or municipal funds. I think something like this has got to happen or else this railroad is going out of business. We have to have it in Connecticut as well as other States in that area—commuter service, freight service—of course, I think the railroad is in its present posture because of dreadfully bad management over the years. I see nothing else that can be done except for the Government and the State governments to get it back on its feet. I believe because I talked with those whom I consider well informed on railroad problems, that it can be done—efficiently and properly operated. But now it needs a blood transfusion. We got to get it well before it can do better. I was a little bit discouraged because the Assistant Secretary of Commerce went before the Interstate Commerce Subcommittee recently and said the Government shouldn't give any help. I think that's wrong—I hope that's not the view of the administration, otherwise I fear the railroad will go down the drain.

Mr. EVANS. You just want to make sure they get the right blood type.

Senator DODD. I do.

Mr. BELL. Senator, what's the future of this high speed rail line between Washington and Boston? Is there any future in this?

Senator DODD. I do think so, Jack, I think Senator PELL has the right idea on this. I think that is what we have to come to. But I think again, this will take time, several years before it will get into operation. Yes, right type blood transfusion is what we need in the meantime.

OTEPKA CASE

Mr. EVANS. The country is pretty much interested in the Otepka case which seems to fall below the horizon occasionally. I know you have been a strong advocate of this man's rights. Where does it stand now?

Senator DODD. The hearing for Otepka in the Department of State, which he requested, has been postponed several times, at his request. I wish they would get on with it and get it done. I think Otepka is waiting for the Senate subcommittee to complete its hearings so that he will have the hearings available for whatever help he thinks it will give him. The State Department, understandably, wants to get on with it. My own view is that it's a mistake on all sides here. This matter ought to be resolved and it can be very simple. Otepka has a lot of ability. He ought to be taken back. I don't say on this or that job, but he ought to be brought back into the Department and put to work. The thing got off on the wrong foot. I think Otepka probably got a little touchy about things that were not of consequence, encouraged by well-meaning friends, the Department got its back up, can't be made to appear as backing down * * * it's all nonsense to me. Let them both back down and let us get on with the business of getting the job done.

Mr. BELL. Do you have more hearings scheduled on it?

Senator DODD. Very briefly. We have some testimony to take to wind it up—witnesses we have already heard.

ADOPTIONS

Mr. EVANS. Can you give me one quick answer, Senator on the black market baby.

Senator DODD. Baby bill? The bill, as you know was reported out of the Judiciary Committee again this year, passed the Senate unanimously, last year, it is a good bill, it will put some curb on this bad uncontrolled traffic in babies for sale, these brokers, these shyster lawyers, and unscrupulous people.

Mr. EVANS. You think it will pass?

Senator DODD. I do.

A NEW CONSERVATIVE MANIFESTO

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on December 29, 1964, Look magazine printed an article, by T. George Harris, Look senior editor, entitled "A New Conservative Manifesto."

One need not be a member of the Republican Party or wear the "conservative" label to be impressed by the conclusions drawn in the article—critical of radicalism, but urging that citizens not be blindly negative in this changing world of exploding population, knowledge, and problems, but that they be "problem-solution directed"; that citizens need not advocate Federal or even Government solutions for every problem; but that they must, if aware and concerned, recognize that there are great and serious problems, and must feel responsible to offer alternative solutions.

Mr. President, in the hope that all our citizens will become more conscious of the tremendous problems brought about by our growth and population, urbanization, and technological and scientific development, and will be motivated to study and think toward various solutions to these problems, rather than be automatically against any solution proposed, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[Reprinted from the Dec. 29, 1964 issue of Look]

A NEW CONSERVATIVE MANIFESTO

(By T. George Harris)

Nice ladies and gentlemen in 44 States have been congratulating each other since election night. We've disposed of Goldwaterism, they say with self-satisfaction, and taught the conservatives a lesson they were too crude to learn any other way. Now, back to the politics of normalcy and moderate accents in the GOP.

They were wrong. Goldwaterism will not evaporate. It brought into the open and voiced, however inadequately, however negatively, the concern, the fear of many bewildered Americans. Goldwater's radical conservative supporters turned to him because they wanted a prophet to lead them out of a modern wilderness. The prophet failed, but the radical conservative is still there.

He is a troubled citizen. In his heart, he still knows that something's wrong. Bad wrong. He will cite you a thousand specifics, from the debt to fluoridation and the fourth estate's liberalism. But his underlying anguish, legitimate and deep, can be found at the sore core of modern life.

There, the individual man or woman cannot long escape an aching doubt—what does he matter to his neighbors, his State, his country? Is a man only a social security number? An instinct warns millions that they are losing the capacity for personal acts that mean anything to anybody. The instinct is decent; its frustration is deadly.

People rising into affluence can feel, more keenly than hungry men, the threat of mortal insignificance. This creeping fear is the raw material of most contemporary literature and theology. After we fill our animal needs for food and shelter, millions of us bump up hard against the larger need for a meaningful role among fellow men. Without it, we are fat beasts caged in ranchhouses.

One of the very human responses to the soft indignities of U.S. life can be found in the hard doctrines of radical conservatism. It has, by organizing an agony, become the most significant political movement of the late 20th century.

Its converts, to whom conservative is a word in flaming capitals, talk of rugged individualism, for they feel the modern threat to the person. Their extreme urgency, which drives them to their radicalism, shocks any traditional conservative (the old common-noun variety) who comes close enough to feel it (see "What Is an Extremist?" Look, October 20). The radical conservative, dwarfed by big Government, big labor and big business, often kicks the whole machinery, Wall Street and all, if only to make it honor him with a flinch.

His dread spreads. He comes to believe that his country is roaring down the road to ruin, too drunk to heed the warning signals. Patriotism of the heart calls him to do something. Who's to blame? Only one answer sounds ominous enough to match the premonition of evil felt within: The Communist conspiracy, which not only menaces the Nation, but, more to the point, is the archetype of the collectivism that smothers a man.

Senator Goldwater, obviously not soft on anything, touched and sensitized this populist discontent. He was in turn shaped by it. In his years of jet-speed campaigning, he became more emphatic and, like any speaker, bore down harder on the phrases and politics that aroused passionate acclaim in his audiences. The radical conservative movement made him its champion and needed only passive help from the GOP Old Guard to nominate him for President of the United States.

The movement gained strength from Senator Goldwater's campaign. By seizing the Republican label for their candidate, this minority of the minority party claimed the endorsement of 26 million voters. The landslide that covered him only hid for a moment the protest that made him.

PROTEST WITHOUT A PROGRAM

Radical conservative organizations and workers became the dominant voice in most Republican State parties months before they picked convention delegates dedicated to their man (see "The Rampant Right Invades the GOP," Look, July 16, 1963). The new breed of political activist, a fanatic volunteer, enveloped the weaker party with speakers and pamphlets. Whatever happens in the GOP National Committee, the right wing will set the tone for much of the party apparatus.

Complacents outside the movement have for years tried to ignore it, or explain it away. But their standard explanations are self-collapsing. To say that the conservative is sick, as many liberals charge, is to say that a sickness, even to despair, is epidemic in the land. To say that he has been converted by propagandists, as the post office suspects, is only to say that he buys what they sell. To say that he is irrational, as moderates believe, is only to say that urgent human needs lie deep in the spirit. To say that legions of know-nothings have risen from the grave to revive conspiracy politics, as scholars declare, is to focus upon democracy's turmoil in times of far less radical change.

Since the crisis settled into the Republican Party, it has been a body convulsed as if by demons. Each daily paper reports another tremor in its trunk and limbs. Leaders maneuver cagily for ways to mix the conflicting humors of the radical conservatives and the element to which they are by nature allergic—the accommodating "me too" wing of conservatism's grand old party. The power struggle within the organization will never be resolved, and may kill the GOP, unless the men who call themselves moderates hear the message of the movement and find a principle on which to respond to it.

This is hard to do, for the protest has been without a program. The movement's facile editor, William F. Buckley, Jr., who claimed credit for "purifying" Senator Goldwater's thought and later for engineering his candidacy, once wrote a book-length essay "Up From Liberalism," to prove that his conservatism needs only a "no-program" like this: "I will not willingly cede more power to anyone, not to the State, not to General Motors, not to the CIO." Of course, the beatnik also asserts his personal liberty against all the "rat race" institutions that load a man with responsibility. But Buckley clothed his self-centered protest in an economic doctrine, anticommunism and the gaudy wit of an expert college debater. Senator Goldwater, in 1961, endorsed it all without reservation.

But this year he tried, as the candidate for the highest office, to do better. He needed to reach beyond the zealots up front to the silent citizens back in the crowds. Failing, he retreated to the rhetoric of communism within the gates, hinting treason as the reason for an untidy world. On his last day of running, as he heard the rumble of the voter avalanche starting down, he told the voters of Fredonia, Ariz., how he had wanted to talk about an America that only they, still near the stand-tall legend of the Old West, could understand.

The pain creeps upon us now, however, not back in Tombstone days. And so, perhaps, does a way to start to work upon it.

Out of the conservative ferment, one little-known man has begun to draw a nourishing stream of ideas. As old as the country and as new as today's rediscovery, his thought reaches the core of the protest, but earns the respect of any liberal who comprehends it.

The man is Richard C. Cornuelle, 37, of San Mateo, Calif. He is neither a bigwig in politics nor a captain of industry. An earnest though humorous idealist, he comes out of that set-apart world of conservative foundations and causes. Once a young right-wing pamphleteer, he steeped himself in a formidable literature—the European thought that has rigidified the present U.S. movement. But his Presbyterian conscience and his young mind drove him beyond dogma, and a few men of wealth and wisdom trusted him with money to test his ideas. He stumbled sometimes and stuttered, but his thought and work took him on a pilgrimage of principle into social experiment far more substantial than Brook Farm.

He hunted immediate ways to reduce our dependence, now and in the future, upon the Federal pills for all ills. With more imagination than any before, he found tactics for nudging private institutions into deliberate attack upon public problems. It may seem odd, though it shouldn't, that he cribbed some of his methods from Chicago's Saul Alinsky, the toughest civil rights leader yet to appear.

What happened? Only enough, so far, to promise much more. Because of Cornuelle, commercial bankers in 49 States now lend millions to needy college students. Galvanized by his thought, the National Association of Manufacturers, not famous for charity work among the unemployed, labored all year on its own "poverty program" to employ the unemployable. Because of his specific results and compelling analysis of U.S. institutions, a few key Republicans on both sides of the ideological divide now hope to turn the party machinery into something more than an instrument of nay-saying, be it moderate or immoderate.

"The success of the Republican political position depends only incidentally on politics," Cornuella believes, rejecting the election-year cynicism of party hacks. "The GOP action program should provide detailed blueprints for private action, and State and local action, on public problems. Then we must produce results, not just gripe at the Government for trying to. We need to compete, not just at the Federal level, but at every level where the public business is debated and acted upon. Conservatives have been demanding political power before they first accepted responsibility."

These notions may sound grandiose to you, or like another revival of hopes that have failed before. I'd feel that way had I not, as a reporter, followed the years of work that brought Cornuelle's body of thought to its present half-finished shape. His book, "Reclaiming the American Dream," is the first installment of a new conservative manifesto. Because it breaks the ideological logjam, you may find it important enough, whatever your politics, to know about even before it goes to the printer.

"I am tired of angry books about America," Cornuelle writes, his belly full of accumulated conservative despair. "You will find this a hopeful book. It does not say the country is going to hell. It says that, perhaps for the first time in her history, America can go wherever she wants to go."

The tone tells more than Cornuelle knows. Those who participate in his effective projects come to talk like the purposeful, yeasty reformers of the early New Deal. They shuck off the helpless pessimism, the random anger and the conspiratorial obsession that mark the 1964 conservative. Like Cornuelle, they find a working redemption from insignificance. They matter, and they know it.

THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR

Cornuelle's best break came a few years back with one simple insight. He spotted the flaw in the standard two-part division of U.S. institutions into the "public sector," which is Government, and the "private sector," which in the main is profitmaking enterprise. Many rely upon this two-tined fork, a tool of conventional wisdom, for any probe of the U.S. system. Liberals tend to trust only Government for serious work. Rightwingers trust only the other prong, private enterprise. Both, Cornuelle saw, miss something fundamental. Neither category offers working space for thousands of distinctive institutions and millions of public-spirited people. He listed a few: 6,000 private foundations worth $14.5 billion; 320,000 churches with 118 million members; 131 labor unions with 13.5 million members; the political parties themselves, and thousands of political "education" outfits from the Birch Society to the ban-the-bomb'ers; 18,000 little and big business associations, plus farm, professional and scholarly groups; 100,000 welfare groups like United Fund; action outfits all the way from civil rights militants to the Association for Retarded Children; 190 million Americans who, beyond the work they are paid for and the one vote each citizen can cast, do such personal things as contribute $7 billion a year to worthy causes.

"These are tremendous raw resources," he noted. "I can hardly imagine a task too great for them." But they don't seem to be doing much.

We notice them mainly when, as pressure groups, they lobby for Government action. They also, less obviously but to greater effect, serve as a lever on the profitmaking sector—as when labor unions bargain for pay and pensions, and private universities raise money to lift general educational standards. So Cornuelle began to see the middle institutions as a hidden fulcrum.

Puzzled that scholars had done so little to define this fulcrum action, Cornuelle hunted his way back to Alexis de Tocqueville, whose 1835 book, "Democracy in America," spelled out more clearly than any before or since the genius of our revolution. Eureka. Tocqueville had considered associations, as he called the middle institutions, the distinctive and unique force in our democracy.

"Nothing is more deserving of our attention," Tocqueville wrote. Upon these groups, he knew, depends our country's progress.

Cornuelle labeled his rediscovery "the independent sector." Then he set out to see why, if it had once been so decisive and today commands even greater raw resources, it has become a mere incidental to any analysis of the mass, affluent society. He wondered if it would be squeezed down to nothing by the vigor of business and Government.

The main failure was easy to spot. As a board member of a local charity, Cornuelle had suffered through reports "on how many lap robes the needlework committee knitted." The charity's social workers, lacking any competitive gage of competence or even Government-style budgeting, had no notion of how to get the best out of their resources. Most independent institutions, he knew, operate on 19th century skills, ideas, and organizations. "We still roll bandages and knit mufflers in the missile age," he noted. Could the independent sector leap into the 20th century?

So began the first Cornuelle experiment. It was 1958, after sputnik, and Congress was launching, through the National Defense Education Act, a program of Federal loans to worthy students. Why didn't the bankers do the job? When Cornuelle hesitantly asked them why not try, most said, "too risky * * * no profit." So he set up an independent agency to lever banks into action. With tax-exempt contributions from business, he founded United Student Aid Funds, Inc., a reinsurance corporation. USA funds did for student loans, on a lesser scale, what FHA insurance did for home mortgages. Any banker who lent to a college student at fair interest could have the loan endorsed, free, by USA funds. If the student defaulted or died, the fund repaid the banker.

The idea was sensible enough to require a few years of selling among bankers and educators. But by this fall, it had begun to pay off. The fund has reinsured $35 million worth of student loans in 4 years, and is now endorsing about that much more each year. Some 48,000 needy students in 674 colleges draw funds from 5,350 participating banks. Savings and loan associations will soon offer the same service. Result: Students will have access to more financial resources than would ever be supplied by the Government's direct loans. And just in time. The post-war litter of babies, now of age to invest in their college education, will test the capacity of all sectors—public, private, independent—to finance education.

What next? Methodical Dick Cornuelle, in picking his first national experiment, had passed over several other obvious needs, from a network of low-cost nursing homes to private slum clearance. He settled on education loans because he ran across a local scheme that would work everywhere. Massachusetts bankers had already proved out the basic idea. Cornuelle copied it nationwide in USA Funds. Looking back later, he suspected that he had stumbled on to both the critical strength and the weakness of his independent sector.

"For almost any social problem, somebody in the country has developed a solution that works," he guessed. "But the independent institutions aren't yet organized to find it and apply it nationwide."

Well, maybe, but nobody would believe it, Cornuelle knew, until somebody deliberately tested the independent sector on a huge, apparently unlickable chore. So, groping for the next move, he reached for bigger trouble. What? Early this year, the answer was obvious in every newspaper and magazine: automation unemployment. The Feds' poverty package would, through the Job Corps, reach only a few hundred thousands of the hard-core unemployed, but would expand unless the real problem could be solved. If our giant economy, mostly private, could not open up jobs for low-skill workers—school dropouts and automation layoffs—then unemployment would swell with the quickening tempo of technological change.

THOUSANDS OF WARS ON POVERTY

So began the second experiment. Cornuelle flew east to see another private reformer, a veteran out of USA Funds: Bennett Kline, executive vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers. The NAM, charged with "coal-black reaction" by more than one big businessman, had tried for years to change its "public image" without changing its working habits. Now, Kline saw the chance for NAM to earn a reputation for public service. Chairman William Brady and the NAM board agreed, though some rank-and-file members viewed such do-goodery with all the enthusiasm of the Baptist deacon who was asked to turn the parsonage into a house for call girls. Surely, they felt, somebody else ought to run this kind of service.

Throughout the summer days and nights, business leaders and the NAM staff turned from preaching free enterprise toward action to make it still better. The private planning sessions, which I attended when possible, settled on a strategy. If Cornuelle was right, many companies and communities must have found ways to help the jobless into jobs. Some of the techniques would work on a national scale. To find them, Kline fired off

26,000 questionnaires. Hundreds of responses poured back. Standard Oil of New Jersey had learned to spot the forgotten talents of men laid off, and help them into job-growth industries. Educators and employers in Bedford, Ohio, had collaborated to cut the high school dropout rate in half. Milwaukee's Manpower, Inc., had successfully test run a free placement service for unemployed teenagers.

Ben Kline bound the best local cases into a handbook for national distribution, persuaded other business associations to plan management seminars in major cities. Harvard Business School, the chamber of commerce, the National Industrial Conference Board and other groups pitched in.

"We have enough evidence to know that somebody has solved every kind of employment problem," Kline decided. "Now, we have to find out how to put these solutions into general use."

Will NAM make a dent? You and I will wait and see. If member executives have the managerial gift to follow through, several million Americans over the next few years will work more productively and in greater dignity. Business, of course, will benefit from more talented, mobile workers. Beyond lies the hidden reward. Those who take part in such a project will have found, as one man suggested, what they can do for their country.

"There should not be one war on poverty in America. There should be thousands," Cornuelle wrote. "Have we come to the point in America where the public business is left undone unless Government does it? I don't believe so."

But the Federal Government looks so big. Isn't it the only agency powerful enough, rich enough to do the big jobs? No. Quite the contrary. The general economy is so much bigger than the bureaucracy that a minor improvement in the Nation's use of low-skill workers, engineered by NAM or local communities, would help many more people than any Federal program in sight. Businessmen know it. Leaders like Chrysler president Lynn Townsend warn against "abdicating the problem-solving responsibility," but have lacked until now a clear strategy on which to act.

Some sense that the GOP ought to help. As far back as the midfifties, I found Chicago industrialist Charles Percy trying to put his party to work. He wanted to mobilize business and other private outfits. If the minds and talents outside Government could focus upon the future needs of America, then all our institutions, not just Government, could work more effectively to meet them. One night, he came back from Washington and talked until 3 a.m. about a session he'd had with President Eisenhower. Yes, he said, Ike understood and would set up a "Goals Committee" inside both the administration and the party. Instead of planning the future through Government, the Goalsmen would strive for general policy agreement upon goals, rely upon public and private leaders to make the decisions on how to reach them.

Percy's idea fizzled. Top scholars and business thinkers contributed to a dull book, and the GOP's 1960 platform concerned itself with such futuristic subjects as "Science and Technology." But the old pros, with the cynical vision of their trade, considered the effort a waste of time, perhaps a flirt with liberalism. Talk of science revives the suspicion, among demon-minded conservatives, that machines produce the sins of modernism. Besides, in the party's councils, even in its Senate caucuses, you could rile the animals more with another sermon against communism.

"That sterile stuff is all we hear at caucus anymore," said one GOP Senator. "They attack everybody, and work up a kind of meanness."

The Goals idea, however, suffered from a more serious weakness. It might have survived its critics if it had fomented action instead of talk. What it lacked was the practicality since developed in Cornuelle's experiments and thought.

Chuck Percy, I find, has come to a similar conclusion. After he lost his bid for the Illinois governorship—because he did not disavow Goldwater—he knew exactly what he wanted to do next. He worked for several days on Teamwork Foundation, Inc., a local outfit that teaches illiterates to read in 8 weeks. Then he went to the Businessmen for Good Government Committee, the 8,000-man mainstay of his campaign. He asked them to help him find jobs for Teamwork's new literates, and to take on other public service chores.

"A businessman's work for good government doesn't necesarily begin in politics," he believes. "It begins where the problems are. Our committee doesn't want to disband. We're going to take my campaign staff and turn it over to the Republican Party. We're going to develop positive programs, yes, and put them into practice."

Percy will, in short, rebuild the Illinois GOP machinery into a clearinghouse for action in the independent sector. Where legislation will help private institutions do better, the staff will draft suitable bills. Thus, the party will try to serve the State, lend a hand in dreary day-to-day toil, instead of just jumping up every 4 years to beg for votes. If the idea works, it may spread. Nine years ago, Percy invented a permanent, broad-based system for raising GOP funds. His Illinois plan has by now spread to 38 other States parties.

A GOP clearinghouse would, in many cities and States, merely stimulate a leadership net that already serves well, often in silent partnership with one or both parties. But on the national level, there's almost a vacuum. So the prospects are jucier. If the national committee appointed a British-style shadow cabinet, as some conservatives want, each "secretary" could concentrate upon independent and private activity in his department.

The shadow Labor Secretary could, for a start, hunt (like the NAM) for local solutions to unemployment, team with management and unions to put the best discoveries into national use. The shadow Commerce Secretary could take it from there, help businessmen and educators improve the retraining programs, that must come with automation job-jumping. Treasury's shadow, while debating fiscal policy, might seek tax encouragement for a much broader base of stock ownership. The shadow at the State Department might cheer on such projects as one now going in Latin America, where U.S. mortgage experts help Peace Corpsmen set up savings funds to build worker homes.

Cornuelle would go further. For decades, Congress has relied upon its ever alert General Accounting Office for a permanent staff to study the Federal bureaucracy, report its successes and failures. "Congress should set up the same kind of permanent staff to study the resources and workings of nongovernment agencies," Cornuelle now proposes. "Then when the executive branch comes up with another job for Government to do, there would be somebody to testify on what people are already doing and what would help them do it better. For the first time, we'd have clear competition with Government in public service. On many jobs, the independent sector could product better results at less cost."

This idea, like any other, turns silly when pushed beyond its useful limit. When I tried it on a horn-rimmed Harvard thinker, he instantly imagined a ladies' auxiliary trying to run a sewage system. "I guess if you asked the John Birch Society to work on the problem of the aged," mutters Cornuelle, "they'd solve it by killing them off."

Ironic though it may be, the radical conservatives who violently protest Federal activity do less than the moderates to offer the alternatives. In the rightwing alphabet agencies, from the JBS to ISI and YAF, many would rather nourish despair than cure it. Star performers on the rightwing lecture circuit, among them ex-Reds who have switched sides in their class warfare, make a profession of dramatizing dangers so terrible that only the Minuteman's rifle will stand them off.

Bill Buckley, the movement's overseer-intellectual, has matured a bit since we studied Plato together at Yale. He rejects as silly the Birch theory, "documented" in rigorous detail, that Communist conspiracy shapes almost every event. But he retains his boyish obsession for public sword practice upon the more pathetic oddities of the far left. Like them, he treats politics as total war between extremes, across a no man's land of muddled middlers. On the day before his candidate's defeat, his National Review Bulletin sounded the feverish theme with which conservatives scared voters more than the Senator did: "Counterrevolution—and that, really, is what Barry Goldwater is talking about—is a sweaty, brawly business."

In this frantic mood, radical conservatives have failed to notice, or often to admit, America's steady march toward a responsible brand of conservatism. The Democratic Party has spread across the middle, and in John F. Kennedy's tax-cut proposal took over the ground long occupied by business-minded Republican moderates (see "Eight Views of JFK," Look, November 17). The fighting liberal of old has almost vanished from politics. Even the new poverty package breaks with the custodial tradition of Federal welfare legislation. Poverty war strategy: Help unemployables off relief by education. The tactics: Hire companies to train workers for their business, make small grants to independent agencies like the Urban League to expand their need-tailored retraining.

Socialism—government takeover of production—is a dead notion. Free enterprise, though aided by subsidy and research technology, is no less pure than in days of land-grant railroading.

Almost unnoticed, the States have risen again. The Federal effort has expanded mainly in defense, while State and local governments have responded to citizen demand for better schools, mental care, recreation grounds. Federal taxing and spending, even debt, now decline sharply as a proportion of all governmental effort in the 50 States. More important, the private economy grows much faster than Federal bureaucracy. Washington just ain't as big a place as it used to be, though the Washington press corps can't yet admit its decline.

Nor, for other reasons, can the radical conservatives. Their intellectuals are only slowly emerging from the underground, a dark place. Their philosophical tradition, which liberal scholars tried to ignore, is strong on principle, but warped by political despair. To see how their individualistic themes may evolve, we can look at the experience of one individual, Richard Cornuelle.

A Navy veteran and Phi Beta Kappa student at California's Occidental College, he became impatient with "uncritical, unexamined liberalism." Then he heard about New York University's Ludwig von Mises, Austrian-born sire of the main-line conservative doctrine that treats individual freedom as the absolute moral imperative. Suddenly, von Mises had a new student and protege.

"I got converted to the hard, doctrinaire conservative position, and moved through a short right-wing anarchist period," says Cornuelle of his personal thought. "If you pursue the logic of the conservative doctrine, you get to anarchy. We used to be proud, in our all-night student sessions at Schrafft's Restaurant, that we weren't afraid to say so—to call ourselves anarchists."

He preached the pure doctrine as a professional propagandist for right-wing foundations. "Our theme was educate, educate, educate—and when you get an effective majority in the country, you sort of call a constitutional convention and straighten it all out." Dick and the other purists believed the United States was creeping far into socialism. The faster the better, they thought, for only in terror would voters panic into counterrevolution. The purists did not fight, as did Taft conservatives, to temper welfare legislation, or to improve nongovernment institutions. No, they aimed for "a choice not an echo," the day when they would spin this huge Nation right around and head back where, they thought, we came from.

Cornuelle, a practical American, was never comfortable with the commandmant of legal revolution from the right. But it bothered him less than the doctrine's permanent rejection of all public charity for the poor and the weak, "the hard cases" that invite socialistic measures. Son of a Presbyterian minister, Cornuelle faced "a growing conflict between a human motive out of church upbringing and the sense of comfort I had in this tidy theoretical position."

Friedrich von Hayek, conservative economist then at the University of Chicago, had watched European governments on "The Road to Serfdom." He put the issue bluntly to his true believers: "The defense of liberty can never rest on its ability to perform in any particular case." But the particular cases, young Cornuelle realized, were people. After writing the pure doctrine about the Kentucky coal fields—"the least able producers have disappeared"—he went to check on those least able producers. "They hadn't disappeared," he admitted painfully, as he saw the hungry men in the mountain towns. He began to suspect that his conservative heroes had been too long in the ivory tower.

He studied their work more intently, and as an officer of the Volker Fund subsidized a major increase in the publishing of their books. He aided most of the men who became Senator Goldwater's campaign brain trust, and still shares their belief in principle rather than accommodation.

UP FROM RADICALISM

But where they quit thinking, he kept going. The conflict between a liberal concern for humanity and a conservative respect for free-enterprise principle, Cornuelle saw, is a standard dilemma. "The opinion polls show it. People contradict themselves. They are against socialism, but vote for programs that they define as socialism. The liberals speak for our humane aspirations. The conservatives stress our desire to keep Government in check. If only the Government can solve modern social problems, the liberals and conservatives have no common ground. Political dialog grows bitter and empty. Debate cannot bring adjustment. Both sides must retreat to hard ideology."

Still devoted to conservative principle, Cornuelle resolved his dilemma only when he recognized that his cause need not rest its case on the profitmaking sector, where the invisible hand of the free market may come too late for human need. "Free enterprise isn't an all-purpose social system," he wrote. Nor can the traditional appeal to voluntary action be left as an excuse for irresponsibility. Using the fulcrum of the independent sector, he proved that individuals and groups can, if they organize their efforts better, make their personal concern effective and lighten the load on Government—how much, nobody yet knows.

Cornuelle has been startled, as have I, at the varieties of people reaching toward the same answer. In the colleges, political debate has lost ground to personalization, a student word for personal action on Negro rights, in slum work and the Peace Corps. In State governments and U.S. agencies, bright young men on tight budgets look for ways to stimulate private action, rather than take on a new job entirely with civil servants.

Their effort reflects the hidden wisdom of the country. In the Kentucky town of Russellville, lawyer-Rotarian Granville Clark thinks hard on the individual's responsibility to society. He drawls his beliefs calmly, and acts upon them. After the Supreme Court's decision on school integration, he personally led the citizen campaign to comply, and soon brought off one of the most peaceful, effective plans in the South. But he worries. He believes that this Nation, unable or unwilling to provide enough voluntary welfare, recognized a need for Federal action a generation ago. "We've Christianized the Federal Government." But he fears that the next generation, trained in the myth of Federal omnipotence, could lose its sense of "obligation to their fellow man." If so, even the liberal spirit that led to welfare programs would be cut off at its human roots.

To some extent, we've already seen the cutoff. The conservative movement in some regions turns into a revolt of the new rich, a selfish attack upon taxes or any other community claim upon a citizen's time or money. Some right-wing writers reject the ideal of love as an instrument of "the looters." Each year of rising prosperity creates millions more Americans who have, as a rich young man put it, "more to do with than they have to do for." The churches, the political parties, and independent institutions have failed to reach out to the moneyed newcomers and harness them into hard, rewarding service. They are left with only their new wealth, which came too quick to seem permanent, and with the Birch Society to feed their fear that it may be taken away.

One symptom is ominous: street violence. It has a peculiar fascination for the sensitized right. Why? It strikes where nobody feels responsible for the victim, the bystanders can turn their backs in mutual anonymity (see "Who Cares?" Look, September 3). It will not be cured by tough cops. It will only give way to treatment of its cause, which is the presence of social outcasts in communities where nobody—in or out of Government—can or will exercise personal concern for them.

In this situation, the argument over the Federal Government's size and role becomes irrevalent. If, as conservatives argue, a mighty Government program will not cure the community malady, the hands-off doctrine does not even admit its existence. Liberalism and radical conservatism end up in their customary stalemate. Unless both can reach down to deeper principle, and compromise on method, the country will merely listen to more debate upon their dilemma.

"If Republicans can resolve the differences between themselves," Cornuelle believes, "they can resolve a dilemma for the whole population."

And in the process, they can become a party with a mission. For decades after the Civil War, the GOP had, and held to, an instinctive vision of vast America's growth into a mighty industrial nation, and no amount of graft or scandal broke its monopoly. The Democrats, living in the memory of Jefferson's agrarian democracy, did not become dominant until the depression. Then they grasped the individual's need for protection against inhuman forces grown too big for one man to fight, or to leave to blind chance.

Today, the future belongs to the party that can provide the individual with something more: the opportunity, in liberty and abundance, to know that he matters.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the crisis in southeast Asia has perhaps deflected the attention of many of us from the equally grave crisis facing the United Nations. In this year, its 20th, it would be hard to imagine a world without the United Nations. An entire generation has lived with it. It is, in no small measure, responsible for the absence of major world conflicts which ravished the world in the first half of this century.

The United Nations today deserves the attention and assistance of the United States more than at any time since its inception.

An editorial published in the Bel Air (Md.) Aegis reflects the concern of many thoughtful Americans for the fate of this organization. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE UNITED NATIONS

With the unexpected cooperation of the Soviet Union the United Nations managed to survive its 19th session without a major calamity, but the prospects for the future look no rosier than ever before. The paths toward great goals, now as always, are filled with hidden traps and strewn with thorns.

Since its founding 20 years ago at the close of the Second World War, the U.N. has been sniped at from all parts of the globe with a variety of weapons ranging from pamphlets and circulars to live bazooka shells. In recent weeks, their target rendered more vulnerable by the Indonesian resignation and the Russian-French debt crisis, the sharpshooters have increased their fire.

To those who would have the United States withdraw from the U.N. and order its representatives from our shores, the international organization appears a sinister nest of conspiratorial foreigners and revolutionaries, most of them suspiciously darkskinned, whose only aims are to discover our secrets and squander our funds. But this conception of the situation rests on a hazy and distorted vision of today's world.

Only through the give-and-take of constructive debate in a properly recognized and sanctioned setting can the inevitable misunderstandings that arise in any intercourse between differing cultures be dispelled. The preservation of the U.N. is, from a practical standpoint, in the direct interest of the United States. To remove ourselves from the only existing forum for broad international discussion would be to become isolated, and in that isolation defenseless against the rising tides of communism and poverty. We could not long survive as a rich island in a sea of discontent.

There are great ethical and political arguments for continued American support of the United Nations, but the most compelling reason is supremely practical. The building by the East River, with its soaring tiers of windows, is more than a symbol of all that is enlightened and fine in man. It represents his last, best hope for the survival of his civilization.

BEL AIR, MD.,
February 27, 1965.

The EDITOR THE AEGIS,
Bel Air, Md.

DEAR SIR: I commend you for your editorial on the United Nations. I hope the many people who read the Aegis were moved by your words.

Citizens should write President Lyndon B. Johnson and Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The President and the Senator should be told that decisions have been put off long enough in the United Nations; and

the United States should take a strong position and move toward making the U.N. the true voice of all the people in the world. It is up to us to make it into a parliament of men.

Yours truly,

MARY C. WOODWARD.

WEST COAST RELIEF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I welcomed the opportunity to cosponsor Senate bill 327. This worthy piece of proposed legislation, introduced by the two distinguished Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mrs. NEUBERGER], is designed to alleviate the effects of the disastrous floods of December and January, last. Recent estimates put the amount of damage done in the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Nevada at some $462 million.

As the Senate knows, my State of Alaska last spring was struck by a natural disaster of equivalent magnitude. Although the much more highly developed economies of the West Coast States have made less crippling the effects of the recent floods, the dollar amount of the damage done was roughly similar. In both cases, commercial insurance coverage paid for only a small amount of the loss.

Mr. President, the States of the West Coast have requested aid from the Federal Government if they are to recover from what has happened. This aid must be sufficient in amount to restore the damage done, and it must occur with some reasonable relationship in time to the events which gave rise to the need.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Public Works will give the West Coast disaster relief bill its early attention, and that we shall have it here on the floor for our consideration as quickly as we did the Alaska earthquake legislation of last summer.

DRUGS AND JUVENILES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a classic series of articles concerning the abuse of dangerous drugs written by a seasoned journalist, Ray Richards, and which appeared in the Boston Globe.

The alarming abuse of these drugs by juveniles and others in the Boston metropolitan area was so effectively brought to the attention of the public by William Davis Taylor, publisher of the Boston Globe, that it was a deciding factor in the judgment of Boston Police Commissioner Edmund L. McNamara to call a seminar for tomorrow, March 16, in that city, to present to public officials, deans of schools and colleges, social workers, and news media the "methods for preventing addiction and detecting the youthful" user of narcotics, marihuana, and dangerous drugs in its early stages.

Law enforcement in Boston is not alone in its confrontation with the havoc wrought on the community, family life, and law enforcement by the abuse of narcotics, dangerous drugs, and other chemical compounds which were designed for one purpose and used for another.

Both the Boston metropolitan police and the Boston Globe should be recognized for the public service they are performing in making the public aware of the threat the abuse of these drugs presents, particularly to the young people. This kind of public service makes President Johnson's war against crime in the streets much easier. And I would like to point out that the crime connected to the abuse of these drugs is a major contributor to the overall crime picture.

I regret that because of another commitment I will not be able to attend Police Commissioner McNamara's seminar in Boston tomorrow, but I consider it important enough to have a personal representative there.

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

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 17, 1965]

THE DRUG MENACE I: WHY KIDS TRY DOPE—A "BIG MAN" AT 12 WITH GOOFBALLS

(By Ray Richard)

Why do kids take dope?

Jimmy can tell you why.

He's only 12 years old, but he's done a lot of living for a boy his age. A lot of dying, too.

He died a thousand deaths a few weeks ago. He gulped down 12 "goofballs."

Then the pains came. He doubled up, fell to the floor of the living room, cried out for help, collapsed in his mother's arms.

She called police. They took him to the hospital where his stomach was pumped out, his life possibly saved.

"Why did you take them, Jimmy?" a social worker asked him later when the boy appeared in Boston juvenile court.

"A kid up the street had 'em. He said it was a new kind of candy. Asked me and a couple of other kids if we wanted to try some. I took a couple, then a couple more, and then I felt funny so I went home and got sick."

This was not a grilling. This was a man-to-man talk about a man-sized problem.

The youngster we're calling "Jimmy" sat up straight in the chair, erect but not tense. He didn't act like a wise guy. He tugged now and then at the sleeves of his bright red sweater but never took his glance from the man across the desk.

He was answering questions from Louis G. Maglio, executive director of the citizenship training program of the Boston juvenile court. Since 1936 the program has been a rehabilitation center for juveniles. Instead of sentencing some delinquents to jail, the court requires them to report daily, after school, to Maglio's downtown Boston facilities for guidance instead of punishment.

"The kid up the street, where did he get them?" Maglio asked.

"We went into his mother's bedroom. He found a bandage box in a drawer. The candy was in the box."

"You thought they were candy, Jimmy?" Maglio asked softly.

"Yes, sir." Jimmy never blinked.

Maglio took a vial of white pills from a drawer and showed them to Jimmy. They were similar to the pills which had been taken from the boy's stomach.

"Do you know what these are?" he asked.

"They look like the candy I had."

Maglio took another tack. "Do you know what dope is, Jimmy?"

"Yes, sir. I've seen it around the corner. Lots of teenagers take it. They have it with ginger ale."

"Why do they take it, Jimmy?"

"They make you high. You have a lot of fun. They make you yell and scream and throw bottles. You take some and in 2 hours you're not walking, you're crawling. It makes you a big man."

"Does it really make you a big man, Jimmy?"

"They think so."

"Would you be willing to take a chance on your life with dope so other kids will think you're a big man?" asked Maglio.

"I'm not, but some of the kids are," the boy replied.

HOLD ON YOUNG

This willingness to risk life itself so they will be considered "big men" is the chief reason why boys and girls get started on the drug habit, in the opinion of many experts consulted by the Globe.

"One of the most deplorable results of the illicit narcotics traffic is the hold that it has upon teenagers," the New York Police Department reported in a recent U.S. investigation of dope.

"The adult makes an introduction to the vice an act entirely of his own volition. However, in most cases this is not so with teenagers; and the reasons for this is that they are teenagers. It is not difficult to imagine a youngster being dared to try the stuff by his pals. Not wanting to be 'chicken,' he does. He then feels he is a 'man' in the eyes of his cronies, for it is axiomatic of youth to emulate adulthood. Thus the lad is proud of what he has done.

"Many a youthful life is shortened because of a wrong turn made during these vital years that sometimes are called the vacuum between childhood and adulthood.

SOME WANT RELIEF

Adults abuse drugs, too, but for other reasons.

Some want "relief" from the monotony of their jobs or their lives, like housewives.

Others—such as musicians, actors, doctors, truck drivers, executives—resort to it to relieve fatigue after a tension-filled day or night.

Some take dope out of frustration with their lot in life and resentment of the society they say caused it.

Some are accidental victims of dope, because they first took narcotics to relieve pain during medical treatment.

Some take drugs to remain awake. Truck drivers fighting tight schedules and college students cramming for exams are in this group.

It's called "academic readiness" on campus.

Other college students get started on dope for what they call "intellectual experimentation."

WHAT'S AN ADDICT?

But regardless of age or how he got started, a drug addict is anyone who takes harmful drugs:

1. In amounts sufficient to create a hazard to this own health or to the safety of the community, or

2. After obtaining them through illicit channels, or

3. On his own initiative rather than on professional advice.

This is the definition set down a year ago by the President's Commission on Narcotics and Drug Abuse.

And, regardless of age, anyone who takes drugs excessively for any reason, except those accidentally hooked, have a personality defect, the Globe was told.

ABUSES SPREADING ALL OVER STATE

The abuse of drugs has become a major social, medical, and legal problem throughout the country. It is growing nationally, in Massachusetts, maybe in the city or town where you live.

It is an "absolute epidemic," says a U.S. Senate committee.

It is an "American tragedy," says Senator THOMAS DODD of Connecticut.

It is all over Massachusetts say social workers, educators, police.

Suburban housewives abusing tranquilizers, teenagers drinking cough medicine, addicts shooting heroin are elements of the same problem.

Here are some insights into the drug menace:

More pep pills and barbiturates are sold illegally in the United States than are sold legally.

The abuse of drugs is causing highway accidents, school dropouts, and many crimes in Massachusetts.

The problem is striking every economic bracket, from slums to suburbia, and every age bracket, from infants to golden agers.

It may be spreading faster in the suburbs than in the cities.

Thousands of forged prescriptions for narcotics are passed every year.

The abuse of pep pills, diet pills, sleeping pills, and tranquilizers potentially is as harmful to the person and the community as are opium, morphine, and heroin.

Marihuana is being smoked on many college campuses, in most cities and in many towns.

Abuse of drugs is fascinating teenagers just as smoking, drinking, and sex parties have.

More than 5 billion pep pills alone get into the illicit market every year.

Confusion, chaos, and controversy hamper attempts to find a cure for addiction.

"Drug abuse today involves not only the narcotic drugs and marihuana, but to an increasingly alarming extent other drugs such as the barbiturates, the amphetamines (pep pills) and even certain tranquilizers," reported the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse.

MAFIA MOVES IN

The Mafia, long connected with the international marketing of opium, morphine, and heroin, has opened up the illicit market for drugs.

Drug abuse is crashing cars, smashing lives, and wrecking families throughout the State.

Last November 17, a 7-pound, 6-ounce baby boy was born in a Boston hospital. It had curly black hair and brown eyes. It was born a dope addict.

An 85-year-old man roams about Greater Boston daily, seeking morphine or marihuana. He has been a dope addict for 50 years.

For 2 years a firetruck has been driven in a North Shore community by a firefighter addicted to cough medicine.

Many drug abusers don't realize they are addicts. For "kicks," to "escape" or for other reasons, they—

1. Drink or inject paregoric, a medicine used to relieve diarrhea and soothe baby's gums;

2. Break open benzedrine-based nasal inhalers and chew the wicks or dunk them in hot tea or coffee;

3. Drink codeine-based cough medicine by the bottle;

4. Go to incredible extremes to satisfy their urge for drugs.

NOT WHOLE STORY

Statistics do not tell the story. The only cases which make up statistics on drug abuse or addiction are cases known and reported. They involve only persons caught. But for every case known and recorded, there are vast numbers of cases undetected.

With most crimes there is a victim to tell the police. Not so with the transfer of drugs illicitly. Such transfers are willing exchanges; there is nobody to report the crime.

Drug abuse is like an iceberg, and most of the problem is hidden in a sea of human misery. By knowing how much iceberg is above the water, geologists can tell how much is beneath. But nobody can measure the amount of drug abuse hidden.

The medical and legal professions, the drug industry, educators, sociologists, enforcement officials are determined to stop the abuse. The goals are clear, but the paths to those objectives are obscured by controversy and lack of facts.

Much can be done, however, by these groups, by the legislature, by the community, by parents—and by drug abusers themselves.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 18, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—II: TEEN ADDICTION HIGH IN EAST BOSTON

(This is the second in an in-depth series by Globe Reporter Ray Richard concerning the growing problem of narcotics among teenagers in the Nation.)

(By Ray Richard)

Georgie took pills three nights last week. He would start about 7 o'clock, get five goof balls down by 8, staggering by 8:30 and wild by 10.

Three times he got into fights with other kids on pills. And three times he had his nose broken. But he still takes the pills.

Georgie is one of many teenagers addicted to drugs in east Boston. Estimates range from 1,000, by a father of a dope addict, to several hundred by police.

The problem breaks out in pockets. It is usually around Day Square. The word is spread, There is pills around. A few youths vanish, come back later in cars, their pockets containing pills. They spread them around and scores of youths get high.

The police arrest a pusher. The pharmacists spot a phony prescription and flash the word to other druggists to be on the alert.

The pills become hard to get, and the wave of drug abuses recedes.

But the problem remains in east Boston, as it does in many other communities in Massachusetts, if sometimes dormant.

The problem is all over the State. In nearly every city and town there probably is some of it, if only one isolated case, declares Capt. John Moriarty, who until last week headed the Massachusetts State Police Narcotics Squad.

Except in the rural communities, he adds.

In Marlboro several years ago, the local police teamed with inspectors from the drug control section of the State department of public health and State police to smash a ring of 25 youths habitually getting high on drugs.

You get a pocket and it branches out into other towns and cities because the kids have access to cars, points out Joseph T. Conley, narcotic consultant to the Massachusetts State Police.

The outbreak in Marlboro snared youths from Framingham, Hudson and other neighboring communities.

When a pocket breaks out in East Boston, the pills—and their abuse—is liable to show up in Winthrop, Revere, Chelsea and as far away as Lynn.

The State department of public health recorded narcotic addicts living in 48 Bay State communities last year. These were users of opium, cocaine, morphine or heroin who had been caught.

It also lists 72 communities which reported intoxication or poisoning from harmful drugs, which cannot be sold legally without a prescription.

Eighty percent of the problem in Massachusetts is in Boston, in the estimation of George A. Michael, director of the food and drugs division of the department of public health.

"Boston has a problem and it's getting worse," says the Federal Food and Drug division in Washington. "Every big city has a problem. If you want to get out and look for it, you can find it. And each year it is getting worse because the stuff is easy to get."

The U.S. Senate subcommittee investigating the problem nationally reports: "There is no doubt it is a problem in Massachusetts, particularly in the Boston area.

"Boston has all of the population characteristics which cultivate a problem in harmful drugs. There are artists, musicians, many college students, all groups which are prone to drug abuse, and an abundance of doctors and hospitals which have legal access to drugs."

Capt. Jeremiah Sullivan of the Boston police vice and narcotics squad says emphatically, "There is no question it has increased in Boston in recent years."

Louis G. Maglio, executive director of the Citizenship Training Center for juveniles, a rehabilitation center for Boston Juvenile Court, says the abuse of drugs is increasing in Massachusetts, particularly among juveniles.

"We are 6 or 7 years behind New York, which really has it bad," Maglio says. "We were the same time behind with the problem of teenagers and alcohol. The drug problem is increasing and we really are worried about it."

He based his estimates on reports of former clients of the center who repeatedly drop in for unrequired visits, and an increased number of queries about the problem from parents.

He sees harmful drugs a potential menace to every community. From a recent month-long tour of 60 cities and towns to gage the juvenile delinquency problem he concludes delinquency in all forms, including the abuse of drugs, is making a distinct gain in the so-called better communities.

Bostonians took cognizance of the dope problem last November when the city council, at the urging of Councilor Fred C. Langone, adopted a resolution asking Mayor Collins to call a citywide conference to discuss ways to beef up the fight against narcotics, drugs and all forms of dope.

"The problem in some sections of the city is so great." Langone told the council, "that community leaders have had meetings and tried to suppress the use of these so-called goof balls and other harmful drugs." But the efforts of these civic leaders, and increased police efforts when an outbreak of dope occurs, have not been enough to lick the problem.

Consequently, Langone said, "We have young high school children, and that is about all they are, stealing and breaking into houses, and stealing automobiles so they can get money to buy the particular drugs they have become addicted to."

"Don't imply that dope is on every street corner," one social worker urged, "or that every teenager who goes out at night is confronted with it."

Dope is not on every street corner. And every teenager who goes out at night isn't confronted with it. But most people of any age who want dope can find it, or know somebody else who will get it for them.

CASES OF INTOXICATION, POISONING

The following Massachusetts communities reported intoxication or poisoning by harmful drugs in 1964:

Acushnet, Andover, Arlington, Bass River, Belmont, Bridgewater, Braintree, Brookline, Brockton, Cambridge, Concord, Chatham, Chathamsport, Chelmsford, Chelsea, Cohasset, Dedham, Dracut, Dorchester, Edgartown, East Bridgewater, East Templeton, Everett, Fall River, Framingham, Franklin, Georgetown, Gloucester, Greenfield, Groton, Groveland, Halifax, Haverhill, Bingham, Lee, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, Malden, Marshfield, Medford, Milton, Marblehead, Newton, New Bedford, Needham, North Chatham, North Chelmsford, North Attleboro, Oakham, Pembroke, Quincy, Raynham, Randolph, Revere, Rockland, South Chelmsford, Scituate, Somerset, Stoughton, Sudbury, Tewksbury,

Tyngsboro, Vineyard Haven, West Roxbury, Wilmington, Winthrop, Woburn and Worcester.

WHERE ADDICTS LIVE

The drugs control section of the department of public health reports narcotic addicts living in these communities in 1964:

Abington, Andover, Ayer, Brighton, Cambridge, Charlestown, Chelsea, Danvers, Dorchester, East Boston, Falmouth, Fairhaven, Framingham, Fitchburg, Holyoke, Jamaica Plain, Kingston, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, Marshfield, Medford, Methuen, Milton, Needham, New Bedford, Newton, Northampton, Norton, Pittsfield, Quincy, Revere, Roslindale, Roxbury, Salem, Saugus, Somerville, South Hadley, Springfield, Taunton, Waban, Waltham, Watertown, Webster, Weymouth, Winchendon and Worcester.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 19, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—III: NARCOTICS EASY TO BUY

(This is the third in an in-depth series by Globe Reporter Ray Richard concerning the growing problem of narcotics and other potentially harmful drugs among the teenagers in the Nation.)

(By Ray Richard)

Drugs are powerful friends. They are responsible for many of the great advances made by medicine in the past century. They have helped lower the death rate of infants, increase the life expectancy of people of all ages, and relieve pain and misery.

But when misused, they can become enemies of those who misuse them and of the community which permits them to be misused.

Laws constantly are being adjusted to make these vital medications available under professional supervision to the greatest number of persons who need them, but unavailable to those who would misuse them.

Consequently, some forms of dope can be purchased easily, if legally, in Massachusetts.

Not opium or cocaine. Few addicts use them any more.

Not heroin or morphine. Vigorous law enforcement activity, particularly around Boston, make them difficult to find.

Marihuana? It's reported to be prevalent on some college campuses and in many sections of the State but in order to buy it you must know a user or pusher or be an undercover agent for one of the enforcement agencies.

But dope in some other forms can be bought almost as conveniently as aspirin. These are the "exempt narcotics," such as cough medicine, which combine with the true narcotics, and with preparations called by law harmful drugs to make up the national dope problem.

And there are over-the-counter products, such as benzedrine-based nasal inhalers and model airplane glue.

Some drug addicts:

1. Drink cough medicine, bottles at a time, for its codeine.

2. Drink paregoric, for its opium.

3. Boil down paregoric and, with a broken-edge eye-dropper, inject the residue into their bloodstream.

4. Inhale the fumes from airplane glue.

5. Break open the benezedrine inhalers and chew the wicks or dunk them in hot coffee.

The cough medicines and paregoric, the glue and the inhalers can be bought in Massachusetts without a prescription. To buy the cough medicines and paregoric, you register your name and address with the pharmacist selling it. These are exempt narcotics which means they are preparations containing a narcotic and exempted from the stringent laws regulating the sale of narcotics.

The true narcotics can be sold only under a special narcotics prescription.

The exempt narcotics can be sold legally only in limited quantities. For example, no more than 4 ounces of an exempt cough medicine can be sold to a person within any 24 hours. And no more than an ounce of paregoric * * * "pep pills" and produce effects opposite to those caused by barbiturates. When improperly used they tend to create reckless behavior. They have many useful medicinal uses, however, such as reducing appetites. Many are prescribed, therefore, as diet pills. Brand names include Benzedrine and Dexedrine.

The barbiturates and amphetamines, when taken in excess or without doctor's instructions or permission, are highly dangerous. Mix them with wine, coffee, paregoric or each other, as some drug abusers do, and they can produce uncontrollable, unpredictable human behavior.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 20, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—IV: WHEN YOUR SON IS AN ADDICT

(In the several weeks he spent investigating the narcotics problem in Boston, Globe Reporter Ray Richard came across this story of family misfortune.)

(By the father of a drug addict as told to Ray Richard)

My son is a drug addict. Like most of them, he started out on cough medicine. The kind he started with they took off the market. Too many kids were buying it.

Then he turned to barbiturates. They are sedatives. They call 'em pep pills. If your kid is on them you've got a problem on your hands. A big problem.

If he takes them, you can tell right away. As soon as he walks in the door, his tongue will give him away.

He may be the wisest kid on the street, but he'll try to be very polite. He'll stagger and try to make you think he's been drinking. He'll talk like he's tonguetied. His tongue will be like a big lump in his mouth, and his lips will be crooked.

You'll notice his tongue is just like a piece of dead weight in his mouth. He can't talk. He'll mumble "Yes, sir. No, sir."

You say to him, what have you been doing? and he'll say, "Oh, I been drinking. I been drinking. Beer. Beer. Smell. Smell my breath."

That'll be the first thing they'll say to you, to throw you off. If you mention dope or act mad, he'll get all riled up.

Then he'll go after you.

He'll fight you. If you're his father, his brother, his sister * * * he'll go right at you. All the way. He'll fight the whole family. Hit his own mother, hit his own father. He'll lose his head, go wild.

He'll look for a knife or a gun or a club. They'll always look for an instrument because they know that all you've got to do is rush them and they'll go down. But they're strong.

You're gonna have to use force to restrain them. You're gonna have to give him a couple of punches in the stomach. It's the only way he'll feel it. You hit him in the stomach and he'll double right up.

Once you get him down, you'll have him under control. Then get him into bed. He'll sleep. Right away he'll sleep.

But you should never forget, as long as they are under the influence of these drugs they'll remember what you did and try to get you later.

If you hit him, he'll hit you later. He'll get you if he's still on the stuff.

When they come off the stuff it's a pitiful thing. If they've had enough, or are hooked, they'll get the horrors. My kid had the horrors. He's in jail now and he's so scared of getting the horrors he won't take anything, not even aspirin.

You get the horrors coming off drugs. They call it withdrawal. The last time, my boy had the horrors for 8 days. And he remembers every bit of it * * * every minute.

It's horrible to watch, to see your son go through this. They see the walls cracking and people chasing them and elephants walking through the doors and stuff like that.

They scream at the top of the lungs, "They're trying to get me."

They think they are dodging bullets and dodging mice. They feel pain, feel a knife sticking into them.

Even if they aren't yet hooked, if they've taken an overdose you've still got a bad problem on your hands. When they wake up they probably will be off it. And then it's a pitiful thing to see.

You'll see them crying and wonder what they've done to their father, their mother. They'll remember hitting their mother, their father. And they'll feel remorse. They'll cry. They won't know how to make up to you. If they don't remember, all you'll have to do is remind them. But they'll never admit it was drugs. They'll say "I'm sorry, but I was drinking and I didn't know what I was doing."

They'll be like Jekyll and Hyde. When they're under the drugs they'll be one type, when they're off it they'll be their regular selves.

This is what prevents you from hating him, because you know that he didn't realize what he was doing. And, after all, he still is your son.

If your boy gets hooked, when he gets off them it's a different thing. When they get up they'll be cocky and tough. But they'll live in fear.

He'll be wondering who he's hurt, who's going to have reprisals against him. And it gets so * * * I'll tell you how bad it gets * * * it gets so that when people get to know you, and how vicious you are, the sight of you will scare them.

You'll walk up to somebody's house that you know well, and they know that you're the person who's been taking the drugs, and they know your habits, and they'll slam the door and start screaming. They don't want you to come in. They won't know whether you are under it or not. And they'll fear you.

How can you help your son?

If you get mad, it ain't going to help. You try to talk to him, tell what happened, what becomes of these people who take dope, what they turn out to be, that their life is ruined, that once they get the reputation that they're drug addicts they can't get a job, no girl will marry them, nobody will go out with them, they're just an outcast.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 21, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—V: BEST WAY TO STOP TEENS—TELL THEM ALL ABOUT DRUGS

(The best weapon for combating the narcotics problem is the subject of this installment, based on information gathered by Globe Reporter Ray Richard from experts and addicts.)

(By Ray Richard)

"It's like you and me jumping off the Mystic River Bridge. I jump first. Then you jump."

This is a dope addict talking.

"As we fall toward the water, you look down at me. And you say to yourself, 'Boy. That poor guy's in a bad way. He can't save himself now. I'm glad I'm not bad off like him'."

Don't fool yourself, is the message. If you now are taking excessive doses of any drugs which make you "high" or allow you to "escape" from your problems, you are like the second fellow who jumps off the bridge. You have started your fall. You haven't fallen

as far as the fellow addicted to dope, but you are headed in the same direction and there is no way you can stop your fall.

As he unfolded this allegory, the addict recalled his own fall, how he had started on his way down by taking pep pills 8 years ago while working around a racetrack, and this habit progressed to marihuana when he became a musician, and then to heroin, which addicted him.

This addict lives within 5 miles of the statehouse. He has an attractive, intelligent wife, five handsome children, a spotless home, and a mother with a broken heart. And twice each day he slides a hypodermic needle into a vein and injects a dose of morphine, paregoric, or other form of dope. His will and his body crave these shots, and for his addiction there may be no cure.

His allegory is not airtight. Every person who habitually takes sleeping pills, pep pills, cough medicines or others of the potentially dangerous drugs is not necessarily condemned, he is not positively headed toward marihuana and on to the addicting drugs such as heroin and morphine. Some are and some aren't.

Some persons, even though they have "leaped off the bridge" by already abusing drugs of various kinds, can get themselves off the habit * * * if they don't wait too long. Informing them of the dangers inherent in abuse of drugs might shock them into stopping the habit. And telling others about the dangers which can result from the abuse of drugs can motivate the community to pass laws and take other unified action against the whole problem of dope.

"A critical need exists for an extensive and enlightened educational effort on drug abuse," reported the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse in 1963.

"The problem is still clouded by misconceptions and misinformation" which range all the way from "the notion that a single dose of heroin can cause addiction to the equally erroneous notion that once a person becomes addicted to narcotics he is beyond all hope of rehabilitation," the report said.

It said the public has not "grasped the magnitude of the economic and social burden imposed by those who use drugs. Millions of dollars in property are stolen each day, and there are the additional costs of law enforcement and of health and welfare services."

It recommended an "enlightened educational campaign" for professional personnel and the public. And it assailed the warning issued by some social workers, educators, and psychiatrists that revealing information about drugs might encourage persons, particularly teenagers, to be fascinated enough to try it.

"When the Commission speaks of the education of the teenager, it is addressing itself to prevention," the report read. "An educational program focused on the teenager is the sine qua non (an indispensable condition) of any program to solve the social problem of drug abuse.

"The teenager should be made conscious of the full range of harmful effects, physical and psychological, that narcotic and dangerous drugs can produce. He should be made aware that although the use of a drug may be a temporary means of escape from the world about him, in the long run these drugs will destroy him and all that he aspires to.

"It said the Commission rejects the view that education can lead the teenager to experimentation.

"Drug abuse is contagious in the social sense of the word, and most abusers of drugs are introduced to drugs by other users. The Commission feels the real question is not whether the teenager should be educated, but who should educate him? Should it be the street corner addict, or should it be the schools, churches, and the community organizations?

It concluded that education "is the best weapon in the long run."

One of the most essential facts to get across to the public, declared a panel at the White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, convened in 1962 by President Kennedy, is that "the drug abuse problem extends beyond narcotics and now encompasses the barbiturates and amphetamines and the list is likely to grow."

And, say many authorities on the problem, although starting off with cough medicine, pep pills, and goof balls may not lead to marihuana and heroin, the harmful drug habit sometimes is as disastrous as narcotic addiction itself.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 22, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—VI: DRUG SMOKING SPREADS ON CAMPUSES, BUT IT'S HARD TO UNCOVER

(The story of the dope problem on college campuses in this area is told in this installment through interviews with administrators and students.)

There are signs that marihuana is becoming more prevalent on college campuses. But, like most aspects of the dope problem, specific examples are hard to uncover.

Like abortions, speeding, and cheating on income tax returns, for every person caught there is an unknown number getting away with it.

On many New England campuses, students freely discuss it. But administrators generally know less about it than they wish because, as Kermit C. Morrissey, dean of students at Brandeis explained:

"The subculture of the students keep the information out of administrative channels. The full extent can be nothing more than a vague guess, even by the best informed administrators.

"Anyone who remembers the ingenuity of his own adolescence realizes how such information can be kept away from administrators," he said. "This inability to determine how extensive it is, is due not to a lack of interest or concern, but to lack of information."

At Brandeis seven students were arrested on marihuana charges last year. Morrissey said it usually is smoked, "not in order to achieve academic readiness for exams, but due to avant gardism. In every student body there are nonconformists."

Some students take it for "intellectual experiment," Morrissey continued. "They rationalize. But they take a different position when they get tripped up by it."

At Boston University, Dean of Students Staton R. Curtis says, "The problem of the use of narcotics on college campuses is a sufficiently recurring problem as to give real concern" to administrators.

"Great pressures are exerted on students. They are going to find many outlets and I look for more of this sort of thing rather than less," he said.

Dr. Graham Blane, Jr., chief of psychiatric services at Harvard, says, "We do not have a drug problem here at Harvard. Everything that can be done to discourage the use of drugs is being carried out and, in my opinion, most effectively."

"Some students use 'pep pills' to cram for exams," he said. "If they take them for this reason, and not for 'kicks,' " he added, "there is no difference morally than taking coffee or soft drinks for the same purpose."

But the Globe got a different response from Harvard students.

Asked how many Harvard students will try marihuana during college the students gave estimates ranging from 1 in 5—or 1,000 out of the student body of 5,000—to 1 in 100. It usually is sold to the students by Cambridge residents, or "townies," these students said.

A University of Massachusetts student told the Globe there are 150 users of marihuana on that campus.

"At the University of Massachusetts the users treat the stuff much as most others treat alcohol. They're more sophisticated about it. There's no pressure on anyone to try it. If they like it, they'll use it. That's all."

But the dean of students at the University of Massachusetts, William F. Field, scoffs at this estimate. "I don't see how anybody could give you any set figure, even an estimate, and be serious.

"In the first place, I doubt that your informant knows 150 people firsthand. He may know a dozen who may claim to know another 10 each. In terms of number, I personally feel that it is a relatively minor problem."

This week Capt. Jeremiah Sullivan of the Boston Police vice and narcotics squad attended in Albany, N.Y., the "Institute for the Prevention of Narcotics Addiction in College Students."

It drew officials from 100 colleges, along with enforcement officers. College officials were there from West Point, Bennington, colleges of every size. The turnout indicated a real interest in the problem by college heads.

The officials showed a genuine desire to be prepared to attack the dope problem should it break out on their campus.

Brandeis already has instituted preventive measures. At the start of each academic year it provides each student with information of the dangers of marihuana and other drugs.

"University administrators have the responsibility to provide information about the uncertainty of what marihuana can do," says Dean Morrissey.

"The position of the administrators has to be made clear, particularly when the action of the student is in violation of human law."

The rumbles around the college about marihuana are not roars. But they indicate the problem is there, if underground.

"Where there are repeated and widespread rumors of drugs being used," he observed, "there is very likely to be protracted use of a variety of drugs. When they are present, the word fans out. Where there are vague references to it, you can be pretty sure some reality is underneath it."

Boston College authorities say there is no marihuana problem there and the use of pep pills is "very small." To keep awake for studying, caffein derivatives are sometimes used.

Marihuana is not addicting in the true sense. No physiological craving is established by smoking it. But it can be habit forming and create a desire to try the addictive drugs.

The Justice Department of California issues this warning: "The user of marihuana is a dangerous individual and should definitely not be underestimated by police.

"Caution should be used at all times in taking any user of either cocaine or marihuana into custody, but particularly the known users of either cocaine or marijuana. They may be dangerous, hard to handle, and resort to violence."

Add theologians at Boston College "Anything that is harmful to one's self is morally unacceptable." Including marihuana.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 23, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—VII: PILLS CAUSE DANGEROUS BEHAVIOR

(By Ray Richard)

The growing abuse of nonnarcotic drugs, including barbiturates and amphetamines,

"is increasing problems of abnormal and social behavior, highway accidents, juvenile delinquency, and broken homes," President Kennedy told the White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse.

Examples:

A stolen car roared through a Boston suburb. A teenager was at the wheel. Police took up the chase. The stolen car struck a parked auto, then another, and another and another.

"He hit 12 parked cars," Lt. James Herrick of the State police narcotics squad said. "He was on pills. He said he didn't even realize he was being chased."

A Boston policeman recalls, "Six kids were in a car. They were mixing pills with beer and wine. A kid 17 years old assaulted one of the others with a small knife. Stabbed him four times in the arm, once an inch below the heart. One inch higher and it would have been murder."

Det. Robert J. Fawcett, of East Boston says, "We pulled a kid out of a wreck only a few weeks ago. He'd hit a tree. There were bennies all over the floor."

Outside of New England there are other examples:

On July 19, 1963, an auto carrying an Air Force sergeant, his wife, his 6-year-old son and an 8-year-old daughter approached a checkpoint set up for a highway survey near Tipton, Iowa.

The car stopped behind a truck. Moments later a tractor-trailer crashed into the rear of the car and drove it under the truck in front. It burst into flames, and all members of the family died. The driver of the trailer truck wasn't injured.

"Three bottles of amphetamine drugs were found in his suitcase," George P. Larrick, Commissioner of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, testified in August before a Senate subcommittee on health.

"He later admitted purchasing and using drugs during the trip. Blood tests proved that he was under the influence at the time of the accident."

In Houston, Tex., an ex-convict shot and killed a schoolteacher, assaulted a 14-year-old farm girl, and committed two robberies while under the influence of amphetamines.

The chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, told the 1963 national convention of the American Legion, "In all classes of American youth, and in all sections of the country, the habitual use of dangerous drugs is on the increase."

The abusers of drugs sometimes commit crimes when under the influence of the drugs, but they also often commit crimes to get their drugs.

They break into drugstores, often more interested in the narcotics than the money. Narcotic supplies were taken in recent breaks in pharmacies in Plainville and Longmeadow.

Last month in Wellesley two men, wearing stocking masks and carrying guns, tied Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Ward with sheets and robbed Ward's drugstore on Washington Street of $125 in cash and narcotics.

Doctors are often robbed of their bags containing narcotics.

Drug abusers of all ages commit crimes to get the instruments sometimes needed to administer drugs..

Boys between 15 and 17 years old twice have broken into an East Boston company which makes hypodermic needles. In the spring of 1963, three youths were charged with the break. Last summer two youths, ages 16 and 17, were charged with stealing 2,000 needles.

"We found some of them hidden on a rafter under a pier," Fawcett said. "When the tide came in, the water prevented you from getting at them, but they were high enough so the water didn't touch them."

Such needles are an expensive item on the drug black market.

Crimes of much greater magnitude also are committed for drugs.

The Food and Drug Administration, trying to find out how many barbiturates and amphetamine pills were getting into the illicit market, instituted a survey of all known manufacturers, brokers, and distributors of basic amphetamine and similar stimulants and of barbiturate chemicals. Some records of manufacturers were incomplete, and two of the Nation's largest pharmaceutical manufacturers declined to provide information about their production.

Even so, the survey showed that enough basic material was produced that year, 1962, to make nearly 5 billion 10-milligram pep pills and nearly 5 billion quarter-grain barbiturate capsules.

Consequently, Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, testified before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare last February 24, "In view of the tremendous quantities of these drugs which FDA has found in illegal channels, it is estimated that no more than half of such drugs produced annually are sold legally. Drugs are being peddled by operators whose activities cover many States and whose operations involve hundreds of thousands, and even millions, of tablets."

A spokesman for the enforcement division of the FDA said, "The number of peddlers has increased. The underworld got into the business because there is so much money in it. They saw how much money there is in narcotics and didn't want any competition from the harmful drug traffic. We have a specific example of gangsters being in command."

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 24, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—VIII: PRESCRIPTIONS ARE FORGED

(This is the eighth in an in-depth series concerning the growing problem of narcotics among teenagers in the Nation.)

(By Ray Richard)

Some of the best amateur acting of our time is taking place in doctors' offices and in hospital emergency rooms by drug addicts tricking doctors and nurses out of prescription blanks to be forged for narcotics.

Two youths will enter a doctor's waiting room. One will claim he is dizzy or mention some vague disturbance. The doctor will take him into his inner office and close the door to the waiting room.

The youth in the waiting room fakes a pain and drops to the floor, moaning. The receptionist summons the doctor, who hurries out of his inner office to help the youth on the floor.

While the doctor is in the waiting room, the boy in the inner office alone will be grabbing any prescription pads he can find.

Some addicts give it a more subtle touch. They take only the top 20 or so prescriptions off the pads to diminish the chance the theft will be detected before they leave the office.

The theft of prescription blanks, the forging of them with prescriptions for narcotics and the passing of them to unsuspecting careless, indifferent or wrongfully cooperative pharmacists is one of the chief methods of obtaining drugs illegally in Boston and throughout the Nation.

That is why the Federal Bureau of Narcotics urges doctors: "Don't leave prescription pads around."

Young men who couldn't pass freshman Latin make out prescriptions for narcotics in perfect technical language. They use with precision the symbols of the medical profession, know the correct amounts to prescribe and can duplicate with flawless exactness the signature of a physician.

And perfection is a must in forging a script. Errors in spelling, in quantities specified or mixtures would easily be detected by the pharmacist.

Revere police have a doctor's reference book stolen by a youth from a doctor's office. The book lists brand names manufacturers give their preparations and is virtually a guidebook on harmful drugs.

"The addict we took it from was then 19 years old," explained Lt. George Hurley of the Revere Police Department. "He was a master at making out phony scripts."

The youth would make out a false prescription for pills and try to pass it at a drugstore. If every druggist he tried rejected him, he'd refer to the book for the brand name of an equivalent pill produced by another firm. Then he'd try another route of drugstores to see if the new script would work.

In the book the addict had penciled many notations and had written model prescriptions for many kinds of drugs.

Another prescription forger was a Latin school graduate.

"He'd write out the prescriptions in perfect Latin with no trouble at all," said Det. Robert J. Fawcett of East Boston. "He'd usually sell the prescriptions to other drug abusers for $1 each, plus one-half of the pills prescribed."

Once a dope user has acquired a prescription blank, written out the prescription and forged a doctor's name he then uses another set of ruses in an effort to outsmart the pharmacists, who are constantly alert for them.

A few years ago on the North Shore a printing plant was set up in a home. The operator would steal a doctor's blank and reproduce his own, copying the doctor's letterhead.

But he'd make one change. Instead of printing the doctor's telephone number, he'd print the number of a pay phone at the local railroad station.

The printer would forge the prescription on his own blank and take it to a pharmacist who did not know him and probably didn't know the doctor named on the prescription.

The pharmacist, if doubtful about the prescription, would ask:

"Are you sure Dr. ——— made this out?"

"Sure," the printer would reply calmly. "If you don't believe it, call him up."

The unsuspecting pharmacist would dial the number. And an accomplice of the forger, standing by the pay phone, would answer, say he was the doctor and verify the prescription.

Enforcement officials and leaders of the retail drug industry agree that the overwhelming majority of pharmacists are conscientiously watching for phony orders.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 25, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—IX: DRUG ABUSE BOTH MEDICAL AND LEGAL

(By Ray Richard)

Is the abuse of drugs primarily a medical problem or a legal problem? How you answer this will reveal the basic approaches you believe should be taken to solve the problem.

Medical men are likely to think of it fundamentally as a medical problem. Their stand comes from knowledge of the symptoms and effects drugs have on their victims.

Enforcement men, who daily match wits with desperate men and women, who would go to any extreme, even killing, to get their drugs, emphasize the criminality aspect of drug abuse.

Addiction itself is not a crime. It never has been a Federal offense; it is not a State offense. In 1952 the U.S. Supreme Court held a California statute, which made addiction to narcotics a criminal offense unconstitutional.

The Court ruled, such a statute would be cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the eighth amendment.

The criminality comes from the possessing, selling, purchasing of dope and the fraud, deceit, and misrepresentation often involved. And, of course, many laws are broken by people under the influence of dope.

After nearly 1 year of investigating every aspect of the Nation's drug problem, the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse reported it subscribes to "certain aspects" of both the sickness and the criminal attitude about drug abuse.

"Rehabilitation is the humanitarian ideal, to be sought wherever possible," it reported. But it added, "The drug abuser, who steals or who sells drugs to finance his habit, is guilty of a crime. Like any other citizen he should face the consequences. Whether he can be held criminally responsible can only be decided in the courts, case by case. The Commission cannot assert a general rule that every confirmed drug abuser is so impelled by his habit that he is not accountable for his acts under criminal law."

Most enforcement people agree.

Massachusetts officially recognized drug abuse as a medical problem, but not a medical problem exclusively, when the legislature established the new drug addiction center last year. That center is now operating. But while the medical profession, and experts in every field of health, medicine, and social work, seek to solve some of the mysteries entangling the keys to the drug problem, the law enforcement men, to protect the public, continue their dogged war against the drug law violators.

To seek out, find, arrest and convict drug abusers requires special skills. Investigators usually have to work through an informer and with a pusher or user to make an arrest. And this can be highly dangerous.

"There is nobody to complain," points out Alfred J. Murphy, chief inspector of the State drug control division. "The peddler is making a buck and the user is getting his drugs.

"To outsmart them you need to know people, be able to fit yourself into nearly all circumstances, be able to play each development by ear. But what you need most of all is patience."

He, Inspectors William Kearney and Richard Kallil of his division, and Gary Flanagan, Thomas Mitchell and Larry McNamara of the Boston police vice and narcotics squad, once waited 3 days and nights in a Boston home before arresting an addict.

And Detectives Arthur Linsky and Richard Casey of the Boston police narcotics squad recently secreted themselves in a cellar off and on for 3 weeks to arrest a heroin pusher.

Then, too, enforcement men must contend with many angles the addicts use to avoid being caught. Some drink wine or beer after taking dope so alcohol will be blamed. Motorists thought to be drunk from liquor sometimes are under the influence of pills.

The registry of motor vehicles last year suspended licenses of 87 operators for driving under the influence of narcotics, barbiturates and tranquilizers. But others driving under such influence must have been undetected.

The effects of too many drugs, or the wrong drugs, often can be blamed on something else. This is true of tranquilizers, which Andrew MacCurrach, head of the registry's division, which handles cases involving narcotics and drugs, says is causing the registry "as many problems as any other drug."

"When you see Mrs. Smith weaving her way down the sidewalk, you usually don't think its caused by drugs," says Chief Inspector Murphy of the drugs control section. "You figure she's been into the cooking sherry again." But it could just as well be caused by an overdose of drugs—accidental or intentional.

The drugs control section of the State department of public health is one of four agencies, in addition to local police departments, which war on narcotics and the abuse of drugs. It concentrates on policing of drugstores and apprehension of violators of the harmful drug law. The Federal Food and Drug division does the same thing, but has jurisdiction only on cases involving interstate commerce.

The Federal Narcotics Bureau works only on narcotics and concentrates on smuggling and the big-scale operations.

The State police narcotics squad deals with violations of both the narcotic and harmful drug laws. So does the Boston police narcotics squad. Eight-hour days are rare in these agencies.

The Globe survey revealed a commendable spirit of cooperation among these agencies, all of whom frequently work side by side to break a case. Similar cooperation exists between these departments and local police, no doubt due to the State agencies' policy of never moving in on a local case without seeking the help of the local police.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 26, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—X: PARENTS DIDN'T BELIEVE THEIR KIDS

(By Ray Richard)

What can parents do to protect their children from the abuse of drugs?

Plenty—if they heed the national authorities who warn that the abuse is becoming more prevalent, that it breaks out "in pockets" and that it is a potential threat to any community.

Some parents haven't acted in time—maybe because they didn't recognize the problem, maybe because they didn't want to face the facts, maybe because they didn't know how to face the facts.

PARENTS DIDN'T ACT IN TIME

Parents didn't act in time in Westchester County, N.Y., a prosperous suburb of New York City.

Because they hadn't seen the problem themselves, many of them, they didn't do anything about the menace of drugs until the district attorney broke up a ring of 250 youths who had become involved in narcotics. Many of the youths were from well-to-do homes.

Parents didn't act in time in Yonkers, N.Y., either. There, last summer, police announced that 900 boys and girls between 14 and 22 years old were using drugs and that 100 of them had become addicted.

In Belleville, N.J., a city of 38,000, many parents did nothing when they heard rumbles that drugs were being abused but hadn't seen the abuse with their own eyes. That's why they were shocked when the city council last night considered a curfew for teenagers because of the menace of drugs.

And in Stockton, Calif., many parents, not believing reports that more teenagers were taking drugs abusively than ever before, were stunned when they learned last month than a 16-year-old boy died from heart failure after he had consumed 12 bottles of codeine-based cough medicine.

ALMOST EVERY TOWN AFFECTED

The day before Christmas, five Newport, R.I., boys, ages 13 to 15, were sentenced to the Youth Training Center for sniffing glue, a practice which already has killed one Massachusetts youth.

In New Jersey, Assistant Prosecutor Patrick J. Hanifin, 2 weeks ago said, "Almost every community is affected" by the abuse of drugs. "The problem does not extend to a large percentage of youngsters, but it has the potential to spread if something isn't done."

The same is true in Massachusetts. The potential is the thing to worry about.

What can parents do? First, they should recognize the warning issued by the Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse which, on the request of President Kennedy, studied the problem for nearly a year throughout the country. This warning emphasized that the dope problem, once confined to opium dens and the heroin users of the slums, now includes not only heroin and morphine, but the synthetic opiates, dilaudid and demerol, along with cocaine, marihuana, and "LSD 25, mescaline, the barbiturates, the amphetamines, ether, airplane glue, and even so-called tranquilizers."

CALL DOCTOR, THEN POLICE

Then what can parents do? If they detect their children abusing drugs, they should first get medical attention for the abusers, then notify police. If the only wrong the child commits is to take the pills, police probably will not take legal action. They are more interested in finding out where the child got the pills. Cutting off the source is essential to the war on drugs.

Parents also can back programs which reveal the signs and dangers of drug abuse because as the President's Commission urged, "public and professional education on drug abuse is still inadequate. The general public must be educated."

Parental action, and community action, is needed to prevent the "potential" from becoming the reality.

Some parents recognize this. They include three men from East Boston who, in different yet correlated actions, have tried to alert that community to the growing danger from the abuse of drugs.

They are George DeMayo, editor of the weekly East Boston Times-Free Press-Leader; Augustino "Pinky" Casaletto, a city building inspector, and Det. Robert J. Fawcett of the East Boston Division.

WARNED EAST BOSTON OF MENACE

In his widely read paper, DeMayo has vigorously attacked the drug problem for many years. He often runs news of drug arrests as the lead story of his paper. His editorials have urged the community to realize what was going on among the teenagers. And he has given extensive publicity to public meetings at which the problem was discussed.

Five years ago, Casaletto began organizing public meetings to alert East Boston that teenagers were abusing drugs.

He's the father of five boys and has his finger on the pulse of the community's young. He knows who the drug abusers are. And he knows that they know that he knows. With few allies, he has waged a courageous, often personal, war against drugs and against those who provide the drugs which the teenagers can abuse.

He, Joseph Francis, Dr. Charles Cataldo, and Dr. Peter Ferrino at the Ward One Club, ran meetings on the drug problem. Physicians, social workers, inspectors from the State spoke. A crowd of up to 300 attended.

If you roam around Greater Boston looking into the dope menace, you will hear very often the name "Bob Fawcett," a detective on the East Boston division.

Fawcett's fearless campaign against the drug pushers has won the admiration of many—and the reprisals of a few. Five times in 2 years he had to change his unlisted telephone number. And in the past 13 months he's had 13 tires of his own car slashed. Twice he found sugar in his gas tank.

These men face the drug problem realistically. But many don't.

Just as many didn't in Westchester, Yonkers, and Belleville.

[From the Boston (Mass.), Globe, Jan. 27, 1965]

THE DOPE MENACE—XI: HOW TO KEEP ADDICTS OFF DRUGS?

(By Ray Richard)

The cure for addiction is as big a mystery as the cure for cancer.

Getting an addict off drugs is no problem. Keeping him off is. You can get an addict off drugs by putting him into prison or a mental hospital, but once he is out he may dash to the nearest pusher for a fix.

To get off such addiction, some persons suffer physically as well as emotionally.

When an addict goes off dope abruptly, it is called the cold turkey method of withdrawal. Addicts get off dope this way in jails, in most hospitals and in organizations such as Synanon, which seeks to rehabilitate addicts who voluntarily commit themselves to around-the-clock group therapy.

In Boston there is a branch of a growing organization called Teen Challenge, which stresses religious inspiration to get addicts off drugs "cold turkey" and to stay off.

Other organizations have been formed within the community to help addicts stay off. Among them is Drug Addicts Anonymous, which offers addicts the same form of group therapy at regular meetings which Alcoholics Anonymous offers alcoholics.

Twice weekly, at the Matt Talbott Center, 21 James Street, South End, near Boston City Hospital in the former Boston College High School Building, 30 or more addicts help each other to kick the habit. More than 125 men and women addicted to drugs have attended these meetings since they began a year ago, and Rev. Richard A. Drea, S.J., director, urges addicts to let this organization help them.

Three-quarters of those admitted were addicted to pills. That's why they took the name Drug Addicts Anonymous.

Chapters of Narcotics Anonymous meet regularly in many prisons and jails throughout the State and outside the walls.

None of these organizations give out narcotics—they couldn't legally—but there is a growing concept that dispensing narcotics under strict scientific supervision is the most effective and humane way to get an addict off dope. Once off, aftercare by social workers takes over.

In Great Britain, doctors dispense narcotics to addicts who the physicians believe need them, and the entire approach to the addiction problem is medically oriented. There is strict regulation over all domestic drug supplies and transfers and "strict control to prevent unauthorized, improper, or indiscriminate supplying of narcotics," as the White House Conference was told by Dr. Edward M. Schur, associate professor at Tufts University and a leading authority in this country on the British system.

Advocates of this method believe that it knocks the pins out from under the illicit drug market because addicts can get legally what they need in the opinion of a doctor.

Massachusetts is making a dramatic attempt to find out the best method for getting an addict off drugs and keeping him off. The legislature has authorized the establishment of a drug addiction rehabilitation board which could make this State a front-runner in the treatment of the dope problem.

The board is headed by the commissioners of public health, mental health, and correction. The director is Lawrence D. Gaughan, who has an extensive background in social work.

The board opened a rehabilitation center last July at Boston State Hospital in Mattapan. It became fully staffed in November. It has accepted 85 patients and had to turn away many more for lack of facilities.

In this project, more than in any other in this State, lies the hope for solving the addiction problem for the victims and the community.

To be admitted to the center, most addicts are committed by the courts, although a few are let in voluntarily. The commitment procedures deal with the addict as a medical problem, not as a criminal.

The minimum commitment is 2 years, but only about 6 weeks is spent at the hospital. The remainder is back in the community under supervision of an aftercare program by social workers.

Patients are withdrawn by the scientific administration of methadon, a weak narcotic which lets the addict down gradually, but under no conditions does an addict get methadon while back in the community.

The project is still experimental, but it is off on the right track, Gaughan believes, because it is patterned after the treatments which have proved successful in other States.

"All of these," he points out, "have civil commitment procedures, use methadon in withdrawal and have a very strong aftercare program."

The aftercare is essential. At his center, efforts are made "to get each patient back into the community as soon as possible," Gaughan said, "but under supervision within the community and with the support of vocational therapy and, if needed, public welfare and other help."

A big reason why the project has progressed so well, he emphasizes, has been "the existence of intelligent law enforcement people who recognize there was a need for treatment and rehabilitation of addicts."

He sees organizations such as Drug Addicts Anonymous of real value.

"At this stage I think any program that is using reasonable or standardized methods of treatment has a place in the community. It is much too soon to turn thumbs down on any type of procedure.

Gaughan and the board have big hopes and plans. Some day they could produce the Nation's model program for attacking the drug problem. Maybe they already have.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 28, 1965]

THE DRUG MENACE—XII: WHAT CAN BE DONE

(By Ray Richard)

What can Congress, the State legislature, doctors, pharmacists, teachers, parents do to reduce the menace from drugs?

The problem is complex and so are the solutions. And the problem has been clouded by emotion, misinformation, lack of facts and contrasting philosophies on how the law, the medical profession, the community should fight the problem.

But new solutions constantly are being sought by experts at every level of government. And nearly every recommendation has a built-in controversy which can be resolved only after extensive study and debate.

The changes which come in the fight—and some people even reject the idea of calling it a fight—generally will be the result of a changing philosophy which nationally, and certainly in Massachusetts, considers the problem more of a medical problem, yet not less of a legal problem, than in the past. But there are dissenters to this change and to the degree to which the change should be made.

The trend is to try to solve the problem of addiction medically while concentrating enforcement measures on the illicit market and the pushers. This doesn't mean, however, the addict can go unpunished for breaking the law.

The Globe, in its survey, consulted with nearly 100 persons and scores of agencies. Addicts, sociologists, penologists, police, educators were consulted. Most offered recommendations to help in their common effort to stop the dope menace.

Basic to the problem nationally is passage of the so-called Dodd bill, named after its sponsor, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut. The bill was passed unanimously in the Senate last year but died in the House. Senator EDWARD KENNEDY is among the cosponsors of the bill in the current session.

The bill would amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to tighten the controls on the "manufactures, compounders, and processors of barbiturates and of amphetamine and other habit-forming stimulant drugs."

It also would prohibit the possession of such drugs for use other than for "the personal use of the possessor, a member of his household or for administration to an animal belonging to him."

And special consideration should be given by the legislature to the needs of the drug addiction rehabilitation board which appears to offer the mechanism by which many of the social and medical problems created by the drug problem can be solved.

These needs during the next few years will include the expansion of the board's center, now limited to 12 beds at Boston State Hospital where there is now a long waiting list of addicts desiring treatment; a 24-hour outpatient clinic for emergencies; a day-care center; a laboratory; a social service department and psychological testing facilities; research and education programs.

"Now, the ward at Boston State Hospital, originally set up to develop new and different techniques of drug addiction treatment, is being so pressed for service that its original purpose has become obscured," say the center's director, Lawrence D. Gaughan.

Parents and teachers are urged to watch for signs of drug abuse in their children and the neighborhood and to cooperate with police in seeking the sources.

And for everyone there is this advice written by a Globe reader: "Abusing pep pills and narcotics will ruin not only your life but your family's." She knows. Her 17-year-old son swallowed six barbiturates and died.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on March 9, 1965, the Senate passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, which would provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, as proposed by Senator MONRONEY and other Senators. As a member of the Rules Committee, and of the Subcommittee on Standing Rules of the Senate, I listened to the testimony presented by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] on this concurrent resolution when it was before the committee on March 1, 1965. I believe Senator ALLOTT made important points which were very useful to the committee in its consideration of the resolution and which I know will be carefully considered by the joint committee to be established to study reorganization of the working procedures of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Senator ALLOTT on Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GORDON ALLOTT ON MONRONEY CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION PLAN BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE ON MARCH 1, 1965

I joined Senator MONRONEY in sponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 because I am

convinced that the review it authorizes is long overdue. A "horse-and-buggy" Congress cannot adequately cope with the problems of the "age of rockets," and it will become increasingly more difficult in the future.

The review to be made by the joint committee established by this resolution will cover two major fields of inquiry which may be stated as follows:

1. How Congress does its work, and how it might do it more effectively; and

2. What Congress fails to do that it should be doing.

The first of these questions will likely receive most of the attention of the committee, and perhaps it must be resolved before the second question can be decided. Many of us are well aware of the numerous deficiencies in how Congress does its work, because we are so familiar with its processes. Certainly, the correction of such deficiencies should be a primary target of the efforts of the committee. But, preoccupation with the first question should not be to the exclusion of the second question which will receive little attention in the daily workings of Congress. Therefore, it is my intention to direct attention to what I consider a major area of deficiency, in the hope that it will receive the consideration I feel it deserves.

The genius of our system of Government lies in the balance maintained through the checks one branch of Government can exercise over the other two. But, there can be no balance if the checks are not applied. Of course, indiscriminate use of congressional checks would be obstructionary, but by the same token laxity in applying congressional checks when the occasion clearly demands it amounts to dereliction. If we in Congress are to perform our sworn duty to our constituents and the Nation, we must be ever alert to abuses of power, particularly by the executive establishment because of its nature, but also by the judiciary. And, we must never shrink from applying the necessary checks with discretion.

In recent years we have witnessed a fantastic expansion of the executive establishment to a point where it is beyond the control of one man and even beyond one man's comprehension. Such bureaucratic proliferation is the greatest of all diluents of the vote, of the citizen. The bureaucratic behemoth conspicuously lacks any sense of built-in, self-imposed limitation or restraint, it treats the whole area of public policy and national interest as its own exclusive playground, and responds to every challenge to its undivided authority with thinly veiled contempt or finally with sheer fury. Bureaucrats are seldom responsive to the wishes of the people since none are elected. The man elected to command and control them becomes a captive of the bureaucracies. A vigilant and unafraid Congress is essential if this Government is to remain a government "of the people."

What does Congress fail to do that it should be doing?

I believe that Congress fails to exercise the surveillance over the executive establishment and the regulatory bodies of its own creation, that the citizens of this country are entitled to expect. All too frequently the agencies and bureaus engaged in jurisdictional power struggles between themselves, with a total disregard for the public welfare. A recent example of this is the battle for jurisdiction by the Securities and Exchange Commission over commingled trust funds held by a national bank subject to the jurisdiction of the Comptroller of the Currency. The results of this particular skirmish are still undecided, but too often power grabs leading to endless and wasteful duplication are successful. Or, on the other hand, one bureau or agency achieves congressional approval for a particular pet program, which has a lot of attractive appeal, all the other bureaus and agencies never rest until they have a similar program of their own. A recent study on Federal educational programs reveals an average duplication factor of 6.7. This duplication factor of nearly seven times is an indictment of Congress. We should have never allowed this traversty to occur. Congress failed to apply its check. An abuse of power may also be the failure to exercise it.

Congressional checks have not been applied in the past when they should have been probably for one of the following three reasons:

1. Congress was not aware of certain abuses of the executive branch or was apathetic to them;

2. Congress could not apply its check because it had previously abdicated its authority legislatively;

3. The congressional check was applied but it proved to be ineffectual because Congress did not or could not follow through.

A large part of the blame for the failure of Congress to resolutely and appropriately apply its "check" must be placed on its inadequate staffing, and this inadequacy is particularly acute on the minority side in the Senate committees. Since there are half as many minority Senators, they must in effect cover twice the ground that the majority must cover. This multiplies the difficulty of their job in being effective as the internal "check" as our system envisions. Under our system the majority relies upon the minority to point out its errors lest those errors become fateful. This system has served the Nation well for nearly 200 years, but it is presently in danger of being destroyed because the minority has been so weakened—weakened not only in numbers, but more importantly, weakened in effectiveness through lack of effective tools. The tools most needed are adequate and competent committee staff members. The smaller the minority the greater the need for staff. Americans for Democratic Action have also recognized the need for adequate staffing for the minority party members of the committees. Let us hope that the Congress will also recognize this need.

I am informed that on some committees there are as many as 15 members to every minority staff member. On other committees the staffs are "nonpartisan." There is no such thing as "nonpartisan" staff when the work of the staff is directed by the chairman or the staff director of the chairman's choosing. "Nonpartisan" staff amounts to "no staff" for the minority in most instances. I am personally acquainted with a past situation where the one and only minority staff member of a committee was required to use a stenographer from the majority staff. Therefore, for anything of a confidential nature he had to rely on the personal staff of minority Senators for typing. Such a situation is not only absurd, it is intolerable.

On the two standing committees which I serve, there is on one which I consider to be an acute situation, while the other is bad but not so acute. Consider the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the staffing ratio is 12 to 2. There is one staff man to cover six subcommittees and the full committee. There are times when it is physically impossible for him to cover the activities of the subcommittees. I consider the inadequacy of minority staff on this committee as acute.

Now consider the Appropriations Committee where the professional staff is on a ratio of 22 to 4. Minority staffing is too slim to allow the minority to follow up on appropriation measures and determine whether the various agencies have spent moneys as directed by the committee. I consider this situation very bad. Congressional "checks" are not applied through a sheer lack of information.

Certainly I would not advocate equal staffing. The majority has certain "housekeeping" functions that require a larger staff, but I do advocate equitable staffing. By equitable staffing I mean sufficient minority staff members to permit the minority to be an effective part of the legislative process. There have been proposals of a 60-to-40 ratio, and this may be appropriate in some instances; however, I do not think that an inflexible ratio can be applied in all instances. On some committees an 80-to-20 ratio may be appropriate, while on others a ratio approaching 50-to-50 may be appropriate. It depends upon the nature of the committee and its work.

If our legislative work is to be other than perfunctory and Congress is to be more than a machine grinding out laws in a thoughtless and mechanical manner, we must have adequate staffing on both sides of the "party aisle," and the minority side is now dangerously lacking. The bipartisan study called for by Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 can be the key to a revitalized Congress—a Congress that accepts its duty and performs it diligently. The American people deserve nothing less. I respectfully urge favorable and early action on this important and urgent legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the calendar be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 71, and I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the appropriate places in the RECORD explanations of the measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

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

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 307) 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, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The consent of Congress is hereby given to any of the several States and to the District of Columbia to enter into a compact on taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to the participation in such compact of the Provinces of Canada and the States, territories and Federal District of Mexico. Such compact shall be in substantially the following form:

COMPACT ON TAXATION OF MOTOR FUELS CONSUMED BY INTERSTATE BUSES

Article I—Purposes

The purposes of this agreement are to—

(a) avoid multiple taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to assure

each State of its fair share of motor fuel taxes;

(b) establish and facilitate the administration of a criterion of motor fuel taxation for interstate buses which is reasonably related to the use of highway and related facilities and services in each of the party States; and

(c) encourage the availability of a maximum number of buses for intrastate service by removing motor fuel taxation as a deterrent in the routing of interstate buses.

Article II—Definitions

(a) State: State shall include the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States, the Provinces of Canada, and the States, territories, and Federal District of Mexico.

(b) Contracting State: Contracting State shall mean a State which is a party to this agreement.

(c) Administrator: Administrator shall mean the official or agency of a State administering the motor fuel taxes involved.

(d) Person: Person shall include any individual, firm, copartnership, joint venture, association, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, syndicate, or any other group or combination acting as a unit.

(e) Bus: Bus shall mean any motor vehicle of a bus type engaged in the interstate transportation of passengers and subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or any agency successor thereto, or one or more State regulatory agencies concerned with the regulation of passenger transport.

(f) Gallon: Gallon shall mean the liquid measure containing 231 cubic inches.

Article III—Governing principle

For purposes of this compact, the primary principle for the imposition of motor fuel taxes shall be consumption of such fuel within the State. Motor fuel consumed by buses shall be taxed on the existing basis, as it may be from time to time, and under the procedures for collection of such taxes by each party State, except that to the extent that this compact makes provision therefor, or for any matter connected therewith, such provision shall govern.

Article IV—How fuel consumed to be ascertained

The amount of fuel used in the operation of any bus within this State shall be conclusively presumed to be the number of miles operated by such bus within the State divided by the average mileage per gallon obtained by the bus during the tax period in all operations, whether within or without the party State. Any owner or operator of two or more buses shall calculate average mileage within the meaning of this article by computing single average figures covering all buses owned or operated by him.

Article V—Imposition of tax

Every owner or operator of buses shall pay to the party State taxes equivalent to the amount of tax per gallon multiplied by the number of gallons used in its operations in the party State.

Article VI—Reports

On or before the last business day of the month following the month being reported upon, each bus owner or operator subject to the payment of fuel taxes pursuant to this compact shall make such reports of its operations as the State administrator of motor fuel taxes may require and shall furnish the State administrator in each other party State wherein his buses operate a copy of such report.

Article VII—Credit for payment of fuel taxes

Each bus owner or operator shall be entitled to a credit equivalent to the amount of tax per gallon on all motor fuel purchased by such operator within the party State for use in operations either within or without the party State, and upon which the motor fuel tax imposed by the laws of such party State has been paid.

Article VIII—Additional tax or refund

If the bus owner or operator's monthly report shows a debit balance after taking credit pursuant to article VII, a remittance in such net amount due shall be made with the report. If the report shows a credit balance, after taking credit as herein provided, a refund in such net amount as has been overpaid shall be made by the party State to such owner or operator.

Article IX—Entry into force and withdrawal

This compact shall enter into force when enacted into law by any two States. Thereafter it shall enter into force and become binding upon any State subsequently joining when such State has enacted the compact into law. Withdrawal from the compact shall be by act of the legislature of a party State, but shall not take effect until one year after the Governor of the withdrawing State has notified the Governor of each other party State, in writing, of the withdrawal.

Article X—Construction and severability

This compact shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating herein, the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining party States and in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters.

SEC. 102. As used in the compact set forth in section 101 with reference to the District of Columbia—

(1) the term "legislature" shall mean the Congress of the United States; and

(2) the term "Governor" shall mean the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 103. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enter into the compact authorized by section 101 of this title without further action on the part of the Congress, and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of such compact. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners (other than the entry into a compact authorized by this Act) or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 104. All provisions of law applicable to the District of Columbia shall, to the extent they are inconsistent with the compact authorized by this title, be inapplicable to the taxation of buses (as that term is defined in the compact) in the District of Columbia during such time as the District is a party to such compact.

SEC. 105. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is expressly reserved.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The consent of Congress is hereby given to any of the several States and to the District of Columbia to enter in a bus taxation proration and reciprocity agreement and to the participation in such agreement of the Provinces of Canada and the States, territories, and Federal District of Mexico. Such agreement shall be in substantially the following form:

BUS TAXATION PRORATION AND RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT

Article I—Purposes and principles

SECTION 1. Purposes of agreement: It is the purpose of this agreement to set up a system whereby any contracting State may permit owners of fleets of buses operating in two or more States to prorate the registration of the buses in such fleets in each State in which the fleets operate on the basis of the proportion of miles operating within such State to total fleet miles, as defined herein.

SEC. 2. Principle of proration of registration: It is hereby declared that in making this agreement the contracting States adhere to the principle that each State should have the freedom to develop the kind of highway user tax structure that it determines to be most appropriate to itself, that the method of taxation of interstate buses should not be a determining factor in developing its user tax structure, and that annual taxes or other taxes of the fixed-fee type upon buses which are not imposed on a basis that reflects the amount of highway use should be apportioned among the States, within the limits of practicality, on the basis of vehicle miles traveled within each of the States.

Article II—Definitions

(a) State: State shall include the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States, the Provinces of Canada, and the States, territories, and Federal District of Mexico.

(b) Contracting State: Contracting State shall mean a State which is a party to this agreement.

(c) Administrator: Administrator shall mean the official or agency of a State administering the fee involved, or, in the case of proration of registration, the official or agency of a State administering the proration of registration in that State.

(d) Person: Person shall include any individual, firm, copartnership, joint venture, association, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, syndicate, or any other group or combination acting as a unit.

(e) Base State: Base State shall mean the State from or in which the bus is most frequently dispatched, garaged, serviced, maintained, operated, or otherwise controlled, or also in the case of a fleet bus the State to which it is allocated for registration under statutory requirements. In order that this section may not be used for the purpose of evasion of registration fees, the administrators of the contracting States may make the final decision as to the proper base State, in accordance with article III(h) hereof, to prevent or avoid such evasion.

(f) Bus: Bus shall mean any motor vehicle of a bus type engaged in the interstate transportation of passengers and subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or any agency successor thereto, or one or more State regulatory agencies concerned with the regulation of passenger transport.

(g) Fleet: As to each contracting State, fleet shall include only those buses which actually travel a portion of their total miles in such State. A fleet must include three or more buses.

(h) Registration: Registration shall mean the registration of a bus and the payment of annual fees and taxes as set forth in or pursuant to the laws of the respective contracting States.

(i) Proration of registration: Proration of registration shall mean registration of fleets of buses in accordance with Article IV of this agreement.

(j) Reciprocity: Reciprocity shall mean that each contracting State, to the extent provided in this agreement, exempts a bus from registration and registration fees.

Article III—General provisions

(a) Effect on other agreements, arrangements, and understandings: On and after its effective date, this agreement shall supersede any reciprocal or other agreement, arrangement, or understanding between any two or more of the contracting States covering, in whole or in part, any of the matters covered by this agreement; but this agreement shall not affect any reciprocal or other agreement, arrangement, or understanding between a contracting State and a State or States not party to this agreement.

(b) Applicability to exempt vehicles: This agreement shall not require registration in a contracting State of any vehicles which are in whole or part exempt from registration under the laws or regulations of such State without respect to this agreement.

(c) Inapplicability to caravaned vehicles: The benefits and privileges of this agreement shall not be extended to a vehicle operated on its own wheels, or in tow of a motor vehicle, transported for the purpose of selling or offering the same for sale to or by any agent, dealer, purchaser, or prospective purchaser.

(d) Other fees and taxes: This agreement does not waive any fees or taxes charged or levied by any State in connection with the ownership or operation of vehicles other than registration fees as defined herein. All other fees and taxes shall be paid to each State in accordance with the laws thereof.

(e) Statutory vehicle regulations: This agreement shall not authorize the operation of a vehicle in any contracting State contrary to the laws or regulations thereof, except those pertaining to registration and payment of fees; and with respect to such laws or regulations, only to the extent provided in this agreement.

(f) Violations: Each contracting State reserves the right to withdraw, by order of the administrator thereof, all or any part of the benefits or privileges granted pursuant to this agreement from the owner of any vehicle or fleet of vehicles operated in violation of any provision of this agreement. The administrator shall immediately give notice of any such violation and withdrawal of any such benefits or privileges to the administrator of each other contracting State in which vehicles of such owner are operated.

(g) Cooperation: The administrator of each of the contracting States shall cooperate with the administrators of the others and each contracting State hereby agrees to furnish such aid and assistance to each other within its statutory authority as will aid in the proper enforcement of this agreement.

(h) Interpretation: In any dispute between or among contracting States arising under this agreement, the final decision regarding interpretation of questions at issue relating to this agreement shall be reached by joint action of the contracting States, acting through the administrator thereof, and shall upon determination be placed in writing.

(i) Effect of headings: Article and section headings contained herein shall not be deemed to govern, limit, modify, or in any manner affect the scope, meaning, or intent of the provisions of any article or part hereof.

(j) Entry into force: This agreement shall enter into force and become binding between and among the contracting States when enacted or otherwise entered into by any two States. Thereafter, it shall enter into force and become binding with respect to any State when enacted into law by such State. If the statutes of any State so authorize or provide, such State may become party to this agreement upon the execution thereof by an executive or administrative official thereof acting on behalf of and for such State.

Article IV—Proration of registration

(a) Applicability: Any owner of a fleet may register the buses of said fleet in any contracting State by paying to said State total registration fees in an amount equal to that obtained by applying the proportion of in-State fleet miles divided by the total fleet miles, to the total fees which would otherwise be required for regular registration of each and all of such vehicles in such contracting State.

All fleet pro rata registration fees shall be based upon the mileage proportions of the fleet during the period of twelve months ending on August 31 next preceding the commencement of the registration year for which registration is sought: Except that mileage proportions for a fleet not operated during such period in the State where application for registration is made will be determined by the administrator upon the sworn application of the applicant showing the operations during such period in other States and the estimated operations during the registration year for which registration is sought, in the State in which application is being made; or if no operations were conducted during such period a full statement of the proposed method of operation.

If any buses operate in two or more States which permit the proration of registration on the basis of a fleet of buses consisting of a lesser number of vehicles than provided in article II(g), such fleet may be prorated as to registration in such States, in which event the buses in such fleet shall not be required to register in any other contracting States if each such vehicle is registered in some contracting State (except to the extent it is exempt from registration as provided in article III(b)).

If the administrator of any State determines, based on his method of the operation thereof, that the inclusion of a bus or buses as a part of a fleet would, adversely affect the proper fleet fee which should be paid to his State, having due regard for fairness and equity, he may refuse to permit any or all of such buses to be included in his State as a part of such fleet.

(b) Total fleet miles: Total fleet miles, with respect to each contracting State, shall mean the total miles operated by the fleet (1) in such State, (2) in all other contracting States, (3) in other States having proportional registration provisions, (4) in States with which such contracting State has reciprocity, and (5) in such other States as the administrator determines should be included under the circumstances in order to protect or promote the interest of his State; except that in States having laws requiring proration on the basis of a different determination of total fleet miles, total fleet miles shall be determined on such basis.

(c) Leased vehicles: If a bus is operated by a person other than the owner as a part of a fleet which is subject to the provisions of this article, then the operator of such fleet shall be deemed to be the owner of said bus for the purposes of this article.

(d) Extent of privileges: Upon the registration of a fleet in a contracting State pursuant to this article, each bus in the fleet may be operated in both interstate and intrastate operations in such State (except as provided in article III(e)).

(e) Application for proration: The application for proration of registration shall be made in each contracting State upon substantially the application forms and supplements authorized by joint action of the administrators of the contracting States.

(f) Issuance of identification: Upon registration of a fleet, the State which is the base State of a particular bus of the fleet, shall issue the required license plates and registration card for such bus and each contracting State in which the fleet of which such bus is a part, operates shall issue a special identification identifying such bus as a part of a fleet which has fully complied with the registration requirements of such State. The required license plates, registration cards, and identification shall be appropriately displayed in the manner required by or pursuant to the laws of each respective State.

(g) Additions to fleet: If any bus is added to a prorated fleet after the filing of the original application, the owner shall file a supplemental application. The owner shall register such bus in each contracting State in like manner as provided for buses listed in an original application and the registration fee payable shall be determined on the mileage proportion used to determine the registration fees payable for buses registered under the original application.

(h) Withdrawals from fleet: If any bus is withdrawn from a prorated fleet during the period for which it is registered or identified, the owner shall notify the administrator of each State in which it is registered or identified of such withdrawal and shall return the plates, and registration card or identification as may be required by or pursuant to the laws of the respective States.

(i) Audits: The administrator of each contracting State shall, within the statutory authority of such administrator, make any information obtained upon an audit of records of any applicant for proration of registration available to the administrators of the other contracting States.

(j) Errors in registration: If it is determined by the administrator of a contracting State, as a result of such audits or otherwise, that an improper fee has been paid his State, or errors in registration found, the administrator may require the fleet owner to make the necessary corrections in the registration of his fleet and payment of fees.

Article V—Reciprocity

(a) Grant of reciprocity: Each of the contracting States grants reciprocity as provided in this article.

(b) Applicability: The provisions of this agreement with respect to reciprocity shall apply only to a bus properly registered in the base State of the bus, which State must be a contracting State.

(c) Nonapplicability to fleet buses: The reciprocity granted pursuant to this article shall not apply to a bus which is entitled to be registered or identified as part of a prorated fleet.

(d) Extent of reciprocity: The reciprocity granted pursuant to this article shall permit the interstate operation of a bus and intrastate operation which is incidental to a trip of such bus involving interstate operation.

(e) Other agreements: Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to prohibit any of the contracting States from entering into separate agreements with each other for the granting of temporary permits for the intrastate operation of vehicles registered in the other State; nor to prevent any of the contracting States from entering into agreements to grant reciprocity for intrastate operation within any zone or zones agreed upon by the States.

Article VI—Withdrawal or revocation

Any contracting State may withdraw from this agreement upon thirty days' written notice to each other contracting State, which notice shall be given only after the repeal of this agreement by the legislature of such State, if adoption was by legislative act, or after renunciation by the appropriate administrative official of such contracting State if the laws thereof empower him so to renounce.

Article VII—Construction and severability

This compact shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this compact shall be severable

and if any phase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States or the applicability hereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating herein, the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining party States and in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters.

SEC. 202. The Board of Commissioners shall have the power to make such exemptions from the coverage of the agreement as may be appropriate and to make such changes in methods for the reporting of any information required to be furnished to the District of Columbia pursuant to the agreement as, in his judgment, shall be suitable: *Provided*, That any such exemptions or changes shall not be contrary to the purposes set forth in article I of the agreement and shall be made in order to permit the continuance of uniformity of practice among the contracting States with respect to buses.

SEC. 203. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enter into the agreement authorized by section 201 of this title without further action on the part of the Congress, and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of such agreement. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners (other than the entry into a compact authorized by this Act) or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 204. All provisions of law applicable to the District of Columbia shall, to the extent they are inconsistent with the agreement authorized by this title, be inapplicable to the taxation and registration of buses in the District of Columbia during such time as the District is a party to such agreement.

SEC. 205. Unless otherwise provided in any statute withdrawing the District of Columbia from participation in the agreement, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be the officer to give notice of withdrawal therefrom.

SEC. 206. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The excerpt from the report (No. 76), explaining the purposes of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill, as amended, is to grant the consent of the Congress, pursuant to section 10, article I, of the Constitution of the United States, to a compact relating to the taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation, proration, and reciprocity. This bill is divided into two titles. Title I would grant such consent for the several States and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact on the apportionment of taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses. Title II would grant a like consent to the several States and the District of Columbia to enter into a bus taxation and reciprocity agreement on proration and registration and other fixed fees, based on the miles traveled by buses in the respective States. The compact also allows and consents to the participation in this compact of the political subdivisions of Canada and Mexico.

CARNETTA GERMAINE THOMAS HUNTE

The bill (S. 190) for the relief of Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be is enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The excerpt from the report (No. 79), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

The beneficiary of the bill is a 48-year-old native of Barbados, a subject of Great Britain, and a citizen of Canada who entered the United States on September 2, 1960, as a visitor. She presently resides in Boston, Mass., with her aged uncle who has no other relatives and suffers from diabetes. Information is to be effect that the beneficiary devotes full time to her seriously ill uncle and desires to continue to care for him.

SUNNYSIDE SEED FARMS

The bill (S. 195) for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

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 not otherwise appropriated, to the Sunnyside Seed Farms, of Middleton, Wisconsin, the sum of $10,200, in full satisfaction of all its claims against the United States for storage charges for the failure to use certain facilities of such firm for a two-year period from November 1, 1951, through November 1, 1953, pursuant to the storage guarantee agreement (alpm (FX) 24721): *Provided*, That 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.

The excerpt from the report (No. 80), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay to the Sunnyside Seed Farms, of Middleton, Wis., the sum of $10,200, for its claims against the United States for storage charges for the failure to use certain facilities in the period November 1, 1951, through November 1, 1953, pursuant to a storage guarantee agreement.

A similar bill for this claimant, S. 1832, was introduced in the 88th Congress in the amount of $17,318.15. In a report from the Department of Agriculture, received subsequent to the adjournment of the 88th Congress, the Department advised the committee that it would have no objection to the enactment of the bill if it were amended to provide for the payment of $10,200. The bill, S. 195, as introduced in the 89th Congress, provides for payment in this amount.

LESTER W. HEIN AND SADIE HEIN

The bill (S. 574) for the relief of Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress asembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein, of Independence, Missouri, the sum of $9,020.78. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein against the United States for compensation for damages sustained by them when, or August 7, 1960, while returning from annual field training, a five-ton federally owned wrecker assigned to the One Hundred Tenth Engineer Battalion of the Missouri Army National Guard, Kansas City, Missouri, crashed into a store owned by the said Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein: *Provided*, That 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: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be delivered to or received by any insurance company as a subrogee for any portion of the amount appropriated to the claimants by this Act. Any persion 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 excerpt from the report (No. 92), explaining the purposcs of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein, of Independence, Mo., the sum of $9,020.78. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Lester W. and Sadie Hein against the United States for compensation for damages sustained by them when, on August 7, 1960, while returning from annual field training, a 5-ton federally owned wrecker assigned to the 110th Engineer Battalion of the Missouri Army National Guard, Kansas City,

Mo., crashed into a store owned by the claimants.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

The bill (S. 619) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nora Isabella Samuelli shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. The time Nora Isabella Samuelli has resided and been physically present in the United States since July 31, 1963, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The excerpt from the report (No. 94), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Nora Isabella Samuelli. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee. A further purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization immediately.

The beneficiary of the bill is a 50-year-old native of Rumania, who is now a stateless person. She was an employee of the U.S. Information Service at the American Legation in Bucharest from December 1945 to July 25, 1949, when she was arrested by Rumanian authorities and accused of espionage in favor of the United States. Thereafter, she was imprisoned until her release in July 1961. Her sister, who worked for the British Government, was imprisoned during the same period on similar charges. Upon their release, her family was stripped of all its possessions and permitted to proceed to France. The beneficiary resided in France until she was admitted to this country as a nonimmigrant visitor on July 31, 1963. She now resides in New York City with, and is supported by, a cousin.

CHUNG K. WON

The bill (S. 642) for the relief of Chung K. Won was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chung K. Won shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. Won Wing, a citizen of the United States.

The excerpt from the report (No. 97), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable Chung K. Won to qualify for nonquota immigrant status as the minor adopted son of a citizen of the United States which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien minor children of citizens of the United States.

The beneficiary of the bill is a 24-year-old native and citizen of China, who presently resides in Hong Kong. His natural mother and father are deceased. He was adopted under Chinese custom when released to his adoptive parents in 1943 by his natural mother. His adoptive parents and their natural daughter reside in the United States and the adoptive father is a U.S. citizen. The beneficiary resided with his adoptive mother from 1943 until she entered the United States for permanent residence in 1954. The beneficiary is dependent upon his adoptive father for support.

ENRICO AGOSTINI AND CELESTINO AGOSTINI

The bill (S. 829) for the relief of Enrico Agostini and Celestino Agostini was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Enrico Agostini and Celestino Agostini shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The excerpt from the report (No. 101), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Enrico Agostini and Celestino Agostini. The bill provides for appropriate quota deductions and for the payment of the required visa fees.

The beneficiaries of the bill are a 28-year-old father and his 5-year-old son, both natives and citizens of Italy, who entered the United States on November 28, 1961, as visitors. The adult beneficiary's first wife died in Italy in 1961 and he married a lawful permanent resident of the United States in Bridgeport, Conn., on March 10, 1962. The minor beneficiary was adopted by his stepmother on August 23, 1962. A third preference visa petition on behalf of the adult beneficiary was filed on March 20, 1962, and approved on July 9, 1962. Adjustment under section 245 was denied in November 1962 because third preference under the Italian quota was not then available. It is alleged that the third preference was current when application for adjustment was filed in July of 1962. The minor beneficiary is being treated by a specialist for a deformity, club foot.

JOSE L. RODRIGUEZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 440) for the relief of Jose L. Rodriguez, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose L. Rodriguez shall be held and considered to have retained his priority on the quota waiting list as of March 24, 1952, the date on which he first registered as an intending immigrant.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The excerpt from the report (No. 107), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to preserve a prior registration date on the quota waiting list in behalf of Jose L. Rodriguez, which was canceled by the Department of State. The bill, as introduced, would have granted the beneficiary permanent residence in the United States and provided for the deduction of a quota number. By preserving the beneficiary's prior registration date, he will be in a position to qualify for nonquota status under the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 87-885.

The beneficiary of the bill is a 42-year-old native and citizen of Spain, who entered the United States as a visitor on August 15, 1958. Since 1959, the beneficiary has been employed as a sheepherder, and he plans to continue in this employment if granted permanent residence in the United States. The beneficiary's wife and three minor children reside in Spain. His widowed mother is a naturalized U.S. citizen residing in Detroit, Mich. The beneficiary's brother and sister are natives and citizens of the United States. The beneficiary registered on the quota waiting list, together with his wife and two children, at São Paulo, Brazil, as of March 24, 1952. This registration was canceled on December 1, 1958, because the aliens had moved and left no forwarding address. The beneficiary had, in the meantime, reregistered on the quota waiting list at the American consulate in Madrid, Spain, as of June 7, 1954. A fourth preference visa petition was approved in behalf of the beneficiary on March 22, 1960. The beneficiary assists in the care of his citizen mother, who is in poor health.

PROFESSIONAL PHOTOGRAPHY WEEK

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) to authorize the President to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That as a tribute to the professional photographer and his many works and in recognition of the importance of professional photography in our life today and in America's future, the President is authorized to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning May 2 through May 8, 1965, as Professional Photography Week, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The preamble was agreed to.

The excerpt from the report (No. 113), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 976) to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargability of taxes in bankruptcy was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

The bill (S. 618) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

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 Nora Isabella Samuelli, the sum of $55,000 as a gratuity for the sacrifices sustained by her as a result of having been imprisoned for twelve years by the Communist Government of Rumania on charges that the said Nora Isabella Samuelli acted as a spy for the United States while employed in the United States Legation in Bucharest, Rumania: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act 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.

SEC. 2. The period from July 24, 1949, to June 14, 1961, inclusive, during which Nora Isabella Samuelli was imprisoned by the Communist Government of Rumania on charges that she acted as a spy for the United States while employed in the United States Legation in Bucharest, Rumania, shall be determined to be creditable service for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251, et seq.).

The excerpt from the report (No. 115), explaining the purposes of the bill, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nora Isabella Samuelli the sum of $55,000 as a gratuity for the sacrifices sustained by her as a result of having been imprisoned for 12 years by the Communist government of Rumania on charges that the said Nora Isabella Samuelli acted as a spy for the United States while employed in the U.S. Legation in Bucharest, Rumania. The bill also contains a prohibition against the payment of attorney's fees and grants to the claimant creditable service for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act those years which she spent in incarceration.

S. 2414, of the 88th Congress, as amended by the committee, is identical to the present bill, S. 618, and was reported by the committee on September 16, 1964, and passed the Senate on September 24, 1964.

The facts are set forth in Senate report No. 1588 on S. 2414 of the 88th Congress, and are as follows:

"The beneficiary, Nora Isabella Samuelli, was born in Rumania on July 9, 1914, and is a stateless person. She graduated from high school and attended law school for 3 years in her native country. Miss Samuelli, who has never married, resides in Paris, France. She is presently in New York City pending action on her claim and is not employed. She has no income or appreciable assets. A well-to-do widowed cousin, also living in New York City, underwrites the beneficiary's complete living expenses and provides financial contributions for her personal needs. Miss Samuelli's widowed mother and brother are political refugees residing in France. Her only sister, who is single, is a British subject, presently in the United States as a temporary visitor.

"Miss Samuelli stated that in December 1945 she became an employee of the U.S. Information Service at the American Legation in Bucharest, Rumania. She continued in this employment until on or about July 25, 1949, when without warning she was seized by Rumanian authorities and accused of high treason and espionage in favor of the United States. Thereafter, she was incarcerated in two penal institutions until her release in July 1961. Her sister, Annie Samuelli, who was employed in the same city by the British Government, was also arrested on a similar charge and detained during the same period. Upon her release, she was granted British citizenship in recognition of her service. In September 1961 the entire family was stripped of its possessions and, upon payment of a ransom by a distant relative in the West, was allowed to proceed to France where they were granted permanent residence. Miss Samuelli resided there until her departure for this country. She is the holder of a French travel document for refugees resident in France valid until May 14, 1965."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on March 10, 1965, the Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported S. 618 and S. 619, bills for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli. On these two bills, S. 618 introduced by Senator DODD, and S. 619 which I introduced, we were joined as sponsors by Senators JAVITS, PELL, HARTKE, and KENNEDY of Massachusetts. These bills are similar to two private bills that I introduced in 1963, and that were passed by the Senate in the last session of the Congress. Both in the 88th Congress, and in this Congress, Senator DODD, as chairman of the subcommittee which formulated action on these bills, gave unceasingly of his time and efforts to bring out the facts and to develop bills to grant the needed relief for Miss Samuelli. I very much appreciate the attention and support given by the committee and the chairman [Mr. EASTLAND] to these bills, and I know that all of the Senators who have sponsored this legislation are pleased at the immediate Senate action on these bills. I hope this action will hasten the granting of the deserved relief which would be provided by these bills.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: I wish to note that the bills for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli, which have been passed, involve a woman who suffered terribly at the hands of the Communists because she was an employee of the American Embassy. It has taken a long time to do justice in this matter. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I were both interested, as were also other Senators. I express my gratitude to the majority leader and to the committee which has reported out the bills and brought about their enactment today.

BENJAMIN A. RAMELB

This bill (S. 149) for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

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 legal guardian of Benjamin A. Ramelb, of Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii, the sum of $68,240 in full settlement of all the claims against the United States of the said Benjamin A. Ramelb arising out of injuries he received when struck by a United States Army truck at Waialua, on July 2, 1944. The said injuries caused damage to the brain resulting in total and permanent disability: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of $1,500 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.

The excerpt from the report (No. 116), explaining the purposes of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay to the legal guardian of Benjamin A. Ramelb, of Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii, the sum of $68,240 in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said Benjamin A. Ramelb arising out of injuries he received when struck by a U.S. Army truck at Waialua on July 2, 1944.

A similar bill for this claimant in the 88th Congress, S. 353, was introduced in the amount of $75,000. In its report on the bill the Department of the Army advised the committee that it would have no objection to the bill if it were amended to pay the amount of $68,240. The bill so amended was approved by this committee, was passed by the Senate on March 17, 1964, and was referred to the House of Representatives. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives favorably reported the bill on August 4, 1964, but no action was taken on it before the adjournment of the 88th Congress.

BENNETT PLACE COMMEMORATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) to provide for Bennett Place commemoration, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, line 9, after the word "on", to strike out "April 24" and insert "April 25"; so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation, on or before April 1, 1965, reminding the American people of the spirit of national unity that is symbolized by the Bennett Place, near the city of Durham, North Carolina, and urging those who can do so to attend the commemorative ceremonies to be held by the people of North Carolina at the Bennett Place on April 25, 1965.

SEC. 2. Departments and agencies of the Government of the United States, includ-

ing the Civil War Centennial Commission, are hereby requested to cooperate with the Governor of the State of North Carolina, with other public officers, and with governmental agencies of said State, and with the city of Durham, and the Bennett Place Memorial Commission in planning and carrying out the aforementioned commemorative ceremonies.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was amended, so as to read:

Whereas a profound spirit of unity among Americans underlies this Nation's greatness; and

Whereas a striking and memorable example of that spirit of unity pervaded the negotiations between General William T. Sherman and General Joseph E. Johnston when those opposing commanders in their search for peace met at the Bennett House, near the city of Durham, North Carolina, in April of 1865; and

Whereas through the diligent and unselfish labors of the Bennett Place Memorial Commission over long years, the Bennett House, together with its grounds and appurtenant buildings, has been carefully preserved and now comprises an official State historic site, administered by the State of North Carolina, so that the Bennett Place today stands as a permanent symbol of the Nation's unity; and

Whereas the people of North Carolina, imbued with the same sense of unity and concord that characterized the Johnston-Sherman Bennett Place conferences a century ago, and wishing to commemorate the centennial of those conferences, will hold appropriate ceremonies at the Bennett Place, near the city of Durham, on April 25, 1965; and

Whereas the Governor of the State of North Carolina, the city of Durham, and Bennett Place Memorial Commission have invited the people of the United States to attend those ceremonies: Therefore be it

The preamble was agreed to.

The excerpt from the report (No. 122), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the joint resolution, as amended, is to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation, on or before April 1, 1965, reminding the American people of the spirit of national unity that is symbolized by the Bennett Place, near the city of Durham, N.C., and urging those who can do so to attend the commemoration ceremonies to be held by the people of North Carolina at the Bennett Place on April 25, 1965.

Bennett Place was originally a small farmhouse, the residence of James Bennett, located on the Hillsboro Road west of Durham, N.C. It was at this small farmhouse, now called the Bennett Place, where Gen. Joseph E. Johnston's Confederate Army surrendered to General William T. Sherman on April 26, 1865, and which was the second and last major stage in the peacemaking process which ended the Civil War.

General Lee's surrender at Appomattox 17 days earlier was the first. The capitulation of Gen. Richard A. Taylor's small force in Alabama a week later and of Kirby Smith's Trans-Mississippi Army at New Orleans exactly a month later concluded the process.

Johnston surrendered by far the largest share of the Confederate troops still in the field at war's end, more than Lee and the others combined. He surrendered all the Confederate forces in the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida and took those States out of the war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar for today.

MANPOWER ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 114, Senate bill 974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 974) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, no action will be taken on the bill this afternoon, but it is anticipated that at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow, the bill will be made the pending business.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed on another subject.

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide uniform Federal participation and eligibility standards for benefits payable as medical assistance for the aged under the so-called Kerr-Mills Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and that the bill be permitted to remain at the desk until the close of business on March 22, for the addition of such cosponsors as may desire to join.

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

The bill (S. 1505) to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide uniform Federal participation and eligibility standards for benefits payable as medical assistance for the aged, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title I of the Social Security Act is amended as follows:

(1) by striking from section 3(a)(1)(C) the words "the Federal medical percentage (as defined in section 6(c))" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "75 per centum".

(2) by striking from section 3(a)(3) the words "the Federal medical percentage (as defined in section 6(c)" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "75 per centum".

(3) by striking therefrom all of section 6(c).

(4) by amending section 2(a)(11)(D) to read as follows:

"(D) include reasonable standards consistent with the objectives of this title for determining eligibility for and the extent of such assistance, provided that assistance shall include and be limited to:

"(a) Any unmarried applicant whose income, after deduction of medical expenses incurred by the applicant, does not exceed $1,800 annually, or any married applicant and spouse living together whose combined income, after deduction of medical expenses incurred by the applicant and his spouse, does not exceed $2,500: *Provided*, That said $1,800 and $2,500 standards shall be reduced in the case of those States, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam whose annual per capita income is less than the annual per capita income of all of the States, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam, and shall be increased in the case of those States, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam whose annual per capita income is greater than the annual per capita income of all of the States, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam. The reduction or increase shall be computed by applying to said dollar standards the percentage which the annual per capita income of a State, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, or Guam bears to the annual per capita income of all of the States, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam. The percentages for reduction or increase shall be furnished each State, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by July 1 of each year for application on January 1 of the following year, and shall be based on per capita incomes computed for the most recent calendar year or fiscal year for which such computations can be made with reasonable accuracy.

"(b) 'Income' for the purposes of the preceding subsection shall mean the adjusted gross income computed for Federal income tax purposes plus the amount of capital gain, interest, annuities, or other retirement payments or portions thereof not included in adjusted gross income. In administering this Act, the probable income for the year during which assistance is applied for shall be taken into account so that assistance for which the applicant would probably be qualified when the income for said year is finally determined can be furnished without delay.

"(c) Any unmarried applicant whose resources do not exceed $2,000 ($12,000 if he does not own real property occupied by him as a residence), or any married applicant and spouse living together whose resources do not exceed $3,000 ($13,000 if they do not own real property occupied by them as a residence): *Provided*, That the value of resources shall be the current market value minus any encumbrances against such resource or resources: *And provided further*, That the following resources shall not be taken into account: real property occupied as a residence by the applicant; household goods and furnishings; one automobile, personal effects, and tools necessary for the pursuit of a trade, occupation, or profession; and the cash surrender value of life insurance policies on the life of the applicant or his spouse."

(5) Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this amendment shall take effect July 1, 1965, and paragraph (4) shall take effect July 1, 1966.

Mr. MILLER. The great majority of States now have a medical assistance for

the aged program enacted by their respective State legislatures pursuant to authority conferred in the Kerr-Mills Act. Many of these programs are only getting underway. In some States, including my own State of Iowa, the program is operating fully and very effectively. The fact that these programs are being administered locally by local people who are familiar with the situation and the needs of the people being served is one of the most desirable features. Older people certainly should have the service of people in their community whenever possible.

There are now pending in the Congress a good many bills on the subject of improved medical care for older citizens. Enactment of most of them would add greatly to the complexity of an already complex system of State and Federal laws designed to meet the needs of millions of people. Some of these proposed programs would tend away from rather than toward the local administration concept.

It seems to me that what Congress ought to do is improve upon the Kerr-Mills program—to take advantage of the administrative machinery which has already been set up on the State and local level while at the same time removing some of the defects which have made their appearance during the relatively short time the Kerr-Mills program has been operating. My bill is designed to do so.

The State legislatures are already hard pressed to meet the revenue needs needed to carry out their responsibilities. This is due to the fact that the major sources of raising revenue have been transferred to the Federal Government down through the years. There is much merit to the idea of transferring back to the States a percentage of the Federal revenue collections. Meanwhile, however, it is likely that adequate coverage under the Kerr-Mills program will not be achieved unless the Federal Government provides a larger percentage of the assistance. Under present law this percentage varies from 50 to 80 percent, with most States falling in the 50- and 60-percent area. My bill would provide for a uniform Federal contribution of 75 percent of the cost.

There are no uniform eligibility requirements under the present law, and the variations of standards of financial need enacted by the various States are so great as to cause inequity among our elder citizens. Accordingly, my bill provides for a uniform standard to be used by all of the States—both as to property and as to income. The property qualification makes it clear that certain property cannot be counted, such as a person's home, auto, cash surrender of life insurance, home furnishings, and tools of a trade, business or profession. Additionally, if a person does not own and live in a home, there is an additional $10,000 of property which will be excluded. I believe this additional exclusion in lieu of a private home is needed to do equity among the recipients of this assistance. This provision will remove the criticism which is frequently leveled at the present law that some States can place a lien on a recipient's home and foreclose upon it when he dies.

The income standard is a uniform $1,800 for single persons and $2,500 for a married couple. But in order to recognize the differences in cost of living and standards of living among the various States, this uniform standard would be raised—thus permitting more people to qualify who are in need—where the State's per capita income is higher than that of the national average; and it would be lowered in the case of those States where the per capital income is lower than the national average. The percentage by which there is a variance with the national average would be used as a basis for lowering or raising the $1,800 and $2,500 standard. I might point out that this is the approach now used under the Kerr-Mills law in determining the percentage of the Federal contribution, so the machinery for making the computations is already present.

I wish to emphasize that Senators who supported the Kerr-Mills Act when it passed Congress did not intend any inequities to arise. But in any massive social program affecting millions of our citizens, it is inevitable that inequities will arise. We are still trying to remove inequities from the social security system which went into effect 25 years ago. But it seems to me that when inequities appear, we should try to legislate them away instead of doing away with the program or superimposing some other vast program on top of one that is already on the books.

Finally, it should be emphasized that the Kerr-Mills program is financed out of the general fund of the Treasury into which tax money is largely paid according to relative ability to pay. This is the fairest system of raising revenue we have—and it is much fairer than by imposing a uniform payroll tax on a limited amount of income, which is regressive and bears most heavily on large family, low income groups in the same manner as a sales tax.

My bill, if enacted, will continue the long-established policy of Congress that services provided by the Federal Government, in whole or in part, to meet the health needs of our people should be on a basis of the financial needs of the people who receive them. By continuing to follow this policy, adequate and decent services will be furnished those who need them. Social justice demands nothing more and nothing less.

JOB CORPS MORE ADVANTAGEOUS THAN THREE LOWEST GRADES IN ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a highly illuminating article appeared in the January 27 issue of the Air Force Times.

In clear detail, it underscores that it is more advantageous to be a member of the new Job Corps than to serve as an enlisted man in the three lowest grades in the armed services.

The Air Force Times points out that a member of the Job Corps is paid $80 a month as a trainee and, after 10 months, can make as much as $100 a month.

Additionally, a Job Corps man gets a $75 a year clothing allowance plus a terminal payment of $50 for each month he has served after completion of Corps duty. If he elects, a corpsman may send home each month $25 of the $50 monthly terminal payment and the Government will match it with another $25 a month. Atop this, this money he sends home does not have to go to a dependent, as military allotments must.

In actuality, a corpsman can be earning as much as $125 a month, excluding clothing allowance.

Let is now look at the person who enlists or is drafted into the service. I quote from the article:

> The man entering military service gets $78 a month. He can get an allotment only if he has dependents for whom he supplies at least half of their support. After 4 months of service, his base pay goes up to $83.20 a month. During his first 2 years of service, even if he rises to the rank of E–3, he will get only $99.37 a month.

The article pointedly examines the recruiting material provided Job Corps men which tells them:

> The purpose is to help you get and keep a good job, maybe return to school, or join the Army or Navy.

And as the article concluded, "if they do join the Army, Navy, or Air Force; they will have to take a pay cut."

Mr. President, this is a sorry state of affairs when the men electing to serve their Nation in the Armed Forces are paid less than those who will serve in the Job Corps.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Trainees in Poverty Corps Higher Paid Than Recruits," be printed in the RECORD. Also on the same subject is a timely article appearing in the current issue of Reader's Digest, entitled "Paupers in Uniform"; and an editorial appearing in the February 17 issue of the Chicago Tribune, entitled "More Expensive Than Radcliffe," which I ask be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Air Force Times, Jan. 27, 1965]

TRAINEES IN POVERTY CORPS HIGHER PAID THAN RECRUITS

WASHINGTON.—The 40,000 unemployed, unskilled youths who will be enrolled for training in the first year of the war on poverty Job Corps program will be better paid than recruits in the armed services.

This was revealed as Job Corps headquarters announced that the first 30 corpsmen were beginning their training at an old depression days Civilian Conservation Corps site in Maryland.

The Job Corpsman is paid $80 a month. The military recruit gets only $78 a month.

Here is the situation for the corpsmen: They will get $30 monthly for spending money. When they complete their service they will get a terminal payment of $50 for each month they spend in the Corps.

After 7 months' training, a corpsman may qualify for the rank of assistant leader. If he does, he will get a $10 monthly raise. If, after 10 months, he makes the rank of leader he will get another $10 raise. So he can, in 10 months, be making $100 a month. In addition to this he gets a $75-a-year clothing allowance.

If he wishes, he may send home each month $25 of his $50 monthly terminal payment. If

he does, the Government will match it with another $25 a month. The money does not have to be allotted to a dependent, as military allotments must be.

So the corpsman who makes leader can be earning (not counting the clothing allowance) $125 month in monthly pay, terminal payments, and in allotments.

The man entering military service gets $78 a month. He can get an allotment only if he has dependents for whom he supplies at least half of their support. After 4 months of service his base pay goes up to $83.20 a month. During his first 2 years of service, even if he rises to the rank of E–3, he will get only $99.37 a month.

Rates for enlisted men with less than 2 years' service has not been changed in 13 years. Both the enlisted man and the Job Corps men get free medical and dental care, housing, and food.

The Job Corps man gets job-finding help when he leaves the corps.

The Job Corps was set up to aid young people from the ages of 16 through 21 who are largely unemployable because they lack education and job skills. Most have not completed high school and their reading and arithmetic skills range from the 4th to the 7th grade levels.

About 40,000 young men and women will be enrolled the first year and 100,000 in the second year of the program. They will go to centers in rural areas where they are given training in a number of skills and do useful conservation work.

Recruiting folders given Job Corps men tell them that "the purpose is to help you get and keep a good job * * * maybe return to school * * * or join the Army or Navy."

If they do join the Army, Navy, or Air Force, they'll have to take a pay cut.

[From the Reader's Digest, March 1965]

PAUPERS IN UNIFORM

(By Francis and Katharine Drake)

A job for Congress: revise the military pay scale upward. The present low-wage policy damages the morale and effectiveness of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen; it also causes constant turnover of personnel, thus wasting the taxpayers' money.

The President's initiation of a crusade against poverty recently brought to light the plight of uncounted numbers of citizens who, at a time of unprecedented national prosperity, are unable to keep their heads above the financial disaster level. This spring the Nation is in for another shock, when the subject of military pay increases comes before Congress. The American people will then get a good hard look at a situation that must fill all but the thickest skinned citizen with a sense of shame: the financial plight of the men who protect our country.

The fact is that thousands of American enlisted men on active duty, skilled volunteers who wear their country's uniform with pride, are actually paupers in uniform. It is ironic that the Government, which established poverty levels, is itself paying many of its uniformed men below these levels. Some soldiers, sailors, and airmen and their families are even being forced to accept relief.

The Air Force, with 719,000 enlisted men and women, has just completed a survey and found (the figures can be tripled to get very rough totals for all services):

(a) 5,000 Air Force men have received relief benefits.

(b) 55,000 more are technically eligible for relief but too proud to accept it.

(c) 169,000 receive basic pay below the Government poverty levels.

(d) 148,000 men are moonlighting in their meager spare time.

(e) 180,000 Air Force wives work to support the family.

It is a fact that a jet pilot, master of the skills involved in maneuvering supersonic planes, actually draws less pay than a Pentagon messenger.

LOST INVESTMENT

Former Senator Kenneth Keating described the pay situation as "a disgraceful reward for those who have sworn to defend our country." More than this, the low pay scale represents a great waste of the taxpayers' money. When poverty forces the majority of highly skilled men out of the services after their first hitch, the result is a perpetual turnover. The Government is committed to the tremendous cost of training new men who, in turn, will walk out. The total investment cost of training just one Air Force radar electronic specialist is $23,000; a ballistic-missile launch officer, $49,140; a B–52 commander, $1,400,000; his crew, another $2 million. When these men quit, all that investment goes down the drain.

Between 60 and 70 percent of all Air Force skilled enlisted men leave at the end of their first 4-year enlistment. Also, an average of 54 percent of the officers separate at the earliest permitted date. In the past 5 years Army resignations have increased by more than 50 percent, Air Force by 137 percent.

IN THE RED

The case history of Joe Doakes, high school graduate, age 19, comes closer to the rule than to the exception. Joe, motivated by patriotism, challenge, the promise of a fine technical education, begins his 4-year hitch as airman basic—pay, $78 a month, living in barracks with no allowances. Three years later he is Airman First Class Doakes, now a skilled electronics specialist, earning $194 a month plus allowances, married, father of one child, expecting another—and in debt up to his ears. How, in 3 brief years, did Joe land himself in such a financial fix? The answer of course is: by marriage. (Our armed services today total 2,700,000 men in uniform, wives number about 1,500,000.)

Ineligible because of lack of rank for base housing, he now receives $83 quarters allowance from the Government. Cheapest off-base lodgings he can find cost $107 a month, not including utilities, which average $30 a month more. Furnishing the apartment sets him back nearly $1,000. Commuting to base involves a secondhand car; repair and gas bills cost him $24 a month. During the last 3 years Joe has had to move twice—and pay the family transportation costs each time. Government food allowance is $31.50 a month, or roughly 10 cents per person per meal for the three Doakeses. Total pay, including all allowances, is $308 a month.

It boils down to this: The Doakes' monthly budget invariably balances in the red. Whenever he can, Joe moonlights, but unpredictable duty hours make spare-time work irregular. The services, perpetually short of skilled men, are forced to hire civilian technical representatives from private industry. Joe works alongside one of these, performing a duplicate job. The technical representative earns $1,000 a month (plus generous overtime). Having spent $25,120 on Joe's training, the Air Force now presses him to reenlist, offering a $779 re-up bonus. The technical representative tells him not to be fool.

THOUSANDS OF JOES

This is the sort of choice faced by thousands of young service couples each year. On the one side, pride, patriotism, the hope of promotion; on the other, more money, shorter hours, higher living, the freedom to change jobs if opportunity beckons.

Joe's decision? "I'm quitting," he says. "Not because I want to, but because I just can't afford to stay in."

Multiply Joe by hundreds of thousands of men in each service: It adds up to billions of dollars a year wasted in unnecessary turnover—and a threat to our protective strength and the safety of our country. As Capt. William A. Golden states in the Naval Institute Proceedings: "It is now necessary to recognize objectively that officers (and enlisted men) cannot be paid like busboys, worked like field hands and released like old, slow halfbacks—it simply is not good business."

Today, our military are in danger of becoming forgotten men. The economy is leaving them so far behind that it is small wonder they are becoming disillusioned and embittered, unwilling to put up any longer with the status of second-class citizens. Many will settle for less pay than they can get in industry, for the privilege of serving their country—but not if they are going to be penalized for marrying young, and driven to live on charity handouts.

How can we make a military career attractive to the youth of America? The services, in mutual consultation, have defined the minimum improvements they believe necessary.

Basic pay: The study proposes an immediate pay increase of 16 percent for enlisted men with less than 2 years' service, 15 percent for officers with less than 2 year's service, plus increases for other officers and enlisted men, plus a redefinition of subsistence allowances for those who cannot eat on base. (There was a military pay raise only last year, but of only 2½ percent—of virtually no benefit to the lower ranks who needed it most.) The proposed increases would average from $12 to $44 a month for enlisted men, from $37 to $111 for officers. By contrast, raises granted last year to civilian Federal employees were five times as high.

Promotion: This is a major grievance among servicemen, since, at present, a promotion with accompanying pay increase is by no means automatically granted when a man becomes eligible. Restrictions on the services' authority to promote enlisted men deny deserved promotions. As a result, some highly qualified lower grade enlisted men are doing sergeants' work but receiving neither sergeants' stripes nor sergeants' pay.

Quarters: Housing has long been acknowledged by Congress to be part of military pay. Quarters, moreover, are supposed to be on-base, so that personnel are readily available in case of emergency. This commitment has never been properly honored. Below the rank of sergeant, virtually no serviceman is able to live on base if he is married. Instead, like the Doakes, hundreds of thousands of young service families dwell in civilian quarters, some adequate, some miserably substandard. Rent gouging in the vicinity of military bases is commonplace.

The services' proposal is to adjust basic quarters allowances to a more realistic amount. This is a stopgap. What is really needed is adequate base housing—which would cost the Government less in the long run.

A cure lies in renewing the Capehart housing bill, which expired last year. That bill permitted the military to have houses built on base, or next to it, by civilian contractors; to borrow the cost from private lenders on FHA-secured 20-year mortgages; and to pay these off out of congressional appropriations. The mortgage cost on a $17,500 unit is actually less than the average amount now paid out for a serviceman's quarters allowance—and the Government ends by owning the house free and clear. While the Government cannot build all the 350,000 units needed, it can and should build more than the 3,000 at present under construction.

But even with adequate housing, military paychecks can never compete with the wages of private industry. A petty officer in charge of the reactor aboard the cruiser *Long Beach* earns $453 a month. His civilian counterpart aboard the *Savannah* rates $1,200.

Privileges: These represent the compensating factors that traditionally bridge the gaps.

Among them—counted as a part of service pay for 99 years—is the right to shop in commissaries, where the military can buy food at cost plus a surcharge of 3 percent. Well stocked at one time, post stores nowadays have only a quarter of the items available at supermarkets, operate only 40 hours a week, carry no "specials," no fancy items, and have long waiting lines; but savings amount roughly to $400 a year per family of four—a sum of critical importance.

A questionnaire recently circulated among 176,000 men in uniform reveals that 50 percent more enlisted men and 30 percent more officers would be obliged to leave the service if post shopping facilities were withdrawn and the $400 savings denied. Loss to the Government on commissary transactions amounts to roughly $40 a year per family, a sizable sum overall. But as Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, points out: An increase of one-tenth of 1 percent in the reenlistment rate would more than cancel out this Government red ink.

Also, the Department of Defense has acknowledged that any attempt to replace commissary savings with a pay raise would "greatly exceed the Government cost in operating base stores." Constant attacks on these and other privileges—base clubs, movies, etc., run by the men themselves at no cost to the Government—tend to make men quit in disgust. Anything that injures the military esprit de corps costs the Nation dearly.

NEEDED: GOOD MEN

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's determination to run his Department as efficiently as a business has been much in the headlines. He has shown courage and ingenuity in saving nearly $3 billion from our defense bill. Yet, in the words of Adm. David McDonald, the Chief of Naval Operations: "No other business in the world leans so heavily on manpower as does the military." Good hardware is of little use without good men.

The cost of the raise in pay and allowances for all services, proposed in the military services' study, is $811 million a year. Against this, savings would be realized. Pay and maintenance of our 2,700,000 men is about $15 billion a year; if, by retention of experienced men, the total manpower requirement could be reduced by only 10 percent, the savings would exceed the pay raise by far.

In the last analysis, the hope for the military lies in the understanding and support of the public, whose welfare is directly concerned. To give servicemen the stepchild treatment is to tamper recklessly with the innermost fabric of military security. If through indifference we cast loose the ablest and most skilled fighting men in the world, our future is indeed in jeopardy.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Feb. 17, 1965]

MORE EXPENSIVE THAN RADCLIFFE

It costs about $3,000 a year to send a girl to Radcliffe or one of the other leading colleges for women. If you think this is expensive, look at the $7,620 which it will cost to maintain a girl at one of the new Job Corps centers of the Johnson administration's anti-poverty program.

Contracts totaling $8½ million have been awarded by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity [OEO] for the opening of the first three centers in Los Angeles, Cleveland, and St. Petersburg, Fla. They will have facilities for 875 girls from 18 to 21.

The groups operating the centers will receive $530 a month to feed, house, and give instruction to each girl. In addition, the OEO will give each girl and her family an allowance of $105 a month. These costs total $635 a month, or $7,620 a year. The OEO also will pay transportation costs, estimated at $75 to $100 per girl.

Similar Job Corps centers are being established for boys. The largest is to be at the abandoned military base at Camp Kilmer, N.J., for which $11½ million has been allotted. Other large centers will be at San Marcos, Tex., and at Astoria, Oreg. The Texas center will be operated by Southwest Texas State College, President Johnson's alma mater. Eighteen smaller centers will be set up in rural areas of 15 States.

The trainees at all these centers will be mostly school dropouts whose families are considered "economically deprived." Efforts will be made to give them basic education and training for jobs, which will help them to become self-supporting.

The idea for the centers has grown out of proposals to reestablish the Civilian Conservation Corps camps which were operated from 1933 to 1942 to help young men who could not find jobs. The Corps did much useful conservation work in State and national parks and it drew much less criticism than the other New Deal "make work" agencies. The CCC camps also were useful in training Army Reserve officers who served as administrators. The cost of operating the camps was less than $1,000 a year per trainee.

Much of the trainees in the new Job Corps centers will do no useful work, but will spend all their time receiving instruction which should have been given to them in the schools. The average cost of maintaining a child in high school in the United States is about $500 a year.

The amount is dirt cheap compared with the $7,620 a year to maintain a girl in the new Job Corps centers.

ADDRESS BY DONALD E. JOHNSON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE LOS ANGELES CIVIC LUNCHEON

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the national commander of the American Legion, Donald E. Johnson, delivered an outstanding address before the Los Angeles, Calif., Civic Luncheon on January 5, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AN ADDRESS BY DONALD E. JOHNSON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE LOS ANGELES CIVIC LUNCHEON, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., JANUARY 5, 1965

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, my fellow American Legionnaires, ladies and gentlemen, I have been here in California for nearly a week now, and among your many other talents and accomplishments I must say that you certainly know how to welcome the New Year.

This opportunity to appear before a blue ribbon audience such as comprises the Los Angeles Civic Luncheon Club has long been regarded by national commanders of the American Legion as one of the true highlights of their term of office. Now that I am here, I can understand why.

On behalf of my 2,600,000 fellow American Legionnaires may I express our sincere appreciation for your presence, and my personal appreciation to all who have helped to make this visit such a memorable one.

This is the traditional season of the year for new expressions of faith and of hope, and the American Legion takes this opportunity to reaffirm its faith in the ability and willingness of the American people to determine their own destiny, and the hope that this year may see remarkable strides toward the realization of that destiny.

The American Legion does not believe we are going to make any substantial progress toward this objective by further coddling of the international Communist conspiracy, and we do not believe that new concessions to the Reds will further the cause of world peace—certainly not peace with honor.

Very rarely do I put a title on any message which I bring on behalf of the American Legion, but if my remarks of today should have such a title I think it might appropriately be called "Myth-ful Thinking."

International affairs and U.S. foreign policy command a major share of time and space of the Nation's news media and well they should, because of the continuing irreconcilable conflict between free world interests and objectives and those of the Communist world.

In recent months a great deal of space has been devoted to the reporting of divergent views as to which policies the United States should pursue to most effectively advance the interests and attain the objectives of the free world.

Expression of dissident viewpoints is an expected and desirable feature of the American scene. Thus, it is quite normal for the American Legion to listen closely when the subject is our national security and the voice is that of a high Government official. East-West relations generally, and U.S. policies toward Communist countries in particular, are of paramount concern to American Legionnaires.

It should come as no surprise to this audience, I'm sure, to hear that the American Legion finds itself in basic disagreement with much of what Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT said in his "Bridges East and West" speech in Dallas, Tex., last month.

We have the utmost respect for the Senator personally and for the powerful position he occupies as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Yet, we feel impelled to record our strong dissent from his thesis that the road to peace with communism lies across "bridges of accommodation."

The Senator visualizes these bridges as spanning a chasm of misunderstanding, and would involve accommodations which he feels should include compromises that respect the vital interests of the Communists.

The American Legion offers no apologies for the hard line it takes toward communism. The Communists have written their own record of deceit and treachery and any chasm which exists between East and West is of the Communists' own making.

Any bridge can span a chasm, but any bridge that is built to serve a useful purpose must have good approaches from either side, and we see nothing in either the historical or the current record of communism to indicate any interest in building a constructive approach to the proposed "bridges of accommodation."

As we interpret the Senator's preliminary remarks, his thesis is based on the five following negative assumptions:

1. The West cannot win the cold war.
2. In the political realm, at least, man is incapable of deciding the best course for man to follow.
3. Realization of the opportunities created by victory in war is beyond man's inherent powers.
4. The nature of war and its effect on men precludes a peace settlement based on reason and justice, and,
5. American idealism is too virtuous for its own good and, therefore, must not be permitted to stand in the way of our getting along with the Communists.

Any policy based on such assumptions would be devoid of hope for the future and would lead to the ultimate conclusion that

this country has no choice but—and I quote Mr. FULBRIGHT—"to build bridges to the Communist world and in so doing to influence the course which it follows in a direction compatible with our own safety."

It would seem to suggest that we adopt the philosophy: "If we can't beat 'em, join 'em." My friends, where communism is involved, the American Legion is not now willing, nor will it ever be willing to endorse such a policy on the part of the United States. Further, we believe the vast majority of the American people would rise in opposition to such a policy.

Senator FULBRIGHT, it must be stated, did concede that the building of bridges to the Communist world would not result in the early resolution of the more fundamental differences between East and West.

Also, he said that "accommodations with the Communist world can be only one part of the grand strategy of American national security." The other two bases which he mentioned are, "the maintenance of the world's most powerful nuclear deterrent force and the maintenance and sustenance of a vigorous Atlantic Alliance."

The American Legion is in complete accord with these latter two points.

Advocacy of a second-to-none deterrent force has been an American Legion trademark throughout our organizational existence. The American Legion was among the earliest proponents of a NATO alliance and has remained one of its stanch supporters.

May I suggest that if bridges are to be built—or repaired—that we concentrate our efforts on those bridges between America and her allies and that those efforts be focused immediately upon the salvation and strengthening of the Atlantic Alliance. It is no secret that a part of our difficulties with our European friends lies in the fact that, too often, we have neglected them in negotiating with the Soviet leaders.

If the United States is to assume the role of bridge builder, let's build those bridges which we might reasonably expect to have usable approaches from both sides and which will be open to two-way traffic.

The history of negotiation with Communist nations does not indicate that further accommodation on our part will reduce the Communist appetite for expansion, as Senator FULBRIGHT suggests. Indeed, the exact opposite is true and Laos is a case in point. There the Communists contend they are entitled to occupy territory formerly under neutralist control because the neutralists now are cooperating with pro-Western factions. This false interpretation of the 1962 compromise studiously ignores the fact that the recent political realinement in Laos resulted from a renewal of Communist aggression.

One positive assumption which the Senator advanced in support of his thesis is that "the Communist countries are susceptible to external influence and to internal change."

We agree that Communist countries are susceptible to external influence, but we believe that a resolute stand on our part would be far more likely to influence the Communists to abandon their imperialistic designs than would a conciliatory policy.

We agree that internal change is possible in Communist countries, but only to the extent that such change will serve the purposes of Communist leaders.

The Senator suggests that we intensify the policy of the present administration to treat different Communist countries differently in the belief that this will help break up the Communist bloc. Specifically, he urges: friendly cooperation with Yugoslavia; restoration of full diplomatic relations with Hungary, and encouragement of increased trade with Rumania. The American Legion is opposed to each such move on the part of our Government.

As for Poland, the Senator would continue our present overly favorable concessions to the Polish Communist regime, but in this instance he believes "that no new initiatives are in order for the time being." In the Senator's own words Poland has "regressed * * * toward more passive acceptance of Soviet leadership." In our words, what the Senator is saying is that the policy which he advocates for other Communist countries was a failure in Poland.

When the Senator speaks of varying degrees of independence of the satellite countries from the domination of Moscow, he is speaking of the puppet governments and not of a degree of independence or liberty of the people themselves. The American Legion would like nothing better than to help materially the people of all Communist dominated countries, but we do not believe that making concessions to their current masters will achieve the objective of restoring to the people the right to a government of their own choosing.

If we are indeed in the business of exploding old myths and exploring and acting upon new realities, as the Senator suggested in a speech on the floor of the Senate last March, I think we can explode the myth that the Red satellites of Eastern Europe are becoming more free to pursue their own destinies.

We should like to see the example of the possibility where, in any one of those unfortunate nations, it can reasonably be anticipated that the liberties of the people will be restored or that the government involved may become alined with the West.

Imagine, if you will, the fate of the freedom fighters should there be another uprising of patriots in Hungary or in any of the other satellite nations. Show us the example of a pro-Western vote by the enlightened Government of Yugoslavia in the United Nations. Show us the tendency of the new leaders of the Soviet Union to be more moderate and reasonable in their policies toward the Western World. How can we interpret the Kremlin's unqualified support of the Congo rebels, and the groundless condemnation of our humanitarian rescue effort, as moderate and reasonable overtures?

The cold, hard facts of life in the international arena fully explode the myth that our salvation lies along the route of accommodation, and mythful thinking will solve none of our problems.

Another myth suggested in that earlier speech before the Senate was the theory that the United States should accept the continued existence of the Castro regime in Cuba as a "distasteful nuisance," but not a threat except to other nations of the hemisphere.

It is the contention of the American Legion that a threat to one is a threat to all and that the security of the Western Hemisphere cannot be considered as a piecemeal arrangement. We believe the existence of a Communist government in the Western Hemisphere is inconsistent with the best interests of the United States, and a formidable threat not only to the United States but to the entire free world.

As reluctant as was official Washington to accept the cold reality of the Russian missile buildup in Cuba just a little more than 2 years ago, the fact remains that it did happen. The fact also remains that we have had no on-the-scene inspection to insure that all offensive missiles were removed. All the evidence indicates that the puppet strings by which Red Cuba is manipulated are controlled from Moscow. The "distasteful nuisance," which Castro alone might be, thus becomes a real and present menace when the power behind the puppet is realistically revealed.

Finally, in a news conference following his December 8 speech in Dallas, the Senator is reported to have expressed the view that involvement of Americans in a stepped-up war in Vietnam would be a "senseless effort," and that our aid program there should not have been undertaken in the first place.

The American Legion takes the opposite view and has pledged its approval and support of "increased commitment of American forces and full employment of those military measures which promise early and complete destruction of the forces of aggression—both at the places of their attacks and at their sources of power as military judgment decided—in an effort not only to preserve freedom in Southeast Asia but also as a part of our worldwide commitments to the defense of freedom against Communist aggression."

The American Legion believes, and by convention resolution has expressed the opinion, that the United States should explore the real possibilities of encouraging "the establishment of and to recognize and support a democratic Cuban government-in-exile."

The American Legion believes that if bridges are to be built they should be built in the direction of our free world allies to strengthen the understandings and cement the alliances which provide the best hope for thwarting the Communist dream of world conquest.

We believe that most Americans will agree with our positions on these vital issues. The course we advocate is not an easy one. It calls for faith, firmness and the facing of reality, yet we believe that in the defense of freedom there can be no compromise.

ENTRENCHMENT OF WELFARE STATE ON AMERICAN LIFE AND OUTLOOK

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a most persuasive and penetrating editorial was published in the Wall Street Journal of March 9, 1965.

More importantly, it contains a warning that many of us should heed: The slow but sure entrenchment of the welfare state in American life and outlook.

It details how the welfare-subsidy mentality pervades the message of the President of the United States. It underscores that:

> At every turn, almost every day, come these fresh proposals for sheltering the individual, for ruthlessly degrading the value of working and sacrificing and daring.

Many thoughtful citizens fear that one day, perhaps sooner than we think, all of us will wake up to find that we no longer have any say over our daily lives; that we have turned over to the Federal Government the initiative upon which this Nation was built.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "The Welfare of the Future," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WELFARE OF THE FUTURE

If any doubts remain that President Johnson intends to build a full-fledged welfare state, they should be dispelled by the accumulation of messages he is sending Congress. The plans go farther and faster than many of last fall's voters, bemused by thoughts on the President as perhaps somewhat conservative, could very well have considered likely.

Even those who welcome a welfare state as a kind of nebulous abstraction may be a bit abashed. In a sense we all want such a state, and to a large extent individual initiative, long relatively free of autocratic restrictions, has created a private welfare state.

What has to be considered about a publicly subsidized welfare state, in contrast, is not only the nature of the bounties proposed but also the unprecedented federalization of American life they entail. For the administration formula goes far beyond the traditional handouts to bigtime farmers, the aids to various other industries and to small business generally.

In addition to all of that, we now have plans for massive new Federal educational grants and loans, from construction to scholarships to textbook buying, implicitly denying the right of individuals and private institutions to make their own way. Federal camps to keep some youths away from the streets and their responsibilities. Medicare, a probable harbinger of Federal medical programs for all. A long step toward Federal administration of multistate regions like so-called Appalachia. New Federal interventions in the arts and humanities.

A particularly revealing insight into the welfare-subsidy mentality occurs in the President's new housing program. The proposal in question is for the Government to provide "rent supplements for families across a wide range of lower and moderate income brackets so they can afford decent housing."

As this idea is being interpreted, the actual housing would be built by private groups or nonprofit companies, with middle-income occupants paying 20 or 25 percent of their incomes for rent. The Federal Government would supply the landlords the difference between that amount and whatever would constitute an economic rent.

Now the definition of "middle income," like the definition of a true "poverty line," is debatable. But by any definition people of middle incomes, even if they are elderly and live in substandard housing, are not derelicts or irresponsibles or those whom unavoidable misfortune has laid completely low. For the most part they are, instead, people who have managed to make out so far. Are they the proper objects of subsidy?

Moreover, when the National Government furnishes direct payments to help individual families with so basic an item as rent (albeit there is dubious precedent in the farm programs), we would say it is establishing a relationship much too personal for comfort.

In view of that kind of intrusion, it is perhaps not surprising that the same housing message calls for a "temporary" national commission on urban codes, zoning and the like—which certainly sounds like incipient federalization of typically local responsibilities. Much more in the way of unhealthy intimacy can be found throughout the Presidential messages.

We recognize that the twin trends, expanding subsidies and expanding federalization, have long roots and are now being carried forward toward their inherently logical conclusions. We also concede that to do so is considered smart politics, especially when it is possible at the same time to appear friendly to the business community by the simple expedient of not setting out to trample it.

Finally, we suppose the administration would be more restrained did it not expect the people's representatives in Congress to go along with much of its welfare-subsidy state. In criticizing the administration, then, we are perforce criticizing all of us who have been too weak or apathetic or otherwise unavailing throughout all the years of developing Federal sprawl.

Still, there is irony, and not a little poignancy, in the rapidly advancing national state. It is all clothed in the rhetoric of the Great Society. Yet it is hard to imagine a morally shabbier society than one in which group after new group is encouraged to suck at one or more Federal subsidies, with all the individual debasement that implies.

Only the other day the President was telling young people they have to "work and sacrifice and dare" as members of the Great Society; they are living in the wrong generation if they want a sheltered and uneventful life. Yet at every turn, almost every day, come these fresh proposals for sheltering the individual, for ruthlessly degrading the value of working and sacrificing and daring.

That may be the most regrettable part: The young people now being so powerfully molded in a Federal pattern, with less and less chance to know the virtues and rewards of self reliance. Let us at least reflect that with their indoctrination the future welfare of free American institutions is also being inevitably fashioned.

THE SOYBEAN INDUSTRY—A SUCCESS STORY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, if anyone needs an example of a "success" story, he need only look to the soybean industry.

From 1946 to 1964, soybean production has risen from 203,395,000 bushels to 699 million bushels. In another 10 years, predicts one of the foremost spokesmen for the industry, Glenn H. Pogeler of Mason City, Iowa, production could reach the astronomical rate of 1.5 billion bushels.

Mr. Pogeler, in a speech delivered in Greenville, Miss., last January 29, confidently forecasts that his industry will find markets for this increased production. I do not doubt this. Since the Soybean Council of America was formed in 1956, exports of soybeans and soybean products have increased by 235 percent. In 1956, the total export value stood at $217.8 million; this had risen to $727 million by 1963–64. This is a remarkable and enviable record.

Because I believe this story merits the attention of all, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Pogeler's address before the Tri-State Soybean Forum in Greenville, Miss., be printed in the RECORD.

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

GLENN H. POGELER, SPEECH, TRISTATE SOYBEAN FORUM, GREENVILLE, MISS., JANUARY 29, 1965

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure for me to appear before the Ninth Annual Tri-state Soybean Forum here in Greenville, Miss. I thank you for inviting me. Your forum reminds me of another forum because just 5 weeks ago, I stood at the site of the ancient Roman Forum in Rome from where world trade was once controlled. We now have a worldwide market for soybeans.

Are you interested in doubling the production of soybeans by 1975? Would you like to take a bigger role in the fastest growing agricultural industry in the United States since 1930? You have already contributed much to this fantastic story, but I believe "you ain't seen nothing yet."

Let me briefly review what has taken place during a short period of less than 20 years. I promise you I did not come here today to bore you with facts, figures and dry statistics. Nevertheless, I must give you a tiny dose of statistics to freshen your mind on what has taken place in this short span of time.

First, let's talk about soybean production:

SOYBEANS PRODUCED

In 1946, 203,395,000 bushels; 1956, 449,251,000 bushels; 1964, 699 million bushels.

These figures alone point up a tremendous accomplishment by the farmers of this country. Where else in the world has this happened? How are we going to double by 1975? Here is how I think the job can be done:

1. Employing more acres of land. We have many idle acres and they can be put to work if need be.

2. Increased yields per acre. Now how will we do that? I suggest a number of ways:

(a) Better varieties.

(b) By soybean breeding research in finding a way to get soybeans to respond to direct fertilizer applications.

(c) Narrow row plantings.

(d) Better weed control, both chemical and mechanical.

(e) Using chemicals on plants to increase pod set and more soybeans per plant.

These projects alone or combined make for a man-sized job ahead.

SOYBEAN OIL PRODUCTION

In 1946, 1,454 million pounds; 1956, 3,200 million pounds; 1964, 5,100 million pounds.

Ninety percent of all soybean oil produced is now going into such products as margarine, shortening, salad oil, and cooking oil. The balance of 10 percent is going into industrial uses and refining uses. The U.S. market is still the No. 1 consumer. We must continue to expand this market. The U.S. industry is doing an excellent job of promoting the sale and is constantly upgrading the products.

SOYBEAN MEAL PRODUCTION

In 1946, 4,086,000 tons; 1956, 7,509,000 tons; 1964, 10,608,000 tons.

The demand generated by World War II food needs made it absolutely necessary that we increase on an explosion basis our protein supplies. Well, we did it with soybean meal; you all know the story.

In this Nation we literally have all kinds of meat sticking out of our ears. Poultry, beef, pork, turkeys, lamb, commercial fish production—you name it. What a success story in a hungry world.

Now let's talk about the soybean council and my subject, "Market Opportunities for Soybeans and Soybean Products." This part of my story covers the U.S. and oversea market.

About 10 years ago, Howard Roach, who is now chairman of the board and who hopes to retire in less than a year, along with other growers and processors, had the foresight and vision to see the tremendous potential in soybeans as the miracle crop. The Soybean Council of America was formed by the growers, processors, handlers, exporters, and others were invited who had an interest in the crop.

Since the soybean council was formed in 1956, the exports of soybeans and soybean products have increased by 235 percent. In 1956 the total export value stood at $217.8 million and by 1963–64 had risen to $727 million. These sales include dollar items and do not include donations.

The council contracts on a yearly basis to engage in market research, promotion, and development of oversea demand for soybeans and soybean products. We also help to promote other U.S. oilseeds if the foreign users have an interest. Our major emphasis for the last year or so has been on soybean oil which has been in a surplus category for some time. In spite of a fast growing demand domestically and a tremendous increase in oversea usage, our processing industry has been able to keep ahead of total usage. Just in the last 12 months have we been able to draw down stocks at a fairly rapid rate.

The council has been in operation since 1956 in the oversea market, and has recently evaluated its program and made some changes in its structure. We now have offices at Madrid, Hamburg, Brussels, Casablanca, Cairo, Ankara, Teheran, Karachi, New Delhi, and Bogatá in South America.

We have plans to open an office at Chittagong in east Pakistan.

Our operation is financed in two ways—the Washington, D.C., office, staff, travel, and all domestic expenses are paid for in dollars which are collected from growers, processors, soybean handlers, exporters, and other trade interests.

Overseas we use foreign currency which has been received by the U.S. Government in exchange for surplus farm commodities sold under the Public Law 480 program. This program is now called the food-for-peace program.

These funds are contracted by us through Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Rules and regulations are drawn up as to the authorized use of the funds and we work closely with FAS.

We also contract with industry and trade groups overseas to participate in our activities. They furnish money and manpower. These groups are called third-party cooperators. We have a number of projects going in countries where we have offices and also operate in quite a number of countries where we do not have a local office. The matching funds and programs are required under the terms of our contracts with Foreign Agricultural Service.

Our program consists of market research, demand studies, country statistics, using trade fairs, newspaper and magazine advertising, radio, recipe books, cooking demonstrations, symposiums and other media. All of these are used to expand the oversea market demand.

The oil promotion campaign has been directed to the oil-short areas such as the Mediterranean countries, the Middle East, Asia and South America. The per capita consumption of fats and oils in many countries is very low.

Soybeans are promoted in countries having a processing industry and where market demands exist for all of the processed products.

Demand for soybean meal is growing and we furnish much information on the nutritional qualities of soybean meal and on quality controls to many interested people.

Now for a few success stories before we wind up with some projections for the future.

The soybean council can point with pride to a number of success stories and the list grows as we receive marketing experience. We are fortunate in having a crop to sell that receives such a ready acceptance in the world. Nevertheless, commodities do not sell themselves and it takes more than an order book to successfully complete a sale. Proper processing, packaging, shipping, delivery and sales follow-up are all essentials to a satisfied customer.

As a starter let's use Spain as an example. When they began to buy oil from the United States, it all moved in barrels. Barrels, drumming and handling all cost money. Rotating stocks too is a problem. We assisted Spain in setting up bulk handling facilities. This has resulted in a considerable savings to the Spanish Government and trade. Savings of $20 to $30 per ton have resulted in switching from drummed shipments to bulk handling. Much technical assistance has been furnished by the United States and this results in more volume of business and better quality products.

We also offer the services of U.S. technicians to the refiner, packers, and handlers of soybean oil in Spain and other countries. As the quality of the product in the hands of consumers improves, so does local consumption.

Spain bought oil under Public Law 480 for a number of years, but now is our largest dollar customer.

In Germany we have supplied information on proper processing of soybean meal so that the crushers have been able to put out a much improved meal. Germany is the second largest importer of U.S. soybeans taking in 28,644,000 bushels last year.

In Japan, the American Soybean Association has conducted programs for a number of years. The result: Japan is the largest importer of U.S. soybeans, taking 45 million bushels last year. The American Soybean Association has used all the promotional devices available in Japan and the results speak for themselves.

I can repeat the story for almost every country in which we work, but let me give you one or two more examples and then move on to my predictions for the future.

How about the newest country to order soybean oil in quantity? I am now directing your attention to India.

India within a few days, will be unloading at Bombay the first 8,000 tons of approximately 75,000 tons of soybean oil which they will take in by midsummer. This oil will be used to produce Vanaspati which is the basic product for India. If the logjam there can be broken, we expect India to eventually become a large consumer of U.S. fats and oil. Four hundred and eighty million people growing in number at the rate of 2½ percent per year make a tremendous potential market. Are we going to make the best of this opportunity? It's up to us, but I assure you, this is no easy job. We have a real money problem here along with many others. India is desperately short of dollars and has to carefully control its money to make the best use of it. Along with the No. 1 problem of money are religious customs, eating habits, lack of handling facilities, a need for new knowledge in the refining and formulation of products. All of these problems are not solved overnight. We are furnishing technicians and expect to have our two oil technicians there when the first shipment arrives. Don't expect miracles, but we will do our best.

We have other stories along this line, but I believe it is time to move on to my projections for the future.

First, let's talk about soybeans which are your No. 1 interest here today.

I am projecting a rapid increase in production and would like to throw a crop of 1,500 million bushels in 1975 at you for your consideration. I am saying double the crop in 10 years. Is this too optimistic? I don't think so. If I am too high by 100 or 200 million, I can still point with pride to a terrific accomplishment.

You can produce the soybeans, but you are going to have to do a number of things:

1. Increase acreage by about 60 percent.
2. Increase yields up to 30 bushels per acre.
3. Net results: 50 million acres of beans times 30 bushels per acre equals 1,500 million bushels. Simple, isn't it? I believe you can do it, but how? By:
1. Better varieties.
2. Closer plantings.
3. Better weed control.
4. New chemicals to increase pod sets and beans.
5. Finding the key to allow soybeans to use direct fertilizer application to the soil.

Now we have the production problem settled. With tongue in cheek, I will tell you how we propose to dispose of the products. I am going to speak in general terms and since I am out on the limb so far anyway, I am reluctant to venture much farther.

On my recent trip overseas, I came home convinced that the world offers a tremendous market for our oilseed products. With the rapid increase in population along with the already pitifully low consumption in many areas, it seems to me that we simply must take advantage of this opportunity.

What is needed? We need to work diligently to expand the demand. The consumers are there waiting—we must cultivate the taste for new oilseed products. When people are exposed to them, they will come back for more. To sell, you must knock on doors. I personally believe we have the prospect for some sore knuckles ahead of us.

We need to service the market after the products are in the buyers' hands. They have to know how to use them and how to get the best results from all U.S. commodities. This means manpower is needed to follow up the first contacts to consummate a lasting business relationship. If the products are available to the market, then it's up to the U.S. industry to follow.

All of this takes money. We are using Public Law 480 funds, but we must match these funds with up to 50 percent of our own dollars or contributions by foreign cooperators. The food-for-peace program has been in existence for slightly over 10 years. I expect it to continue for some time at least. Nevertheless, we should be looking to the future and thinking of the day when we will take over the program without Government assistance. I place this before you for your future thinking.

Before I conclude, let me call your attention to some of the products that we believe could well be the important new products to take their place in the problem of feeding the human population of the world.

Remember, the world desperately needs fats and oils and proteins. These important nutritional needs have been documented by many world organizations.

The calorie needs can be met by additional supplies of fats and oils. Soybeans will take a leading role in filling the gap—but, how about protein? The shortage of this essential dietary component has long been recognized.

Meat has long been a great supplier of this need, but in some nations of the world meat is not consumed because of religious restrictions. Soybean protein can fill this gap.

What are some of these products? Let's name a few: soy beverage, soy grits, soy flour, whole soybeans as food and soy protein as meat replacer are a few.

The U.S. Government, at the present time, is preparing specifications to ask for offers on 7,500 tons of soybean beverage and soybean grits. These products are to be tested among schoolchildren for their acceptability in about half a dozen countries.

Acceptance of these products could literally open up a Pandora's box of demand. The soybean could then be truly called upon to feed the world.

The Soybean Council is working closely with the Government to assist them in drawing up the specifications and arrangements necessary to acquire the products for testing.

Yes, we have a lot of history left to write, and the lowly immigrant from China will probably be asked to help do the job.

In the meantime, we hope to continue to be effective and to do the job you expect of us. We need your support and your help. I thank you for your kind support in the past.

DEATH OF DR. VIRGIL HANCHER, FORMER PRESIDENT OF UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, when Dr. Virgil Hancher died on January 30, Iowa and the Nation lost a great educator.

As president of the State University of Iowa for nearly a quarter century, Dr. Hancher was a leader in shaping education in the Nation. During his tenure, SUI doubled its student enrollment and tripled its original size.

As the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Gazette, stated it:

He never let down in his efforts to interpret those needs to the public, and particularly to the legislature, in ways that would

result in greater financial support for the institution.

Mr. President, I was privileged to be a member of the Iowa Legislature during some of the years when Dr. Hancher used to interpret these needs to the legislature. I can vouch for the effectiveness with which he did so.

The United States lost a forceful spokesman when he died in India while serving with the Ford Foundation only a few months after his retirement as president of the State University of Iowa.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "A Friend's Tribute," published in the Fort Dodge Messenger, and an editorial entitled "So Little Time," published in the Cedar Rapids Gazette, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Fort Dodge (Iowa) Messenger, Feb. 5, 1965]

A FRIEND'S TRIBUTE

Dr. Virgil Hancher, who headed the University of Iowa for 23 years until his retirement last June, was a man who deserved the numerous eloquent tributes which have been paid to him since his death in India last Saturday.

His career during a time when the university grew 3½ times its original size and student enrollment doubled has been amply publicized. The Rolfe-born and raised lawyer-educator is held in especially high esteem in this area—he was truly one of northwest Iowa's most famous and best loved sons.

No one we know could better sum up the human side of Dr. Hancher than W. Earl Hall, longtime editor of the Mason City Globe-Gazette who as a member of the board of regents was instrumental in bringing him back to Iowa to head the university. Mr. Hall, who retired from the Mason City editorship 2 years ago, was a close friend of Dr. Hancher from the time they met as freshmen on the Iowa campus in 1914. Here is the moving tribute Mr. Hall had paid to his departed friend:

"I never knew anybody more considerate of those about him, or more sympathetic with them in their problems.

"I never knew anybody with a greater affection in life, or a greater veneration in death, than he had for his wonderful parents. This quality was manifest in him as husband and father.

"I never knew anybody as articulate in conversation or public address. His comprehension of our language gave him a word for the finest shades of meaning. I heard him speak publicly countless times and I never once heard him make a poor speech.

"But just as important * * * maybe more so * * * he was a wonderful listener.

"I never knew anybody with as complete a stock of appropriate stories.

"I never knew a layman with as profound an understanding of the Bible.

"I have seen him in his moments of righteous indignation, but I never saw him lose control of his temper.

"Even in our student days, I had Virgil Hancher pegged for greatness. So did everybody else who knew him. I thought in terms of statesmanship, governor, then senator, perhaps.

"It didn't turn out that way. And I am persuaded that from the standpoint of total contribution to his day and age, the path he took was the right one.

"His was a life of supreme usefulness.

"Virgil Hanchers don't come along very often. There will never be another one so far as I am concerned."

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette, Feb. 3, 1965]

SO LITTLE TIME

Most poignant element in the sorrow and shock thousands of Iowans felt on hearing of the sudden death of Dr. Virgil M. Hancher doubtless was regret that he and his good wife had only a few months to enjoy a well-deserved respite from the long strain of administering of a large and growing State university.

Much of Dr. Hancher's quarter-century tenure of the presidency of the University of Iowa was a constant and discouraging struggle to meet steadily mounting needs with inadequate resources. He never let down in his efforts to interpret those needs to the public, and particularly to the legislature, in ways that would result in greater financial support for the institution. But he well knew that it was a struggle which would have no ending, and its recurring skirmishes often brought him disappointment bordering on despair.

After 24 years of that, even though he could look back on an outstanding record of accomplishment, it is quite understandable that he looked forward to lessened pressure and fresh experiences in the new undertaking that followed his retirement from the university post. It is a pity that he had so little time to savor them. One consoling thought is that the occasion of Dr. Hancher's retirement inspired his many friends to say while he could still hear them the things they will continue to say about him for many years in the future.

REAPPORTIONMENT: SHALL THE COURT OR THE PEOPLE DECIDE?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, an article entitled "Reapportionment: Shall the Court or the People Decide?" written by Holman Harvey and Kenneth O. Gilmore, was published in the March 1965 Reader's Digest. Because of its timeliness in connection with the hearings that are now in progress before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concerning the proposed constitutional amendment, of which I happen to be a cosponsor, I believe the article will be of terest to readers of the RECORD; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REAPPORTIONMENT: SHALL THE COURT OR THE PEOPLE DECIDE?

(By Holman Harvey and Kenneth O. Gilmore)

It is more than a power struggle between city dwellers and country dwellers. At issue in today's political battles over the makeup of State legislatures are fundamental principles of democratic representation.

Lightning struck last June 15 when the Supreme Court handed down its "one man, one vote" reapportionment decision. This decree requires both branches of every State legislature to be strictly based on population only. It represents the most far-reaching change in American political structure since our Constitution was written 178 years ago.

Few issues in recent times have stirred more controversy or created more confusion. Nearly every State in the Nation—from Montana to Maryland, from Alaska to Florida—is struggling to satisfy the Federal judiciary's order. A dozen States have already remapped their legislative districts. Others are desperately trying to meet Court-imposed deadlines or to devise delaying tactics. In the meantime, proposals for a constitutional amendment reversing the Court's action are being seriously debated in Congress and in the States.

Make no mistake, we are at a crossroads: our form of government is in a major crisis. What then are the stakes?

REPRESENT THE PEOPLE

"The basic issue," says Robert G. Dixon, Jr., professor of law at George Washington University, "is not simply 'one-man, one-vote.' It is fair representation, a concept which philosophers and politicians have been arguing about for ages."

Since the beginnings of democracy in the Greek city-states, man has groped for the best ways to govern himself and to achieve a true representation of the people's will. As far back as the 11th century England began to move painfully toward more representative government; kings formed various councils consisting of lords, clerics, and powerful landowners. Later, townships, boroughs and counties were called into councils—originally to be consulted on property taxes.

In America at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787, this was the essential question: How could a balanced genuinely representative form of government be achieved, one that would reflect the majority will while protecting the minority and preventing mob rule? A solution was hammered out by our forefathers. So that the large States could not be controlled by the small or the small steamrollered by the large, a two-house plan was born, with a House of Representatives based on population and a Senate based on geography.

Thomas Jefferson is reputed to have asked George Washington why he favored the system. Washington asked Jefferson why he poured his coffee from cup to saucer. "To cool it" was the response.

"Even so," Washington said, "we pour legislation into the senatorial saucer to cool it."

As America matured into the world's first successful example of modern constitutional democracy, States adopted the Federal two-house system. By 1961, all but 11 States had constitutions that took into account interests other than population—geographic factors, mainly—so as to achieve fair representation. Missouri's "Little Federal" system furnishes an example. One house is apportioned on the basis of districts of fairly equal population in both city and rural areas, with districts adjusted every 10 years. In the other chamber each of the 114 counties has at least 1 member. Under these provisions, cooperation between city and rural areas is a valued tradition.

THE CHICKEN VOTE

But—and this is where the rub came—as America's cities grew, some States neglected to reapportion their lower houses. The result was, in many States, unjust rural domination of legislatures. Delaware's house districts had not changed since 1897. So unbalanced was Connecticut's house of representatives that one vote in a rural town was worth 429 votes in Hartford. In New Hampshire's lower house, one district had 1,000 times more residents than another.

One remiss State was Tennessee, with no revisions since 1901. A group went to court to force reapportionment of the assembly, with Memphis resident Charles W. Baker suing the secretary of state, Joe C. Carr. "The pigs and chickens in our smaller counties have better representation in the Tennessee Legislature than the people of Nashville," declared that city's mayor.

The case reached the Supreme Court. Contrary to all previous decisions—and to Justice Felix Frankfurter's warning that the judiciary "ought not to enter this political thicket"—the Court ruled in 1962 that State legislative districts are subject to its judicial scrutiny.

The *Baker* v. *Carr* decision was a bombshell. It spawned similar reapportionment suits in 34 States. So varied were the court interpretations that cases from six states—Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Virginia—were appealed to the High Tribunal.

Then on June 15, 1964, the nine black-robed men filed into the marbled chambers and handed down their shattering decision. In four cases the voting was eight to one; in the other two, six to three. In all cases, the long-established "Little Federal" system was knocked out. Chief Justice Earl Warren justified the decision on the provision of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution which requires that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." He wrote: "Legislators represent people, not trees or acres. Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests."

QUESTION THE WISDOM

There were vigorous dissents to the decision, Justice Potter Stewart noted: "The Court's draconian pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, or in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union."

"It is difficult to imagine a more intolerable and inappropriate interference by the judiciary with the independent legislatures of the States," said Justice John M. Harlan. "Peoples are not ciphers, legislators can represent their electors only by speaking for their interests—economic, social, political—many of which do reflect where the electors live."

Aroused critics from both political parties questioned the wisdom of the Court's fiat. The Wall Street Journal summed up the feelings of many when it said, "The Court had a chance to bolster our traditions by requiring one house truly on population, and permitting the other on a geographical or other basis to reflect common interests. Instead of stopping with that, its fiat threw out institutions painfully wrought by experience and tried to substitute abstract theory."

The House of Representatives was so incensed that it rammed through a bill stripping all Federal courts of the power to hear or review State legislative apportionment cases. The Senate passed a "sense of Congress" with the purpose of asking the courts to go slow in forcing State legislatures to fall into line until the whole matter could be reviewed.

PROBLEMS THAT COUNT

Today, as this momentous issue is debated across the land, every citizen should ponder these points:

(1) The Court's decree threatens to spark a chain reaction that may go all the way down to the school board level. There are 3,072 counties in the United States, and 91,185 local governments. How long will it be before the Federal courts poke into each of these units of representative democracy to take head counts and draw boundary lines? A Michigan court recently told Kent County's board of supervisors that it must be reapportioned on a population-only basis. Other suits have been filed in New York and California. Where, exactly, will it end?

"Carry the Court's decision to its logical conclusion," says William S. White, Pulitzer Prize-winning biographer and journalist, "and even the historic and deliberate population imbalance in the U.S. Senate could not in any logic longer prevail." After all, Nevada's 285,000 citizens elect as many U.S. Senators as do New York's 17 million.

(2) The decision will swing the pendulum from legislatures with outdated apportionment and too much rural weight, to legislatures under the raw control of metropolitan vote-getting machines. In 25 States, more than half the population resides in metropolitan areas. In 14 States, three populous counties or fewer will elect more than 50 percent of the legislators.[1] America's sprawling urban areas will call the shots, up and down the land. Chicago will hold sway over Illinois, Detroit over Michigan, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh over Pennsylvania, Phoenix over Arizona, and Las Vegas over Nevada.

The specter of raids on State treasuries by metropolitan-dominated legislatures concerns many. They see pressures mounting for more State funds for urban renewal, relief cases and public housing—with many of the funds being matched by U.S. tax dollars. These spending programs in turn will garner more votes for the city machines. Mayors in some States may soon be far more influential than the Governor.

New York is perhaps the most vivid case. Here 38 percent of the population has been able to elect a majority in the senate, thus protecting certain underpopulated counties of this large State with all its diverse interest. But, under the Court's rule, it is only a matter of time before the New York City metropolitan area, with 63 percent of the State's population, will be completely dominant.

(3) Some groups of voters can be wiped out, under a "winner-take-all" numerical system. The Court's decision, notes the Christian Science Monitor, "will tend to weaken the complex American system for diffusing power and protecting minorities." For example, under a purely numerical system of redistricting, South Dakota's 30,000 Indians, who live in huge reservations covering entire counties, will lose two State senators who now watch out for their interests.

Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, says: "People have ever-changing problems that sometimes fail to yield to computer logic. Some may be lumbermen, miners, fishermen, or farmers. Some may be of one religion or national origin peculiar in need or consideration. Some may direct their needs toward secondary roads or superhighways, while others are more concerned about the rapid-transit system. Certainly the majority must have effective rule, but the minority, too, is entitled to effective representation, lest important segments of our people be completely subject to the tyranny of a temporary majority."

Chief Justice Warren himself declared, in 1948, when he was Governor of California: "Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting the representation in the (State) senate to a strictly population basis."

(4) The Court's decree is a dangerous intrusion by the Federal judiciary into the political affairs of the States. Hardly was the "one-man one-vote" decision announced before lower courts showed how fast and how far they were willing to muscle in on the deliberations of State governments. Just 2 days after the June 15 decision, a U.S. district court directed the Michigan Apportionment Commission to come up with a districting plan in 48 hours. In a Vermont case appealed to the Supreme Court, it was ruled in January that the legislature must decide upon a plan and then disband—even though this defies the State constitution.

In Oklahoma a three-man Federal district court ignored the machinery set up by the State for reapportionment and autocratically undertook to rearrange the State's legislative districts itself. It set up a master plan that was a nightmare of free-floating voting zones and mistakes. Angrily, Oklahoma's Senator MIKE MONRONEY said: "Hasty and ill-advised redistricting formulas promulgated by the courts can result in confusion and inequities. Good local self-government cannot be imposed from above. It must be generated by the people themselves."

(5) The Court's edict means that the citizens of a State can no longer decide upon their own form of representative government. One of the six States involved in the Court's June 15 ruling was Colorado. Few States have so diligently attempted to work out a method of representation tailored to their own unique characteristics. Since it became a State in 1876, its legislature has been reapportioned five times. In the spring of 1962, citizens' groups gathered to work out a reapportionment amendment that would keep pace with the State's increasing urban growth. They split into two camps. One wanted both houses of the general assembly based on population alone; the other supported a "Federal plan," keeping geographic representation in the senate.

Each side took its case to the public. They fought up and down the State with countless speeches, debates, newspaper ads, billboard posters, radio and TV spots. This referendum overshadowed all other election issues in Colorado that year. And the outcome was stunningly clear. The Federal plan won by 305,700 to 172,725. It carried every county in the State.

The amendment was challenged; it was upheld by a Federal district court. And then, on June 15, the Supreme Court threw out Colorado's plan. In an amazing statement, Chief Justice Warren said that, because the plan adopted was contrary to the Court's new ruling, Colorado's referendum vote was "without Federal constitutional significance."

There were stinging dissents. Said Justice Tom C. Clark: "Colorado, by an overwhelming vote, has written the organization of its legislative body into its constitution. In striking down Colorado's plan of apportionment, the Court is invading the valid functioning of the procedures of the States, and thereby commits a grievous error which will do irreparable damage to our Federal-State relationship."

Today Colorado's senate has been redrawn to satisfy the Court. But the issue is still being debated. Meanwhile, the voters wonder what, if anything, their ballot is worth, or their State constitution.

WILL OF THE PEOPLE

Only one recourse is left to American citizens who wish to restore our representative system to its original integrity: an amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Today in Congress, and in the States, forces are gathering behind proposals that would:

1. Guarantee the citizens of every State the right to decide for themselves, by one-man one-vote ballot, the apportionment of their own legislature.

2. Guarantee that this power will not be curtailed or reviewed by any Federal court.

3. Guarantee that one house of each legislature can reflect factors other than population if such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people.

This in essence would be the 25th amendment to the Constitution. Whether it is passed in Congress and ratified by the States will depend upon the support it receives from the American people. The stakes are

[1] Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington.

high—as high as the preservation of our Republic.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 352) providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble 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, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the wish of the Senate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate concur in the desire of the House to welcome the President in joint session.

PROTECTION OF RIGHT OF INDIVIDUALS TO REGISTER AND VOTE

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and a bipartisan group of Senators, namely, Senators CASE, CLARK, COOPER, FONG, HART, JAVITS, MCNAMARA, PROXMIRE, and SCOTT, I introduce a bill to protect the rights of individuals to register and to vote in State and Federal elections without discrimination because of race or color.

A bipartisan group of Senators, in keeping with our long established practice developed over a period of years, has been working together this winter for many weeks to develop a more effective voting rights bill, and detailed drafts have been prepared and subjected to criticism and review.

The deplorable events at Selma and elsewhere have shocked us all and intensified our desire to develop and aid in the passage of an adequate bill.

INTENTION TO INTRODUCE BILL ANNOUNCED

Last Thursday a group of 10 Senators—virtually identical with those who are now sponsoring this bill—announced that they intended to introduce such a bill today, Monday, March 15, and that it should be a bill, and not a proposed constitutional amendment; that it should apply to State and local elections as well as national elections; that it should outlaw literacy and other tests designed to deny the right to vote; that it should provide for appointment of Federal voting registrars by the President, who would be brought into existence almost automatically by certain objective and standard requirements.

It is in keeping with this promise which we made to the country and to our constituents that the present group is now introducing this bill, which I ask unanimous consent may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1517) to protect the right of individuals to register and to vote in State and Federal elections without discrimination because of race or color, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

APPLIES TO STATE AND LOCAL ELECTIONS AS WELL TO FEDERAL ELECTIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there are several features of the bill which I think should be noted.

First. It applies to Federal, State, and local elections. It is necessary to have a bill apply to State and local elections if the right to vote is to be made meaningful. We believe that there is abundant constitutional justification for the application of a bill to State and local elections under the first and second sections of the 15th amendment to the Constitution, and also under certain provisions of the 14th amendment to the Constitution, primarily the equal protection of the laws clause.

OUTLAWS LITERACY TESTS

Second. The bill outlaws all literacy tests in those areas of the country where there has been discrimination against Negroes. Specifically, it outlaws literacy tests in Mississippi, Alabama, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, and Louisiana.

OUTLAWS OTHER TESTS

Third. The bill also outlaws other methods of discrimination in those areas, such as tests of moral character and requirements that there should be other persons who would vouch for applicants for registration. It sweeps away the discriminatory provisions which have been passed in many Southern States since the epoch-making civil rights decision of the Supreme Court in May of 1954.

AUTOMATIC APPOINTMENT OF REGISTRARS

Fourth. The bill provides for Federal registrars wherever there is discrimination in registration and/or voting, and it makes the appointment of registrars practically automatic.

Thus, wherever less than 25 percent of the total number of Negroes of voting age residing in any county were not registered to vote in the national election of 1964, the President must appoint Federal registrars within 90 days of the enactment of the bill.

He must also appoint them whenever less than 50 percent of the total number of persons of voting age voted in the November 1964 election if 20 persons file a written petition alleging denial of their efforts to register.

Fifth. These Federal registrars are to be selected from existing governmental officials who occupy the status of grade 12 or above in the civil or postal service, and they can be drawn from the country as a whole, and need not be drawn from any given judicial district, State, or local political subdivision.

SIMPLE QUALIFICATIONS

Sixth. The Federal registrars will register everyone who meets State qualifications of age, residence, citizenship, mental competency, and absence of the conviction of a felony. These qualifications are frozen as of May 17, 1964.

POWER TO CAST VOTE AND HAVE IT COUNTED

Seven. The bill provides that anyone who is registered by a Federal registrar must be accorded the right to vote in all elections and provides for enforcement of this right, including the staying of the certification of results of any election in which persons federally registered have been denied the right to vote.

STATE POLL TAXES OUTLAWED

Eighth. The bill outlaws poll taxes in all State and local elections.

WELCOME PRESIDENT'S BILL

Mr. President, perhaps I should say a word about the relationship of this bill to the welcomed message of the President tonight and to the bill which it is reported the Department of Justice is drafting.

The present bill, as I have said, has been under discussion and detailed drafting now for many weeks.

We have had a productive interchange of views between ourselves and the members of the Justice Department, especially during the last week. We wish to commend the President for the splendid way in which he has taken up the challenge of Selma, for his excellent statement to the country on Saturday, and for what we believe will be an epoch-making Presidential address tonight.

COOPERATIVE EFFORT

The bill is in no sense a rival to the bill which will be introduced on behalf of the Justice Department in a few days. As I have stated, it has been a cooperative relationship between the drafters of our bill, the Senators sponsoring it, and the Department of Justice. We may well have learned certain things from them. It is possible that they may have learned certain things from us. This is a highly important subject. There are many issues involved. We believe that the general good is served if we have alternative drafts before the Senate and before the country. We believe that these alternative drafts will result in a healthy dialog over the issues. I do not believe that there will be any division over the purposes. We seek the most effective measure that we can get. For the benefit of the public this bill is merely our expression of what we believe a voting bill should be like, and we ask that it be studied and scrutinized.

In conclusion, let me read into the RECORD a telegram which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and I have just received:

The introduction of the bipartisan voting rights bill is a great opportunity to enact a Federal statute which will put an end to the continued denial of the right to vote. We commend you, your colleagues, and the senatorial staff members for the serious, tireless, and effective manner in which you have

sought to cover all valid complaints against racial discrimination in registration and voting. We appreciate the numerous and extensive conferences held during the past weeks and months since the 89th Congress began. For our part we have sought to present and discuss the views that we were authorized to state on behalf of our associates in the civil rights struggle for justice and equality under law. As always, we have found attentive ears and cooperative hearts among those who today sponsor this bill.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Sr.,
General Counsel, UAW,
Vice Chairman, Americans for Democratic Action.

CLARENCE MITCHELL,
Director, Washington Bureau, NAACP.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The following States have literacy laws that would be effected by this act: Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.

The following States in the 1964 presidential election had fewer than 50 percent of those of voting age actually voting in the election:

	Percent
Alaska	48.7
Louisiana	47.3
Texas	44.0
Arkansas	49.8
Virginia	41.0
Alabama	36.0
South Carolina	38.0
Georgia	43.2
Mississippi	32.9

The following States in 1964 are estimated to have had less than 50 percent of the Negro population of voting age registered in 1964:

	Percent
Alabama	23.0
Arkansas	49.3
Georgia	44.0
Louisiana	32.0
Mississippi	6.7
North Carolina	46.8
South Carolina	38.8
Virginia	45.7

EXHIBIT 1

S. 1517

A bill to protect the right of individuals to register and to vote in State and Federal elections without discrimination because of race or color

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Voting Rights Act of 1965".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that the denial or infringement of the right to vote because of race or color is a violation of the fourteenth and fifteenth Amendments of the Constitution of the United States and of the legislation adopted by the Congress to enforce those amendments, including the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the Civil Rights Act of 1960, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Congress finds that, despite those enactments, the right to vote continues to be denied to many citizens of the United States on grounds of their race or color, and that the methods prescribed in this Act are the only available means of assuring all citizens their right to vote.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "election" means any general, special, or primary election held in any State or political subdivision thereof solely or partially for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate to public office; and any election held in any State or political subdivision thereof solely or partially to decide a proposition or issue of public law.

(b) The term "voting district" means any county, parish, or similar political subdivision of a State, or any political subdivision of a State which is independent of the political jurisdiction of a county, parish, or similar political subdivision. If there are no counties, parishes, or similar political subdivisions of a State, such State shall, for the purposes of this Act, constitute a single voting district.

(c) The term "test" includes (i) any test of, or condition of registration or voting requiring, the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter; (ii) any test of moral character; (iii) any requirement that other persons vouch for or act as witness for applicants for registration.

(d) The term "mental competency" means absence of an adjudication of mental incompetency.

TITLE I—LITERACY AND OTHER TESTS

SEC. 101. (a) Congress hereby finds that—

(i) The unconstitutional segregation of educational and other facilities on grounds of race or color in various States has resulted in inequalities of educational attainment and opportunity which render tests in such States discriminatory on grounds of race or color;

(ii) tests have been utilized in various States as an instrument of discrimination on grounds of race or color through the use of arbitrary standards, unfair decisions, and similar devices; and

(iii) tests have been required of persons of one race or color as a condition of registration and voting in various States at the same time that such tests have not been required of another race or color.

(b) Congress further finds that in any State employing a test—

(i) where the number of persons of any race or color of voting age residing in such State who were registered to vote at the time of the November 1964 election was less than 50 per centum of the number of all persons of such race or color of voting age then residing in such State; or

(ii) where less than 50 per centum of the persons of voting age residing in such State voted in the November 1964 election,

such test has been and is being utilized as an instrument of discrimination in violation of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution.

SEC. 102. Within sixty days of the enactment of this Act, the President shall certify and cause to be published in the Federal Register a list of those States to which either numerical finding in section 101(b) applies.

SEC. 103. In any State listed in accordance with section 102, the application of any test to a person seeking to register or vote in a Federal, State or local election, is hereby prohibited.

SEC. 104. The provisions of section 103 shall remain in effect in any State unless and until the President shall certify that discrimination in registration and voting in that State has terminated and that there is no substantial risk of any renewed discrimination.

SEC. 105. The provisions of this title shall be enforceable:

(a) By appropriate civil actions instituted in the district courts of the United States by the Attorney General, for or in the name of the United States; and

(b) By the appointment of a Federal registrar or registrars in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 106. The contempt provisions of section 151 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and the three-judge court provisions of section 101(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall be applicable to proceedings brought under section 105(a).

TITLE II—FEDERAL REGISTRARS

Appointment of Federal registrars

SEC. 201. (a) The President shall, within ninety days after the enactment of this Act, establish an office of Federal registrar for any voting district, if the President determines that the total number of persons of any race or color who were registered to vote in the November 1964 election in such voting district for the purpose of electing any candidate for the office of President is less than 25 per centum of the total number of all persons of such race or color of voting age residing in such voting district.

(b) In addition, the President shall establish an office of Federal registrar for any voting district at any time thereafter that the total number of persons of any race or color who are registered to vote in any succeeding general election is less than 25 per centum of the total number of all persons of such race or color of voting age residing in such voting district.

(c) Whenever twenty or more persons residing in a voting district file a written petition with the President alleging denial of their right to register to vote in any election in such voting district on account of their race or color, the President shall establish an office of Federal registrar in such voting district if he has reason to believe such allegations are true, and—

(i) the voting district is one in which less than 50 per centum of the total number of all persons of voting age residing therein voted in the November 1964 election, or

(ii) the voting district is in a State where less than 50 per centum of the total number of all persons of voting age residing in the entire State voted in the November 1964, election.

(d) Upon the establishment of an office of Federal registrar in any voting district, the President shall appoint a sufficient number of Federal registrars for such voting district to achieve the purpose of this title from among officers or employees of the United States who receive basic compensation at a rate of basic salary which is equivalent to at least grade 12 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949. Each individual, so appointed as a Federal registrar, shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for his regular office or employment, but while engaged in the performance of the duties of a registrar shall be allowed travel and subsistence expenses while away from his home or regular post of duty in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

(e) Each individual who is appointed a Federal registrar for a voting district shall perform the duties required by this Act, as may be designated by the President, until such time as he is relieved of such duties by the President, or until the office of Federal registrar for such voting district is terminated by the President as provided in subsection (f).

(f) Whenever the President determines that denial of the right to vote has ceased in any voting district for which he has established an office of Federal registrar, he shall terminate the office of Federal registrar for such voting district.

(g) If, after the termination of the office of Federal registrar for a voting district, the President determines in accordance with subsections (b) or (c) that it is necessary and appropriate to reestablish the office for such

voting district in order to enforce the provisions of this Act, he shall do so and appoint one or more Federal registrars for such area as provided in subsection (d).

Registration by Federal registrars

SEC. 202. The Congress hereby finds:

(a) The qualifications and other conditions prescribed by State laws for voting, or registering to vote, in Federal and State elections, other than qualifications based upon age, residence, citizenship, mental competency, and absence of conviction for a felony, are susceptible of use, and have been used, to deny persons the right to vote, because of their race or color; and

(b) The application of qualifications and other conditions by Federal registrars appointed under this title, other than those excepted in subsection (a), would impede and obstruct Federal registrars in the performance of their duties.

SEC. 203. (a) The Federal registrar or registrars for any voting district shall, upon application therefor, register to vote in elections held in such voting district any individual whom the Federal registrar finds to have the requisite qualifications as to citizenship, age, residence, mental competency, and absence of conviction for a felony under the laws of the State in which such voting district is located. An individual so registered by a Federal registrar shall receive a certificate identifying him as a person so qualified to vote in such elections.

(b) If a State imposes or has imposed qualifications with respect to citizenship, age, residence, mental competency, or absence of conviction for a felony more restrictive than those in effect on May 17, 1954, the Federal registrar or registrars in that State shall apply the State law in effect on May 17, 1954.

(c) The Federal registrar or registrars for any voting district shall conform to regulations promulgated by the President with respect to the time, place and manner of the performance of the duties prescribed by this Act.

(d) The Federal registrar or registrars of any voting district shall, from time to time, transmit certifications to the proper State and local officials of the individuals who have been registered by them. Such certifications shall be final and not subject to judicial review except as provided in section 205.

(e) All persons certified for registration by Federal registrars in a voting district shall continue to be entitled to vote in any election held in such voting district during the period of service of a Federal registrar in such district, notwithstanding the requirement of reregistration or any other requirement by the State in which such voting district is located. After the office of Federal registrar for any voting district is terminated, all persons certified for registration by Federal registrars in such voting district shall continue to be entitled to vote in any election held in such voting district, if reregistration is required under the laws of the State in which such voting district is located, until they have a reasonable opportunity to reregister without discrimination on account of their race or color.

Voting in elections

SEC. 204. Each individual who is registered by a Federal registrar pursuant to section 203 shall have the right to vote, and to have such vote counted, in any election held in the voting district where he resides during the effective period of his registration, unless after his registration and prior to any such election the Federal registrar determines that by reason of any of the qualifications specified in section 203(a) of this Act he has become ineligible to vote in such elections.

Enforcement

SEC. 205. (a) Any challenge to the eligibility to vote of persons registered under section 203 of this Act, or any review of the denial of registration by a Federal registrar under section 203 shall be within the sole jurisdiction of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the voting district is located. Each person registered under this Act shall be permitted to cast his vote and have it counted pending the determination by the reviewing court of the validity of such challenge or challenges. Any challenge to the eligibility of a person to register under this Act shall be made within five days following such registration, except that challenge shall be in order in any case of fraud or ineligibility arising after registration.

(b) The provisions of this Act shall be enforceable by appropriate civil actions instituted in the district courts of the United States by the Attorney General, for or in the name of the United States. When necessary to assure persons registered under this Act of the right to vote and to have their votes counted, the district court concerned shall issue permanent or temporary injunctions or other orders directed to appropriate State or local voting officials, requiring them to permit persons so registered to cast their votes and have them counted and staying the certification of the results of such election pending the determination by the court in the case involved.

(c) The provisions of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971) shall be applicable with respect to all cases of criminal contempt arising under the provisions of this Act.

(d) The provisions of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971) shall be applicable with respect to all threats of intimidation or coercion of persons seeking to register and vote under the provisions of this Act.

Continued effect pending judicial review

SEC. 206. In any case in which a challenge is made to the constitutionality of this Act, the appropriate reviewing court shall issue an order authorizing the provisions of this Act and the authority granted therefrom to continue in effect pending determination of the validity of such challenge..

TITLE III—PROHIBITION OF POLL TAXES

SEC. 301. The Congress hereby finds:

(a) That the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting has historically been one of the methods used to circumvent the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, and that the passage of laws establishing such a requirement in the States still retaining this requirement was for the purpose, in whole or in part, of denying persons the right to vote because of race or color, and that this requirement has been and is being applied discriminatorily so as to deprive persons of the right to vote because of race or color;

(b) That the requirement of the payment of poll tax as a condition upon a prerequisite to voting is not a bona fide qualification of an elector, but an arbitrary and unreasonable restriction upon the right to vote in violation of the 14th and 15th amendments.

SEC. 302. No State shall require the payment of a poll tax as a condition upon or a prerequisite to voting in any election conducted under its authority.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Section 2004 of the Revised Statutes

SEC. 402. Section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971), is amended as follows:

(a) In subsections (a)(2) and (c), strike out "Federal", immediately preceding "election", wherever it appears in such subsections.

(b) Strike out subsection (f) thereof.

Exercise of functions conferred upon President

SEC. 403. (a) The President may delegate authority to exercise any of the functions conferred upon him by this Act to such officer of the United States Government as he shall direct.

(b) In making numerical determinations required under this Act, the President may make such determinations on the best statistical information available to him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] will deal with this subject as will I. The bipartisan cooperation we have met with is typified by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and other Senators; namely, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], who have joined with an equal number of Republican Senators in cosponsoring the bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. This bipartisanship has been a source of great inspiration to me, and of great sustenance and support in the civil rights struggle.

This must be clearly understood: the introduction of this bill is in no sense a race or rivalry with the President's message, to be delivered tonight, in what we hope will result in an even better bill than ours. All that we are trying to do is to erect a standard both in terms and in time, and to utilize that standard for the purpose of advancing the enactment, at the earliest possible moment, of a voting rights bill, which has been shown to be so critically necessary.

The real spark in this matter is the danger to the country now. We see that justice has been too long deferred in the voting rights field. Let us not forget what happened in 1957, 1960, and 1964, when men like the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators, including myself, wore our hearts out trying to get the terms which are now being incorporated into the bill, or at least terms like them. We saw coming exactly what has occurred. Of all the problems which we could not defer, the denial of voting rights is the most important.

I emphasize, therefore, that this bill sets an optimum standard both as to timing and as to terms. Representing the great State of New York, nothing would please me better than to see the administration racing far ahead of us both in terms and in time, and to have one steady march of progress along the track, in the hands of those who are dedicated to seeing to it that Negroes get the right to vote—to put it bluntly and simply.

Selma has aroused the country to the reality of the situation, that elementary justice calls for action on the part of Congress.

We do not know what the administration bill provides for. We have not seen it. We have seen many reports of what it will contain. We have been acquainted with some drafts. From what we know about it, I believe that our bill contains

certain principal provisions which should be followed. One of those provisions would be the elimination of the poll tax in State and local elections, which we believe to be important. Another of the provisions would be the appointment of registrars from among Federal officials who need not be residents of the voting district in order to serve there. Another provision would trigger the appointment of registrars where there are an unusually small number of Negroes registered, according to the best figures available to the President. Finally, the President should appoint the registrars, which would give them the greatest prestige and authority.

We believe that this problem is one on which the country should be able to get together, including our southern friends, who have themselves often stated that the right to vote is one right they do not challenge, even considering the so-called social order of the South. I believe that doing something meaningful and tangible in this area is now very much in order.

Incidentally, although Selma is being epitomized and dramatized widely, a great many people have approached me, Negro and white alike, telling me it is almost a shame, that in the concern for Selma, it has not been noticed that in community after community in this same area of the country, bodies have been crushed, lives have been extinguished, people have been intimidated just as forcefully and in greater numbers than in Selma, but they have not been widely publicized.

With that kind of tragic situation, anything that can be done to get action is desirable. With the greatest respect for the President and with the greatest desire to uphold his hand in doing what is right, I feel deeply that this will be the time to push for the terms and the timing and to get done what must be done for the country.

I hope very much that the bill which I have introduced, S. 1497, with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], dealing with excessive police action, may similarly have the prompt consideration of Congress. The need for this measure has also been markedly emphasized by the events in Selma.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I commend the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for his able, courageous, and cooperative work in the field of civil rights.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

I wish all Senators to know how deeply gratifying it is to be associated with them in this great effort. As has already been stated, we are not rivals of the executive branch of the Government, the President, or the Department of Justice. Our action represents the evidence of our deep conviction of urgency in this matter.

It would be most inappropriate for Congress, it seems to me, not to take the initiative. Congress is supposed to legislate and develop policy and enact bills into law. It would be doing less than its duty, especially in the view of those of us who have a deep conviction on this subject, if we sat back and waited for some proposals to be presented by the executive branch of the Government, with the approval of the President and with the authorship of the Department of Justice.

We welcome these proposals, and we shall work in partnership with the executive branch, as we have endeavored in the past, in this bipartisan group, who have been concerned with this matter for the past many months, when we have urged and begged that the legislation be forthcoming. We have withheld our own initiative in the introduction of legislation so that we could have full unanimity as between those of us in Congress and the people in the legislative branch.

We are happy indeed that reports have indicated that it is proposed to introduce a bill that will have the full support of the President. I hope that the majority leader and the minority leader in the Senate and also the majority and minority leaders in the House will give it overwhelming support in both Houses of Congress.

However, we have too long delayed. As the Senator from New York has suggested, what we propose should have been a part of the legislation that was enacted in 1957, 1960, and 1964, that great monument, because, as both the Senator from New York and the Senator from Illinois have indicated, the voting right is something that no one on the floor of the Senate or in the country will say in public is something that ought to be denied to a person on the ground of his color, race, creed, or national origin.

Therefore, we are not in disagreement on the right; only on the question of whether it should actually be granted, or merely be given lip service but actually denied.

The urgency of this matter is such that Congress should, and I hope it will, give its undivided, constant, and continuous attention to it until a bill is passed in the Senate and in the House and signed by the President. That would be doing a great deal for the morale of the country and for those who have suffered under the indignities and injustices of the deprivation of the franchise. If necessary, we should remain here nights and holidays and weekends until this job is done. I pledge for myself continuing support for every effort, in cooperation with my colleagues in the Senate and with the executive branch of the Government to bring this about.

The only thing that will make me at all unhappy or unwilling to cooperate will be an attempt, if it is made, to offer only lip service and not actual legislative accomplishment, or dragging of the feet. I do not look for it, but we shall be ready to meet it if it comes.

The Senator from New York is eminently correct when he says that Selma means, in addition to the basic deprivation of voting rights, brutality by the citizenry and by the governmental officials through their police deputies against people protesting the deprivation of their constitutional rights.

We should do something about this, and that speedily.

I am very hopeful that as a part of this proposed legislation, we may at the same time enact legislation designed to place the responsibility for police brutality, for absence of police protection against private brutality, upon the communities whose agents are guilty of withholding protection and thus inflicting brutal treatment.

For the sake of the country as a whole, for the sake of the country's reputation abroad, for the sake of the individuals who have been mistreated and maimed and killed, and for the sake of their families, we can do no less.

As I said earlier, the right to vote, all agree, is the most basic right of citizenship.

It is equally undeniable that large numbers of citizens are being deprived of that right simply because of the color of their skin.

Through the years, with an ingenuity that would do credit to a worthier cause, there have been fashioned in some States a variety of devices and tests, masking as qualifications for registration and voting, which have effectively blocked the efforts of Negro citizens to exercise the right of the franchise. Indeed, those who oppose those efforts have in many cases resorted to unlawful measures to evade their constitutional responsibilities. Threats, intimidation, coercion, terrorism, and economic reprisal have in many places become commonplace as the protest of the disenfranchised has swelled.

Three times in recent years Congress has acted to protect voting rights. But these measures have not been equal to the task. Frustration and bitterness have grown as attempts at suppression have sunk to new and ugly depths.

As the President has indicated, the situation is urgent. I strongly support his determination that every eligible citizen, be he white or Negro, whatever his race or religion, wherever he may reside, be given effective protection for his right to vote.

The bill in which I and my colleagues join is not a hasty measure.

The bill is the fruit of many weeks of consideration and exchange of views not only among ourselves but with officials of the executive branch. We introduce it in the hope to help Congress fashion an effective instrument to wipe out the shame of discrimination in the voting field.

Salient features of the bill are:

First. The bill applies to Federal, State, and local elections.

Second. The bill outlaws all literacy tests in those areas of the country where there has been discrimination against Negroes. Specifically, it outlaws literacy tests in Mississippi, Alabama, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, and Louisiana.

Third. The bill also outlaws other methods of discrimination in those areas,

such as tests of moral character and requirements that persons vouch for applicants for registration.

Fourth. The bill provides for Federal registrars wherever there is discrimination in registration or voting and it makes the appointment of registrars automatic. Thus, wherever less than 25 percent of the total number of Negroes of voting age residing in any county were registered to vote in the 1964 election, the President must appoint Federal registrars within 90 days of the enactment of this bill. He must also appoint Federal registrars wherever less than 50 percent of the total number of persons of voting age voted in the November 1964 election if 20 persons file a written petition alleging denial of their right to register to vote.

Fifth. The Federal registrar will register everyone who meets the State qualification of age, residence, citizenship, mental competency, and absence of conviction for a felony and these qualifications are frozen as of May 17, 1954.

Sixth. The bill provides that anyone who is registered by a Federal registrar must be accorded the right to vote in all elections and further provides for enforcement of this right, including the staying of the certification of the results of any election in which persons federally registered have been denied the right to vote.

Seventh. The bill outlaws poll taxes in all State and local elections.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. He has always been a highly cooperative and unselfish Member. I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator. I know the Senator from Wisconsin has been on his feet trying to obtain the floor. He has been very kind to yield to me, because he knows I have an engagement that I must keep.

The Senator from Illinois, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from New Jersey have spoken of the high hopes of those of us who have introduced the bill. We make no pretense that this is the best or the last word in the effort to develop a legislative response which is adequate to the enormous public pressure all around the country today. We feel that it offers an additional suggestion of those of us in Congress and those in the executive branch of the Government as a means of getting at the problem.

I am grateful to the Senator from Illinois for his leadership over the weeks, as we have sought to find legislative language to meet the situation. I am grateful to the Department of Justice for its exchange of points of view with us. This Congress will be judged very harshly if, with the alarm bell shrieking, we do less than what is required in order that that alarm bell shall never sound again in this country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Michigan. I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished Senator from Illinois and other Senators in support of the bill. First of all, along with the Senator from Illinois, I welcome the decision of the President to take the almost unprecedented step involved in his speech tonight of speaking personally to Congress on one specific domestic issue. It is very rare that any President has done so throughout American history. In speaking to us this evening at 9 o'clock he will be able to speak to as many people in the country as possible, in addition to the Congress. This decision of the President is extremely welcome. It means the President is throwing the immense prestige of his office behind voting legislation in a remarkable way. We have offered this proposed legislation in an effort to support the President in getting the strongest and best possible legislation in this field.

It is very important, as the Senator from Michigan has said, that we enact legislation which is not a matter of bits and pieces. After all, the 1957 Civil Rights Act was a voting rights bill, as was the 1960 bill; so was title I of the 1964 act. And yet, we know we have not done the job. We know that in some sections of the country hundreds of thousands of American citizens, Negroes, are not able to register and are not able to vote. Therefore it is extremely important that we have the strongest and most comprehensive kind of bill enacted into law.

The bill we are offering covers Federal registrars, which many have argued for; it covers State and local elections; it also provides for doing away with the remaining use of literacy tests for discrimination.

As one who had practically no part in the drafting of the bill, I can say that the bill has been most expertly drafted, not only by the Senators involved, but also by the staffs of the Senators and other leading experts in the country, who brought to this bill drafting a lifetime of experience in this subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join in the introduction of the voting rights bill, whose principal sponsors are the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I have joined in the introduction of the voting rights bill with full knowledge that the President will speak to us this evening and that he will immediately propose an effective voting rights bill which he has so urgently discussed and supported. My purpose in joining with others in introducing this bill is to state again my support for an effective voting rights bill, whether it be the administration bill, the one we introduce, or some other.

For 8 years, beginning in 1957, the group of Senators who sponsor this bill, along with others, have introduced numerous bills on civil rights, dealing with subjects including voting rights, school desegregation, public accommodations, and fair employment practices. For example, I have introduced voting rights, school desegregation, and public accommodations bills. These bills were not enacted separately, but they served a useful purpose—and they helped inform and secure the support of the people of of country. They also gave help to the executive branch, and many of the provisions of the bills introduced by this group and others, were incorporated in the bills passed in 1957, 1960, and 1964, sometimes in identical language.

I do not doubt that the bill that will be introduced at the request of the President will contain sections similar to those in the bill we introduce today. It is entirely probable that it may be a stronger and more effective bill. But the bill we introduce today contains ideas which have been developed by study over a period of many days and, indeed, weeks. It could supplement the forthcoming administration bill, and, at minimum, indicate our full support.

Now I would like to turn to another subject which is related to the bill we introduce today. It is the situation in Selma, Ala., and in other areas—situations which illustrate a need for a more effective voting rights law. The States and municipalities have the authority under their police powers—powers to provide for the public safety and order—to enact laws and ordinances regulating demonstrations.

A grave dilemma is thus posed. It is that those who seek their constitutional rights, against States and municipalities, whose officers are violating the Federal Civil Rights Acts and the Constitution itself, do find themselves in violation of State or municipal law. And out of this confrontation, violence has ensued and will continue to ensue unless the true cause is corrected. That cause in the case of Selma is predominantly the violation of the Federal Civil Rights Acts and the Constitution with respect to voting rights. When I spoke on the Birmingham situation 2 years ago, I said that it was hardly intended that the police powers of a State would be used to deny the reasonable expression of speech and petition by citizens seeking their constitutional rights.

The Congress has the authority and the duty to move on its part to enact effective voting rights legislation to remove the substantive cause—which is the denial of the right to vote by States and municipalities.

But the immediate means of removing the danger of violence and brutality lies with the States and municipalities themselves. The Governor of Alabama and the city authorities of that State, as well as those in other States, should permit peaceful demonstrations by those seeking to achieve constitutional rights, as this can be done without obstructing public order and safety. Certainly there is nothing wrong with marching at the side of a highway, and this opportunity could be provided without any obstruction of traffic or order. I believe the demonstrators would and should adhere to such reasonable provision. If the right of peaceful expression is not provided by the States and municipalities, there will be continued violence and brutality, and this is intolerable in our country whose system is based upon the processes of the

law and upon concern for the individual and his rights.

Last week, I joined in the introduction of a bill to provide sanctions against officers and those acting under color of law who use brutality in the exercise of their authority. It should be enacted, but the enactment of these necessary laws, including one for more effective voting rights, will take some time in this session. I hope that the State and municipal authorities will act, and that they will authorize peaceful demonstrations with reasonable provisions for safety and order. If they will not do this, they will create conditions for violence and brutality. They will encourage a disregard for law and order, but above all, they will continue to obstruct and deny the rights of our fellow citizens.

I joined today in the introduction of this bill to indicate again my concern—and the concern of many thousands in my State and throughout the Nation—that the right of every citizen to vote shall be not only guaranteed by the Constitution, but that it shall be made effective by law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his remarks.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield very briefly?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. On the question of timing, which is very important, I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that there be printed in the RECORD the statement of the bipartisan group made last Thursday in which we said we would introduce such a bill today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that statement be printed at this point in the RECORD. Does the Senator from New York have the text of that statement?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. I shall furnish it for the RECORD.

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

MARCH 11, 1965.

A bipartisan group of Senators announced today that on Monday they will introduce a voting rights bill.

The heart of the bill will be a provision for the appointment by the President of Federal voting registrars. The President's power would depend solely upon his factual finding of discrimination measured by specific objective criteria. Thus, the procedure would be automatic and expeditious.

The bill would cover State and local as well as Federal elections.

The Senators are: CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey; JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., of Pennsylvania; JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky; PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois; HIRAM FONG, of Hawaii; PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan; JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York; ROBERT F. KENNEDY, of New York; WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin; and HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, effective legislation to protect the voting rights of all Americans is long overdue.

The 15th amendment to the Constitution provides that "the right of the 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." It directs that "Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Three times during the past 8 years Congress has passed such "appropriate legislation" to enforce "equal protection" for the right to vote. But these enactments have not been effective, because some State and local authorities have unfairly applied voting qualifications and standards of eligibility to many of our Negro citizens.

Mr. President, last year during the civil rights debate I pointed out the many inadequacies of title I of the Civil Rights Act. The bill which a bipartisan group of Senators now proposes effectively provides for these inadequacies. I am happy to join this group of Senators as a cosponsor.

I am aware that the President, deeply concerned about this problem, has announced his intention to speak to a joint session of Congress tonight on the subject of voting rights legislation. I look forward to his address, hopeful that he will propose legislation to the Congress which will secure the right of the franchise, once and for all, to all Americans.

The Congress will have for its consideration a number of voting rights bills. The measure we introduce today, as we promised we would last week, is a product of long and serious consideration. I believe it is a very meritorious measure which I hope Congress will seriously consider before taking final action on badly needed voting rights legislation.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last week the world witnessed a shameful display of police brutality which took place in Selma, Ala. The armed posse of a racist sheriff flogged American citizens whose only crime was their desire to vote and their attempt to protest peacefully against those who were preventing them from voting.

The right to vote is fundamental to our way of life. It is a tragedy that we must further guarantee by new legislation that right which the Constitution and subsequent amendments guarantee to all citizens. But the posse in Selma made it quite obvious that we must further spell out the rights of all Americans.

That is why I have joined today with a bipartisan group of Senators in introducing legislation which provides Federal registrars for persons who are denied their right to register and vote because of their race.

The bill provides for Federal registrars to be appointed by the President in areas where the number of Americans of any one race who are registered to vote is less than one-quarter of the total number of Americans of that race residing in that voting district.

It would also provide for Federal registrars on the petition of 20 persons where the voting district is one in which less than half of the total number of all persons of voting age voted in the November 1964 election.

This legislation would also outlaw literacy and other tests in those States where the number of Americans of any one race who are registered to vote in November 1964, was less than half of the total number of Americans of that race of voting age, or where less than half of all voting-age residents voted in the 1964 election. It would also prohibit poll taxes.

These measures would eliminate once and for all the insidious methods of limiting the vote to a select few and would constitute another step toward making the land of the free a land where all men are truly free to vote.

BELOIT COLLEGE STUDENTS MARCH 50 MILES IN SYMPATHY WITH SELMA PROTEST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President on Tuesday, March 9, a group of Beloit College students marched from Beloit, Wis., 50 miles over a wintry Wisconsin highway to Madison in sympathy with the Selma, Ala., demonstrators.

The Beloit students not only called their march an expression of sympathy with those protesting the denial of their rights of franchise in the South but as one of them put it, "a demonstration of freedom in Wisconsin" and an expression of "their gratitude and pleasure in living in a State where citizens can freely congregate and march on a public highway."

Mr. President this is the kind of wholesome, healthy expression of American freedom at its best. It happened just last week and these young people who trudged a long, weary 50 miles in the cold of a Wisconsin winter—and in support of their convictions represent the same generation that has been called too soft and too apathetic.

The admiring reaction of Wisconsin people to this march was not confined to the Governor of the State and president of the college.

As Elliott Maraniss in his remarkable article in the Madison Capital Times, describing the march, pointed out, it was widespread and shared by highway motorists and Madison and Evansville residents.

I ask unanimous consent that a perceptive and sensitive article describing this march by Elliott Maraniss, of the Capital Times, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BELOIT MARCHERS ENTER MADISON

(By Elliott Maraniss, of the Capital Times staff)

EN ROUTE WITH THE BELOIT MARCHERS.—With aching feet but soaring spirits, a group of 130 Beloit College students walked into Madison early this afternoon after a 50-mile march in the clear, bright air of the Free State of Wisconsin.

When the dome of the State capitol came into view as they reached the top of a hill on Highway 14, a cheer swept the ranks of the boys and girls who had been walking in double file since noon Tuesday.

The capitol dome symbolized the purpose of the march: to demonstrate the freedom in Wisconsin as compared with Alabama, where marchers have been clubbed, whipped, and gassed.

Meantime, eight other Beloit students flew to the battleground of Selma, Ala., to join the thousands there. Fellow students quickly collected $500 to send the eight to Alabama. One of those who went south is a Madison boy, John McCall, 5202 Odana Road.

The Beloit students have called their march "a demonstration of freedom in Wisconsin."

A spokesman for the college said, "The students are expressing their gratitude and pleasure at living in a State where citizens can freely congregate and march on a public highway. They are also expressing sympathy for the situation in Alabama, where they believe the opposite is true."

The students left Beloit shortly after noon Tuesday and arrived in Evansville, about 25 miles up Highway 13, at 8:30 p.m. exhausted but happy.

The students were put up overnight at the Congregational Church in Evansville. They were fed by local residents, who greeted them warmly and sympathetically.

President Miller Upton, of Beloit, telephoned Gov. Warren P. Knowles to tell him that the students are coming to Madison. He told the Governor that the march was a demonstration of freedom and not a protest.

Upton expressed his pleasure with the student initiative that led to the march, although it is not officially sponsored by the college.

Students don't have permission to cut classes, but faculty feeling can be judged by the fact that several instructors are following the marchers by car to help those who need it and to supply coffee and sandwiches.

After the students meet with Governor Knowles they were to go to the Covenant Presbyterian Church, 326 S. Segoe Road, for coffee before returning to Beloit in cars.

The coffee hour at the church in Madison is being sponsored by Chancellor Robben W. Fleming, of the University of Wisconsin. Both Fleming and his wife, Sally, are graduates of Beloit and their daughter, Nancy, a sophomore at Beloit, is one of the marchers.

A demonstration at the main post office was scheduled to start at 1 p.m. under the auspicies of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

The students walked on the left-hand side of the road, facing traffic, as they marched through the open countryside. When they passed through towns they crossed to sidewalks on the right side of the street.

State patrol cars toured the highway to be sure that the students were safe and that traffic moved along. There were no incidents or accidents.

"They're a great bunch of kids," one traffic patrolmen said near Oregon, "I admire them."

Most of the youngsters were dressed in winter garb, but there was a definite difference in footwear. The boys all wore heavy shoes or boots, but the girls tramped along in low-cut tennis shoes and ankle socks, apparently immune to mud and snow.

One pair walking side by side consisted of David Howe, a freshman from Boston, Mass., and pretty Carlotta Creavey, a freshman from Troy, N.Y. David wore boots, but Carlotta wore tennis shoes.

"She's crazy," David said, but the tone was obviously one of admiration.

Tim Morrison, a Beloit student last year, had spent the summer of 1964 as a teacher in a freedom school in Mississippi. This year he is working for the U.S. Government.

Tim heard the news about the Beloit march over the radio in Iron Mountain, Mich., late Tuesday night. He jumped into his car, drove all night, arrived in Evansville just before dawn this morning, and joined the march.

Glen Ridnour, pastor of Calvary Methodist Church at 633 West Badger Road in Madison, drove his homemade bus down to Evansville late Tuesday night. He stayed with the youngsters at the church in Evansville and then drove along with them on the march today, offering a place to rest and refreshments. The marchers stopped at his church for a short time before heading up Park Street on the last leg of the walk.

Passing motorists, who had heard the news of the march on the radio, waved friendly greetings as they passed the students. "The reception has been just great," a sophomore from Milwaukee said.

Warren Hegge, a towheaded freshman from Boise, Idaho, carried a walkie-talkie at the end of the line and was in communication with the man at the point, Vic Friedlander, a sophomore from New York City.

Hegge said the march was a completely spontaneous thing.

"We gathered at the union at the college yesterday with the idea of going to Selma," he said. "Fifteen students signed up to go to Selma, but we had money and transportation for only eight. We chose the eight by drawing straws.

"Then the rest of us thought that we ought to do something too. We didn't want to be left out. That's when we got the idea of marching to Madison."

The signs carried by the students expressed the purpose of the march perfectly. Some of them said, "We march in freedom," "Eight to Selma," "To Madison in appreciation."

The marching pace was a steady 4 miles an hour. A middle-aged reporter and photographer who went down to get a story and pictures were puffing and panting after a couple of miles.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR U.S. SENATOR

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on September 10, 1964, I introduced a Senate joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution dealing with the qualifications necessary to hold the office of U.S. Senator. Today, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, an identical proposal. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the joint resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the qualifications of Members of the Senate, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 64

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-third of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected or appointed, have been an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen for at least one year immediately prior to his election or appointment.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this proposal provides that, in addition to the other qualifications already in the Constitution a U.S. Senator would have to be an inhabitant of the selecting State for a period of at least 1 year prior to election or appointment.

As we know, each State imposes certain residency requirements as a prerequisite to the right to vote in local and national elections. In 33 States, residency requirements for voting purposes for all offices, except President and Vice-President, are established at 1 year. In two States it is 2 years. In 14 States it is 6 months and in 1 State, Hawaii, it is 1 year or 9 months by registration. Yet, during the elections for the U.S. Senate last year there were two candidates who won the nominations of their party who could not even qualify to vote in their own elections. In doing research on this problem, I found that the question of residency or of being an inhabitant for a required number of years prior to being eligible to serve as a Senator was debated by the framers of our Constitution. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of that discussion may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

IN CONVENTION

Mr. John Francis Mercer, from Maryland, took his seat.

Mr. Rutledge delivered in the report of the committee of detail, as follows—a printed copy being at the same time furnished to each member:

"We the people of the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, do ordain, declare, and establish, the following Constitution for the government of ourselves and our posterity:

"ARTICLE I. The style of the government shall be, 'The United States of America.'

"ART. II. The Government shall consist of supreme legislative, executive, and judicial powers.

"ART. III. The legislative power shall be vested in a Congress, to consist of two separate and distinct bodies of men, a House of Representatives and a Senate; each of which shall in all cases have a negative on the other. The Legislature shall meet on the first Monday in December in every year.

"ART. IV—SEC. 1. The Members of the House of Representatives shall be chosen, every second year, by the people of the several States comprehended within this Union. The qualifications of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors, in the several States, of the most numerous branch of their own legislatures.

"SEC. 2. Every Member of the House of Representatives shall be of the age of 25 years at least; shall have been a citizen in the United States for at least 3 years before his election; and shall be, at the time of his election, a resident of the State in which he shall be chosen.

"SEC. 3. The House of Representatives shall, at its first formation, and until the

number of citizens and inhabitants shall be taken in the manner hereinafter described, consist of 65 Members, of which 3 shall be chosen in New Hampshire, 8 in Massachusetts, 1 in Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, 5 in Connecticut, 6 in New York, 4 in New Jersey, 8 in Pennsylvania, 1 in Delaware, 6 in Maryland, 10 in Virginia, 5 in North Carolina, 5 in South Carolina, and 3 in Georgia.

"SEC. 4. As the proportions of numbers in different States will alter from time to time as some of the States may hereafter be divided; as others may be enlarged by addition of territory; as two or more States may be united; as new States will be erected within the limits of the United States—the legislature shall, in each of these cases, regulate the number of representatives by the number of inhabitants, according to the provisions hereinafter made, at the rate of one for every forty thousand.

"SEC. 5. All bills for raising or appropriating money, and for fixing the salaries of the officers of Government, shall originate in the House of Representatives, and shall not be altered or amended by the Senate. No money shall be drawn from the Public Treasury, but in pursuance of appropriations that shall originate in the House of Representatives.

"SEC. 6. The House of Representatives shall have the sole power of impeachment. It shall choose its Speaker and other officers.

"SEC. 7. Vacancies in the House of Representatives shall be supplied by writs of section from the executive authority of the State in the representation from which they shall happen.

"ART. V.—SEC. 1. The Senate of the United States shall be chosen by the legislatures of the several States. Each legislature shall choose two members. Vacancies may be supplied by the executive until the next meeting of the legislature. Each member shall have one vote.

"SEC. 2. The Senators shall be chosen for 6 years; but immediately after the first election, they shall be divided, by lot, into three classes, as nearly as may be, numbered one, two, and three. The seats of the members of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year; of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year; of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that a third part of the Members may be chosen every second year.

"SEC. 3. Every Member of the Senate shall be of the age of thirty years at least; shall have been a citizen in the United States for at least four years before his election; and shall be, at the time of his election, a resident of the State for which he shall be chosen."

Mr. Sherman moved to strike out the word "resident" and insert "inhabitant," as less liable to misconstruction.

Mr. Madison seconded the motion. Both were vague, but the latter least so in common acceptation, and could not exclude persons absent occasionally, for a considerable time, on public or private business. Great disputes had been raised in Virginia concerning the meaning of residence as a qualification of representatives, which were determined more according to the affection or dislike to the man in question than to any fixed interpretation of the word.

Mr. Wilson preferred "inhabitant."

Mr. Gouverneur Morris was opposed to both, and for requiring nothing more than a freehold. He quoted great disputes in New York, occasioned by these terms, which were decided by the arbitrary will of the majority. Such a regulation is not necessary. People rarely choose a nonresident. It is improper, as, in the first branch, the people at large, not the States, are represented.

Mr. Rutledge urged and moved, that a residence of 7 years should be required in the State wherein the member should be elected. An emigrant from New England to South Carolina or Georgia would know little of its affairs, and could not be supposed to acquire a thorough knowledge in less time.

Mr. Reed reminded him that we were now forming a national government, and such a regulation would correspond little with the idea that we were one people.

Mr. Wilson enforced the same consideration.

Mr. Madison suggested the case of new States in the west, which could have, perhaps, no representation on that plan.

Mr. MERCER. Such a regulation would present a greater alienship than existed under the old Federal system. It would interweave local prejudices and state distinctions in the very Constitution which is meant to cure them. He mentioned instances of violent disputes raised in Maryland concerning the term "residence."

Mr. Ellsworth thought 7 years of residence was by far too long a term; but that some fixed term of previous residence would be proper. He thought 1 year would be sufficient, but seemed to have no objection to 3 years.

Mr. Dickinson proposed that it should read "inhabitant actually resident for — years." This would render the meaning less indeterminate.

Mr. WILSON. If a short term should be inserted in the blank, so strict an expression might be construed to exclude the members of the legislature, who could not be said to be actual residents in their States, whilst at the seat of the general government.

Mr. MERCER. It would certainly exclude men, who had once been inhabitants, and returning from residence elsewhere to resettle in their original State, although a want of the necessary knowledge could not in such cases be presumed.

Mr. Mason thought 7 years too long, but would never agree to part with the principle. It is a valuable principle. He thought it a defect in the plan, that the representatives would be too few to bring with them all the local knowledge necessary. If residence be not required, rich men of neighboring States may employ with success the means of corruption in some particular district, and thereby get into the public councils after having failed in their own States. This is the practice in the boroughs of England.

On the question for postponing, in order to consider Mr. Dickinson's motion,—

Maryland, South Carolina, Georgia, aye 3; New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, no, 8.

On the question for inserting "inhabitant," in place of "resident,"—agreed to, nem. con.

Mr. Ellsworth and Col. Mason moved to insert "one year" for previous inhabitancy.

Mr. Williamson liked the report as it stood. He thought "resident" a good enough term. He was against requiring any period of previous residence. New residents, if elected, will be most zealous to conform to the will of their constituents, as their conduct will be watched with a more jealous eye.

Mr. Butler and Mr. Rutledge moved "3 years," instead of "1 year," for previous inhabitancy.

On the question for "3 years,"—

South Carolina, Georgia, aye, 2; New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, no, 9.

On the question for "1 year,"—

New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, aye, 4; New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, no, 6; Maryland divided.

Article 4, sec. 2, as amended in manner preceding, was agreed to.

The term "resident" was struck out, and "inhabitant" inserted.

Article 5, sec. 3, as amended, was then agreed to, nem. con.

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe that the language I have chosen would most nearly conform to the original intent that was expressed by the delegates to the framing of our Constitution.

In addition to the so-called "carpetbagging" debate—which is part of the phraseology which was used at that time—other very serious questions have been raised during my research which need to be explored by the Judiciary Committee or by this body as a whole. For example:

Is there any provision in the Constitution as presently written or any precedent which would prevent a person from running for election for the office of U.S. Senator from two or more States in the same election? Is there any provision in the Constitution to prevent a citizen of 30 years of age to file for the office of U.S. Senator in two States on the same or different tickets?

Is there anything in our Constitution which would prevent a Senator from, for example, California—if the distinguished junior Senator from the State [Mr. MURPHY], who is sitting next to me, will pardon the reference—while holding office, from also seeking election to the office of U.S. Senator from Oregon or any other State?

Is there any precedent or U.S. Supreme Court decision which would prohibit the same person from holding the office of U.S. Senator from two or more States?

If the Senate decided to seat a person as a Senator from two States, would that person be entitled to two offices, two staffs, two votes, and two salaries?

These are only a few of the vexatious and troublesome questions that are posed. It is, of course, within the province of the Senate to refuse to seat a person as a Senator from more than one State. But if the Senate were presented with a valid certificate of election from one or more States, it would certainly make a very difficult problem. It would generate many unpleasantries, to say the least, and a decision to affirm or reject any such certificate would constitute constitutional legislation without constitutional process.

In order to determine the reasonableness and probabilities concerning these questions, I asked the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, and some of the leading law firms in the country to comment. I ask unanimous consent that the text of these comments and opinions may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1964.

To: Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK.
Attention: Mr. Richards.
From: American Law Division.
Subject: Answers to certain questions as to election of a candidate as a U.S. Senator from two or more States.

Question I. If a candidate is possessed of the constitutional qualifications exacted of a U.S. Senator, and is deemed by each of two or more States to be a legal resident thereof, is there anything in the Constitution and laws which would prevent such person from

running as a candidate for a seat in the Senate in two or more States?

No. Since Congress, consistently with article 1, section 4, clause 1 of the Constitution, has been disposed to rely on State laws for the election of Members of Congress, each State is privileged to determine, in conformity with its own laws, whether a candidate for the office of U.S. Senator is eligible to be placed on its election ballots. Accordingly, if the officials and courts of a given State were convinced that a prospective candidate was a bona fide resident, conceivably it would not be dissuaded from so ruling by the knowledge that the courts of one or more other States were prepared to make, or had made, a ruling to the effect that the same individual also was a bona fide resident of the latter, or other States. Presumably, the courts of the first State would view the decision of the others as the product of error.

Question II. If a person were elected as a U.S. Senator from two or more States, is there anything in the Constitution and laws of the United States, or in Senate precedents, which would prevent a person from being seated as a U.S. Senator from two or more States, and casting two or more votes?

It is highly probable that the Senate would construe the following constitutional provisions as a bar to the candidate-elect being accorded more than one seat; to wit: article 1, section 3, clause 3, and amendment 17. The first provision, in enumerating the qualifications of a Senator, stipulates that he shall "be an inhabitant of the State from which he shall be chosen." Since it is inconceivable that an individual simultaneously can be an inhabitant of more than one State, the Senate probably would rule that only one of the several States had correctly concluded that the candidate-elect was indeed a resident thereof. In addition, amendment 17 provides that the Senate "shall be composed of two Senators from each State * * *; and each Senator shall have one vote." The last quoted phrase also would seem to preclude the seating of a single individual as a duly elected Senator from several States, and according him more than one vote, that is, a vote from each of the States from which he has been elected (Senate Election, Expulsion and Censure Cases; S. Doc. No. 71; 87th Cong., 2d sess. (1962), pp. 5, 44; refusal to seat Adalbert Ames from Mississippi on the ground that he was not a resident thereof). Apart from the last mentioned instance, no other relevant example has been found in published treatises on the Senate or in compilations of Senate precedents.

There remains to be considered the highly unlikely possibility that the Senate might disregard all of the aforementioned considerations; and by an arbitrary exercise of its virtually unlimited powers as the final judge of the qualifications of its Members (art. 1, sec. 5, cl. 1) accord more than one seat and vote to an individual elected to the Senate as an inhabitant of more than one State. In so ruling it also would find it necessary to alter its own rules with reference to the maximum number of committee assignments to be allotted each Member; but since the Senate enjoys virtually unlimited competence to formulate its own rules, amendment of the latter to accommodate the Member-elect as the delegate of several States would occasion no serious problem.

Question III. Is there anything in the Constitution and laws of the United States which would present such Member from drawing two or more salaries or having two sets of staffs?

The Constitution merely provides that "Senators * * * shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law * * *." (art. 1, sec. 6 cl. 1.) A companion provision against dual office holding (art. 1, sec. 6, cl. 2) stipulates that "no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office."

Whether the phrase, "shall receive a compensation," would be strictly construed as barring the receipt of a compensation for more than one seat in the Senate is a matter for speculation; for this provision hitherto has not been officially construed. The second provision is inapplicable; for it refers to dual office holding arising when an officer in the executive or judical branches attempts to acquire and retain a seat in the Congress.

As to statutory provisions, one pertaining to the "salaries of Senators" (2 U.S.C. 36) is silent as to the hypothetical problem presented; and has not been the subject of a relevant interpretation by the Comptroller General. Other statutory provisions prohibiting the receipt of dual compensation are directed principally at officers and employees in the executive branch of the National Government (5 U.S.C. 58, 62, 69–72). However, 5 U.S.C. 70, might be susceptible of a construction which would render it operative as a bar to the collection of multiple salaries by an incumbent holding more than one Senate seat. Section 70 provides that "no officer in any branch of the public service, * * * shall receive any additional pay, extra allowances, or compensation, in any form whatever, * * * for any service or duty whatever, unless the same is authorized by law, and the appropriation therefore explicitly states that it is for such additional pay, extra allowance, or compensation."

NORMAN J. SMALL,
Legislative Attorney.

DICKENSON, WRIGHT, MCKEAN & CUDLIP,
Detroit, Mich., September 1, 1964.

Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOMINICK: You have submitted to us a draft of a Senate joint resolution proposing an amendment to article I, section 3, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States, which establishes the qualifications for the office of U.S. Senator. The proposed amendment is as follows (new language in italic, matter to be deleted in black brackets):

"No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained [to] the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected *or appointed,* [be an inhabitant] *have been a resident* of that State for which he shall be chosen *for at least one year immediately prior to his election or appointment.*"

You have asked whether this proposed amendment, if adopted, would prevent recurrence of situations such as those in which Senator Salinger seeks election in California and in which Attorney General KENNEDY seeks election in New York. As we understand the factual situations involved in these cases, neither Senator Salinger nor Attorney General KENNEDY claims to have been an inhabitant of the State in which he seeks election until immediately prior to the commencement of the nominating process (filing as a candidate in the California primary election, and indicating candidacy at the party nominating convention in New York, respectively). Thus, neither makes any claim that he will have inhabited, resided in, or been domiciled in the State from which he seeks election for 1 year immediately prior to the election date.

It is clear that your proposed amendment, if adopted, would disqualify a candidate seeking election in the future under these factual circumstances.

However, it should be noted that the proposed amendment, could, if adopted, create new problems of construction. The term "resident" is one which has been variously defined in judicial decisions. The scope of these definitions is such that the proposed amendment might be construed to require little more than the acquisition of a dwelling place within the State a year prior to the election, with the announced intention to reside there, but without very much in the way of actual physical presence during the year. At the other extreme, the proposed amendment might be construed to bar an incumbent Senator from seeking reelection, on the ground of his residence in Washington, D.C., rather than in the State from which he was originally elected. Admittedly, these examples lie at the extremes.

However, review of the debates of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 (as reported by James Madison; Elliot, "Debates in the Federal Convention," vol. V. pp. 389 et seq.) suggests that while these examples may be improbable, they are not completely fanciful. An amendment proposed to the 1787 convention which would have required that a Senator be an "inhabitant actually resident — years" prompted one delegate to state that "a short term * * * inserted in the blank * * * might be construed to exclude the members of the legislature, who could not be said to be actual residents in their States, whilst at the seat of the general government."

It is interesting that the draft originally proposed to the 1787 Convention required Senators and Representatives to be "residents" when elected, rather than "inhabitants." This was changed on motion of Mr. Sherman, of Connecticut, who proposed that "resident" be stricken, and "inhabitant" inserted, as being "less liable to misconstruction." James Madison, supporting this change, said that both terms were "vague" but "inhabitant" less so than "resident." Madison pointed out that "inhabitant" "would not exclude persons absent occasionally, for a considerable time, on public or private business." He concluded on a note worthy of current consideration:

"Great disputes had been raised in Virginia concerning the meaning of residence as a qualification of representatives, which were determined more according to the affection or dislike to the man in question than to any fixed interpretation of the word."

The debate is instructive, and it may be significant that after full consideration of many possibilities, the delegates adopted the present provision. Copies of the report of pertinent portions of this debate are attached for your ready reference.

You have also asked whether there is "anything in the present Constitution or Federal precedents which would prohibit one person * * * from being elected in the same election as U.S. Senator from two or more States * * * [or] * * * from seeking election as a U.S. Senator in another State while holding office as a U.S. Senator." We have not had time to research these questions adequately, and have advised you that we are not able to give our opinion with respect to these points. You have nevertheless requested that we repeat here some observations which we have made to you by telephone after brief consideration of these questions. So qualified, those comments follow:

It does not appear to have been the intention of the draftsmen of the U.S. Constitution that one State be represented in Congress by a citizen of another State, or that one individual could simultaneously be an "inhabitant" of more than one State. Madison, for example, deplored in the 1787 Convention the fact that Delaware had on two occasions been represented in the Continental Congress by citizens of other States. Elliot, "Debates in the Federal Convention," vol. V, p. 210.

However, the term "inhabitant" has been variously construed, and has sometimes been equated with the concept of "domicile."

Logically, one individual should not, at any given moment, be "domiciled" in more than one State. Nevertheless, in at least one case involving substantial sums in inheritance taxes, a single individual was found, in separate proceedings carried to the highest courts of the respective States, to have been domiciled in two different States at the time of his death. (See *Dorrance's Estate*, 309 Pa. 151; *In re Estate of Dorrance*, 115 N.J. Eq. 268, 116 N.J. Eq. 204; *New Jersey* v. *Pennsylvania*, 287 U.S. 580; *Hill* v. *Martin*, 296 U.S. 393. See also *Texas* v. *Florida*, 306 U.S. 398, esp. pp. 410, 411.) It is not inconceivable, therefore, that an individual might similarly be found, in separate tribunals, to be an "inhabitant" of more than one State at a single point in time. The possibility would be greatly enhanced, of course, in the case of an individual who habitually divided his time on a more or less equal basis between residences maintained by him in two different States.

Furthermore, the requirement that the Senator be an "inhabitant" seems, under article I, section 3, clause 3, to be confined to the time "when elected." This might affect the question you pose regarding the qualification of an incumbent Senator from one State seeking election from another during his term of office.

In summary, while the suggestion of dual candidacy may seem farfetched, the technical adequacy of the constitutional language to preclude such dual candidacy is a question which cannot be answered casually. As indicated above, we do not express our opinion on these questions.

As a practical matter, of course, it is not to be expected that the people of two different States would be disposed to share a Senator, even if he were given two votes, and the possibility of such dual election seems unbelievably remote. Furthermore, even if some form of dual candidacy were successful, the Constitution does give the Senate the means of dealing with the situation. It provides, in article I, section 5, clause 1, that "Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members." This provision would appear to give the Senate ample power to prevent a single individual from occupying two seats, even if two States each asserted that he was an inhabitant thereof.

We recognize that the foregoing is not completely responsive to your request, but we hope it may prove helpful.

Very truly yours,

DICKINSON, WRIGHT, MCKEAN & CUDLIP.

HOLLAND & HART,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
Denver, Colo., September 1, 1964.

Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOMINICK: You have requested our opinion whether, under the Constitution of the United States, (i) there is any restriction, by nature of qualification provisions or otherwise, upon a candidate for the office of U.S. Senator seeking election in more than one State; (ii) if elected in more than one State, could he hold two seats, or, indeed, could he hold two different Federal elective offices? Also we understand that you desire our opinion and observations upon the State residency qualifications for a U.S. Senator.

The Constitution negatively states the qualifications of a Senator as follows: "No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of 30 Years, and been 9 Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen." (U.S. Constitution, art. I, sec. 3, par 3).

Despite what this would seem to require literally, it was early established that it is sufficient if a Senator possesses the necessary qualifications when he takes his seat or oath of office. The case of Henry Clay, who was not 30 years of age when elected, established this precedent. Age at the time of assuming office and not at election was used again in 1935 in the case of Senator Rush D. Holt (Corwin, "The Constitution and What It Means Today," 12th ed. 1958, pp. 7, 9–10; "Constitution of the United States of America Annotated," Senate Doc. No. 170, 82d. Cong., 2d sess., 1953, p. 88). In the case of Senator Adelbert Ames of Mississippi, in 1870, it was held that residency at the time of taking his seat in the Senate rather than at the time of election was a sufficient qualification (Senate Doc. No. 71, 87th Cong., 2d sess., p. 44). This is contrary to the case of James Shields, of Illinois, in 1849, where it was held that the qualification of having been a citizen for nine years must be fulfilled "* * * at the commencement of the term for which he was elected" (Senate Doc. No. 71, 87th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 14–15).

Residency (an "inhabitant" is a resident (Corwin, supra, p. 7)) in a State at the time of election not being either required nor a disability, it appears quite possible that a candidate could run wherever he chooses. If he is successful in one State, he can establish residency there after the election and become one of its Senators. If he be successful in more than one, presumably he can elect which State he will represent, become a resident of it, and effectively deny the other the representation it chose. Furthermore, the Senate has refused to question whether a Senator-elect was a bona fide inhabitant of the State from which he was elected, holding that the certificate of the Governor that he is an inhabitant is sufficient qualification. See the case of Senator Stanley Griswold, of Ohio, in 1809 (S. Doc. No. 71, 87th Cong., 2d sess., p. 5).

We find no provision against this hedging possibility. However, there may be some deterrent effect in article I, section 5, paragraph 1, which we shall discuss shortly.

The problem of simultaneously holding two Federal elective offices is not solely related to the residency problem. In any event, there is no positive constitutional barrier to such possibility. The real deterrent would probably be article I, section 5, paragraph 1 which provides that "each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns, and Qualifications of its own Members. * * *" The "qualifications" referred to do not mean only the qualifications of sections 2 and 3 of article I. A House may disqualify "for reasons that appeal to the common judgment." For example, the House excluded a polygamist and the Senate excluded as a Member one whose credentials were deemed tainted by fraud and corruption because of the acceptance of certain sums of money in promotion of his candidacy. It might reasonably be anticipated that a House would exclude one who sought a seat there plus another Federal elective office.

At first blush it might appear that paragraph 2 of section 6 of article I would prohibit the holding of multiple Federal elective offices. That paragraph provides in part: "* * * no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office." First excluding an officeholder from "either House" indicates that "office" in his sense is not that of the office of a Member of either House. Further the literature indicates that "office" in this sense means an appointive office (*United States* v. *Hartwell*, 6 Wall. 385, 393 (1868)); these are the offices created by the Constitution or by act of Congress and, usually, filled by the President under provisions relating to the Executive Establishment (See Schwartz, "The Powers of Government," vol. II (1963), pp. 40–47, passim).

From the foregoing, it is our opinion that there is no constitutional bar to seeking election to the Senate from more than one State. There probably is a practical deterrent in occupying more than one Federal elective office.

As to the State residency qualification which would be desirable in the event the Constitution is amended to require more stringent residency requirements, we have some opinions and thoughts.

It has been this country's general constitutional scheme to leave to the States the determination of who is a qualified elector but the Constitution has prescribed the qualifications of the elected. We believe it would be desirable that any amendment leave the qualifications for the Senate in this posture, otherwise there can be 50 varieties of qualifications.

A quick survey shows that even for the electors there are very wide divergences among the several States. For example, 33 States have residency periods of 1 year to qualify as a voter. Seventeen States have residency periods other than a year, 2 of which require 2 years, 1 State 9 months, and 14 States 6 months. Nineteen States have different qualification to vote in presidential elections. In some this is as low as 20 days.

It is our feeling that any constitutional amendment should require that the candidate have been a bona fide resident of the State from which he seeks election for at least 1 year and it would be good if there could be built into the amendment or into its historical background the even tighter concept of domicile because this carries with it the implication of a "home." The following two observations of the late Justice Jackson illustrate what we mean:

"Domicile means a relationship between a person and a locality. It is the place, and the one place, where he has his roots and his real, permanent home." *Williams* v. *North Carolina*, 317 U.S. 287 at 322.

"The search for the domicile of any person capable of acquiring a domicile of choice is but a search for his 'home' ". *District of Columbia* v. *Murphy*, 314 U.S. 441 at 455.

If as a matter of expediency it is deemed advisable to give the States a greater share in the residency qualification, we believe that that qualification should be at least the qualification of an elector eligible to vote for representatives to the most numerous branch of the State's legislature. This would get away from extremely short periods of time which prevail in some instances for presidential elections. There may be a very good reason to have a short period for presidential election because of the great national importance of the office. One who is already a citizen should not be easily disenfranchised. As to Members of Congress, however, while they are national officers, their area of concern must include in some large measure the concerns of the State from which they are elected and in order adequately to discharge this duty, they should have had more than a formal or nominal contact with their States.

We hope that this opinion will assist you in answering the questions which you have raised.

Very truly yours,

HOLLAND & HART.

CHICKERING & GREGORY,
San Francisco, September 1, 1964.

Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOMINICK: Your letter to us of August 19, 1964, requests our opinions regarding certain questions arising out of the existing qualifications of a U.S. Senator and

regarding a proposed constitutional amendment relating to these qualifications. Our opinions are set forth below, together with a general discussion of the applicable law upon which we based these opinions.

Your proposed amendment and questions are addressed to the two principal problems of the "stranger senatorial candidate" and the "holding of multiple Senate seats."

As we see it, the "stranger candidate" situation involves a case in which a person, who is not a permanent inhabitant or resident of a State, attempts to establish such residence or habitancy shortly before deciding to run for the U.S. Senate in this State. In this connection, it should be noted that a "stranger candidate" could be either a "complete stranger," as in the cases of ROBERT KENNEDY and Pierre Salinger who have had few or none of the usual indicia of residence or habitancy for any long period of time, in the State in which they chose to run, or a temporary resident or inhabitant who, by maintaining a home, voting status, or other incidents in several States for some period of time, has established more substantial indicia of residence or habitancy in more than one State.

The problem of the "holding of multiple Senate seats" could involve a case in which a person seeks to run for several Senate seats simultaneously in the same national election, or one in which a person who has already been elected and seated as a U.S. Senator, subsequently seeks to be elected as a U.S. Senator from another State in another election.

Furthermore, these two problems will often interrelate in that a "multiple seating" situation will invariably involve a "stranger" situation, although the "stranger" situation will not always involve a "multiple seating" situation.

Your specific questions and our answers to those questions are as follows:

1. Would the proposed amendment in effect restrict a citizen to running for the office of U.S. Senator from one State only, and in that connection is the word "resident" sufficient to prevent the type of situation with which we are presently faced in the Salinger-Kennedy cases?

In our opinion, your proposed amendment would not restrict a citizen from running for the office of U.S. Senator from one State only nor is the word "resident" sufficient to prevent the type of situation presented in the cases of Pierre Salinger and ROBERT KENNEDY, although the adoption of such an amendment would make it more difficult for a person to run for the office of U.S. Senator from more than one State or to run in a State in which he has not established a permanent residence.

2. Is there anything in the present constitutional requirements of Federal precedents which would prevent a person:

(a) From running for the office for U.S. Senator in two or more States?

In our opinion, no existing constitutional requirement or Federal precedent specifically prevents a person from filing or running for the office of U.S. Senator in two or more States.

(b) From running while holding the office of U.S. Senator from one State for the same office from another State?

In our opinion, no existing constitutional requirement or Federal precedent specifically prevents a person from filing or running, while holding the office of U.S. Senator from one State, for the same office from another State.

(c) If elected from two or more States, be seated in such capacity from each of the States and thereby having the right to multiple votes, multiple staffs, and even perhaps multiple salaries?

The problem of the simultaneous holding of more than one Senate seat does not appear to be discussed by any of the authorities. However, in our opinion, a correct construction of the Constitution would prevent the seating of a person as a Senator from two or more States.

DISCUSSION OF QUESTIONS

The constitutional and legal principles applicable to the answers to these questions and the reasoning upon which we based our answers as are follows:

Article I, section 3, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution provides:

"No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of 30 years, and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

Article I, section 5, clause 1, provides:

"Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns, and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide."

The 17th amendment to the U.S. Constitution adopted May 31, 1913, provides:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

Pursuant to article I, section 5, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, the U.S. Senate has the sole authority to judge the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members. However, the U.S. Supreme Court may construe the language of the Constitution relating to this authority (*Barry v. United States ex rel. Cunningham*, 279 U.S. 597; 73 L. Ed. 867).

The words "resident" and "inhabitant," have no precise, separate and distinct legal definition. The meaning of these words must be determined by the contexts in which they are used and they are often used interchangeably.

The individual States select their nominees for election to the office of U.S. Senator through varying procedures and filing requirements. Some States, as in the case of California, provide for the selection of the party nominees by party primaries. Others, as in the case of New York, provide for such nominations through State conventions. After nomination, pursuant to the 17th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, all U.S. Senators must be elected by the direct vote of the people. Such election is then followed by a certification from a State official to the Senate of the fact of such election.

No existing provision of the U.S. Constitution or Federal precedent prevents a person who is over 30 years of age and has for 9 years been a citizen of the United States from moving to a State other than that of his permanent residence, establishing a temporary habitation or residence, filing and running for the office of U.S. Senator and being elected from said State if, at the time of his election, he is an "inhabitant" of that State. Moreover, no minimum period of time is required within which a person must have been an "inhabitant" and no State can enact any laws regarding residence, habitancy, or other requirements which add to or vary the constitutional qualifications for a Senator.

No existing provision of the U.S. Constitution or Federal precedent specifically prevents a person who is over 30 years of age and who has been 9 years a citizen of the United States from filing in two or more States for the office of U.S. Senator and running simultaneously for such offices or from filing for the office of U.S. Senator and running for such office in one or more additional States after he has already been elected and seated as a U.S. Senator. However, we believe it probable that, based upon some or all of the following arguments, the United States Senate would refuse to seat such person as a Senator from two or more States.

Multiple Senate seating accomplished by simultaneous election, appears to be prevented by the U.S. Constitution, article I, section 3, clause 3, providing that "no Person shall be a Senator * * * who shall not, when elected be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen," if the applicable Senate elections take place on the same day, because it would be difficult for a person to be an "inhabitant" of more than one State at once.

In addition, the 17th amendment to the U.S. Constitution clearly sets forth that each State shall have two Senators and that each Senator shall have one vote. It appears to be even less in keeping with the historic regional-representational basis of the U.S. Senate to permit the same person to hold Senate seats from different States than to permit the same person to hold different seats from the same State.

Furthermore, since the composition of the United States Senate is stated to be two Senators from each State, not merely representing each State, it appears that a Senator must continue to be an inhabitant from the State for which he has been chosen after he has been elected and during his continuance in office. Therefore, he could not qualify as an "inhabitant" of another State "when elected" during the continuation of another Senate term from another State.

Finally, the provision that each Senator shall have one vote appears to refer to an individual rather than to a Senate seat. Under this construction, if an individual were to hold several seats he would have only one vote with the result that only one of the several States whose seats he held would be able to vote both its seats.

It should be noted, in this connection, that article I, section 3, clause 1, contained provisions similar to those discussed immediately above, before being superseded by the 17th amendment.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

In our opinion, the proposed amendment, while helpful in both the "stranger candidate" and "multiple Senate seats" problem, does not completely prevent these practices for the following reasons:

The substitution of the word "resident" for the word "inhabitant," without setting forth more specific criteria, does not, in our opinion, make the provisions of article I, section 3, clause 3 more restrictive because, as seen above, the words "inhabitant" and "resident" are used interchangeably.

The addition of the 1-year requirement would tend to restrict the practice of "stranger candidacies," particularly in a "complete stranger" situation in which such a person would appear to be barred from filing or running by any reasonable interpretation by State officials of your amendment. However, in the case of a "temporary resident," the 1-year requirement, without further criteria, might not be such an effective prohibition.

The proposed 1-year residence requirement does not, in and of itself, prohibit a person from filing and running for multiple Senate seats. Nevertheless, particularly in a "complete stranger" situation where a person is running simultaneously in two or more States, it would be of some indirect assistance, because it would be more difficult for one person to meet this 1-year residence requirement in two or more States. However, where a person is a "temporary resident" in two or more States or where a person who

has been elected a Senator subsequently attempts to file and run in one or more States, this amendment would not be of such great assistance because such person may have established, to the satisfaction of State officials or courts, a 1-year residence for the purpose of filing and running.

This amendment does not specifically prohibit a person from being seated as a U.S. Senator from two or more States, if he has filed, run, and been elected as such. However, because of the additional 1-year requirement, the U.S Senate might base a refusal to approve multiple seating on a failure of the person to meet the somewhat stronger residence requirements in one or more States

Very truly yours,

CHICKERING & GREGORY.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I do not claim that the constitutional amendment I have proposed would solve all of the problems posed or answer all of the questions. It would, however, serve as a vehicle to explore the entire field and lead the way to more certainty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may lie on the table until March 22, 1965, for additional sponsors.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I hasten to concur in the remarks of the esteemed Senator from Colorado and to congratulate him for taking care of a situation with which I had first-hand experience and on which I did some research.

It is of extreme importance that a clarification of this situation be made, and made quickly, for the reasons which have been stated today and for other reasons, as well.

In my State of California, there was deep concern over the fact that the law was not clear on the subject of qualifications. I feel certain that one of the most popular things that could happen would be that a candidate running for the high office of U.S. Senator should be required to be a resident and a registered voter of the State for a period of at least 1 year.

Senators may recall that my experience was with a man whom I respect highly but to whose candidacy I objected because he arrived in the State, according to his own testimony, at 4 o'clock in the morning, took a room in a hotel, and at 5 o'clock that afternoon became a candidate for the high office of U.S. Senator. This is an example of what has happened in the past and might happen in the future.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Colorado upon his statement. I concur in it completely and hasten to add my name as a cosponsor.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from California for his comment. I had the pleasure of notifying his predecessor, when he sat in this body under an interim appointment last year, that I would probably use his name in the process of introducing this measure. He was in the Chamber and heard my comments at that time.

I stated at that time the very fact that the Senator from California has just mentioned: That the election of the Senator's predecessor was a classic example of one of the objections I was seeking to overcome. The Senator's predecessor said, and properly said, that he had been born in California and had lived there for a long time prior to his election, although he had not been there for many years.

Perhaps the Senator from California would be entertained to know that Mr. Mason, during the process of the debate on the constitutional provisions, said, in part:

If residence be not required, rich men of neighboring States may employ with success the means of corruption in some particular district, and thereby get into the public councils after having failed in their own State. This is the practice in the boroughs of England.

It was from the boroughs of England that we got the phrase "the rotten borough system." This is one of the problems that the proposed constitutional amendment might not wholly solve, but it would, at least, make a large step in that direction. I believe we should rely on the good judgment of the American people and the Members of this body to take care of any other problems that might arise thereafter.

Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] has asked me to have his name added as a cosponsor of the resolution, which I am happy to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. First, I should think the Senator from Colorado would get some encouragement for his resolution by reason of the recent experience in England, where the movement of Members of the House of Commons on a kind of magic flying carpet has been the custom for a long time. The people of England, though, are beginning to rebel against the practice; and the rather surprising defeat of a distinguished member of the Wilson cabinet in the recent election was attributable, in part, to the fact that he was not a resident of the district which he sought to represent.

Mr. DOMINICK. If I remember correctly, he has now been defeated in the last two byelections. Of course, he ran in a different district each time. In neither case was the district the one in which he originally lived.

Mr. MUNDT. He was looking for the kind of district that Mr. Mason had in mind so long ago.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES TONIGHT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk House Concurrent Resolution 352 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 352), as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

RECESS TO 8:25 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate, under the previous order, stand in recess until 8:25 this evening.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the previous order, until 8:25 p.m., the same day.

At 8 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m., on the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Vice President.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, the Chair appoints as members of the committee on Reorganization, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS].

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate, preceded by its Chief Clerk (Emery L. Frazier), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives, to hear

the message of the President of the United States.

(The message of the President of the United States, this day delivered by him to a joint session of the two Houses of Congress, appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, and in accordance with the order previously entered, at 9 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m., the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, March 16, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 15, 1965:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Verdi Beethoven Barnes, O17198, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Russell Lowell Vittrup, O17681, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Vernon Price Mock, O19906, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Paul R. Tyler	Bruno A. Hochmuth
William J. VanRyzin	William R. Collins
William T. Fairbourn	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

John G. Bouker	Joseph L. Stewart
Norman J. Anderson	John P. Coursey
Keith B. McCutcheon	Joseph S. Reynaud
Ronald R. Van-Stockum	William K. Jones
	Hugh M. Elwood

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

George E. Tomlinson
John L. Winston

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Charles F. Duchein
Sidney S. McMath

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

J. B. Skates, Bessemer, Ala., in place of M. E. Baird, retired.

Ralph L. Newsom, Georgiana, Ala., in place of Herman Pride, retired.

Agnes J. Thompson, Midway, Ala., in place of E. D. King, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Michael E. Neish, Crescent City, Calif., in place of M. B. Ellis, retired.

Roscoe J. King, Indio, Calif., in place of D. P. Furgeson, retired.

Lucius D. Davis, Morongo Valley, Calif., in place of V. C. McCracken, retired.

Joseph J. Morabito, San Martin, Calif., in place of W. B. Sheldon, retired.

Emeret M. Beltrami, Soulsbyville, Calif., in place of E. R. Campbell, retired.

COLORADO

Claudius E. Allbee, Alamosa, Colo., in place of H. E. May, deceased.

Ole H. Lee, Arriba, Colo., in place of J. R. Kraxberger, deceased.

Hattie A. Myers, Association Camp, Colo., in place of D. B. Byrd, retired.

Laurell E. Julius, Evergreen, Colo., in place of A. J. Elmgreen, retired.

Wilbur D. Kaufman, Genoa, Colo., in place of Mary Stramp, retired.

Norman H. Ely, Golden, Colo., in place of Z. M. Pike, retired.

Clifford E. Anderson, Grover, Colo., in place of W. L. Robbins, transferred.

Margaret S. Willits, Haswell, Colo., in place of J. E. Johnson, retired.

Cletus M. Gilleland, Manassa, Colo., in place of Frank Brady, retired.

GEORGIA

Harry L. King, Brinson, Ga., in place of J. D. Watts, transferred.

Clifford A. Pickens, Fitzgerald, Ga., in place of J. J. Pryor, retired.

Lindsey H. Epps, Marietta, Ga., in place of P. E. Cody, retired.

Fred L. Cowart, Metter, Ga., in place of P. L. Miles, deceased.

Helen M. O'Hearn, Parrott, Ga., in place of W. H. Marshall, retired.

Ernest L. O'Brien, Surrency, Ga., in place of Carr McLemore, retired.

IDAHO

Paul M. Thornton, Clark Fork, Idaho, in place of E. W. Nowlin, retired.

Margene S. Altom, Oakley, Idaho, in place of D. B. Howells, retired.

ILLINOIS

Joseph E. Cavalier, Maywood, Ill., in place of R. T. Gavin, retired.

George R. Kohlmiller, Moro, Ill., in place of M. E. Ayres, resigned.

INDIANA

James R. Zoll, Bluffton, Ind., in place of Roy Biberstine, retired.

Robert L. Lewis, Campbellsburg, Ind., in place of N. P. Lewis, retired.

Verl L. Gray, Sidney, Ind., in place of F. R. Jellison, retired.

IOWA

Dennis S. Brannan, Coon Rapids, Iowa, in place of L. C. Bowman, deceased.

Thomas L. McDermott, Oto, Iowa, in place of C. P. McKenna, deceased.

Roger E. McCormick, Rinwick, Iowa, in place of L. P. Mimbach, retired.

Joseph R. Gamble, Spirit Lake, Iowa, in place of E. E. Shelledy, retired.

Maurice A. Clemens, West Point, Iowa, in place of M. C. Schuck, retired.

KANSAS

Philip E. Travis, Eskridge, Kans., in place of F. L. Robinson, retired.

Blanche L. Bell, Isabel, Kansas., in place of E. D. Thompson, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Robert L. Collier, Crittenden, Ky., in place of W. H. Lillard, resigned.

Louis A. Runyon, Pikeville, Ky., in place of Grant Phillips, Jr., retired.

MAINE

Donald S. Bradstreet, Albion, Maine, in place of V. G. Clark, retired.

Everett B. Lenentine, Monticello, Maine, in place of O. F. Temple, retired.

Robert L. Sutherland, Portage, Maine, in place of Phoebe Stevens, retired.

MARYLAND

Alice I. Baker, Saint James, Md., in place of G. P. Bloom, retired.

MICHIGAN

Dorothy M. Carrington, Bay Port, Mich., in place of B. C. McLeish, retired.

MINNESOTA

Marian L. Peterson, Afton, Minn., in place of H. R. Peterson, deceased.

Thomas E. Devine, Belle Plaine, Minn., in place of J. G. McRaith, retired.

James R. Maalis, Crosby, Minn., in place of K. J. Hasskamp, deceased.

Delbert E. Lutterman, Sherburn, Minn., in place of P. D. McCarron, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Raoul K. Read, Louin, Miss., in place of H. A. Kennedy, retired.

MISSOURI

John E. Daniels, Kirksville, Mo., in place of L. B. Funk, retired.

David A. Hoverson, Saint Joseph, Mo., in place of T. J. Quinn, retired.

NEBRASKA

Lois I. Huffer, Monroe, Nebr., in place of R. T. Fleming, retired.

NEVADA

Ardith C. Burrell, Crystal Bay, Nev., in place of V. L. Wood, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Eva D. Young, Center Harbor, N.H., in place of H. F. Smith, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Alfred W. Conrads, Andover, N.J., in place of E. D. Hill, retired.

Helen B. Milne, Elwood, N.J., in place of E. F. Bozarth, retired.

Allan George, Hazlet, N.J., in place of J. R. L. Jackson, retired.

Philip Serpico, Keyport, N.J., in place of H. T. Hopkins, retired.

Patricia A. Caul, Wallpack Center, N.J., in place of E. B. Rosenkrans, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Betty C. Ortega, Prewitt, N. Mex., in place of I. G. Fullerton, retired.

NEW YORK

William H. Roberts, Blossvale, N.Y., in place of B. D. Ritter, deceased.

Elizabeth D. Baker, Setauket, N.Y., in place of K. D. Woods, resigned.

William W. Thomas, Stittville, N.Y., in place of J. C. Blust, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Marvin A. Rivenbark, Currie, N.C., in place of W. E. Newton, transferred.

Frank Ramsey, Marshall, N.C., in place of Grace Freeman, retired.

William R. Ray, Nakina, N.C., in place of L. C. Ward, retired.

OHIO

Lloyd O. Smith, Little Hocking, Ohio, in place of M. C. Sellars, retired.

OKLAHOMA

William I. Rains, Krebs, Okla., in place of Josie Michael, retired.

Dorothy W. Orr, Mill Creek, Okla., in place of P. L. Bulman, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

William F. Jung, Baden, Pa., in place of Richard Wilson, deceased.

Richard C. McLaughlin, Corry, Pa., in place of J. P. Sullivan, deceased.

Nicholas C. Nachman, East Springfield, Pa., in place of M. G. Spencer, retired.

Eslie L. Emerson, Genesee, Pa., in place of B. M. Fitzstephens, retired.

William H. Couch, Greenville, Pa., in place of J. W. Reznor, retired.

Russell R. Weaver, Jackson Center, Pa., in place of J. H. McConnell, retired.

Charles M. Griffith, Mahaffey, Pa., in place of W. L. Stephenson, deceased.

Donald J. Bogert, North East, Pa., in place of L. A. Clavin, retired.

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.

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 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 farmowners 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
	Chelf	Evins, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn	Clark	Farbstein
	Cohelan	Farnsley
Andrews, N. Dak.	Corman	Farnum
	Craley	Feighan
Annunzio	Cramer	Flood
Aspinall	Culver	Fogarty
Ayres	Curtin	Ford, Gerald R.
Barrett	Daddario	Fraser
Bates	Daniels	Frelinghuysen
Beckworth	Davis, Wis.	Fuqua
Bingham	Dawson	Garmatz
Boggs	de la Garza	Gathings
Brademas	Dent	Giaimo
Broomfield	Denton	Gibbons
Brown, Calif.	Dingell	Gonzalez
Broyhill, Va.	Dow	Goodell
Burke	Downing	Green, Pa.
Burton, Calif.	Dulski	Greigg
Byrne, Pa.	Duncan, Oreg.	Grider
Cahill	Dyal	Griffin
Callan	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
	Duncan, Tenn.	Moore
Arends	Edwards, Ala.	Murray
Ashmore	Erlenborn	O'Konski
Baldwin	Findley	O'Neal, Ga.
Baring	Fisher	Passman
Battin	Flynt	Poff
Belcher	Fountain	Pool
Bell	Gettys	Quillen
Bennett	Gross	Reid, Ill.
Berry	Gubser	Roberts
Betts	Gurney	Robison
Bonner	Hagan, Ga.	Rogers, Tex.
Bow	Haley	Roudebush
Bray	Hall	Satterfield
Brock	Halleck	Shriver
Brown, Ohio	Hansen, Idaho	Sikes
Buchanan	Harsha	Skubitz
Burleson	Harvey, Ind.	Smith, Va.
Burton, Utah	Hébert	Springer
Byrnes, Wis.	Henderson	Stanton
Cabell	Hull	Steed
Callaway	Hutchinson	Stephens
Casey	Jarman	Talcott
Cederberg	Johnson, Pa.	Taylor
Chamberlain	Jonas	Teague, Calif.
Clancy	Jones, Mo.	Teague, Tex.
Clausen, Don H.	King, N.Y.	Tuck
	Kornegay	Tuten
Clawson, Del	Langen	Utt
Collier	Latta	Waggonner
Colmer	Lennon	Watkins
Cooley	Lipscomb	White, Tex.
Cunningham	Long, La.	Whitener
Dague	McCulloch	Younger
Davis, Ga.	McEwen	
Devine	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,	Love	St Germain
William D.	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,
Laird	Roncalio	Charles H.

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]

MALE 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	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 discriminating 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. Sochinenila, 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 milita, 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

implemented and is working out very well. It can be made to work in any State that really wants it to work.

The 46th Anniversary of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, 46 years ago this month, the American Legion was founded in Paris by 20 officers who served in the American Expeditionary Force in France during World War I. A temporary committee was formed and they selected several hundred officers for membership who had the confidence and respect of the whole Army.

This group brought with them the raw material with which to build an association of veterans whose primary dedication was to God and country, to the child and to the veteran. Over the course of nearly half a century, the Legion has grown into the world's largest veterans organization with approximately 2.6 million members in about 16,500 posts in the United States and some foreign countries.

One of the areas in which the Legion has made its greatest contribution to American life is in the work it has done to develop a greater awareness of the importance of education to the Nation's welfare. As early as 1921, the Legion embarked on a determined campaign to improve the quality of our country's schools. They recognized that national greatness could only be achieved and maintained by a people trained to meet the challenges of the modern world. And toward that end they have supported countless programs to insure that American children are educated in quality schools manned by qualified instructors.

National Education Week, established to focus public attention to our schools, was a brainchild of early thinking by concerned Legionnaires. The Legion continues today as a cosponsor of this observance.

The Legion has also been in the forefront of those who are concerned with the need to foster patriotism. They do it directly through their National High School Oratorical contests which promote a knowledge and an understanding of the U.S. Constitution. They do it indirectly through the American Legion baseball program—a training ground for sound bodies, sound minds, and good sportsmanship.

These are wonderful examples of the actions taken by the American Legion to meet the challenge of its heritage—a heritage we must all strive to keep shining—a heritage that must be carried into the future by vigorous and selfless service at the community, State, and National level.

The American Legion looks forward to continuous useful contributions to American life. It will continue to shape its plans and adhere to principles set forth in the preamble to the National Constitution to the end that the American Legion always may be rightfully known as the best insurance policy a country ever had.

I am proud to salute the American Legion on the occasion of its 46th birthday.

Remarks of Speaker John W. McCormack at Veterans of Foreign Wars Banquet at Sheraton Park Hotel, March 9, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include your speech at the annual banquet of the VFW held on March 9, 1965, upon acceptance of their annual Congressional Award:

REMARKS OF SPEAKER JOHN W. MCCORMACK AT VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS BANQUET AT SHERATON PARK HOTEL, MARCH 9, 1965

I am highly honored and deeply touched by being selected as the recipient of the 1965 Veterans of Foreign Wars Congressional Award. I shall always treasure this honor conferred upon me by your great American organization.

For your organization stands for the highest ideals of Americanism, which your members have manifested by outstanding service in time of war, as well as dedicated service in time of peace.

While I am the direct recipient tonight of this significant award, I feel that I am receiving and accepting the same in the name of the House of Representatives, for its entire membership.

In confining my remarks to the House, which I love, I am proud of its actions in this period of world tension, of its contribution to a powerful national defense, and a strong and firm foreign policy.

This award brings back extraordinary remembrances.

Remembrances of battlefields in far countries.

Remembrances of fallen comrades in fierce fighting.

Remembrances of basic privations, of utter exhaustion, of discomforts almost beyond endurance.

Remembrances of perils shared—of heroism involving even the peril of life itself.

I know that you regard those experiences among the greatest, the most cherished, and the most precious of your lives, and which tie you in forever with the destiny of our beloved country.

But, unfortunately, war has never ceased.

The world is now undergoing a period of great strain.

Peace does not exist.

The very greatness we have achieved, so much through your direct services, has placed upon our country, whether or not we like it, the responsibility of the leadership of the free world.

And we have the responsibility of doing those things that are essential in the national interest of our country.

Sometimes those decisions are hard ones to make and to execute.

But above all, we must keep uppermost in our minds the national interest of the United States.

History has shown that our country and our people want world peace.

But not peace at any price.

If a climate favorable to progress toward peace exists, we should and will negotiate.

But we will not capitulate.

And the threats from Moscow or Peiping will not create fear in our minds.

For history has shown that America, when necessary, will fight—not for imperialism but for justice, freedom, and peace. And we Americans are fighters.

And the present membership of both political parties, under the leadership of President Johnson, will not tolerate appeasement.

For we know that the fears of the leaders of certain European nations before World War II lead to appeasement.

And we know that appeasement is the road to war.

We are aware when action is taken, such as Cuba, Tonkin Bay, and now Vietnam, that there are certain calculated risks involved.

But we are also aware that there is the other side of the coin—the calculated risks of inaction.

And in the life of a nation, and in the making of history, inaction can be more harmful at times than action.

For the basic policy of the United States of peace through strength is not only sound but is necessary.

And it is well that America is strong.

The price we pay for national defense is wise and necessary.

And as a legislator, if I am going to err in the field of national defense, particularly in the world of today, I prefer to err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness.

For the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear. And that is greater military strength on our part than possessed by the Communist part of the world.

For we cannot negotiate or deal with them on a moral level for they have no moral origin.

And for the same reason we cannot do so on the level of idealism. But there is one thing that the Communists cannot deny, and that is that the law of self-preservation applies to the people of the Soviet Union as it does to our people or the people of any other country.

And the price we pay for national defense is the premium we pay for the preservation of independence and liberty, and a marked contribution toward ultimate world peace.

And fortunately we now have, and in the past have had, Presidents who recognize the importance and the necessity of a powerful national defense, with the courage to make decisions and to take action when necessary.

And equally fortunate we now have and have had both branches of the Congress who, with vision and judgment, have voted for strong military strength.

And the world, particularly in the Communist part, is served with notice that there is complete unity between our executive and legislative branches, for a powerful national defense and a firm foreign policy.

And this unity, and more broadly the unity of our people in all respects, is a matter of great importance and strength in the eyes of the rest of the world.

With the deep religious convictions of our people; with the unity that exists among all our people and with our great military strength, we can look forward in the years that lie ahead with confidence to the ultimate success of our aims and to a world of peace. It is in this spirit that I accept this

significant award from your great organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America.

In my remarks to you at this point I'd like to emphasize my respect for one of the most astute and one of the most patriotically acceptable items in the long catalog of the achievements of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This is your brilliant and honorable technique for drawing into the orbit of your influence as a veteran and a patriotic organization the youths of America. This is why I look with pride and hope at the young people here who are the winners in the essay contest entitled "Voice of America." For these young folk are indeed the breadth and the spirit of our country and the repository of its dreams and its destiny.

And you, the VFW, are their guide and their mentors.

May I put in here humbly as one who has struggled for almost a half century to focus the attention of our people everywhere on the legacy and the ideals and goals of our country that in my judgment no work is greater than this mass educational effort in 50 States and our territories that you call Voice of America. It is in the field of education—inspired education—that we have the heartbeat and the life's blood of democracy. But before we can have democracy you and I know that it must be learned, and understood. And the earlier we teach and inculcate it into the hearts and the minds of America's youth the greater is the force it promises to be for the future.

To project this teaching on the competitive plane and make it a contest to see who can think the best and write and speak the best for the ideals of our country is a tribute to the principle of enlightened incentive which the VFW so wisely employs in this instance.

I congratulate the winners of this noble contest and I salute its sponsors, the VFW, and its leadership. It is through contests exactly like this that you, the VFW, are giving our people one of the dramatic, exciting, and affirmative antidotes to juvenile shortcomings and failure and an avenue for uplift that—as we see here—has its obvious and heartening success.

The History and Craft of Lettering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, much is heard these days of the need for publishing by college professors and for the constant requirement that they participate in the intellectual pursuit of their specialties. Prof. Thomas D. Greenley of Amityville, Long Island, in my congressional district, is a scholar who has done just that. He has recently completed a booklet called "The Descendants of Alpha Beta—A Brief Guide to the History and Craft of Lettering." I call the attention of my colleagues to this scholarly treatise because it greatly and fascinatingly describes how lettering has affected the art of commmunication of mankind.

Professor Greenley has most lucidly explained how lettering is truly the product of international cooperation. Nearly every great nationality of the world has made a contribution. Every nation in its own way has helped develop this most needed art called communication. It is a pleasure for me, as the Congressman from the Second Congressional District of New York, to have as one of my constituents such an outstanding scholar as Prof. Thomas D. Greenley, professor of art at the State university agricultural and technical institute at Farmingdale.

Rev. John J. Reeb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I suggested that American flags be flown at half-mast to express the Nation's sorrow over the death of the Reverend John J. Reeb in Alabama, who gave his life in the cause of human rights, dignity, and freedom.

Lowering the flag would also be an expression of shame for the events in Alabama, where the courageous clergyman was a victim of ignorance, bigotry, and hate, a natural reaction to the breakdown of civilized government in that State, where the murder of innocent men and the killing and crippling of little girls goes unpunished.

The Governor of Alabama and his police-state tactics have seriously damaged the image of the United States in the free world and have given the Communists a powerful propaganda weapon.

Our Nation mourns today with a widowed mother and her four fatherless children. Let us hope that the recent brutal killing will encourage the good citizens of Alabama to cleanse their State of official lawlessness, brutality, and national shame.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, Alabama has been represented in both Houses of Congress by dedicated Representatives, of whom the people of that State and the Nation are mighty proud.

Let us give encouragement to the decent white citizens of that State who last week marched to the courthouse in Selma to express a sense of outrage at official misconduct, police brutality, and suppression of the rights of citizens.

The leader of the group of 72 white citizens which made the courageous march was Joseph Ellwanger, chairman of the Concerned White Citizens of Alabama.

As white citizens of Alabama—Ellwanger said:

> We have come to tell the Nation that there are white people in Alabama who will speak out against the events which have recently occurred. By our presence we affirm our faith in the abiding principles upon which our Nation is founded—a nation under God with liberty and justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, if the recent tragic event in Selma will awaken the consciences of Alabama citizens, Reverend Reeb will not have died in vain.

What the People Are Thinking—Answers to a Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent questionnaires to every registered voter in the district I represent, covering nine important current issues. The responses were tremendous, and furnish a dependable and accurate cross section of public opinion on the subjects included, in the 27-county Texas district.

It is believed this represents the first complete poll of a district this year. Tabulation of the returns has now been completed. The results should, under the circumstances, be of particular interest as an indicator of public opinion at the grassroots level.

It is significant, for example, that in that 27-county district, 83 out of every 100 are opposed to a medicare program to be financed by an increase in social security taxes.

Eighty-six out of every one hundred in that large district oppose repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, thus favoring right-to-work laws.

Another interesting reaction relates to the President's proposed changes in our immigration laws. By an overwhelming majority of 78 percent the people in that area oppose scrapping our traditional national origins quota system, and the other proposed changes.

Had the people in the 21st District of Texas had their way about it the mammoth Appalachia aid project would have been soundly defeated. They oppose it by a ratio of 67 to 23, with 10 percent undecided.

The people down there want no part of additional Federal aid to education, as shown by the tabulation.

Sixty-nine percent of them think the Federal Government should do more research in the field of birth control, and the dissemination of such knowledge to those who desire it.

I am indebted to my constituents for their cooperation in making this survey such a success. The returns include thousands of comments on various topics, such as foreign aid—which they think should be reduced, and I think correctly so. These people are understandably concerned about the mounting public debt, so much deficit spending, and the constant growth of big government in Washington at the expense of local self-government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, and all others, to heed the views thus expressed by a constituency that is aroused and concerned about their Government and the future of our country.

The questions and the results of the tabulation follow:

1. Right-to-work laws: Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permits States to enact laws prohibiting compulsory unionism as a condition for employment (right-to-work

laws). Nineteen States, including Texas, now have such laws. The President has asked the Congress to repeal section 14(b), the purpose of which would be to invalidate the States right-to-work laws.

Are you in favor of repealing section 14 (b)?

	Percent
Yes	11
No	86
Undecided	3

2. Aid to Appalachia: In addition to the antipoverty and other programs now in effect, the President has asked the Congress to authorize a special Federal aid program for Appalachia (consisting of 11 States—Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama), at a Federal cost of about $1 billion the first year. The program calls for additional highway construction, more hospitals, public works, agriculture and mining assistance, etc.

Are you in favor of this?

	Percent
Yes	23
No	67
Undecided	10

3. Immigration: The President has called for the repeal of our 40-year-old national origins quota system which fixes limited quotas of immigrants from European countries at one-sixth of 1 percent of people in each national origins group, as of 1920; and for nonquota admissions of people from Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago.

Are you in favor of this?

	Percent
Yes	13
No	78
Undecided	9

4. Local aid: Do you believe the Federal Government should spend more or less money to aid local problems of transportation, welfare, housing, etc.?

	Percent
More	14
Less	66
Present level	53

(NOTE.—A number of these answers were qualified.)

5. Aid to education: The President has proposed a 5-year Federal aid plan for public and private schools and colleges, costing $1.2 billion the first year. This would include teacher salary and classroom construction for some elementary and secondary public schools; aid for nurseries and kindergartens; aid for upgrading school libraries; aid to finance supplemental centers; aid for colleges, including scholarships and loans for needy students; aid for buying books, operating workshops, science labs, and participation in "supplemental" centers for public, church-supported and other private schools.

Do you favor Federal aid for teachers' salaries?

	Percent
Yes	25
No	69
Undecided	6

Are you in favor of Federal aid for school construction?

	Percent
Yes	39
No	54
Undecided	7

Do you favor Federal aid for church-supported and other private schools?

	Percent
Yes	11
No	84
Undecided	5

6. Medicare: 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?

	Percent
Yes	13
No	83
Undecided	4

7. Kerr-Mills medicare: Six years ago the Congress authorized a joint Federal-State plan to help finance the cost of both hospital and medical bills for the needy over 65, administered by the States. Many States, including Texas, have adopted this plan.

Do you prefer the Kerr-Mills plan over the President's plan as set forth in question 6?

	Percent
Yes	80
No	12
Undecided	8

Do you favor both plans?

	Percent
Yes	8
No	71
Undecided	21

8. Do you think Federal expenditures during a fiscal year should be limited to Federal revenues collected for that period?

	Percent
Yes	84
No	9
Undecided	7

9. Birth control: Having in mind the problem posed by population explosion, do you think the Federal Government should do more in scientific research for birth control techniques, with results to be made available to those who seek more knowledge on the subject?

	Percent
Yes	69
No	22
Undecided	9

Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is not only the American farmer that cannot afford to have farm programs ended. The American economy and the public which it supports can afford it even less than the farmers.

Farmowners and operators hold about $216 billion in assets which is approximately 40 percent of all capital investment in the United States today. Farmers annually spend about $29 billion in production expenses and have about $16 billion invested in cars, trucks, and farm machinery. Should farm programs be terminated and farm income fall, one of the first expenditures to be cut would be investment in machinery and equipment.

The cost to the Federal budget for maintaining these expenditures at about the present production rate is $12.8 billion a year which is what the Commodity Credit Corporation spent in price supports and acreage diversion programs.

These programs maintained farm income $6.6 billion a year higher than it would have been without them. Each $100 of expenditures by the Commodity Credit Corporation, therefore, increased farm income by $236.

The American farmers of today contribute a great deal to the economy. Farmers now have engines which produce more horsepower than the combined power of engines and turbines of all the Nation's factories, private and commercial aircraft, railroads, merchant ships, and mines together.

American farms now annually use about 3.4 billion gallons of fuel, 28 billion kilowatt hours of electricity, about 7 percent of the Nation's steel production, 320 million pounds of rubber which is about 9 percent of that used in the country, and $1.7 billion for dwellings and service buildings.

The economy of this country can well afford to support agricultural programs. If we are to maintain job opportunities and economic growth, we cannot afford to overlook the contributions of American agriculture. Money spent in raising farm income reflects back into the economy of America at a ratio of 2 to 1.

President's Anticrime Message Outlines Worthy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, all Americans should be aware of the announcement Tuesday by J. Edgar Hoover that the serious crime rate in the United States increased 13 percent in 1964 over 1963.

This is compared to an increase of 10 percent over the previous year, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It means an increase of more than 250,000 serious offenses last year, including murder, up 9 percent; forcible rape, up 19 percent; aggravated assault, up 18 percent, and robbery, up 12 percent.

These are shocking figures, and need to be brought to the attention of all of our citizens.

President Johnson has made a strong effort to halt this rise in crime in the United States by his message to Congress last Monday, suggesting positive legislation to combat crime and juvenile delinquency. He has a worthy program, and I am hopeful that Congress will enact proper and substantial legislation in this field.

Believing that the problems of crime and juvenile delinquency—FBI's Director Hoover reports that there was a 13-percent jump in arrests of persons under 18 years of age in his recent survey, while the juvenile population aged 10 through 17 increased by only 4 percent—are critical problems, I have introduced three bills, which follow the President's outline. My bill, H.R. 4937, would provide for Federal assistance for programs of research and experimentation in crime prevention and detection, and for the

training of law enforcement personnel. H.R. 4938 would establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime, and H.J. Res. 321 would provide for a White House Conference on Crime Prevention and Juvenile Delinquency.

Crime is a national problem, although it is the direct responsibility of our local and State governments. The responsibility extends to all of our citizens, and we must do all we can to reverse these drastic increases in crime rates.

We Want for Every Family a Sense of Identification With Middle-Class America—Address to National Housing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed for the past 10 years the privilege of serving on the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and the opportunity to help write laws which now provide so much help to the average American family—and to all families—to achieve better living conditions in our expanding cities and suburban areas, and in rural areas, too. Since the end of World War II, America has become a nation of homeowners. But slums remain unconquered and the problems of assuring decent housing for low-income families still persist.

This morning, on the invitation of Mr. Nathaniel S. Keith, president of the National Housing Conference, I participated in a general session of the 34th annual convention of this outstanding organization and discussed some of the many problems we are facing and trying to solve in the field of housing and community development. The National Housing Conference has contributed tremendous leadership and imagination to the solution of these problems ever since it was organized during the depths of the great depression in 1931.

The point I tried to stress in my address, Mr. Speaker, was the need for the instilling of motivation and responsibility in the families we are trying to help most—motivation to want to improve their living standards and a sense of responsibility for the programs geared to help them. As I see it, we should try to encourage every family needing assistance in the achievement of better housing to identify itself with middle-class America and seek to become a part of it.

Years ago, the Communists—and some non-Communist intellectuals—sneered at middle-class standards and middle-class goals. But today, I think most American families are "middle class," and proud of it, and I think it is a mighty good group to be part of. Every American family should be helped to reach that level; and that means not only the achievement of more comforts of living, but also of the sense of responsibility and morality which traditionally go with "middle class" standards.

My remarks, Mr. Speaker, were as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSOURI, AT 34TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 15, 1965

It would be impossible for a longtime member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency not to feel completely at home at a convention session of the National Housing Conference, particularly with my former colleague in the House, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, sharing the speaking program today and with "Mr. Housing and Redevelopment" of my hometown of St. Louis, Charlie Farris, serving as chairman of this meeting.

I am delighted to be able to join you this morning to discuss some of our mutual problems in this great work of remaking our cities into a proper environment for the Great Society.

We still have a long, long, road to travel to reach that destination.

But I do not say that in despair, or even in discouragement; and certainly not in disparagement, either. Looking back on the long road we have already traveled in pursuit of the goal of good housing and adequate community facilities for our expanding population, I sincerely believe we have much to be proud of, even though our cities are no Eden, by any means. If we want to comfort ourselves further, we need only remember that—speaking of our cities and their failure to approach Eden—there was sin in Eden, too.

The National Housing Conference was formed at a time when only idiots and visionaries saw any horizon of hope for the future of America and her cities. In 1931, the goal of a decent home for every American was realistic only in terms of getting people in out of the rain—and for many Americans, an abandoned coke oven or a packing box under a bridge abutment fulfilled this minimum ambition.

THE CHALLENGES TO OUR CITIES

In the 34 years in which your organization has been in existence, our Nation has been transformed from a miserably poor to an affluent population, and from a nation of renters and transients into one of homeowners. Nevertheless, there is still at least as much need now for the continued efforts and drive of this organization as there was before the Federal Housing Act made homeownership a practical reality, or the Housing Act of 1937 established the principle of public housing, or the Housing Act of 1949 accomplished the great breakthrough of urban renewal. For, despite the rows of ramblers marching across suburbia, and the high-rise apartments—public or private, co-op or condominiums—dotting our cities, and rising particularly in the expanses of empty land in urban renewal areas, we all know very well that the vigorous running we have done since 1937 to try to eradicate slums and replace them with good housing has hardly done more than keep us even—as if we were on a treadmill.

The cities have been magnets for the disadvantaged and dispossessed from rural areas all over America; they have come to settle alongside of, or in the same buildings or even the same dwelling units with, our hard-luck urban families. We shuffle them around from time to time as new structures are erected on the sites where they had lived, but in a great many cases they do not find themselves in any better environment and often it is worse. The cities have made a remarkable comeback since President Truman put through the 1949 act, but many of the people in the cities, no matter how good their housing, are trapped in giant spider webs of congested, dirty streets, and a miasma of environmental pollution of every kind, not to mention a crime problem which sends shivers through us every time we read a newspaper or hear a newscast of the latest beatings, knifings, shootings, robberies, and vandalism.

IMPERFECT COMMUNICATION

If I may say so, the troubles in our cities today are to a certain extent, your fault. I mean that seriously. I know you are decent, hard-working, upstanding people—that you are dedicated to the cause of good housing in communities where people can live together in comfort and contentment. But with all you have accomplished in these past 34 years as an organization, you have nevertheless failed.

You have failed not because of lack of hard work on your own part; but you have failed because you haven't imparted to enough of your neighbors in your own communities the excitement which you yourselves have felt in tackling this great challenge.

In other words, too much of the housing and community development effort of the past 34 years has been the dedicated effort of a few, rather than the mass effort of the whole community.

Let me give the perfect example. In my own city, the fruits of urban renewal are beginning to appear in great clusters. A tour through the renewal areas is a thrilling experience, particularly for those who remember the forbidding slums and ugly warehouses and rundown industrial plants and pot-holed streets and the other eye-sores which used to occupy the same land. But in the years in which these marvels of redevelopments were being planned, the empty land, to thousands of impatient St. Louisians, was an eloquent testimonial to public waste and planned chaos.

Southwest Washington for years presented a similiar picture of a war-ravaged wasteland before the new buildings began to rise and the surge of revitalization began.

Artists' renditions of how something is going to look years hence are seldom convincing to the people who see a teeming area of a city turned into a vast and silent cemetery for rubble and fill. Critical citizens add on to the proposed resale subsidy of a redevelopment area the total of taxes lost during the period the land lies fallow, and what appears sometimes to be a top-heavy bureaucracy of planners, architects, administrators and real estate lawyers, and come to the conclusion that urban renewal is going to destroy the city's solvency—and that of Uncle Sam as well. Farsighted elective officials go down to defeat as bumblers and wasters. Then, years later, when the spectacular results are clearly visible, no one even bothers to remember the identities of the officials who sacrificed their careers for what seemed to be a giant boondoggle.

I use urban renewal as an example of poor communication to the public, only because it is such a glaringly obvious one. On a less spectacular level, however, everything about community development, and particularly public housing, suffers from the same lag in community understanding and effective communication.

PROBLEMS IN PUBLIC HOUSING

I have served on the Housing Subcommittee since it was established by Brent Spence in 1955, with Albert Rains as our first and, until this year, only chairman. During all of that time, and for years before that, public housing has been the whipping boy in all of the housing bills and in all of the appropriation bills which included funds for housing programs. Yet without public housing,

we could never have begun to carry out our relocation programs, and without substantially more public housing—or the alternative of rent subsidies proposed by the President—we will find it more and more difficult to clear the sites for further civic improvements.

There are many reasons why public housing has suffered so consistently from attack. And I don't think we have faced up to the criticisms with sufficient courage or candor. I can illustrate that best, I believe, with a personal recollection.

Several years ago, during our subcommittee hearings on an omnibus housing bill, I raised a lot of questions about the law and the practices under which public housing operates. I always raise such questions whenever I have an opportunity to discuss this matter with informed people. I have done so in all of our hearings over the years. I have bitterly condemned the restrictions which make it necessary—or seemingly necessary—to build high-rise apartment structures for low-income families with young children. I know there are dollar limitations on dwelling unit costs under public housing. I know that land in our central cities is terribly expensive, and that a high-rise is much more economical to build than a similar number of units in garden-type buildings. But until we get out of this format for family dwelling units, I will continue to be critical.

I constantly raised questions about the pay scales for the people who do the actual interviewing of prospective tenants. I feel that we need our very best staff people in those jobs—these are the critical points of contact with people who will make or break a public housing project.

I urged an opening up of the projects to intensive community education and social rehabilitation work—such as we are doing in St. Louis through the University of Missouri Extension Service and trained social workers on an experimental basis.

WE MUST NEVER CLOSE OUR EYES TO PROGRAM FAULTS

I wanted to know how urgently the housing authorities were tackling the project crime problem—using our own diligent efforts in this direction in St. Louis as a yardstick. I pressed for information on the methods used to impart a higher sense of responsibility among the tenants for protection of the property and to help through example and interest to raise standards all along the line.

Certainly these were critical questions and were based on a conviction that all in public housing was far from well.

But imagine my complete surprise one day when a good friend came to see me—one who knew my record over the years on housing legislation and who knew I was a friend of good housing for all Americans—and reported to me that the word had gotten around that I was going to oppose new funds for public housing.

Had I changed my mind—done a flip-flop—run out on my own voting record?

I was flabbergasted. I find it somewhat amusing now to look back on the experience, but I was not amused at the time. Together, my friend and I went through the transcript of the most recent hearing in which I had raised so many questions. When we finished, my visitor said:

"If everyone were as much an 'enemy' of public housing as you are we'd have the most successful public housing program in the world for it is obvious you want the program to succeed, not fail."

I believe that with the help and assistance of the antipoverty program, we are now getting down to essentials. We are going to work much more with people, instead of just bricks and mortar, in making public housing more effective as an instrument of social progress.

PROJECT DESIGNED FOR GENERATIONS AGO

It is just too bad that much of this could not have been accomplished long before now, without waiting for the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. We have had a golden opportunity in the public housing program for 28 years to do the things we are now going to do.

Everyone in this room, I am sure, is an enthusiastic supporter of the goals of the antipoverty program. Most of you have been trying to achieve these same goals for as long as you have been identified with or interested in public policy. But housing people have not always had community support for these goals, and sometimes it was necessary to go along with community attitudes rather than to try to overcome them.

When public housing first came in, a generation and a half ago, the projects were plain, raw, far from luxurious, but were heaven for the people who moved into them from festering slums. Practically everyone was poor in the thirties, and the slum-dwellers eligible for public housing were a pretty good cross section of urban America. For those with motivation, and some education, the housing projects were a welcome way station on the way to a better life. The tenants took fierce pride in their new homes, and in the neighborly life of the new community. The public housing we have today, however, is largely designed for that urban life of a generation ago. In the meantime, as wage levels rose, and employment opportunities expanded, the income limitations more and more tended to restrict public housing to disadvantaged families which made the projects their permanent residences.

GETTING MORE FAMILIES OUT OF PUBLIC HOUSING

Now we have got to work at getting more families out of public housing by helping them to train for better employment opportunities. We have got to help get the children into college—if they have the capacity—or into vocational classes which can train them in today's technical skills. The housing project, in my opinion, is a perfect battleground for one of the most important engagements of the war on poverty. Thanks to President Johnson's multiweapon attack on poverty, we have many new tools we can use. The important thing, however, must be personal motivation.

We can't do the job which must be done with our impoverished families merely by providing a clean apartment in a building equipped with all modern improvements. In addition to AMI, we need AOM—all out motivation. There is no reason whatsoever—with the opportunities which now exist for any youngster to get a good education—for project kids to be dropouts because of a sense of what's the use. There is a use. If their families won't or can't get on the tails of these youngsters to push them into the path of their beckoning opportunities, then society has got to provide that push. Those who run our public housing programs have a magnificent opportunity to provide some of that inspiration—and there are countless community organizations, from the Cub Scouts on up to an urban equivalent of the 4–H Clubs, to provide know-how and active assistance.

We constantly hear, in the Subcommittee on Housing, that public housing has limitations; that it can't provide the complete answer to the housing needs of the Nation, that it has been undernourished in terms of congressional support and community acceptance, and so on and so son. All of us know those statements to be true.

RESPONSIBILITY ON TENANTS

But I feel that we have not accomplished nearly as much as we could have accomplished with the public housing program we already have. And because we haven't done more than has been done, the necessary public and congressional support to accomplish the necessary expansion of public housing has been denied to us. Thus, after a good fast start in the late thirties, and again after World War II, public housing became almost a bad word on the Hill, and in countless communities, and at one point we had to fight merely to keep the program from being abandoned. The advocates of public housing went on the defensive then and have remained there ever since.

I believe in the principle of a good home for every American family willing to try to do its share toward maintaining or improving the environment in which it lives. There are exciting opportunities open to us now to make this idea into a reality. But the days are past when we can afford the philosophic luxury of believing the apartment itself upgrades the people in it. Many families must learn how to live in today's society. They just don't know how. We want for every family a sense of identification with middle-class America. How do we go about imparting middle-class values to those who never were exposed to them? This, I believe, is our main challenge in the war on poverty. Middle-class standards impose such things as good manners, consideration for others, respect for morality and decency—in effect, the Ten Commandments written into daily living. Most of America is middle class. Everyone should be helped to aspire to at least that level.

The families which live in public housing came there originally out of desire for better living conditions. We have tried hard to make them feel that they are not charity cases—that they deserve decent housing and that the community and the Federal Government are more than willing to help them achieve this goal. Somewhere along the line, however, many families have lost sight of the fact that their fellow citizens have made sacrifices—perhaps not great sacrifices, but some sacrifice—to make these new homes possible. When a community builds a public housing project and relegates the people in it to an isolated life out of the community mainstream, there is hardly much room among the tenants for a great surge of gratefulness for living in what amounts to a ghetto. On the other hand, when the community approaches public housing with a sincere desire to help the tenants make a better life in the American tradition, there is a tremendous responsibility on the tenants—all of them—to rise to the opportunities. But we are dealing with people, not abstract concepts. And I don't think—by and large—we have worked hard enough, or with sufficient hardheadedness, to extract as much responsibility from public housing tenants as we could, or to inspire them sufficiently with the opportunities open to them, or at least to their children.

WE MUST FIGHT HARDER FOR HOUSING GOALS DESPITE ATTACKS

Marie McGuire has been doing an outstanding job—I want to make that clear. I am with her in what she is trying to do. This organization has also done an outstanding job of providing leadership in the whole field of housing, and I salute you for it—as a friend who perhaps speaks to friends too frankly. But my purpose is to encourage you to fight harder for what we all believe in—and never mind the attacks from those who have always opposed our housing programs. We will never win over the anti's, no matter what we do. We have the strength now, I believe, to push ahead decisively. This is a good Congress, and the Banking and Currency Committee in the House, under WRIGHT PATMAN's chairmanship, will almost certainly recommend a good housing bill. We will miss Al Rains in managing the

bill on the floor but I have no doubt that the bill will again be well managed nonetheless.

If what I have said today touches on any sensitive nerves—and I hope it does not—I apologize for hurt feelings, but I think this issue is too important to be allowed to suffer from lack of complete candor among the friends of housing legislation. I am reminded of a news article which appeared recently discussing some of the tough consumer legislation I have introduced in the field of food, drug, and cosmetic safety, and the belligerence of some of my statements about the need for long overdue reform. An enthusiastic reporter referred to Congresswoman SULLIVAN "getting her Irish up."

Apparently, he was not aware of the fact that my maiden name was Kretzer, from the ethnic background known in St. Louis as 'Southside Dutch." Perhaps, if covering this meeting today, he might refer to me talking to the friends of housing, including public housing, as a "Dutch Aunt." In any event, I want you to know that with its faults—and it has many—our housing program developed over the years is as good as it is—and it is mighty good, taken on balance—only because the National Housing Conference 34 years ago, in the depths of the depression, decided that visionaries, as well as idiots, could be hopeful about the future of this country and the people in it, and has worked with dedication and great effectiveness for all of those 34 years to achieve miracles in the improvement of living conditions for our citizens. For that, I thank you from the bottom of my heart, and, as a Dutch Aunt might do, I summon you to do the much, much more which it is within your enormous capabilities to achieve.

Importance of Agriculture to the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, no group seriously recommends that the Congress end all farm programs and leave the farmer to his own individual devices to cope with the chaotic market which would result. But there are people who seriously advocate that the Congress drastically curtail acreage diversion and price support programs. At this point, with American agriculture having the potential to produce far beyond any reasonable demand, we must be very careful in what we do to, and for, this im portant segment of our economy.

It is clear that one of the root causes of the great depression of 1929 was a persistent sickness in the economy of agriculture in the years preceding the crash. It has already been shown that a reduction of $1 in expenditures for agricultural programs results in a decline in farm income of $2. Any substantial decline in farm income must, of necessity, bring with it a decline in the buying power of the farmers.

In the past several years, the President has recommended, and the Congress has passed, legislation to cut taxes as a device to stimulate the economic growth of this country. The fact that the farmers of this country buy an important part of all the goods and services produced in America seems to me to mean that we must protect the buying power of the American farmer.

It makes anything but good sense to pass tax cuts on the one hand, and turn around and injure the economic health of one very important segment of the economy by curtailing farm programs when these programs produce so much in increased economic activity.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress Should Consider an Administrative Counsel or "American Ombudsman"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced a bill, H.R. 4273, to establish an Administrative Counsel of the Congress.

The Administrative Counsel would help Congressmen help their constituents, without interfering with the traditional congressional-constituent relationships.

The results would be:

First. Better protection of citizens' rights and interests in their dealings with the large and remote Federal bureaucracy.

Second. An opportunity for Congressmen to be more thoughtful and better-advised legislators through the removal of a significant part of the burden of dealing with constituents' problems with administrative agencies.

Establishment of the Administrative Counsel would allow Congress to operate more efficiently and more effectively.

The Administrative Counsel would provide the same sort of valuable assistance in fulfilling our representational function that the legislative counsel has given for legislative drafting and the Legislative Reference Service for research.

I intend to propose the Administrative Counsel to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, with the hope that it will be considered fully and recommended to the House and to the other body.

The Administrative Counsel is an adaptation to American Government and politics of the ombudsman, an institution which has been highly successful in its native Sweden and in other countries.

I have recently written an article entitled, "We Need an American Ombudsman," which was published in the March 3, 1965, issue of the Christian Century. The article follows:

WE NEED AN AMERICAN OMBUDSMAN: AN OFFICIAL GRIEVANCE MAN WOULD PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS IN TODAY'S BUREAUCRACY

(By Hon. HENRY S. REUSS)

A fascinating Swedish institution with an outlandish-sounding name has aroused interest in many Western democracies. Since the end of World War II, political, legal and administrative experts in almost a dozen countries have been studying and often urging importation of the ombudsman.

The Swedes established their first ombudsman in 1809 and for more than 100 years the institution was confined to that country. The idea was first exported when Finland established an ombudsman after gaining her independence from Russia. Ombudsmen became increasingly popular and in 1955 Denmark adopted the institution, followed by New Zealand in 1962 and Norway in 1963.

On July 16, 1964, I introduced a bill in Congress to establish an American ombudsman, to whom I gave the more prosaic and pronounceable title of "administrative counsel of the Congress." Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, and I have reintroduced the bill in the present Congress. Legislation for a State ombudsman was considered in the 1963 session of the Connecticut General Assembly. A bill to set up an ombudsman has been introduced in the current session of the Utah Legislature. And in the wake of last summer's riots and the accompanying allegations of police and administrative injustice, several cities are contemplating the appointment of ombudsmen.

Establishment of an ombudsman was a campaign pledge of British Prime Minister Harold Wilson. Ireland, the Netherlands, Australia and Canada are studying proposals for ombudsmen. In fact, a generous-sized book entitled "The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender" is due to be published by the University of Toronto Press this spring. Edited by Prof. D. C. Rowat, the book tells of existing and proposed ombudsmen around the world.

REMEDYING ABUSES AND ERRORS

So what is this ombudsman and why is there so much interest in him?

The ombudsman is an official grievance man who can look into and remedy abuses and errors of government administrators. An agent of the legislative body, his job is to insure fair administration of the law. Any citizen may approach the ombudsman to complain about illegal, unfair or even impolite administration. The ombudsman may make random inspections to look for administrative abuses or an investigation may be instigated by a newspaper account indicating bureaucratic injustice.

With the assistance of his staff, the ombudsman looks into any case that seems to have merit. He may ask an administrator to correct a wrong decision, may chastise an errant official or make public recommendations and criticisms. And he makes reports to the legislature. When appropriate he may uphold an official and explain the propriety of the action to the complaining citizen.

The remarkable attractiveness of the institution of the ombudsman lies in its ability to solve one of the major problems confronting all modern democratic governments: how government can give administrators the power and discretion they need to act effectively and at the same time protect civil liberties by giving citizens a practical means of correcting abuses and errors by administrators.

If there are no avenues for correcting maladministration, programs for the general welfare, such as social security, public housing and veterans' benefits, are full of possibilities for individual injustice.

Thus far we Americans have met this problem by making our Congressmen mediators between the citizen and the bureaucracy. When an American encounters undue delay or redtape or does not get what he is entitled to from the Federal Government, he is likely to take pen in hand and write his Congressman. He may also make an administrative and a judicial appeal, but both tend to be slow and costly. The judicial process,

moreover, is designed primarily for settling constitutional questions.

Thousands of citizens' complaints and problems flow into congressional offices every year. Two examples will show the nature of these problems. A man recently complained to me that he was being turned down for a temporary post office job because of unsatisfactory performance in 1961 when, in fact, he declared he had not worked for the Post Office that year. At first the Department persisted in its position. Not until I asked to be shown the man's 1961 appointment papers did the Office check its records and learn that the man's contention was right and that he was eligible for the job.

Another man appealed to me when his social security payments that were to have started 3 months previously had not yet begun to arrive. He had filed an application for disability benefits but had withdrawn it later and sought old-age benefits instead. I discovered that the withdrawal form was following the original application through the lengthy administrative process, always one step behind. While the application for disability benefits was pending, old-age benefits could not be started. The hapless applicant was feeling the pinch. I was able to get this snafu straightened out promptly.

Legislators and their staffs spend a large part of their time investigating such problems, urging correction of apparent injustices and errors and explaining to the citizens a bureaucracy that is often too wrapped up in jargon to explain itself.

This congressional role has been important in humanizing the bureaucracy and in making it responsible. After all, the appointed civil servants who run the vast, impersonal Federal machinery are remote from the will of the people. Even the best administrators do not always handle public business with the realization that it involves the needs, hopes, and fears of their fellow citizens. It helps to have their actions watched by a Member of Congress who has to answer to the people every two or six years; he is sure to prod them toward the best possible administration of the laws.

CONGRESSMEN'S INCREASING CASEWORK

So the United States, in a sense, already has not only one but 535 ombudsmen in its 100 Senators and 435 Representatives. And Congressmen, on the whole, do a good job in this role. They recognize that helping a voter in his problems with the Government may win not only his vote but that of his family and friends as well.

But here is the rub: there are just not enough hours in the day for Congressmen to be both ombudsmen and effective legislators. The volume of constituent problems—called "casework" in Capitol Hill parlance—increases continuously.

As Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY said recently, "Many Members of the Senate and the House spend up to 90 percent of their time—and the time of their staffs—answering mail, meeting with constituents, and handling individual constituent complaints or requests." "I thought I was going to be Daniel Webster," remarked another Member, "and I found that most of my work consisted of personal work for constituents."

Yet at the same time the legislative problems coming before Congress have become more numerous and more complex. In the new Congress we will be considering further major changes in taxation, the controversial proposal for hospital care for the aged, the complicated questions of foreign and military policies, and a host of other difficult problems. Members need more time to study thoughtfully, debate, and vote on the great issues that confront us, yet the press of casework gives them less time. Thus Congress is caught in a squeeze between multitudinous demands and an inadequate amount of time for them.

A better solution is needed than just another increase in congressional office staffs; House Members already have approximately 10 staff members each and Senators have 30 or more.

HOW THE OMBUDSMAN WOULD OPERATE

I think the best solution is to adapt the excellent ombudsman idea to the American system of government. My proposal is to create an Administrative Counsel of the Congress to whom Members could refer problems arising between citizens and the Federal Government. The Counsel, appointed by the House Speaker and the Senate President pro tempore, would be paid the same salary as a Congressman. Aided by a staff initially numbering only 100, he would review cases on the basis of material submitted to him by the legislators or he would make his own investigations. He would have the same investigatory power as a congressional committee, far more than any individual Congressman. Government officials would be required to give him the information he requested and to open their records to him.

The Counsel would report his conclusions and recommendations back to the legislator who had referred the matter to him. In routine cases of administrative error or misjudgment, the investigation itself would probably bring corrective action. In other cases the Counsel's recommendation, which would be referred informally to the administrator, might well lead to a remedy.

In more stubborn cases the Counsel would make a public report to Congress. In other countries the sanction of public opinion has proved powerful in correcting maladministration exposed by ombudsmen. The ultimate resort would, of course, be to the legislative power of Congress.

Freeing Congressmen, Senators, and their staffs from a large part of the time-consuming effort now devoted to casework would be one big advantage of the Administrative Counsel. Every hour saved from wrangling with the Veterans' Administration or the Social Security Administration could well be used to study legislation. The final result would be sounder, wiser laws.

In addition, the ombudsman proposal would have other significant advantages:

Constituents' rights would be better protected because the Counsel's staff would include experts in various categories of casework. Congressional staffs, which are not large enough to have experts trained in such matters as the social security system, military allotments, and the like, often find themselves at the mercy of more knowledgeable administrators.

Use of the Counsel could avoid wasteful duplication. As it is now, an energetic constituent may write to his Representative and both Senators, each of whom may take separate action.

The Counsel would be able to see the broad pattern of constituent complaints and spot continuing sources of trouble, such as surly or incompetent officials or ill-considered procedures. In doing this he would assist the work of the administrative conference which Congress established last year as a permanent organization.

Specialization in the Counsel's office would make casework more efficient and hold down increases in congressional office staffs.

FILTERING THE COMPLAINTS

Like his Nordic and New Zealander models, the American ombudsman would deal with maladministration through investigation, recommendation, criticism, and publicity. Unlike the other ombudsmen, the Administrative Counsel would receive citizens' complaints through Members of Congress rather than directly. Several good reasons are behind this provision: the tradition of turning to one's Congressman for help is already well established; Members would probably continue to get such appeals even if there were direct access to an ombudsman; Congressmen might also be loath to risk losing a function which is a major source of strength at the polls; a proposal which provides indirect access to the ombudsman through the Congressman stands a better chance of passage; many Congressmen consider casework an important source of ideas for new legislation; and, in a large country, as New Zealand Ombudsman Sir Guy Powles recently noted, "One good method of filtering a flow of complaints to the 'grievance man' would be to have them come through elected representatives." In little New Zealand this filtering is not so necessary although Sir Guy reported that he receives many cases through Members of Parliament.

Congressmen would not have to use the Counsel, just as they do not have to use the legislative counsel for the drafting of legislation or the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for research. But in practice heavy use is made of both. Last year the Legislative Reference Service handled more than 105,000 congressional inquiries. I believe the Administrative Counsel would win similar acceptance.

I hope that the new Congress will give serious consideration to our bill. Establishment of an Administrative Counsel or an American ombudsman would be a significant innovation but not a radical one. It would increase the effectiveness of the presently sound but overburdened arrangement for handling complaints. By helping Congressmen help their constituents, the Amercian ombudsman, like his Swedish prototype, would be an important factor in the protection of individual rights against the bureaucracy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARCH 16, 1965.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer, and used this verse of Scripture: I John 5: 4: *This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.*

Almighty God, as we unite in prayer at this noon hour, may our minds and hearts move outward toward the far horizons of democracy as we seek to solve the difficult problems of our troubled times.

May we never be provincial or bigoted in our faith or in our vision of Thy love