All over this country exciting and significant breakthroughs are being made in data processing and information retrieval.

Our hope, contained in H.R. 664, is to create a national system which would make funds available to these individual efforts and then, under their own auspices, management, and direction, tie them in to the national information system.

I sincerely believe we are on the threshhold of one of the most exciting and daring achievements in the history of civilization. When man has devised a system for quick exchange of the products of his ingenious mind, only then will we be able to solve the many problems which have plagued civilization since its beginning.

Finally, gentlemen, what we propose here today can indeed help pave the way for mankind to solve his most pressing problem—that of conflict between nations.

The United States has been seeking ways to capture the imagination of people throughout the world, and through our various programs to convince them that indeed their future promises greater hope by alining themselves with our concepts.

We have succeeded in some areas and failed in others.

A national information system can have a profound effect on this Nation's foreign policy and help chart the way toward better understanding among nations—particularly among the newly emerging nations of the world.

I need only recall for you the impassioned plea made by some 2,300 scientists and scholars from the newly emerging nations of the world who met in Geneva 2 years ago, and in a formal resolution called upon the free world to establish a system by which they could share in the exchange of scientific knowledge for their own countries.

Man has made nuclear war so costly that we have reason to hope it can be avoided.

Our battlelines now are in the field of ideas; in the field of knowledge; in the field of concepts and philosophy.

Imagine, if you can, what a fantastic weapon for peace and freedom the United States would acquire if it had a National Information System now which it could make readily available to the scientists of the whole world to use as they wish. Here, I submit, is the lasting road to peace and dignity among men. Dr. Jerome Weisner, President Kennedy's science adviser, quite properly observed that, "The balance of power between nations may well be resolved in favor of that country which has the most effective information retrieval system."

And so you see, gentlemen, the challenge before us is breathtaking. Through hard work and unselfish support, we can build a National Information System which will not only strengthen our own democracy, but will prove one of our most formidable weapons in the struggle for peace.

My plea to the cynics and the skeptics is, "Don't fail to see the forest for the trees." We are not talking about centralization. We are not talking about the Government taking over the whole operation. We are not talking about reducing or eliminating existing facilities.

Indeed, it would be my hope that we could devise a method by which a national information system could be operated within the concept of Comsat, a private corporation created by Congress with strong support from the Federal Government, and this may also come. But for now we need a start, and I submit that H.R. 664 is the vehicle by which we can give everything said here today living meaning.

You will recall President Kennedy so eloquently reminded us that even a journey of 1,000 miles requires a first step. President Johnson, in every single program which he has presented to Congress, has recognized that ancient Chinese proverb.

I urge you to join me in supporting this first step embodied in H.R. 664.

May I conclude by reminding you that the true meaning of democracy is that whatever sacrifice we must make for our freedom to endure, we shall endure it freely.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Harry E. Olson, Jr., pastor, Messiah Lutheran Church, Fargo, N. Dak., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, the eyes of all wait upon Thee in this moment of silence and prayer. Empower these chosen men and women with evidence of the spirit of God within them. Help us to remember that this place is not an island unto itself but a part of the mainland. It is within these walls that we must remember the needs of all men. To that end enable those in positions of responsibility with such a sense of duty that no self-interest shall turn them from it. May we full well realize this day, O Lord, that history is being made by our judgments and the destiny of men's lives charted by our decisions. Grant Thy mighty aid to the efforts of men to establish peace among the nations of the world, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE PRESIDENT'S ACTION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the American people and the Congress will not only support strongly but appreciate the action taken by the President of the United States in dispatching troops to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of safely evacuating American civilians and other foreign nationals. The President had no alternative under the circumstances.

The President had made urgent appeals to both sides in this struggle to cease fire long enough to permit the removal of civilians from the area. His petitions were ignored. Those in charge of the law-enforcement agencies of the Dominican Republic had notified American officials that it would no longer be possible for either civilian or military personnel on the ground to protect American citizens.

Under the circumstances the action of the President of the United States was not only correct; it was absolutely necessary. Marines were used in a protective evacuation and up to this time have not engaged in any shooting incidents.

The President has been joined in his appeal for an immediate cease fire by the Organization of American States which will present a formal request at an open meeting of the OAS later today.

I understand that the French Republic also has taken steps to protect the lives of its citizens in the Dominican Republic by sending in two warships for evacuation purposes.

THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to supplement and approve what the majority leader has said concerning the Dominican Republic. It has been established beyond the peradventure of a doubt that while that which the commentators have referred to as a local and internal conflict which started with the best intentions in the world to keep it a local affair, it has been documented that those now in charge have been oriented, trained, and directly identified with Castro's Cuba and that they are Communists. There is no question about this. It has been established.

The Americans in that part of the world were in grave danger. The local government could not cope with this type of warfare. The people in charge of this activity have been trained to conduct this type of guerrilla warfare and the government was unable, even with the implements in their possession, to control it.

It has also been established that those who started this and who had good intentions, have repudiated the present leadership. After getting these facts the President had no alternative.

The Marines are now ashore and this is the only way to protect the Americans. There are great numbers there. I applaud the action of the President. He had to act as he did. I am sure he will have the backing of the Congress and of the American people because had he not acted, Castro—and it was his intention to do so—could well have taken charge of the Dominican Republic. We cannot and must not permit such a thing to happen as happened in Cuba. It will happen if we are not firm and if we had not acted as we have.

LANDING OF MARINES IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], have already said much more eloquently and authoritatively than I can say what I came to the floor today to remark upon.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question of the fact that the landing of our marines in the Dominican Republic is a matter of very grave import. There is no question of the fact that having our marines in battle positions in this capital city poses a very grave crisis in our relations in the Western Hemisphere. But I believe the President has undoubtedly been in possession of information on this subject which has not been available to most of us. I believe further that the course of wisdom is to give to him the full and strong support which our Presidents have uniformly commanded in the actions which they have taken to protect American interests around the world. To me it is encouraging that our good friends and neighbors in Latin America are urging restraint on the subject in the reactions of the capitals of those countries on this subject as the Council of the Organization of American States meets today.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the halls of this great body and the other body on the other side of the Capitol and across the country there can be restraint in any criticism of the President's actions at this time and support for the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief as he endeavors to meet a fresh threat to freedom and justice in the democracies in the Western Hemisphere.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Ashbrook	Halpern	Pepper
Ashley	Hanna	Powell
Blatnik	Harris	Redlin
Bolton	Harvey, Ind.	Resnick
Broyhill, Va.	Hawkins	Schisler
Corman	Hays	Scott
Culver	Holland	Senner
Daddario	Jarman	Sisk
Dawson	Jones, Ala.	Steed
Dingell	Lindsay	Todd
Dow	Madden	Toll
Dulski	Mathias	Tupper
Evans, Colo.	May	Van Deerlin
Farnsley	Moeller	Waggonner
Giaimo	Morrison	White, Idaho
Gibbons	Nix	Willis
Goodell	O'Brien	Young
Green, Oreg.	Olson, Minn.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may sit during general debate during the session of the House this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7091) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, since this bill is over $109 million more than was approved by the House a couple or three weeks ago, may I assume the gentleman will take ample time to explain where these increases occur and why?

Mr. MAHON. I shall undertake to do so and will be glad to yield to the gentleman for any inquiries or statement he wishes to make.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas and withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will it be possible to get a separate vote on one of the items in disagreement?

The SPEAKER. If an item is reported in disagreement, that would call for separate action.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will it be possible to get a separate vote on an item involving veterans' insurance?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 270)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7091) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 33, 34, 37, and 56.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 7, 12, 13, 14, 25, 31, 32, 38, 43, 44, 45, 48, 50, 51, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, and 69, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,960,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,376,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,305,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,985,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$89,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

"Salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary for the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, $25,000, to remain available until May 1, 1965."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$9,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$717,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "$32,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,153,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30.

GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
FRANK T. BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CARL HAYDEN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7091), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

Chapter I

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $2,960,000 for "Research" instead of $2,860,000 as proposed by the House and $3,109,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $2,376,000 for "Plant and animal disease and pest control" instead of $2,176,000 as proposed by the House and $2,417,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment; the action to be proposed is in no way to be considered as prejudging the program for the ensuing fiscal year.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $1,137,000 for "meat inspection" as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,047,000 as proposed by the House.

Chapter III

Foreign Operations

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment which will permit the Peace Corps to use an additional sum of $1,858,000 for administrative expenses.

Chapter IV

Independent Offices

Amendment No. 6: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist upon disagreement.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $35,000,000 for "Disaster relief" as proposed by the Senate instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $4,305,000 for "Construction, public buildings projects" (Ogden, Utah) instead of $4,055,000 as proposed by the House and $4,506,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $2,750,000 for "Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service" instead of $1,331,500 as proposed by the House and $4,166,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist upon disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist upon disagreement.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $30,000,000 for "Urban renewal fund (liquidation of contract authorization)" as proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained nothing on this item.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $8,320,000 for "Annual contributions, Public Housing Administration" as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $150,000,000 for "Compensation and pensions, Veterans' Administration" as proposed by the Senate instead of $108,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

Chapter V

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 16: Deletes Senate language to authorize $15,000 for travel and transportation of persons, National Park Service.

Amendments No. 17 and 18: Delete the Senate proposal to allow $8,000 for travel and transportation of persons under the appropriation for "Construction, National Park Service", and appropriate $580,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 19 and 20: Apportion funds in the manner proposed by the House instead of the Senate relating to land and water conservation funds. This action is taken without prejudice to the Senate proposal which can be given further consideration in connection with the regular annual appropriation bill.

Amendment No. 21: Deletes Senate language relating to acquisition of land for Grand Teton National Park.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $550,000 for "Surveys, investigations, and research, Geological Survey" as proposed by the House instead of $800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $1,985,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Water Resources Research" instead of $985,000 as proposed by the House and $2,825,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter VI

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $89,000,000 for "Manpower development and training activities" instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House and $103,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $11,000,000 for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen" as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 27: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Chapter VII

Legislative Branch

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $8,000 for "Folding documents, Senate," as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter VIII

Department of Defense—Civil

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $1,735,000 for "operation and maintenance, Corps of Engineers" as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Chapter IX

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $3,750,000 for "Buildings and facilities, Federal Prison System" as proposed by the House instead of $4,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 34: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate $293,000 for "Registration and voting statistics, Bureau of the Census." This item was disallowed without prejudice, the conferees feeling that the matter should

be settled at a later date after action has been taken on pending voting-rights legislation. The amount proposed in the amendment would have been available for only two months—an insufficient period of time to accomplish worthwhile results, and a greater sum as proposed in the budget estimate would have been subject to a point of order.

Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $25,000 for "salaries and expenses" instead of $50,938 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees further agreed with the statement in the Senate report (No. 167) to wit: "the Committee directs that the Commission not incur any obligations payable with appropriated funds on or after May 1, 1965".

United States Information Agency

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $9,000,000 for "Special International Exhibitions" instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and $11,700,000 as proposed by the Senate; and deletes the Senate proposal to allow $25,000 for representation and entertainment expenses.

TITLE II

Appalachian regional development

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $100,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Research" as proposed by the House instead of $200,000 as proposed by the Senate. No funds are provided for planning a fruit and berry laboratory.

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39: Appropriate $300,000 for "Payments and expenses, Cooperative State Research Service" instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $500,000 as proposed by the Senate; and permit its use for contracts and grants for basic and applied research.

Amendments Nos. 40 and 41: Appropriate $750,000 for "Cooperative extension work, Payments and expenses" instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $1,575,000 for "Conservation operations" instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $600,000 for "Watershed planning" as proposed by the Senate instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45: Appropriate $10,220,000 for "Watershed protection" as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House; and provide $3,100,000 for loans as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates $300,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Economic Research Service" instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House and $400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $325,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Farmers Home Administration" instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House and $400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates $7,100,000 for the "Direct loan account" as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $50,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Rural Community Development Service" instead of $35,000 as proposed by the House and $65,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 50, 51 and 52: Appropriate $2,000,000 for "Forest land management" as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House; authorize $1,000,000 for acquisition of land as proposed by the Senate instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House; also appropriate $1,225,000 for "Forest research" instead of $1,125,000 as proposed by the House and $1,325,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Defense—Civil

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates $14,153,000 for "Construction, general, Corps of Engineers" instead of $13,778,000 as proposed by the House and $14,700,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed provides $375,000 for small flood control projects as proposed by the Senate, but disallows the amount of $547,000 for recreation facilities which was added by the Senate.

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 54: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed ten passenger motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates $16,000,000 for "Appalachian Region Mining Area Restoration" instead of $15,850,000 as proposed by the House and $16,250,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed provides $500,000 for evaluation study instead of $750,000 as proposed by the Senate and $350,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates $1,350,000 for Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife as proposed by the House instead of $1,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III

Increased pay costs

Amendments Nos. 57–67: Appropriate $3,426,445 for increased costs of various Senate activities as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV

Claims and judgments

Amendments Nos. 68 and 69: Appropriate $31,411,444 for claims and judgments as proposed by the Senate instead of $23,643,495 as proposed by the House; and include the items set forth in Senate Document No. 19.

GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
FRANK T. BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Committee on Appropriations this morning approved a recommendation of about $8 billion for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the bill is scheduled to be before the House for consideration on next Tuesday. We are continuing to move along with these appropriation bills.

Now, Mr. Speaker, today we have the conference report on the second supplemental appropriation bill of the session.

There are three items in disagreement where the committee has insisted upon the House position. They relate to a number of matters, and on one of them the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] has already indicated a desire to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be well if we withheld discussion of these especially controverted questions until we have adopted the conference report. We will have an hour, if necessary, on each of the separate motions. The Members who have an interest will have full opportunity to discuss the issues involved.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as the conference report itself is concerned there is no great controversy.

As the conference report will indicate, there is about $2.227 billion involved. It is over the House bill by $109.2 million. It is under the Senate bill by $30.3 million. It is under the budget estimates by $52.7 million.

Mr. Speaker, in this supplemental bill we only considered matters generally considered of the greatest urgency. Naturally, there is not the latitude for deep reductions that might otherwise have been taken. So the reduction in the bill, in this $2.2 billion, is only $52 million below the budget estimates.

Mr. Speaker, the other body had before it some $53 million in budget requests not considered by the House. This accounts for a large portion of the increase made by the other body.

Another matter here involves $30 million which the House disallowed to provide funds under the urban renewal program. The House did not consider this to be of an emergency nature, but it must eventually be paid under the law. The other body put it in the bill and we have agreed to it. We thought it could be provided in the regular bill, but in order to come to agreement with the other body we agreed to it.

Mr. Speaker, I would also call the attention of the Members to the $100 million contained in the bill for the Small Business Administration in which many are interested. There are, in addition, a large number of items in the bill involving the Department of Agriculture, the District of Columbia, the foreign operations program, independent offices, the Interior Department, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Labor, the legislative branch, public works, the Departments of Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary as well as the Department of the Treasury. Many of these—most of these, in fact—are of course unchanged from the original House position.

Then we have funds in here for Appalachia, and a lot of money for pay increases. We passed a bill providing for pay increases throughout the Government and appropriations had not previously been made to cover those increases. In many cases the funds were partially absorbed, but not in all cases was that possible. Again the other body did not change the great majority of House amounts.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the conference report itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa for a question.

Mr. GROSS. It has come to the point in the House of Representatives and in the Congress where regular appropriation bills have less and less meaning; is that not true?

Here you have another supplemental or a deficiency appropriation bill amounting to some $2.25 billion. So that the regular appropriation bills really do not mean what they say or say what they mean.

Mr. MAHON. I believe that the regular appropriation bills say what they mean. We will probably never get completely away from supplemental and deficiency bills if we follow the pattern of last year. After the regular appropria-

tion bills had been approved, the Congress passed new legislation changing the picture and at least implying additional demands for this current fiscal year, 1965. New legislation, mandatory-type items, and emergency measures account for 85 or 90 percent of the bill, as I recall from figures I gave here on the floor when the bill was before the House earlier this month.

As I said at the time, only limited portions represent amounts eliminated in the regular bills last year. I think the gentleman understands it is a somewhat unusual situation which confronts us.

Mr. GROSS. One notable exception to that is the Commodity Credit Corporation when everyone knew last year this money was going to be required, yet it was withheld from the regular appropriation bill, if I remember correctly.

Mr. MAHON. With respect to the Commodity Credit Corporation, that was in the first supplemental bill earlier in the year, and is not in this bill. We did in that instance underappropriate with the hope that the additional funds would not be required, but the calculations were in error. Requirements were in excess of what had been provided for; the gentleman is correct on that.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the question of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is certainly a very timely and proper one. May I respectfully point out to him that the Bureau of the Budget and the President's budget messages change from time to time as the situation requires and they specifically stated in the budget message "We are going to send you a new program later in the supplemental" instead of putting it in the January message.

Mr. GROSS. Every 15 minutes or 15 days.

Mr. THOMAS. That has complicated the situation.

Mr. MAHON. The President requested appropriations—new obligational authority to the extent of about $106 billion for the fiscal year 1966 which begins on July 1, 1965. He also indicated he would request supplemental sums for fiscal 1965 in the amount of about $6 billion. So this is not some unexpected action on the part of the Congress. These supplementals were forecast in the President's budget last January.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I may say to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I would hope this practice is not going to continue. It would seem to me that in orderly fiscal policies we should have in our regular bills that which is necessary, and in the deficiency bills that we have deficiencies considered. I would hope that the Bureau of the Budget and the administration would do their planning so we might know. It seems to me the Congress is better informed when we come in with the regular bills and take care of the regular appropriations, and use the deficiency bills for deficiency purposes, in which event it would seem to me we would have much better control of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. MAHON. I believe the situation is somewhat unusual this year. It will not be duplicated next year; at least as far as I can now foresee, that is the situation. It is regrettable that it is necessary to have supplemental or deficiency bills. But I doubt if it is possible to completely avoid deficiency bills, but the numbers and amounts can certainly be minimized. I share the basic views of the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, under permission, I append the customary comparative statistical table on the conference report.

Comparative statement of budget estimates, amounts in House and Senate bills and agreed to in conference—2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1965 (H.R. 7091)

Chapter	Department or activity	Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill
	TITLE I							
I	Agriculture	$22,563,000	$22,083,000	$22,663,000	$22,473,000	−$90,000	+$390,000	−$190,000
II	District of Columbia	(1,563,600)	(1,563,500)	(1,563,600)	(1,563,600)			
III	Foreign operations	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000			
IV	Independent offices	268,972,500	188,925,400	276,038,400	267,913,900	−1,058,600	+78,988,500	−8,124,500
V	Interior	72,527,000	69,602,000	72,412,000	70,602,000	−1,925,000	+1,000,000	−1,810,000
VI	Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare	527,900,000	496,900,000	511,900,000	507,900,000	−20,000,000	+11,000,000	−14,000,000
VII	Legislative	130,000	130,000	168,000	168,000	+38,000	+38,000	
VIII	Public works	14,229,000	13,369,000	13,604,000	13,604,000	−625,000	+235,000	
IX	State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary	141,769,000	129,390,000	133,983,938	130,415,000	−11,354,000	+1,025,000	−3,568,938
X	Treasury	271,000	271,000	271,000	271,000			
	Total, title I	1,298,361,500	1,170,670,400	1,291,040,338	1,263,346,900	−35,014,600	+92,676,500	−27,693,438
	TITLE II							
	APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT							
	Agriculture	42,840,000	30,560,000	36,810,000	35,395,000	−7,445,000	+4,835,000	−1,415,000
	Commerce	248,000,000	247,500,000	247,500,000	247,500,000	−500,000		
	Defense—Civil	17,271,000	15,778,000	16,700,000	16,153,000	−1,118,000	+375,000	−547,000
	Health, Education, and Welfare	34,775,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	−2,775,000		
	Interior	19,250,000	18,000,000	18,800,000	18,150,000	−1,100,000	+150,000	−650,000
	Appalachian Regional Commission	500,000	490,000	490,000	490,000	−10,000		
	Total, title II	362,636,000	344,328,000	352,300,000	349,688,000	−12,948,000	+5,360,000	−2,612,000
	TITLE III							
	Increased pay costs	587,842,383	579,691,188	583,117,633	583,117,633	−4,724,750	+3,426,445	
	TITLE IV							
	Claims and judgments	31,411,444	23,643,495	31,411,444	31,411,444		+7,767,949	
	Grand total:							
	Direct appropriations	2,261,836,327	2,099,918,083	2,239,454,415	2,209,148,977	−52,687,350	+109,230,894	−30,305,438
	Appropriation of receipts	16,012,000	16,012,000	16,012,000	16,012,000			
	Special accounts	1,435,000	1,435,000	1,435,000	1,435,000			
	Indefinite appropriations	968,000	968,000	968,000	968,000			
	Total	2,280,251,327	2,118,333,083	2,257,869,415	2,227,563,977	−52,687,350	+109,230,894	−30,305,438

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to use the entire 5 minutes but do want to take a minute or two to call a few things to the attention of the House and to the people of the country who will read the RECORD.

I do not expect to discuss the supplemental appropriation bill in detail because we have already heard the pertinent facts about it, namely that it contains $2.227 billion in supplemental appropriations and $109 million more than the bill contained as it passed the House.

You have already listened to the interesting colloquy between the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. MAHON and Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from

Ohio [Mr. Bow], concerning the problems that arise whenever we are requested to approve supplemental appropriations. I was especially pleased to hear the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations say that he did not expect we would run into a similar situation next year, and I should certainly hope that he is correct. Many items amounting to millions and hundreds of millions of dollars have been packed into this supplemental appropriation bill in order to have them charged up against fiscal year 1965 appropriations although they are not projected for spending until fiscal year 1966 and normally should have been included in regular appropriation bills for 1966. The net effect of this is to make budget requests for 1966 look good in comparison with 1965. It is a gimmick used by budget makers but we should not be misled by it.

We have been reading a lot in the press recently about how fine our fiscal condition is. I read this morning that the anticipated deficit at the end of the current fiscal year is expected to be lower than was visualized last January. First let me say that I am glad that it is going to be lower instead of higher but I cannot generate too much enthusiasm because there is still going to be a substantial deficit. To run any deficit at all in periods of high prosperity cannot be justified. If this Government cannot live within its means during prosperous times, pray what will it do if adversity should ever strike. The time to start living within our means and begin curtailing the national debt is during periods of high prosperity. To lay away something for a rainy day is not too old fashioned for me.

We hear a lot of talk these days about spending under $100 billion. The truth of the matter is that 10 months of the current fiscal year has passed and spending to date has already crossed the $100 billion mark. I hold in my hand the daily statement of the U.S. Treasury for April 22, 1965, and it shows that since July 1, 1964, more than $100 billion have been withdrawn from the U.S. Treasury and spent. This means that our Government is currently spending money at the rate of $338,983,000 a day which works out to $14,124,290 per hour and $235,404 per minute.

I did not trust my own mathematics so I had the computer people make the computation and the figures given come from the computer.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Referring to the figure of $100.7 billion to which the gentleman referred, from his analysis of that spending, is that figure accurately to be compared with the estimate of between $97 and $98 billion that was forecast as being the outlay for this fiscal year?

Mr. JONAS. This sum would apply to the $127 billion of cash expenditures expected to be made by the Government out of regular and trust funds during the year.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It includes trust fund expenditures?

Mr. JONAS. That is right. But we have already in the middle of April of this year gone above the $100 billion mark and I had this computation made for those who, as I say, may be interested in knowing the current rate of spending by the administration.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. 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 316, nays 55, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—316

Abbitt	Conte	Hagan, Ga.
Abernethy	Conyers	Hagen, Calif.
Adair	Cooley	Halleck
Adams	Corbett	Hamilton
Albert	Craley	Hanley
Anderson, Ill.	Curtin	Hansen, Idaho
Anderson, Tenn.	Daniels	Hanson, Iowa
Andrews, George W.	Davis, Ga.	Hansen, Wash.
Andrews, N. Dak.	de la Garza	Hardy
Annunzio	Delaney	Harsha
Arends	Dent	Harvey, Ind.
Ashley	Denton	Harvey, Mich.
Aspinall	Donohue	Hathaway
Ayres	Dorn	Hébert
Baldwin	Dowdy	Hechler
Bandstra	Downing	Helstoski
Baring	Duncan, Oreg.	Henderson
Barrett	Dwyer	Herlong
Bates	Dyal	Hicks
Battin	Edmondson	Holifield
Beckworth	Edwards, Calif.	Horton
Bennett	Ellsworth	Howard
Berry	Everett	Hull
Bingham	Evins, Tenn.	Hungate
Boland	Farbstein	Huot
Bolling	Farnum	Ichord
Bonner	Fascell	Jacobs
Bow	Feighan	Jennings
Brademas	Fino	Joelson
Brooks	Fisher	Johnson, Calif.
Broomfield	Flood	Johnson, Okla.
Brown, Calif.	Flynt	Johnson, Pa.
Burke	Fogarty	Jonas
Burleson	Foley	Jones, Mo.
Burton, Calif.	Ford, Gerald R.	Karsten
Burton, Utah	Ford, William D.	Karth
Byrne, Pa.	Fountain	Kastenmeier
Cabell	Fraser	Kee
Cahill	Frelinghuysen	Keith
Callan	Friedel	Kelly
Cameron	Fulton, Pa.	Keogh
Carey	Fulton, Tenn.	King, Calif.
Carter	Fuqua	King, Utah
Casey	Gallagher	Kirwan
Cederberg	Gathings	Kluczynski
Celler	Gettys	Kornegay
Chelf	Gilbert	Krebs
Clancy	Gilligan	Kunkel
Clark	Gonzalez	Laird
Clausen, Don H.	Grabowski	Landrum
Cleveland	Gray	Latta
Clevenger	Green, Oreg.	Lipscomb
Cohelan	Green, Pa.	Long, La.
Colmer	Greigg	Long, Md.
Conable	Grider	Love
	Griffin	McCarthy
	Griffiths	McCulloch
	Gubser	McDade
		McDowell
		McEwen
		McFall
		McGrath
		McMillan
		McVicker
		Macdonald
		Machen
		Mackay
		Mackie
		Mahon
		Marsh
		Martin, Mass.
		Martin, Nebr.
		Matsunaga
		Matthews
		May
		Meeds
		Michel
		Miller
		Mills
		Minish
		Mink
		Mize
		Monagan
		Moore
		Moorhead
		Morgan
		Morris
		Morse
		Morton
		Moss
		Multer
		Murphy, Ill.
		Murphy N.Y.
		Murray
		Natcher
		Nedzi
		O'Hara, Ill.
		O'Hara, Mich.
		O'Konski
		Olsen, Mont.
		O'Neill, Mass.
		Ottinger
		Passman
		Patman
		Patten
		Pelly
		Pepper
		Perkins
		Philbin
		Pickle
		Pike
		Pirnie
		Poage
		Powell
		Price
		Pucinski
		Purcell
		Quillen
		Race
		Randall
		Reid, N.Y.
		Reifel
		Reinecke
		Reuss
		Rhodes, Pa.
		Rivers, Alaska
		Rivers, S.C.
		Roberts
		Robison
		Rodino
		Rogers, Colo.
		Rogers, Fla.
		Ronan
		Roncalio
		Rooney, N.Y.
		Rooney, Pa.
		Roosevelt
		Rosenthal
		Rostenkowski
		Roudebush
		Roush
		Roybal
		Rumsfeld
		Ryan
		Satterfield
		St Germain
		Saylor
		Scheuer
		Schmidhauser
		Schneebeli
		Schweiker
		Secrest
		Selden
		Shipley
		Sickles
		Sikes
		Slack
		Smith, Iowa
		Smith, N.Y.
		Smith, Va.
		Springer
		Stafford
		Stalbaum
		Stanton
		Steed
		Stephens
		Stubblefield
		Sullivan
		Sweeney
		Taylor
		Teague, Calif.
		Teague, Tex.
		Tenzer
		Thomas
		Thompson, La.
		Thompson, N.J.
		Thompson, Tex.
		Trimble
		Tuck
		Tunney
		Tuten
		Udall
		Ullman
		Vanik
		Vigorito
		Vivian
		Walker, N. Mex.
		Watkins
		Watts
		Weitner
		Whalley
		White, Tex.
		Whitener
		Whitten
		Widnall
		Williams
		Wilson, Bob
		Wilson, Charles H.
		Wolff
		Wright
		Wyatt
		Yates
		Zablocki

NAYS—55

Andrews, Glenn	Davis, Wis.	MacGregor
Ashmore	Derwinski	Martin, Ala.
Belcher	Devine	Minshall
Bell	Dickinson	Mosher
Betts	Dole	Nelsen
Bray	Duncan, Tenn.	O'Neal, Ga.
Brown, Ohio	Edwards, Ala.	Poff
Broyhill, N.C.	Erlenborn	Quie
Buchanan	Findley	Rhodes, Ariz.
Byrnes, Wis.	Gross	Shriver
Callaway	Grover	Skubitz
Chamberlain	Gurney	Smith, Calif.
Clawson, Del	Haley	Talcott
Collier	Hall	Thomson, Wis.
Cramer	Hosmer	Utt
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Walker, Miss.
Curtis	King, N.Y.	Wydler
Dague	Langen	Younger
	McClory	

NOT VOTING—62

Addabbo	Goodell	Pool
Ashbrook	Halpern	Redlin
Blatnik	Hanna	Reid, Ill.
Boggs	Harris	Resnick
Bolton	Hawkins	Rogers, Tex.
Brock	Hays	St. Onge
Broyhill, Va.	Holland	Schisler
Corman	Irwin	Scott
Culver	Jarman	Senner
Daddario	Jones, Ala.	Sisk
Dawson	Leggett	Staggers
Diggs	Lennon	Stratton
Dingell	Lindsay	Todd
Dow	Madden	Toll
Dulski	Mailliard	Tupper
Evans, Colo.	Mathias	Van Deerlin
Fallon	Moeller	Waggonner
Farnsley	Morrison	White, Idaho
Garmatz	Nix	Willis
Giaimo	O'Brien	Young
Gibbons	Olson, Minn.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Addabbo with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Schisler with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Culver with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Garmatz.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Dulski.
Mr. Nix with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Corman.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Irwin.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Young.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Todd.
Mr. Olson of Minnesota with Mr. Senner.

Mr. BRAY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 11, insert: "(3) and including $100,000 for the purpose of extending the screw-worm barrier zone to Arizona and California with cost-sharing from State and local sources of at least 50 per centum of the expenses of production, irradiation and release of the screw-worm flies;"

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "and including $100,000 for the purpose of extending the screw-worm barrier zone on a limited basis to Arizona and California with cost-sharing from State and local sources of at least 50 per centum of the expenses of production, irradiation and release of the screw-worm flies;".

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 4, line 16, insert:

"PEACE CORPS

"During the current fiscal year an additional amount of $1,858,000 shall be available in the appropriation for 'Peace Corps' for administrative and program support costs."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 5, line 8, strike out "$1,932,000" and insert "$2,874,000, of which not to exceed $942,000 shall be for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEOGH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, if you have never witnessed a very small boy being sent on a great big man's errand, you are witnessing that now.

My devotion, esteem, and respect for our dear and beloved colleague from Texas, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices [Mr. THOMAS], knows no bounds. In all the years I have been here I face this task today with the fear that is normally in one, with the trepidation that one should have, and with the hope that the House will hear my plea.

My motion will have the effect of continuing in this second supplemental appropriation bill $942,000—not millions—$942,000. That represents an actual binding and, in the opinion of those who know, a legal commitment of the U.S. Government, which one day in one way or another will have to be paid. If that payment is delayed it will be paid in excess of $942,000.

All we seek here, Mr. Speaker, is to assure and insure the continuation until June 30 of this year of the scheduled helicopter services now being provided in three of the largest cities in the country—New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. That service has been of immeasurable assistance in the national interests of this country and will continue to be so.

I regret exceedingly that the effect of the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be to terminate without notice these services that have been so well rendered over the past year. We realize and I appreciate the increasing reluctance on the part of the Congress to continue subsidies beyond the point where they are needed. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, for us to fail to give 2 months' notice would be an act of questionable wisdom.

I, therefore, hope, Mr. Speaker, that as much as I regret pitting my inadequate self against the obvious terrific forces of the highly respected and distinguished Committee on Appropriations, for once—for once you will hear my plea and for once you will do the justice that this day calls for lest that justice be denied by being delayed. I hope my motion will prevail.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from the great "state" of Brooklyn.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in addition to commending the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] upon his remarks on this subject here today, I should like to ask him if it is not the fact that the President of the United States, his Bureau of the Budget, and the Civil Aeronautics Board which controls aviation in this country have recommended this requested appropriation—the $942,000.

Mr. KEOGH. The gentleman as usual is eminently correct. The fact of the matter is that this represents a legal obligation of the U.S. Government.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Exactly; this money has to be paid.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the most eminent authorities in the House on this subject are members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices. And the best informed man on this subject is the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. He will speak later, but I have listened with so much interest and feeling to the statement of our friend, the gentleman from New York, that I want to make a few remarks about this question.

There are three cities in the United States that have this helicopter service subsidized by the Government. There are at least 39 great cities that are interested in helicopter service. I would suspect that there are more than that.

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

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. I have heard this argument made, Mr. Chairman, but I say to you in response to that: However many States there may be that are eligible for this type of service, why penalize the three cities that have had the foresight and the courage to institute this type of service?

Mr. MAHON. Well, I do not want to penalize the three cities that have instituted it—in large part at the cost of the taxpayers. The city of San Francisco has not been penalized. It has helicopter service for which it pays.

Mr. KEOGH. You may not want to penalize the three cities but you certainly are penalizing them by your motion. But I do want to refer to San Francisco. I think the facts will show that that operation, operating without a subsidy, is losing at the rate of $1,250,000 a year, which loss is taken by the affiliate companies operating that service. So they are in fact being indirectly subsidized by the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. My colleagues, you can see that there is more involved here than catches the eye. This is not something that came up the day before yesterday. Since 1947, one or more of these three cities have been getting subsidized helicopter service. I think it was an excellent idea to try it on an experimental basis.

It has now been tried in at least one of the cities for more than 15 years, and

the operators are not able to run it without a Government subsidy.

We ought to do one of two things. Either we ought to eliminate the subsidized program for the three cities or we ought to enlarge it to cover other cities which are interested in this kind of service.

We have had a lot of time now to test out the service. It has not proved to be successful from an economic standpoint in these three cities.

But there is even more involved here than an experiment in three cities. There is a question of principle, a question of the dignity and the integrity of the Congress is involved in this issue. We must not only be heard but heeded.

It is occasionally said in the press and elsewhere that Congress has lost control of the purse strings. If agencies are able to do what they are undertaking to do in this instance, then to a considerable extent Congress has lost control of the purse strings, and there could be almost no end to the consequences.

We do not have the same platform from which we can address ourselves to the people as the executive branch has. But if we ever forfeit the power of the purse, "we have had it." That power is the supreme power of the Congress, representing the people, over the Government and the control of the Government.

This is the issue. I point it out in this way: From year to year we have been complaining about this program. We have been wrestling with this issue. We have been trying to get this service on a paying basis. But we have failed.

Mr. THOMAS' subcommittee last year, working with the other body on the conference report on the bill carrying an appropriation for this item, put some pertinent information in the conference report on page 13. And there was, in addition, in the appropriation law itself last year a specific limitation on the fiscal 1965 funds for these services.

This is the reason why I say the stature and integrity and prestige of Congress is in a measure involved here. I read from page 13 of the Independent Offices conference report of last year: "; and authorize $3,358,000 for subsidy for helicopter operations instead of $3 million as proposed by the House and $4,300,000 as proposed by the Senate."

The appropriation law reads as follows: "including not to exceed $3,358,000 for subsidy for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year."

So, the conference committee put in $3,358,000 for helicopter service in last year's bill. That was approved by Congress. The Congress turned over authority to spend an appropriation of $3,358,000 to the executive branch for this helicopter service for these three cities. The amount was limited to a sum certain.

This was the package. Officials did not get all they wanted, so it was up to them at that time to tailor the program within the $3,358,000.

Let me also read the language in the statement of the conferees which accompanied the conference report last year on the $3,358,000:

> This is the last money to be recommended by the committee for these projects exclusively.

You see, they were told. The Bureau of the Budget was told. The CAB was told. Everybody involved was told that "this is the last money to be recommended for these projects exclusively." Continuing to read the statement:

> The conferees respectfully request—

Do we have to get down on our knees every day to a Government agency which we create? Are we men or mice? What is our attitude? Do we have a right to the respect of the country? Is the prestige of Congress involved here? Of course it is.

> The conferees respectfully request the the CAB not to include 1 penny for these three lines in its budget next year.

What has it done? Here we are faced with a supplement of $942,000 to the $3,358,000, in the regular bill for fiscal 1965. This is a complete flouting of the action of Congress by the executive branch.

I continue to quote from the statement of last year:

> This position is unanimously agreed to by the House conferees and a majority of the conferees of the Senate.

They spoke not for the Appropriations Committee, but for the Congress, because the conference report was adopted in both Houses.

Let me quote again the entire part of the paragraph relating to helicopter subsidies:

> And authorize $3,358,000 for subsidy for helicopter operations instead of $3 million as proposed by the House and $4,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have been wrestling many years with continuing subsidies for helicopter service for 3 cities while 39 other cities need it as badly as those that now have it. This is the last money to be recommended by the committee for these projects exclusively. The conferees respectfully request the CAB not to include 1 penny for these three lines in its budget next year. This position is unanimously agreed to by the House conferees and a majority of the conferees of the Senate.

So, in utter disregard of the will of the Congress, as so well and succinctly put in the report, the Civil Aeronautics Board has gone along and has been overspending, has not tailored the helicopter program to the funds available, as every family should try to do in handling money matters, and which every child knows is the right way to proceed. It has flouted the will of Congress in this matter. It has also asked for funds, in direct opposition to the expressed view of Congress, for the next fiscal year—$2,100,000 for fiscal 1966—and is planning to run this program until 1970.

As one Member of Congress who is not too interested in this from the standpoint of any service involved but who is interested in the prestige of Congress and the preeminence of Congress in money matters, I respectfully dissent, and I say to the CAB that Congress has control of the purse and that we do not intend to tolerate a continuation of this program in the face of the action of Congress last year. We do not intend to let the agency determine the appropriation. That is the business of Congress and must remain so.

That is where I stand, and that is where every Member of the House ought to stand.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAHON. I will be glad to.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], in the course of his address indicated that this was a legal obligation of the U.S. Government. Will the gentleman from Texas tell us whether this is true or not? As I understand it, the Civil Aeronautics Board takes the position that the law on the books requires them to establish this subsidy. Does the chairman of the committee contend that the words of the committee in its report amount to a repealer of the law which is on the books?

Mr. MAHON. The law authorizes the establishment of subsidies. Officials could subsidize under the law, if they had the money, dozens of cities for helicopter services, as I understand the law. So, yes; the law permits this to be done. But Congress only provided funds for the three cities, and the Congress has to find ways of meeting its responsibility for itself and to the people. So what shall we do when we are trampled upon by a Government agency which is the creature of the Congress? Shall we fight back? I think we should fight back. How can we? By denying funds. Where contracts have been made there is a legal responsibility, and if we can get our will established with respect to these funds, these funds can be appropriated by the Congress or could be provided by the Court of Claims. But the course we advocate here is the only avenue we have at the present time to project the determination and the will of Congress with respect to these matters, and no one will be deprived of any legal right thereby. We all know, if they are entitled to the funds, they can get the funds, and I would be perfectly glad to join in appropriating the funds after the subsidies have been terminated and after the Civil Aeronautics Board has seen fit to follow the mandate of Congress on the issue of subsidizing helicopter service to cities.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my good friend from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. I think I should assure the gentleman from Texas that I share his views with respect to the necessity for maintaining the dignity and powers of the House of Representatives and of the Congress of the United States. I join with you in that. However, my point is simply that this is the wrong way to assert yourself. You are using a meat ax here when you should really reach for a surgeon's scalpel. That is all. Because you admit it is a liability. You know they are going to collect it and it is going to be increased by the costs involved and the interest. In the meantime you are terminating a service such as we have in New York where we are just about to open the operation on top

of the Pan Am Building, the use of which by the President and the Vice President of the United States will more than make up this subsidy business. It is so thoughtless in my opinion. Excuse me for seeming to be strong about it, but it is shortsighted to do this in this way at this time.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman's views are of interest, and if I were in New York City or in Los Angeles or in Chicago, I think I would see the issue in this same way. We are confronted with the problem. If we can use a small surgeon's knife to accomplish the results, all right. However, if the authority of Congress is involved and the only way we can protect ourselves is with a meat ax, then I say let us use the meat ax.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has said about what I was going to say a minute ago. It seems to me the Congress used a scalpel last year and in this very gentle operation we gave them an opportunity to cut the cord with the funds provided for them. This House passed that bill with the provision in it that there should be no more. What this is is simply a restoration of funds which Congress cut last year.

Are we going to pass bills with cuts and tell the agencies how to spend the money, and then have them disregard completely what we have told them on the theory that they could come back here and bludgeon us to give them the money later on in a supplemental? I think that is a mistake. I think we have got to stand by the committee on this and by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] who has made a study of this; because that committee and this House supported them last year in a reduction of the funds. This is an attempt to come back here and suggest that an agency downtown will disregard the reports of the committee and the action of the Congress and say, "You have got to give it to us in a supplemental bill." I think it is the wrong way to approach the matter.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is correct.

And if we in Congress do not stand up for our own prerogatives it is certain no one else is going to.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished chairman's yielding.

I am very sensitive to the remarks made with regard to the authority of Congress in this matter. However, it is my understanding, after talking with Chairman Alan Boyd of the CAB, that the matter that is at stake here, as he told it to me, is this: He has said—

In our judgment—

Meaning the CAB—

if this supplemental is not put back in the bill the carriers could be put out of business.

I asked him most particularly whether that was his clear and thoughtful judgment, that the effect of this action could put the carriers out of business. He assured me that that was the case. And he said in addition that he thought that should this action be taken here, that is proposed today, there could be a suit in the court of claims which could result possibly in a more substantial payment or a payment of "at least" the amount involved in the bill. He thought that this was a clear, legal obligation of the United States and would be so upheld.

So my question to the chairman is this: If this has the effect of or runs the risk of putting the carriers out of business, is there not some remedy that could be applied to continue until such time as a more equitable formula could be worked out?

Mr. MAHON. We do not know whether it will put the carriers out of business. We would hope that they might be able to carry on without a subsidy, as is the case in San Francisco. But the agency has shown that it has not the slightest intention of complying with the wishes of Congress. It went ahead with a program which utilizes more than the $3 million plus Congress appropriated for the helicopter subsidy. Not only that, in the budget estimate for next year, 1966 the sum of $2.1 million has been included. So this is an indication that officials are saying. "We know what Congress did but we do not approve it and therefore, regardless of the action of Congress, we are going to proceed as we desire."

We cannot tolerate that. We must not tolerate that.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one further question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. REID of New York. The point here it seems to me is this. I cannot comment on the gentleman's testimony on this point other than to say that whatever the testimony before the gentleman's great committee and the undertakings that were made, is it correct, is it proper to penalize the public interest and convenience? Because if there is any validity in the concern that the Chairman of the CAB has indicated to me, that the carriers might go out of business, then in effect, because of the relationship between the Congress and the CAB, we are penalizing the public interest and a young industry that is trying to serve both the national defense and the country. Have we the right to penalize the public regardless of undertakings that may or may not have been made between the committee and the CAB?

Mr. MAHON. I would say that these people have been getting this service a long time at a rather heavy cost in subsidies. Other cities have been trying to get into the picture and have not been able to do so. We have asked that this experiment be terminated. We gave the agency $3 million plus with which to tailor its program for this fiscal year. The act and the will of Congress have not been complied with. It is time for us to stand firm.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] who as I stated before is the best informed Member of the House on this issue.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, let me address myself to this subject and let us clear away the cobwebs.

It has been said that no notice has been given. It has been said that it is a legal debt and there will be a judgment plastered against us.

Mr. Speaker, let us see the beginning of all this thing. You know how long it has been in operation? A little bit better than 15 long years. Do you know what these three cities have cost us? Right at $48 million. Has this been for the mutual benefit of the cities involved? Let us be frank about it. It is a direct subsidy to the major trunklines.

Mr. Speaker, studies have been made and they show beyond any doubt that the vast majority—not all, of course, but the vast majority—of the traffic served in these areas are out-of-town businessmen whose time is very valuable and they are willing to pay a premium to go from one airport to another.

This got started as an experiment, listen, as an experiment. To do what? To haul mail; to haul mail, not people. It was too expensive and it was dropped for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen in my experience here on this floor the pressure brought to bear on any one little item as that which has come up on this. That sugar that these operators are getting tastes mighty good and they just do not want to give it up. When it would not work for mail, then they said, "Well, let us experiment and we can develop the helicopter."

You are sure going to develop the helicopter through carrying a little 30-pound, 40-pound, or 50-pound bag of mail, when the armed services have hundreds and hundreds of them and they are in use every day in Vietnam.

So, where does the experiment go? Here, gentlemen, is the proposition.

As our distinguished chairman has pointed out to the Members, we have mentioned it on this floor every year for the last 6 or 7 years—and I shall not call any Members' names but I can see them here—they have got up and chided this little subcommittee for not ending this subsidy. You have heard it. I have heard it and everyone has heard it, and we have moaned and groaned and have asked them to either quit or cut bait.

Mr. Speaker, there are 39 other cities who want this and one is just as much entitled to its as another. It is all taxpayers' money. It goes to the use and benefit of the big trunklines.

Mr. Speaker, if we wind this up, the trunklines will work out this problem in less than 6 or 8 months, just as sure as shooting, in one form or another.

Now, they say this is a debt. You know whose story that is, and I say that with great humility and respect. Not even the Civil Aeronautics Administration will tell us positively about it. They say they think it is. Well, if they think it is, why not then subsidize that little line in San Francisco? Are there not other lines which are just as much entitled to this subsidy as the line that is

operating further down south in California? Can you make fish out of one and fowl out of another?

Mr. Speaker, if they thought it was a legal obligation why did they not subsidize some of the other 39? Can you imagine any place on earth where you need it any more than from Washington to Dulles Airport or Washington to Baltimore or in Boston, as well as hundreds of other cities such as Atlanta, Cleveland, and so forth?

Mr. Speaker, it is not a debt in my humble judgment, and if I am wrong I will get up on this floor and tell you I am wrong. But it looks to me as if the Civil Aeronautics Board does not think it is a debt, because if they did, they would subsidize the other 39 and equalize it.

But of all the effrontery I have seen in a long time by governmental agencies created by this Congress, this is it, and there are good men on that Board. They are just as fine as any I know. But their great trouble, Mr. Speaker, is they want to spend the money and appropriate it too. That conference report was clear as a bell. We finally said, "We respectfully ask you to listen to us, we have been pleading with you for 6 or 7 years."

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. You have me convinced. I suggest that the gentleman turn around and address his remarks to those on his side of the aisle who do not seem to be convinced.

Mr. THOMAS. In my humble opinion this is not a debt. They have had notice, not 1 year, not 2 years, not 3 years, not 4 years, but 5 and 6 years. We have gotten up here pleading just as we are doing now. Then they talk about a meat ax and no notice.

How much notice did they need? They are not going to do a thing in the world, and neither will the Civil Aeronautics Board. Let us do even-handed justice. You have taken the major trunklines off of direct subsidies. You give it to them in an indirect way.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the preferential motion is voted down—and it should be voted down. It is just giving even-handed justice, and I hope the committee will support your Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to my beloved friend from New York, who has announced he is going to retire. If he will listen to me he will be here another 30 or 40 years. He is beloved, he is chairman of our caucus, and if he has an enemy on the floor I do not know who it is.

Mr. KEOGH. My dearly beloved friend virtually took the words right out of my mouth. I was going to refer to his intention to retire. I hope he never does, I hope he is here for many years, and I say to him, Mr. Speaker, that my admiration and respect for him is exceeded by no one.

I would say further to him that when my preferential motion is adopted by the House I will love him just as much as I do now.

Mr. THOMAS. That will be mutual.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I have asked the chairman for some time on my own, but since the gentleman has been good enough to yield I might mention the fact so many x millions of dollars have been voted over the years for subsidies to the helicopter service, and to the ones that are in operation. This figure pales into insignificance somewhat when you realize the testimony given before a committee in the other body in March of this year.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the question?

Mr. MICHEL. I am going to make the point if I may.

Mr. THOMAS. Go ahead.

Mr. MICHEL. The Defense Department witnesses say that the Defense Department has saved $70 million by the experience of the S–58 helicopter in the Chicago area alone.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know where they got that figure or where the gentleman got it, but if he says it is true I will buy it.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman makes the point of the experience we have had in South Vietnam, but in substantially the same period helicopters are being utilized to the extent of 5 to 1 what they are in the military, and I say that is an experience that is of real consequence.

Mr. THOMAS. They are getting some rough treatment in Vietnam.

I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, of course, it is always very difficult to follow the very distinguished and able gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. As a matter of fact, it is just about as difficult as following the junior Senator from Illinois, the distinguished minority leader, EVERETT DIRKSEN, but I do believe that there is another side to this story, and that these facts ought to be known to make the record complete.

My good friend, the distinguished chairman of our Appropriations Committee, made reference to last year's conference report in the course of his remarks, and that report was the subject of discussion in recent hearings on helicopter air service before the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate. Senator MONRONEY was presiding and said on page 25 of those hearings:

> The Chair is in doubt whether a majority of the conferees of the Senate did agree to the House position. I recall no vote that was taken in the closed conference that was held, and, of course, it was not a matter of record anyway, because the Senate conferees could have spoken out by official voice at the time the conference report was adopted if they had concurred in the House conference, which they did not.

I might say that there were several of us as House conferees in the conference yesterday who are not in agreement with the House position and have as a matter of fact spoken out on this matter on previous occasions.

The funds previously provided for the helicopter carriers for this fiscal year were exhausted on April 11, 1965, and presently there are no funds to take them through the period from April 11 to June 30, 1965.

The $942,000 is needed to bridge this gap, and a supplemental appropriation in this amount has been requested by the administration. This request is set forth on page 21 of House Document No. 80 containing the communication from the President of the United States.

There are several reasons why it is vital for the House to approve this supplemental appropriation for the helicopter carriers.

Without this money, the scheduled helicopter industry in the three largest cities of the United States, New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago, would collapse within the next several weeks. One of the most promising new forms of transportation would be killed off just as it is beginning to demonstrate its capability of getting off of subsidy within a reasonable time.

The opposition to helicopter subsidy here in the Congress seems to be based on a misunderstanding that it is being used simply to defray the cost of a local transportation service in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, which unjustly discriminates in favor of these three cities and against other cities which also need but do not have helicopter service.

The fact is that these three operations were created by the Civil Aeronautics Board to operate as national helicopter laboratories, to develop the art of helicopter transportation to the point where it can become self-sustaining and then spread to other cities, employing the advances gained in these operations. The transportation service which these three carriers provide is only a necessary incident to the more important developmental function they are performing.

What we are buying with this subsidy is the maintenance of incubators or test beds which are developing for future national application this newest form of air transportation and the only form that can bring air transportation closer than airports to the people that use it.

The Congress itself has expressed interest in having helicopter service extended to new cities. In acting on the appropriation for fiscal 1963, the Senate voted to increase helicopter subsidy to $10 million, to provide for additional services. Last year, when the House conferees requested the exclusion of helicopter subsidy from the budget this year, there was an indication that this might help to get service for "39 other cities that need it as badly as those that now have it."

Actually, the reverse is true, because the quickest way to advance an expansion of helicopter service to other cities is by first perfecting the existing operations, after which new services in new cities can be authorized on a nonsubsidy basis.

Hence, what is at stake here today is not only the existing helicopter services in the three largest cities of the Nation

but also the extension of service to other cities, which would be impaired if the present development program were to be snuffed out by cutting off all of the funds.

The helicopter carriers have been criticized because of the length of time it has taken for them to become free of subsidy. However, the delay has largely been beyond their control. They were delayed in getting their turbine-powered equipment. After the new equipment was delivered, the in-service debugging of the aircraft took substantially longer than expected.

Progress has also been deterred by the length of time it has taken to get instrument flight rules authority, which is essential to achieve high schedule performance and reliability, and the higher revenues which come with more reliable service. It has taken time to increase the period between overhauls on the new equipment and its components, which has kept costs at a higher level until the overhaul period could be increased.

These and other factors have accounted for the economic improvement of the carriers not having been more accelerated than it has been, and the delays encountered have been largely attributable to the uniqueness of this new breed of flying machine and the complexities it involves.

What is important today, is that the improvement in these helicopter carriers is now moving forward to the point where the CAB has just found—in orders Nos. E–21798 and 21799—that the two carriers receiving 82 percent of the total subsidy—New York and Los Angeles—can be expected to break even without subsidy in fiscal 1969. The third carrier—Chicago can be expected to do the same with the further activation of Midway Airport in Chicago.

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

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

Mr. KEOGH. Can the gentleman affirm for me the fact that I have stated, that the San Francisco operation is running at a net loss in excess of $1 million, which is used as a tax carryover in connection with other operations?

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. KEOGH. This is subsidizing San Francisco to the extent of 49 percent of its loss.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is correct. He serves on the Committee on Ways and Means and knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind the gentleman from Illinois that at the conference on yesterday, as one of the House conferees, I took the position favoring the appropriation and agreed with the Senate conferees whose views were principally voiced by the distinguished senior Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL. At that time I pointed out that in most of the capitals of Europe there is 100 percent government-subsidized helicopter service; that here in this country in our three largest cities—and the three largest cities here are larger than most of the capital cities of Europe—we have only partially government-subsidized service. I should also mention the fact that at one time years ago this helicopter subsidy was a very substantial one. The government subsidy has now been brought down as the result of superior operating know-how and the more economical operations of these three helicopter companies.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the motion offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] will prevail.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman. I would say further, Mr. Speaker, that the collapse of the scheduled helicopter industry in our three largest cities could impair this country's world leadership in the field of vertical-lift aircraft.

The cessation of service in these three cities would receive worldwide attention because of the many international users of the service and the many representatives from countries throughout the world who visit these carriers seeking advice and assistance in the formulation of their own helicopter service plans.

U.S.-manufactured helicopters are being used in transport operations in a number of foreign countries, and a real stigma would ensue from closing down our own helicopter carriers while at the same time foreign operators were carrying on with the same kind of U.S. equipment which we ourselves have not seen fit to continue in service.

Lack of confidence in our helicopter products would inevitably follow, and existing and foreseeable foreign markets would be impaired as foreign competitors capitalized on the situation. Thus, our balance of payments could be adversely affected in a substantial way.

Another reason why this country cannot afford to scuttle its helicopter transport industry is the growing need for such a vehicle to combat the increasing congestion in urban areas.

Population studies show that by 1980 more than 72 percent of the U.S. population will be squeezed into our metropolitan areas, and the resultant congestion will require a whole new kit of transportation tools.

The helicopter is one of the most promising new transportation tools, because it operates in a new dimension lying above surface congestion on the ground and beneath the congestion of fixed-wing airplanes in the air.

Three Presidents of the United States have demonstrated that the helicopter is practical and safe and does a good job of jumping over ground transportation tangles on short-haul local and interurban flights.

One of the greatest challenges the helicopter has to offer is its potential of replacing fixed-wing aircraft on short-haul intercity operations in highly congested areas, and thus dispense with millions of dollars of otherwise needed additional airport facilities and at the same time better serve the passenger by flying him into the heart of the city instead of depositing him at an outlying airport as is now the case. Under the concept, New York City could forget about building a fourth or fifth airport, by funneling its short-haul operations into heliports and confining its airports to medium- and long-haul operations.

The point I am leading up to is that the continuation of the scheduled helicopter industry is far too important a matter to be determined by a supplemental appropriation covering less than a 90-day period. The $942,000 supplemental appropriation in question here today covers only the 80 days from April 11 to June 30, 1965.

Just last month, the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee held extensive hearings on the helicopter air service program and what the policy of the Congress should be on this subject. Certainly, we should retain the status quo until policy determinations have been made as a result of those hearings. It would be most inappropriate for this body prematurely to foreclose this whole inquiry by blocking the supplemental appropriation and putting these carriers out of business before the other body has had time to finish its task.

In closing, I want to add that the issue being debated here today also involves the willingness of the Congress to honor the legal obligations incurred by the U.S. Government.

In the debate this last Tuesday on the floor of the Senate, it was pointed out that the certificates of public convenience and necessity and rate orders issued to the helicopter carriers by the CAB, under the existing Federal Aviation Act, create a legal obligation on the Government to pay out the $942,000 for which a supplemental appropriation is being requested by the administration. There is a consensus of view that if the Congress does not appropriate this money, the helicopter carriers could successfully prosecute claims in the Court of Claims.

It is my understanding that a change would be required in the basic statute under which the CAB operates in order to eliminate the subsidy obligation to the helicopter carriers. The obligation cannot be eliminated simply by denying appropriations without changing the substantive law.

Those who advocate the termination of helicopter subsidy should address themselves to a change in the law instead of trying to achieve such a result through the appropriation process. I would oppose such a change in the law, and bring up the subject simply to point out the procedural problem involved.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield for a question.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it not a fact, Mr. Chairman, that what we are asking now—the additional funds—is a part of the CAB's program to phase out this subsidy and put these helicopter services on a pay-as-you-go basis? In other words, this is not part of a permanent, continuing program, but rather part of a plan

established and agreed to by the CAB to phase out this subsidy to the helicopters and make them self-sufficient.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would say that what we will vote on presently is a preferential motion made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] to overturn the recommendation of the conference committee, which has taken the position that we should insist on the $3 million being an adequate appropriation for this subsidy program for helicopters for the current fiscal year.

I do hope that Members, on this motion, will vote "No," and then will vote with the committee on the motion to insist upon the House position.

I do hope that the will of the Congress can be carried out, and the will of the Congress can be carried out by voting "No" on the motion which will presently be before us. When the House speaks, it ought not only to be heard but also heeded.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman from New York's preferential motion that the House recede and concur with the Senate on amendment No. 6 under chapter IV, independent offices. Our two bodies agree on an allowance of $1,932,000 for the payment of subsidy obligations mainly for local service air carriers. The disagreement is focused on a subsidy of $942,000 for helicopter operations in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York. The House failed to include these funds when H.R. 7091 was considered on April 6; however, the Senate believes that funds should be provided for payment of such subsidy obligations so long as the existing certification has not been discontinued by administrative or legislative action.

The Senate displays wisdom supporting an industry that is proving to be a valuable service, not only in the field of public service, but also in the defense structure of our Nation. And the issue at hand is important to the overall purpose of helicopter operations in both areas for the improvements realized in public transportation will benefit the defense phase of helicopter use and save our Government money in experimentation for improvement.

While the funds we now seek are designated to support three specific areas in the United States, the overall effects of the experiment in utilizing helicopters as a means of public transportation will reach out to all areas of this Nation, for as the industry progresses, its benefits will be available to a large majority of our citizenry.

The helicopter trial was launched with far-sighted vision of the needs of our people in expanding metropolitan areas. Traffic congestion is one of the most difficult problems facing our society. When you consider the costs in lost time of productive people who must sit in traffic jams, and the cost of moving freight in congested urban areas, we cannot hope to resolve these losses unless we can provide a solution to reduce travel time from outlying areas to the hub of industrial and business operations in the heart of these growing metropolitan complexes. The benefits we gain from the increased speed of cross country and intercontinental air travel will not be fully realized if we fail to provide a link between the airport terminals at the perimeter of metropolitan areas and the eventual destination in the center of these areas. The helicopter is the swiftest means of establishing this link.

In Chicago we have realized the need of helicopter service in our overall transportation picture of the city of Chicago and its farflung suburban areas.

We are reactivating Midway Airport on the South Side of Chicago as a supplement to the growing air traffic at O'Hare Field on the far northwest side of our city. Helicopters play an important role in transporting air passengers and air freight betwen these terminals where connections are made for continued travel to other areas of the United States and continents across the oceans. But this interexchange is only one part of the service that can be offered by helicopter transportation. They also proved a swift link between these terminals and Chicago's Loop and there are plans for intercity downtown service from Chicago to nearby cities like Milwaukee and South Bend.

The funds we seek in this amendment will enable the Chicago Helicopter Service and similar services in New York and Los Angeles to remain solvent while establishing their important foothold in the transportation field. If we fail to subsidize these services they will be lost for they have not had sufficient time to become firmly established and self-supporting. The benefits gained to date will be lost and will restrict the potential that can be realized from this service.

Congress had great vision in supporting air travel at its introduction in transportation and we now observe the results of this assistance through the development of modern aircraft and faster travel in the world. The helicopter is an outgrowth of the advancements in air transportation. It can and will develop as an important cog in this mode of travel but we will not realize this importance unless we support its purpose. Therefore Congress should continue its wisdom by assisting this industry to develop its full potential. Although we are seeking aid to only three large metropolitan areas in this amendment, the progress experienced in these areas can produce a self-sustaining industry which will eventually benefit other metropolitan areas and outlying communities. An expanding business helps the economy of our country and the birth of a new business certainly meets with the plans of a great society in the future.

The need for this subsidy has been affirmed by the Civil Aeronautics Board. They have carefully studied the results of the helicopter experiment to date and sustain its position as an important link in air travel. Their plan proposes a phaseout of subsidy payments over a 5-year period. By then the industry will have matured and be self-supporting.

A vote in favor of the motion to recede and concur with the Senate's amendment to subsidize the helicopter services in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York will indicate the wisdom of this Congress by continued support of air transportation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEOGH) there were—ayes 62, noes 77.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the 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 144, nays 228, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—144

Adams	Griffiths	Philbin
Anderson, Tenn.	Grover	Pike
	Hagen, Calif.	Pirnie
Annunzio	Halleck	Powell
Arends	Hanley	Price
Ayres	Hays	Pucinski
Barrett	Helstoski	Race
Bell	Hicks	Reid, N.Y.
Bingham	Holifield	Reinecke
Bolton	Hosmer	Reuss
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Rhodes, Pa.
Burke	Huot	Rodino
Burton, Calif.	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Byrne, Pa.	Karsten	Ronan
Byrnes, Wis.	Karth	Roncalio
Cahill	Kastenmeier	Rooney, N.Y.
Cameron	Kee	Rooney, Pa.
Carey	Kelly	Roosevelt
Celler	Keogh	Rosenthal
Clawson, Del	King, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Clevenger	King, N.Y.	Roybal
Collier	King, Utah	Rumsfeld
Cooley	Kluczynski	Ryan
Corbett	Krebs	St Germain
Daniels	Lipscomb	Scheuer
Delaney	Love	Secrest
Dent	McCarthy	Sickles
Derwinski	McDowell	Sisk
Donohue	McEwen	Slack
Dwyer	McGrath	Smith, Calif.
Dyal	McVicker	Smith, N.Y.
Edwards, Calif.	Macdonald	Stratton
Ellsworth	Martin, Mass.	Sweeney
Erlenborn	Matsunaga	Teague, Calif.
Farbstein	Meeds	Tenzer
Fino	Michel	Thompson, N.J.
Foley	Minish	Tunney
Fraser	Moorhead	Ullman
Frelinghuysen	Morgan	Utt
Fulton, Pa.	Moss	Watts
Fulton, Tenn.	Multer	Widnall
Gallagher	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, Charles H.
Gilbert	Murphy, N.Y.	
Gilligan	Nedzi	Wolff
Grabowski	O'Hara, Ill.	Wright
Gray	Olsen, Mont.	Wydler
Green, Pa.	Ottinger	Yates
Greigg	Patten	Zablocki
Grider	Pepper	

NAYS—228

Abbitt	Andrews, Glenn	Baldwin
Abernethy		Bandstra
Adair	Andrews, N. Dak.	Baring
Albert		Bates
Anderson, Ill.	Ashley	Battin
Andrews, George W.	Ashmore	Beckworth
	Aspinall	Belcher

Bennett	Griffin	O'Neal, Ga.
Berry	Gross	O'Neill, Mass.
Betts	Gubser	Passman
Boland	Gurney	Patman
Bolling	Hagan, Ga.	Pelly
Bonner	Haley	Perkins
Bow	Hall	Pickle
Brademas	Hamilton	Poage
Bray	Hansen, Idaho	Poff
Brooks	Hansen, Iowa	Pool
Broomfield	Hansen, Wash.	Purcell
Brown, Ohio	Harsha	Quie
Broyhill, N.C.	Harvey, Ind.	Quillen
Buchanan	Harvey, Mich.	Randall
Burleson	Hathaway	Reid, Ill.
Burton, Utah	Hechler	Reifel
Cabell	Henderson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Callan	Herlong	Rivers, S.C.
Callaway	Horton	Roberts
Carter	Hull	Robison
Casey	Hungate	Rogers, Fla.
Cederberg	Hutchinson	Rogers, Tex.
Chamberlain	Ichord	Roudebush
Chelf	Irwin	Roush
Clancy	Jacobs	Satterfield
Clausen, Don H.	Jennings	Saylor
	Joelson	Schmidhauser
Cleveland	Johnson, Okla.	Schneebeli
Cohelan	Johnson, Pa.	Schweiker
Colmer	Jonas	Selden
Conable	Keith	Shipley
Conte	Kirwan	Shriver
Craley	Kornegay	Sikes
Cramer	Kunkel	Skubitz
Cunningham	Laird	Smith, Iowa
Curtin	Landrum	Smith, Va.
Curtis	Langen	Stafford
Dague	Latta	Stalbaum
Davis, Ga.	Long, La.	Stanton
Davis, Wis.	Long, Md.	Steed
de la Garza	McClory	Stubblefield
Denton	McCulloch	Sullivan
Devine	McDade	Talcott
Dole	McFall	Taylor
Dorn	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	MacGregor	Thomas
Downing	Machen	Thompson, La.
Duncan, Oreg.	Mackie	Thompson, Tex.
Duncan, Tenn.	Mahon	Thomson, Wis.
Edmondson	Mailliard	Todd
Edwards, Ala.	Marsh	Trimble
Everett	Martin, Ala.	Tuck
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Nebr.	Tuten
Farnum	Matthews	Udall
Fascell	May	Vanik
Feighan	Miller	Vigorito
Findley	Mills	Vivian
Fisher	Mink	Walker, Miss.
Flood	Minshall	Walker, N. Mex.
Flynt	Mize	Watkins
Fogarty	Monagan	Weltner
Ford, Gerald R.	Moore	Whalley
Ford, William D.	Morris	White, Tex.
	Morse	Whitener
Fountain	Morton	Whitten
Friedel	Mosher	Williams
Fuqua	Murray	Willis
Gathings	Natcher	Wilson, Bob
Gettys	Nelsen	Wyatt
Gonzalez	O'Hara, Mich.	Younger
Goodell	O'Konski	

NOT VOTING—61

Addabbo	Giaimo	Nix
Ashbrook	Gibbons	O'Brien
Blatnik	Green, Oreg.	Olson, Minn.
Boggs	Halpern	Redlin
Brock	Hanna	Resnick
Broyhill, Va.	Hardy	Rivers, Alaska
Clark	Harris	St. Onge
Conyers	Hawkins	Schisler
Corman	Hébert	Scott
Culver	Holland	Senner
Daddario	Jarman	Springer
Dawson	Jones, Ala.	Staggers
Dickinson	Jones, Mo.	Stephens
Diggs	Leggett	Toll
Dingell	Lennon	Tupper
Dow	Lindsay	Van Deerlin
Dulski	Mackay	Waggonner
Evans, Colo.	Madden	White, Idaho
Fallon	Mathias	Young
Farnsley	Moeller	
Garmatz	Morrison	

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Giaimo for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Dulski for, with Mr. Stephens against.
Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Morrison against.
Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Waggonner against.
Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Holland against.
Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Garmatz against.
Mr. Halpern for, with Mr. Fallon against.
Mr. Dow for, with Mr. Brock against.
Mr. O'Brien for, with Mr. Hardy against.
Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Lennon against.
Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Scott against.
Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Dickinson against.
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.
Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia against.
Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Young against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Culver with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Harris with Mr. St. Onge.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. White of Idaho.
Mr. Gibbons with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Redlin.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Olson of Minnesota with Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Senner.
Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Evans of Colorado.

Mr. BOB WILSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CLEVELAND changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: On page 7, line 14, insert:

"FEDERAL-STATE TRAINING PROGRAMS

"For matching grants to States for authorized training and related activities, and for expenses of providing technical assistance to State and local governmental or public bodies (including studies and publication of information), as authorized by title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 801–805), $5,050,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 8, line 1, insert:

"FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES

"For fellowships for city planning and urban studies as authorized by section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 811), $515,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000 of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House insist upon disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 9, line 7, insert:

"VETERANS REOPENED INSURANCE FUND

"All premiums and collections on insurance issued pursuant to section 725 of title 38, United States Code, shall be credited to the 'Veterans reopened insurance fund', established pursuant to that section, and all payments on such insurance and on any total disability provisions attached thereto shall be made from that fund, notwithstanding any provisions of that section: *Provided*, That for actuarial and accounting purposes, the assets and liabilities (including liability for repayment of advances hereinafter authorized and adjustment of premiums) attributable to each insured group established under said section 725 shall be separately determined: *Provided further*, That such amounts of the 'Veterans special term insurance fund' as may hereafter be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be in excess of the actuarial liabilities of that fund, including contingency reserves, shall be available for transfer to the 'Veterans reopened insurance fund' as needed to provide initial capital: *Provided further*, That any amounts so transferred shall be repaid to the Treasury and shall bear interest payable to the Treasury at rates established in accordance with section 725(d)(1) of title 38, United States Code."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the motions of the committee which is somewhat controversial. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I respectfully urge that you vote down the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. Only a few moments ago you heard my distinguished colleague say that the issue involved then was whether or not the Congress "would get into bed with an agency of the executive branch which has defied the legislative branch of the Government." That is exactly the issue here before us. If you vote to sustain the committee you are doing just that.

Let me give you the history of what has happened. Last year the Congress voted to open the GI insurance program under very limited terms. In that bill authorization was given the Veterans' Administration to ask for appropriations to carry on the work required. The VA officials appeared before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in February of this year to give us a report on how they were proceeding with carrying out the authority given to the agency. They told us absolutely nothing of the procedure proposed to finance it except that

they intended to operate in the same manner we had specified in our legislation.

Then, without saying a word to the staff of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, without saying a word to the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], or to any other member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, they went to the Appropriations Committee and asked them to write in language which would completely change the manner in which this bill was to be financed.

I made a point of order against that language when the bill was before us the first time. That point of order was sustained.

As soon as the point of order was sustained I immediately wrote to the Senator, JOHN O. PASTORE, who is the chairman of the Senate subcommittee handling this bill, and explained to him why I had done this, and pointed out this action had the complete support of all members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I asked that it not be put back in the bill.

My letter was as follows:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1965.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for the opportunity to express my position in connection with the rider relating to the veterans' insurance program which was contained in the second supplemental appropriations, H.R. 7090, in the form in which it was reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Your attention is invited to page 7131 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6, on which I made a point of order against this language, a violation of the rules, which point of order was sustained.

It is my understanding that the Veterans' Administration still desires to have authority of this nature. It seems to me the transfer of any funds from a trust fund for purposes not contemplated when the trust fund was established, is a highly questionable procedure. It certainly is not countenanced in the business community, and I doubt the wisdom of the Veterans' Administration proceeding in this fashion.

I feel very strongly that the legislative committee, in this case, our own Veterans' Affairs Committee, should have been consulted on this point and prior approval obtained.

The simplest procedure, it seems to me, is for a direct appropriation to be made for this administrative service. The appropriation is quite warranted and will be repaid promptly as the premiums on the reopened insurance are received.

I have advised Mr. Brickfield and his associates, while I am sympathetic and fully understand the position in which they find themselves, if the Senate in its wisdom should include this language, I would feel duty bound to object to it when it came before the House at the time of the presentation of the conference report.

I appreciate the opportunity to make clear my position on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

Despite that fact, the Senate subcommittee inserted the language in the bill, and because of the fact that it is now brought up in the manner it is, I cannot make a point of order that it is legislation on this bill.

I have, however, sent a letter to the subcommittee chairman, ALBERT THOMAS, under date of April 28, 1965, and would like to have it inserted as part of my remarks:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT THOMAS,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you in your capacity as chairman of the subcommittee which handles the second supplemental appropriations bill H.R. 7091, because of the role which you and your associates will, I assume, play when this measure goes to conference.

I am disturbed to learn from reading the Senate reported version that the language permits the Veterans' Administration to transfer money from an insurance fund to meet the operating expenses authorized by appropriate sections of Public Law 88-664. You will recall that on April 6, 1965, I made a point of order against this identical language, which point of order was sustained by the Chair. On page 7131 of the RECORD of that date, I indicated to some small degree the reasons for my action.

Inherent in the entire history of this legislation as well as specifically in several sections of Public Law 88-664, is the authority to make appropriations necessary for the administration of this reopening. As you will recall, this entire insurance section was added to the non-service-connected pension bill, H.R. 1927, and in adding this section the Senate Committee on Finance in its report (S. Rept. 1591, 88th Cong.), made this statement: "There will be, however, an initial administrative outlay to the Veterans' Administration estimated at $6,580,000 for the first year, $4,408,500 for the second year, $2,989,750 for the third year, $2,945,000 for the fourth year, and $2,867,250 for the fifth year. In reality, this is a bookkeeping transaction involving no cost to the Government inasmuch as the bill provides that funds 'so appropriated' shall be repaid to the Treasury by collection of the administrative expenses from the policyholders."

I have supplied the emphasis in the aforementioned quotation to indicate that the authority of this legislation clearly shows that the administrative expenses inherently necessary in this reopening program would be appropriated from the Treasury and repaid by the policyholders who take advantage of this new law which is effective May 1. At no time during the hearings or consideration of this measure in the Senate or any time subsequent to the enactment of this law has the Congress been officially advised other than by the language of the supplemental appropriation, H.R. 7091, that it was contemplated to enact legislation through these means or otherwise, to permit the transfer of moneys from this trust fund for administrative purposes.

On February 17, the Deputy Administrator, Mr. Brickfield testified before the Subcommittee on Insurance of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, at what was supposed to have been a hearing calling for full and complete disclosure of all facets of the reopening of the program of National Service Life Insurance. At no time during the hearing did Mr. Brickfield or any of his associates in any way indicate that legislation to permit such a transfer was needed or contemplated. On page 51 of these hearings, Mr. Brickfield states, "The initial working capital will be obtained by making a loan from the Treasury which will be repaid with interest as premium and other income becomes available." It would seem that if legislation were needed, full disclosure to the Congress would require that it take place in that hearing and Mr. Brickfield would have advised the subcommittee to this effect. Such advice was not forthcoming and the most charitable consideration which can be placed upon the Veterans' Administration action in this field is one of deviousness and a desire to be less than frank.

Subsequent to the House passage of 7901, I communicated the background of this question to the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. PASTORE, who was in charge of this legislation in the Senate and expressed the desire that the Senate committee would follow regular standards in this matter by use of the legislative committee rather than resorting to a rider as has been done. Unfortunately, the Senate has seen fit to restore the language in question to the appropriation bill. On April 13, an executive session was held of the Subcommittee on Insurance of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and Mr. Brickfield and his associates from the Veterans' Administration appeared. Although not a member of the subcommittee, I also was asked to appear. It was learned during the course of this executive session that as long ago as last November the decision to proceed in this fashion to bypass the Committee on Veterans' Affairs had been made by the Bureau of the Budget with the full knowledge and acquiescence by the Veterans' Administration. This was at the time of the preparation of the 1966 budget. Mr. Brickfield and his associates were advised by all members of the subcommittee who were in attendance at this executive session to at once request the necessary funds by the regular appropriation route and they were also given assurance that the subcommittee members would do what they could to see that this was granted. For reasons unknown to me, the Bureau of the Budget refused to permit the Veterans' Administration to proceed in this fashion.

At this same executive session, the Veterans' Administration representatives were advised that if an appropriation could not be obtained for this purpose, that legislation to permit a transfer of funds would be introduced and carefully considered by the subcommittee. I have now introduced H.R. 7597, which accomplishes this purpose and is now pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Insurance, would have introduced identical legislation at the same time had he not been absent because of illness.

I am hopeful that this legislation can be speedily considered by the subcommittee, that a hearing be held on this specific bill, at which time this entire unfortunate affair can be laid bare. I am sure that the Subcommittee on Insurance as well as the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs will act promptly on this matter and in a responsible fashion.

I am sure that you would not for one moment be a party to the Veterans' Administration flouting the wishes or evading the responsibility or authority of a committee of the Congress and yet that is what the Veterans' Administration has sought to evade, a proper accounting to the committee which is charged with the legislative oversight of this agency.

The comptroller of the Veterans' Administration made it clear to the members of the subcommittee in executive session on April 13 that if this rider should not be approved, other funds would be transferred to provide for the necessary administrative funds for the reopening of this national service life insurance program. I stress this point to indicate that there will be no delay and no inconvenience to the veterans who are eligible for this type of insurance.

I hope that it will be possible for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to act on this legislation before H.R. 7091 leaves the conference stage but in any event I ask your support in resisting the efforts of the managers of the bill in the other body to include this legislative language in the final version of the appropriation bill, H.R. 7091.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

The representatives of the Veterans' Administration have now been before the Veterans' Affairs Committee. They have told us they do not need this language now, and have further informed us that they do not need the money now.

We asked what they needed. They drafted a bill and brought it to our committee. I have introduced H.R. 7597 which establishes the veterans reopened insurance fund, and wish to include it in entirety at this point of my remarks:

H.R. 7597

A bill to establish the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund in the Treasury and to authorize initial capital to operate insurance and programs under title 38, United States Code, section 725

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective May 1, 1965, section 725 of title 36, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By placing a period after the word "basis" in clause (8) of subsection (b) and striking all of the remainder of such clause.

(2) By substituting a period for the semicolon at the end of clause (7) of subsection (c) and striking all of the remainder of the subsection.

(3) By amending subsection (d)(1) to read as follows:

"(d)(1) All premiums and collections on insurance issued pursuant to this section and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be credited to the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund, a revolving fund established in the Treasury of the United States, and all payments on such insurance and any total disability provision attached thereto shall be made from that fund. For actuarial and accounting purposes, the assets and liabilities (including liabilities for repayment of advances hereinafter authorized, and adjustment of premiums) attributable to the insured groups established under this section shall be separately determined. Such amounts in the Veterans Special Term Insurance Fund in the Treasury as may hereafter be determined by the Administrator to be in excess of the actuarial liabilities of that fund, including contingency reserves, shall be available for transfer to the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund as needed to provide initial capital. Any amounts so transferred shall be repaid to the Treasury over a reasonable period of time with interest as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the average yield on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States of comparable maturities then forming a part of the public debt."

(4) By striking the words "subsection (b) of" wherever they appear in subsection (d)(2).

(5) By striking the following words from subsection (d)(3): "or the National Service Life Insurance appropriation, as appropriate,".

The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT], who is the chairman of the Insurance Subcommittee called a special committee meeting this morning. We held hearings and heard the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration. We reported this bill out unanimously. I urge the House, if they believe what the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has said, namely, that the integrity of the House is involved and that we should not get into bed with an agency downtown that has defied the legislative branch of the Government, then you should vote down his motion.

Another thing I would like to call your attention to is the language meddles with trust funds. One of the important things you have to remember is that a trust fund is a rather sacred thing. It is set up for a special purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. SAYLOR. This trust fund that has been set up, that they now propose to transfer under the language in this bill, is not for the purpose they are trying to use it for now. If we have any financial integrity, if we as Members of Congress believe that trust funds are sacred funds and should be used only for the purposes for which they are created, then we should not meddle with this trust fund. I sincerely hope that you will support the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and vote down this motion.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT].

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there are just a few times that I have come to this floor to make any kind of remarks, but I am here today to protect the integrity of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Last November 1964, when the budget was in preparation, a decision was made to try this route of transferring, from an insurance revolving fund, money to provide for the administrative expenses of the reopening of national service life insurance on May 1, and to accomplish this by means of legislation on an appropriation bill. We did not know a thing in the world about it. The distinguished gentlemen from Texas [Mr. MAHON and Mr. THOMAS] have been in charge of this. Our distinguished chairman, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE, has fought them on many occasions—not once but five or six times—protecting the Veterans' Administration and securing through the acts of this House millions of dollars to repair hospitals and to spend more millions of dollars to renovate old hospitals and construct new ones. At the present time we are working very hard to save a lot of the veterans' hospitals that the bureaucrats downtown want to close. So, my friends, when they brought this to our attention, we asked the appropriate Veterans' Administration officials why they chose this route after the point of order had been made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] on April 6, 1965, and sustained. They did not heed the Veterans' Affairs Committee; they went on over to the other body. And what did they do there? They got it put on, and now they bring it back to us. They say, "Oh, we were wrong about coming before this committee, but we want this passed because time is of the essence." They can live for 2 or 3 months without these funds. The minute we heard about it we introduced a bill—I and Mr. SAYLOR did—and the Subcommittee on Insurance met this morning and voted this measure out with full assurance from the chairman of the full committee that he will call a meeting soon, perhaps next week, to give the necessary authorization.

If you wish to protect the integrity of this House and protect us and all of the other legislative committees, I certainly want you to vote to agree with Mr. SAYLOR and Mr. TEAGUE, who will follow me in a few minutes.

I thank you.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, we on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have tried through the years to act responsively with respect to veterans programs. Members of the House know that there have been a number of highly controversial programs proposed, and it has been our purpose and our effort to try to do the things which we believe are in the best interests of the House, the veterans, and the people of the United States generally. I feel strongly that the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT], which is the position of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, ought to be sustained. I urge that the Members so vote.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of the House realize that we are not being critical of the Committee on Appropriations, but we do have a good committee that works very hard, as does the Insurance Subcommittee under the gentleman from Tennesse [Mr. EVERETT]. He has done a good job, as good a job as any subcommittee can do. I question that any committee of Congress is more responsive to any agency than we are to the Veterans' Administration. But I very much resent the fact that they did not even approach the legislative committee, but went to the Committee on Appropriations and asked for money which had not been authorized.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be voted down.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the House and the country are under heavy obligation to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. That committee does a fine job for our veterans and the Nation and I want to pay tribute to it. The question involved here is whether we make a direct appropriation from the Treasury or handle it through a transfer from a so-called trust fund. Certainly there is no desire on the part of the Committee

on Appropriations to clash with members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. We are all working for the same people. I can understand some of the resentment which they feel against the Veterans' Administration for failing to make proper contact with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. There must have been some misunderstanding. Certainly this important committee should have been fully consulted in the matter. However, we are now confronted with the proposition of what to do about this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] who handles these matters in the subcommittee for the independent offices bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that a misunderstanding has developed between, not the Committee on Appropriations and our distinguished friends on the legislative committee, but between the legislative committee and the Veterans' Administration officials downtown. Sometimes I wonder how awkward some of the Bureau people can get. Of all the hard working, efficient and distinguished legislative committees in this House I know of none that does a more efficient job or a better job, or has the interest of the veteran at heart more than this great committee of the House composed of our distinguished friends over here on my left and on my right. They are all my close personal friends.

I do hope that the Veterans' Administration officials will come over and make their peace with this committee. They cannot operate without them. You know it and I know it. They carry the load. This subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations are nothing but waterboys for this legislative committee. We are delighted and happy and honored to serve them in that capacity.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that your subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations does not have but just 50 percent of the authority—not all of the authority.

Mr. Speaker, we have an equal and coordinate body over at the other end of the Capitol and, of course, it is made up of great people also. But I suppose we have to brag on ourselves a little bit. They are not the greatest. However, they are equally important. Unfortunately, though, we have to listen to them every now and then because they have a vote also.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me review what happened.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Why, surely I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVERETT. Will not the gentleman from Texas admit that if we had listened to the other body over there what in the world would the national debt be today? Would the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT] that I did not go to school that long.

Mr. EVERETT. If the gentleman will yield further, no one has worked any harder throughout the years during which he has served here in the Congress in protecting the rights of this House time and time again and in holding down expenditures when the other body loaded the bill time and time again with them and the gentleman has come back and he has used the butcher knife on them very effectively, has he not?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, we have tried, we have tried. I thank you for your contribution. We all love you and respect you.

Mr. Speaker, let us see what is involved here. I believe our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], explained it very well. Outside of the personal controversy—and I do hope they can make it up, and if the VA officials downtown are smart, they had better make it up before the sun goes down—we are talking about $5.5 million, gentlemen, to take care of three insurance programs, to pay the premiums on those programs. These premiums are coming due now. Incidentally, the three programs came into existence through the only route by which they can become established and that is by law and this was because our beloved and efficient Committee on Veterans' Affairs sponsored them and urged the House of Representatives to approve them.

So, Mr. Speaker, in one sense of the word every key in the legislative process has been fully respected. Every "i" in the legislative process has been dotted. In other words, the three programs about which we are talking now were put forward and the House passed them by virtue of the high standing which these gentlemen who serve on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs enjoy. So what is involved really is a little question of money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why was the point of order raised against it and why was it sustained, since they had already passed on the three programs and approved them legislatively? The reason is because there was no freshly appropriated money contained in the bill for that purpose. In other words, we were not taking from the taxpayers the $5.5 million contained in the bill. The Veterans' Administration had that amount of money in a trust fund and they merely wanted to transfer it and spend it for this purpose. Therefore, what is the alternative? This has got to be paid. These premiums are coming due. These gentlemen will have to come back and request what? A supplemental. If they do come back and request it, they are going to get it, and you know it and I know it.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I am delighted to yield further to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVERETT. This morning we passed a bill giving them the authority, the proper authorizing authority, to do that and to come back and get the approval of this distinguished committee. Now, what we are trying to do is to break these agencies and all of these departments and bureaus downtown from just completely ignoring the will of this House of Representatives as well as the will of the other body.

Mr. THOMAS. No one can fall out with the gentleman for that purpose; I cannot, I will tell the gentleman that.

Mr. EVERETT. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman enjoys serving on the Committee on Appropriations just as I enjoy serving on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. But I surely hate to be ignored in the manner in which they have ignored the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman does a tremendous job and if they are halfway smart, they will not ignore the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members of the House want to wait 60 or 90 days—I suppose we will be here anywhere from 30 to 60 to 90 days, who knows—they will have to come back and you will have to take from the taxpayer's pocket an additional $5.5 million.

As the matter now stands, and the way the Senate has put it in there, they can use the funds they already have. What you are doing is this: You are going to increase the debt another $5.5 million. It is that simple.

I have no quarrel with my distinguished friends. They do so much for the veterans. They do such a fine job that I cannot quarrel with them. But I think every legislative "i" has been dotted and every "t" crossed. The reason it was subject to a point of order is because it dealt with funds not in the bill, but appropriated in prior years.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I happen to serve on the subcommittee that dealt with this problem. My understanding is this money which was proposed to be transferred would otherwise go back to the Treasury. This is not costing or saving the taxpayers any money, one way or the other. But I do suggest we all bear in mind if we sustain the position of the House this is not going to affect in any detrimental way any veteran in this country. The program should be reinstated.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not intend to intimate it was, because I know those programs are going to be paid, and your great committee will see to that, and we will cooperate with you.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. The membership understands it is not a pro or anti-veteran proposition, but as I see it a case of sustaining the position of the House and following our regular legislative procedure.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. I have been a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs under the chairmanship of three different members. For the length of time that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] has been chairman, we have had a very close and friendly relationship with the Veterans' Administration.

I was surprised in the last 6 months to see that there has been somewhat of a change. A concrete example of this happened a few months ago when the Veterans' Administration through the public press made an announcement they were going to close certain regional offices and hospitals. The chairman of the committee and myself were notified of the decision that they had made. They have had ample opportunity to come before the committee on this issue and ask for the proper authorization. Today we have an opportunity to cast a vote to show the Veterans' Administration that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is capable, willing, and able as soon as they come before us. To date they have not done that.

Mr. THOMAS. Did not your committee really pass on these insurance programs? You brought them to the floor of the House and asked the Congress to write them and make them law, and by virtue of your recommendations to the House, the House followed your suggestion. So really, in truth and in fact, the "t's" have been crossed, and the "i's" have been dotted. What we were talking about is purely a matter of form.

Mr. AYRES. No. We are talking about the amount of money.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not going to fuss with my friend, because we love him, and he has done a fine job for the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes, 45, nays, 93.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 16, line 13, insert "together with such amount as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for benefit payments for any period subsequent to May 31 of the year."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 17, line 10, insert the following:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"Amounts available for any activity under appropriations under this head in the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, shall also be available for any other activity thereunder to the extent needed in preparing for and carrying out the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"Amounts available for any activity under appropriations under this head in the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, shall also be available for any other activity thereunder to the extent needed in preparing for the programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 17, line 17, insert the following:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"Water supply and water pollution control

"Not to exceed $820,000 of the amount appropriated under this head in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, shall remain available until June 30, 1966, for construction projects to demonstrate control and abatement of acid mine drainage."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 18, line 4, insert the following:

"SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

"Limitation on salaries and expenses

"Amounts available for any activity under appropriations under this head in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, shall also be available for any other activity thereunder to the extent needed in preparing for and carrying out the Social Security Amendments of 1965."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

"SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

"Limitation on salaries and expenses

"Amounts available for any activity under appropriations under this head in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, shall also be available for any other activity thereunder to the extent needed in preparing for the programs authorized by the social security amendments of 1965."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: On page 19, line 11, insert:

"SENATE

"For payment to Gladys A. Johnston, widow of Olin D. Johnston, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina, $30,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the conference report may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain tables relating to the conference report which has been adopted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING NATIONAL ARTS AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1964

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 325) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 325

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4714) to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations therein. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN]; and pending that, to myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rule to make in order a bill to correct an error that was made in Public Law 88–579, which establishes the National Council on the Arts. The clear intent of the act was to establish the Council on a continuing

basis. But language was left out so there is a limitation on the appropriation for only 1 year. This obviously is not the intent of the Congress. The purpose of this resolution and bill which will be taken up pursuant to the resolution is to clear up this legislative error.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri has adequately explained the purposes of the bill. I would like to point out, however, as I understand it, the bill was objected to previously under suspension and now it is up under a rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of 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 motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4714, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, last year, culminating almost 90 years of effort, the Congress gave national recognition to the arts by the enactment of Public Law 88–579. This act, the National Cultural Development Act of 1964, created a National Council on the Arts, to be composed of a Chairman and 24 members, plus the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, ex officio.

The Chairman of the Council is a full-time employee, appointed for a 6-year term. His salary is established, at $21,000 a year. During a term—he may not succeed himself—he will be paid a total of $126,000.

The Council, by law, must meet at least twice a year. When actually working, we authorize the standard per diem allowance for Council members, plus travel and subsistence payments. Council members serve for 6 years, staggered terms. During the tenure of one Chairman, the Council must meet at least 12 times. The cost of a meeting of the Council is about $3,500. Thus for the tenure of one Chairman, the statutory meetings of the Council, would cost $84,000, in total.

The act assigns a number of functions to the Council, including special studies, the appointment of panels of experts, and so forth. Special studies could be contracted out. The panels of experts would be paid in accord with existing laws and regulations for the use of such personnel.

During the debate on the bill last year, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], suggested that the Chairman would need four permanent employees in his office. Obviously he will need stationery, telephone service, office space, travel funds, and so forth.

But if we count only the salary of the Chairman, and the estimated cost of the statutory meetings of the Council for one 6-year term, the sums required would amount to $200,000.

When the bill was reported to the House last year, section 10 authorized "such sums as may be necessary" for the expenses of the Council. During the debate the question of an authorized ceiling was discussed, and the majority accepted an amendment offered by the then ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], setting a ceiling of $150,000.

The inclusions of the words "per annum" was overlooked. At this time, the Appropriations Committee may not provide more than $150,000 for the lifetime of a permanent Council, whose expenses for just the Chairman's salary and for the statutory meetings, will exceed that sum during the 6-year tenure of the first Chairman.

The bill before us today corrects that error, and makes it possible to carry out the intent of the Congress.

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 4714 is a short bill, making a simple two-word amendment to the National Cultural Development Act of 1964. It adds the words "per annum" to section 10 of that act. It has the effect of authorizing annual appropriations for the National Council on the Arts, of not to exceed $150,000.

Due to a technical error, the House, in adopting an amendment which placed a ceiling on appropriations, omitted the words "per annum." It was clearly the intent that appropriations would be authorized on an annual basis.

As the report accompanying this bill sets forth, the Council is a permanent body. We create a Chairman who is specifically authorized to receive $21,000 per annum, and who is appointed for a 6-year term.

Unless we adopt this amendment, the Council may be funded at no more than $150,000 for its lifetime. It was granted $50,000 for the current fiscal year. In the absence of an annual authorization, the House has allowed but $50,000 for fiscal year 1966. The President, in his budget, included a request for $150,000 for the Council for fiscal year 1966.

I urge approval of the bill.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 4714. I believe my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], expressed the point clearly. This is essentially a technical amendment, merely adding the words "per annum".

It represents, in my judgment, the clear intent of what was meant in the passage of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964.

I might add that I have talked with my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], the former ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, who offered the amendment which limited the authorization to $150,000, and he told me it was his intent and his understanding at the time that "per annum" was implicit and that it was merely a technical oversight when it was not included. I do not know whether the gentleman from New Jersey is on the floor at present or whether he would wish to add to that, but I believe his intent was clear.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and I hope it will be promptly passed with bipartisan support. The legislation which we enacted into law in the 88th Congress—establishing the National Council on the Arts—was an important first step in recognizing the arts at the national level and will—I believe—encourage the growth and development of the arts throughout the United States.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS].

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, had I been a Member of this House when it enacted the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, I would have voted for it. Today I am offered a second-best opportunity which I accept. I, therefore, rise in strong support for H.R. 4714 which will clarify the intent of annual appropriations not to exceed $150,000.

It is entirely fitting that this bill be passed as we seek to extend the great American society throughout not only the huge urban centers that have traditionally been able to support their performing arts, but through the smaller communities that have tasted the greatness of our American culture but which somehow have not been able to alone maintain and nurture aspiring American artists.

From time to time one hears condescending attitudes from abroad about the lack of American capacity to maintain its artists, and, in fact, the number of artists who feel compelled to study and perform in foreign countries tends to lend credence to those critics.

Americans want and do support efforts to encourage and promote the arts at every level of government. Last year's

passage of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act responded to that mandate. Let us in Congress today respond to a renewal of support for that goal by voting for this technical amendment contained in H.R. 4714.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4714, a bill to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations therein.

My colleagues will recall my longstanding and profound interest in Federal legislation to promote nationwide support for the arts and humanities. In its earlier forms I have recommended this legislation since 1962. This bill, H.R. 4714, would simply correct a technical error in Public Law 88–579 since the clear intent of this act was to establish the National Council on the Arts on an ongoing basis and I urge favorable consideration of the measure.

It is my earnest desire that this legislation under consideration will be but the beginning of much greater expansion in this area and on March 10 of this year it was my privilege and satisfaction to be associated with the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman THOMPSON, in the introduction of 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.

On that same day the President transmitted the administration's recommendations supporting this bill and declaring, in part:

> Government can seek to create conditions under which the arts can flourish; through recognition of achievements, through helping those who seek to enlarge creative understanding, through increasing the access of our people to the works of our artists, and through recognizing the arts as part of the pursuit of American greatness. That is the goal of this legislation.

I feel that the President's carefully chosen words express the essential meaning of this historically important legislation.

It is my hope that the Members of the House of Representatives will soon have the opportunity to approve this legislation and I want to take this opportunity to call attention to some of its features:

First. We are dealing here with a force vital to society which cannot sustain itself without help.

Second. The United States must not limit its effort to science and technology but must give full value and support to the other great branches of man's scholarly, literary, and artistic activity.

Third. This bill provides the necessary implementation of the National Council on the Arts which was established by Public Law 88–579—the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 which is presently under consideration.

Fourth. It provides assurances against Federal interference in scholarship, teaching, research, and artistic endeavors.

Fifth. Community, private, and State support for the arts and humanities will be increased by this legislation. Some of the States, notably New York, have proved the validity of this assumption through the additional local funds generated as the result of the expenditures of limited State funds by their respective State arts organizations.

Sixth. The bill emphasizes cooperation with existing Federal programs.

Passage of H.R. 4714 today, I believe, will provide the necessary groundwork to get this show on the road.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time unless someone present would like to use it. Mr. Chairman, I merely add my support to the bill. I think the National Council on the Arts should be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 10 of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 is amended by inserting "per annum" after "$150,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt very much that this was an oversight or a technical error. In any event, the law ought to be retained as it is. As a matter of fact, there is no need for a $21,000-a-year Director of Cultural Affairs. Up to this point I have been unable to discover anything that this individual or cultural council has accomplished for the thousands of dollars already expended. In March, when this same bill was before the House under suspension of the rules and was defeated on that occasion, we were not able at that time to discover anything that had been accomplished up to that point as far as cultural affairs are concerned except to provide for a few payrollers. Therefore, I would hope that the House would stand by the position many of the Members took in March of this year and put this on an annual review basis as far as the Congress is concerned. I think that the proponents of this legislation, who propose to spend $150,000 a year on a small number of fat cats to promote alleged cultural affairs, ought to have to come to the floor of the House and justify how the money has been spent. With the rejection of this bill this is what they would have to do. This is apparently what they do not want to have to do, that is, come to the floor of the House and justify how the money has been spent and explain what this council is or, especially, is not doing. So I hope that the House will reject this measure and continue the situation as it presently is. Let them come in and justify it each year.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the enormous debt with which this country is confronted I think of nothing less necessary than a permanent Federal appropriation and the spending of $150,000 every year for the promotion of so-called culture when there are so many other drains upon the Treasury.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to give my friend from Iowa a bit of comfort by reassuring him on the question of what the intent of the author of the bill and its proponents was at the time an amendment limiting the appropriation to $150,000 was adopted last year. It was, I assure my friend from Iowa, our intent that this be on an annual basis. As the manager of that bill at the time, I am somewhat embarrassed now to have to admit my mistake in not noting the omission of the words "per annum." It was then, it is now, and it will continue to be our intent that this be a maximum of $150,000 per annum. I might remind my friend from Iowa further that this proposition received rather overwhelming support even in March when, even though we failed to receive a full two-thirds vote—the vote, I believe, was 217 to 118 or a margin of 99 votes—indicating a consensus here, I am convinced. I am also convinced of the need for this, and I might reassure my friend from Iowa by reminding him that this council must go before the appropriate subcommittee and before the full Committee on Appropriations each year to make its request and to justify its request.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. That is exactly the point. We had some experience here this afternoon with the operations of the Committee on Appropriations and its various subcommittees. And so I say that as to a matter of this kind, with an expenditure of $150,000 a year—I do not know what for and I do not know that anyone can point to anything specifically that has been accomplished for the spending of thousands of dollars thus far——

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further and wish to say only that the maximum is $150,000 and it has to be justified. I think it is entirely appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4714) to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations therein, pursuant to House Resolution 325, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the 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 239, nays 116, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—239

Adams	Grider	Patten
Albert	Griffin	Pelly
Andrews, N. Dak.	Griffiths	Pepper
Annunzio	Grover	Perkins
Ashley	Hagen, Calif.	Philbin
Aspinall	Hamilton	Pickle
Ayres	Hanley	Pike
Bandstra	Hansen, Iowa	Pirnie
Bates	Hansen, Wash.	Poage
Battin	Hardy	Powell
Beckworth	Harvey, Mich.	Price
Bingham	Hathaway	Pucinski
Boland	Hechler	Purcell
Bolling	Helstoski	Quie
Brademas	Hicks	Race
Brooks	Holifield	Randall
Broomfield	Horton	Reid, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Reifel
Burke	Hungate	Reuss
Burton, Calif.	Huot	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Ichord	Rivers, Alaska
Byrnes, Wis.	Irwin	Rivers, S.C.
Cahill	Jacobs	Rodino
Callan	Jennings	Rogers, Colo.
Cameron	Joelson	Rogers, Fla.
Carey	Johnson, Calif.	Ronan
Carter	Johnson, Okla.	Roncalio
Chamberlain	Karsten	Rooney, N.Y.
Chelf	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Cleveland	Kastenmeier	Roosevelt
Clevenger	Kee	Rosenthal
Cohelan	Keith	Rostenkowski
Conable	King, Calif.	Roush
Cooley	King, Utah	Roybal
Corbett	Krebs	Rumsfeld
Craley	Kunkel	Ryan
Cramer	Leggett	St Germain
Curtin	Long, Md.	Saylor
Daniels	Love	Scheuer
Davis, Wis.	McCarthy	Schmidhauser
de la Garza	McClory	Schneebeli
Dent	McDade	Schweiker
Denton	McDowell	Sickles
Diggs	McFall	Sisk
Donohue	McGrath	Slack
Downing	McVicker	Smith, Iowa
Duncan, Oreg.	Macdonald	Smith, N.Y.
Dwyer	MacGregor	Springer
Dyal	Machen	Stafford
Edmondson	Mackay	Stalbaum
Edwards, Calif.	Mahon	Stratton
Ellsworth	Mailliard	Stubblefield
Everett	Marsh	Sullivan
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	Sweeney
Farbstein	Matsunaga	Teague, Tex.
Fascell	Matthews	Tenzer
Feighan	May	Thomas
Fino	Meeds	Thompson, La.
Flood	Michel	Thompson, N.J.
Foley	Miller	Thompson, Tex.
Ford, Gerald R.	Minish	Thomson, Wis.
Ford, William D.	Mink	Trimble
Fraser	Mize	Tunney
Frelinghuysen	Monagan	Udall
Fulton, Pa.	Moorhead	Ullman
Fulton, Tenn.	Morgan	Vanik
Fuqua	Morris	Vigorito
Gallagher	Morse	Vivian
Gathings	Morton	Walker, N. Mex.
Gettys	Mosher	Watts
Gilbert	Moss	Weltner
Gilligan	Multer	Whalley
Gonzalez	Murphy, Ill.	Willis
Goodell	Murphy, N.Y.	Wolff
Grabowski	Natcher	Wright
Gray	Nedzi	Wyatt
Green, Oreg.	O'Hara, Ill.	Wydler
Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Mich.	Yates
Greigg	Olsen, Mont.	Zablocki
	Ottinger	
	Patman	

NAYS—116

Abbitt	Adair	Andrews, George W.
Abernethy	Anderson, Ill.	
Arends	Fisher	Poff
Ashmore	Flynt	Pool
Baldwin	Fountain	Quillen
Baring	Gross	Reid, Ill.
Bell	Gubser	Reinecke
Bennett	Gurney	Rhodes, Ariz.
Berry	Hagan, Ga.	Roberts
Betts	Haley	Robison
Bolton	Hall	Rogers, Tex.
Bonner	Hansen, Idaho	Roudebush
Bow	Harsha	Satterfield
Bray	Harvey, Ind.	Secrest
Brown, Ohio	Henderson	Selden
Broyhill, N.C.	Hosmer	Shipley
Buchanan	Hull	Shriver
Burleson	Hutchinson	Sikes
Burton, Utah	Johnson, Pa.	Skubitz
Cabell	Jonas	Smith, Calif.
Callaway	King, N.Y.	Smith, Va.
Casey	Kornegay	Stanton
Cederberg	Laird	Steed
Clancy	Langen	Talcott
Clausen, Don H.	Latta	Taylor
Clawson, Del	Lipscomb	Teague, Calif.
Collier	Long, La.	Tuck
Colmer	McCulloch	Tuten
Cunningham	McEwen	Utt
Curtis	Mackie	Waggonner
Dague	Martin, Ala.	Walker, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Nebr.	Watkins
Derwinski	Mills	White, Tex.
Dole	Minshall	Whitener
Dorn	Moore	Whitten
Dowdy	Murray	Williams
Duncan, Tenn.	Nelsen	Wilson, Bob
Edwards, Ala.	O'Konski	Younger
Erlenborn	O'Neal, Ga.	
	Passman	

NOT VOTING—78

Addabbo	Fallon	Lindsay
Anderson, Tenn.	Farnsley	McMillan
Andrews, Glenn	Farnum	Madden
Ashbrook	Findley	Mathias
Barrett	Fogarty	Moeller
Belcher	Friedel	Morrison
Blatnik	Garmatz	Nix
Boggs	Giaimo	O'Brien
Brock	Gibbons	Olson, Minn.
Broyhill, Va.	Halleck	O'Neill, Mass.
Celler	Halpern	Redlin
Clark	Hanna	Resnick
Conte	Harris	St. Onge
Conyers	Hawkins	Schisler
Corman	Hays	Scott
Culver	Hébert	Senner
Daddario	Herlong	Staggers
Dawson	Holland	Stephens
Delaney	Jarman	Todd
Devine	Jones, Ala.	Toll
Dickinson	Jones, Mo.	Tupper
Dingell	Kelly	Van Deerlin
Dow	Keogh	White, Idaho
Dulski	Kirwan	Widnall
Evans, Colo.	Kluczynski	Wilson, Charles H.
	Landrum	
	Lennon	Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Findley against.
Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Devine against.
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Brock against.
Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Halleck against.
Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Lennon against.
Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Scott against.
Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.
Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Toll with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Todd with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Dow with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Clark.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Schisler.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Dulski.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Corman.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Farnum.
Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Gibbons.
Mr. Young with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Olson of Minnesota with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Redlin.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Farnsley.

The vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LAIRD. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader the program for the remainder of the week and the program for next week.

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

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin, we have completed the legislative program for this week and it will be our intention to ask to go over after the announcement of the program for next week, which is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

There are seven suspensions:

H.R. 908, Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho;

H.R. 500, providing for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, Nebr.;

H.R. 6926, improvement and modernization of Government employees' life insurance program;

H.R. 5640, jury commissions for U.S. district courts;

H.R. 5167, amending title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5184, for the relief of the port of Portland, Oreg.; and

H.R. 5283, inclusion of years of service as judge of the district court for the Territory of Alaska in the computation of years of Federal judicial service for judges of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I advise the House that these bills may not be taken up in the order in which they have been announced.

Also on Monday H.R. 2986, the Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965, under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day. Also on Tuesday the 1966 appropriations for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Also on Tuesday H.R. 2985, the Community Mental Health Centers

Act Amendments of 1965, under an open rule with 3 hours of debate. Also on Tuesday H.R. 5401, the Interstate Commerce Act amendments, under an open rule with 3 hours of debate.

On Wednesday H.R. 7657, authorizing defense procurement and research and development.

On Thursday H.R. 7717, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

On Friday and the balance of the week H.R. 2984, the Health Research Facilities Amendments of 1965, under an open rule with 3 hours of debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further for the purpose of making some unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. LAIRD. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader if we can expect early programing of the emergency basin authorization bill which was reported yesterday by the House Committee on Public Works, with regard to which there is a growing emergency in terms of monetary authorizations for contracts?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would say that, of course, when the rule is granted on that bill I think we can assure the gentleman of early programing.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the man very much.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD with relation to the bill H.R. 4714.

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

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. CABELL. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, in these days when a better understanding is so important on the part of the American people concerning the administration's policy in Vietnam, it is gratifying to know that our news media is so diligently trying to keep our Nation informed. I pay tribute especially to the Dallas Morning News, a great newspaper, which has so strongly expressed its support of our President.

At this time, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Dallas Morning News on April 21, 1965:

L.B.J.'s DIVIDENDS

Dividends from the President's recent policy speech on Vietnam are coming in. Even if nothing ever comes of the offer of peace with honor, as matters now stand we will have received important cold war gains just by making it.

The speech was not only a combination of sweet talk—which the neutralists like—and strong action—which the Reds understand. It was also an example of Johnson political jujitsu: It threw the Communists off balance at every level from the diplomatic to the tactical.

On the tactical level, the northern Vietminh officers of the Vietcong are having a tough time trying to get any new recruits in the South. Furthermore, they are losing the ones they have. The United States is accentuating the positive goal of development and it sounds good to many Vietcong troopers, apparently.

On the diplomatic level, it is now the Red North Vietnamese and their Chinese "big daddy" who are telling the neutralist peaceseekers to go jump in the lake and warning the U.N. to mind its own business. While this doesn't affect the military situation, it costs the Reds points among the Afro-Asian nations.

In between, it made necessary an embarrassing switch in the party line of the leftist movements in this country. Heretofore, they had covered their goal of a free world surrender with the reasonable sounding appeal for negotiations. The two terms are synonyms in their book, anyway. Now they can no longer use "negotiations" as a cover and must campaign more explicitly for a sellout.

All in all, it appears L.B.J. has won an inning in the Reds' own political warfare game.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROBLEMS OF VIETNAM

Mr. BROWN of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, because of the urgency of the problem of Vietnam, I would like to discuss the implications from the answers on the Vietnam question in the recent questionnaire which I sent to constituents in the 29th District of California.

There were four policy choices available. These choices, with the percentage favoring each one, are as follows:

	Percent
1. Expansion of the war	42
2. Continue current level, without expansion	12
3. Seek negotiated settlement	29
4. Immediate withdrawal	11

Six percent did not give a choice or did not answer. Looked at another way, 54 percent favored continuing or expanding our effort, while 40 percent favored negotiating or withdrawing. Still another way of interpreting the results is that 52 percent disagree with the 42 percent who favor expansion.

We have analyzed these total responses in several different ways, and there are significant differences based on political preference, sex, religious preference, age, and education. I should mention, incidentally, that our sample of 13,000 is extremely close to the average of all voters in the district in terms of political affiliation and most other characteristics. It is slightly biased in favor of men, but I suspect that may result from husbands and wives collaborating in some cases and sending in the results under the husband's name. The returns are also biased in favor of the better educated, who, generally, are less afraid of questionnaires.

Broken down by political preference, the results show only 34 percent of the Democrats favoring No. 1, but 54 percent of the Republicans favoring this course. An equal percentage of Democrats—34 percent—favor No. 3, a negotiated settlement, but only 21 percent of the Republicans favor this alternative. About 10 percent of both parties favor the fourth choice—immediate withdrawal.

On the basis of sex, the women are evenly divided on policy, with 46 percent favoring No. 1 and No. 2 and 46 percent favoring No. 3 and No. 4. The men, on the other hand, favor No. 1 and No. 2 by 60 percent, with 37 percent favoring No. 3 and No. 4.

There is no significant difference between Catholic and Protestant responses, but the Jewish and "other" respondents, who represented about 15 percent of the total, were much more strongly in favor

of negotiations—40 percent—and much less in favor of expansion—27 percent.

The distribution of responses based on education was quite interesting, and somewhat difficult to explain. For all of those having less than a high school education—11 years of schooling or less—more supported No. 3 and No. 4 than supported No. 1 and No. 2. For those with 12 years through 16 years of education, which was the largest grouping, opinion was strongly in favor of No. 1 and No. 2. For the "egghead" group—17 through 21 years of schooling—more favored negotiation than expansion. The responses of this group were about the same, in proportion, as the responses of those with less than high school education.

With regard to age, the significant results were that those under 30, who have never experienced war, were much more strongly in favor of continuing or expanding the military action than any other age group. Those 30 and over, whose generation participated in one or more wars, are considerably less enthusiastic.

In a very general way, the profile which emerges from this data is that the citizens of the 29th Congressional District in California are leaning toward a hard-line, expand-the-war policy, led by those who are young, college educated, Republican, and male. Those who are holding back, leaning toward a negotiated settlement, tend to be older, with either more or less education than the hard-line group, Democratic, more predominately female, and of a minority religious belief.

A number of interesting questions are raised as to how I should be guided by results such as these. Which "group" do I seek counsel from? Frankly, I believe that my course should be to decide my stand for myself, based on the best knowledge and judgment I possess. Having done that, I should make my position clear to all, and we should encourage a dialog, a broad exchange of views, to seek to achieve better understanding by all citizens and more reasonable decisions by our Government. We will rarely find that any of us are all right or all wrong. By exchanging views, we may each come a little closer to the truth. Obviously, there is no clear concensus of opinion indicated by the questionnaire results, and a lot of controversy is shown.

It may be anticlimactic for me to indicate, again, that I feel that our country is following the wrong policy in Vietnam.

A TRIBUTE TO THE PEOPLE OF RUSSIAVILLE, IND.

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, I take this time to pay tribute to the people of the town of Russiaville in my district in Indiana. On Palm Sunday a terrible, devastating storm cut a swath through my district which destroyed millions of dollars worth of property and claimed scores of lives. The town of Russiaville is a small and unincorporated town. They lost their post office and all of their public facilities, schools, and churches. However, the people of Russiaville are determined people and, despite this loss and despite the fact that they have not been able to determine how they might receive aid from either the State or the Federal Government because of the fact that they are not incorporated, they have banded themselves together with a determination which I think is commendable. I would commend their actions to the people of this country as an exemplification of the American spirit. I would trust that the Members of the House might give these people their moral support as they strive and endeavor to rebuild a community of very fine people.

They already have formed a nonprofit organization and will use the funds being obtained toward gaining legal recognition of their town. They have taken the initial steps which I am certain will lead to a new Russiaville replacing the scars left behind in the devastation of the original.

MAY 3 IN PROUD HISTORY OF POLAND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next all Americans will join with their fellow Americans of Polish birth or descent in celebrating the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

May 3, 1965, which is Monday next, will remind us of several significant dates in Polish-American history.

Three hundred and fifty-seven years ago on September 1608, the first Polish settlers landed in Jamestown, Va. The annals of John Smith attest to the fact that these Polish settlers were a most valuable asset to the struggling young colony. They brought their strength, their willingness to work, and their love of freedom to a settlement which needed and welcomed their sturdy qualities.

May 3, 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution, Poland adopted a Constitution which marks that country as a pioneer of liberalism in Europe. It eliminated with one stroke the fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. It proclaimed the sovereignty of the people, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany.

The Polish Constitution of May 3 proclaimed:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the State, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

The year 1966 will mark the one thousandth anniversary of the baptism of the Polish nations. One thousand years ago Poland linked her destiny with that of the west. During a period equal to one-half our Christian era, Poland linked her destiny with that of the west and became an integral and creative force in its culture.

The people of Poland have since the days of Jamestown and through the centuries events to the present furnished the bone and sinew of American Growth. At Jamestown, Poles, cheered and supported John Smith. During the Civil War her soldiers fought on the side of the Union while her daughters nursed our soldiers on the battlefield. Throughout the years these sturdy pioneers of freedom have been a source of strength to the country of their adoption. Today, Polish Americans have set their purpose to the ultimate liberation of their homeland. In their hopes and in the attainment of their prayers all Americans join.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE REVOLVING FUND? NO, NO

Mr. ICHORD. 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. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the recent recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget for a $100 million cut in the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service and to establish a revolving fund for the conservation program is shortsighted planning and is damaging, to say the least, to an effective program which has been one of the most successful ventures of the Federal Government in conserving for the future.

The Soil Conservation Service, initiated in 1929, has without doubt returned dividends amounting to many, many times the original investment of the Government. Created to conserve America's farmland and to protect it from washing, eroding, and devastating windstorms, the Soil Conservation District has been one of the most productive farm programs ever devised.

It is my understanding the proposed reorganization of the program would require that participating farmers pay 50 percent of the cost of conservation practices. Let me reflect briefly on the accomplishments of the Soil Conservation Service.

The program was conceived at a time when the farmers of the United States could ill afford to spend money to conserve and rehabilitate America's greatest resource—the soil, which is the base of our economy. In 1936 when the conservation programs were born, much of our farmland had been both "misused and abused" through lack of funds for rehabilitating the land and also through lack of information about conservation practices. At that time duststorms, gullies, and damaging erosion were steadily and alarmingly consuming our topsoil. Millions of acres had been

rendered unfit for crop use as a result. But the advent of conservation policy in 1936 has had miraculous effects. After 30 years of technical assistance through the Soil Conservation Service nearly 3,000 soil and water districts with nearly 2 million operators operating 648 million acres of land are engaged in conservation practices. They have applied 40 million acres of contour farming, nearly 20 million acres of stripcropping, 1.2 million miles of terracing; planted 11.3 million acres of trees; and have built 1.3 million ponds. In 1964 alone the Soil Conservation Service provided direct services to 1,123,801 landowners and farmers. Between 1 and 2 million acres of cropland were converted to other uses during the year as a result of conservation plans worked out by the Soil Conservation Service.

Through the operations of the Soil Conservation Service local needs and practices are worked out locally. The farmers themselves formulate the plans for conservation practices and are able to control and manage the same. By working together on a districtwide plan, countless advances and forward strides in meeting flood control problems and other agricultural problems have been made. Improvements in living standards can form better use of the land and water resources.

It is recognized that our future prosperity will depend on the foresight we have now in planning for the future use of all our resources. Is it not preposterous then to even suggest that this program of vital importance and significance be reduced? Every American, man, woman, and child has an interest in maintaining and conserving the productivity of our soil and for that reason careful thought must be given. The cost-sharing program proposed by the Bureau of the Budget would not work. It would not do the job the present program is doing. The $20 million which the Bureau of the Budget wants to delete from the appropriation is a mere drop in the bucket compared to the returns from the investment. Does the Bureau of the Budget actually believe that the American farmers can afford to engage in soil conservation practices to insure that the land will be productive and fertile for future generations? It really is not his job. It is the responsibility of the Government to plan far in advance for the future. I strongly oppose the revolving fund proposal and any reduction in benefits and operations of the Soil Conservation Service and the agriculture conservation program.

A STATEMENT ON THE MARCH FROM SELMA TO MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Mr. REID of New York. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that in recent weeks an effort has been made by some groups to discredit the march from Selma to Montgomery, Ala. Certain sensational and unfortunate charges have been made and may indeed be made again.

In order that the RECORD may be more complete on this matter—my colleague, Senator JAVITS, has previously inserted a statement on morality in the Selma crisis issued by a group of religious leaders—I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a sworn statement of Dr. Theodore A. Gill, president of the San Francisco Theological Seminary in San Anselmo, Calif.

As a participant in the march, Dr. Gill's full sworn statement expressing concern at any effort "to distort the central drive and character of this historic march" is worthy, I believe, of the attention of the Members.

It is regrettable that this is even necessary, because nothing should be allowed to dim the clear need for new legislation so eloquently called for by the President to assure every citizen his or her inherent right to vote now.

As a member of a bipartisan group of Members of the House who made a private visit at our own expense to Selma in February, and who met with Dr. Martin Luther King, the legal and moral imperatives of additional legislation were all too plain. The remarkable and hopeful thing was that men and women throughout the United States, as well as many in Alabama and in the rural Black Belt counties, recognized the need for action.

It is a matter of some hope for our democracy that young men and women of our generation recognized that where any American is unconstitutionally denied the right to vote, the rights of all Americans are belittled.

Along with Members on both sides of the aisle, I have introduced voting rights bills covering Federal, State and local elections and striking down unconstitutional literacy tests and State poll taxes. It is my hope that the Judiciary Committee will soon report a voting rights bill and that it will enjoy the broadest bipartisan support.

Only in this way, can we in the House keep faith with those who believe freedom now must be made a present reality, for all Americans now. This is the message of Selma, and of the march on Montgomery, and nothing must be allowed to distort the need for this legislation, or to cast doubt on the remarkable spirit that is making the American dream come true.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Gill's statement follows:

SWORN STATEMENT OF DR. THEODORE A. GILL, PRESIDENT OF SAN FRANCISCO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, SAN ANSELMO, CALIF.

(Given before Harry A. Cannon, a certified shorthand reporter and notary public in and for the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, on Monday, April 26, 1965, commencing at the hour of 10:40 a.m., at the offices of Thomas Elke, Esq., attorney at law, third floor, 333 Pine Street, San Francisco, Calif.)

Dr. Theodore A. Gill, being first duly sworn by the notary public to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY MR. ELKE

Question. Would you state your name, please.

Answer. Theodore A. Gill.

Question. Where do you reside?

Answer. 124 Seminary Road in San Anselmo.

Question. What is your business or profession?

Answer. I am the clergyman of the United Presbyterian Church, United States of America, president of the seminary of that church located in San Anselmo.

Question. How long have you been a minister, Dr. Gill?

Answer. I have been a minister since 1943. Twenty-two years.

Question. Did there come a time when you were in Selma, Ala., at or about the time of the march from Selma to Montgomery?

Answer. Yes. I arrived in Selma on the 19th of March.

Question. How did you arrive?

Answer. By air.

Question. Who went with you?

Answer. Rev. George Wilson from San Gabriel, Calif. He was a seat mate. Also on the plane were another eight or nine, I should think, colleagues from the seminary and from northern California, ministerial colleagues.

Question. You arrived in Montgomery and drove to Selma?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you were in Selma from——

Answer. From Friday morning until what I call or refer to as the march to Montgomery, until that march left on Sunday noon about——

Question. Were you continuously in the March from Sunday when it left Selma until it got into Montgomery on the Thursday?

Answer. It dispersed at the capitol on the afternoon of Thursday, the 25th.

Question. Where did you spend the night, Friday?

Answer. In the home of Clementine Murphy, a lady living in what was called the compound, the Negro section of Selma.

Question. That is a brick housing project?

Answer. Brick housing project.

Question. In the area of Brown's Chapel?

Answer. That's right. Staying with me were this George Wilson from San Gabriel and Charles Smith, an alumnus of San Francisco Theological Seminary where I work.

Question. On Saturday night did you stay in the same place?

Answer. I stayed at the same place Saturday night.

Question. Were the same people with you?

Answer. The same people were with me.

Question. Sunday night where did you stay?

Answer. Somewhere in the woods, on the line of march, the first night's bivouac, wherever that was.

Question. Monday night you were in——

Answer. Still with the marchers, at the second campsite.

Question. And Tuesday night?

Answer. Still with the marchers at the third campsite.

Question. And Wednesday night?

Answer. Wednesday night the fourth campsite was at the city of St. Jude, a Roman Catholic institution on the edge of Montgomery, and I was with the marchers there.

Question. And Thursday you left Montgomery?

Answer. Thursday night we were, all people from San Anselmo, we were on the bus going back to California.

Question. All right, sir. Will you describe generally the tent arrangement that you indicated you slept at on Sunday, Monday,

Tuesday, and Wednesday afternoon and evening?

Answer. Because our own men from the seminary were involved in setting up the tents and taking them down, we were probably more aware of the tenting situation than most other participants. There were two large tents, and two smaller tents at each of the campsites. As soon as arrangements were organized the first night, Sunday night, and it took an hour or two for things to shape down that night, one of the large tents was for the men marchers and one of the other large tents for the women.

Question. Who were the two smaller tents for, do you recall?

Answer. They were intended to be for the press. One of the smaller tents was for the press and the other for the cook shack in case it rained.

Question. Will you tell us on Sunday which of the tents you slept in?

Answer. I slept in the tent intended for the men.

Question. Were there any women in that tent?

Answer. In the first few minutes of our occupancy, when there was just a general milling around—this was the first night of the march and organizational matters were just being transmitted, for the first, I should not think, not more than an hour or so, in the midst of all the milling around, everybody was everywhere but we were all together in brightly lit tents, just wondering what the procedure should be. After about an hour of this kind of confusion, the orders came that the tent I was in at the time was to be the men's tent, and all the women, whatever women were there, should go to the other tent, and from that time on segregation was careful and complete.

Question. When you say "segregation" are you talking about segregation of sex?

Answer. Sexual segregation, yes.

Question. You mentioned these tents were lighted. Could you tell us how they were lighted?

Answer. They were lighted by just bare bulbs running from the standards; also by the light of furiously burning kerosene furnaces of some kind. And on the first night by television lights of the crews who were in there at all times. Especially until we got separated, in those first minutes of confusion the television lights were everywhere and were bright. It was the most public time of all, that first hour or so, when we weren't sure where we ought to be.

Question. Could you tell us around the tent area whether there were any security arrangements made at all?

Answer. Yes. The National Guard and the Army units were protecting the whole operation through a perimeter, a circle of soldiers around the camp every night. This was a ring of small campfires with at least two soldiers at each fire. I don't know precisely how far apart they were but probably not more than 100 feet.

Question. How far from the tents were they?

Answer. They were out about a city block from the center of the tents, off in every direction. I should say that the space between the tents and the Army patrol was patrolled regularly by the security force of the march itself.

Question. Were there any instructions with respect to any of the marchers or anybody in the tents leaving the tent area to go out in any area?

Answer. Oh, yes, and it was generally understood by all of us when you march with Army protection and helicopters hovering overhead that this was not a healthy area. I think it would hardly have taken any instruction. But I heard of those who went even to the perimeter to look out of being ordered back peremptorily. I am not aware of any attempt or any reason for any attempt to get beyond the ring.

Question. These lights—let's just take Sunday night—how long were they on? Did there come a time when they were turned off?

Answer. I don't think so. I was awake all night because confusion reigned and did every night. Many of the marchers were young people, of high school age, boys and girls, and they were greatly exhilarated by the unusual nature of the event and worried and anxious too, and this came out in kind of high spirits but for some reason or other seemed more antic at night than in the daytime, so that we were—at least I and I'm sure a great many other adults—were awake all night and, at least to my recollection, it seemed every night. So these sleeping arrangements were very public there.

Question. We have talked about the Sunday night arrangements, and in the course of that you made some general comment with respect to the sleeping arrangements on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday nights. Were there any differences apart from the location of the sleeping arrangements that you described on Sunday, with respect to any of the other nights?

Answer. None, except that from the second night on, the tent crew, largely made up of our own students from San Anselmo, commandeered what had been intended to be either the cook tent or the press tent—there always was debate as to which they were occupying. But anyway it was one of the smaller tents, and they used that. On the last night I think I shared that with them. That was in St. Jude, the city of St. Jude.

Question. Will you tell us very generally, what was the procedure in the morning when you would get ready to go on the march?

Answer. On the morning we struggled up out of the mud, usually—it rained a good deal on this march—and shaped up in a long line for the library paste that the oatmeal turned into in some way, and that was it, that was our whole preparation for the day, and soon after that we were organized, and the march began again. Our men, the students from San Anselmo, who were the tent crew, then struck the tents, after we had moved out, picked up as well as they could from the grounds. But you can get more precise information from them on that.

Question. I am not talking about the time of the march. I am talking of the time in each one of these camps and I will ask you whether you saw any kind of sexual behavior between men and women or even between men and men at any one of these camps that you were in, Doctor?

Answer. Absolutely not. I—well, I will just leave it flat and categorical.

Question. Was there any kind of drinking that you know about at any of those camps?

Answer. I have heard those charges, which are the most—well, I wouldn't say most ludicrous because there have been some very funny charges filed, but they are about as amazing as any could be. Not only wasn't there any drinking, we didn't hardly even have water—at least potable water. There was a creosote truck that carried tar or something before it started lugging water for the marchers, but none of us, after one taste of it, had very frequent recourse to that. It was about as dry, as parched a 4 days as most of us ever will be able to remember. We hope.

Question. Apart from the excitement that you indicated, some of the younger marchers evidenced in the tents and your difficulty of obtaining any sleep because of that, was there any kind of partying or excitement, or any kind of abhorrent behavior of any kind that you saw while you were in any of these camp areas?

Answer. Not at all. The atmosphere was more reminiscent of evangelistic campaigns than any great political event. There was a kind of exhilaration, even exultation about it in the midst of very difficult physical circumstances. There was very generous commeraderie and good fellowship, as we say, but certainly nothing dramatic, out of order, about the social relationship.

Question. With respect to the march itself—and I think you indicated to me that you were on the march continuously from its beginning to its end at the State capitol in Montgomery—could you tell us, sir, whether on that march itself, as distinguished from the time you were in the camp, did you notice any kind of unusual or even the usual sexual behavior or drinking or revelry or partying of any type?

Answer. Certainly not. Again, flat and categorical. Temperamentally, if not professionally, my own antenna are atuned for that sort of thing, so I think I would be aware of it as anybody. And I would say no, except—no, except—I would say no, in recalling at the same time this very pleasant and generous attitude and atmosphere of personal acceptation which marked the whole event. I speak of now of an entirely public friendship.

Question. Would you tell us of the security arrangements during the march, with particular reference to whether people were able to get in and out of the line or go off into any nonpublic area?

Answer. Oh, my, no. This was regulated by both State and Federal and local constabulary. Most of the march, the Army men, the soldiers lined the way. Every few feet there would be another soldier standing with his gun. The press sealed the front, we couldn't get past them ahead, and we were surrounded on both sides and at the end by military units, helicopters hovered overhead almost the whole length of the way observing from there. The land itself is inhospitable along most of the march. It is a raised highway with deep swamp coming right up to the edge of the highway on both sides. It is unthinkable that anyone should wander from the group or even wanted to. It is very hostile territory.

Question. I'm speaking only of the people on the march or the people who were at the campsites. Did you notice any particular amount of obscenity or swearing or what I would call bad language?

Answer. No, I cannot recall any specific words or language from my companions and colleagues on the march. I would be less realistic than I am, I think, if I thought for a moment there weren't some pretty excited language from time to time. As I say, I do not recall specific incidents. I do recall and will never forget the sustained and repetitive and unimaginative brutal obscenity of the white Alabamans who lined the route for long stretches. This was as foul as we have in the English language and it was excessive. But these were not marchers; these were people hostile to the march.

Question. All right, sir, based on your experience as a minister and the time you were on the march, would you give us your reaction to the character of the behavior of the people that were on the march or the people that were at the campsites?

Answer. Yes. I would think, not just on my experience as a minister but on my perceptions as a human being, it would be highly unlikely for a group as large as the group involved in this march, together as long as the members were together, if there were not somewhere in the picture some kind of hanky-panky. I did not see any. I have not talked to anybody who did see any. And I have made some effort to discover whether anybody I was with was aware of what we call "carrying on." But just in general, I must say I would be very surprised if there wasn't somewhere, somehow, although the ingenuity and the athleticism that would have been involved in this defy my imagination. But this is an entirely general observation. It would be very surprising if

somehow or other in a group of this many college and high school kids some of that particular exercise were not at least attempted. My further generalization would be, though, that if so, this would be in far smaller percentage than is going on now by my observation of most college or university campuses of the country in much more normal situations.

But in all these last remarks I have been addressing myself to a hypothetical possibility which I find it reasonable to entertain but of which I had no evidence.

Question. Based on your observation, sir, would you care to generally characterize the general behavior of the people on the march or the people who were setting up the tents with respect to their general approach to what they were doing and the general reaction you felt there of the people involved in this endeavor?

Answer. Yes. The atmosphere was mingled hilarity and gravity. Everybody involved was fully aware of the international attention being given this event, very hopeful of the cultural consequences of this event, but we were all also full of the novelty of the occasion and enjoying each other's presence so that the atmosphere was, as I said a moment ago, mingled pleasure and deep purpose. I think I have already observed that there were at least religious overtones to the whole project and this was evidenced in the atmosphere and in the attitude of the people involved.

As a participant, I resent deeply any effort to pick up isolated incidents, however they may be documented, and suggest that they represent in any way what the point of this event was or what the prevailing mood of it was, or what the large generality of its action was, and I would assume that the intelligent and sophisticated Congressmen would resent, as much as those of us on the march, any effort to be treated as innocent or ignorant people who cannot distinguish between the accidents of the event and the large central purpose and action of the event.

Question. Could you tell us quite generally what you did in Selma before the march started?

Answer. Well, there was a good deal of milling around for the 2 days before the march was organized. We went to meetings, we attended rallies, we listened to preaching, we did a good deal of singing. There was very little sleeping on anybody's part, formal or informal. The place was charged. For most of us it was the first experience of being contained within a military shield. Everything was very close, very compressed, and everybody was under everybody else's observation. This was an extremely public event.

Question. Did you notice anything untoward there with respect to sexual behavior or drinking or partying or anything of that sort?

Answer. Absolutely not. From the point of view of diet, it was the soberest event on record, I am sure. From the point of view of personal spirits, maybe one of the most excited.

Question. Apart from what you told us, is there any particular thing that stands out in your mind, of any kind or character, that you feel you would like to get on the record?

Answer. No, except what I have already suggested in some of the other answers, a kind of angry bewilderment at any effort to distort by seizing at peripheral evidences, whatever they may be, to distort the central drive and character of this historic march. I can only suppose—because I would like to put a good light on this whole latest development—I can only suppose such effort to distort represents the action of men who know that they have been beaten on the main argument, that they cannot win on points and so now they must destroy the challenger.

Question. Dr. Gill, it is obvious that you just didn't show up here. Could you give us a little bit of the background as to the circumstances of why you are here and why I am taking these statements and why we are taking the statements of the remainder of the people.

Answer. Word came to us in San Anselmo from churchmen in Washington, speaking through the person of Rodney Shaw.

Question. Who is Rodney Shaw?

Answer. A Methodist liaison man to the operation of the American Government, and assigned liaison man for the Methodist Church; that charges would be made on the floor of the House of Representatives on Tuesday of this week, April 27. The nature of these charges has been well advertised by Congressman DICKINSON; and people who had been on or near the march and in accord with its aim have been very disturbed at the thought of the possibility of its character being so distorted at this late date and so Mr. Shaw called me up on Sunday, April 25, and asked me, as one who had made the whole march and also as the president of the seminary from which so many members of the tent and cleanup crew had come, whether we had any evidence one way or the other. This is no effort to obscure evidence. We are concerned about the truth. And Mr. Shaw wondered what we had seen. So among us we decided to make this as legal and binding, since the whole crew of us cannot go to Washington, as we wish, and that is where this interrogation comes in. We would like to get it on the record, our observation, in the hopes that a moralistic hearing will not drag the whole country's attention from the tremendous moral purpose of the whole operation.

Mr. ELKE. Thank you.

THEODORE A. GILL.

CERTIFICATION

State of California, city and county of San Francisco

I hereby certify that Dr. Theodore A. Gill was by me duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; that said statement was reported at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said Dr. Theodore A. Gill was reported by me, Harry A. Cannon, a certified shorthand reporter and a disinterested party, and was thereafter transcribed into typewriting. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said statement.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office this 26th day of April, 1965.

HARRY A. CANNON,

Notary Public in and for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California.

STATE OF INDIANA PROUD OF MAJ. VIRGIL I. "GUS" GRISSOM

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, quite naturally, the State of Indiana is proud of Maj. Virgil I. "Gus" Grissom.

We Hoosiers would like to think that Major Grissom is a typical Indiana product, but, of course, his space feats as a member of our astronaut team place him in the most select group of Americans.

Major Grissom and his family will honor all Hoosiers on May 31 by attending the world-famous speed classic—the Indianapolis 500-mile race.

There is no other person in the United States whom Hoosiers would prefer to have as their honored guest on this occasion, and the entire State of Indiana is looking forward to Major Grissom coming back home for the big race.

A recent editorial presented by Indianapolis television station WISH–TV, and an article in the Washington, D.C., Star by Mr. William Hines, state very clearly why Indiana thinks so much of Virgil Grissom.

Mr. Speaker, these two statements merit the consideration of this entire body, and I request and am privileged to include them in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANA'S FRONTIERSMAN IN SPACE

(Editorial by WISH–TV 8, Mar. 22, 1965)

It would be quite an understatement to say that Indiana has just a special interest in the launching of this Nation's first two-man space vehicle. For no other State can really claim a greater personal share in the Gemini launch than can Indiana.

Virgil "Gus" Grissom, the command pilot of the Gemini spacecraft, is every inch a Hoosier. Born and raised in the southern Indiana town of Mitchell, he's the very personification of the hometown boy who made good.

The Hoosier heritage of Gus Grissom runs deep. His parents—the Dennis Grissoms, of Mitchell—still live in the same house that they moved into when Gus was only a year old. Gus grew up as might any other youngster in a small Indiana town, delivering newspapers and working summers in a grocery store and meat market.

He completed his early schooling in Mitchell, where he met and married his wife, the former Betty Moore. And like many other young marrieds, the Grissoms worked together to earn Gus a degree in engineering from Purdue University.

Now after a 1961 flight into space in the Mercury program, Gus Grissom is on the verge of making further history with the Gemini launch. And we don't think we really need to say that his family and friends in Mitchell are being joined in their feelings of pride by Hoosiers all over the State.

People like Gus Grissom are rare individuals in a society where "just getting by" seems to be a current philosophy. But it has been the pioneering Gus Grissoms of this Nation who have made America the country that it is, through courage, dedication, and personal sacrifice.

Gus Grissom is as much the frontiersman of the space age, as were those people who braved oceans and crossed mountains to extend the boundaries of the United States in its earliest days. And our descendants will be just as much in his debt.

[From the Washington Star]

GUS GRISSOM HAS SPUNK AND SENSE OF HUMOR

(By William Hines)

Basically, Gus Grissom is my kind of hero.

He's a homely little guy who dislikes newsmen—an attitude that is extremely easy to understand. Reporters have been putting him down ever since he lost *Liberty Bell–7* almost 4 years ago.

The *Liberty Bell* incident is the story of Gus' life. He's the type for whom everything goes perfectly (up to a point), and that's the story of my life, too. He is a man that a typical Walter Mitty can relate to without straining.

Gus is John Glenn reduced to life size and stripped of his merit badges. He'll never be anyone's "most unforgettable character," but he was the only comic relief the space program had after Shorty Powers left to sell cars, until John Young came along. And John, of course, is intentionally funny.

Everyone in the space effort takes his job very seriously, which is exactly as it should be, but everyone also takes himself very seriously—which is not so good.

Everyone except Gus. You don't catch him making inspirational little talks or running for the Senate or doing "Smokey-the-Bear" type commercials. He keeps his eyes open and his mouth shut (most of the time), plays it straight, and if things don't go just exactly right, brushes himself off, puts on a fresh bandaid, and is at it again.

Things have a way of not going just exactly right for the ride of the Mitchell boy. *Liberty Bell–7* was only one example.

Gus is not much of a talker, but sometimes he manages to squeeze a size eight shoe into a size two mouth to the consternation of his bosses and eventually of himself. Like his visit to the Titan plant outside Baltimore, when he commented to the effect that the rocket wasn't likely to get off the ground.

Gus ate his crow some time later, when the Space Agency stood him up and made him say publicly:

"I am here today to tell you Titan is 'Go.' "

People are always standing Gus up and telling him to talk. One time when he was on a television interview, he remarked that he wouldn't be there if he hadn't been ordered to.

In fact, Gus and his traveling companion, John Young, together said considerably less than Glenn said alone. Before the Gemini-Titan-3 mission there were no long delays like those before Glenn's flight, so Gus was not called on to say things like Glenn's famous, "The delay will only serve to hone the edge more sharply."

Gus is no more reticent than any of the other astros when the loot is being passed out. He is not interested in limelight; he follows Omar's advice: "Ah, take the cash and let the credit go, nor heed the rumble of a distant drum."

Gus is a grouchy, taciturn, introverted and not-very-lovable character who sometimes seems out of place in a lineup of all-American boys. There are those who would not give you 27 cents a pound for him, dressed and drawn, but one thing you've got to concede Grissom—he's got spunk and a sense of humor.

As I said, Gus Grissom is my kind of hero.

UNNECESSARY COST, WASTE, AND INEFFIENCY IN PROGRAMS UNDER JURISDICTION OF AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ERLENBORN. 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. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions I have discussed unnecessary costs, wastes and inefficiencies found in the administration of programs under the jurisdiction of the Agency for International Development.

Each example of improper or inadequate administration by AID has been contained in reports to the Congress from the Office of the Comptroller General.

Today I wish to call your attention to still another example of inept administration found in a report issued on April 15, 1965, by GAO entitled "Failure To Effectively Utilize Excess U.S.-Owned Foreign Currencies To Pay International Air Travel Ticket Costs Being Paid in U.S. Dollars."

In this study the Comptroller General advises Congress of an annual loss, estimated at $2.3 million, when U.S. moneys are used, to buy airline tickets for official travel to and from eight countries instead of using U.S.-owned foreign currencies.

The eight countries involved in the report are: Burma, India, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, and Indonesia.

The reported $2.3 million annual estimated loss concerning these countries is divided between two categories:

The first involves an estimated unnecessary expenditure of $1.2 million because U.S. agencies have failed to develop, or have not adhered to, administrative regulations requiring maximum use of foreign currency.

The second involves an estimated $1.1 million annual expenditure of U.S. dollars because the State Department failed to obtain an agreement with Indonesia to allow the tickets to be paid for with excess United States-owned Indonesian rupiahs.

The unnecessary expenditures were not totally made by the Agency for International Development. The Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the U.S. Information Agency, too, failed to utilize excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies.

The Comptroller General notes that overall 31 percent of international air travel tickets eligible for payment in U.S.-owned foreign currencies were paid for in dollars instead of available foreign currencies.

The report states 42 percent of AID travel tickets eligible for payment in foreign currency were paid for with U.S. dollars.

I mention this report because once again it demonstrates the apparent disregard agencies of the United States seem to have for the rules and regulations under which they should operate.

The Comptroller General's report states:

> This report is being issued to the Congress because it demonstrates a laxity on the part of agency officials in making effective use of the substantial amounts of excess foreign currencies owned by the U.S. Government, despite congressional and executive branch interest in using these currencies to substitute dollar expenditures and to alleviate continuing U.S. balance-of-payment deficits.

I would be remiss if I did not add the Comptroller General was most hopeful his recommendations would be adhered to by the involved agencies in the future. GAO reports the agencies did recognize their carelessness in not utilizing excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies in this instance.

I wish to mention one other report from GAO today.

On March 19 of this year the Comptroller General's Office issued a report entitled "Unnecessary Costs Resulting From an Inflexible Policy of Donating Flour Instead of Wheat to Voluntary Relief Agencies for Distribution Abroad."

While the report's title may be long, the study itself is comparatively short. It deals with unnecessary costs amounting to about $3.7 million incurred by the U.S. Government in the surplus flour program to voluntary relief agencies for distribution to the needy people in the Republic of China.

The $3.7 million waste took place under the administration of the Agency for International Development and policies set by the Department of Agriculture.

Like other reports by the GAO concerning AID this one has worldwide application. While the specific example under study involves the Republic of China, the problem involves many other AID programs in many other nations.

The Comptroller General's Office advises Congress they "believe several million dollars could be saved each year on a worldwide basis if the Department of Agriculture revised its policy to permit the delivery of wheat, instead of flour, to those countries which have the milling capacity and the capability for processing and distributing wheat products."

The impact of a change in policy can be assessed when it is noted that the Department of Agriculture reports that in fiscal 1964 some 14 voluntary agencies distributed over 1 billion pounds of flour in 72 countries.

At present, the Department of Agriculture through AID could donate processed commodities, but the language of the act needs clarification.

The Comptroller General's office reports, that in this case, AID officials seem most willing to cooperate to enact any savings.

GAO advises that the Congress may wish "to enact legislation which would amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to permit the donation of processed commodities, such as flour, instead of whole grains, to voluntary agencies for distribution abroad only after the Secretary of Agriculture has determined on a case-by-case basis that it would not significantly increase costs to the United States to do so."

The Comptroller General further states his office would "be pleased to assist in drafting such proposed legislation."

I have mentioned this GAO report because it does involve AID.

It is apparent to me that, while AID, in the case of donations of flour to voluntary agencies in the Republic of China, seemed willing to enact economies, AID generally has not been economy minded or efficient in its operations.

Furthermore, the combined impact of the Comptroller General's reports involving AID indicates the Agency for International Development is not—

Operating in a most efficient and economical manner;

Following public law in all cases;

Adhering to the policies approved by the Congress;

Of its own accord seeking out inefficiencies and waste.

I urge the Congress to initiate a study of the multiplicity of activities of the Agency for International Development.

WATER POLLUTION

Mr. HUNGATE. 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. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, all America is acutely aware of its water problems. Yesterday, the House passed a bill to attack the problem of water pollution. All communications media resound with news of flood devastation throughout the Mississippi River Valley.

It has been proposed, in a suggestion we can only hope will receive serious reconsideration, that a substantial reduction be made in appropriations for the soil conservation service.

Mr. Speaker, when the floodwaters roll over the business districts of Hannibal, Mo., and other cities along the Mississippi, and when hundreds of thousands of acres of farmlands stand desolated by destructive torrents from our rivers, it is somewhat late to seek to control these waters. I submit a far more effective and useful job can be done through the support and, indeed, the expansion of our soil conservation service program, so that our natural water resources may be employed to improve rather than to inundate the American family farm.

I would call to the attention an acute analysis of this problem presented by Don Sosey, mayor of Palmyra, Mo., and editor of the Palmyra Spectator, as follows:

MAY NOT BE A WISE DECISION

We have been a firm believer in economy in government for many years and have frequently written articles about it, but occasionally the cut may come in the wrong place. It is being proposed to make a considerable reduction in the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service, which would curtail much of the technical assistance given in setting up plans for the management and preservation of farmlands throughout the Nation. The idea is to have the landowner pay approximately 50 percent of the cost.

This might be all right if the farmer could be induced to do so, but a large majority of them feel that the land will last throughout their lifetime and they will not have to make this extra expenditure. While land is owned by individuals it is also the heritage of our country and one which is important to every citizen today and also to future generations. To allow it to become marginal and then nonproductive would be inviting famine at some future date. The wornout and eroded soil of many countries has caused food to be scarce in them and hunger and malnutrition to be high.

Even with the technical aid the Soil Conservation Service has been giving, it is difficult to obtain the cooperation of all land owners. Without this aid soil districts would probably lose much of their usefulness. We believe there are many other departments of Government, which could stand a reduction far better than the Conservation Service.

For a number of years we have believed that the most useful money expended by the Federal Government in water control is at its source. If through the construction of terraces, structures, ponds, timber and grass strips on the lands where the water originates its flow can be slowed, giving it a chance to seep into the ground, then the erosion will be checked and the heavy silting of our main streams will decrease. Such a plan can also raise the level of our water table and lessen the danger of water shortage.

Dams and levees have been constructed to control floods, but slowing the runoff at the source would be much more effective in the long run. The Soil Conservation Service provides the most important aid, which can be given by the Government to the landowner, and it should not be curtailed when so much remains to be done and there is such unnecessary waste in other departments of Government.

IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to announce that hearings on pending immigration legislation by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality have been delayed necessarily because of consideration of the voting rights bill by the full Judiciary Committee.

Our hearings opened on March 3, 1965, at which time Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach appeared before the subcommittee. Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, and representatives of the U.S. Public Health Service appeared at subsequent hearings. We have taken testimony from interested Members of Congress and the record of hearings is still open for inclusion of statements from other interested Members.

It has been necessary to cancel scheduled hearings on three occasions since completing testimony from the Public Health Service on March 31, 1965.

I wish to assure representatives of nongovernmental organizations and the interested public who have made written requests to appear, that we expect to take up this phase of our hearings during the week beginning May 10. Full Judiciary Committee meetings preclude setting an earlier date. Notice will be provided witnesses of the day and time set for their appearance.

REPORT ON REFUGEE ADMISSIONS

Mr. FEIGHAN. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 14, 1960—Public Law 86–648—the so-called fair share law, enabling the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees, the Attorney General is directed to forward to the Congress every 6 months a report on administrative operations authorized under that law.

In view of the continuing interest of my colleagues in the House and for their information, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point the ninth semiannual report of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization covering the operations from July 1 to December 31, 1964, together with a summary covering the preceding eight semiannual periods.

Detailed case reports on each person paroled into the United States are in the custody of the Committee on the Judiciary and are available for inspection by any Member of the House at the office of subcommittee No. 1 at 2139–A Rayburn House Office Building.

The report which is addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1965.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Refugee operations under the act of July 14, 1960, as amended by the act of June 28, 1962, were continued during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1964. This was the ninth 6-month period of operations under the act. During the preceding 6-month period, according to advisory report furnished by the Secretary of State, 17,651 refugee-escapees, as specified in section 1 of the act, availed themselves of resettlement opportunities offered by nations other than the United States. Accordingly, the number authorized by statutory "fair share" during the period covered by this report was 4,413. During the period, 1,994 registrations were received from refugees in the seven countries in which refugee operations were carried out under the act.

In addition to the 1,994 refugees who registered under the act during the 6-month period, there were 366 registrations pending at the beginning of the period, making a total of 2,360 refugee applicants available for consideration. Of these, 1,485 were found qualified for parole and 348 were rejected or otherwise closed, leaving 527 registrations pending at the end of the period.

The following reflects the activity in each of the countries in which the refugee operations were conducted during the period:

Country	Registrations pending June 30, 1964	Registrations received during period	Total	Found qualified for parole	Rejected or otherwise closed	Pending Dec. 31, 1964
Germany	13	130	143	49	51	43
France	50	349	399	261	78	60
Austria	31	152	183	99	25	59
Belgium	11	24	35	7	23	5
Italy	230	965	1,195	772	89	334
Greece	16	59	75	37	19	19
Lebanon	15	315	330	260	63	7
Total	366	1,994	2,360	1,485	348	527

Established screening procedures resulted in the rejection of 122 applicants during the period, on the following grounds:

Ineligible	19
Security grounds	18
Criminal grounds	3
Medical grounds	4
Immorality	0
Undesirability	7
Firmly settled	26
Split families (spouses and children left behind in country of origin)	11
Spouses and children of above principals	34
Total	122

As of December 31, 1964, the total number of refugee-escapees authorized by statutory "fair share" since the effective date of the act totaled 31,467 and a total of 29,714 refugees had registered since the beginning of the program. Statistics for the program are tabulated below:

	1st through 8th periods	9th period	Total
Authorized by statutory fair share	27,054	4,413	31,467
Pending beginning of period		366	
Registered during period	27,720	1,994	29,714
Total registered (pending plus received)	27,720	2,360	
Found qualified for parole	17,408	1,485	18,893
Rejected or otherwise closed	9,946	348	10,294
Pending end of period	366	527	

Of the refugees approved for parole to date, 365 have been approved under section 2(b) of the act, which provides for a numerical limitation of 500 "difficult to resettle" cases.

A total of 18,022 refugees, in whose cases assurances of housing and employment have been received, have been referred to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration for transportation to the United States. Of these, 16,322 had arrived in the United States as of December 31, 1964, as follows:

Country of flight	During 1st 8 periods	During 9th period	Total
Albania	432	18	450
Bulgaria	257	67	324
Czechoslovakia	15	9	24
East Germany	5	0	5
Estonia	14	0	14
Hungary	1,426	112	1,538
Iraq	26	0	26
Jordan	2	0	2
Latvia	70	0	70
Libya	1	0	1
Lithuania	39	0	39
Poland	929	41	970
Rumania	2,988	785	3,773
Syrian Arab Republic	46	6	52
Turkey	15	0	15
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	2,861	181	3,042
U.S.S.R.	93	5	98
Yugoslavia	5,357	522	5,879
Total	14,576	1,746	16,322

Registrations of applicants in the various countries, since the beginning of the program, have been as follows:

Country	In camp	Out of camp	Total
Austria	996	2,435	3,431
Belgium		1,602	1,602
France		8,759	8,759
Germany	630	3,382	4,012
Greece	986	290	1,276
Italy	4,467	2,603	7,070
Lebanon		3,564	3,564
Total	7,079	22,635	29,714

Of the refugees who registered during the ninth period, 397 were camp residents and 1,597 were out-of-camp residents.

As of December 31, 1964, a total of 8,600 aliens, who have been in the United States for at least 2 years after their parole as refugee-escapees had been inspected and examined for admission, and accorded the status of permanent residents under section 4 of the act.

During the ninth period, the Congress approved private laws for four aliens in the United States, providing that these aliens shall be held and considered to have been paroled into the United States as provided for in the act of July 14, 1960.

In compliance with the provisions of section 2(a) of the act, detailed reports on individuals paroled into the United States are attached.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND F. FARRELL,
Commissioner.

THE DOMINICAN CRISIS

Mr. BENNETT. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson is to be highly commended for his prompt action in sending in U.S. marines to the Dominican Republic to protect U.S. citizens in the country.

I sincerely hope the Marines may also serve as an indication of U.S. assistance to protect the freedom and stability of the government in that area of the world.

Although the activities of the original revolutionary forces in the country were apparently led by freedom-loving people, as far as the leadership was concerned, it seems clear to me now that the present leadership of the revolution is in the hands of Castro-Cuban-trained Communist agents.

Under these circumstances it is necessary, I believe, for the Organization of American States, or the United States acting independently, to bolster the stable and free government in the country to prevent another Cuba.

Today I have reintroduced a resolution, first introduced in 1961 by me, that asserts the sense of Congress to be that in emergency situations such as the one we have today that the United States and other free countries in this hemisphere do not have to wait on the action of the Organization of American States to deal with emergencies of this type.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the intervention of international communism directly or indirectly in an American republic would constitute a fact or situation threatening the sovereignty and political independence of the states of the entire New World; and

Whereas the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, have long since ceased to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power or powers; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, would be in effect such a colonization by a non-American power or powers, and would violate the sovereignty and political independence of an American state; and

Whereas such a fact or situation extended to any portions of this hemisphere would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States and the American continents; and

Whereas the American Republics have condemned intervention or the threat of intervention, even when conditional, from any extrahemispheric power and have rejected the attempt of the Sino-Soviet conspiracy in its attempt to destroy hemispheric unity and security; and

Whereas in the rapidly developing contingencies of the atomic age there might not be time to assemble a meeting of the Inter-American Organ of Consultation to provide for joint action to repel the danger: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That if such a fact or situation should present a sudden emergency, then any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance would be justified, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in taking steps to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World.

In case of such defensive measures having been taken by the defending state or states, it or they should report to the Inter-American Organ of Consultation, to the end that an emergency committee, after the manner provided by the Convention of Havana of 1940, be set up for the provisional administration of the state thus defended, pending its restoration to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

Mr. RYAN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, spring is a time of year when all nature seems to come back to life. It is a joyous time; a time of renewal; a time of regeneration.

But, over two decades ago spring was not such a time for the Jewish inhabitants of the Warsaw ghetto; for theirs was a spring of sorrow, a spring of tragedy, a spring of death.

To speak of the Warsaw ghetto is to speak again of man's inhumanity to man.

Before Poland was overrun by the German and Soviet military forces in September 1939, the Jewish population of Poland was estimated at 3 million. On the eve of the invasion the population of the Warsaw ghetto was placed at approximately 300,000. After the Nazi and Soviet conquest of Poland, Jews from other areas throughout Poland were brought into the ghetto. The ill-fated inhabitants of the ghetto now numbered an estimated 450,000.

This is a formidable number of people, a number almost equivalent to the population of the city of Buffalo, N.Y.

These people, these unfortunate souls, imprisoned in their ghetto, were destined by fate and by the will of their Nazi overlords for total extermination; they were destined to be destroyed in the Nazi crematoriums.

In November 1940 the Nazi rulers of Warsaw began to take measures that would eventually lead to the so-called "final solution" of Poland's Jews. At that time the Warsaw ghetto was sealed off, and the prisoners, subjected to starvation, disease, and cruel and inhuman treatment by their Nazi captors, awaited the tolling of their death knell.

The destruction of the Warsaw ghetto and its inhabitants was carried out in an orderly and systematic manner, a manner that fits very well the image and reality of Nazi precision and thoroughness.

The "final solution" got underway in the summer of 1942.

On July 22, 1942, the Nazi forces began a systematic reduction of the Warsaw ghetto. On that day, they transported 6,289 persons to Treblinka where they perished.

On the following day, July 23, another 7,815 were transported; on July 24, another 7,444.

During the period from July 2 to July 23, 66,701 were taken from the ghetto.

In August, another 142,353 were removed.

In September, the number was 56,730.

It has been said that after this forced evacuation during the summer of 1942 only an estimated 40,000 to 50,000 Jews remained in the Warsaw ghetto. Reduced in numbers but not in their determination these human remnants of the Warsaw ghetto began in January 1943 to stage an open resistance to the Nazi campaign of extermination.

Let me say at this point that the details I am about to relate are taken from an account written in May 1943 by eyewitnesses.

According to this account, in early December 1942 a new wave of massacres and deportations began. Rumors circulated in Warsaw that January was the deadline. On January 18, the Germans began a campaign of total destruction that led to the obliteration of the Warsaw ghetto.

Early in the morning on January 18, strong detachments of the Nazi SS and their henchmen entered the ghetto. But, to their surprise some of the imprisoned Jews, in a final act of desperation, barricaded themselves in blocks of houses and mounted a bitter and heroic last-ditch fight.

In the first few days of the attack the Germans lost a score of dead and a few score wounded. The battle raged on until January 23, whereupon German tanks drove into the ghetto. Houses were burned down, and their dispossessed inhabitants were captured and killed. Over a thousand Jews perished.

However, the majority in the ghetto were forced to submit to the Nazi terror. Large transports departed each day for Treblinka; and after a few days this initial resistance to their Nazi oppressors ceased. The fate of the tragic remnants in the ghetto was still undecided.

A new crest of terror and violence was reached in April 1943. By this time many older men, women, and children, who had survived the deportations during the summer and fall, had been taken from the ghetto. But most of the younger men and women resisted offers of removal because they knew that every step from the ghetto would bring them closer to death. These young heroic Jews, these Davids of the beleaguered Warsaw ghetto, vowed to resist to the end from their imprisoned citadel.

Recognizing the danger of keeping tens of thousands of resolute young people in this concentrated area, the Germans decided to move in and liquidate the ghetto by force.

On the eve of the Passover in April 1943, the Nazi overlords made their decision. Many in the ghetto were slowly starving to death. Others were dying of disease. Living conditions, such as they were, were intolerably miserable. Their numbers dwindling, these heroic defenders had little hope for survival as the Nazis attacked en masse on April 19, 1943, in their last effort to destroy the imprisoned Jews and level the ghetto to the ground.

The "final solution" began suddenly at dawn on the 19th. The formal reason for the sudden strike was the failure of the Jews to answer a call for workers to be sent to Trawniki. Only 200 had responded and this did not meet the Nazi quota. Forthwith the ghetto was surrounded by SS men, German police, and their henchmen. Units of Germans, heavily armed with machineguns, grenades, and armored trucks, entered through the Zamenhof Street gate to the ghetto.

Though expecting some resistance, the Germans must have been surprised at the fury of the initial engagement in which they suffered serious losses. Within a few hours the first German attack was repulsed; the Germans retreated to the borders of the ghetto and called for reinforcements of tanks and artillery. Striking again with unrestrained fury, the Germans broke through the first line of defense. In the face of heavy artillery fire, the defenders fought back with machinegun fire, causing still further serious German losses. In this engagement the Nazi losses included two tanks.

Now the Germans were forced to use more powerful means, namely, to direct artillery fire from airplane observation and set fire to all houses. Changing their tactics, the Nazis refrained from attacking in the daytime using this time for observation. But during the night they launched a merciless barrage and burned block after block of houses in the outer streets of the ghetto. What the Nazi planned to do was to reduce the area of the struggle gradually and starve out the beleagured fighters.

During the nights of April 23–25, the Germans mounted a heavy barrage of artillery fire.

On the last day of the attack, the resistance weakened; the defense was now sporadic; and the ghetto was terrorized by enormous fires that consumed the rubble with its tragic human litter. Eventually the ghetto was split by the attaching Germans, forcing the defenders to retreat to the northern part of the city. Those who had not participated in the uprising were seized by the Nazis and transported to prison camps.

The thoroughness of the Nazi drive to destroy the ghetto was appallingly precise. Success on the night of April 23 was so considerable that now they decided to employ only long-range artillery. In addition to this they confined themselves to setting street after street to the torch and making escape impossible from this flaming inferno.

German guards shot every person within range whom they had seen in the ghetto.

They destroyed the openings of sewers on Plac Krasinsich, Leszno, and Bonifraterska Street through which attempts to escape were made.

Germans patrolled neighboring streets in order to catch those escaping. Those who were captured were shot on the spot. It was estimated that during the period from April 19 to May 5, about 3,000 Jews were killed in this manner.

Then the Germans published large placards declaring that the ghetto was being liquidated and that those Poles who were sheltering Jews would be severely treated by the occupation authorities. An announcement from the German commander called on the population to turn over any Jews who were in hiding.

In the early days of May the struggle in the ghetto stopped suddenly; resistance to the German oppressors was broken. There was no hope of survival against the heavy fires that swept over the ghetto. Hundreds of houses were destroyed, numerous streets were pulverized, and those houses remaining were destroyed by dynamite. The material loss from this calculated, diabolical campaign was greater than that which had occurred in the bombing of 1939. Fires raged on for 15 days. The great synagogue on Tlomackie Street situated a short distance outside the ghetto was destroyed by German demolition crews.

In what was called the small ghetto, the Germans used other tactics than those applied in the large ghetto. They did not come with tanks and artillery. Jews were ruthlessly seized from their workshops, deported, or killed. Through the early part of May the Germans had succeeded in killing and deporting 12,000 Jews. The liquidation of the small ghetto occurred, without a struggle, on May 15–18, 1943. All remaining Jews were deported or killed while their houses were leveled to the ground.

Thus, Gen. Jurgen Stoop, the Nazi commander of the attacking forces, could triumphantly announce: "There was a Jewish section in Warsaw, but it no longer exists."

These remarks, as I said before, are based upon eyewitness accounts written in May 1943. Let me quote from the last two paragraphs of this account:

> Today [that is, May 1943], the Warsaw ghetto consists only of the remains of hundreds of burned and ruined houses. The number of Jewish victims has not been counted and will probably never be counted, because the bodies of fighters were burned along with the houses. Hundreds of suffocated and burned bodies are to be found in the cellars of these houses. It is estimated that 5,000 Jews died within the iron ring of fire and shell. The rest were left to the Germans, and were tortured to death in execution camps. Only those who escaped from

the ghetto and hid in the Aryan part of Warsaw are left in the city.

A Jewish fighting organization led the defense in the ghetto. Their forces were small, they did not have much ammunition. Nevertheless they fought for 4 weeks to better effect than the Germans in this tragic struggle.

Mr. Speaker, 22 years ago courage and heroism abounded in the confines of the Warsaw ghetto. There can be no doubt of that. The few thousand Jews who had arms with which to fight fought as soldiers of freedom. They fought in the spirit and with the fury of the ancient Hebrews who sought so desperately to turn back the onslaught of their enemies. The odds against them were enormous, and yet their heroism shone through their miserable condition like a glowing light when in a last spasm of courage they struck at the enemy and were consumed by artillery and flames.

This tragic struggle must stand as another one of the many monuments of Nazi inhumanity toward mankind. Such inhumanity casts doubt upon man's capacity to progress into a new era of enlightenment. Yet we must not allow the tragedies of history to overwhelm our judgment of man's capacity for good.

We must never lose faith in mankind. Let us, therefore, find some solace in this tribute to the misery of a great and tragic people. This poem, called "A Child in the Warsaw Ghetto," is taken from the Warsaw ghetto paper, Gazeta Zydowska:

From tomorrow on, I shall be sad
From tomorrow on!
Today I shall be gay
What is the use of sadness—tell me that?
Because these evil winds begin to blow?

Why should I grieve for tomorrow—today?
Tomorrow may be so good, so sunny,
Tomorrow the sun may shine for us again
We will no longer need to be sad.

From tomorrow on, I shall be sad
From tomorrow on!
Not today; no! today I will be glad
And every day, no matter how bitter it be,
I shall say:
From tomorrow on, I shall be sad,
Not today!

A POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on a point of personal privilege.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the Members here of a grave breach of privilege which may threaten the integrity of the House.

At present I am being subjected to a criminal prosecution in a case which is not criminal in nature. Article I, section 6, of the U.S. Constitution states that Senators and Representatives "shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during the attendance at the sessions of their respective Houses, and going to and returning from the same."

This has been interpreted to mean that each Representative shall have immunity from criminal arrest except in a criminal case. It follows that immunity from arrest renders a Representative immune from criminal prosecution. The privileges of the Members of this House are threatened by the present proceedings in New York by masking a civil case as a criminal case, thus subverting the clear intention of the Constitution.

In House Resolution 279, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to supply certified copies of "such documents and papers in possession or control of said Sergeant at Arms as the court found to be material and relevant." I request the House to make an investigation into this matter since it is clear that it did not get sufficient information before it authorized the resolution. First of all, the affidavit used to induce the Supreme Court to sign an order that "records are material and relevant" has not been submitted for perusal by the House. We have not been informed of the materiality and the relevancy of the required documents.

Are these records relevant? If they are, what are they relevant to? The resolution requests to examine records for 3 years. Is this relevant to an alleged crime that has been committed in a single moment? Should not copies of this affidavit have been produced so that the House might have known whether its requirements were fairly and accurately stated to the court? Only on perusal of the affidavit would we know whether the judge acted in accordance with the constitutional privileges of the Members of the House, and whether the Members of the House are adequately protected. It is obvious that if the House cannot see the affidavit it cannot know what representations were made to the court.

Furthermore, House Resolution 279 states that there is a criminal action being prosecuted by the people of the State of New York against ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. The House has been misinformed. The subpena served on Bertha Klausner, a witness called before the grand jury, recited that the proceeding was People against "John Doe." The grand jury has been serving John Doe subpenas on all witnesses. It appears from the information given the House of Representatives that the criminal charge has been converted from the People of the State of New York against John Doe to the People of the State of New York against ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. But no case is pending in the New York courts of the People of the State of New York against ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

The present criminal investigation is frivolous with no other purpose than harassment. The grand jury has been investigating a misdemeanor. In the State of New York a grand jury has never been used for the indictment of a misdemeanor. A grand jury would not ordinarily be called to investigate a Member here if he spit on the street. Yet, to prove the harassment involved in the present proceeding, let me point out that the grand jury has been investigating "John Doe" 4 or 5 months without having returned a true bill.

For the protection of its Members, the House should make an inquiry into the reason for the present investigatory proceedings against "John Doe," who just might be a Member of this body possessed of the privilege of the House. In the city of New York, when grand jury investigations have merit, the grand jury does not usually take more than 2 or 3 hours to make a determination. This is a very strange and unusual proceeding which the grand jury is conducting concerning "John Doe," and since it may be criminal in form but not in substance, the House should inquire into the question of whether the investigation by the grand jury of "John Doe" constitutes a real and bona fide effort to substantiate a charge already pending or whether it is an investigation for the purpose of finding a charge to place against a Member of this body.

The purpose of a grand jury is to investigate an allegation that a crime has been committed. Its purpose is never to decide in advance that a crime has been committed and then to look around for evidence to substantiate such decision. The House should not condone or approve or aid or assist in the fulfillment of this purpose. Nor should it allow its Members to be harassed by frivolous matters. The indictment of "John Doe" presently pending in the criminal courts of the State of New York does not even charge a crime. It charges that "John Doe" gave his wife $900. This is not a crime in the State of New York, or in any State in this Union.

Because of the matters at stake in this cause, I counsel the Members here to be careful of their rights where this type of impairment of privilege is involved, lest it solidify into a common practice and deny the Members of the House the unencumbered right to attend to their duties.

I therefore urge, for the protection of the Members of this body against the mischievous use of legal processes to invade their privileges or render them meaningless, that the House investigate these matters and I ask the Speaker's courtesy to suspend all proceedings under the resolution until such inquiry has been concluded.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY SHOULD BE SENT TO INDIA AND PAKISTAN TO RESTORE GOOD RELATIONS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I joined 11 Republican Members of the House in proposing that Vice President HUMPHREY be sent to India and Pakistan to attempt to restore good relations with those nations in advance of the SEATO foreign ministers meeting beginning in London next Monday.

Congressmen ANDREWS of North Dakota, BROOMFIELD, ELLSWORTH, FRELINGHUYSEN, HORTON, LINDSAY, MATHIAS, MCDADE, MOSHER, REID, and TUPPER believe as I do that the abrupt postponement of the impending visits of the heads of government of those two nations constitutes an unfortunate example of insensitivity in the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs.

Yesterday in the New York Times there appeared a letter from Mr. H. R. Vohra, the Washington correspondent of the Times of India. Mr. Vohra pointed out how unfortunate the timing of this administration action was in light of Prime Minister Shastri's proposed visit to Moscow in May, and the current harmony in United States-Indian relations. In his words:

The withdrawal of the invitation by our rules of hospitality seemed not only ill-mannered, but political ill-conceived.

I would like to call the attention of the House to the full text of the statement issued on Monday and to the letter of Mr. Vohra by including them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks:

STATEMENT ON CANCELLATION OF INDIAN AND PAKISTAN VISITS

We propose that Vice President HUMPHREY be sent immediately on a mission to India and Pakistan to assure friendly relations between the United States and these two nations. We urge the administration to explore promptly with the governments involved the possibility of such a trip as evidence of deep American concern over current misunderstanding.

The administration's sudden cancellation of the impending visits of President Ayub Khan of Pakistan and Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri of India is an unfortunate example of insensitivity in the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs. While the administration certainly did not intend to insult either nation or their leaders the timing and means of the cancellation may have undermined American influence in Asia. Even the best of diplomatic purposes and policies can be ill-served by clumsy diplomatic practices and timing.

The visit of President Ayub Khan of Pakistan was cancelled only 9 days before it was to begin and only 17 days before the crucial SEATO foreign ministers conference in London on May 3. Thus President Johnson denied himself the opportunity to use his considerable persuasive abilities on the Pakistani leader immediately in advance of the London meeting.

The June visit of Prime Minister Shastri of India was cancelled within a few days after its itinerary had been made public. As a result, the Indian Government may be less inclined to respect American leadership. It has already issued a stinging denunciation of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The reasons given publicly by the administration for the cancellation are insufficient. The pace of congressional business should never be allowed to dictate foreign policy. And while the President may be preoccupied with problems in Vietnam, so are most of the world's leaders. Surely American policy in Vietnam is directly affected by U.S. relations with all the countries of Asia.

An early visit by Vice President HUMPHREY to Pakistan and India could demonstrate that the administration intended no slight. It could facilitate a better understanding of U.S. policy in Vietnam. It could be a valuable diplomatic initiative in advance of the SEATO conference in early May. And it might also provide an opportunity to improve relations between the two countries themselves.

WITHDRAWAL OF INDIA'S INVITATION CRITICIZED

To the EDITOR:

Indian reporters (and I am one of them) whose task it is to interpret the changing moods and problems of this country have found it difficult to explain to our readers at home how so practiced a President could be so brusque in his treatment of an elected Prime Minister of the world's largest democracy.

I have been at a loss how to sell the official explanation that the President's load has so increased that the invitation he issued in the last week of March had to be withdrawn in the third week of April.

The difficulty was augmented when, necessarily, one viewed the official explanation in the lucid light of facts. No President in recent history, so one is told, has had an easier time with Congress. In any case, between March and April, nothing new has happened to add to the President's troubles and much has happened to establish that he can continue to rely on Congress to do his bidding.

The explanation about Vietnam relates to a chronic situation which has existed for months.

Reluctantly one came to the conclusion that there was more to it than meets the eye. It gave Indians no satisfaction that our Prime Minister should be equated even in the implied (or unwitting) discourtesy with Field Marshal Ayub Khan.

The Indian Ambassador sought an explanation of the debacle. Secretary Rusk tried to mollify Indian feelings, so it is reported, by reminding him that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at one stage had cut $100 million from the aid authorization bill to mark its displeasure against two warring neighbors—India and Pakistan. The implication was that India and Pakistan should be grateful for the withdrawal of the invitations. The President, by this master stroke, was providing both with assured aid. It was better to have aid than to be invited.

POLITICALLY ILL CONCEIVED

The withdrawal of the invitation by our rules of hospitality seemed not only ill mannered, but politically ill conceived. Mr. Shastri was due to visit Moscow in May. In the past Moscow has sought to exploit every reverse in Indo-United States relations. It filled the gap when the United States faltered on the Bokaro project. It gave India MIG's when the United States hesitated on F–104's.

The disinvitation now leaves Mr. Shastri in an unbalanced political posture when he was anxious to correct it by a visit to this country. It would have been in the mutual interest of the United States and India that this should happen early.

The postponement, inexplicably, came at a moment when Indo-United States relations had achieved an unaccustomed harmony—the greatest source of harmony being the mutual understanding on Chinese communism and India's sworn determination to serve as a bulwark against its machinations across a 2,000-mile-long border. For the responsibility we bear in this matter at tremendous sacrifice to ourselves, we seek no reward. But, surely there is scope to recognize the difference between the Indian outlook and the Pakistani stand on Peiping. This difference makes the balancing between India and Pakistan a particularly ugly spectacle.

Let me make one final point to explain why Indian reaction to the postponement has been sharp. It is not the postponement which matters much but the way it was carried out.

There was no consultation, as far as I can make out, between the President and India's Prime Minister prior to the postponement. He was merely handed a letter asking to call later. The indelicate procedure adopted made the postponement doubly galling.

H. R. VOHRA,
Washington Correspondent, the Times of India.

WASHINGTON, *April 24, 1965.*

ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN MASSACRE

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the tragic fate of the Armenian people in Turkey in 1915 stands out as the saddest and most unforgettable event of the First World War. This involved the lives of 2 million industrious, enterprising, intelligent, and prosperous people. In this wholesale and indiscriminate massacre, secretly planned and carefully concealed from the public until after the outbreak of the war, no one was to be spared from this ghastly holocaust.

Certain Turkish authorities had decided that for the alleged disloyalty of some Armenian leaders, all Armenians, irrespective of age and sex, had to pay with their lives. It is this aspect of the tragedy, the deliberate massacre of more than 1 million innocent and helpless Armenians under circumstances seldom recorded in the annals of history, that makes this crime against humanity and civilization stand out.

In the course of less than a year these Turks had done their very worst to finish this task. The large community of 2 million Armenians in Turkey was no more. It had ceased to exist. More than 1 million lost their lives in outright massacres and through starvation. Women and children by the hundreds of thousands were sold into slavery, to the Turks, Kurds, and Arabs. Some were lucky enough to save their lives by finding refuge in neighboring countries, and only the Armenians in Constantinople—today's Istanbul—were spared from this national scourge through the efforts of the U.S. Ambassador.

The United States is fortunate in that many Armenians have chosen to come here to establish new homes for themselves and their families. The Armenians have made many significant contributions to America. They are industrious and hardworking, and are fine citizens dedicated to advancing the welfare of their communities and their Nation.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the sad event, the national tragedy of Armenians in Turkey. Armenians and their friends here and elsewhere observe this anniversary and mourn the tragic loss.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago Lithuania reestablished itself as a completely free sovereign state, and for 21 years the citizens made great progress under a stable, effective government.

Since 1940 the Soviet Union has held Lithuania in bondage; however, we in the United States have not forgotten the plight of the Lithuanian people and rededicate ourselves to the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania.

Therefore, I call to the attention of the Members resolutions adopted by the Illinois Senate and Illinois House of Representatives, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 12

Whereas this year marks the 47th year since the date the country of Lithuania regained status as an independent nation; and

Whereas Illinois citizens of Lithuanian descent are observing Lithuanian Independence Day on February 16; and

Whereas 20 years after World War II, Lithuania is still occupied and controlled by the Soviet Union contrary to international law and the will of the Lithuanian nation; and

Whereas the people of this State and Nation of Lithuanian ancestry have contributed much to the fiber of our society and the accomplishments of America as a whole: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That we salute the Lithuanian people and extend our hope that their nation will again regain its independence; and that the people in this State and Nation of Lithuanian ancestry be congratulated for the contributions they have made for the preservation of freedom and to the greatness of this country.

Adopted by the house, February 3, 1965.

JOHN P. TOUHY,
Speaker of House.
CHAS. F. KERVIN,
Clerk of the House.

Concurred in by the senate, February 9, 1965.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 24

Whereas this year marks the 47th year since the date the country of Lithuania regained status as an independent nation; and

Whereas Illinois citizens of Lithuanian descent are observing Lithuanian Independence Day on February 16; and

Whereas, 20 years after World War II, Lithuania is still occupied and controlled by the Soviet Union contrary to international law and the will of the Lithuanian nation; and

Whereas the people of this State and Nation of Lithuanian ancestry have contributed much to the fiber of our society and the accomplishments of America as a whole: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we salute the Lithuanian people and extend our hope that their nation will again regain its independence; and that the people in this State and Nation of Lithuanian ancestry be congratulated for the contributions they have made for the preservation of freedom and to the greatness of this country.

Adopted by the senate, February 3, 1965.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Senate and Illinois House passed these respective resolutions unanimously. It is indeed stimulating to note the dramatic fashion in which these Illinois legislators have commemorated the anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

URGENTLY NEEDED: EXPANDED VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there is some thought being given to enlarging certain Veterans' Administration hospitals in the near future.

In this regard, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the situation existing at the Veterans' Administration in Seattle, where, in my opinion, the need for expansion is desperate. I am sure that the Seattle VA hospital is only one of many in similar circumstances.

Recently, I received an urgent request from one of my constituents whose father, a veteran, is presently in a hospital where the cost for care is $50 a day. Inasmuch as the family has but a very small income, it is easy to see how such care is imposing a definite hardship on the family. My constituent asked that I do what I could to get her father transferred to the VA hospital, stating that the family had tried, but found that no space would be available until about the middle of next month.

In checking with the hospital, I found that the facts given by my constituent were quite correct. The hospital presently has a waiting list of 16 urgent cases, some of the patients being hospitalized elsewhere, and at least one instance where private hospitalization has used up just about all the patient's finances.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a situation like this is positive indication that the proposal to enlarge VA hospitals should be made a definite project—and just as soon as possible. Our veterans deserve the gratitude of all Americans for the service they have rendered their country, and in my opinion, one of the best ways to express our gratitude is to assure that sufficient hospital space is available when the time comes that they have to call upon us for assistance.

I sincerely hope that expeditious action will be taken. Every day that passes with nothing being done to improve conditions at our VA hospitals adds to the urgency of the issue, and imposes additional strain and suffering on those waiting for the care to which they are entitled.

THE INEQUITY IN FINANCING SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the House acted on the Social Security Amendments of 1965, H.R. 6675. On the two rollcall votes concerned with the final passage of this legislation, I voted in favor of the Republican substitute and against the majority bill which included the compulsory medicare plan financed by a regressive payroll tax.

At the time of the debate I said:

I object to medicare because it is needlessly compulsory and because it is financed by a regressive payroll tax that will reduce the take-home pay of many people who cannot afford to pay additional taxes. * * * I also share the view expressed today that the inclusion of service-type benefits in the social security program may impair the ability to meet future cash benefit obligations.

It is in part because of my business background that I am gravely concerned over the payroll tax burdens that will result from this bill. We are proposing to take almost $5 billion more in taxes next year just for social security purposes. The present $17 billion that we now collect in social security taxes will almost double by 1972 and the total will continue to mount after that.

During my remarks on the House floor, I associated myself with the able expression of additional separate views by my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], who serves as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, as his views are set forth in the committee report beginning on page 258. Mr. BROYHILL and I were among the cosponsors of the eldercare approach to meeting the health needs of our senior citizens under a voluntary program made available to those individuals requiring Government assistance. In his views, Mr. BROYHILL called attention to the fact that with the medicare proposal we were adding many billions of dollars to the more than $300 billion of existing unfunded obligations of the OASDI system. It was pointed out this unfunded condition of the system would mean that the younger and future members of our working population would be subjected to the inequity of having to pay not only the cost of their own benefits, but also the cost of beneficiaries who had preceded them in the program.

Mr. Speaker, as our young citizens become aware of the fact that social security is not the bargain it now appears, we will find a growing resentment developing with respect to the prodigality with which we have approached our responsibilities in financing social security. When this realization comes, we will find

more sound than soundness in regard to social security financing. In this connection, it should be borne in mind that it is not a question of whether a Member is for or against the old people when he stands for a social security system that is responsibly financed. Indeed, the converse is true. A willingness to underfinance social security is a measure of the extent to which a Member of Congress is willing to go in imposing our tax burdens on the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of Barron's, there is an article captioned "Robbing Peter—A Critical Look at the Pending Social Security Bill." It comments on the financing aspects of social security. This article should be read by every American who has any interest in keeping our social security system on a sound basis. Accordingly, I include this article as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

ROBBING PETER—A CRITICAL LOOK AT THE PENDING SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—"Because social security recipients have been getting benefits 10 times as great as what they have paid in, people seem to think we have a special machine here which turns out $10 bills for $1 bills," says a top official of the Social Security Administration.

Since the SSA possesses no such wondrous device, it is counting on future contributions in excess of benefits to make ends meet for its old-age, survivors, and disability insurance. The present benefits-contributions ratio will grow even more unfavorable if the Senate enacts the social security bill, H.R. 6675, recently passed by the House.

The benefit-payment ratio for persons already retired obviously is responsible for much of the enthusiasm for the bill, which contains not only medicare but also a 7-percent increase in cash benefits. Retirement contributions, however, have been stepped up even more.

PUBLIC IGNORANCE

Says one official: "Continued general support for the social security system hinges on continued public ignorance of how the system works." He adds: "I believe that we have nothing to worry about because it is so enormously complex that nobody is going to figure it out."

Barron's hereby takes on the job.

The SSA worked up the following table, which purports to show that benefits in every age group exceed contributions.

	Retiree age 71	Worker now age 50	18-year-old future worker
Total contribution	$1,290	$5,832	$10,212
Retirement benefits	13,422	14,094	14,205
Wife's and widow's benefits	9,363	9,831	9,909
Total benefits	22,785	23,925	24,114

The table warrants close scrutiny. Based on maximum contributions and benefits, it includes only amounts paid by employees, even though employers pay matching amounts for their benefit. It also excludes interest which the money could have earned for the contributors if it had not been tied up in social security funds.

This approach, however, is far from realistic. To cover the true situation, the table would obviously have to include both interest and the employer's contribution. Starting with the 71-year-old retiree, and calculating interest at 3 percent (approximately the average national rate during the period of his contributions) would produce a figure of $3,373, against benefits of $22,785. Actuarially, he can expect to live to 79 to collect this amount. The 7-percent increase in cash benefits under H.R. 6675 would raise his benefits to $24,379. His contributions, of course, would not thereby increase, since he no longer makes any.

As for the 50-year-old worker, by including the employer contribution and interest at 3 percent during 1960 and 4¼ percent thereafter (again, the national average for the period) his total payments come to $22,856, against benefits of $23,925—if he lives long enough. The actuarial table used by the Internal Revenue Service for taxing annuities indicates he can expect to live to only 75½, whereas SSA has assumed he will live to 79.

The new bill would require this worker and his employer to contribute an extra $4,240 for retirement. At the same time, the bill's 7-percent increase in cash benefits would mean $1,667 for him. Thus, if H.R. 6675 becomes law, the 50-year-old worker can expect to make contributions of $26,012, including interest, against benefits of $25,592.

As for the 18-year-old, including the employer's contribution and figuring interest at 4¼ percent for the latter's 46-year working life (assumed by SSA) gives a total of $61,596, against $24,114 in benefits. For this contribution the worker could purchase from a private company a monthly annuity of $463 for life, after retirement. His maximum benefit under social security would be $254 a month.

MONTHLY ANNUITY

Under the new bill bill, H.R. 6675, employer-employees retirement contributions for the 18-year-old with 4¼ percent interest, would come to $84,300. The 7 percent increase in cash benefits would bring the latter to only $25,802. For this amount, the worker could purchase from a private company a monthly annuity of $634 for life. His maximum benefit under social security would be $312 a month.

The benefits figured may be high under both present law and the pension bill because SSA has assumed the youngster will retire at 67 and live to the ripe old age of 79. But the Internal Revenue Service actuarial table assumes that an 18-year-old today can expect to live to only 71.9. SSA in any case, has adopted a policy of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Obviously, those who are urging Congress to be still more generous are thinking chiefly of people already retired or close to retirement. Few of these enthusiasts realize, however, that OASDI has been in operation for only 28 years and that therefore no one has paid social security taxes for his whole working life of 46 years. The system took in an additional 10 million people as recently as 1951, when new legislation covered farm and domestic workers. Another 7½ million members were added only 10 years ago, when coverage was extended to some self-employed. H.R. 6675 would take in still others, including waiters and additional professional workers.

A REAL BONANZA

For the 20 million retirees collecting today, social security is a real bonanza. For those who turned 65 a few years after entering the system, it represents a windfall. For new workers, however, today's largesse will be a crushing burden because, in order to pay Paul, SSA must rob Peter.

Neither SSA officials nor members of the Ways and Means Committee make any bones about the prospect that future contributions will pay the bill. This, they point out, is the great difference between social insurance and private pension plans.

The latter should have enough in the till to fulfill all obligations without counting on any new entrants. But under a compulsory system, the experts explain, they can count on the taxes on new workers coming into the system. SSA officials insist that an employer's social security taxes are for the social good, not for the individual good of the worker on whose earnings they are based.

Whether SSA will be able to sell this idea remains to be seen. Ray M. Peterson, vice president and associate actuary of the Equitable Life Assurance Society, has his doubts. Says he: "We may expect from sophisticated, market-oriented employers, and from labor union experts increasing dissatisfaction with the disparity between what OASDI promises and what could be secured under a private plan."

Some dissatisfaction already is becoming apparent. Students at Northern Illinois University have formed a young citizens council, to combat exploitation of young taxpayers under the social security program. Commented the Chicago Tribune; "They think it only fair that the young taxpayer who is getting set on a job and starting to raise a family should pay lower social security taxes than older persons who have to pay only a few years before they start receiving benefits."

Nobody knows the exact debt young workers will have to pay. Back in 1962, when the SSA last figured out its unfunded liability for OASDI, it totaled $321 billion. Now the experts think it may come to $330 billion or more. Just for present members, according to SSA officials, passage of H.R. 6675 would mean an additional liability of $40 to $50 billion for increased cash benefits and another $35 billion for medicare.

At the end of last year the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund totaled $19.1 billion, compared with a high of $22.5 billion 8 years ago.

The story is even worse for the disability insurance fund. When Congress created it in 1956 to finance disability payments, authorized then for the first time, much was made of the fact that the disability insurance fund was set up separately from the OASI fund. Congress developed a habit, however, of enlarging disability benefits more than it enlarged the fund. Last year disbursements exceeded receipts by $188 million, and the fund shrank to $2 billion at the end of the year. By 1969, under present law, it is expected to fall to $81 million.

The following table shows how the combined unfunded liability has increased since 1956:

[In billions of dollars]

	Taxes plus trust funds	Value of benefits	Unfunded liability
1956 act	217	486	269
1958 act	254	543	289
1960 act	276	587	311
1961 act	304	625	321

INCREASED BENEFITS

The unfunded liability has risen even though both the tax rate and the taxable earnings base have grown over the years. One difficulty, of course, is that each time Congress raises contributions, it also increases benefits.

When the system started out in 1937, the maximum earnings base was a mere $3,000, and employer and employee each paid a tax of 1 percent. The rate was to go up to 1½ percent each in 1940, to 2 percent in 1943, 2½ percent in 1946, and 3 percent in 1949. To reduce the burden of social security during World War II, however, Congress temporarily suspended the scheduled increases. By 1950 the combined tax went to 3 percent, and the following year the base went up to $3,600. In 1954 the rate rose to 4 percent, and the following year the base rose to $4,200. In 1956 Congress provided for the first cash benefits for disability, and the following year the rate went up to 4½ percent. In 1959 the rate became 5 percent, and the base $4,800. The next year, the rate increased to

6 percent. Another quarter percent was added in 1962. In 1963 it went up to 7½ percent.

Congress has always felt that the tax rate must not exceed 10 percent. This ceiling however, has been pierced in H.R. 6675. The following tables show what would happen to the combined tax rate and maximum contributions, under present law and under H.R. 6675.

Combined employer-employee contribution

[In percent]

Year	Present law	H.R. 6675	Amount [1]
1965	7.25	7.25	
1966	8.25	8.70	0.70
1967	8.25	9.00	1.00
1968	9.25	9.00	1.00
1969–70	9.25	9.80	1.00
1971–72	9.25	9.80	1.00
1973–75	9.25	10.70	1.10
1976–79	9.25	10.80	1.20
1980–86	9.25	11.00	1.40
1987 and after	9.25	11.20	1.60

[1] Portion of H.R. 6675 tax required for basic health insurance program.

Combined maximum contributions

Year	Present law	H.R. 6675 without medicare	H.R. 6675 with medicare
1965	$348	$348.00	$348.00
1966	396	448.00	487.20
1967	396	448.00	504.00
1968	444	448.00	504.00
1969–70	444	492.80	548.80
1971–72	444	580.80	646.80
1973–75	444	633.60	706.20
1976–79	444	633.60	712.80
1980–86	444	633.60	726.00
1987 on	444	633.60	739.20

Even these contributions do not assure the actuarial soundness of social security. In its last annual report, the board of trustees figured things out on the basis of high, low, and intermediate cost estimates, and on both a 75-year and perpetuity basis.

On a high-cost and perpetuity basis, benefits will come to 10.83 percent of payroll, and contributions will total 9.11 percent, producing an actuarial imbalance of 1.72 percent. On the intermediate cost estimate, however, contributions will total 9.11 percent and benefits 9.35 percent, leaving an imbalance of 0.24 percent, just within the limit of 0.25 percent which Congress has considered acceptable. Figured on a 75-year rather than a perpetuity basis and on intermediate costs, contributions will total 9.10 percent and benefits 9.09 percent, leaving the minuscule positive balance of 0.01 percent. With low costs and a 75-year basis, it is possible to show a positive balance of 1.13 percent. The figures, in short, can be juggled to show whatever one wants.

The Ways and Means Committee has chosen the figures which show a positive balance of 0.01 percent. It says H.R. 6675 would shift this "to a lack of balance of 0.08 percent, which is below the established limit within which the system is considered substantially in actuarial balance."

However, if the past is any key to the future, contributions will have to rise and liberalizing of benefits will follow, in a dizzy spiral. As employers' social security payroll taxes go up, their operating costs will rise. With increasing amounts deducted for social security, employees are likely to ask for wage increases to maintain their take-home pay. Faced with these twin developments, employers probably will raise prices. With higher prices, however, social security checks won't go so far, and beneficiaries again presumably will pressure Congress to boost monthly benefits.

In H.R. 6675 Congress seems to feel that it can slow down this process by giving up financing solely through social security taxes. For persons over 65 who are not eligible for medicare benefits from the general funds of the Treasury, the latter also would be used to match $3 monthly benefits; it would finance voluntary contributions from persons over 65 who want insurance to cover doctor bills.

Some observers feel that the introduction of general Government contributions is the first crack in the dike of financial controls maintained by payroll taxes. They expect some future Congress to decide that if workers and employers object to more than a 10-percent levy, the Government could keep on liberalizing social security and make up the difference from the Treasury's general funds.

SSA officials maintain, however, that there is a limit to how much the social security system can obtain from the latter source without necessitating an increase in the income tax.

The Ways and Means Committee has made much of the fact that H.R. 6675 sets up a separate fund for medicare benefits. Representative GERALD R. FORD, Republican, of Michigan, contended during the floor debate on H.R. 6675, however, that the trust funds will not be inviolate. "I need only point out to you that in this bill now before us is a provision increasing the allocation of funds to the disability trust fund to the detriment of the OASI fund," he declared.

Congress is as aware as anyone that there is no such thing as a free lunch—or free retirement or medical benefits. It is, however, much more concerned with the voters of today than with the youngsters who will pay their bills in the future.

This is an appropriate time, then, to recall what the Ways and Means Committee said 10 years ago: "We should take sober warning that, in our zeal to provide ever-greater benefits and to provide against an ever-wider area of need, we do not destroy the very system which we have created."

OBSERVANCE OF 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MASSACRE OF ARMENIANS BY THE TURKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this week the Turkish atrocities and mass murders against the Armenian population of the then Ottoman Empire commenced. The slaughter by the Turks of the helpless Armenian civilian population was the first great genocide of modern times.

I call upon the Armenians throughout the United States to expand their program of commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenians not only to develop proper world opinion in support of justice which the Armenian people have not received but also to point out the unpunished Turkish genocide, a precedent which has resulted in the slaughter of additional millions of people in struggles since that time.

Just 6 years ago the people of Tibet were the victims of Chinese Communist genocide, and the world was silent just as the world was silent during the deliberate famines created by the Soviet Government against non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R. in the 1920's and 1930's.

The acts of genocide perpetrated by the Nazis during World War II might not have occurred had world justice been applied against the Turks in 1915. The postwar acts of genocide by the Soviet Union against the Baltic peoples could have been averted had world justice moved to support the Armenians in 1915.

On Monday in the House of Representatives Archbishop Hrant Katchadoorian, prelate of the Armenian National Apostolic Church of North America, delivered the invocation. This afternoon Archbishop Katchadoorian delivered the invocation in the other body. He signifies the united, active participation of the American Armenian community in commemorative events in observance of the great tragedy that befell the Armenian nation.

Last Sunday evening in Boston the commemorative committee on the 50th anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenians sponsored a banquet in Cambridge, Mass. The main address was delivered by Prof. Setrak Benjamin Minas, national chairman of the commemorative committee. I include his address in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks:

SPEECH BY PROF. SETRAK BENJAMIN MINAS, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMEMORATIVE COMMITTEE, ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH GENOCIDE OF THE ARMENIANS

In April 1915 the Turkish Government began the planned mass murder of the Armenian people. This marked the 1st act of genocide in the 20th century. Over 300 years of periodic massacres and pillage and constant oppression culminated in the indiscriminate murder of 1½ million Armenians in 1915, and the deportation of over 1 million more under conditions so incredibly inhuman as to shock the sensibilities of the civilized world. All Armenian property was confiscated or destroyed.

Thus the 20th century began with this massive attempt to murder and to extirpate an entire people; an attempt to obliterate its entire culture; and did rob the Armenians of their entire material wealth. Never before, in the memory of living men had a crime of such enormity and viciousness been conceived and executed by a government. Of this appalling subhuman crime, the Government of Turkey in 1915 stands condemned, but unpunished, by documented history.

I refer to the book entitled "The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire," published by the Houses of the British Parliament as an official paper. I quote from page 653:

"In one way or another, the Central Government (of Turkey) enforced and controlled the execution of the scheme, as it alone had originated the conception of it; and the Young Turkish Ministers and their associates at Constantinople are directly responsible, from beginning to end, for the gigantic crime that devastated the Near East in 1915."

Impartial history places the blame for this horrendous crime on the Turkish Government of 1915. This shocking tragedy is further compounded in 1965, when the Turkish representative in the United Nations and current Turkish news releases refer to this mass murder as the "alleged massacres

of the Armenians," and then Turkey piously declares "the act of genocide can never be excused."

When the Turkish Government of 1965 attempts to pervert documented history, it discloses a studied ignorance and indifference that leads one to agree with the words of Viscount Bryce, "Can anyone still continue to hope that the evils of such a government are curable?" It is this Turkish Government that is allowed to sit as a member in the United Nations, and is permitted to use a civilized forum to express and to perpetuate its uncivilized character. The United Nations was established by civilized nations with the moral purpose of replacing the rule of force with the rule of law. An organization with a moral purpose cannot permit the membership of an amoral nation. The Turkish Government should sit in the defendants dock accused of a heinous crime, and not as a member of an organization seeking to act as a moral force. This travesty of logic and morality reduces this potentially great organization to a sham and a mockery. The United Nations must take a firm position on the side of good against evil. In the words of a great American, "Nonconformance with evil is just as important as conformance with good." If the majority of the member nations in the United Nations do not subscribe to international morality and justice, the minority of the member nations ought to resign their participation; if the majority of the member nations firmly believe in equal justice for all peoples, then it is their duty to courageously guide the United Nations to the achievement of its moral purpose.

In 1915, Talaat Pasha, Turkish Minister of the Interior and one of the chief architects of the genocide of the Armenian people, declared, "We will give the Armenians such a blow that there will be no Armenian Question for fifty years."

The year 1965 marks the end of the fifty years. Talaat Pasha is dead! The Armenian Question remains alive! One and one-half million Armenian voices were forever stilled in 1915—but in 1965, the resonant voices of their children and grandchildren ring out to remind the civilized world of the Turkish crime that defies human comprehension; to remind the civilized nations that the Armenian Question is still on the agenda of unfinished business.

For 600 years the Turkish Government attempted to destroy the identity of the Armenian people. But, the Armenian and his culture still live. Because the Armenian has always placed himself on the side of good against evil, he has become the indestructible Armenian.

The Turk of 1965 has inherited a legacy of guilt. The Armenian has inherited a legacy of noble adherence to God and to the Right. It is this noble heritage that makes the Armenian indestructible.

The indestructible Armenian on this Memorial Day declares that no nation or combination of nations has the legal or moral license to deny him his sovereign rights. As Pope John XXIII said in his "Pacem in Terris," the rights of men and governments stem not solely from human consent, but from the design of the Creator. The sovereign rights of the Armenian stemming from "the design of the Creator" cannot be abrogated by the Treaty of Lausanne. That which has been bestowed by God, only God can take away.

The avowed purpose of all civilized nations is to secure a universal peace which still remains beyond their grasp. The Armenian people would remind the free world that the only basis of a universal peace is the establishment of the principle of equal justice under the law, to be applied to the rights of all peoples. There can be no segregation in the application of human rights.

In the gigantic confrontation today of the forces of the free world, and the forces of evil, hundreds of millions of people stand uncommitted to one side or the other. Each side condemns their neutrality. It is not understood that these peoples are not being given the choice between good and evil, but only a choice between conflicting military power. Their posture of neutrality holds for them less danger than a choice that might become disastrous by the unpredictable shifts of modern weaponry. The neutral nations are wooed with money, when it is the morality of the Wilsonian doctrine they are seeking.

The Armenian question is the oldest unsettled business of the civilized world. I submit that if the Armenian case were reopened today and a just verdict were rendered, a long-lost faith would be rekindled in the hearts of the neutral peoples giving them the courage to arrange themselves on the side of good and the free world.

The disease infecting the free world today is lack of courage. It requires more courage to seek peace than to wage war; more courage is demanded to administer equal justice under the law, than to bow before the demands of political expediency.

The prerequisite of justice—unshakable courage. To stand for right against wrong.

The indestructible Armenian will continue to remind the world that genocide is a crime against the law of God—and remains a crime whether the nations of the world ratify or ignore the convention of genocide.

The indestructible Armenian, in defense of civilization, and in defense of his inalienable rights, will continue to appeal to the conscience of the free world for a just solution of the Armenian case.

The salvation of the human race lies in the renaissance of that conscience.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] for calling the attention of this House and of the Nation to the subject of this 50th observance of the massacre of the Armenians. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and congratulate him for his work in this behalf as well as in behalf of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world.

Also, I want to commend the gentleman for his sponsorship and his leadership in the matter of the Captive Nations Resolution and all of the other great freedom-seeking efforts in which the gentleman has taken part.

I take particular interest in this subject because of a large Armenian community in the district which I represent, particularly in the area of Waukegan in Lake County, Ill., and the very fine citizens of Armenian descent who now occupy positions of leadership in the business, civic and political life of the congressional district which I serve. I direct attention, for instance, to the distinguished mayor of the city of Waukegan, a gentleman by the name of Robert Sabonjian, who is of Armenian descent. There are also many other public, civic, and business leaders in this area, of Armenian birth or descent, who have gained the respect of the entire community and who are intensely interested in the matter of this 50th observance. I am proud to join with them and with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] in paying respect to the Armenian nation which some day, we hope, will be restored to full identity and full statehood.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY] for his pertinent comments and point out to the Members of the House that in addition to his very busy legislative schedule, he has been especially helpful in cooperating in the Illinois area with commemorative events this year.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my able colleague from Illinois for yielding to me. I wish to commend the gentleman for having had set aside this time today that the Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States could express our undying friendship for those of Armenian blood or descent and our sympathy for those who suffered cruelly in the tragedy of a half a century ago. That tragedy I remember so vividly, for a member of one of the Armenian families numbered among its victims escaped to the United States and was in my office.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women of Armenia during the wars have had a strong faith, an abiding faith, in God.

Among the unspeakable horrors and terrifying deeds of the First World War, the massacre of more than 1 million helpless and innocent Armenians in Turkey stands as the foulest crime. It was not caused by the war, although the war did provide the setting in which the foul act could be carried out with impunity. For the war tied the hands of all friends of the Armenian people, and no sympathetic European government could help them in their gravest national crisis.

Historic Armenia was conquered by Ottoman Turks more than 400 years ago, and Armenians thus became Ottoman subjects in their homeland. There they lived under oppressive alien rule, and were also subjected to pillage and plunder by other peoples, especially the wild and unruly Kurds. During all that time, helpless and unarmed Armenians were at the mercy of these lawless elements, for the Turkish Government made no effort to check such lawlessness on the part of its unruly subjects. Year after year Armenians complained of these outrages to the government, of the physical violence committed by the Kurds and others against them, of the way they were robbed and manhandled by these armed and uncontrolled bands. They asked the Government for its aid, feeling that if it were unable to provide it, then they should at least be allowed to arm themselves in self-defense. The Government promised to aid the Armenians, but that promise was never made good. Moreover it would not allow the Armenians to arm in self-defense, even though the Kurds and other non-Christians were allowed to bear arms. Such an absolutely unfair and

discriminatory policy brought about a very precarious and dangerous situation for the Armenians, and they were in a very serious dilemma. This was the situation from the end of the 19th century until the outbreak of the First World War.

In the meantime the Turks developed their own plan for taking care of the Armenians' problems as became evident soon after the outbreak of the war. Taking Germany's side in that war, the Turks felt they were in a position to carry out their evil design of eliminating the Armenian element in Turkey, for none of the foreign governments sympathetic to the Armenians would be able to intervene on their behalf. Unfortunately, in this the Turks were correct; there was no one to restrain their deadly hands, and no power could stop them in their murderous task.

Their plans were carried out so effectively and efficiently that of the 2 million Armenians then living in the Ottoman Empire, more than 1 million died by the end of 1915. Half of these were massacred outright, while the rest were starved to death, or lost their lives under unbearable hardships during their forced deportation. In this national genocide Armenians by the hundreds of thousands were sold into slavery, while some managed to escape into Russia and Persia.

Such was the fate of the most industrious, enterprising, and progressive element in the Ottoman Empire. In one foul campaign they were eliminated from the land where they and their ancestors had lived for thousands of years. It was the most tragic blow struck against this helpless and peaceful national group in their long and turbulent history. In the past these people had experienced hardships, had put up with oppressive alien rulers, and some had even been massacred. But at no time in their national history were they subjected to wholesale and indiscriminate massacres until in 1915. This was done to them by their heartless overlords, the Turks.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of that national tragedy, that first case of genocide in modern history, perpetrated by the Turks in 1915. Armenians throughout the world are observing this sad anniversary with due solemnity, and their friends join them in paying tribute to the victims of that unspeakable crime against humanity.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased that so many Members of the House have seen fit to participate this afternoon in this special order. Earlier in the week and during sessions last week, other Members have spoken on the subject of this year's commemoration of the Turkish genocide against the Armenian people.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, with mixed emotion we mark the 50th anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenian people.

In taking special notice of the shocking events in 1915, we observe this anniversary with sorrow in recalling the massacres of Armenians and with pride in saluting those brave patriots who survived the attacks to fight on the side of freedom during World War I.

The stouthearted Armenian people who escaped the terror, murder, and carnage set an example for the free world by their devotion to the cause of freedom and by their tremendous personal sacrifices.

I join my colleagues in pausing to extend our deep sympathy to thousands of Americans whose Armenian forefathers fought for freedom with our war allies and who have given so much of themselves to make this a better country, and a strong one.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Armenian people were the helpless victims of the First World War. They lost all their wordly possessions, and more than 1 million of them died through wholesale massacres and famine. All this terrible holocaust took place in Turkey in 1915. At the beginning of that year there were about 2 million living in the Ottoman Empire. There they had lived for many centuries, long before the coming of the Ottoman Turks into Asia Minor. In their ancient homeland in eastern Asia Minor, they had somehow fended for themselves and had preserved their distinct ethnic status. They were successful in doing this even under the Ottoman Turks for several centuries, but toward the end of the last century, when all other non-Turkish subjects of the Turks had secured their freedom, it was natural for the Armenians to work for the improvement of their unhappy lot.

With that in mind, they asked the Turkish authorities for help, for reforms in areas where they formed a considerable portion of the population. In particular they asked for protection against the unbridled brigandage and violent acts of the Kurds. The Government promised to do something, but nothing was done. Then in desperation Armenian leaders appealed to European governments for aid.

These governments had already shown serious concern over the fate of the Armenian people in Turkey, and they advised the Turkish Government to introduce administrative reforms to improve their lot. The Turks agreed to introduce certain reforms, but they felt that European interference in their internal affairs was uncalled for, and they blamed the Armenians for this. The Turkish authorities were furious, and they seem to have decided to teach the Armenians a lesson.

Early in the First World War, this lesson took the form of the wholesale massacre of Armenians in all parts of the Ottoman Empire. In the execution of this inhuman measure the Turks were efficient and thorough. Before the end of 1915 nearly all of the 2 million Armenians had been uprooted from their homes and about half of them had been massacred and starved to death, while most of the survivors either became refugees in nearby lands, or were serving as slaves in Turkish homes. Such was the tragic fate of the Armenians in Turkey in 1915, and today the 50th anniversary of that national tragedy is being observed in all Armenian communities throughout the world.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, back in 1939, Adolf Hitler contemptuously asked the members of the Third Reich: "Who, pray say, remembers the Armenian massacres today?" He recognized that the world had not acted to redress the heinous genocide which the Government of the Turkish Empire launched against the Armenians on April 24, 1915. But today there is a determination among freedom-loving people everywhere that neither the mass murders of Hitler's Germany nor the atrocious massacres of the Armenians will ever be forgotten.

As we pause to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the World War I Turkish outrage, a World War II concentration camp in Germany is being unveiled as a permanent museum and reminder of the acts of other madmen. Never again let it be said that the world does not remember.

However, as new generations come along, there always seem to be those who believe that "it can't happen to us." We have in America and other Western nations today those who would have our country turn its back on aggression and oppression by modern-day practitioners of fear and intimidation—yes, and genocide. May God help all doubters to understand and rally against any repetition of such lessons in history as on those ignominious pages of 1915–18.

More than 1 million citizens of the Armenian nation were slaughtered and another million displaced at the hands of the Turkish brigands. Yet, those who survived went on to become what President Wilson affectionately called "our little ally" of the First World War. Their contribution to the American victory was great, inspired by the martyrdom of those who lost their lives in the cause of freedom.

It is incredible that such an all-out attempt to annihilate a whole race of people should have been started in Turkey in 1915, particularly in view of nearly a century of bloody massacre after bloody massacre, in which hundreds of thousands of Armenians, Greeks, Syrians, Maronites, and Bulgarians were slain by the Turks. But the bloodiest of all the Turkish massacres did take place a scant half century ago.

Hopefully, the rapidity of modern communication and the prospect of prompt retaliation from peace-loving countries will deter future despots from repeating such acts of wholesale barbarism. But we cannot leave it to history books alone to express our contempt for genocide or anything closely resembling it. We must continually remind the world as we are doing today—so that the sacrifice of the Armenians, and others like them, shall not have been entirely in vain.

Mr. Speaker, we in the United States are proud of the people of many races and creeds who have made our Nation great. Those of Armenian descent have contributed notably to the preservation and proliferation of the American way of life. I salute them particularly at this time as we honor the memory of their forebears in their former strife-stricken homeland.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I think that our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], is performing a valuable service in reminding the people

of the United States of the brave history of the Armenian people.

I want to express my own personal admiration for the gallantry which Armenians have displayed in their fight for freedom.

In the congressional district which I represent, many Americans of Armenian descent have proven that they can render the same great service to this Nation as their ancestors have rendered in the past in their homeland.

They are warm, friendly, hard-working people who are respected and admired in their community.

I am proud and pleased to hail them and wish them well.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, today we are observing the 50th anniversary of one of the greatest crimes against humanity in the history of the world, the murder or deportation of almost 2 million Armenians by the Turks.

What happened 50 years ago was part of a plan to obliterate the Armenian people from the face of the earth. Clearly, the Turks were guilty of the most heinous of crimes, genocide, the attempted murder of a whole people.

It is easy to blame only the Turks for this terrible crime. But in a larger sense all the people of the world can share in the guilt for the awful happenings which occurred in this ancient land, for the world treated this monstrous crime with an attitude of almost complete disinterest.

In the Bible we read of the certain man who rode down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among robbers and after being robbed and beaten, lay in a ditch while two priests passed him by despite his obvious need for aid. Fifty years ago, the so-called civilized world behaved toward the Armenian people as those two priests did toward the man who had been robbed and beaten.

In that same Biblical story, a certain man out of Samaria, that most despised of lands, came to the aid of the victim after the two lordly religious leaders had ignored his plight.

So many years have passed since those terrible days that there is very little that we can do to right the wrongs that were committed, other than to utter a silent prayer that one day the Armenian people shall come into their rightful inheritance. We can, however, resolve to always emulate the way of the good Samaritan.

There are very few Armenian families who were not personally touched by the great massacre. It has left a scar that time will never wipe out. To the descendents and relatives of the victims we who did so little in their time of need can only say mea culpa.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this year one of the most cold-blooded and savage attempts to eradicate a people from the face of the earth took place: the massacre of hundreds of thousands of helpless Armenians by the troops of the Ottoman Turkish Empire. Seeking only their freedom from the tyranny of the Sultan, the Armenians were subjected to a campaign so ruthless in its effects that, despite the intervening barbarities of Hitler Germany, the mind boggles at its severity and magnitude.

The Armenians established themselves in the Transcaucasus hundreds of years before the birth of Christ, and became an important part of the mosaic of peoples and cultures which made up the past as well as the present Middle East. It is only in recent years, as the spade of the archeologist digs deeper into the history of man, that we are beginning to learn of the contributions made by the Armenians. Yet, for centuries they were used by this power or that power in order to fulfill selfish ends. And, when their very existence as a people was threatened, no one offered assistance.

We should remember this event and this people. We should remember the massacres as a symbol of the futility of carnage as a solution to problems of race or creed, and we should remember this people as a symbol of the will of all peoples to live according to their own traditions, in freedom.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Armenian tragedy of 1915 was the saddest heritage of the First World War for the Armenian people. Even in their long and turbulent history, full of trials and tribulations and massacres, the tragedy of 1915 was quite unprecedented in its immensity and extent. It is difficult if not impossible to comprehend the nature of this tragedy, which, in less than 1 year, uprooted nearly all of the 2 million Armenians in Turkey. More than 1 million Armenians died while many hundreds of thousands were condemned to involuntary servitude in Turkish households and others were sold to Arabs and Kurds as slaves. As if by some unaccountable stroke of fate, the Armenians in Turkey were singled out and carried off from an area three times the size of the New England States, with most of them doomed to certain death. The monstrous machinery which the rulers of Turkey had devised for bringing on this wholesale deportation and massacre worked so effectively and ceaselessly, that even before the end of that year they were congratulating themselves for ridding Turkey of its Armenian population.

There are so many causes for this tragedy, so many alleged and actual reasons for Turkish cruelty toward the Armenians that it is not easy even now to list and catalog them in full. While I will try to enumerate and elaborate on some of these causes, it would be well to begin with some background information on Armenia and the Armenian people.

Armenia is the name of the country in the high, mountainous plateau in the eastern and northeastern part of Asia Minor, with an area of about 100,000 square miles. This area has been the homeland of the Armenian people for at least 2,500 years, and perhaps for a much longer period. Today more than four-fifths of this area form part of Turkey. Only a small portion in the northeasternmost part, about 11,000 square miles, constitutes the Soviet Socialistic Republic of Armenia—an integral part of the Soviet Union. The most characteristic feature of the land is its high elevation, most of it ranging well over 3,000 feet above sea level, and some reaching up to and above 6,000 feet. Armenia is a rugged and rough country, with a rather temperate climate, quite cold in winter and severely hot in dry summers. Only part of the country is productive agricultural land, but its fertile valleys and plains have produced abundant food under normal peaceful conditions for its hardy inhabitants. From most ancient days the country has been known as being rich in mineral and metallic natural resources, though to this day it has not been properly and adequately explored or surveyed.

The Armenian people have given their name to this land and have lived there. During the 9th–6th centuries before our era, part of the country was known by another name, Urartu. Centuries earlier the country was inhabited—in part, at least—by a people called Hurrians, who ruled over it during the 15th–13th centuries before our era. The coming of the Armenian people into the area and their origin is not quite clear. The generally accepted view has been that they came from Thrace sometime during the Greek migration to Asia Minor in the 11th century B.C., and then gradually moved to the Armenian tableland. More recently the prevalent view is that not all of the ancestors came from Thrace, but that many were of native stock, and the intermixture of these two groups gave rise to the Armenian people. Be that as it may, the Armenians lived in this land known by their name for more than 2,500 years, until their almost total elimination from that part of Armenian territory which is part of today's Turkey.

The long and turbulent history of the Armenian people has been sad and tragic. Throughout their history the Armenians have enjoyed peace and tranquillity in their homeland for only brief periods. Their homeland has been the bridge as well as the battleground of invading and conquering hordes from the east. Because of their geographic location, the Armenians have suffered in the course of wars between Rome and Persia, between the Greeks and the Arabs, between the Greeks and the Turks, and finally between the Persians and the Turks. Innumerable times their homeland has been partitioned between Rome and Persia, and between the Turks and Persians.

From the 7th to the 10th century Armenia was under the suzerainty of the Arabs. But by the mid-11th century Seljuk Turks overran the country. For several centuries the Armenian people were subjected to the oppressive rule of these Seljuk overlords. Then early in the 16th century nearly all Armenia was conquered by the Ottoman Turks, and from that time on, for four centuries, most of the Armenians lived under Ottoman sultans.

During their subjection to Ottoman Turks the Armenians struggled to maintain their national consciousness by keeping alive their national church and their language. Whenever they were oppressed by the Turks and whenever they felt the weight of the Ottoman yoke unbearable, they inevitably dreamed of the day when they could be free in their homeland, free from alien rulers. These

aspirations were supported by their friends and sympathizers in the West. Late in the 19th century many Armenians felt that with the aid of European governments, they could obtain a measure of the autonomy to which they felt they were entitled. At the same time the Turkish Government, never admitting the validity of Armenian claims to equality and justice under the Turks, persecuted them for alleged conspiracy. Thus a very tense situation had developed by the turn of the century. The more the Armenian people pressed for some equality, the more the Turks resisted these Armenian claims. Numerous times the Turks resorted to mass murders and massacres, thereby hoping to discourage the Armenians from putting forth any claim for justice and equality. But such inhuman measures did not discourage the Armenians.

Massacres convinced the Armenian people that unless they could find a way of improving their unbearable lot, they were doomed to extinction as a distinct national community. And since they themselves could not bring about a change for the better, and since the Turkish Government was unwilling to do anything for them, they felt that the only way was to enlist the aid and assistance of European governments. As they made this move in desperation, they were overly optimistic. They felt that since these European governments had helped other Christian subjects of the Turks to attain autonomy and independence, these same governments would also aid them in their struggle. Of course we know today that this was a grave miscalculation on their part. For a number of reasons, these governments, though sympathetic with the Armenian cause, could not and would not aid the Armenians. And during World War I, when none of them could come to their aid, they were at the mercy of angry Turks.

During the decades preceding that war, when Armenian leaders were quite active in enlisting European sympathy for their cause, the Turks became suspicious of these moves. They felt that if European governments became too involved in Armenian affairs, they would use that as an excuse to interfere in Turkey's internal affairs. And the more these European governments showed some concern over the lot of the Armenian people, the more suspicious became the Turks. It seems that then the Turkish Government had its own plan for getting rid of its Armenian population at the first opportune moment, when none of the European friends of the Armenian people could come to their aid.

The War of 1914–18 offered them the opportunity. At the time, Britain, France, and Russia were stanch supporters of the Armenian cause; but, as all these governments were involved in the war against the Turks, they could not restrain the Turks in their inhuman excesses. In less than a year these callous and clumsy, but shrewd and wily Turks, succeeded in carrying out their design of ridding Turkey of its Armenian population through deportation, massacres, and slow death by famine and misery.

Today, 50 years after that tragic event, there are hardly any Armenians left in the historic Armenia that is part of the Turkish Republic, and only about 75,000 Armenians in certain Turkish cities remain of the once wealthy and prosperous Armenian community of about 2 million souls. Some fortunate ones who had survived this tragedy have since joined hands with their compatriots in the Russian-held portion of Armenia and have constituted their own Soviet Socialist Republic. On the 50th anniversary observance of this wanton genocide we do homage to the memory of its victims and wish peace and tranquillity to those living in a corner of their historic Armenia.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, World War I caused misery and misfortune to many peoples, some being innocent victims of that war, but none suffered such irreparable losses as did the Armenians in Turkey.

Early in the war the Turkish Government publicized spurious charges that certain Armenian elements were fomenting uprisings and revolutions in the country, and on the basis of such unproved charges the authorities proceeded to eliminate all of the 2 million Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. Their plan was to get rid of the Armenians through deportation, famine, and wholesale massacres.

This hideous plan, carefully concealed until Turkey's entry into the war, was carried out in the course of 1915. Nearly all Armenians were uprooted from their homes, and many hundreds of thousands were massacred during the first few days of this forced deportation, while other hundreds of thousands were starved to death. Some saved their lives by escaping to nearby lands, and others were sold to Arabs, Kurds, and Turks as slaves.

In less than a year, this large, prosperous and industrious Armenian community in Turkey was no more. It was wiped out in the first case of genocide in modern history.

It is fitting for us today to honor the memory of the Armenian people who sought only to live peacefully in their ancient homeland. And in remembering the sufferings of the Armenian people we serve the cause of humanity by reaffirming this Nation's dedication to the ideals of liberty and justice for every individual.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] for offering me the opportunity to join with him and many of our colleagues in this House in the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenian people.

America properly recognizes this occasion because of our belief in humanity and because of the help the Armenian people gave the Allied war effort in World War I.

For decades and even for centuries the Armenian people in Turkey were known as the most enterprising and industrious racial element in the country. But soon after the First World War this people became known as the massacred Armenians and the starved Armenians. At the time no adjectives could describe these unfortunate souls more correctly, for in the year 1915 about half of Turkey's 2 million Armenians were massacred, and the survivors of this ghastly holocaust were starving. There is no denying of these horrors and terrors, this man-made hell on earth to which the blameless and defenseless Armenians were relegated.

No other event in the whole First World War was so shocking as this inhumanity of Ottoman authorities toward their Armenian subjects. They meant to annihilate through wholesale massacres, famine, and unthinkable tortures, all Armenians in Turkey, irrespective of age and sex. In this fiendish task they almost succeeded. Before the end of 1915 nearly all Armenians were uprooted from their homes, and not one Armenian was to be found, except in slavery, in the land which was their ancient homeland for thousands of years.

That event of 50 years ago, Mr. Speaker, is the national tragedy of the Armenian people. They are observing its sad anniversary everywhere, and I am glad to join them in paying tribute to the memory of the 1 million Armenians who were victims of Turkey's act of genocide in 1915.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago one of the most monstrous crimes ever perpetuated against a nearly defenseless people took place—the Armenian massacres. Although they have since been surpassed in fury by the actions of the Nazi Germans against the Jews shortly over two decades ago, this is no reason why they should be forgotten.

In the years before World War I, the Ottoman Empire, the last of the great multinational empires of the East, exercised dominion over literally scores of different peoples, races and religions. Decrepit and incompetent, it was called "the sick man of Europe." During its last years, many of the peoples within its borders sought to regain their freedom, and agitated for reforms. Among these were the Armenians, a people with a history and culture extending back into the millennia before Christ.

The advent of World War I and the preoccupations of the other powers unfortunately gave the Empire its opportunity to extract revenge. Beginning in the spring of 1915, it undertook a barbarous campaign designed to eliminate once and for all the imagined threat which the Armenians presented. Hundreds of thousands of innocents were slaughtered, and nearly all the remainder driven into exile.

It is worth recalling these events today as a reminder of the barbarity of man at his worst. At the same time, however, it is a more meaningful reminder that it is impossible to eradicate brave men anywhere. I therefore pay tribute to the Armenian people and their past tribulations, and wish them nothing but the best in the future.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the legacy of the First World War still weighs heavily upon all peoples involved in that international conflict, for all of them suffered by it. In some cases, however, certain minority groups suffered more during the war, and lost infinitely more

than many actual participants in the war. The fate of the Armenian people in Turkey is a sad and tragic instance. There these unhappy people suffered the loss of all their worldly possessions, and their losses in human lives totaled more than 1 million people. And even more tragic is the fact that this loss was caused by carefully planned and effectively executed wholesale massacres by the Turkish Government.

For centuries the Armenian people had led a precarious existence as subjects of Ottoman sultans. They suffered under severe discriminations and disabilities. When they were attacked and manhandled by the Kurds, and when their homes were ravaged by unruly tribes, the Government failed to afford them protection; nor did it allow the Armenians to bear and possess arms in self-defense. Despite the fact that economically they were more prosperous than the indolent Turks and carefree Kurds, the Armenians were considered as second-class citizens by the Government and treated accordingly.

Toward the end of the 19th century, as other Christian subjects of Turkey regained their freedom with the aid of European governments, Armenians hoped that these governments would also help them to improve their unbearable lot. They did not expect just and fair treatment to be offered by the Turkish Government, but they felt that certain European governments could induce the Turks to be just toward them. Actually these governments did influence the Turkish Government to issue promises and make pledges with a view to introducing reforms in the Armenian provinces. All this seemed promising, and the Armenians were encouraged to look forward to the betterment of their unenviable lot. In reality, however, it turned out that the Turks resented deeply this European interference in their purely internal affairs. They thought that the Armenian leaders were responsible for Europe's intervention, and therefore they decided to teach the Armenians a lesson. They resolved to eliminate the Armenian element in the country, and thus once and for all put an end to the Armenian problem. World War I presented the Turks with the best possible opportunity to carry out their hideous designs with impunity.

At the beginning of the war there were about 2 million Armenians in Turkey. Early in 1915 nearly all of them were uprooted from their homes on the baseless pretext that they were plotting against the Government, and deported to distant Mesopotamian and Syrian Deserts. There, some were massacred with a brutality and cruelty rare in the annals of human history, while others were condemned to slow death by starvation. In this manmade holocaust, the first case of planned genocide in modern history, more than 1 million Armenians lost their lives in the course of a single year. Several hundred thousand Armenians were lucky enough to escape to neighboring countries, while a larger number of women and children were enslaved in Turkish, Kurdish, and Arab homes. In short, in 1 year during the First World War, the entire Armenian community in Turkey, consisting of the sinews and brains of Turkey's economic, industrial, and commercial life, was wiped out through wholesale massacres, deportation, and enslavement. That was the legacy of World War I to the Armenians who by sheer chance and good luck survived their national tragedy.

It is unfortunate and paradoxical that these people, who were the first to adopt the Christian faith as their state religion in the third century and who stoutly defended Christianity against paganism and Mohammedanism for more than 1,500 years, often at a terrific cost in human lives, could not obtain effective aid from their European friends. This nation of a few millions, though seldom allowed to enjoy tranquillity in their historic homeland, had rendered signal services to Europe's crusades in the Holy Land. And finally, this unhappy and unfortunate people, many of whom had enrolled abroad in the fighting forces of the Allied and associated Powers during World War I and fought gallantly in defense of democracy and freedom, were left to their unhappy fate at the end of the war.

On the 50th anniversary of this national tragedy we pay tribute to the Armenian victims of Turkish genocide and wish peace and tranquillity to the surviving Armenian people.

The great sacrifices of the Armenian people and their undying devotion to the cause of freedom will be spread upon the pages of history for all future generations. The Armenian fight for good government and their fight for human rights should not be forgotten. I am happy to be able to participate in paying tribute to these brave people and hope that their suffering for the cause of freedom and justice shall not have been in vain.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, April 24, 1915, a turbulent day forcasting many days of national and individual pain and sorrow, is a scarred, bloody marker in the chronicle of human suffering.

The security of peace and freedom as we in America enjoy it is almost totally unknown in the small nation of Armenia. This country has geographically and historically been the bridge and battleground of foreign forces. The strife erupting between Rome and Persia, between Byzantium and the Arabs, the Arabs and the Turks, exploded on Armenian soil slashing the ugly knives of hate and greed through Armenia's soul. Many alien masters have tried to impose their language and religion on these captives of history but the strong determination of the Armenians resisted and remained loyal to their consciences and culture.

For 400 years the Turkish Empire ruled over the Armenians. During this period the Armenians forecasted, faithfully fought, and waited for the day they could have freedom in their own homeland. Finally in the aging 19th century, the Armenians felt their endless plight could be realized with the aid of European governments. Simultaneously the Turkish Government, waiting for an opportunity to take severe action against their captives, persecuted the Armenians for alleged conspiracy and for fomenting disturbances.

This persecution formulated one of the most vile, inhuman chapters of ancient and modern books. On April 24, 1915, the Turks commenced vast massacres and at the end of that year, 1 million Armenians had been murdered at the hands of these dictators. The deadly hand of vengeance passed over every Armenian community smearing the land with blood, filling the Armenians with sorrow and desperation—slaughters carried out by a prearranged plan through monstrous machinery. A decree by the Turks had declared that all Armenians be disarmed. Armenian men had been drafted into an army. A public crier would announce to a town that all men were to report to duty—a rendezvous with death on a desolate road. Wives of these victims were killed or sold into slavery as were their children.

On April 24 we paid a solemn tribute to the thousands of Armenians who fifty years ago lost their lives for the sake of individual and national freedom—for the right of life with all its responsibilities and freedoms.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] today in a tribute to the terrible sacrifice of a brave people.

The road to eventual universal freedom is bathed in the blood of patriots, to paraphrase Thomas Jefferson. In this long and weary journey toward liberty for mankind, the grandeur of the spirit of the Armenian people rises like a beacon in the dark night of the soul of the oppressed.

If we, as Americans in a free society, enjoy the privileges of liberty today, we owe a debt of gratitude to the Armenian people. They fought by our side in World War I; they resisted aggression on their own soil; they were overwhelmed by the numbers of those who opposed them, but the spirit they gave to the battle endures.

We pause, today, to remind ourselves of the legacy we have been given. We look back upon it. We profit from it.

And the spirit of all men is enlarged and ennobled because of it.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, the Armenian people who were martyred 50 years ago through the Turkish genocide are almost forgotten in the moments of history so I take this opportunity to recall the courage of these courageous victims.

The Armenian nation was a great part of the Allied forces which gained victory against greed and tyranny in World War I and its contribution was overwhelming for so small a country.

In my hometown of Racine, Wis., I treasure my genuine friendships with surviving and following generations of these Armenian martyrs. They are wonderful Americans who share in the responsibilities of community life and contribute greatly to intellectual wealth of our Nation. I humbly pay respect to the memory of their martyred forebears.

My esteemed colleague from Wisconsin, Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, eloquently traced this story of human sacrifice and devotion to the cause of

freedom on April 25 when he addressed the Armenian community at Memorial Hall in Racine to commemorate the 50th anniversary of this horrible mass murder of innocent human beings.

The full text of Congressman ZABLOCKI's commemorative address, "Genocide and the Future of Man," follows:

GENOCIDE AND THE FUTURE OF MAN

(Speech of Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, at Armenian martyrs 50th observance, Sunday, Apr. 25, 1965)

At the outset I want to express my deep appreciation at having been asked to speak at this 50th observance of the Armenian martyrs. I am indebted to your committee and to Mr. Jeknavorian for having asked me to participate in today's program.

My friends, we truly live in a marvelous age.

Only 7 years ago the Soviet Union launched its first sputnik into space. Today men are sent into space and tomorrow men will land on the moon, to explore that planet as once Columbus explored the Western Hemisphere.

There are wonders, too, of modern medicine. Diseases which had been the scourge of men for centuries have been virtually wiped out in the space of a few years.

Smallpox, typhus, bubonic plague, polio, typhoid, cholera—all these diseases have yielded before the mind and technology of modern man.

There also have been tremendous advances in feeding people, in housing them, in providing clothing for their bodies.

Through modern fertilizers and irrigation techniques the deserts have been made to bloom and former wastelands have produced abundance beyond man's wildest hopes.

New building materials have revolutionized man's search for proper housing for himself and his family.

New synthetic fibers have brought more versatile and less expensive clothing.

We need only look around us to see the marvels which have been brought to us by modern science and technology.

Yet for all these signs of progress, for all these indications that man is advancing, we still have not learned to cope with the basic problem of man's inhumanity to man.

As knowledge has grown more vast, wars have grown more terrible. With new methods of preserving and improving life have come novel ways of killing and destroying.

Today at least five nations have developed bombs capable of destroying whole cities—millions of people—in a single blast. We have seen the destruction which can be wrought by an atomic bomb—at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. We have seen the awesome power of the H-bomb at Bikini Atoll.

Modern science also has produced other modern weapons of awesome destruction. I am thinking of napalm, a jellied petroleum-base explosive that envelopes its victims in flames and cremates them alive.

There is nerve gas—developed by the Germans during World War II—which is invisible, odorless, and tasteless. Yet this gas can kill a man as quickly as a bullet to the brain.

It was scientific advances which put into the hands of the Nazis power to carry out extermination of Jews and Slavs in numbers that even today stagger the imagination.

Six million Jews in Europe went to the gas chambers. In addition more millions of Poles, Czechs, and other Slavic peoples were killed by Hitler's madness.

Without the specially developed gases, this slaughter would have been impossible. Without the specially designed ovens, the mass killings would have been thwarted.

Science—a tool of man's peaceful progress—became in the hands of the Nazis an instrument of that most heinous of crimes: genocide.

Genocide: The use of deliberate measures to exterminate a racial, political, or cultural group. Genocide: A crime against mankind that stands condemned by all organized religions, by history, and, in our own time, by special convention of the United Nations. Genocide: A sin that cries to God for vengeance.

Terrible though it is, genocide is an age-old sin of man. Born of narrow loyalties, nurtured in dark hatred and practiced with unrivaled savagery, genocide—instances of genocide—blacken the pages of world history.

We call to mind the great Greek epic of Homer—the Iliad. It is the story of the war between the Greeks and the Trojans. The conflict ended with the complete destruction of the Trojan people and their culture.

History also tells us of the titanic struggle between Rome and Carthage in the ancient world. When the Roman armies overcame the Carthaginians after years of battle, men, women, and children were put to the sword.

The city of Carthage itself was leveled—not one stone left upon a stone. And when that was finished the Romans salted the earth round about so that no living thing would grow there again for centuries.

It was with similar savage deeds that later Romans attempted to crush Christianity. We all know the stories of men, women, and children fed to lions simply because of their belief in God. We revere those who lost their lives because of their faith and honor them as saints and martyrs.

Today we honor another group of martyrs—Christian Armenians who became victims of mass persecution less than three generations ago.

It was on April 24, 1915, that the Government of Turkey, led by ruthless villians, took the first step in a systematic plan to exterminate the Armenian people.

On that day over 100 Armenian intellectuals were arrested in Constantinople. These victims were transported into the interior of Turkey and coldly murdered.

It was the first step in an attempt to wipe out the Armenian nation, the oppressed ancient inhabitants of Asia Minor and the Caucasus.

The events of those days and nights of horror are, I am sure, known much better to you than ever they could be recounted by me—even if a lifetime of study were devoted to the subject.

One can read of the massacre of the Armenian men, of the women being attacked, raped, and murdered, of children put to the sword or sold into slavery.

It is not an exaggeration that 1 million Armenians died during those terrible days.

One can comprehend all those facts and yet not appreciate their import as you do. Many of you lost parents, brothers, aunts, uncles, cousins, friends in the slaughter. Your lives have been intimately touched by this senseless outrage.

You know full well the horror of genocide.

It is a lesson that the world should learn well. Despite the terrible example of genocide practiced against the Armenians in World War I and the Jews in World War II, we still see attempts by races—peoples—to annihilate others.

Last year, for example, the newspapers were full of the story of the fierce tribal war between the Balubas and the Watusis. The rivers of Africa ran red in the slaughter of the tall Watusi tribesmen by the much smaller, but more numerous Balubas.

Less violent, but no less significant has been the effort by the Soviet Union to stifle its Jewish minority. The Jews are deprived by law from the basic cultural rights accorded to other nationalities.

The present Kremlin rulers are blaming the Jewish population of the U.S.S.R. and making them scapegoats for the regime's unsound economic policies. Jews have been singled out for persecution for so-called "economic" crimes, and have been denied the right to practice their religion.

We need only look to Communist Rumania for another example of a people systematically persecuting other people. For years the Hungarian minority living in Transylvania, a province of Rumania, have suffered discrimination, persecution and even death—simply because of their nationality.

Another prime example of genocide can be seen in the treatment of the people of Tibet by the Red Chinese. China has imposed a harsh rule on that once sovereign country and has forced the Tibetan ruler and spiritual chief—the Dalai Lama—to flee for his life.

Although few reports reach the West from those remote regions, it is evident that the Chinese have murdered thousands of persons in an attempt to stamp out any opposition to its absolute rule. The culture and religion of Tibet—among the oldest in the world—have all but been extinguished.

These examples help us to realize that genocide still remains a threat. Nor does it suffice simply to point the accusing finger at the Communist countries or at half-savage African tribesmen.

Here in our own country we have those who would—if given a chance—crush another minority.

There are Americans whose anti-Semitic bias is so strong that they would reinstitute the horrors of Hitler.

There are those in this great land of ours, who, if given a chance, would exterminate those of differing religious beliefs.

Some who harbor these feelings of hatred do not hesitate to state their objectives. There is a small group of fanatics and misfits which calls itself the American Nazi Party.

The leaders of this group have called on many occasions for open warfare against Jews and Negroes. There are other groups—perhaps less extreme than the American Nazi Party—which have similar aims.

It is a credit to the American people that those who support violent racist views are a small minority—most of them on the lunatic fringe.

But at the same time it would be foolish to state flatly that "it can't happen here"—to believe that the genocide practiced against Armenians, against Jews, against Christians, couldn't possibly happen in the United States.

It could happen here if we as Americans fail to hold fast to the ideals upon which this Nation was founded and prospered.

It could happen here if we cease to be on guard against every form of bigotry and prejudice.

It could happen here if we forget that every time the rights of another man are curtailed, we all are that much less free.

When an American citizen is denied the right to vote because he is a Negro, the democratic franchise of us all is less secure.

When a Jew is denied a job because of religion, our own right to work and support our families is abridged.

When a man is treated badly because he has an accent to his speech, or slanted eyes, or distinct facial characteristics or unique customs—then we are all less secure in the enjoyment of our liberties.

It is in this sense, then, that we must struggle to fulfill the promise of America. The Great Society, as described by President Johnson, is a striving, a constant effort to bring the fruits of democracy and justice to all our citizens.

In this effort, you as Americans of Armenian descent can play a special role. You and your ancestors have struggled for centuries for freedom and self-determination. You know the value of liberty and have been willing to pay the cost of preserving it.

Thus, you are in an excellent position to assist other peoples, other minority groups,

as they strive for freedom and equality within our American system.

But your role extends beyond just the shores of the United States. The Armenian heritage contains a lesson for all mankind.

It exposes the folly of narrow nationalistic concerns which breed hatred and violence.

The Armenian experience emphasizes the horror which results when one race, one nation, sets out to destroy another.

It points up the fact that genocide must be universally condemned as abhorrent to humanity and to the author of all life.

In our nuclear age—when a single act of genocide could encompass whole continents—the future of mankind may well depend on how well individual human beings learn the lesson taught by the death of the Armenian Martyrs.

The task, therefore, is an awesome one. Yet the reward is high. For if our efforts—and those of men of good will everywhere—come to fruition, our children or our children's children may see a blessed time on earth, characterized by one outstanding fact:

That man is humane to man.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Armenians are one of the oldest peoples in human history, and today they are one of the few surviving nations of the ancient world. Their national history precedes our Christian era by many centuries. In their mountainous homeland in eastern Asia Minor they had constituted their own state and were content with their primitive, self-contained lot. But Armenia being placed across the path of invaders and conquerors, it was invaded and overrun by numerous Asiatic hordes including the Mongols, Tartar, Seljuk Turks, and finally Ottoman Turks, and the Armenian people lived for centuries under the oppressive alien rulers in their homeland.

While thus overwhelmed by these powerful hordes, and held down by brute force for centuries, the Armenians managed to maintain their distinct national entity, their own language, and above all their Christian faith. They did this even under most adverse circumstances, under the Ottoman Turks. Toward the end of the 19th century, however, they were unduly oppressed by both the government of Turkey and also by the unruly and wild Kurds. The Armenian leaders complained to the authorities and when the government failed to do anything for the improvement of conditions in the Armenian provinces of Turkey, then they appealed to European governments for some aid. These governments, which had acted as trustees of oppressed Christian subjects of Turkey, manifested serious concern with the fate of the Armenians, and they induced the Turks to protect the Armenians against the Kurds. The Turks reluctantly promised to do this but considered it European interference in their internal affairs. They felt that European intervention was caused by the presence of Armenians in Turkey. They then thought of eliminating the Armenian element in Turkey, through wholesale massacres if necessary.

Their evil and inhuman intentions were revealed in 1915, when in the course of less than 1 year, nearly all of the 2 million Armenians in Turkey, who had for centuries constituted the most industrious, energetic, peaceful, loyal, and productive element in the Ottoman Empire, were uprooted of their homes and deported to desolate and inhospitable deserts in Mesopotamia and northern Syria. Meanwhile more than 1 million of these were massacred and lost their lives through famine and otherwise. Only a fraction of the total number succeeded to save their lives by escaping to neighboring countries, while hundreds of thousands of others were sold into slavery by Arabs, Kurds, and Turks.

That is the sad and dismal story of the Armenian people in Turkey. It is indeed tragic that these people, who were among the earliest Christians and were the first to adopt Christian faith as their state religion, who had successfully held their own against all their conquerors and preserved their national entity, and through their enterprising activity had become a positive asset of the Ottoman Empire, were decimated and exterminated under circumstances of inhuman cruelty during the First World War. Fortunately for them, and also for us here, the many survivors of that holocaust have migrated to this hospitable Republic, and in a relatively short time, they have already made considerable contribution to our democratic way of life. They have made their marks in industry, in the arts and sciences, in commerce and trade, and in the fine arts and literature. Over all and above all else, they have become faithful, law-abiding, industrious, patriotic, and loyal citizens of their adopted country. On the observance of the 50th anniversary of their national tragedy in Turkey, we join them and pay tribute to the memory of Armenian victims of Turkish massacres in 1915.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the Armenian people is characterized by misery and misfortune. Subjected to alien conquerors in their homeland, at times they were not even allowed to enjoy peace and tranquillity in their servitude. Such was their unenviable lot under Ottoman sultans for more than 400 years. There in their historic homeland in eastern Asia Minor, surrounded by wild tribes of different faiths, and held down by inefficient but oppressive government, most of them managed to survive. About 1 million Armenians were thus isolated from the West, and another 1 million were scattered in other parts of Turkey, constituting the most enterprising and industrious element in the old Ottoman Empire. For years they formed the commercial and industrial sinews of Turkey. Unfortunately their usefulness and even their indispensability to the country did not make the Armenians full-fledged citizens of Turkey. They were subjected to discrimination and a series of disabilities which made them barely second-class citizens. Since the Armenians were not members of the dominant race and did not accept the religion of the Turks, they were considered inferior in every respect. Armenians, on their part, had done everything to improve their lot, but all their efforts proved of no avail. They were the constant and ready prey of the plundering and robbing Kurds and corrupt government officials. Neither their property nor their very lives were safe under the prevailing conditions. And the most discouraging aspect of it all was that the Government did nothing about this abominable situation.

Armenians in desperation had appealed to the governments of Europe for help. They felt that since the Turkish Government would do nothing for them, they hoped and prayed for good words and deeds on the part of certain European governments. Fortunately, for the time being, these governments took up the case of the Armenians and urged the Turkish authorities to make reforms that would help the situation. The Turks promised to do something about it, but they felt that such a promise was extorted from them at the instigation of Armenian leaders. They were intensely angry, and they did not forget this. They seemed determined to teach the Armenians a lesson, and in the course of the First World War that lesson was administered to Armenians indiscriminately, regardless of age and sex, in the form of wholesale massacres, forced deportation, and famine.

This murderous machinery of genocide was put into effect in 1915. First all Armenian community leaders were arrested, imprisoned, and then murdered. Simultaneously Armenians serving in Turkey's armed forces were separated from their fighting units, disarmed and removed under heavy guards to the rear of fighting fronts, and then massacred by their Turkish comrades-in-arms. Then all able-bodied males in Armenian communities, ranging from 12 to 60 years old, were conscripted into "labor battalions," and soon these too were massacred. That left the women, the children, and the aged. These were removed from their homes, some were massacred in a few days, and others were deported to distant Mesopotamian and Syrian deserts, where they suffered slow death through starvation. Others were enslaved as servants and household help in Turkish, Kurdish, and Arab homes. In less than 1 year, in 1915, nearly 2 million Armenians in Turkey disappeard, more than 1 million having lost their lives in this first planned genocide in modern history. Committed decades before the savage onslaught of Hitler against the Jews, this ghastly deed cannot be minimized or condoned by the civilized world. Fifty years after their national tragedy, Armenians everywhere observe this sad anniversary, and I personally join them in paying tribute to the memory of 1 million Armenian victims of this genocide.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, April 24 marked the 50th anniversary of the tragic losses of the Armenian people under the Ottoman Empire. Over 2 million gallant Armenians lost not only their worldly possessions, but more than half died under circumstances of brutality and cruelty.

Arnold Toynbee has written in his definitive work, "Treatment of the Armenians:"

The exact quantitative scale of the crime remains uncertain, but there is no uncertainty as to the responsibility for its preparation. The guilt must therefore fall upon the officials of the Ottoman government, but it will not weigh equally upon all members of the official hierarchy. The behavior

of the gendarmerie, for example, was utterly atrocious; the subordinates were demoralized by the power for evil that was placed in their hands.

There is no earthly power that can approach the bar of public morality with clean hands, unstained by the blood of human life. But if we are still living in a world which has not yet learned to love rather than hate, our remembrance of this tragic occurrence from the past rekindles hope for the future. By paying tribute to the brave Armenian people on this occasion, we dramatize mankind's effort, no matter how feebly, to arouse an awakened conscience to search harder for a better way to live, a more decent way to settle our differences.

Time, education, and spiritual strength remain our best weapons in this eternal struggle against man's inhumanity to man.

Thanks to one of my colleagues, the distinguished Representative from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] made it possible for me to meet His Grace, Archbishop Hrant Kaichadourian, prelate of Armenians of North America. This privilege brought a delightful sense of the oneness of the human family, emphasizing that the suffering of one group is indeed part of the life of all others.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, many great tragedies live not only in the history books, but in the minds and memories of a great people. The 50th anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenian population still brings a feeling of horror to the American Nation. It is not simple to grasp the dimensions of this tragedy—the fact, for instance, that more was contributed by Armenians to the Allied cause in terms of World War I casualties than by any other single Allied state, large or small, or the fact that it is as if all Armenians living in an area equal in size to the area of the New England States were hunted out, and carried off by some unaccountable affliction.

The Armenians were not protagonists in the war—they bore none of the guilt for its outbreak. But 2 million lived in Turkey, in that empire which had become known by the 20th century as the sick man of Europe, and by the end of 1915, only a handful was left, after a purge that accounted for more than 1 million Armenian lives. The real cause seemed to have been the determination of Turkey to do away with European intervention in behalf of the suffering Armenians.

The devotion of these people to their way of life and their perseverance in the face of oppression and tyranny deserves to be remembered.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, on April 24, 1915, marked the beginning of the Turkish massacres of the Armenians. On that day the Government of the Turkish Empire arrested over 100 Armenian intellectuals and in a short time executed them. Within the year over 1 million Armenians were killed and another 1 million were driven from their homeland. Because of their Christianity the Armenians were the object of Turkish hatred. By 1915 international politics further compromised the Armenians in the eyes of the Turks. The Turkish Government, then in the midst of World War I on the side of the Germans, found itself fighting a losing war against the French and the English. The longstanding religious hatred, plus the common Christianity of the Armenians and the Western European allies made the Armenians a natural scapegoat for the proud Turks. Geographically isolated, the Armenians were an easy prey.

In 1915, the church was the principal institution of the Armenian people. Scarcely 10 percent of the Armenian clergymen survived the atrocities. Only one prelate was spared, the others were brutally murdered. Armenian Catholic priests and nuns joined their Armenian Apostolic brethren in death. A frightful toll was exacted from the Armenian Protestant community. According to careful studies, the Turks seized 2,050 Armenian churches and 203 Armenian monasteries during the genocide. Many churches were made into armories or torn down ritualistically.

Mr. Speaker, the spiritual leaders of the Armenian church have designated April as a month of mourning for the massacred Armenians. Pope Paul sung a solemn pontifical mass during the recent session of the Ecumenical Council in Rome for the Armenian martyrs. The Honorable John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, has issued a proclamation designating April 24 through May 31, 1965, as a period of mourning for these martyrs. On Saturday last, April 24, the 50th anniversary of the beginning of the Armenian massacres, special commemorative services were conducted throughout the United States for the million Armenians lost in 1915. I had the privilege of participating in one of these observances sponsored by St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church of Indian Orchard, Mass., held at the Sheraton Motor Inn in Springfield. I am sure that this was one of the most moving and impressive events held throughout the country to mark the 50th anniversary of the Armenian massacres. It was certainly one of the finest and most impressive commemorative events that I have ever attended. The address delivered by the Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, D.D., bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield, was particularly appropriate. The address in the Armenian language by the Very Reverend Khachadour Guiragossian, pastor of the St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church, was moving and impressive.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD a newspaper story from the Springfield Sunday Republican of April 25, containing excerpts of Bishop Weldon's fine speech, a copy of the excerpts of the Armenian language speech of Very Rev. Guiragossian, a copy of my address of tribute on this very significant occasion, and a copy of the program for the St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church commemorative dinner:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Sunday Republican, Apr. 25, 1965]

MASSACRE ANNIVERSARY OBSERVED BY ARMENIANS

Observance of the 50th anniversary of the 1915 massacre of some 1,500,000 Armenians by the Turkish Government was highlighted by an address delivered by Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield, at a commemorative dinner program Saturday night at the Sheraton Motor Inn.

TWO HUNDRED ATTEND

More than 200 Greater Springfield residents of Armenian descent remembered that tragic day of April 24, 1915, and heard Bishop Weldon paraphrase that portion of Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address which states, "It's for us the living to dedicate ourselves for those who suffered and died, in order that they may not have died in vain."

Bishop Weldon, signifying Roman Catholic participation in the Armenians' anniversary observance of the slaughter, praised the Armenians here in America and abroad for remembering and keeping alive memories of that day 50 years ago. "Forgetfulness," he said, "breeds repetition."

He said that the Christian idea of brotherhood and love means we may even try to understand why the massacre happened and labor to prevent any repetition in the future.

TRUE TEST

The Springfield clergyman, drawing an analogy to the fact that a 50th anniversary traditionally means gold, said "The true test of gold is that it survives fire." "Armenians," he said, "have been tested by fire, and have survived."

"The fires of hatred ranging with all the atrocities done to the Armenian people," he continued, "have not destroyed the gold of the Armenian spirit."

The Very Rev. Khachadour Guiragossian, pastor of St. Gregory's Armenian Apostolic Church, speaking in Armenian, told of the history and background which led to the Turkish massacre of the Armenians, and said, "Fifty years have passed since that day and the Armenian people still live."

A WITNESS

He said he witnessed in Syria "thousands of starved women and children—unrecognizable, skeletonlike, and nearly naked. Of these Armenians," he continued, "many died before my eyes."

Father Guiragossian said it was the Armenian's faith in Christ that has given them the strength to endure, and concluded, "In this, the 50th year since the massacre, this must be our lesson—our martyrs died to teach us to live."

High masses commemorating April 24, 1915, will observe and remember that day in Armenian churches, locally, nationally, and abroad.

OTHER SPEAKERS

Tributes to the fallen Armenian martyrs were given in short addresses by Mayor Charles V. Ryan, Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND, and Carnig Piligian, chairman of the board of trustees of the St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church, sponsors of the evening's program.

Ryan spoke of the enormity of the 1915 tragedy, and reminded the guests that they have a responsibility in the revitalization and perpetuation of the Armenian people.

A SURVIVOR

Present at the commemorative dinner was Onnik Melikian, who has lived in Springfield since 1926 and who was one of the survivors of the massacre.

He told the Republican he was studying at the St. Nishan Mission, a monetary school in Central Armenia, at the time of the Turkish slaughter. In 1914, he recalled, Armenia's Turkish overloads began registering all Armenians in the Turkish Empire. He received word while at school of the impending tragedy, and left the mission to start resistance groups in the surrounding hills.

There were about 200 groups all together he said, engaging in guerrilla warfare, with between 20 and 25 persons per group.

One day in March 1915, Melikian said, before the sun came up, Turkish troops were dispatched to surround every home in the Turkish Empire in which Armenians lived. The soldiers took all Armenian males between the ages of 13 and 45, put them in jail, and questioned them for 30 days.

STABBED TO DEATH

On April 24, he recalled, the soldiers removed their prisoners at night by twos at bayonet point, and tied them all together in groups of eight. The Armenians, he said, were thrown into pits 100 at a time, and then stabbed to death.

After the males were disposed of the women, the children, and the older men were forced into the Syrian desert and left with no means of support.

Melikian said his closest call came when his band was beseiged for 18 days by Turkish troops at the site of an old Roman fort in Central Armenia. He lost more than half his group of 25 men, and he and the survivors escaped to the hills under the cover of darkness.

Official records show that more than 1,500,000 of his countrymen died at the hands of the Turks, but Melikian estimates the true figure, which he says only the Turkish Government knows, may run as high as 3 million.

Included in the 50th anniversary program Saturday night was a recitation by Mrs. Ardashus A. Aykanian and Mrs. Nishan H. Vartanian of an Armenian poem called The Pilgrimage by Avedis Aharonian, and the singing of two selections appropriate to the day by the Choir of St. Gregory's Armenian Apostolic Church.

Members of the Armenian Martyrs' Day Committee were: Arthur A. Aykanian, chairman; Aroxy Aykanian, Leon Charkoudian, Mrs. Popken J. Hachigian, Alice Margosian, Harry Setian, and Leo Vartanian.

EXCERPTS FROM THE ARMENIAN ADDRESS BY THE VERY REVEREND KHACHADOUR GUIRAGOSSIAN, PASTOR OF ST. GREGORY ARMENIAN APOSTOLIC CHURCH, DELIVERED AT THE COMMEMORATIVE DINNER ON THE 50TH OBSERVANCE OF ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY, SATURDAY, APRIL 24, AT THE SHERATON MOTOR INN

Today, April 24, for the Armenian people is a day dedicated to the memory of the 1 million martyrs. In Armenian the word "April" means "to live," but it was that month that the Turks chose to end the life of all Armenians. Fifty years have passed since that day and the Armenian people still live.

The Turkish Government was looking for the opportune moment to exterminate the Armenian people. This time came when the Allies were preoccupied with World War I. The Turkish Government took advantage of the isolated Armenians and at midnight April 24 arrested 100 intellectuals in the capital of Istanbul, deported them inland, then executed them. During the ensuing holy week began the deportation of Armenians from every village, from every town—black clouds hung over Armenians who were driven from their homes of 3,000 years to the barren desert land.

I witnessed with my own eyes in Syria, thousands of starved women and children—unrecognizable, skeletonlike, nearly naked Of these Armenians, noble Christians, many died before my eyes.

Between 1915 and 1918 Armenians took refuge in Syra. The Turks wanted to kill us all but they did not reach their objective. Evil never succeeds. For the Armenians that began to gather in Syria, aid came from America through the Near East relief. Orphanages and hospitals were set up. Armenians are eternally indebted to Americans for this aid.

Today 50 years have passed since those dark days and the Armenian population throughout the world has increased to at least that of 1915. Armenians have established themselves as good citizens in countries throughout the world.

In 1915 Turks made Armenia a burial ground. Armenians bore a cross on their shoulders; their faith in Christ gave them the strength to endure.

In this, the 50th year since the massacre, this must be our lesson—our martyrs died to teach us to live. Armenians all over the world are commemorating this day. We must have faith in Christ; faith in our future. Faith is a must to succeed and faith is tied to hope and love. Love of God, love of friends, neighbors—no matter of race, nationality. Love works miracles.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN EDWARD P. BOLAND

The long and turbulent history of the Armenian people has been sad and tragic. Throughout its uneven course the Armenians have seldom enjoyed peace and rest in their homeland for any length of time. Their homeland, had been the bridge, as well as the battleground, of invading and conquering forces, from the east and from the west, and because of that geographic fact they have suffered in the course of wars between Rome and Persia between Byzantium and the Arabs, between Byzantium and the Turks. Numerous times their country was partitioned between Rome and Persia.

Early in the fifth century, nearly the whole country became part of Persia, and every effort was made by Persian rulers to have Armenians renounce their Christian religion.

A bitter religious war was fought in 451, one in which the Armenians were the losers, but they still refused to yield to superior Persian power on matters of conscience. By clinging to their Christian faith, they claimed moral victory over Persian authorities.

Toward the middle of the seventh century Armenia was overrun and conquered by the Arabs—and for some 250 years, Armenians lived under the ruthless Arab governors appointed by caliphs of Damascus and Baghdad.

In the late ninth century, as the Arab rule weakened, Armenians asserted their freedom, regained a good measure of independence and then for about 200 years lived in freedom and glory in the northern part of the country. That period was the medieval Golden Age of Armenia.

By the middle of the 11th century, Asiatic invaders—Suljuk Turks—were harassing the Armenians on their eastern borders. In 1071, the last Armenian stronghold surrendered to these invaders. Large groups of Armenians fled the country—seeking refuge and eventual homes in other lands. Thus late in the 11th century began the Armenian diaspora, the dispersion of Armenians from their historic homeland. Despite this, the majority of the population refused to abandon their native land and remained there until their extermination in 1915.

During the next several centuries, Armenians in Armenia endured all the hardships caused and brutalities committed by their Asiatic conquerors. Certain Turkish tribes replaced others as rulers of the land. As time went on, the number of invading peoples increased while the number of Armenians inevitably decreased through emigration, forced conversion to Islam and also through wanton massacres. Early in the 16th century, most of the country and the majority of Armenians were brought under the rule of the Ottoman Sultans. This did not improve the lot of the Armenian people. The Armenians were fated to suffer under their new masters as they had suffered under others—and for 400 years they endured their unenviable lot.

They made the best of a very bad situation, and through it all more than a million of them managed to survive in their homeland until the outbreak of the First World War.

And then came their national tragedy. Then came the day that we commemorate this day. Martyr's day. This day, marked by Armenians the world over, retells the brutal massacres by the Turkish rulers in April of 1915. Fifty years usually notes a golden anniversary. But not this event.

This event and this day commemorate one of the most tragic pages in the history of mankind. Think of it. Over a million Armenians massacred. This barbarous, inhuman sacrifice of human life has been exceeded in the world's history only by the insane actions of Hitler against the Jews in World War II.

And so we gather this day so that the world will never forget what happened 50 years ago to a brave and resolute people.

Is this occasion and the many, many like it throughout the world, an exercise in futility and frustration? No. I think not. The world must pause and reflect and point with shame to the events that this martyr's day brings to mind. It must not be allowed to forget. For the placid acceptance of the Armenian tragedy of 1915 begets the danger of repetition.

So I come to join with you in this meaningful occasion. To congratulate you on keeping the memory of your national tragedy alive—to commend you for your magnificent adherence to the cause of Christianity—to compliment you for not forgetting.

I express the gratitude of this Government for the contributions you have made and are making to this Nation. Your culture, your attractiveness, your intelligence, your spirit, have spread the world over. This Nation has been the beneficiary of these attributes and the United States of America appreciates them.

PROGRAM

Invocation: The Reverend Emerson W. Smith, executive director, Council of Churches of Greater Springfield.

Dinner.

Message: Carnig Philigian, chairman, board of trustees, St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church.

Armenian recitation: Mrs. Ardashus A. Aykanian, Mrs. Nishan H. Vartanian.

Honored guests: The Honorable Charles V. Ryan, mayor of Springfield; the Honorable EDWARD P. BOLAND, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Armenian address: The Very Reverend Khachadour Guiragossian, St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church.

Choir: St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church.

Address: The Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the Springfield Diocese.

Hayr Mer.

Benediction: The Very Reverend Khachadour Guiragossian.

Chairman of Armenian Martyrs' Day Observance: Ardashus A. Aykanian.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic story of Turkey's brutal slaughter of 1½ million Armenians in 1915 is a record of infamy to match the worst of the atrocities which have so filled and so defiled this century of human history. The genocide of this little nation which was American's staunch ally ranks with the crimes of Red China or of Nazi Germany. Indeed, Hitler himself drew from the fate of the Armenians inspiration to move forward in his war of extermination against Poland. To the military commanders of the Third Reich at Obersalzburg on August 22, 1939, he said:

Our strength is in our quickness and our brutality. * * * I have given the order, and will have everyone shot who utters one word of criticism. * * * Thus for the time being I have sent to the east only my Death's Heads

with the order to kill without pity or mercy all men, women, and children of the Polish race or language. Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?

He did well to cite the terrible fate of these brave people as his example, for this genocide by Turkey set the pattern for the other mass exterminations of our time.

This was, however, not even 50 years ago, a new pattern for the Turks. In a long record of systematic slaughter of Armenians, Greeks, and other groups, it has been estimated that Turkey has been responsible for the deaths of some 2,600,000 persons in a series of acts of genocide stretching from 1822 until the present time.

It is worthy of mention that in this 50th anniversary year of the Armenian tragedy, the nation responsible is engaged in another conflict, this time against America's friend of longstanding and staunch ally, the nation of Greece.

It is my profound hope that in this conflict we will neither be unmindful of Turkey's demonstrated propensity for violence and cruelty, or Greece's long and strong traditions of Christian faith and morality and of friendship for the United States. It is my further hope that as we remember the tragedy of these noble friends of yesterday, we shall be redetermined to keep faith with and act responsibly toward our friends of the here and now, so that nevermore shall an ally of this country suffer the terrible fate at the hands of Turkey that did the brave Armenians whose memory we honor this day.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, half a century ago the people of Armenia suffered perhaps the first attempt at genocide in modern times. The Government of the Turkish Empire instituted a plan which led to the massacre of 1 million people and uprooted from their homes another 1 million. This terrible crime against humanity has gone virtually unnoticed through the years; in fact, Hitler, in 1939, contemptuously asked:

Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?

To reemphasize that sad history Armenians in the United States have established a commemorative committee on the 50th anniversary of the Turkish massacre of the Armenians. I congratulate them on this effort, for the terrible episode they commemorate should be ever present in our minds as further evidence of man's inhumanity to man. We must ever be aware that such terrible things can happen.

In recent days we have learned of wholesale murders in the Dominican Republic. In another part of the world we rightly fear that our withdrawal from Vietnam would lead to the mass murder and persecution of those who have gallantly fought to defend their land.

Even this terrible trial was not the end of troubles for the people of Armenia, for after becoming a free country in 1918, Communists invaded the army and labor unions and attempted an uprising, which was suppressed. Thereafter Russia made a secret deal with Turkey whereby Turkey would attack Armenia from the south and Russia would begin harrassing action on the north. In 1920 Russia offered Armenia a treaty, which amounted to an ultimatum. Despite a guarantee of sovereignty, Russia took over on December 2, 1920. The Russian treatment of the Armenians was so cruel that on February 19, 1921, an outraged people threw out the Communist government and established their independence.

Upon reorganization of the independent Republic, Prime Minister Simon Veratzain appealed to the free world to help keep Armenia free. No aid came, however. In August 1921, great concentrations of Soviet military forces broke down Armenia's military resistance.

So the troubles of the Armenian people have been many, but at least in the commemoration of their great tragedy in 1915, we can perhaps renew our belief in the freedom and dignity of man and rededicate ourselves to prevent further occurrences of genocide wherever and whenever they may occur.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the year 1965 marks the 50th anniversary of the saddest and most tragic event in the long and proud history of the Armenian people.

The Armenians, although the smallest of the Allied nations to participate in the struggle against Germany and Turkey in World War I, contributed more to the Allied cause in terms of casualties than any other single Allied state, large or small.

More than 1,500,000 Armenians perished during the Turkish genocide in the years 1915–18.

It is important that this event not be allowed to pass without the citizens of the United States of America pausing a moment in tribute to the memory of these martyrs.

It is important that we Americans know that these brave Armenians gave their lives so that the cause of virtuous democratic government, freedom, justice and human rights be served; and in advancing that cause, the Armenian victims advanced the cause of America and that of all freedom-loving countries in this world.

Such great sacrifices and devotion to the cause of freedom must not be forgotten in this year 1965, one-half century removed from the tragic events of 1915.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the revolt which brought a request from the Dominican military for assistance in protecting the lives of U.S. citizens made the action of President Johnson last evening not only necessary but urgent as well.

In a report issued only last week, the House Subcommitee on Inter-American Affairs, of which I am chairman, pointed out that recent failures of the Communists in Latin America only increase the possibility that they will now seek to extend their influence in that area by violence and by terrorist activities. While the situation in the Dominican Republic is far from stable at this moment, there is every indication that the rebel forces are now controlled by leftist, Communist, and Castro elements.

In my opinion, the President acted wisely in sending U.S. Marines to the Dominican Republic to protect the lives of U.S. citizens. Developments in that country should be watched carefully, as there is every indication the Communists are attempting to exploit the situation.

ECONOMIC WARFARE AND ECONOMIC SUICIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is openly engaged in an all-out effort to bury us—at sea.

This point can best be illustrated by the high priority which the Kremlin has assigned to the construction of ships for the Russian merchant and naval fleets. There can be little doubt that the Soviet Union is determined to control the oceans and trade routes of the world. As a naval power, she is already second only to the United States. As a maritime power, experts predict she will surpass the United States in less than 2 years. Because of her enormous fleet expansion program, the Soviet Union may soon be able to manipulate world ocean freight rates at will, and through a superiority in terms of numbers of ships, she may be well on the road to economic domination of the world. The weight of numbers will soon begin to tell.

As of February 1, 1965, 612 merchant vessels of various sizes and types—mostly dry cargo ships and tankers—totaling more than 4,197,200 deadweight tons were on order or under construction for the Soviet Union. With her own shipyards fully utilized, this tremendous building program is being accomplished

by awards of sizable contracts to shipyards in East Germany, England, Finland, Holland, Hungary, Japan, Norway, Poland, Sweden, and Yugoslavia.

During the 3-month period from November 1964 through January 1965, the Soviet Union accepted delivery of 27 dry cargo ships. By comparison, U.S. shipyards delivered only 16 merchant vessels during the entire year of 1964. Moreover, it needs to be pointed out that other satellites in the Communist orbit—Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Red China, Rumania, Soviet Cuba, and Yugoslavia—are also participating in this maritime buildup. As will be seen from the attached tabulation, the Soviet bloc countries are building another 173 oceangoing vessels totaling more than 2,031,964 deadweight tons.

The extensive building program has obviously not been undertaken merely to serve Soviet foreign trade or as a military contingency, but must represent the Communists' approach to the cold war on the economic front, and recognition of ships as instruments of major economic influence. The present Soviet merchant shipbuilding effort alone is more than 10 times that of the United States. Nearly 2 million tons of the vessels under construction for the Russian flag are being built in Russian shipyards—an activity level 3 times that of U.S. shipyards. It should be noted that the Soviet Union has placed shipbuilding contracts with other countries—including some of our friends in the community of free nations—only because of this high degree of utilization of her own shipyard capacity.

As of February 1, 1965, there were 44 commercial vessels, totaling about 613,829 deadweight tons, on order or under construction in the United States. These involved 2 tankers, 39 cargo vessels, and 3 ferryboats. In other words, the Russians are building 15 times as many merchant ships as we are. In terms of tonnage, they are outbuilding us by a ratio of 7 to 1. And, I might add, the Soviet Union is committing large domestic resources and a substantial portion of its foreign exchange to enlarging its merchant fleet.

While the Communists are building a new and modern sea power potential, almost half of our naval fleet is composed of vessels 20 years of age and older. In less than 2 years, more than two-thirds of our Navy fleet will be overage. About 90 percent of all U.S.-flag dry cargo ships and 55 percent of our U.S.-flag tankers are 20 years of age or older. Our fleet of dry cargo ships engaged in domestic trades is virtually extinct. The average age of the ships in our Great Lakes fleet is 47 years. Our private shipyards are more than 50 percent idle. And, U.S.-flag shipping is carrying only 5 percent of our export and import commercial cargoes.

About these facts and figures, it is virtually impossible to find an adjective which would appropriately describe the depth of my concern and alarm. Our national security is at stake—so, too, is the collective security of the Western Hemisphere and the entire free world. Every new ship delivered to Russia by any shipyard on this side of the Iron Curtain nourishes the ever-extending arm of Soviet economic tyranny. It is particularly ironic that Spain—with whom we have a mutual security pact and with whom we conducted a large-scale military amphibious assault exercise only several months ago—has accepted contracts to build ships for Soviet Cuba. The necessary funds can probably be traced to the Kremlin.

One of the experts on this problem, Mr. Vincent F. Caputo, Director for Transportation and Warehousing Policy in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, stated recently:

> Spearheading the economic warfare of the U.S.S.R. is the oil offensive. In struggling for the world's petroleum markets, the U.S.S.R. has the oil, and can undercut the Western competitive prices. But it needs the tankers and pipelines that it cannot construct itself.
>
> It has asked the West to make the boomeranging poison darts that will ultimately undo the maker. And the West—a part of the West—has naively agreed to thus contribute to its own economic suicide.
>
> Last year the Soviet bloc was building 10 tankers in its own yards. But it can't meet the needs of its grand economic warfare strategy. So 43 tankers are being built for the bloc in the free world yards.

Once in a position to control the seas and the trade routes of the world, the hammer and sickle fleet will be able to force the ships of other nations into layup. To exploit Communist strategy, ocean freight rates will be deliberately and adroitly manipulated to undermine, bankrupt, and eventually eliminate free world shipping. Then, we may witness the display of Communist ships serving American ports.

There is another aspect to our present predicament. We also have the anomaly of witnessing the rapid decline of U.S.-flag passenger ships at a time when the Soviet Union and other countries are vying with one another in the construction and operation of luxury-class vessels. While in this country there are no oceangoing passenger ships on order, elsewhere in the world 43 are presently under construction, and 16 of these are for the Russians.

Press dispatches of January 3, 1965, reported Soviet Russia's ambition to operate regular passenger liner service between Odessa and New York.

Agreement has already been reached on new transatlantic passenger service between Leningrad and Montreal with stop at Helsinki, Stockholm, Southampton, and LeHavre. Russia's desire for a passenger service link with the United States was expressed last year when Soviet Merchant Marine Minister Victor Bakayev stated in a Moscow press conference:

> It is our dream to have them (the new Franko-class of luxury liners being built in East German shipyards) operate on a Soviet-American service between Odessa and New York.

All of this takes place while the United States apparently has decided to abandon passenger trade. All of this takes place despite actions by the Congress more than 5 years ago authorizing the construction of two superliners to augment the U.S. fleet—one for the Pacific and one for the Atlantic service.

It is clear that we are relaxing while the Communists aggressively build more ships and expand their maritime strength. Have we failed to recognize the real aims of Communist ideology?

Much public attention must be focused on this problem. The solution can be found only through nationwide resolution, stating in effect that America needs and wants a strong merchant marine. A first step could be taken by this Government, acting in the interests of the American people to preserve and build a strong merchant fleet for the sake of national defense. A first approach may well be increasing the requirement that U.S. Government-generated cargoes be shipped aboard American merchant ships. Is the present requirement that 50 percent of U.S. Government cargoes be carried by our own ships and crews sufficient? I do not think it is. More Government cargoes for our own shippers would help their business, create demand for more ships to be built, and cause adjustments in our national maritime policies. And cutting down the amount of U.S. Government cargoes shipped aboard foreign-flag ships would certainly cut down the outflow of U.S. gold. This step would surely be appropriate for the Government to take.

To serve the national interests on the oceans and Great Lakes, where foriegn shippers have penetrated to the point where they carry the majority of cargoes transported into the heartland of America, a reappraisal is in order. We must note the difference between destructive pennypinching and constructive investments.

The American people must be awakened to the threat that faces us on the oceans. We must recognize the wisdom of engaging in realistic maritime and shipbuilding programs. We must realize the time for action is now. To delay longer could be disastrous.

As part of my remarks I ask that the following table be included:

Communist shipbuilding contracts on order as of Jan. 31, 1965

	Number	Deadweight tons
Soviet Russia:		
Dry cargo vessels	427	2,269,900
Tankers	120	1,769,800
Bulk carriers	7	157,500
Passenger and specialized vessels	58	(1)
Total	612	4,197,200
Poland:		
Dry cargo vessels	71	531,400
Bulk carriers	6	135,000
Total	77	666,400
Yugoslavia:		
Dry cargo vessels	18	139,000
Tankers	8	264,000
Bulk carriers	11	320,000
Passenger and specialized vessels	4	(1)
Total	41	723,000

See footnote at end of table.

Communist shipbuilding contracts on order as of Jan. 31, 1965—Continued

	Number	Deadweight tons
Bulgaria:		
Dry cargo vessels	5	41,295
Tankers	2	49,900
Total	7	91,195
Rumania:		
Dry cargo vessels	6	38,500
Tankers	2	71,900
Bulk carriers	8	204,000
Total	16	314,400
Red China:		
Dry cargo vessels	5	70,660
Specialized vessels	1	(1)
Total	6	70,660
Soviet Cuba:		
Dry cargo vessels	8	81,709
Specialized vessels	2	(1)
Total	10	81,709
East Germany: Dry cargo vessels	14	69,200
Czechoslovakia: Dry cargo vessel	1	12,700
Hungary: Dry cargo vessel	1	2,700
Total	785	6,229,164

[1] Not available.

Source: Fairplay Shipping Journal, "World Ships on Order," February 1965.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ACTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's action in sending the U.S. Marines into the Dominican Republic to protect the lives of American citizens caught in the attempted revolt, is urgent and necessary and I fully support it.

Furthermore, it appears that the revolutionary group is infiltrated by Castro Communists and they are attempting to take over the Dominican Republic.

The United States should promptly support the request for assistance by any anti-Communist provisional government so that this attempted takeover can be quashed.

The Organization of American States acting under article 39 of the charter of the OAS should immediately send an observation group to the Dominican Republic to assure the Latin American countries and the other nations as to what is transpiring and to insure the return of a democratic government to the people of Santo Domingo.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I commend the gentleman for his comments and I agree with him. It is my sincere hope that the President's actions represent a foreshadowing of the new approach that our Government will use in its foreign policy, that wherever the lives of Americans are in danger in any part of the world, the President will use whatever strength and force is necessary to give protection to American nationals.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES OF SELECTED FOREIGN COUNTRIES PROVIDING FOR PREFERENCES FOR DOMESTIC MATERIALS AND FIRMS IN THE AWARDING OF PUBLIC SUPPLY AND PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, continuing the series of findings developed out of a study of the public purchasing policies of leading industrial nations doing business with the United States, I am today presenting the third of a series of documents that first appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 27. The set to be included at the end of my remarks relates to the policies and practices of France, Germany, Italy, Greece, and Turkey.

As this series is continued, Members of Congress can understand more clearly and to appreciate more sympathetically why American industry and labor cry out against the U.S. Government's insistence on buying with tax funds for public use the products of alien industry and labor when the facilities and manpower to make them are available at our own plants.

Why, we ask, are U.S. Treasury funds expended outside this country at the expense of this Nation's work force?

Why, when our unfavorable balance-of-payments position threatens our whole monetary stability, are Federal dollars not kept at home whenever practicable?

Why is our own self-interest ignored when our friends abroad are so careful to exclude use of American products for public works projects?

It would be naive to suggest that the U.S. Government is pursuing its anomalous course as a gambit or stratagem to induce reciprocal treatment, for by now it must be obvious even to the most stubborn doctrinaire that the most friendly governments are not so magnanimous as to make contracts with outsiders while home industries and workers go begging.

The one remaining question, Mr. Speaker, is: How much longer must we tolerate Federal frivolity favoring foreign fiduciaries?

Following is part three of the series:

FRANCE

(Member of EEC, GATT, and OECD)

French Government contracts are generally governed by the Public Contracts Code established by Decree No. 64–729 of July 17, 1964 (Journal Officiel, July 21, 1964, p. 6438), which is for the most part a codification of a large number of earlier decrees and other regulatory provisions.

The Code provides for the following principal methods of letting contracts:

1. Open public tendering (adjudication ouverte): bidding is open to all interested persons.

2. Restricted public tendering (adjudication restreinte): Only persons approved by the contracting authority may submit bids.

3. Open invitation for bids (appel d'offres ouvert): Bidding is open to all interested persons.

4. Restricted invitation for bids (appel d'offres restreint): Only persons approved by the contracting authority may submit bids.

5. Private contract (marché de gré à gré): The contract may be negotiated with a supplier or contractor selected by the contracting authority.

The Code also provides for a special type of competitive invitation for bids (appel d'offres avec concours), which is authorized when technical, aesthetic or financial considerations justify special research, such as a proposal for a new public building of modern design. The competition takes place on the basis of a program drawn up by the contracting authority.

Both types of public tendering and the open invitation for bids must be preceded by advertisement in the official bulletin published for that purpose and in other media, such as trade and technical journals. Most government departments maintain lists of approved suppliers and contractors and written application must be made to each department for inclusion on its list. The lists are used in the selection of suppliers and contractors who are to be contacted in the case of restricted invitations for bids as well as the negotiation of private contracts. An unofficial translation from French of the application form of the PTT (Posts, Telegraphs and Telephones Administration) is attached hereto.

In the case of public tendering the contracting authority must award the contract to the lowest bidder, provided the price does not exceed the stipulated maximum and subject, in the case of open public tendering, to the right of the contracting authority to exclude bidders whom it regards as presenting insufficient moral, financial or technical qualifications.

In the case of invitations for offers the contracting authority need not accept the lowest bid and may accept the bid which it deems the most advantageous (la plus intéressante) according to objective criteria set forth in the Code.

Except for the private contract method, the contracting authority has complete discretion to select the method by which the contract is to be let. Theoretically, the use of the private contract method is limited to the special cases specified in the Code.

In any case the contracting authority always retains the right to reject every bid and to order the bidding procedure repeated. In the case of invitations for bids, the contracting authority may elect to negotiate a private contract.

Under the provisions of article 104 of the code that method of awarding contracts may be used for items of exclusive manufacture, for negotiating with owners of patents or inventors, or persons with exclusive rights to patents or inventions; in cases for which the technical problems and investments require the use of direct agreement, for products which must be bought at the place of production or at the stockpile, for work and services carried out at research centers in places of experimentation, etc.; whenever bidding by other methods has proved unacceptable to the contracting authority; for products and supplies as to which, on account of the shortage of material it is impossible to employ competitive bidding; when the enterprises and persons who were previously awarded contracts failed to carry them out and they are awarded to others at their risk and peril; in cases of shipping by public transportation services; and for all work, supplies and services which, due to urgency, are motivated by unforeseeable circumstances; for all those which, in the interest of the nation, must be kept secret or for any similar work, supply or service concerning national defense.

As the result of the broad interpretation given by the administrative authorities to the special cases permitting the use of the

private contract method, which the code and previous statutory and other provisions on which it is based regard as the exceptional method, it is in fact the one most frequently used. According to the December 1964 issue of "Marchés Publics" [public contracts] published by the French Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, during the calendar year 1963 contracts concluded by open or restricted public tendering represented 1 percent of the total value of all contracts, contracts concluded by open invitations for bids 6.4 percent, contracts concluded by restricted invitations for bids 33 percent, and private contracts 58.8 percent. During that year the military contracting authorities continued to use the private contract and restricted procedures in preference to open procedures much more frequently than the civilian contracting authorities.

In practice, therefore, there is ample opportunity for discrimination against foreign bidders.

Under the provisions of decree No. 60–724 of July 25, 1960 (Journal Officiel, July 27, 1960), contracts of the departments, communes, departmental and communal public establishments, urban districts and other local and municipal entities, including the City of Paris, are governed in general by the same rules as French government contracts. The 1960 Decree does not, however, suppress the supremacy of public tendering, as does the Public Contracts Code, and grants much less discretion to use the invitation for offers method and the private contract method.

The 1964 code is not applicable to nationalized industries or state monopolies or to corporations wholly or partly owned by the state. Their procurement practices are essentially the same as those of private enterprises, although the provisions of the Code naturally have considerable influence.

In many cases, government contracts may be reserved for French nationals by the terms of the request for tenders or the invitation for offers. That situation is expressly recognized in the "Guide de Fournisseur de L'État" (Guide for the State Contractor) published in 1964 by the Commission Centrale des Marchés (Central Contracts Commission). The Guide states (page 12) that foreign suppliers can submit bids subject to having satisfied, if necessary, the conditions prevailing for importations of goods, but that in certain cases the French citizenship of the contractors is required. The French Council of State has held, however, that the contracting authority does not have the power to reject a bidder by reason of his foreign nationality, if the exclusion of foreigners was not expressly provided for by a provision of the law or of the General Contract Specifications. An example of such a provision is Section 2 of Article 6 of the General Administrative Clauses applicable to contracts for current supplies (fournitures courantes) approved by Decree No. 62–1510 of December 14, 1962 (Journal Officiel, December 16, 1962), which provides that, subject to not contravening the stipulations of international agreements, the Minister can decide that the bidders must be of French nationality. The decision must be mentioned in the notice of public tendering or invitation for bids. The notice must also specify the nature of the documents to be furnished by way of proof of nationality. According to the treatise by Hainaut and Joliet cited infra (volume 1, section 104 bis), similar provisions are contained in the General Contract Specifications of the Ministry of War (article 11) and the Ministry of the Navy (article 2), the General Contract Specifications for Military Supplies (article 21), the General Contract Specifications for Public Works of the P.T.T. (Posts, Telegraph and Telephones Administration) (Article 2) and the General Contract Specifications for Public Works of the City of Paris (Article 2).

In the field of military procurement and works contracts, specific regulatory provisions have the effect of reserving orders (except on very rare occasions) to purely French companies. Section 2 of Article 30 of the Arrêté (Order) of the Minister of National Defense and Armed Forces of May 7, 1958 (Journal Officiel, May 29, 1958, p. 5111), approving the General Administrative Clauses applicable to industrial contract of the Departments of National Defense, provides as follows (unofficial translation from French):

"2. Unless authorized by the Minister [of National Defense] and subject to the supplemental provisions of Article 33 relating to war materiel, allocation of orders can only be obtained by:

"Physical persons who are nationals of the French Union;

"Corporate bodies which are not, in law or in fact, subject to foreign influences which the contracting authority would consider incompatible with the requirements of national defense."

The provisions of Article 33 of the same Ministerial Order relating to orders for "war materiel" imply that enterprises manufacturing such equipment must be French or at least must manufacture in France. The provisions of that Article are as follows (unofficial translation from French):

"1. In addition to the obligations provided for in Art. 30, every candidate for a 'war materiel' contract must fulfill the special legal and regulatory obligations concerning such materiel, and in particular:

"Special nationality requirements;

"Obtaining a manufacturing license or a sales authorization;

"Control of the management;

"Maintenance of net price accounting in compliance with the provisions of Article 34 below;

"These provisions apply to concession holders, to sub-contractors as well as to subsuppliers ["sous-commandiers"] who are themselves manufacturing components classified as war materiel.

"2. If, in an exceptional case, the State should give formal notice of a war contract to an enterprise which does not hold a manufacturing license or sales authorization for the materiel concerned, such notice shall take the place, for such enterprise and for the materiel under consideration, of a manufacturing license or sales authorization.

"During the entire duration of the execution of the contract, the enterprise shall remain subject to all legally enacted regulations which apply to license holders.

"Not later than one month after the giving of formal notice of such contract, the enterprise must deposit with the competent authority a file containing the documents laid down for all requests for a manufacturing license or sales authorization for the materiel which forms the subject of the contract.

"In case of non-compliance with this time-limit, the holder is liable to fines which, in the absence of respective regulation in the contract, shall be computed at the rate of ½ per mil of the amount of the contract per day of delay."

Under the provisions of Article 1 of the Decree-Law of April 18, 1939 (Journal Officiel, June 13, 1939, p. 1589) the term "war materiel" is defined as firearms and ammunition conceived or intended for land, naval or aerial war and material intended to carry or employ such firearms in combat.

Article 2 of the same Decree-Law provides that enterprises manufacturing or engaging in the purchase and sale of "war materiel" cannot operate without the previous authorization of the State and under its control, pursuant to the conditions prescribed by decree. Article 5 of the Decree of August 14, 1939, for the implementation of such Article 2 and following Articles (Journal Officiel, August 19, 1939, p. 10438) provides that, in order to receive a manufacturing license, a corporation (société par actions) must be of French nationality, must be managed and directed by French citizens and the majority of its capital must be held by French citizens.

In the field of public works, article 21 of the General Administrative Clauses applicable to public works contracts entered into in the name of the State established by Decree No. 61–529 of May 8, 1961 (Journal Officiel, May 31, 1961, p. 4915), provides for preferences for materials, etc., of French origin in the following terms (unofficial translation from French):

"5. With the exception of provisions arising from international treaties or agreements, where applicable, all materials, materiel, machines, apparatus, tools and appliances used for the execution of the works must be of French origin.

"6. With the same exception, special deviations may be provided for in the special contract specifications or may be granted in the course of the contract by ministerial decision."

The reference to international treaties and agreements is obviously intended to take into account the provisions of the Treaty of Rome, particularly those relating to the right of establishment and the free provision of services.

Article 3 of the same decree requires the submission with bids of proof of the nationality of the bidder and its personnel as required by the tender notice or the invitation for offers, if the contract is entered into for defense requirements.

The opportunities for preference in favor of French contractors and French materials in practice and under the applicable regulatory provisions are described in the following statement contained (pages 8–9) in the letter dated December 10, 1963, from Maitre Jean L. Sarrut and Maitre Bernard Siegler, cited infra.

"(b) Our public authorities have various possibilities to put aside foreign suppliers:

"In connection with national defense they may invoke the above referred regulations;

"They may raise the import duties;

"In connection with adjudications they may put aside the foreign tenderers, in the same manner as French tenderers who, in their opinion, do not fulfill the required conditions, without any recourse being possible;

"In connection with the 'appels d'offres' and the 'marchés de gré à gré' they may choose French suppliers without contacting foreign suppliers.

"Another means may consist, in connection with contracts concerning equipment of material, for example, in requiring such characteristics concerning the material that only French equipment can comply with.

"(c) In fact, certain of these means are indisputably used in some cases in France. In connection with national defense, for example, it might happen that French suppliers be selected, although their prices are much higher than those of foreign suppliers.

"But according to the information that we have gathered, the preference in favor of French suppliers has certain limits:

"The preference for French suppliers will not play if French prices are fairly higher than foreign ones. If, for example, foreign equipment costs, say 10 percent less than French equipment, our public authorities will hesitate to order French equipment as such decision might be criticized by the public control accountants.

"Also there are cases when, by reason of economic policy, for example when the French prices are going up, our public authorities buy abroad deliberately.

"All this is not theoretical, and we know, for example that our public authorities in charge of the manufacturing of French coins made abroad substantial orders which might have been passed in France. Also certain

employers' federations complain about the fact that our public authorities pass too often contracts abroad."

The situation in the field of civilian government procurement is succinctly and accurately summarized in a publication entitled "France's Fifth Republic and the Business World" published in 1963 by Business International S.A., as follows (at page 31):

"Foreign companies can sell to civilian state 'markets' whether they manufacture in France or import, provided they abide by import regulations. There is no equivalent of the 'Buy American Act' in France. But in the absence of written regulations and presuming equal prices and services, the 'love-rate' (cote d'amour) is applied in favor of national suppliers, a reaction that the Commission Centrale [des Marchés] calls 'visceral.'"

The situation in France was confirmed by a conversation which two members of the United States Embassy in Paris had in April 1960 with Mr. Paul Gros, then Chief Purchasing Officer of the French State Railways and at the same time President of the French Association of Purchasing Agents, and a Mr. Dumas, of the Government Procurement Committee. The conversation is reported in Foreign Service Despatch No. 1585 (unclassified) dated April 12, 1960, from the United States Embassy in Paris to the Department of State. Messrs. Gros and Dumas were reported as stating that, while there are no legislative or administrative regulations corresponding to the Federal Buy American Act in France, preference would generally be given to the French suppliers without any official requirement to do so. Mr. Gros is also reported as stating that for a non-French firm to be seriously considered as a potential supplier, its bid would have to be 20 percent to 30 percent below the lowest French bid.

PRINCIPAL SOURCES

(1) Letter dated December 10, 1963, from Maitre Jean L. Sarrut and Maitre Bernard Siegler, Avocats à la Cour d'Appel, Paris, letter dated May 28, 1964 from Maitre Siegler and letter dated November 6, 1964, from Maitre Sarrut, all to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, Paris.

(2) Foreign Service Despatch No. 1585 dated April 12, 1960, from the United States Embassy in Paris entitled "EXPORT: Public Procurement Methods in France".

(3) Business International, S.A., "France's Fifth Republic and the Business World" (Geneva, Switzerland, 1963).

(4) Commission Centrale des Marchés (France), "Guide du Fournisseur de l'État" [Guide for the State Contractor] (Paris, 1964).

(5) de Grand Ry, "L'Harmonisation des Legislations au sein du Marché Commun en Matière de Marchés Publics" [The Harmonization of Laws concerning Public Contracts in the Common Market], Revue de Marché Commun (No. 37) pp. 247–251 (No. 38), pp. 282–292 (1961).

(6) Hainaut and Joliet, "Les Contrats de Travaux et de Fournitures de l'Administration dans le Marché Commun" [Public Works and Supply Contracts in the Common Market], vol. 1 (Brussels, 1962), vol. 2 (1963).

Posts—Telegraphs—Telephones

FORM OF GENERAL INFORMATION FOR SUPPLY CONTRACTS [FRANCE]

(Unofficial translation from French)

I. Administrative and Legal Information

A. to be furnished by all candidates:
Correct name of enterprise_____.
Address and telephone number:
(a) of business seat_____.
(b) of plants, workshops or storage places where the supplies will be manufactured or kept_____

Posts—Telegraphs—Telephones—Continued

FORM OF GENERAL INFORMATION FOR SUPPLY CONTRACTS [FRANCE]—continued

Manner of working: working owner_____; lessee-manager (state since what date)* _____.

B. to be furnished by companies only:
Juridicial form (example: stock company, limited liability company, partnership limited by shares)_____.
Business capital_____.
Date of information_____.
Persons authorized to bind the company in matters of contracts:
Name.
Office.
Nationality.
Authorizing documents.
(1) President-director general, manager, commercial director, etc.
(2) As applicable: by-laws, board of directors' resolutions dated_____, etc.

II. Technical Information

1. Activities of the enterprise:
(a) List current manufactures:_____.
(b) Do you wish to be consulted on all these manufactures or only on certain among them? (In that case, list them):_____.
2. Area of plants, workshops, or storage spaces indicated on page 1 under 1–A, section b:_____.
3. Personnel force used: Total number: _____ of which _____ laborers.
4. Energy used: Nature and power:_____.
5. Machines and installations comprising plant equipment (list with indication of power and maximum capacity of each):_____.

GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

(Member of EEC, GATT and OECD)

The only statutory provision relating to public procurement in the Federal Republic of Germany is the Reich Public Budget Regulation (Reichshaushaltsordnung) adopted December 31, 1922, and now in effect as last revised on April 30, 1938. Section 46 of the Regulation provides as follows (unofficial translation from German):

"(1) Contracts made for the account of the Reich must be preceded by public tender, unless the nature of the transaction or special circumstances justify a deviation.

"(2) The Government of the Reich shall establish uniform principles for the making of contracts."

The public budget laws of the Länder (States) contain similar provisions.

The basic provisions which are applied by public procurement authorities are:

(1) Regulations for the Placing of Public Orders—Except those in the Construction Industry (Verdingungsordnung für Leistungen—ausgenommen Bauleistungen) (VOL); and

(2) Regulations for the Placing of Construction Contracts (Verdingungsordung für Bauleistungen) (VOB).

The VOL and the VOB are not mandatory legal provisions but only general principles drafted by specialists and considered by them to constitute the best procedures. They have, however, been made binding on federal government departments and agencies and the Länder by means of administrative circulars.[1] The VOL applies to most government departments, including the Ministry of Defense, the Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications (PTT), the State Railways, the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry for Economic Property. The VOB is applicable to all public works financed by means of federal credits. All nine Länder have also adopted both the VOB and the VOL and they are also binding on the municipalities.

Section 3 of the VOL and Section 3 of the VOB prescribe the following methods for the letting of contracts:

(1) Public invitation for offers (öffentliche Ausschreibung)—invitations for offers are made to an unrestricted number of firms by publication in the Bundesausschreibungsblatt (Federal Bulletin for the Invitation of Offers) and in the Bundesanzeiger (Federal Bulletin) as well as in daily newspapers and trade journals.

(2) Restricted invitation for offers (beschränkte Ausschreibung)—limited invitation for offers addressed privately to selected firms.

(3) Direct procurement (freihändige Vergabe)—contracts are awarded without formal proceedings in the discretion of the contracting authorities, usually on the basis of informal offers by at least three firms.

The first method is the standard one, but is used principally for construction contracts and even then accounts for only about one-third of such contracts in value. The second method may be used, if the nature and extent of the order or work demands special reliability, capability, or competence. The third method may be used in the restricted cases specified in the VOL and the VOB. In practice, however, the applicable provisions of the VOL and VOB are liberally interpreted by the contracting authorities, with the result that the method to be used is largely in their complete discretion.

In any event, even in the case of a public invitation for offers, the contracting authority is under a duty to accept the offer which is the most economical (wirtschaftliche), taking into account all relevant factors; hence, there is no duty to accept the lowest offer pricewise. There is, accordingly, ample opportunity for discrimination in favor of domestic suppliers and contractors.

Both the VOB and the VOL regulate explicitly the utilization of products or materials of foreign origin but they do not contain any specific provision dealing with the treatment to be given to foreign bidders.

Section 10, No. 4, of the VOL contains the following discriminatory provision (unofficial translation from German):

"4. Specified places of origin or supply sources shall be prescribed only in a case where required because of important reasons. Foreign products may not be supplied if appropriate products are manufactured in the interior of the country at reasonable prices."

Section 9, No. 7, of the VOB provides that (unofficial translation from German):

"The use of materials or construction components of foreign origin must not be requested if appropriate national products exist on the same terms and conditions."

Section 8, No. 1, of the VOB provides that (unofficial translation from German):

"In case of public invitation for offers, the contract documents must be sent to all domestic applicants who undertake professionally to effect performance of the class for which tenders have been invited".

All the foregoing provisions are, however, temporarily suspended. On May 20, 1954, the Federal Finance Minister issued a Circular (Ministerialblatt das Bundesministers für Wirtschaft, No. 12, June 30, 1954) initially providing for their suspension in the following terms (unofficial translation from German):

"In trade exchanges with the country of origin, the principle of reciprocity must be granted in the case of public invitations for tenders, i.e., offers by foreign competitors and of foreign products will, in the evaluation of bids, be considered in application of the same handicaps which the country of

* Strike out one or the other, as applicable.

[1] The current (1960) edition of the VOL was confirmed in effect with amendments by a Circular dated May 11, 1960, of the Federal Ministers of Economic Property and Economy. The current (1952) edition of the VOB was promulgated by a Circular dated April 23, 1953, of the Federal Ministers of Finance, Trade and PTT.

origin concerned will apply to West German bidders."

Moreover, for contracts valued at more than DM50,000 ($12,500), which involved the designation of a foreigner as the contractor or the use of products of foreign origin, the authorization of the Federal Minister of Finance was required.

The 1954 Circular was superseded by a Circular of the Federal Minister for Economic Patrimony dated April 29, 1960, and still in effect, which, at least literally, placed foreign competitors and products on the same level with domestic competitors and products. An unofficial translation from German of the 1960 Circular is attached hereto. It should be noted that paragraph 3 of the Circular states that application of the principle of reciprocity will again be taken into consideration if difficulties should arise.

The 1960 Circular does not affect provisions for the award of contracts to the following privileged groups:

(a) Expelled people and refugees from the Soviet Zone of Germany, individuals and firms in areas classified as "distressed areas" (including West Berlin), evacuees and victims of National Socialist persecution.

(b) Suitably qualified German "medium-sized" firms (i.e., employing not more than 50 persons). The Ministry of Defense places a proportion of the total value of its contracts with such firms. The proportion varies according to the type of supplies required but in practice ranges between 30 and 40 percent.

In the case of the first mentioned group, the contract is to be placed with the privileged applicant provided he is otherwise qualified and his bid is as economical as (or even, subject to adequate budgetary funds being available, slightly above) the most economical bid submitted by a non-privileged applicant. The *Länder* and municipalities are required to apply the same preferences.

It will be noted that the provisions relating to privileged groups bear considerable resemblance to the provisions of Executive Order No. 10582 under the Federal Buy American Act relating to awards to small business concerns and to concerns located in economically distressed areas.

By virtue of agreements with the United States a great deal of German defense procurement is carried out in the United States, primarily to offset the cost of maintaining United States armed forces in the German Federal Republic.

PRINCIPAL SOURCES

(1) Airgram No. A–737 dated October 31, 1963, entitled "Orders Placed by the German Bundespost with 'Privileged Bidders' ".

(2) Letters dated January 31, 1964, and October 15, 1964, from the United States Embassy in Bonn to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, Paris.

(3) de Grand Ry, "L'Harmonisation des Legislatións au sein du Marché Commun en Matière de Marchés Publics" [The Harmonization of Laws concerning Public Contracts in the Common Market], Revue du Marché Commun (No. 37) pp. 247–251, (No. 38) pp. 282–292 (1961).

(4) Hainaut and Joliet, "Les Contrats de Travaux et de Fournitures de l'Administration dans le Marché Commun" [Public Works and Supply Contracts in the Common Market], vol. 2 (Brussels, 1963).

(5) Marketing Conditions: Germany—III, Business International, February 5, 1965.

GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

(Joint Ministerial Circular dated April 29, 1960 (Ministerialblatt of the Federal Minister for Economy, No. 11, 1960, page 269)

(Unofficial translation from German)

Bonn, April 29, 1960.

The Federal Minister for Economic Property of the Federation: Ref.: III gen.—0 6060—2/60.

The Federal Minister for Economy: Ref.: I B 9—4436/60.

Foreign Office: Ref.: 400—80.10 (21).

To:

(a) The Federal Minister.

(b) The Federal Minister for Atomic Energy and Water Administration.

(c) The Federal Minister of the Interior.

(d) The Federal Minister for Post and Telecommunications.

(e) The Federal Minister for Transportation—with a copy to the Central Administration of the German Federal Railroads.

(f) The Federal Minister for Defense.

For information to: (g) the Federal Minister for Housing Construction.

Subject: Procurement Matters: Consideration of Foreign Bidders and Foreign Products (VOL/A § 10, No. 4, second sentence; VOB/A § 8, No. 1, first sentence, § 9, No. 7).

Reference:—

Enclosures: One.

The rules provided for in the Regulations (VOL/A § 10, No. 4, second sentence; VOB/A § 8, No. 1, first sentence; § 9, No. 7), concerning:

(a) the consideration of foreign bidders, and

(b) the use of products of foreign origin (where domestic bidders perform services) in the case of public orders must be applied in keeping with the general economic development and, in particular, the progressive integration within the framework of the European Economic Community (EEC); in agreement with the Federal Finance Minister, it is requested that the following principles be observed in connection with all procurements within the Federal territory:

1. In view of the increasing liberalization, especially of the European Market, the German economic situation makes the purchase of foreign products and the consideration of foreign bidders desirable from the viewpoint of commercial and economic policies.

2. The advantages and disadvantages for the domestic employment situation which arise from the use of foreign products or ordering from foreign bidders must not be judged from the viewpoint of the individual economic section directly concerned. In the case of individual sectors of the economy for which special circumstances exist (e.g., mining), a need for protection might be justified from the point of view of national economy; in cases of doubt, it is recommended that an inquiry be addressed to the Federal Minister for Economy (Department I B 9; telephone Bonn 3 01 61).

3. The principle of reciprocity in the case of granting state orders to foreign bidders, as it had been set forth in the circular by the Federal Finance Minister dated May 20, 1954 (II D–O–6060–25/54), shall for the time being not be applicable. If in the future, in certain cases, particular difficulties should arise, the problem of reciprocity will be examined again. The circular of the Federal Finance Minister dated May 20, 1954 (II D–O–6060–25/54) shall in this respect become invalid.

4. When considering offers by foreign bidders, attention is to be given first of all to the following:

(a) the principle for granting orders must be observed (VOL/A § 2, No. 1, VOB/A § 2), i.e., that the bidders are competent, efficient and reliable;

(b) considering all circumstances, the offer must be the most economical ["das wirtschaftlichste"] (VOL/A–§ 24, VOB/A–§ 25), in which connection, particularly in the case of foreign bidders and foreign products, the sufficient securing of warranty rights, supplies of replacement parts and, where applicable, servicing of delivered equipment must, among other things, be carefully weighed.

Since the Federal Republic will, for the time being, no longer apply the principle of reciprocity in the case of public orders (No. 3), offers by foreign bidders shall be evaluated the same as all other offers, although the guiding principles for preferred bidders shall be observed.

5. The principles set forth in Nos. 3 and 4 shall apply mutatis mutandis in cases where domestic bidders intend to use foreign products in the execution of the work.

6. The participation of foreign bidders in public bids is promoted by the distribution abroad of the Federal Gazette publishing invitations to bid which the Foreign Office has originated. In connection with the nomination of suitable foreign bidders for limited invitations for offers and direct orders, to which special attention should be paid, it is recommended that inquiries be addressed to the representatives of foreign industrial organizations in the Federal Republic of Germany (see enclosure) or to the Consular offices.

The Economic Ministers (Economic Senators) and Finance Ministers (Finance Senators) of the States ["Länder"] as well as the municipal central organizations have today been informed correspondingly.

The Federal Minister for Economic Property of the Federation:
By order:

ROSSIG.

The Federal Minister for Economy:
By order:

Dr. LANGER.

Foreign Office:
By order:

Dr. HARKORT.

Attested
[OFFICIAL SEAL]

HOWALD.
(Howald)

Enclosure: to the joint circular from the Federal Minister for Economic Property of the Federation, the Federal Minister for Economy and the Foreign Office dated April 29, 1960 concerning: Defense Matters: Consideration of Foreign Bidders and Foreign Products (VOL/A § 10 No. 4 second sentence; VOB/A § 8 No. 1 first sentence, § 9 No. 7)

German-Belgian-Luxembourg Chamber of Commerce: (22c) Köln Cäcilienstr. 46.

United States Chamber of Commerce (16) Frankfurt (M) Rossmarkt 12.

Italian Chamber of Commerce for Germany (16) Frankfurt (M) Feldbergstr. 24.

Netherlands Chamber of Commerce for Germany (16) Frankfurt (M) Forsthausstr. 111.

French Commercial Service in Germany (22 c) Bad Godesberg Kappellenstr. 1 a.

Federation of British Industries (22 c) Köln—Marienburg Goltsteinstr. 219.

The Austrian Commercial Delegate in the Federal Republic of Germany (16) Frankfurt (M) Friedensstr. 5.

ITALY

(Member of EEC, GATT, and OECD)

The public works and public supply contracts of the State are governed by the provisions of Royal Decree No. 2440 of November 18, 1923, making new provisions regarding the administration of Government funds and the general accounting for Government services, as implemented and regulated by Royal Decree No. 827 of May 23, 1924, approving the rules for administration of Government funds and the general accounting for Government services.

Articles 3, 4, and 6 of the 1923 decree provide for the following four methods for the letting of contracts:

(1) Public tender (asta púbblica)—public invitations for tenders are issued to an unlimited number of bidders by notices in the press, and, in the case of larger contracts, in the Gazetta Ufficiale (Official Gazette) of the Republic.

(2) Selective tender (liticazione privata)—private invitations to tender are issued to a

limited number of suppliers or contractors selected by the contracting authority.

(3) Competitive tender (appalto-concorso)—this method is essentially the same as selective tender but is used in special cases.

(4) Private contract (trattativa privata)—the contract is let after private negotiation with one or more selected suppliers or contractors.

The 1923 decree prescribes public tendering by means of advertising as the normal method. Under the provisions of the 1924 decree selective tendering may be adopted in specified cases, including cases of urgency. Competitive tendering is essentially the same, except that it is used only for special works or supplies requiring well established technical, artistic or scientific qualifications. Under the provisions of the 1924 decree the private contract method may be used in specified cases where special or exceptional circumstances prevail which do not conveniently permit the use of any of the other procedures.

Under the public tendering and selective tendering procedures, the contract is awarded to the bidder who offers the best terms (i.e., the lowest tender in price). The contracting authority does not have discretion to select the bid which appears to it to be the best or the most advantageous. Nevertheless, the contracting authority has the power to exclude any bidder, despite the regularity of the documents which he presents. The exclusion may not be appealed and no reason need be given therefor.

The bidding procedures described above are mandatory for the entire State administration, that is, not only for the Ministries and their subordinate departments, but also for the autonomous agencies and other governmental agencies. They are also mandatory on the local administration level but different rules obtain in the Regions. They are not, however, applicable to industrial enterprises owned by the State, which operate like private corporations.

The only express statutory provision discriminating in favor of Italian firms and Italian materials are contained in Law No. 429 of July 7, 1907, as amended, relating to the State Railways, Articles 33 and 34 of which provide as follows (unofficial translation from Italian):

"33. Supplies of fixed and moveable material and metal structures are, as a rule, contracted out to national industry, by the system of public bidding.

"The general management of the State Railways, upon appropriate resolution of the Board of Directors, may proceed by selective tendering or private contract, when the interest of the Administration so advises or for the purpose of assuring an equitable distribution of the equipment among similar establishments in the various parts of the Kingdom, the provisions of Art. 16 of the Law of July 8, 1904, No. 351, remaining in effect.

"If the result of the public bidding, selective tendering or private negotiations demonstrate that the conditions of national industry do not permit the obtaining of satisfactory prices, the general management of the State Railways, upon due deliberation of the Board of Directors, and following authorization of the Council of Ministers, may proceed with international tenders, to which national firms are also invited.

"The director general shall give a detailed accounting of the above-mentioned supplies in the annual report pursuant to Article 9.

"34. Under the same conditions, national industry must be preferred in international tenders.

"For supplying of materials pursuant to the preceding article, there will be granted by deliberation of the Board of Directors an adequate protection to national industry, which, however, may never exceed 5% of the offer of foreign industry, increased by the expenses of customs and transport to the place of delivery.

"By offer of foreign industry is meant the average of the lowest offers which represent one-half of the number of foreign offers deemed valid. If these are in odd numbers, one-half is arrived at by the number itself increased by one.

"If the foreign offer consists of only one, the determination of equality of conditions will be submitted to the judgment of the Board of Directors.

"Whenever it may be necessary to provide promptly for the normal supply of materials for the operation of the State Railways, there may be specially authorized, upon resolution of the Council of Ministers, selective tendering or private negotiations with foreign firms.

In the case of public works, bids by foreign firms are effectively precluded by the fact that all contractors who perform works pertaining to the State or to public entities in general in an amount exceeding 10,000,000 lire (about $16,600) shall be registered in the national list of contractors established by Law No. 57 of February 10, 1962 (Gazzetta Ufficiale, March 2, 1962). Articles 13–15 of such Law, copies of an unofficial translation from Italian which are attached hereto, contain detailed prerequisites for inscription on the list. Most important, Article 13, read in conjunction with Article 15, requires, with respect to private firms, partnerships and corporations that the technical manager and all legally responsible directors be Italian nationals, or if they are foreigners, residents of Italy and nationals of countries which grant the same privilege to Italian citizens on a reciprocal basis. Exceptionally, Article 4 of the 1962 Law provides that, when the works described required a very particular skill and no suitable contractor appears to exist among those registered on the list, the contract may be awarded to Italian contractors not registered on the List or even to foreign contractors, subject to prior notice setting forth the reasons therefor being given by the contracting authority to the Committee in charge of the List.

Nevertheless, the basic form of discrimination against foreign bidders is administrative in nature. Despite the fact that the basic laws and regulations prescribed public tendering as the standard and normal method of letting contracts, the contracting authorities have so interpreted the law and regulations as to relegate public tendering to second place in favor of selective tendering, with the result that that method is used in an estimated 70 to 80 percent of the cases.

In selective tendering the contracting authorities resort to companies included on lists of suppliers, the most important of which is that maintained by the Provveditorato Generale dello Stato (General State Purchasing Office).

In order to obtain registration on the List of that Office, an application must be submitted and the applicant's technical and commercial ability must be established. Other lists of suppliers, more or less governed by the same practice, are maintained by various autonomous and state agencies and by the three branches of the Ministry of Defense (Army, Navy, and Air Force). Other ministries and government offices normally use the first mentioned list. It is extremely difficult, although not impossible, for a foreign company to obtain inclusion on any particular list, unless it operates in Italy through its own organization or a permanent representative. Each agency maintaining a list has full and complete discretion, moreover, as to whether it will or will not inscribe a company on the list, even if it complies with all the requirements prescribed. The same discretion exists in the case of removal from a list.

Furthermore, a number of important agencies are expressly authorized to let contracts by private negotiations. Article 1 of Royal Decree No. 540 of March 11, 1923, prescribes that method as the normal one for the General State Purchasing Office, which purchases certain supplies for all central and local administrations, except the State Railways. Under the provisions of Article 1 of Royal Decree-Law No. 1718 of September 30, 1929, the Ministry of Defense (Air Force) has complete discretion in most cases to use either the selective tendering or private contract methods. Also, Article 31 of Royal Decree No. 728 of June 28, 1912, grants the State Railways complete discretion to use the private contract method. Numerous other agencies have similar statutory dispensation.

PRINCIPAL SOURCES

(1) Letter and memorandum dated May 4, 1964, from Avv. Nicola Troilo of Studio dell'Avv. Ercole Graziadei, attorneys of Rome, Italy, to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, Paris.

(2) Foreign Service Despatch No. 922 dated March 25, 1960, from the United States Embassy in Rome, entitled "EXPORT—Italian Procurement Regulations and Practices as they affect American Bidders and Suppliers".

(3) Airgram No. A–1241 dated March 5, 1963, from the United States Embassy in Rome, entitled "Foreign Government Procurement Practices".

(4) Letter dated December 6, 1963, from the United States Embassy in Rome to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, Paris.

(5) de Grand Ry, "L'Harmonisation des Legislation au sein du Marché Commun en Matière de Marchés Publics" [The Harmonization of Laws concerning Public Contracts in the Common Market], Revue du Marché Commun (No. 37) pp. 247–251, (No. 38) pp. 282–292 (1961).

(6) Hainaut and Joliet, "Les Contrats de Travaux et de Fournitures de l'Administration dans le Marché Commun" [Public Works and Supply Contracts in the Common Market], volume 1 (Brussels, 1962), volume 2 (1963).

ITALY

(Excerpts from law of February 10, 1962, concerning the institution of a national registry of contractors (Gazzetta Ufficiale, Mar. 2, 1962))

(Unofficial translation from Italian)

ARTICLE 13. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR REGISTRATION

The general requirements and necessary certifications for registration in the Registry are:

(1) Italian citizenship, or residence in Italy with respect to foreigners, contractors or directors of legally constituted commercial companies, provided they belong to States which grant reciprocal treatment with respect to Italian citizens.

(2) absence of penal records or pending matters relating to crimes under No. 2 of article 21.

If the technical manager (direttore) of the undertaking is a different person from its owner, the requirements of Nos. 1 and 2 must apply to both;

(3) certificate of registration with the Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture with indication of the specific activity of the firm;

(4) certificate of direct taxes of the district office from which income under category B is realized, for which the applicant has been registered in the income tax rolls in the 3-year period preceding the registration application, with respect to the particular activity as a contractor developed by him. If the latter is not yet registered, he must produce an appropriate statement by such office;

(5) certificate (optional) of registration in a similar association.

ARTICLE 14. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR REGISTRATION

(1) Technical qualification—Technical qualification is demonstrated by means of diplomas, certificates issued or confirmed by technical officials in service activities referring to work executed or directed by the applicant and by any other document.

The certificates under the preceding paragraph must specifically indicate the works executed or directed, their amount, the time and place of execution and state if they were carried out properly and successfully or whether there were disputes with the Administration by arbitration or judicially, with an indication of the results of the same.

If the works were executed on behalf of the State or public entities, the certificate is issued by an official in active service, with qualifications no less than those of the Chief Engineer of Civil Engineering or by an office director, under the immediate direction of whom or under the supervision of the office, of which the official himself is chief, the works were executed.

If the works were executed on behalf of private parties, the relative declaration to be issued by the contractor or, if there was one, by the director of the works, must be confirmed, subject to verification, by the Chief Engineer of Civil Engineering.

For works executed or directed abroad, there may be submitted certificates by the proper consul, which contain all data required above, with the explicit declaration that, before issuing them, the official by whom the documents are signed carried out accurate investigations and obtained information from the technical authorities of the location.

(2) Financial capacity—This is demonstrated by proper bank references or by documents which validly prove the economic and financial potential of the interested party.

Bank references are requested directly and reservedly by the competent Committee of the institutions indicated by the applicant in the registration of the request in question. The other documents must be of a date not earlier than one month from the date of the application for registration and, if of an earlier date, must be expressly confirmed under date no earlier than 1 month from that of the application.

(3) Technical equipment—The possession of technical equipment must appear in the declaration of the applicant, in which there must be listed and described means of operation, equipment, and materials in general at its disposal, reserving to the Administration facilities to execute controls and to provide for legal redress in case of false or inaccurate statements.

Whenever the owner of the undertaking is someone other than the technical manager, the documents under No. 1 must refer to the manager, those under Nos. 2 and 3 must refer to the owner.

ARTICLE 15. REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMERCIAL COMPANIES AND COOPERATIVES

For the registration of commercial companies, cooperatives and their branches:

(a) The requirements under Nos. 1 and 2 of article 13 are applicable: to the technical manager and all "components" if it is an unlimited partnership; to the technical manager and all partners, if it is a limited partnership; to the technical manager and the directors (amministratori) furnished with powers of representation, for every other type of company.

(b) The documents under No. 1 of article 14 are applicable to the technical manager.

The companies must also exhibit an authentic copy of their certificate of incorporation and a certificate of the court issued not more than two months prior to the application for registration, from which it may be ascertained that the company is not in a state of liquidation or bankruptcy and has not submitted an application for bankruptcy. It must also be ascertainable from the certificate whether bankruptcy proceedings or an application for bankruptcy have occurred within the 5-year period prior to the above date.

GREECE

(Associate member of EEC; member of GATT and OECD)

Under the provisions of Law No. 3215 of April 26, 1955, Greek industrial products are accorded preference in purchases (through public bidding or otherwise) by State or quasi-governmental agencies, municipalities and communities as well as private business organizations enjoying partial or total duty-free import privileges. An unofficial translation from Greek prepared by the U.S. Embassy in Athens is attached hereto as schedule A.

The preferences are applied as follows:

(a) The margin of preference for Greek products is 8 percent of the landed cost of foreign products (i.e., c.i.f. invoice price plus all duties and taxes, other than turnover tax, payable upon importation). The maximum allowable margin of preference, calculated on the c.i.f. price of a similar foreign product, is 30 percent for domestic products in general and 35 percent for the products of the domestic iron and steel and metalworking industries. In determining the landed cost of imported products, the amount of import duty and taxes added as above to the c.i.f. invoice value may not be higher than 30 percent ad valorem generally and 35 percent ad valorem for metal products, exemption being granted for any duties and taxes in excess of those percentages.

(b) In lieu of the foregoing preferential treatment, Greek enterprises may apply for the duty and tax-free importation of the raw and auxiliary materials required for the production of the goods being procured, in which case the margin of preference accorded the domestic industry is 10 percent (instead of 30 percent or 35 percent) of the c.i.f. price of the foreign product.

(c) In comparing the prices of Greek provincial industrial and handicraft products with those of imported products, the price differentials in favor of Greek products indicated in paragraphs (a) and (b) above, are further increased by the margins of preference accorded provincial products in relation to products manufactured in the capital area, under the provision of Decree Law 2176 of 1952. The margin of preference accorded provincial products over those of the Athens area varies, according to the type of product involved from 2 percent to 5 percent and may in no case exceed 8 percent. By virtue of Law No. 3213 of 1955 those percentages are further increased by 50 percent for industrial enterprises operating on Greek islands (except the island of Euboea). Accordingly, provincial industrial and handicraft enterprises may be given a price preference of 11 percent to 20 percent of the landed cost of foreign products, depending on the location of the producing plant and the type of product involved.

The provisions of Law No. 3215 are not applicable to procurement contracts pertaining to industrial projects authorized under Greece's basic foreign investment law (Law No. 2687 of 1953) and under Law No. 4171 of 1961. For such projects, equipment and supplies may be purchased freely from any source at the discretion of the investor.

THE AGREEMENT OF ASSOCIATION WITH THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

The Agreement was signed on July 9, 1961, and took effect on November 1, 1962 (Journal Officiel of the European Communities, February 18, 1963). It provides for the association of Greece with the Community under the provisions of Article 238 of the Treaty of Rome on the basis of a customs union, with the prospect of full membership when the progress of the Greek economy allows Greece to assume fully the obligations imposed by the Treaty. The customs union is to become fully effective on November 1, 1974, except in the case of specified manufactured goods produced in Greece as to which the effective date will be November 1, 1984.

Article 3 of the Agreement provides for an institutional structure for its implementation. The Association Council, which is composed of representatives of Greece on the one hand and of the Member States and of the Community on the other hand, has the general function of taking all measures necessary to assure the realization of the aims of the Agreement and to conduct all examinations into the development of the cooperation between the Contracting Parties. All decisions adopted by the Council must be unanimous.

The Agreement in general follows the outline of the Treaty of Rome. In the field of public contracts the most important provisions are Article 5 relating to the elimination of discrimination on the basis of nationality, Articles 47 and 48 relating to establishment, Article 49 relating to services, Article 57 dealing vaguely with the approximation of laws and Protocols 1 and 9 limiting the application of the Agreement in the field of public contracts. A copy of an unofficial translation from French of those Articles and Protocols is attached hereto as Schedule B.

It seems obvious that the application of the provisions of the Agreement, as limited by the Protocols, is not likely to have much effect in the foreseeable future in the field of public contracts. Protocol 1 contains express limitations on the application of Article 5 of the Agreement insofar as public contracts are concerned; Protocol 9 contains an exception with regard to agreements for financial aid between the United States and Greece and exempts them, at least until the end of the first transitional period ending in 1974, from the application of the provisions of Article 5. Moreover, Articles 47 and 48 contain only vague provisions with regard to the right of establishment and leave the ultimate decisions in this field to be worked out by the Association Council. Also, under Article 49 the authority to regulate the furnishing of services between the Community and Greece is reserved to the Association Council.

PRINCIPAL SOURCES

(1) Industrial Development Corporation S.A. (Athens), "Greece: Basic Incentives to Industrial Development and Foreign Investment" (July 1963).

(2) United States Department of Commerce, "Basic Data on the Economy of Greece," Overseas Business Reports, No. OBR 64–20 (February 1964).

(3) United States Department of Commerce, "Establishing a Business in Greece," Overseas Business Reports, OBR No. 62–10 (November 1962).

SCHEDULE A. GREECE

(Law No. 3215 of 1955 providing preferences for domestic industrial and handicraft products (Official Gazette, Apr. 30, 1955))

(Unofficial translation from Greek by U.S. Embassy in Athens)

PAUL, KING OF THE HELLENES

Having unanimously voted with Parliament, we decide and ordain:

Article 1

1. In connection with procurements effected by the State, or by Municipalities, or Communities, or any other legal entity of public or private law enjoying total or partial

exemption from import duties, either through competitive tender or otherwise, directly or through the State Procurement Service or any Committee, the products of domestic industry and handicraft are given preference as against the products of foreign origin even if the cost of the domestic products in question is higher up to 8 percent than that of the respective foreign products.

2. Procurements of domestic fertilizers are excepted, as coming under the application of law 760 of 1948 "re marketing of fertilizers" and as long as the law in question is valid.

3. Power production enterprises operating by virtue of contract privileges ratified by specific law, are excepted as well.

Article 2

To determine the comparative cost of a foreign product, we add to the offered CIF price the corresponding import duty—basic and additional—which is provided for each time by the duty tariff, as well as any other tax or due levied on importation, excepting the business turnover tax, which is not reckoned on the cost of the respective home product, and then we add the 8-percent rate provided for in the previous article to the price resulting in this way.

Article 3

1. A 30-percent rate on the respective CIF price of the foreign product is fixed as a maximum of the preference provided for in article 1 hereof in respect of home industry and handicraft products.

2. The maximum rate provided for in the previous paragraph is increased to 35 percent in respect of home metal industry products.

3. As places of delivery for such comparison of prices, according to the above, are determined: (a) the Customs House for the imported foreign products, and (b) the supplier's factory warehouse for the local products.

Article 4

1. At the request of a local industry or handicraft, in lieu of the protection provided for in articles 2 and 3 hereof, exemption from import duty is granted by joint decision of the Ministers of Finance and Industry in respect of the raw and auxiliary material required for the manufacturing of the products offered, in which instance the home product preference rate is fixed at 10 percent on the CIF price of the respective foreign items.

2. The terms and formalities for duty free importation of the raw and auxiliary material dealt with in the previous paragraph, as well as for control over the disposal of these for whatever purpose they have been imported, will be determined by joint decisions of the Ministers of Finance and Industry to be promulgated in the Government Gazette.

Article 5

In respect of monopoly items, as well as of industrial products, on which no direct or indirect duty is levied according to the duty tariff operating each time, the preference rate for the respective home industry and handicraft products is fixed either at 10 percent on the CIF cost of the foreign product, with duty free importation of the raw and auxiliary material required for the manufacturing of such home products, or up to 30 percent without duty free importation of the material in question. The above 10-percent preference rate can fluctuate between 10 and 20 percent in respect of certain monopoly items, following decision of the Ministerial Council.

Article 6

1. The terms of the procurements provided for in article 1 hereof are compulsorily formulated in such a way as to correspond to the possibilities of the local industrial or handicraft production under the prerequisite that the relative products can meet the requirements for which they are intended.

2. The method of application in general of the previous paragraph will be specified each time by joint decisions of the Ministers of Finance and Industry to be promulgated in the Official Gazette.

3. After 3 months from effect hereof, the procurements provided for in article 1 of the present law shall be effected in accordance with the decisions provided for in the previous paragraph.

Article 7

1. In connection with procurements effected according to the provisions hereof, eventual preference for items of foreign origin as against the respective local ones, entails an obligation for payment of the relevant duties and other taxes whose total cannot, however, exceed 30 percent on the CIF cost of these, or 35 percent as regards iron or metal industry products. In respect of duties and taxes over this percentage, exemption is granted in accordance with the relevant provisions, paragraph 3 of article 2 of E.L. 896/37 having no effect in this connection.

2. Particularly as regards Municipalities and Communities, full exemption from duties and taxes can be granted—following decision of the Ministerial Council issued upon proposal of the Ministers of Finance and Industry—in respect of water pipes imported from abroad, as long as the price of those offered by the local industry exceeds the preference rate of the CIF cost of the former.

3. The previous paragraphs are applicable on procurements of State items as well.

Article 8

The preference rates in favor of local industry products which were determined by virtue of the relative R.D. of the 2nd September 1952 in application of the provisions of article 3 of L.D. 2176/52 re protective measures for provincial industry, as well as by virtue of para. 1 of article 2 of the Law "re amendment and supplementation of the provisions concerning protective measures for provincial industry", are valid collectively in every instance of application of the provisions of the present Law.

Article 9

The contribution on every kind of wax materials, either foreign or local, which is levied in favor of T.A.K.E. (Greek Clergy Insurance Fund) by virtue of E.L. 816/1937, as subsequently amended and supplemented by E.L. 2293/1940, Law 1017/1949 and E.L. 3092/1954, is hereby abolished, as long as the materials in question are utilized—in the opinion of a Committee to be set up by joint decision of the Ministers of Industry and Education—for industrial or handicraft purposes, except for the manufacturing of candles or tapers.

Article 10

Transgression of the provisions hereof constitutes a disciplinary offense, while any civil, municipal or communal servants, or any municipal or communal authorities, or any of the administrative councils or the competent officials of the other entities provided for in article 1, who would eventually approve, or suggest for approval, the minutia of an adjudicated competition, or otherwise carry out a procurement in transgression of the above provisions, shall receive a disciplinary punishment by the competent agents, irrespective of any other legal consequence of such transgression.

Article 11

The following provisions are abolished: (a) article 6 of Law 2948/1922 re promoting industry and handicraft, (b) article 2 of Law 4536/1930 re amendment and supplementation of Law 2948/22, the Decrees issued in application of this article (1) of 14–5–31 re extending the preference limit for all kinds of stamps, (2) of 23–3–32 re extending the preference limit for military cartridges and ammunition from 20 to 30 percent, (3) of 25–10–35 re extending the preference limit up to 27 percent in respect of machinery and iron construction in general made by the Greek industry, (c) of article 8 para. 4 of E.L. 254/36 re amendment of the emergency laws of 19–10–35 and 28–12–35 re organization of a cotton institute, (d) of joint decision No. 6825/1263/22–1–37 of the Ministers of Finance and National Economy re fixing the preference limit for local cotton industry products at 35 percent, issued in application of para. 4 of article 8 of E.L. 254/36, and (e) of E.L. 477/37 re supplementation of article 16 of Law 2948/22 re promoting industry and handicraft, as amended by article 2 of Law 4536/30.

Article 12

Acts Nos. 261/3–3–1951 and 628/21–5–51 of the Ministerial Council are hereby ratified for the period they have operated, and are abolished by the present. Act No. 602/7–6/52 of the Ministerial Council is likewise abolished.

The acts in question read as follows:

[Note: Translation of Acts No. 261 and 628 of 1951 and Act No. 602 of 1952 omitted]

The present Law, having been passed by Parliament and ratified by Us today, shall be promulgated in the Official Gazette, and enforced as a Law of the State.

ATHENS, *April 26, 1955.*

PAUL R.

The Ministers of Industry:

A. PROTOPAPADAKIS.

Finance:

L. EFTAXIAS.

Ratified and sealed Athens, April 29, 1955.

The Minister of Justice:

CL. THEOPHANOPOULOS.

SCHEDULE B. GREECE

(Excerpts from agreement establishing an association between the European Economic Community and Greece and attached documents [1])

Article 5

1. In the area of implementation of the Agreement, and without prejudice of any special provisions which it contains, none of the Contracting Parties shall exercise or tolerate discriminations by reason of nationality or against physical persons who are nationals of another Contracting Party established in the territory of one of them.

2. For the implementation of the preceding paragraph, companies constituted pursuant to legislation of a Member State of the Community or of Greece which have their corporate business seat, their central administration or their principal establishment in the territory of one of the Contracting Parties shall be given equal standing with physical persons.

By companies, companies of the civil or commercial law shall be understood, including cooperatives, and other juridical persons under public or private law, with the exception of non-profit companies.

3. The Association Council shall, insofar as necessary, make the appropriate decisions for putting an end to the discriminations referred to in this article.

TITLE III. CIRCULATION OF PERSONS AND SERVICES

Article 47

The Contracting Parties shall facilitate, in a progressive and balanced manner, the establishment of nationals of the Member States in the territory of Greece and of

[1] Unofficial translation from French. The Agreement was executed in Dutch, French, German, Greek and Italian, each of which is equally authentic (Article 77). There is no official English translation.

nationals of Greece within the Community, in accordance with the principles of articles 52 to 56, inclusive, and 58 of the Treaty establishing the Community, with the exception of the provisions and articles relating to time-limits and to the procedure for the realization of a liberalization of establishment.

Article 48

The Association Council shall by decree set the tempo for this realization and establish the terms of implementation concerning the provisions of the preceding article for the different categories of activities; progressive implementation shall take place after the corresponding directives provided for in articles 52 to 56, inclusive, of the Treaty establishing the Community have become effective and in consideration of the special economic and social situation of Greece.

Article 49

The Association Council shall decide, during the transition period provided for in article 6 of the Agreement [1962–1974], on appropriate provisions to be taken in order to facilitate the rendering of services between the Community and Greece.

TITLE IV. PROVISIONS RELATING TO COMPETITION, TAXATION AND GRADUAL ELIMINATION OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LEGISLATION

Article 57

In the areas not covered by the provisions of this Agreement which have a direct influence on the functioning of the Association or in the areas covered by these provisions where they do not contain any specified procedure, the Association Council may make recommendations to the Contracting Parties inviting the latter to take measures which will serve to harmonize legislative, regulatory or administrative provisions.

PROTOCOL NO. 1—CONCERNING PUBLIC CONTRACTS

The contracting parties have agreed on the following provisions:

In deviation from the provisions of the Association Agreement, and in particular article 5, the Contracting Parties shall progressively adjust the terms and conditions for participation in contracts awarded by the administrations or public enterprises as well as private enterprises to which special or exclusive rights have been granted, in such a manner that, by the end of the transition period provided for in article 15 of the Agreement [1984], all discrimination between nationals of the Member States of the Community and those of Greece established within the territory of the Contracting Parties will be eliminated.

The terms and tempo under which the adaptation provided for in this Protocol must be realized shall be fixed by the Association Council taking its inspiration from the solutions which may be adopted in this field by the Member States of the Community.

This Protocol shall be attached to the Association Agreement.

PROTOCOL NO. 9—CONCERNING UTILIZATION OF AMERICAN AID BY GREECE

The contracting parties, in an endeavor not to interfere with the utilization of American aid by Greece, have agreed on the following provisions:

1. If the provisions of the Association Agreement form an obstacle to utilization by Greece of special assistance funds placed at the disposal of the Greek economy, either directly by the Government of the United States of America, or by intermediary of an organization designated by it, Greece shall have the power, after notification to the Association Council:

(a) To establish tariff quotas in observation of article 21, paragraph 2, of the Agreement for the importation of merchandise originating in the United States the purchase of which is financed with the funds in question;

(b) To import duty-free merchandise which forms the substance of the gifts provided for by Title III of "Public Law 480";

(c) To restrict awards of contracts to suppliers of products originating in the United States only where the utilization of the funds in question involves the importation of merchandise originating in the United States and where a competitive bidding procedure is required under legislative provisions either of Greece or the United States.

2. At the end of the transition period provided for in article 6 of the Agreement [1974], the Association Council may decide whether the provisions of this Protocol should be abolished or amended.

In the meantime, if changes occur in the nature of the funds referred to in paragraph 1 of this Protocol or in the procedures for utilization, or if difficulties arise with respect to such utilization, the Association Council shall re-examine the situation with a view to taking appropriate measures.

This Protocol shall be annexed to the Association Agreement.

TURKEY

(Associate member of EEC; member of GATT and OECD)

The basic law concerning public procurement is Law No. 2490 of June 2, 1934 (Official Gazette, June 10, 1934), as subsequently amended. Under the provisions of that Law, sealed public tenders are the standard and, in practice, the usual procedure. Procurement authorities may resort to open public tenders or to direct negotiation only when an invitation for sealed public tenders has met with no response, the volume of the goods and services is small or the articles in question are available only from a single source.

The objective of the sealed-envelope bidding system was to eliminate bargaining and price cutting by requiring every bidder to state his lowest price at the outset of the adjudication. In practice, however, there is much bargaining after the bids are opened, since all of them must then be reviewed privately by the Adjudication Commission, which subsequently invites each bidder separately to explain or amplify his offer.

Foreign firms or individuals may tender in the same way as Turkish nationals, unless the contract is for less than LT15,000 (about $1,667). In that event foreign nationals may not tender unless they are registered with the Turkish Commercial Registry Office and have been established in Turkey for at least 10 years.

In principal no preferential treatment is given to tender from any one foreign country as compared to any other country, except in the case of "tied" external financing arrangements. Under the provisions of Decree No. 6/3083 dated June 1, 1964, however, the Ministry of Finance is authorized to designate the country from which imports of capital goods exceeding $50,000 are to be made by departments, organizations and establishments in the State sector. The procurement authorities concerned are required to obtain information concerning foreign financing possibilities from the Ministry of Finance prior to their decision to purchase, or award of contracts for, imports exceeding $50,000. The Ministry may require that the terms and conditions of available credits be taken into consideration by the procurement authority concerned before a contract award is made.

Preference for Turkish products is provided by the requirement that, if the Ministry of Industry determines that a product is manufactured in Turkey in sufficient amounts to meet local demands, no similar product can be imported. On July 28, 1964, the Minister of Industry announced that a new list of products manufactured in Turkey was being compiled with a view to issuing new regulations precluding the importation of all such products.

AGREEMENT OF ASSOCIATION WITH THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

The Agreement between Turkey and the European Economic Community was signed in Ankara on September 12, 1963, and entered into force on December 1, 1964 (Journal Officiel of the European Communities, December 29, 1964).

The Agreement provides for the association of Turkey with the Community under the provisions of Article 238 of the Treaty of Rome on the basis of a customs union, with the long-term possibility of full membership of Turkey in the Community.

The Agreement provides for a preparatory, a transitional and a final stage in the association. During the preparatory period of 5 years, possibly extended to 9 years, from the effective date, Turkey will continue its efforts to reorganize its economy and for that purpose the Community granted certain concessions in the form of tariff quotas for imports of particular importance to the Turkish economy as well as the granting through the European Investment Bank of financial assistance.

The Agreement provides only a general outline of the arrangements for the transitional stage, the details of which will be settled only towards the end of the preparatory stage. During the transitional stage, which may not exceed 12 years from the effective date, the Contracting Parties will gradually institute a customs union and bring into alignment the economic policies of Turkey and the Community.

The final stage is based on the customs union, which will cover all commodity trade except products of the European Coal and Steel Community.

Article 23 of the Agreement provides for an institutional structure for its implementation similar to that provided by the Agreement of Association with Greece. The Association Council, which is composed of representatives of Turkey on the one hand and of the Member States and of the Community on the other hand, has the general function of taking all measures necessary to assure the realization of the aims of the Agreement and to conduct all examinations into the development of the cooperation between the Contracting Parties. All decisions adopted by the Council must be unanimous.

The Agreement in general follows the outline of the Treaty of Rome. Unlike the Agreement of Association with Greece, there is no specific provision with regard to the elimination of discrimination on the basis of nationality in the field of public contracts. Articles 8 and 9, however, contain the following general provisions with regard to the elimination of discrimination on the basis of nationality during the transitional stage (unofficial translation from French by the American Society of International Law, 3 International Legal Materials 65 (1964)):

"Article 8

"In order to realize the objectives set forth in Article 4, the Association Council shall establish, prior to the start of the transitional phase, and in accordance with the procedure provided in Article 1 of the Provisional Protocol, the conditions, terms and rate of application of the provisions pertaining to the fields covered by the Treaty establishing the Community which will have to be considered, specifically those covered by the present Title, as well as any safeguard clause which might be considered useful.

"Article 9

"The Contracting Parties acknowledge that within the field of application of the Convention, and without prejudice to the specific provisions which might be established

by virtue of Article 8, any discrimination on account of nationality is prohibited in accordance with the principle set forth in Article 7 of the Treaty establishing the Community."

Vague provisions relating to the right of establishment and the free rendering of services are contained in Articles 13 and 14, which provide as follows:

"Article 13

"The Contracting Parties agree to take inspiration from Articles 52 through 56 and 58 of the Treaty establishing the Community in order to eliminate the restrictions on the freedom of establishment among them.

"Article 14

"The Contracting Parties agree to take inspiration from Articles 55, 56, and 58 through 65 of the Treaty establishing the Community in order to abolish the restrictions on the free performance of services among them."

Similarly, vague provisions relating to the approximation of legislation are contained in Article 16, which provides as follows:

"Article 16

"The Contracting Parties recognize that the principles set forth in the provisions relating to competition, fiscality, and the approximation of legislation, contained in title I of the third part of the Treaty establishing the the [sic] Community, must be made applicable in their Association relations."

It seems obvious that the application of the provisions of the Agreement is not likely to have much effect in the foreseeable future in the field of public contracts.

PRINCIPAL SOURCES

(1) Union of Chambers of Commerce, Industry and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey, "Investment Guide to Turkey" (Ankara, 1964).

(2) United States Department of Commerce, "Investment in Turkey: Basic Information for United States Businessmen" (1956).

(3) United States Department of Commerce, "Selling in Turkey," Overseas Business Reports, OBR No. 64-97 (September 1964).

EXCISE TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a petition I recently received from some 400 good citizens of the Lambertville, Ottawa Lake, and Temperance areas in the Second Congressional District of Michigan. The petition urges Congress to remove the Federal excise tax on telephone service.

This is an outstanding example of citizens being personally and individually interested in national legislation, and wisely acting to inform their representatives in Washington of their opinions. The merits of the reduction or abolition of the excise tax on telephone service deserves careful attention.

Few would argue today that telephone service is a luxury; certainly the productivity of my own office would be considerably diminished without our telephones. I have received a number of letters from elderly people in Lambertville and Temperance reminding me that they live alone and must maintain their telephone service, but that the tax on this service is a heavy load on their severely limited incomes. Most of us will agree that the telephone is no luxury for these people. Is it, in fact, a luxury for any of us?

Is the telephone a luxury for the businessman who orders, sells, and generally conducts a great deal of his business on the phone? Is it a luxury for the professional man; the housewife; the public administrator?

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the answer to these questions is: No. The telephone is a necessity in 20th century America, and everyone in this body knows it. My petition has come from citizens of the Second District of Michigan, but I believe they speak for millions of American telephone users.

As we all know, most excise taxes now in force were enacted in order to discourage "consumer" spending at a time when national resources and production were needed for a war effort. Today, we promote consumer spending in an effort to maintain our booming peacetime economy. Is it wise to maintain a tax which operates in opposition to national economic policy? I think not.

And, I would add, it is particularly inappropriate to continue a tax, falling on an essential service, which taxes without regard to a family's ability to pay. In this country, we have established the graduated income tax as that tax most likely to fall upon the citizen with some relation to his ability, as judged by his income, to pay. We have tried to reserve excise taxes largely to the function of "user taxes." This is how we justify, for example, gasoline taxes: they force the user of motor vehicle fuel to pay his share of the cost of constructing and maintaining highways.

But surely there is no cost to the Federal Government in the private use of telephone service. And the impact, for the average family in any given tax bracket, falls most heavily, as a percentage of income, on those low-income families least able to pay.

When legislation to adjust the Federal excise tax reaches this floor for a vote during this session of Congress, I hope we will abolish the fiction of the "luxury" telephone and remove this tax from the statute books.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LIV

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following articles from the March 11, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

These articles concern New York City's participation in the poverty program and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The articles follow:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—CITY POVERTY PLEA TODAY: $11 MILLION

(By Barry Gottehrer)

An anticipated request by Mayor Wagner for more than $11 million in additional antipoverty funds from the Federal Government is expected to trigger at least two moves to audit the books of and investigate Haryou-Act, the controversial Harlem community-action program. Haryou-Act, which has been beset by internal conflict and external criticism since its formation last June, has been the target of increasing attacks and rumors during the last 2 months.

The audit reportedly would come from Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity, which Mayor Wagner will ask today to give $1.5 million of the requested $11 million to Haryou-Act.

Though the audit is expected to be described as "customary procedure" when it takes place in the next 10 days, it is understood that the Federal agency has been waiting for its first opportunity to see exactly what has been taking place behind the doors of the Harlem organization, which now occupies two floors of the Hotel Theresa at 125th Street and 7th Avenue.

Though more than $5 million in city and Federal funds have already been appropriated for Haryou-Act, today's request represents the first time any funds have been requested directly from Sargent Shriver's office.

The second investigation will be called for by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, whose 18th Congressional District includes Haryou-Act's headquarters and whose reported influence and control of the program has been the chief source of much of the organization's continuing difficulties.

It was also learned last night that the city's antipoverty operations board, which has had only praise for the program publicly, has been privately conducting its own intensive audit of Haryou-Act's books for nearly a month.

Though Anne Roberts, the $22,500-a-year staff director of the city board, maintained last night that the city audit was "standard practice whenever city funds are used," Livingston Wingate, executive director of Haryou-Act, said that the audit has been brought about by "outside criticism" and "all those rumors."

Mr. Wingate, a onetime assistant to Representative POWELL, said he was referring to rumors centering around Haryou's decision to rent new quarters in the Theresa Hotel early this year.

Haryou-Act, which has been negotiating a lease with the owner of the Posner Building on 128th Street and still hopes to move there, had moved into the Theresa in early February to accommodate its expanding program and staff of 150.

Rumors of an inflated rental and a possible real estate coup, according to Mr. Wingate, reached city hall and precipitated the audit.

"Screvane (city council president and antipoverty board head) called us down and has been having his auditor go over our books for nearly a month," Mr. Wingate said yesterday.

Though he says the audit is still going on, Mr. Wingate says the city now agrees that Haryou-Act got "quite a deal" in renting the space at the hotel.

Under the contract rental according to Mr. Wingate, Haryou-Act is paying less than $14,000 in rent for 6 months and has induced owner Philip Edwards to pay $10,000 to repair and renovate the two floors, a section of the lobby, and a private elevator.

According to a contract signed and dated February 16, however, Haryou-Act agreed to pay the landlord $3,312.50 a month—a total of $19,875 for the 6 months.

Reached at his downtown office last week, Mr. Edwards said he was "gambling"—that he was hoping that Haryou-Act would stay longer than the 6 months.

Mr. Wingate said yesterday, however, that Haryou-Act had already made it clear to Mr. Edwards that it could not possibly extend its contract.

Mr. Wingate, 49, who earns $25,000 a year as director of the Nation's largest and most controversial antipoverty project, says he is also aware of the other possible investigations of the program.

"I have been hearing about plans to audit our books and investigate Haryou-Act for weeks," he said yesterday. "I welcome the investigation. If there is anything wrong here, I'd like to know about it. No project in the Nation has done as much as we have in so short a time. Any investigation that will give us a fair and honest appraisal will be most welcome."

Mr. Wingate heartily disagreed with the criticism that he had packed Haryou-Act with friends and associates of Representative POWELL.

This criticism has existed since early last year, when Dr. Kenneth Clark, acting chairman of Haryou whose perceptive study, "Youth in the Ghetto," helped to launch the Harlem program, resigned from the group, which was to be merged with Act.

His charge: Representative POWELL was trying to control the entire program.

These charges flared anew last month when Kenneth Marshall, Haryou-Act's program director, was ousted.

Mr. Marshall and his attorney, Paul Zuber, charged that the entire organization had become Representative POWELL's private project and brought their charges to the attention of at least one New York Representative and a Middle Atlantic Senator.

"A congressional investigation is completely warranted," said Mr. Zuber last night. "This becomes mandatory when it is considered that the area served by Haryou-Act is a high-tension area and a potential danger area during the summer if there are no facilities and programs available for youngsters in the community."

Although Mr. Wingate—and the city administration—say that the Haryou-Act program has made "tremendous strides," considering that the first funds were not received until last September, others in addition to Mr. Zuber and Mr. Marshall have serious doubts.

One member of a group of New York City and State businessmen told several city officials after a tour of the Haryou-Act headquarters last fall that "as a matter of fact, if we were running the city, probably the first thing we would do would be to run a good hard audit on Haryou-Act."

The majority of these visiting businessmen saw little evidence of progress and achievement in the program, which had been designed to ungrade the skills and psychological attitudes of the area's 71,000 youths.

When the program was first conceived, Haryou-Act was described as an attempt to reduce the awesome delinquency and school dropout rate and at the same time combat the general hopelessness and despair of central Harlem's 232,000 residents.

It is precisely this conflict—between the city's claims and the mounting criticism—that reportedly has brought about the call for audits and investigations.

Though he says he is "satisfied" with the Haryou-Act progress and describes the program as the best in the United States, Representative POWELL said yesterday that as chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, which must pass on antipoverty funds, he still plans to call for an investigation of Haryou-Act and antipoverty programs all over the country.

"This investigation is the first order of business," he said. "Since the program began in my committee I think it's my responsibility to check and see how it's functioning."

Mr. Wingate said yesterday that the program had been somewhat slow in getting started but only because funds had been slow in being released. He said that, as of yesterday, only one-third of the appropriated funds had been utilized.

It was also learned last night that Mayor Wagner's plea for new Federal funds today will also request the setting up of six community project centers to combine all antipoverty services under one roof in various areas of the city.

These program centers, which reportedly will consume the large share of the $11 million, will resemble the Haryou-Act and mobilization-for-youth programs where all of an area's antipoverty programs are consolidated.

These six centers are reportedly scheduled for south Jamaica, Brownsville, east Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, south Bronx, and lower Manhattan.

Criticism of the city's program and its delay in making its Federal request occurred at a luncheon of the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies yesterday afternoon.

Lester Granger, former president of the International Conference of Social Work, said, "We haven't got a war on poverty. We have a government pronouncement of an objective. Whether or not we have a real war on poverty is going to depend on this man (gesturing at Mayor Wagner) and you guys and gals."

After the luncheon, Mayor Wagner told reporters that Mr. Granger, "an old friend"—had "made a broad statement."

"We have a lot of programs," said the mayor, who then conceded that there had been "a great deal of delay due to bureaucracy." "We are really just at the beginning," he added. "I think we're ahead of anywhere else in the country."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—FOR THE CITY'S WAR ON POVERTY, A $500-A-WEEK CONSULTANT

(By Martin J. Steadman)

The city's antipoverty program has a $500-a-week consultant.

She is Mrs. Mary Conway Kohler, one of three consultants hired by the Poverty Operations Board.

The others are Mrs. D'Jaris Watson, wife of Civil Court Judge James Watson, and Sidney Shiff. Mrs. Watson earns $65 a day and Mr. Shiff is paid $60 a day as a consultant on small business problems.

Mrs. Anne Roberts, $22,500-a-year director of the antipoverty program, said the three consultants were "vital, vigorous, social workers," who have been very helpful to her administration.

Mrs. Kohler also is a $75-a-day consultant to the U.S. Labor Department, and to the National Institute of Mental Health. In addition, she is paid $250 a day by two private foundations as a consultant.

She said yesterday that she keeps a diary and only charges a day's pay to the agency or foundation she worked for that day.

"Listen, this is none of your business," she said. "Sure, I make a lot of money. But I'm not going to tell a newspaperman how much I earn from my private business. The $100 a day I receive from the poverty program is really one of my cheapest fees."

Though Controller Abraham D. Beame's office has Mrs. Kohler listed as "$500-a-week consultant" to the Poverty Operations Board, and a spokesman for the controller said she was paid "fairly regularly" since May 1964, Mrs. Kohler said she sometimes works only half-time and can only recall charging the city full-time during December and January, when she helped set up the Neighborhood Youth Corps Program.

The total amount paid to Mrs. Kohler could not be learned late yesterday. She said she wouldn't tell if she knew.

She also refused to identify the two private foundations, and refused to say how much she is paid as a consultant to the National Institute of Mental Health. She did say that she probably only worked a few days for that agency last year.

Mrs. Roberts, the director, said Mrs. Kohler was "a tremendous consultant, with a respected background in social work."

Mrs. Kohler is paid at a higher rate of daily pay than the director, Mrs. Roberts.

Mrs. Kohler, who is now 60, came to New York from San Francisco in 1952. She had been a referee in San Francisco's Juvenile Court for 15 years. On her arrival here, she became a consultant to family and children's courts.

She is a member or trustee of 15 voluntary service organizations, and on November 2, 1963, Mayor Wagner appointed her to a vacancy on the board of education.

At the time of her appointment, Mrs. Kohler said she had devoted her entire life to "the disadvantaged children. I never thought of doing anything else."

Five months later, Mrs. Kohler resigned from the board of education to accept the poverty program job. In an interview shortly after taking her new job, Mrs. Kohler told a reporter:

"I decided early in life that I wanted to do some sort of public service work either as a social worker or a lawyer, and I chose the latter. I was born in Oakland, Calif., but went to convent schools all over the country and in Europe. My upbringing in the convents taught me always to serve and be responsible for the poor."

Mr. Shiff and Mrs. Watson could not be reached at the Poverty Operations Board offices at 250 Broadway yesterday afternoon. Mr. Shiff was at a meeting in Harlem and Mrs. Watson was in the field. Mrs. Watson is a trained social worker.

Judge Watson was until last year a Harlem political power, serving in the State senate. Her name was recently mentioned as a possible candidate for Manhattan borough president to succeed Edward R. Dudley, who became a supreme court justice January 1. Though Mrs. Constance Baker Motley won the post, it was said Judge Watson was the first choice of Tammany Hall leader J. Raymond Jones.

The Poverty Operations Board was formally announced June 30, 1964, by Mayor Wagner in an executive order. The mayor said his new antipoverty agency would "facilitate, expedite and energize the prosecution of 'The War Against Poverty.'"

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LV

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the second on New York City's participation in the war on poverty. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 12, 1965.

The article is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis," and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—THE INVESTIGATION OF HARYOU—POWELL WILL LEAD IT

(By Alfonso Narvaez and Barry Gottehrer)

Mayor Wagner called on the Federal Government yesterday to provide the city with more than $10.3 million to implement the community action phase of New York's war on poverty.

At the same time, reports of an investigation of Haryou-Act, the controversial Harlem project which has been beset by internal conflict and external criticism since its formation last June, were confirmed.

The investigation of Haryou-Act and "poverty programs all over the country" will be conducted by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, whose 18th Congressional District includes Haryou-Act headquarters and whose reported control has been the source of much of the program's problems.

CITY PROGRAM

In Washington, a Federal spokesman said that the Office of Economic Opportunity, which Mayor Wagner asked to give $1.5 million of the $10.3 million to Haryou-Act, "might" audit the Harlem project's books.

Though the spokesman said that "no special attention" would be paid to Haryou-Act, it had been learned previously that the Office of Economic Opportunity has been interested in clearing the air of controversy that has surrounded the project. An audit, as reported in yesterday's Herald Tribune, is expected to take place in the next 10 days.

In making his announcement at city hall yesterday, the mayor said the city would begin a "multipronged community action program based in six poverty-stricken neighborhoods, aimed at providing work for the disadvantaged, supplying needed new services and coordinating present ones.

"This new undertaking is designed to encourage, equip and help train the poor to help themselves, to make the services of government and voluntary agencies available and accessible to all * * * and encouraging the neighborhood people to participate in shaping the form and content of the anti-poverty programs in their neighborhoods."

The mayor said that under the terms of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the city would have to provide an additional $1.1 million, bringing the total cost of the program to $11.5 million.

The city's request for funds will be reviewed by Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington, but a reply is expected within 30 days. The proposals will then be sent to Governor Rockefeller for final clearance.

Council President Paul R. Screvane, chairman of the city's antipoverty operations board, who took part in the press conference, denied heatedly a report that his office was conducting a special audit of Haryou-Act's books. He said that he did not know if the Federal Government or Representative POWELL was planning to conduct any investigation.

"I've been in constant touch with the people in the Office of Economic Opportunity and I have not heard of any probe," Mr. Screvane said. "I am not conducting one. We called Mr. Wingate (Livingston Wingate, executive director of Haryou-Act) a month ago, and we spoke of program, and went over fiscal matters. Their controller and our fiscal officer have been talking since then but there is nothing unusual about this."

PROGRESS CENTERS

When asked about reports of possible investigations, Mr. Wingate told the Herald Tribune, "I welcome the investigation. If there is anything wrong here, I'd like to know about it. No project in the Nation has done as much as we have in so short a time. It's the only project in the country where the people in the ghetto have diagnosed their own ills, formulated their own program and are implementing it. Any investigation that will give us a fair and honest appraisal will be most welcome."

When the money is finally approved, the city hopes to establish community progress centers in 6 of the 16 major areas of poverty in the city. However, no centers will be established in Harlem or on the Lower East Side, where Haryou-Act and mobilization for youth are already working.

The centers, which the city has requested $6.4 million to get going, will be established in East Harlem, Manhattan's West Side, Southeast Bronx, South Jamaica in Queens, and in the Williamsburg and Brownsville sections of Brooklyn.

Each center will employ about 25 professionals who will train and eventually employ more than 4,500 nonprofessional youths and adults. Representatives of city agencies will also use the centers to service the local residents.

The nonprofessional youths will serve as social worker aids, laboratory assistants, recreational aids, nurse aids, and orderlies. Adults will get training as school aids, homemaker aids, home visitors, housing aids, and information aids.

Youths working under the program will be paid $1.25 an hour, while adults will get $1.50 during their training period and eventually $1.75 an hour.

The city hopes that these nonprofessionals will learn enough to be able to take jobs in private industry.

The main target of the city's war on poverty will be the 1.7 million residents who live in conditions approaching poverty. The city will direct its efforts toward helping the unemployed adults, preschool children, mentally retarded children, unemployed school dropouts, unwed mothers and the aged.

The city hopes that the establishment of the centers will result in jobs for 4,800 persons, direct assistance to 55,000 others living in the designated poverty areas, and opportunities for participation in the program to the areas' 888,000 persons.

Other items in the city's request call for $1.5 million for Haryou-Act for the creation of neighborhood boards and neighborhood service centers, $500,000 for three programs for the Puerto Rican community, and $1.1 million for educational enrichment programs.

Mayor Wagner said that the funds being requested were for the rest of the calendar year, and that the request next year would be even greater. He said that he hoped to have the program working in 15 poverty areas next year.

LATIN AMERICA—THE WAGE BACKGROUND

Mr. KREBS. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in the past few months I have delivered a number of speeches on the floor of the House in regard to Latin-American relations and the Alliance for Progress. I have been attempting to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the accomplishments of the Alliance, its potential for bringing about reform and development in Latin America, and the hard work that needs to be done.

Encouraging as are the steps that have been taken through the Alliance—the housing units, schools, and roads that have been built, the tax reforms that have been initiated—the problems that remain are enormous. Anyone who has a familiarity with the stark poverty of the Latin American masses, contrasting sharply with the wealth of the ruling families, is struck not only by the injustice of those conditions, but also by the difficulty in conveying or explaining them properly to others.

The American Institute for Free Labor Development in its April 1965 report published a compilation of data on the average monthly earnings in selected worker categories in the Latin American countries. The worker categories covered are textiles, mining, construction, and white collar. Earnings are given in the dollar equivalents.

Anyone interested in our own hemisphere should glance over this list, which I will insert in the RECORD at the close of my remarks. Some of the wages, particularly those in Venezuela, seem fair enough. Wages in that country range from $100 per month in the textile industry to $300 per month for white collar workers. But the workers in the other countries, in the categories selected, do not do so well.

Think what it means to earn $21.02 per month as a mineworker or $23.28 per month as a construction worker in Paraguay. How does one feed his family, much less house and clothe it, if he earns only $25.62 per month as a textile worker in Brazil, or $37.26 per month in the same industry in Chile, or $40 per month as a mineworker in El Salvador, or $25 per month as a construction worker in Bolivia? The answer, in many cases, is that you do not, adequately—that your children get sick and die.

While reading this list of average monthly earnings, one should keep in mind that only four categories are portrayed. In many other areas, such as agriculture, the wages are even lower. Further, there are millions of Latin Americans who are not even within the money economy. That is, they grow only enough food to subsist, make their own clothes, and barter for what necessities they can.

This is part of the meaning of economic underdevelopment.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD the compilation of statistics, "1964 Wage Background—Latin America," from the AIFLD report, April 1965:

THE 1964 WAGE BACKGROUND—LATIN AMERICA

The following data was compiled by the AIFLD social projects department from information furnished by United States and Latin American official sources and, most especially, reliable Ibero-American trade union representatives. The table below shows average monthly income ranges. In some instances where minimum and maximum ranges were not available or where the extent of disparity was negligible, the only available figure or deducible average is given. In other cases for which figures were either unavailable or deemed unreliable, the designation "NA" has been used.

It should likewise be noted that the wages cited are based on official currency exchange rates. They, therefore, reflect disparities caused by unrealistic rates for some currencies. Inasmuch as no attempt whatever has been made to correlate this data with the purchasing power of individual national currencies, the figures themselves cannot be regarded as a reliable measure of the standard of living. They are presented solely as factual information within the body of reservations indicated above.

Average monthly dollar equivalent earnings in selected worker categories

Country	Textiles	Mining	Construction	White collar
Argentina	94.00	[1]	[2] 65.33	[2] [3] 86.00
Bolivia	50.00–67.00	40.00–70.00	25.00–41.00	40.00–100.00
Brazil	25.62	37.50	26.25	[1]
Chile	37.26	46.58	33.22–86.41	51.55–120.80
Colombia	60.34–69.62	[4] 73.10–149.11	49.46–80.58	58.92–181.86
Costa Rica	52.50–67.50	75.00–100.00	75.00–137.50	[1]
Dominican Republic	[1]	50.00–150.00	57.50–190.00	190.00
Ecuador	53.00–68.14	[1]	19.47–113.57	216.33
El Salvador [5]	65.00	40.00	60.00	80.00
Guatemala	40.00–70.00	[1]	30.00–50.00	250.00
Honduras	62.50	57.50	70.00	72.50
Jamaica	83.99–189.00	148.76–324.00	89.78–218.81	324.00
Mexico	72.00–91.20	56.00–80.00	68.80–72.00	64.00–88.00
Nicaragua	64.28	58.91	82.85	100.00
Panama	[1]	[1]	64.00–120.00	100.00
Paraguay	[1]	21.02	23.28	[1]
Peru	87.87	63.02	66.57	38.77
Trinidad and Tobago	47.20–94.40	[4] 99.12–112.34	59.47–75.52	47.20–70.80
Uruguay	48.00–75.00	[1]	105.00–122.00	107.00–185.00
Venezuela	100.00–135.00	[4] 170.00–220.00	135.00–190.00	240.00–300.00

[1] Not available.
[2] Minimum.
[3] Does not include allowance for married workers of additional $9.33 for spouse and per each child.
[4] Includes petroleum workers.
[5] Does include 15 percent for fringe benefits received.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM IS OVER

Mr. KREBS. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, that the bracero program is finally over no one can now seriously doubt. The following article in the April 1965 issue of the Laborer reviews briefly the news conference held by the Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, in Los Angeles, after his 4 days of field visits and inspections of farm labor areas. In the course of the 1,200 miles that Secretary Wirtz covered in his inspection tour he saw for himself the backwardness and the substandard working conditions to which farm laborers are subjected.

Secretary Wirtz concluded not only that Congress was correct in ending the bracero program and ending the guaranteed labor supply that the Federal Government had been providing to the large growers, but he also concluded that the working conditions must and will be improved—there must be as a minimum improvement, decent housing and better wages for the farm workers.

I was particularly interested to note in the Secretary's remarks that he has endorsed a Federal minimum wage for agricultural employees. My bill, H.R. 2422, extends Federal minimum wage coverage to farm workers. The need for such a law has been dramatically demonstrated by Secretary Wirtz' recent inspection tour.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of the article "Wirtz Predicts More Unionization of Farm Workers," from the April 1965 issue of the Laborer.

WIRTZ PREDICTS MORE UNIONIZATION OF FARM WORKERS

"The bracero program is over." With this terse statement at a news conference in Los Angeles, Calif., Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz spelled out conclusions reached following 4 days of field visits and inspections of the California farm labor areas from Sacramento in the north down to the Mexican border. He was accompanied by Under Secretary of Labor John Henning, on the trip.

Following his 4 days of visits the Secretary held an informal press conference at the Los Angeles airport at which he spelled out his general reactions and conclusions to what he had seen and heard during the 1,200-mile trip.

Three main factors in the California labor situation were cited by the Secretary who has been under pressure to recommend admitting thousands of braceros or Mexican temporary laborers to help harvest the vegetable and fruit crops of the Far West. The Secretary noted:

Congress in ending Public Law 78 admitting braceros has "changed a situation in which there had previously been a fully insured, guaranteed labor supply for California agriculture. That will no longer be the case."

Another change is the fact "that this previously guaranteed and assured labor supply had been provided under terms which included no competitive or bargaining power as between employer and employee—the employment was solely on terms and conditions which could be dictated, subject only to the application of laws by the employers."

On this point the Secretary said that "From here on there will be a competitive factor in the labor situation which there has not been before."

A marked change in character of workers will be made. Under the old law at least one-fifth of California agriculture labor was performed on the basis of single individuals living apart from their families.

In the future, Mr. Wirtz said, "it is clear that to the extent that this labor is performed by workers from the United States, it will mean to a considerable extent workers who travel with their families."

Throughout the press conference the Secretary noted the importance of decent housing (he blasted some of the horrible housing conditions observed) and the necessity of providing decent wages and living conditions. He punctured the myth that decent wages would mean skyrocketing prices. While admitting that there would be some increase, he said that studies showed that field labor costs were in the order of a "part of a cent" a unit (a can of tomatoes, a head of lettuce, a dozen oranges, a pound of asparagus, etc.).

He also foresaw an "increased amount of unionization" with U.S. workers used as against braceros. He also said he and Henning personally favored a national minimum wage law for farmworkers. He said he felt that there would be an adequate supply of domestic workers and he concluded by saying "* * * there have been grossly unfair suggestions that the domestic workers involved here are an inferior breed compared to the rest of us."

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF CORAL GABLES, FLA.

Mr. KREBS. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the travel section of the New York Sunday Times reads throughout the long, cold, Yankee winter as though it were a Florida publication. Story after story relates the history, the attractions, and the beauties of different Florida cities, towns, beaches, race tracks, museums, colleges, and, of course, occasionally a photograph of a Florida bathing beauty is included because of our prospective northern visitors' well-known cultural and intellectual interests.

For example, the issue of the Sunday Times for January 31, 1965, contained a long and interesting article about Florida's Gold Coast, with a detailed map of the area that extends from Hollywood to South Miami. But all that was said of Coral Gables was that it contained a "Miracle Mile" and the palm-lined campus of the University of Miami. There is much, much more to be said than that about Coral Gables, and its 40th anniversary as a city is an appropriate time to say it.

On April 29, 1925, Coral Gables was incorporated by the Legislature of the State of Florida as a city in its own right. Ever since then, no city in America has been able to excel Coral Gables in its boundless opportunities for everyday, winter-and-summer outdoor sports, enjoyment, and pleasure.

George Merrick was the moving spirit behind the development of Coral Gables. By about 1922, he began to obtain the financial support that was needed for the city of his dreams. He permitted nothing to be built on his land that did not conform to high architectural standards. He managed to interest leading American architects, town planners, and engineers in the infant Coral Gables, and they worked together in long committee meetings and endless conferences.

In the rise in land values that took place, Mr. Merrick found the basis for the financial support that he needed for his great project. An additional purchase of land extended his territory until it included 10,000 acres in all, or approximately 16 square miles. The Coral Gables Corp. came into being; boulevards were constructed; canals and waterways and lakes were blasted with dynamite and cleared by ditching machines; winding avenues with courts and fountains and plazas were cut out of the solid coral rock; hotels and public buildings began to rise out of what had been, only a few years before, George Merrick's father's 160-acre grapefruit grove.

Two hundred miles of paved streets were built, along with schools and banks and shops. In 2 years from the founding of the city, no less than fifteen hundred private homes were passed by the architectural board. At the time when the Florida land boom reached its height, Coral Gables was only about a fourth completed, sufficiently far advanced to give an indication of Mr. Merrick's conception of what the perfect city should be. The prevailing architecture was Spanish. Its main boulevards were all 100 feet wide, and at their intersections were fountains surrounded by tropical trees and wide plazas paved with coral rock. Everywhere was foliage of brilliant hues.

The streets were not laid out in the usual rectangular pattern, but, in many instances, were made to run parallel to the waterways. The houses were built to stand well back in their gardens. Then, as now, there were dazzling colors, white walls, striped awnings, red roofs, brilliant greenery, and always the intense blue of the Florida sky.

Taken as a whole, the building of Coral Gables was a magnificent achievement, in many ways far in advance of its time. Its water and lighting, its drainage and public utilities generally, embodied the best in scientific thought and engineering.

Coral Gables has survived boom-and-bust, it has survived hurricanes, it has survived to become the thrilling and beautiful spot it is today. The Gables is a city secure in its wealth and prestige with such outstanding city officials as, Mayor C. L. Dressel, Jr., Commissioner William H. Chapman, Commissioner Joseph H. Murphy, Commissioner W. Keith Phillips, Jr., Commissioner George M. Wilson, and City Manager L. W. Robinson, Jr. On its 40th anniversary, my colleagues will join me in a salute to Coral Gables, the city beautiful.

NEW UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the President on his selection of Mr. John A. Schnittker to be the new Under Secretary of Agriculture. He has made an outstanding choice.

It has been my privilege to work very closely with Mr. Schnittker on a number of occasions. I believe this has given me the opportunity to become well acquainted with him, both as a person and in a professional capacity.

As a person, he is always pleasant, courteous, and interested in other people and their problems. To my knowledge, his integrity is unquestioned.

In his professional capacity, I have gained the highest respect for Mr. Schnittker's knowledge of agriculture and the operation of farm programs. He has served most capably in his position as Director of Agricultural Economics, a position which prepared him very well for his new responsibilities. I have been with him in conferences with legislators, farmers, processors, and consumers. He has a deep insight into the desires, needs, and problems of all groups concerned with the vast field of agriculture.

His appointment is another example of President Johnson's desire to give merit promotions to capable and deserving career Government employees. I congratulate the President and Mr. Schnittker on this appointment.

THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAJUNS ARRIVAL IN LOUISIANA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is general knowledge that south Louisiana is the center of French culture in the United States. A large percentage of the French-speaking people of Louisiana are Canadian in origin. Having come from an area in Nova Scotia called Acadia, they are referred to as "Cajuns," a corruption of the word "Acadians."

This year we Cajuns are celebrating the 200th anniversary of our ancestors' arrival in Louisiana, and in this regard I insert into the RECORD statements by Dean Thomas Arceneaux, of the University of Southwestern Louisiana, and by the Honorable Roy R. Theriot, Louisiana State Comptroller, which tell of the coming of the Acadians to Louisiana and of the French-Acadian culture which has thrived there:

TWO CENTURIES OF ACADIAN CULTURE IN LOUISIANA

(By Thomas J. Arceneaux, dean, College of Agriculture, University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, La.)

This year marks the completion of the second century of Acadian culture in Louisiana. It was 200 years ago and 10 years after their cruel exile from their once peaceful valley in far off Nova Scotia, that the first official group of displaced Acadians arrived in Louisiana. There is a tradition that a few Acadians had come here previous to the beginning of the migration which started two centuries ago, but we do know positively that, beginning in 1765 and continuing for over 20 years thereafter, many groups of displaced Acadians arrived in Louisiana to once again plant the culture of old France in still another part of the New World.

We, of Acadian Louisiana, are proud that we are the descendants of the first French colonists in the New World. Port Royal, in old Acadia, now Nova Scotia, was settled in 1605. That was 2 years before the founding of Jamestown, 15 years before the landing of the Mayflower, and 113 years before New Orleans became the capital of Louisiana. Following their exile from Canada in 1755 and after many years of sufferings as a displaced people, they finally settled the vast fertile and yet undeveloped regions of south Louisiana. Because of their high ideals, their thrift, and their rural French-Acadian culture, they transformed a wilderness into one of the most highly developed rural sections of our Southland. Yes, beautiful is the land with its prairies and forest of fruit trees. They who dwell there have named it the Eden of Louisiana.

Before their exile from Nova Scotia, the Acadians had honestly endeavored to live, for 42 years, as best they could under British rule, only to be deported as criminals. Then it was that they suffered the hardships of long years of exile, and they lived through those horrible years inspired and sustained by the hope that someday their wanderings would lead them to sunny Louisiana where dwelt their own race and where waved the flag of "La belle France." Their wanderings did lead them to Louisiana, but to a Louisiana that had become, by that time, a Spanish colony. So once again, fate denied them the privilege of becoming citizens of their mother country. In sprit they remained as French-Acadians as ever, but at the same time they became loyal subjects of his Spanish majesty. Gladly did they accept land grants in the bayou and prairie country, and gladly did they brave the dangers of the wilderness in order to build a solid foundation of civilization and culture.

The loyalty of the Acadians to the country of their adoption is strongly attested by the fact that many among them enthusiastically responded to the call of Governor Galvez, when he led his expeditions to fight for the cause of the American revolutionists. Thus it is that many of the descendants of those brave pioneers are justly proud of their memberships as Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution.

To become citizens of yet a different country, as a result of the Louisiana Purchase, was not a new experience for our ancestors, but to become citizens of the rapidly growing Nation they had helped to establish by their active participation in the Revolution, must have been a welcome challenge to a group who had suffered so much in order to persevere in their high ideals. Their continued contribution to Louisiana and to America is proof of their strong determination to live as decent, law-abiding men of good will. Their faith in America and America's faith in them has been richly rewarded. Today, south Louisiana is one of the most progressive regions of our great Nation.

Today, the Evangeline country has been enriched by the migration, to our midst, of people from all parts of our Nation and from abroad. Together we strive to work in peace and in harmony in the great task of contributing our full share to the continued progress of our section, our State, and our Nation. While we commemorate the completion of two centuries of Acadian culture in Louisiana, we, the descendants of those brave pioneers, together with all the people of our great State, should take this great occasion as a means to thank God for having led our Acadian ancestors to the

"Eden of Louisiana," and eventually to become citizens of the greatest nation of all times. We gladly accept the challenge to remain true to their high ideals; true to the ideals which inspired Longfellow to immortalize their deeds in his great poem, "Evangeline." Thus, it is with justifiable pride that we commemorate two centuries of Acadian contributions to the development of our area, our State, and our Nation.

The rich heritage of the Louisiana Acadians is graphically represented by the flag recently adopted by their cultural society, France-Amerique de la Louisiane Acadienne. To symbolize the French origin of the Acadians, a portion of the arms of their mother country—three fleurs de lis—silver on a blue field—is used as part of the flag. To symbolize Spain, the nation which controlled Louisiana at the time of the Acadian migration to Louisiana and under whom they prospered after years of exile, the old arms of Castille—a gold tower on a red field—appear in one section of the flag. A gold star on a white field represents Our Lady of the Assumption (Maris Stella), Patroness of the Acadians. The star also symbolizes the active participation of the Acadians in the American Revolution, as soldiers under Galvez.

STATEMENT BY ROY R. THERIOT

The year 1965 marks the completion of two centuries of Acadian culture in Louisiana—200 years have passed since our noble and courageous forebears officially started their migration to Louisiana, a land destined to become a vast reservoir of unexcelled culture.

It is only fitting and apropos that the offspring of these high-principled, scrupulous, and loyal people commemorate the year 1965 with sacred memories of the past, a glorious and proud present, and with a resolute future, for no other people can be prouder of its great heritage than the Acadians of Louisiana.

The activities of our forebears at the moment of their exile in 1755 establishes beyond any question of doubt their principles, their courage, their fortitude, devotion to their church, and to their heritage. As a result, the sacrifices which they made became our dividends, blessings, and our good fortune. Because of this glorious inheritance we should accept it with pride and an unshakable determination to keep it alive forever. Let us, therefore, during this commemorative year of 1965 rededicate ourselves anew with vigor toward the preservation and perpetuation of our great birthright. To reject this plea and to entertain the thought of allowing our great heritage to wilt and die is paramount to denouncing the historic bravery, courage, and sacrifices, of our forebears and would be nothing short than the loudest expression of ingratitude to our fathers, mothers, our grandfathers, our grandmothers, to our great-grandfathers, our great-grandmothers, and to our kinsmen even beyond that.

The Acadians of Louisiana have given to our State and Nation distinguished leaders in all fields among which are lawyers, jurists, doctors, engineers, architects, public servants, teachers, priests and other religious leaders, and some of the finest business people. Certainly with this type of contribution to our State and Nation no person of Acadian descent can have but the greatest of pride.

The hospitality of the Acadians is unsurpassed and unexcelled. Our joie de vie and esprit de corps have endeared other people to us. The kindliness, friendliness, and considerateness of the Acadians have brought to us the highest praise.

In view of all of these accomplishments, no Acadian needs to apologize to anyone for his heritage. In fact, every Acadian should be proud of his heritage.

Thank God I am an Acadian—I am proud to be an Acadian, and I want my children to be as proud as I am of our ancestry.

I urge and invite everyone to join with us at the various events during this year commemorating 200 years of Acadian culture.

REGULATION OF SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF FIREARMS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments and observations regarding legislation that has been introduced into the Congress to regulate the sale and distribution of firearms.

We are all aware of the tragedy of Dallas. The American people will always mourn the loss of their young President at the hands of a demented assassin. However, I do not believe we should be stampeded into passing legislation which would drastically curtail the availability of firearms to the American people. It was the very availability of personal firearms that gave birth to this great Nation. This right is written into our Constitution.

I know that many of us enjoy the occasional use of firearms in target practice, hunting, and other areas. Firearms are necessary to the individual to protect life and home. There is no doubt that some means of control should be established to keep these dangerous weapons out of the hands of juveniles, the mentally incompetent, and similar types of persons. However, I would urge the Congress to be most careful and thoughtful before enacting any legislation that would tend to deny the right to own and bear arms by the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful a meaningful bill that will properly regulate the sale and distribution of firearms will come before the Congress for consideration. But, I call on this House not to let emotions or hysteria infringe upon a right of the American people since the beginning of our Republic.

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. FASCELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina), for 20 minutes, on May 3; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TENZER (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 30 minutes, on May 6; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MAHON to revise and extend his remarks and include tables on the conference report on H.R. 7091.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KREBS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OTTINGER.
Mr. MINISH.
Mr. CORMAN.
Mr. MONAGAN.
Mr. FASCELL.
Mr. DORN.
Mr. FULTON of Tennessee.
Mr. VANIK.
Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 3, 1964, 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:

1018. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as heretofore amended, to provide that taxable income for District income tax purposes and net income for District franchise tax purposes shall conform as closely as possible to taxable income for Federal income tax purposes under the present and future income tax laws of the United States, except as otherwise specifically provided herein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1019. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of ineffective interservice utilization of aircraft jet engine parts, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1020. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of overpricing of aircraft identification equipment under contract AF 30(635)-13712 with Bell Aerosystems Co., a division of Bell Aerospace Corp., Wheatfield, N.Y., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1021. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary costs incurred in the indirect procurment of selected subsystems and assemblies for A-4 aircraft and other types, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1022. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary retention of high-value land for recreation, Reserve forces training, and military housing purposes at Fort DeRussy, Waikiki Beach, Hawaii, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1023. A letter from the commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which the Immigration and Naturalization Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, and pursuant to section 204(c) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1024. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1822 (a) of title 38, United States Code, to extend the provisions for treble-damage actions to direct loan and insured loan cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1025. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the one Air Force military construction contract awarded by the Department without formal advertising for the period July 1 through December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 605 of Public Law 88-390; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7657. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7765. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 7740. A bill to provide Federal assistance to restore and repair certain disaster areas in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 7741. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for increased eligibility for and greater utilization of the displaced business disaster loan program established under section 7(b)(3) of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7742. A bill to amend section 3 of the act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 7743. A bill to establish a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans, to assist students to attend postsecondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 7744. A bill to establish a national policy and program with respect to wild predatory mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 7745. 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. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7746. A bill establishing the rate of compensation payable to certain employees of the United States for performing inspection or quarantine services on a Sunday or holiday; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7747. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code in order to assist career members of the Armed Forces to provide their children with a college education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7748. A bill to amend chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, to dispose of telephone facilities by negotiated sale; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOORE (by request):

H.R. 7749. A bill to nullify certain rules of the Federal Communications Commission relating to the Citizens Radio Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 7750. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 7751. A bill to amend the Export Control Act to prohibit actions by domestic concerns furthering restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7752. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 7753. 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. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 7754. A bill to amend certain laws relating to housing in order to assist in the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for low-income families in urban and rural areas, to provide standards for determining just compensation in eminent domain proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7755. A bill to amend section 633 of title 28. United States Code, prescribing fees of U.S. commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 7756. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 7758. A bill to designate a proposed park on the shores of the J. Percy Priest Reservoir as the "Estes Kefauver Memorial Park"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 7759. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act of 1937 to require hearings on the adequacy of milk marketing order prices under drought conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7760. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to provide additional assistance for disaster victims; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 7761. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 7762. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7763. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to declare a national policy with respect to the right of Americans to employment without regard to sex or age; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 7764. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Susanna Madora Salter, first woman mayor in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7765. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.J. Res. 436. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 437. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning February 10 in each year as National Parkinson Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H. Con. Res. 402. Concurrent resolution regarding the right of self-defense of the parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance in forestalling intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Con. Res. 403. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H. Con. Res. 404. Concurrent resolution to request the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to gaining the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. Res. 359. Resolution to stop the transfer of the Naval Training Devices Center at Sands Point, N.Y., pending an investigation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Res. 360. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

230. By Mr. PEPPER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, to the Congress of the United States to provide for the designation of a highway from Tampa, Fla., to Miami, Fla., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

231. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, relative to proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting literacy tests, so-called, in the States, as

a prerequisite to the exercise of voting rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 7766. A bill for the relief of Miss Charicila Dede; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 7767. A bill for the relief of Dominic Barbaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7768. A bill for the relief of Lena S. Tillman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7769. A bill for the relief of Gerlando Sottile, Giuseppa Sottile and Pasqualina Sottile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 7770. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Maturo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 7771. A bill for the relief of Timothy Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 7772. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Daniel Chase; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7773. A bill for the relief of (John) Juan N. Ganaden, his wife, Lucia Magusara Ganaden, their minor son, Ernesto Alejandro Magusara Ganaden, and their minor daughters, Lucille Magusara Ganaden, and Georgina Magusara Ganaden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 7774. A bill to provide for conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in real property situated in Florida to the record owners of the surface of that property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 7775. A bill for the relief of Timoteo A. Tuazon; to the Comimttee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

194. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Columbus, Ohio, relative to requiring the Committee on Government Operations to issue certain charts annually which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1965

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

Archbishop Hrant Khaichadourian, prelate of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America, New York City, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for Thy most cherished gift, the spirit of freedom. We ask that Thy every blessing be showered upon this Nation, where freedom and human justice proceed triumphant. Reveal always Thy infinite and holy spirit to the several Members of this august body, that they may be inspired toward a greatness of purpose, that they may be ennobled in the great and constant quest for peace, freedom, and justice for all mankind.

In Thy unbounded kindness, remember the souls of the 1½ million Armenians who perished in the Turkish massacres of 1915. Their once blessed land, O Lord, is now but an accursed and barren desert of empty silence. Give us, we beseech Thee, the joy of fulfillment in that land which was sanctified by the blood of our martyrs. We commit our hands and hearts to make of it an altar of glorification of Thy spirit.

Today, in sorrow, and yet in hope, we offer to Thee our bitter sacrifices upon the altar of freedom, in an act of redemption for all mankind. In turn, Heavenly Father, we ask only that Thy other children be always spared the anguish, the terror, and the agony of the final and overwhelming act of human rejection—genocide. We have seen that anguish. We have felt that terror. We have known that agony. We pray that the tyranny of man over men will vanish as the morning mist under the brilliance of Thy shining countenance. Armenians suffered long under the yoke of tyranny; and yet, Almighty Father, they asked little, and wanted nothing but freedom to live in the image of Thy Son, Our Lord, Jesus Christ.

Grant, O God, courage and forbearance to this great Nation, that it may stand steadfast against any future visitation of horror on mankind. Give, we beseech Thee, but a particle of Thy celestial wisdom to all men and nations, that they may learn to walk together on the path of righteousness and freedom. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 28, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in prevention, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 349) welcoming to the United States the Inter-American Bar Association during its fourteenth conference to be held in Puerto Rico, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING 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.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, wishes to announce the appointment of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] to the U.S. National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LOAN OF CERTAIN SUBMARINES TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

LOAN OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SALE OR LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the sale or loan of naval vessels to friendly Latin American countries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, TO CONFORM TO THE CONVENTION FOR THE SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA, LONDON (1960)

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to conform to the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, London (1960) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide

for the annual inspection of all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia," approved February 18, 1938, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF THE "UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT"

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the "United Nations Participation Act," as amended, 63 Stat. 734–736 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs resulting from the entry into the military supply system of items identical or similar to items previously eliminated or to standard items that were retained, Department of Defense, dated April 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on lack of proper inspection and effective maintenance practices for communication and electronic equipment in certain strategic army corps units at Fort Hood, Tex., Department of the Army, dated April 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs resulting from failure to acquire rights-of-way for an interstate highway in the State of Utah before properties were improved, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated April 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive costs incurred by the Government for purchases of electronics equipment from Honeywell, Inc., Denver division, Denver, Colo., dated April 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need to consider modification of law relating to medical services furnished without charge to civilian field employees of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated April 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on additional costs incurred in the procurement of dress raincoats with expensive back vents, Department of Defense, dated April 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on failure to modify pallets to avoid unnecessary procurements, Defense Supply Agency, Department of Defense, dated April 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on failure to use available warehouse platform trailers to avoid unnecessary procurements of similar equipment, Department of Defense, dated April 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF NAVAL SEA CADET CORPS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Naval Sea Cadet Corps, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEDICAL CARE FOR VETERANS

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assure adequate and complete medical care for veterans by providing for participation by the Veterans' Administration in medical community planning and for the sharing of advanced medical technology and equipment between the Veterans' Administration and other public and private hospitals (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF DUAL COMPENSATION ACT

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Dual Compensation Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21

"Whereas 15 States observe daylight saving time on a statewide basis; and

"Whereas 16 States observe daylight saving time but not on a statewide basis; and

"Whereas 19 States do not observe daylight saving time; and

"Whereas all of the 15 States observing daylight saving time on a statewide basis switch to daylight saving time on the last Sunday in April; and

"Whereas the States observing daylight saving time but not on a statewide basis use varying dates for switching to daylight saving time; and

"Whereas 13 of the 15 States observing daylight saving time on a statewide basis return to standard time on the last Sunday in October; and

"Whereas a great deal of confusion and inconvenience has arisen due to the differences in time between States and between different localities within a State that does not observe daylight saving time on a statewide basis: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested to enact a daylight saving time law that would make daylight saving time uniform throughout all of the States; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate, to the President of the United States, and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

"PETER F. HANSEN,
"DAVID STANLEY.
"Senators.

"We, Robert D. Fulton, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa, Robert G. Moore, secretary of the senate, Vincent B. Steffen, speaker of the house of representatives, and William R. Kendrick, chief clerk of the house of representatives, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the senate and house of the 61st General Assembly of Iowa.

"ROBERT D. FULTON,
"Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
"ROBERT G. MOORE,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"VINCENT B. STEFFEN,
"Speaker of the House.
"WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 19

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to consider instructing the National Institutes of Health to mount a program of fertility control

"Whereas the National Academy of Sciences has declared that 'the problem of uncontrolled population growth emerges as one of the critical issues of our time since it influences the welfare and happiness of all world citizens'; and

"Whereas this problem has been formally recognized by President Johnson in his state of the Union message, and by former Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman and by leading demographers, city planners, health and welfare experts, theologians and the American Medical Association; and

"Whereas new methods of fertility control widely useful in all cultures and fully acceptable to all religious faiths must be found and these can come about only through expanded research in physiology; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is the one source of research support of significant magnitude to attract the scientists and get the job done: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to give due consideration to instructing the National Institutes of Health to mount a major crash program to perfect a variety of simple means of fertility control widely useful in all cultures and fully acceptable to all religous faiths; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 10

"Joint resolution relating to the Eel River and its tributaries

"Whereas through the gracious consent of the Honorable GEORGE FALLON, chairman of the Home of Representatives Committee on Public Works, and the Honorable ROBERT JONES, chairman of the Committee for Western Flood Inspection of the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works, the Committee for Western Flood Inspection met with the representatives of the County of Humboldt on January 11, 1965; and

"Whereas during the course of this meeting, the question of a study by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to control the flood-causing aspects of the Eel River and its tributaries was discussed; and

"Whereas in the opinion of the Board of Supervisors of Humboldt County, the lack of control of the Eel River and its tributaries was a dominant cause of the severe damage experienced by the County of Humboldt in the flood of December 1964; and

"Whereas authorization already exists with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to study the Eel River and its tributaries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are respectfully urged to take such steps as may be necessary to cause a study to be made of the flood pre-

vention control aspects of the Eel River and its tributaries; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States and to the Chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers."

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 11

"Joint resolution relating to the Klamath River and its tributaries

"Whereas through the gracious consent of the Honorable GEORGE FALLON, chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works, and the Honorable ROBERT JONES, chairman of the Committee for Western Flood Inspection of the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works, the Committee for Western Flood Inspection met with the representatives of the County of Siskiyou on January 11, 1965; and,

"Whereas during the course of this meeting, the question of a study by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to control the flood-causing aspects of the Klamath River and its tributaries was discussed; and

"Whereas in the opinion of the Board of Supervisors of Siskiyou County, the lack of control of the Klamath River and its tributaries was a dominant cause of the severe damage experienced by the County of Siskiyou in the flood of December 22, 1964; and

"Whereas authorization already exists with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to study the Klamath River and its tributaries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are respectfully urged to take such steps as may be necessary to cause a study to be made of the flood prevention control aspects of the Klamath River and its tributaries; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States and to the Chief of the U.S. Corps of Engineers."

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

"SENATE RESOLUTION 1965—Ex 24

"To the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"Whereas it is vital to the future economy of the State of Washington and the entire country that land and water resources be developed to their greatest potential use; and

"Whereas the Columbia Basin project has made a significant contribution to the State and Nation in utilizing these resources to create a growing economy; and

"Whereas the opportunities provided to date through irrigation of arid basin lands can be multiplied many times by complete utilization of land and water resources in an orderly development program; and

"Whereas there are areas of significant size in the Big Bend country of eastern Washington State in addition to the original authorized Columbia Basin project that could be served by project power and storage; and

"Whereas the crops raised on Columbia Basin project lands are not in surplus: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate, That we do hereby endorse and support the orderly development program outlined by the Columbia Basin Commission proposing:

"(1) A development rate of 20,000 acres per year for the immediate future;

"(2) Immediate preparations to initiate construction of the necessary main line works to support this rate and prepare for increases as changing conditions might warrant; and

"(3) A reconnaissance survey of the Big Bend area not now served by an irrigation system or included in current studies; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington, and to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

"WARD BOWDEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

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

"SENATE MEMORIAL 27

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to provide for the designation of a highway from Tampa, Fla., to Miami, Fla., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to provide for the designation as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways described in section 103(d) of title 23 of the United States Code, a highway running from Tampa, Fla., to Miami, Fla.; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the U.S. Congress.

"Approved by the Governor April 22, 1965.

"Filed in office, secretary of State, April 22, 1965."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relating to the protection of our gold reserves; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mrs. SMITH (for herself and Mr. MUSKIE) on April 26, 1965, p. 8396, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, favoring the extension of the northern terminus of the Interstate and Defense Highway System in Maine from Houlton to Fort Kent; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the above joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mrs. SMITH (for herself and Mr. MUSKIE) on April 26, 1965, p. 8396, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Martin County, Fla., praying for the continuance of the policy of providing technical assistance to soil and water conservation districts; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of Samuel S. Warda, of Modesto, Calif., relating to the manufacture of safer automobiles; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution of the Council of the City of Sitka, Alaska, protesting against the proposed closing of the Veterans' Administration facility in Alaska; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the women's division of the Kern River Valley Chamber of Commerce, Lake Isabella, Calif., relating to the protection of the Kern River Valley watershed; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Kern Plateau Association, Inc., of Bakersfield, Calif., relating to the protection of the Kern River watershed; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the National Bicycle Dealers Association, Inc., of Wickliffe, Ohio, favoring the President's program for the development of bicycle paths; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 6767. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 172).

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H.R. 3043. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 173).

SALE OF UNIFORM CLOTHING TO NAVAL SEA CADET CORPS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original bill (S. 1856) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps, and submitted a report (No. 171) thereon, which bill was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar, and the report was ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of February 1965. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL STOCKPILES INVENTORIES, FEBRUARY 1965

INTRODUCTION

This is the 63d in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of February 1965.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of February 1, 1965, totaled $13,236,183,096 and as of February 28, 1965, they totaled $13,052,653,269 a net decrease of $183,529,827 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of

commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, but the cost value figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category

Major category	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile [1]	$5,539,247,000	$5,521,145,800	−$18,101,200
Defense Production Act	1,424,948,300	1,414,482,900	−10,465,400
Supplemental—barter	1,399,569,506	1,400,563,510	+994,004
Total, strategic and critical materials [1]	8,363,764,806	8,336,192,210	−27,572,596
Agricultural commodities:			
Price support inventory	4,452,548,700	4,294,069,340	−158,479,360
Inventory transferred from national stockpile [1]	56,800,834	56,062,977	−737,857
Total, agricultural commodities [1]	4,509,349,534	4,350,132,317	−159,217,217
Civil defense supplies and equipment:			
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense	11,861,075	11,857,563	−3,512
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	200,820,272	200,708,260	−112,012
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	212,681,347	212,565,823	−115,524
Machine tools:			
Defense Production Act	45,300	45,300	
National Industrial Reserve Act	88,684,100	88,939,100	+255,000
Total, machine tools	88,729,400	88,984,400	+255,000
Helium	61,658,009	64,778,519	+3,120,510
Total, all inventories	13,236,183,096	13,052,653,269	−183,529,827

[1] Cotton inventory valued at $128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87-548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net change figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the original acquisition cost of the commodities delivered to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, et cetera, costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

Appendix A to this report, beginning on page 8924, includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

The stockpile inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1.—Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month).

Table 2.—Agricultural commodities inventories, February 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3.—Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, February 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4.—Machine tools inventories, February 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 5.—Helium inventories, February 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

New stockpile objectives

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new stockpile objectives for strategic and critical materials.

Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives established between May 1963 and April 1964, based on essential needs in the event of a "conventional war emergency."

Appendix B, beginning on page 8925, contains excerpts from Office of Emergency Planning statements setting forth the new policy and current studies with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials required for "conventional war emergency" and "nuclear war emergency."

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Aluminum, metal:									
National stockpile	$487,680,600	$487,680,600		Short ton	1,128,988	1,128,988			
Defense Production Act	401,660,300	400,267,600	−$1,392,700	do	796,656	793,906	−2,750		
Total	889,340,900	887,948,200	−1,392,700	do	1,925,644	1,922,894	−2,750	450,000	1,472,894
Aluminum oxide, abrasive grain:									
Supplemental—barter	15,717,600	15,717,600		Short dry ton	50,905	50,905		[2]	50,905
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude:									
National stockpile	21,735,100	21,735,100		Short ton	200,093	200,093			
Supplemental—barter	22,747,400	22,747,400		do	178,266	178,266			
Total	44,482,500	44,482,500		do	378,359	378,359		160,000	218,359
Antimony:									
National stockpile	19,814,700	19,655,200	−159,500	do	29,320	29,096	−224		
Supplemental—barter	13,550,500	13,550,500		do	22,704	22,704			
Total	33,365,200	33,205,700	−159,500	do	52,024	51,800	−224	25,500	26,300
Asbestos, amosite:									
National stockpile	2,637,600	2,637,600		do	11,705	11,705			
Supplemental—barter	10,004,950	10,084,168	+79,218	do	39,918	40,217	+299		
Total	12,642,550	12,721,768	+79,218	do	51,623	51,922	+299	40,000	11,922
Asbestos, chrysotile:									
National stockpile	3,356,200	3,356,200		do	6,224	6,224			
Defense Production Act	2,102,600	2,102,600		do	2,348	2,348			
Supplemental—barter	5,001,054	4,990,054	−11,000	do	7,576	7,576			
Total	10,459,854	10,448,854	−11,000	do	16,148	16,148		13,700	2,448
Asbestos, crocidolite:									
National stockpile	702,100	702,100		do	1,567	1,567			
Supplemental—barter	10,827,262	10,777,962	−49,300	do	41,588	41,588			
Total	11,529,362	11,480,062	−49,300	do	43,155	43,155		[2]	43,155
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:									
National stockpile	13,925,000	13,925,000		Long dry ton	879,740	879,740			
Defense Production Act	18,168,000	18,168,000		do	1,370,077	1,370,077			
Supplemental—barter	95,316,163	95,646,124	+329,961	do	6,195,489	6,217,796	+22,307		
Total	127,409,163	127,739,124	+329,961	do	8,445,306	8,467,613	+22,307	5,000,000	3,467,613

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:									
National stockpile	$78,552,500	$78,552,500		Long dry ton	4,962,706	4,962,706			
Supplemental—barter	45,197,400	45,197,400		do	2,927,260	2,927,260			
Total	123,749,900	123,749,900		do	7,889,966	7,889,966		5,300,000	2,589,966
Bauxite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	11,347,800	11,347,800		Long calcined ton.	299,279	299,279		173,000	126,279
Beryl:									
National stockpile	9,768,400	9,768,400		Short ton	23,230	23,230			
Defense Production Act	1,425,600	1,425,600		do	2,542	2,542			
Supplemental—barter	23,049,900	23,049,900		do	12,277	12,277			
Total	34,243,900	34,243,900		do	38,049	38,049		28,000	10,049
Beryllium metal:									
Supplemental—barter	18,703,500	18,703,500		do	153	153		[2]	153
Bismuth:									
National stockpile	2,674,300	2,674,300		Pound	1,342,402	1,342,402			
Defense Production Act	52,400	52,400		do	22,901	22,901			
Supplemental—barter	5,536,700	5,536,700		do	2,506,493	2,506,493			
Total	8,263,400	8,263,400		do	3,871,796	3,871,796		3,600,000	271,796
Cadmium:									
National stockpile	15,148,200	15,148,200		do	7,699,481	7,699,481			
Supplemental—barter	12,326,600	12,326,600		do	7,448,389	7,448,389			
Total	27,474,800	27,474,800		do	15,147,870	15,147,870		5,100,000	10,047,870
Caster oil:									
National stockpile	44,902,900	44,830,800	−$72,100	do	176,562,924	176,204,914	−358,010	22,000,000	154,209,914
Celestite:									
National stockpile	1,412,300	1,412,300		Short ton	28,816	28,816			
Supplemental—barter	893,735	885,635	−8,100	do	20,968	20,968			
Total	2,306,035	2,297,935	−8,100	do	49,784	49,784		10,300	39,484
Chromite, chemical grade:									
National stockpile	12,288,000	12,288,000		Short dry ton	559,452	559,452			
Supplemental—barter	21,993,100	21,993,100		do	699,644	699,644			
Total	34,281,100	34,281,100		do	1,259,096	1,259,096		600,000	659,096
Chromite, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	264,565,500	264,565,500		do	3,795,291	3,795,291			
Defense Production Act	35,879,900	35,879,900		do	985,646	985,646			
Supplemental—barter	227,010,900	227,245,892	+234,992	do	1,558,054	1,560,749	+2,695		
Total	527,456,300	527,691,292	+234,992	do	6,338,991	6,341,686	+2,695	2,970,000	3,371,686
Chromite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	25,149,300	25,149,300		do	1,047,159	1,047,159			
Supplemental—barter	5,039,000	5,039,000		do	179,775	179,775			
Total	30,188,300	30,188,300		do	1,226,934	1,226,934		1,425,000	[3]
Cobalt:									
National stockpile	169,228,500	169,228,500		Pound	76,068,771	76,068,771			
Defense Production Act	52,075,300	52,075,300		do	25,066,651	25,066,651			
Supplemental—barter	2,169,000	2,169,000		do	1,065,398	1,065,398			
Total	223,472,800	223,472,800		do	102,200,820	102,200,820		42,000,000	60,200,820
Coconut oil:									
National stockpile	984,200	984,200		do	6,517,421	6,517,421		[2]	6,517,421
Colemanite:									
Supplemental—barter	2,636,400	2,636,400		Long dry ton	67,636	67,636		[2]	67,636
Columbium:									
National stockpile	24,845,500	24,845,500		Pound	7,364,642	7,364,642			
Defense Production Act	50,238,900	50,238,900		do	7,966,341	7,966,341			
Supplemental—barter	799,100	799,100		do	371,426	371,426			
Total	75,883,500	75,883,500		do	15,702,409	15,702,409		1,176,000	14,526,409
Copper:									
National stockpile	524,503,100	524,503,100		Short ton	1,008,474	1,008,474			
Defense Production Act	41,942,800	34,749,400	−7,193,400	do	74,591	61,864	−12,727		
Supplemental—barter	8,252,100	8,252,100		do	12,382	12,382			
Total	574,698,000	567,504,600	−7,193,400	do	1,095,447	1,082,720	−12,727	775,000	307,720
Cordage fibers, abaca:									
National stockpile	37,034,100	37,034,100		Pound	146,933,033	146,933,033		100,000,000	46,933,033
Cordage fibers, sisal:									
National stockpile	41,858,500	41,822,000	−36,500	do	309,500,206	309,230,337	−269,869	300,000,000	9,230,337
Corundum:									
National stockpile	393,100	393,100		Short ton	2,008	2,008		2,500	[3]
Cryolite:									
Defense Production Act	5,402,200	5,309,900	−92,300	do	19,563	19,229	−334	[2]	19,229
Diamond dies:									
National stockpile	599,300	599,800	+500	Piece	19,248	19,414	+166	25,000	[3]

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:									
National stockpile	$61,601,800	$61,601,800		Carat	31,109,411	31,109,411			
Supplemental—barter	15,800,500	15,800,500		do	5,550,579	5,550,579			
Total	77,402,300	77,402,300		do	36,659,990	36,659,990		24,700,000	11,959,990
Diamond, industrial, stones:									
National stockpile	100,509,400	100,509,400		do	9,319,183	9,319,183			
Supplemental—barter	186,341,500	186,341,500		do	15,425,827	15,425,827			
Total	286,850,900	286,850,900		do	24,745,010	24,745,010		16,500,000	8,245,010
Diamond tools:									
National stockpile	1,015,400	1,015,400		Piece	64,178	64,178		[2]	64,178
Feathers and down:									
National stockpile	31,216,400	30,734,900	−$481,500	Pound	7,534,338	7,418,509	−115,829	3,000,000	4,418,509
Fluorspar, acid grade:									
National stockpile	26,167,500	26,167,500		Short dry ton	463,049	463,049			
Defense Production Act	1,394,400	1,394,400		do	19,700	19,700			
Supplemental—barter	33,531,100	33,531,100		do	673,232	673,232			
Total	61,093,000	61,093,000		do	1,155,981	1,155,981		540,000	615,981
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	17,332,400	17,332,400		do	369,443	369,443			
Supplemental—barter	1,508,100	1,508,100		do	42,800	42,800			
Total	18,840,500	18,840,500		do	412,243	412,243		850,000	[2]
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump:									
National stockpile	937,900	937,900		do	4,455	4,455			
Supplemental—barter	341,200	341,200		do	1,428	1,428			
Total	1,279,100	1,279,100		do	5,883	5,883		5,500	383
Graphite, natural, Malagasy, crystalline:									
National stockpile	6,725,000	6,732,800	+7,800	do	32,640	32,678	+38		
Supplemental—barter	232,500	232,500		do	1,908	1,908			
Total	6,957,500	6,965,300	+7,800	do	34,548	34,586	+38	18,000	16,586
Graphite, natural, other, crystalline:									
National stockpile	1,894,400	1,894,400		do	5,481	5,481		2,800	2,681
Hyoscine:									
National stockpile	30,600	31,200	+600	Ounce	2,100	2,140	+40	[2]	2,140
Iodine:									
National stockpile	4,082,000	4,082,000		Pound	2,956,713	2,956,713			
Supplemental—barter	1,412,300	1,421,000	+8,700	do	1,333,563	1,333,563			
Total	5,494,300	5,503,000	+8,700	do	4,290,276	4,290,276		8,000,000	[3]
Iridium:									
National stockpile	2,525,800	2,525,800		Troy ounce	13,937	13,937		17,000	[3]
Jewel bearings:									
National stockpile	4,564,600	4,578,600	+14,000	Piece	52,435,065	52,592,365	+157,300	57,500,000	[3]
Kyanite-mullite:									
National stockpile	721,400	717,200	−4,200	Short dry ton	8,344	8,295	−49	4,800	3,495
Lead:									
National stockpile	305,368,000	304,397,000	−971,000	Short ton	1,004,387	1,001,195	−3,192		
Supplemental—barter	78,398,500	78,398,500		do	327,998	327,998			
Total	383,766,500	382,795,500	−971,000	do	1,332,385	1,329,193	−3,192	0	1,329,193
Magnesium:									
National stockpile	124,281,700	124,170,500	−111,200	do	171,168	171,015	−153	145,000	26,015
Manganese, battery grade, natural ore:									
National stockpile	21,025,500	21,025,500		Short dry ton	144,485	144,485			
Supplemental—barter	14,076,600	14,121,400	+44,800	do	142,245	142,245			
Total	35,102,100	35,146,900	+44,800	do	286,730	286,730		80,000	206,730
Mica, muscovite block:									
National stockpile	27,627,600	27,627,600		Pound	11,622,775	11,622,775			
Defense Production Act	40,689,700	40,689,700		do	6,432,569	6,432,569			
Supplemental—barter	6,665,744	6,677,544	+11,800	do	1,950,810	1,950,810			
Total	74,983,044	74,994,844	+11,800	do	20,006,154	20,006,154		6,000,000	14,006,154
Mica, muscovite film:									
National stockpile	9,058,100	9,058,100		do	1,719,308	1,719,308			
Defense Production Act	633,300	633,300		do	102,681	102,681			
Supplemental—barter	1,060,200	1,062,600	+2,400	do	116,556	116,556			
Total	10,751,600	10,754,000	+2,400	do	1,938,545	1,938,545		2,000,000	[3]
Mica, muscovite splittings:									
National stockpile	40,598,300	40,598,300		do	40,040,169	40,040,169			
Supplemental—barter	6,225,800	6,225,800		do	4,826,257	4,826,257			
Total	46,824,100	46,824,100		do	44,866,426	44,866,426		22,200,000	22,666,426
Mica, phlogopite block:									
National stockpile	303,600	303,600		do	223,239	223,239		17,000	206,239

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Mica, phlogopite splittings:									
National stockpile	$2,580,500	$2,580,500		Pound	3,079,062	3,079,062			
Supplemental—barter	2,501,800	2,501,800		do	1,986,902	1,986,902			
Total	5,082,300	5,082,300		do	5,065,964	5,065,964		1,300,000	3,765,964
Molybdenum:									
National stockpile	74,869,500	74,869,500		do	72,052,882	72,052,882		68,000,000	4,052,882
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide:									
National stockpile	3,095,500	3,095,500		do	21,272	21,272			
Defense Production Act	2,524,700	2,524,700		do	3,779	3,779			
Total	5,620,200	5,620,200		do	25,051	25,051		6,700	18,351
Manganese, chemical grade, type A:									
National stockpile	2,133,300	2,133,300		do	29,307	29,307			
Supplemental—barter	7,922,100	7,922,100		do	117,607	117,607			
Total	10,055,400	10,055,400		do	146,914	146,914		68,500	78,414
Manganese, chemical grade, type B:									
National stockpile	132,600	132,600		do	1,822	1,822			
Supplemental—barter	6,669,800	6,669,800		do	99,016	99,016			
Total	6,802,400	6,802,400		do	100,838	100,838		64,000	36,838
Manganese, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	248,240,900	248,240,900		do	5,852,191	5,852,191			
Defense Production Act	172,122,100	172,122,100		do	2,980,257	2,980,257			
Supplemental—barter	266,280,404	266,630,937	+$350,533	do	3,987,110	3,988,982	+1,872		
Total	686,643,404	686,993,937	+350,533	do	12,819,558	12,821,430	+1,872	7,900,000	4,921,430
Mercury:									
National stockpile	33,077,100	33,080,300	+3,200	Flask	184,365	184,365			
Supplemental—barter	3,446,200	3,446,200		do	16,000	16,000			
Total	36,523,300	36,526,500	+3,200	do	200,365	200,365		200,000	365
Nickel:									
National stockpile	181,737,000	181,721,100	−15,900	Short ton	166,761	166,736	−25		
Defense Production Act	94,103,700	92,404,700	−1,699,000	do	49,779	49,065	−714		
Total	275,840,700	274,125,800	−1,714,900	do	216,540	215,801	−739	50,000	165,801
Opium:									
National stockpile	13,661,700	13,661,700		Pound	196,364	196,634		141,280	55,354
Palladium:									
National stockpile	2,079,000	2,079,000		Troy ounce	89,811	89,811			
Supplemental—barter	12,170,200	12,170,200		do	648,124	648,124			
Total	14,249,200	14,249,200		do	737,935	737,935		1,300,000	[3]
Palm oil:									
National stockpile	1,776,700	1,776,700		Pound	9,871,585	9,871,585		[2]	9,871,585
Platinum:									
National stockpile	56,879,900	56,879,900		Troy ounce	716,343	716,343			
Supplemental—barter	4,024,500	4,024,500		do	49,999	49,999			
Total	60,904,400	60,904,400		do	766,342	766,342		450,000	316,342
Pyrethrum:									
National stockpile	415,100	415,100		Pound	67,065	66,969	−96	25,000	41,969
Quartz crystals:									
National stockpile	67,075,300	66,934,100	−141,200	do	5,437,702	5,412,627	−25,075		
Supplemental—barter	3,519,200	3,519,200		do	232,352	232,352			
Total	70,594,500	70,453,300	−141,200	do	5,670,054	5,644,979	−25,075	650,000	4,994,979
Quinidine:									
National stockpile	1,846,000	1,846,000		Ounce	1,600,428	1,600,428		2,000,000	[3]
Quinine:									
National stockpile	2,617,000	2,617,000		do	4,137,733	4,137,733		4,130,000	7,733
Rare earths:									
National stockpile	7,134,900	7,134,900		Short dry ton	9,969	9,969			
Supplemental—barter	5,830,900	5,830,900		do	5,810	5,180			
Total	12,965,800	12,965,800		do	15,779	15,779		3,000	12,779
Rare earths residue:									
Defense Production Act	657,200	657,200		Pound	6,079,961	6,079,961		[2]	6,079,961
Rhodium:									
National stockpile	78,200	78,200		Troy ounce	618	618		[2]	618
Rubber:									
National stockpile	658,578,100	651,272,800	−7,305,300	Long ton	851,773	842,320	−9,453	130,000	712,320
Ruthenium:									
Supplemental—barter	559,500	559,500		Troy ounce	15,001	15,001		[2]	15,001
Rutile:									
National stockpile	2,070,100	2,070,100		Short dry ton	18,599	18,599			
Defense Production Act	2,725,100	2,725,100		do	17,385	17,385			
Supplemental—barter	1,061,300	1,061,300		do	11,632	11,632			
Total	5,856,500	5,856,500		do	47,616	47,616		51,000	[3]

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Sapphire and ruby:									
National stockpile	$190,000	$190,000		Carat	16,187,500	16,187,500		18,000,000	[3]
Selenium:									
National stockpile	757,100	757,100		Pound	97,100	97,100			
Supplemental—barter	1,659,294	1,659,294		do	306,603	306,603			
Total	2,416,394	2,416,394		do	403,703	403,703		475,000	[3]
Shellac:									
National stockpile	8,204,800	8,184,300	−$20,500	do	16,365,883	16,324,946	−40,937	8,300,000	8,024,946
Silicon carbide, crude:									
National stockpile	11,394,500	11,394,500		Short ton	64,697	64,697			
Supplemental—barter	26,803,600	26,803,600		do	131,805	131,805			
Total	38,198,100	38,198,100		do	196,502	196,502		30,000	166,502
Silk noils and waste:									
National stockpile	1,232,100	1,232,100		Pound	979,924	979,924		[2]	979,924
Silk, raw:									
National stockpile	486,600	486,600		do	113,515	113,515		[2]	113,515
Sperm oil:									
National stockpile	4,775,400	4,775,400		do	23,442,158	23,442,158		23,400,000	42,158
Talc, steatite block and lump:									
National stockpile	494,800	494,800		Short ton	1,269	1,269		200	6,069
Talc, steatite ground:									
National stockpile	231,200	231,200		do	3,901	3,901		[2]	3,901
Tantalum:									
National stockpile	12,104,200	12,104,200		Pound	3,148,556	3,148,556			
Defense Production Act	9,734,400	9,734,400		do	1,536,023	1,536,023			
Supplemental—barter	21,100	21,100		do	8,036	8,036			
Total	21,859,700	21,859,700		do	4,692,615	4,692,615		3,400,000	1,292,615
Thorium:									
Supplemental—barter	17,991,700	17,991,700			3,965,461	3,965,461		500,000	3,465,461
Thorium residue:									
Defense Production Act	42,000	42,000		do	848,354	848,354		[2]	848,354
Tin:									
National stockpile	723,811,500	715,095,800	−8,715,700	Long ton	297,661	294,046	−3,615		
Supplemental—barter	16,404,000	16,404,000		do	7,505	7,505			
Total	740,215,500	731,499,800	−8,715,700	do	305,166	301,551	−3,615	200,000	101,551
Titanium sponge:									
Defense Production Act	175,871,900	175,871,900		Short ton	22,339	22,339			
Supplemental—barter	32,097,700	32,097,700		do	9,021	9,021			
Total	207,969,600	207,969,600		do	31,360	31,360		20,500	10,860
Tungsten:									
National stockpile	369,128,100	369,128,100		Pound	120,013,898	120,013,898			
Defense Production Act	315,501,800	315,413,800	−88,000	do	77,351,978	77,326,520	−25,458		
Supplemental—barter	18,651,400	18,651,400		do	5,774,827	5,774,827			
Total	703,281,300	703,193,300	−88,000	do	203,140,703	203,115,245	−25,458	44,000,000	159,115,245
Vanadium:									
National stockpile	31,567,900	31,567,900		Short ton	7,865	7,865		1,400	6,465
Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:									
National stockpile	9,988,300	9,931,100	−57,200	Long ton	35,800	35,595	−205	15,000	20,595
Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:									
National stockpile	48,858,500	48,858,500		do	197,472	197,465	−7	86,000	111,465
Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:									
National stockpile	9,826,900	9,826,900		do	38,962	38,962		15,000	23,962
Zinc:									
National stockpile	342,598,600	342,563,100	−35,500	Short ton	1,181,076	1,180,952	−124		
Supplemental—barter	79,588,400	79,588,400		do	323,896	323,896			
Total	422,187,000	422,151,500	−35,500	do	1,504,972	1,504,848	−124	0	1,504,848
Zirconium ore, baddeleyite:									
National stockpile	710,600	710,600		Short dry ton	16,533	16,533		[2]	16,533
Zirconium ore, zircon:									
National stockpile	113,300	113,300		do	1,920	1,920		[2]	1,920
Total:									
National stockpile	5,539,247,000	5,521,145,800	−18,101,200						
Defense Production Act	1,424,948,300	1,414,482,900	−10,465,400						
Supplemental—barter	1,399,569,506	1,400,563,510	+994,004						
Total, strategic and critical materials.	8,363,764,806	8,336,192,210	−27,572,596						

[1] Stockpile objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h). The Office of Emergency Planning is currently in the process of revising stockpile objectives. (See app. B, p. 8925.)

[2] No present objective.

[3] Not in excess of stockpile objective.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, February 1965 (showing, by commodity, net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month
Price-support inventory:							
Basic commodities:							
Corn	$990,987,974	$919,955,197	−$71,032,777	Bushel	810,035,515	748,654,071	−61,381,444
Cotton, extra-long staple	32,612,591	31,464,795	−1,147,796	Bale	123,813	119,462	−4,351
Cotton, upland	1,240,208,449	1,216,844,375	−23,364,074	do	7,506,558	7,365,114	−141,444
Peanuts, farmers' stock	9,301	9,301		Pound	78,291	78,291	
Peanuts, shelled	5,089,622	4,637,836	−451,786	do	29,628,627	26,973,292	−2,655,335
Rice, milled	100,520	111,828	+11,308	Hundredweight	12,102	11,320	−782
Rice, rough	4,738,994	3,965,397	−773,597	do	914,241	768,453	−145,788
Wheat	1,396,020,762	1,353,406,852	−42,613,910	Bushel	679,213,858	656,903,309	−22,310,549
Wheat flour	663,758	358,516	−305,242	Pound	11,704,300	6,443,700	−5,260,600
Total, basic commodities	3,670,431,971	3,530,754,097	−139,677,874				
Designated nonbasic commodities:							
Barley	19,090,756	18,638,000	−452,756	Bushel	22,165,809	21,648,945	−516,864
Grain sorghum	649,474,592	639,242,812	−10,231,780	do	574,794,144	563,923,230	−10,870,914
Milk and butterfat:							
Butter	22,069,628	19,823,947	−2,245,681	Pound	37,919,036	33,879,168	−4,039,868
Butter oil	8,208,357	5,954,555	−2,253,802	do	10,622,100	7,704,922	−2,917,178
Cheese	7,853,405	4,269,100	−3,584,305	do	20,413,640	10,837,897	−9,575,743
Milk, dried	23,117,306	25,836,554	+2,719,248	do	154,047,490	173,725,871	+19,678,381
Oats	19,362,206	19,084,199	−278,007	Bushel	32,029,357	31,520,470	−508,887
Rye	477,381	475,792	−1,589	do	424,390	422,766	−1,624
Tung oil	3,556,366	3,563,619	+7,253	Pound	14,818,194	14,848,355	+30,161
Total, designated nonbasic commodities	753,209,997	736,888,578	−16,321,419				
Other nonbasic commodities:							
Beans, dry, edible	2,807,283	1,427,489	−1,379,794	Hundredweight	395,562	201,428	−194,134
Cottonseed oil, refined, other	7,667,302	6,482,209	−1,185,093	Pound	68,283,871	57,730,953	−10,552,918
Cottonseed oil, refined, salad oil [1]	877,827	1,260,699	+382,872	do	4,784,843	6,611,329	+1,826,486
Flaxseed	8,127,063	7,784,763	−342,300	Bushel	2,738,980	2,622,679	−116,301
Linseed oil	9,330,758	9,447,039	+116,281	Pound	78,648,000	79,609,000	+961,000
Soybeans	96,499	24,466	−72,033	Bushel	42,092	11,803	−30,289
Total, other nonbasic commodities	28,906,732	26,426,665	−2,480,067				
Total, price support inventory	4,452,548,700	4,294,069,340	−158,479,360				
Inventory transferred from national stockpile: [2]							
Cotton, Egyptian	34,530,328	33,923,747	−606,581	Bale	40,873	40,155	−718
Cotton, American-Egyptian	22,270,506	22,139,230	−131,276	do	44,278	44,017	−261
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile.	56,800,834	56,062,977	−737,857	do	85,151	84,172	−979
Total, agricultural commodities	4,509,349,534	4,350,132,317	−159,217,217				

[1] Reported as "Cottonseed oil, refined," prior to February 1964.
[2] Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. (See app. A, p. 8924.)

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, February 1965 (showing, by item, net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense:							
Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings).	$10,063,183	$10,060,221	−$2,962	10-mile units	45	45	
Chemical and biological equipment	1,797,892	1,797,342	−550	(1)			
Total	11,861,075	11,857,563	−3,512				
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses.	117,504,941	117,078,905	−426,036	(1)			
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations	5,090,353	5,036,008	−54,345	(1)			
Packaged disaster hospitals [2]	71,554,585	71,900,718	+346,133	Each	2,187	2,218	+31
Supply additions (for packaged disaster hospitals)	6,670,393	6,692,629	+22,236	(1)			
Total	200,820,272	200,708,260	−112,012				
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	212,681,347	212,565,823	−115,524				

[1] Composite group of many different items.
[2] Reported as "Civil defense emergency hospitals," prior to February 1965.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, February 1965 (showing, by item, net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month
Defense Production Act:							
On loan	$45,300	$45,300		Tool	7	7	
National Industrial Reserve Act:							
In storage	75,912,100	75,962,800	+$50,700	do	6,610	6,661	+51
On lease	27,500	27,500		do	1	1	
On loan to other agencies	14,900	14,900		do	3	3	
On loan to school programs	12,729,600	12,933,900	+204,300	do	3,029	3,061	+32
Total	88,684,100	88,939,100	+255,000	do	9,643	9,726	+83
Total, machine tools	88,729,400	88,984,400	+255,000	do	9,650	9,733	+83

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

TABLE 5.—*Helium inventories, February 1965 (showing, by item, net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1965	End of month, Feb. 28, 1965	Net change during month
Helium:							
Stored aboveground	$213,989	$270,436	+$56,447	Cubic foot	18,800,000	23,800,000	+5,000,000
Stored underground	61,444,020	64,508,083	+3,064,063	do	5,771,100,000	6,034,600,000	+263,500,000
Total, helium	61,658,009	64,778,519	+3,120,510	do	5,789,900,000	6,058,400,000	+268,500,000

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of the Interior.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS AND STATUTORY CITATIONS

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order No. 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Supplemental—barter

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958, and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price support loans. With limited exceptions, price support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of

1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Inventory transferred from national stockpile

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85–96 and Public Law 87–548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Civil defense stockpile

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201 (h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

Civil defense medical stockpile

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducts the stockpiling program for medical supplies and equipment pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as delegated by the President following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, of 1958. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare plans and directs the procurement, storage, maintenance, inspection, survey, distribution, and utilization of essential supplies and equipment for emergency health services. The medical stockpile includes a program designed to pre-position assembled emergency hospitals and other medical supplies and equipment into communities throughout the Nation.

MACHINE TOOLS

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order No. 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

National industrial equipment reserve

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462).

HELIUM

The helium conservation program is conducted by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Helium Act, approved September 13, 1960 (Public Law 86–777; 74 Stat. 918; 50 U.S.C. 167) and subsequent appropriations acts which have established fiscal limitations and provided borrowing authority for the program. Among other things, the Helium Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to produce helium in Government plants, to acquire helium from private plants, to sell helium to meet current demands, and to store for future use helium that is so produced or acquired in excess of that required to meet current demands. Sales of helium by the Secretary of the Interior shall be at prices established by him which shall be adequate to liquidate the costs of the program within 25 years, except that this period may be extended by the Secretary for not more than 10 years for funds borrowed for purposes other than the acquisition and construction of helium plants and facilities.

This report covers helium that is produced in Government plants and acquired from private plants. Helium in excess of current demands is stored in the Cliffside gasfield near Amarillo, Tex. The unit of measure is cubic foot at 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute pressure and 70° F.

APPENDIX B

NEW STOCKPILE OBJECTIVES

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives established between May 1963 and April 1964 for 79 materials (including 3 removed from stockpile list), based on essential needs in the event of a "conventional war emergency." The new objective for each material has been noted in the reports, beginning with June 1963, for the months in which the respective objectives were established.

The following excerpts from OEP statements dated July 11 and 19, 1963, February 28, 1964, March 6, 13, 20, and 27, 1964, and April 3 and 10, 1964, set forth the new policy with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials:

"The Office of Emergency Planning is now conducting supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials which will reflect current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. On the basis of recently completed supply-requirements studies for the foregoing materials, the new stockpile objectives were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by the Office of Emergency Planning and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy to establish a single objective for each stockpile material. They have been determined on the basis of criteria heretofore used in establishing maximum objectives, and reflect the approximate calculated emergency deficits for the materials for conventional war and do not have any arbitrary adjustments for possible increased requirements for other types of emergency.

"Heretofore, there was a 'basic objective' and a 'maximum objective' for each material. The basic objectives assumed some continued reliance on foreign sources of supply in an emergency. The former maximum objectives completely discounted foreign sources of supply beyond North America and comparable accessible areas.

"Previously, maximum objectives could not be less than 6 months' normal usage of the material by industry in the United States in periods of active demand. The 6-month rule has been eliminated in establishing the new calculated conventional war objectives.

"The Office of Emergency Planning also announced that the present Defense Mobilization Order V–7, dealing with general policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling, was now being revised to reflect these new policies. When finally prepared and approved, the new order will be published in the Federal Register.

"New conventional war objectives for the remaining stockpile materials are being developed as rapidly as new supply-requirements data become available. They will be released as they are approved.

"The Office of Emergency Planning is also making studies to determine stockpile needs to meet the requirements of general nuclear war and reconstruction. Stockpile objectives for nuclear war have not previously been developed. Some commodity objectives may be higher and others may be lower than the objectives established for conventional war.

"After the nuclear war supply-requirements studies are completed, stockpile objectives will be based upon calculated deficits for either conventional war or nuclear war, whichever need is larger.

"The Office of Emergency Planning stressed that any long-range disposal programs undertaken prior to the development of objectives based on nuclear war assumptions would provide against disposing of quantities which might be needed to meet essential requirements in the event of nuclear attack. While the disposal of surplus materials can produce many problems which have not heretofore arisen, every effort will be made to see that the interest of producers, processors, and consumers, and the international interests of the United States are carefully considered, both in the development and carrying out of disposal programs. Before decisions are made regarding the adoption of a long-range disposal program for a particular item in the stockpile, there will be appropriate consultations with industry in order to obtain the advice of interested parties."

The OEP statement of April 17, 1964, contained the following excerpts:

"Today's action completes supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials based on current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. Objectives for 79 materials in the stockpile were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by OEP and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy which accords with the recommendation of the Executive Stockpile Committee to establish a single objective for each material in the national stockpile. These new objectives will be reviewed and revised as necessary each year. Because military requirements and estimated emergency supplies of stockpile materials are constantly shifting, the supply-requirements balance for any material that is now or may become important to defense must be kept under continuing surveillance. Supply-requirements studies of the conventional war needs of approximately 20 other strategic and critical materials, which do not have stockpile objectives, are underway and are expected to be completed in the next few weeks. At the same time, studies on supply requirements for nuclear war are going forward. No definite date for completion of these studies has been established as yet.

"OEP stressed that long-range programs for disposal of identified surpluses would take into account the interests of producers, processors, and consumers, as well as the international interests of the United States. Appropriate consultation with industry will precede all decisions for the adoption of every disposal program and the advice of interested parties will be sought."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of February 28, 1965, totaled $13,052,653,269. This was a net decrease of $183,529,827, as compared with the February 1 total of $13,236,183,096. Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:

Major category	Cost value, February 1965	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Strategic and critical materials	−$27,572,596	$8,336,192,210
Agricultural commodities	−159,217,217	4,350,132,317
Civil defense supplies and equipment	−115,524	212,565,823
Machine tools	+255,000	88,984,400
Helium	+3,120,510	64,778,519
Total	−183,529,827	13,052,653,269

These figures are from the February 1965 report on Federal stockpile inventories compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile, (2) the Defense Production Act inventory, and (3) the supplemental-barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 94 materials stockpiled in the strategic and critical inventories. Stockpile objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 76 of these 94 materials. Of the 76 materials having stockpile objectives, 63 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of February 28, 1965.

Increases in cost value were reported in 13 of the materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 21 materials, and 60 materials remained unchanged during February.

National stockpile

The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of February 28, 1965, totaled $5,521,145,800. This was a net decrease of $18,101,200 during the month. The largest decreases were $8,715,700 in tin and $7,305,300 in rubber.

Defense Production Act inventory

The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of February 28, 1965, totaled $1,414,482,900. This was a net decrease of $10,465,400. The largest decreases were in copper, nickel and aluminum.

Supplemental-barter

The cost value of materials in the supplemental-barter stockpile as of February 28, 1965, totaled $1,400,563,510. This was a net increase of $994,004. The largest increases were in manganese and bauxite.

OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report the largest is $4.4 billion in agricultural commodities. Major decreases in agricultural commodities during February were reported for corn, wheat, cotton, and grain sorghum.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed a net decrease; the machine tools inventories showed a net increase; and the helium inventories showed a net increase during February.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of 125 general officers in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and ask that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

The nominations, ordered to placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Rear Adm. Luther C. Heinz, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving;

Col. Edward Morton Hudgins, Col. William Arthur Reinken, and Col. Henry Albert Smith, Jr., Army National Guard of the United States officers, for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Maj. Gen. George Merle Powell, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Henry Schuldt Murphey, U.S. Army, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Col. George Anson Kuhn, U.S. Army, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. James C. McGehee (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Brig. Gen. Gilbert L. Pritchard, Regular Air Force, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force;

Brig. Gen. John L. Zoeckler (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, for temporary appointment in the grade of major general, U.S. Air Force;

Gen. Hamilton Hawkins Howze, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general;

Lt. Gen. Dwight Edward Beach, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general;

Lt. Gen. Gordon A. Blake (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; and

Maj. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 525 promotions in the Regular Army in the grade of captain and below; 1,010 appointments in the Navy in the grade of commander and below; 2,377 appointments in the Marine Corps in the grade of colonel and below; and 455 appointments in the Air Force in the grade of colonel and below. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

James T. Abbey, and sundry other Naval Officers' Training Corps candidates, for permanent assignment in the Navy;

Erich H. Ashburn, and sundry other graduates from the Navy enlisted scientific education program, for permanent assignment in the Navy;

Allen C. Minser, and sundry other Naval Reserve officers, for assignment in the Navy;

Francis X. Baglioni, and sundry other U.S. Navy officers, to be reverted to permanent chief warrant officers (W–4) in the Navy;

William J. Caldwell, and sundry other officers of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps;

Richard E. Waters (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps), for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps;

Vaughn E. Hill, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Alexander A. Abela, and sundry other distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Joseph N. Acinapura, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Joseph S. McAuliffe, and sundry other distinguished military students, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Nels E. Anderson, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps.

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. METCALF:

S. 1846. A bill for the relief of Dr. Glen Fulcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1847. A bill to provide for the modification of the excess land provision of Federal reclamation law as it applies to irrigable lands in the drainage area above Canyon Ferry Dam, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 1848. A bill for the relief of Mary Horalek and Eva Horalek, Blue Rapids, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1849. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay the market value of certain leasehold interests, buildings, and improvements and to pay severance damages to certain persons having interests in lands acquired for the Marion Dam and Reservoir project in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. HART):

S. 1850. A bill to authorize disaster loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, including refinancing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1851. A bill to provide fellowships for research leading to a doctoral degree; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1852. A bill to increase the annuities of certain schoolteachers in the District of Columbia who retired prior to October 1, 1956; and

S. 1853. A bill to provide for regulation of the professional practice of certified public

accountants in the District of Columbia, including the examination, licensure, registration of certified public accountants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Finance.

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

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

S. 1855. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 1856. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above bill when reported by Mr. CANNON, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1857. A bill for the relief of Cesare Tambellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years;

S.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of U.S. Senators shall be 4 years; and

S.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of U.S. Senators shall be 8 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTION

AMENDMENT OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 103) amending the Standing Rules of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

FELLOWSHIPS FOR RESEARCH LEADING TO A DOCTORAL DEGREE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide fellowships for research leading to completion of doctoral degrees.

For some time, both within and without the higher educational community, the extent of the present faculty shortage and its implications for academic standards has been hotly debated. The background for this debate has been some undeniable facts. Current college enrollments of 4.3 million will rise to 5.7 million in 5 years; within a decade the college population will reach approximately 8 million, or almost double what it is today.

For permanent appointments to college and university staffs, the doctoral degree has become almost a necessity. If staffing problems are difficult today, what will they be like in 10 years? Another undeniable fact is the low rate with which graduate students complete advanced degree requirements and enter college and university teaching with Ph. D.'s in their respective academic disciplines. The number of Ph. D.'s graduated in 1963 was only 20 percent higher than in 1953. During the same period, the college population increased twofold. It is obvious that the supply of graduated Ph. D.'s has fallen far behind the demand. From this situation follows two critical problems: The problem of maintaining staff quality—in some fields maintaining any staff at all—is acute in colleges and universities of low prestige offering the poorest rewards and heaviest burdens for academic service. The problem of maintaining staff quality is especially acute in fields with attractive employment possibilities outside the academic community, notably in science and economics.

In brief, there is great competition among colleges and universities for graduated Ph. D.'s in the sciences, in certain timely nonscientific fields like Russian, African and Asian studies, and great competition for quality people in all other fields. The intensity of this competition has compelled graduated schools all over the country to reexamine their programs with a view toward shortening the time necessary to complete doctoral work. In addition, private foundations like the Danforth, Woodrow Wilson, and Ford have provided scholarship funds and otherwise encouraged superior undergraduates to undertake graduate study. The business and industrial communities have continued to make substantial contributions to graduate programs in scientific fields and to a lesser degree to the social sciences and humanities. Graduate schools themselves have added greatly to their existing programs of student aid, and the Federal Government through the National Science Foundation and National Defense Education Act programs has progressively increased its direct financial support of graduate study.

Given the availability of scholarship, fellowship, and assistantship opportunities for superior students, why has not the number of Ph. D.'s graduated increased more rapidly? The truth of the matter is that many more students begin graduate studies than complete them. They are, if you please, Mr. President, dropouts. While the reasons for dropping out are many—including intellectual and psychological reasons—one of the most important reasons for leaving graduate school is economic. Most of the direct assistance available to graduate students is for the first year of study; the availability of direct grants diminishes as the student progresses through his second, third, fourth, and subsequent years. After the first year, graduate students in scientific fields generally support themselves either by teaching assistantships of 2 or 3 years' duration or by participation in nonteaching research programs. Students in nonscientific fields have the alternatives of teaching assistants or full-time employment as teachers before all of their degree requirements are satisfied.

Because graduate students are rarely full-time students after their second year, sometimes after their first year, the time required to complete degree requirements is excessively prolonged. Less true in scientific fields because of the greater availability of nonteaching and research assistantships, students in nonscientific fields without the good fortune of independent means are trapped by the economics of their situation. The consequence is that such students rarely complete their degree requirements in 4 years; some take 5, 6, 7, and many never finish at all. What is needed is a fellowship program that will make possible completion of what has been well begun. What is needed is a program of grants that will enable Ph. D. candidates in nonscientific fields to complete the writing of their doctoral dissertations. They must have some escape from their economic situation; the colleges, and the country need them.

Existing private programs simply do not approach the problem, and Federal ones all but ignore it. The Woodrow Wilson program has a small number of dissertation fellowships, those wise people at the Danforth Foundation try to see their fellowship holders through the completion of their graduate work, and departments in some of the leading graduate schools have programs that include a number of dissertation fellowships. To be sure, recent amendments to the National Defense Education Act fellowship programs are helpful. Grants available for 3 years need not be taken in three consecutive years, but students not on a National Defense Education Act program—by far the preponderance of students currently undertaking graduate study—have not even that resource.

To deal with this genuine problem in graduate education, to check the developing shortage of college professors, to improve the general state of instruction and research in all of our colleges and universities, Mr. President, I propose a program supported by the Federal Government offering fellowships for completion of doctoral dissertations. Though intended to assist students in nonscientific fields, this program would not discriminate against students studying in scientific fields. This program would be available to all graduate students in good standing in accredited graduate schools that have satisfied all academic requirements for the doctoral degree except completion of their dissertation. The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to award up to 2,000 fellowships for the first fiscal year and up to 2,000 new fellowships for the next 2 fiscal years. The fellowships would be awarded for such periods as the Commissioner of Education may determine but not to exceed 2 years. The amount of individual fellowships

would be the same as is presently offered during the third year of the National Defense Education Act programs. Recipients of these fellowships will not be subject to a residence requirement. They will have the option of traveling to any library, archive, or research center in this country or elsewhere whose resources would facilitate completion of their dissertations.

Mr. President, the annual cost of this fellowship program would be minimal; the impact of this program upon American higher education could be a profound one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bill may lie on the desk for 5 days to enable other Senators to become cosponsors.

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

The bill (S. 1851) to provide fellowships for research leading to a doctoral degree, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

FELLOWSHIPS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 2. (a) The Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") is authorized to award under the provisions of this Act not to exceed two thousand fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and not to exceed two thousand new fellowships for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, for graduate research incident to the presentation of a doctoral dissertation. Such fellowships may be awarded for research at any institution of higher education, library, archive or other research center approved by the Commissioner. Such fellowships shall be awarded for such periods as the Commissioner may determine but not to exceed two years.

(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this Act but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of research, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine.

AWARD OF FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 3. (a) Recipients of fellowships under this Act shall be persons who have completed all course work required for the granting of a doctoral degree (except such course work credited on the dissertation) and comprehensive examinations where appropriate, and whose doctoral dissertation proposal has been approved by the appropriate officials of an institution of higher education. For the purpose of this section, the term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a doctor's degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on trnasfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited.

(b) No fellowship shall be awarded under this Act for research at a school or department of divinity or research leading to a degree of Doctor of Divinity. For the purposes of this section, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

DISTRIBUTION OF FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 4. In awarding fellowships under the provisions of this Act the Commissioner shall endeavor to provide an equitable distribution of such fellowships throughout the Nation.

STIPENDS

SEC. 5. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this Act shall receive stipends at the rate of $2,800 for the first year of research, and $2,800 for the second year, plus an additional amount of $400 for each year on account of each of his dependents.

(b) Such stipends shall be paid to each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this Act in such installments as the Commissioner deems appropriate.

FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

SEC. 6. (a) A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this Act shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 5 only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory progress in, and devoting essentially full time to, the research for which such fellowship was awarded, and is not engaging in gainful employment.

(b) The Commissioner shall require reports containing such information in such form and to be filed at such times as he determines necessary from each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this Act. Such reports shall be accompanied by a certificate from an appropriate official at the institution of higher education, library, archive or other research center approved by the Commissioner, stating that such person is making satisfactory progress in, and is devoting essentially full time to, the research for which the fellowship was awarded.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. For each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1967, and June 30, 1968, there are authorized to be appropriated $8,000,000, and such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969 in order that fellowships already awarded might be completed.

INCREASED ANNUITIES OF CERTAIN SCHOOLTEACHERS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the annuities of certain schoolteachers in the District of Columbia who retired prior to October 1, 1956.

On June 4, 1957, the 85th Congress approved Public Law 85–46, a bill to amend the act for retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia. This bill provided a more liberal formula for computing the annuities of teachers and officers retiring from the District of Columbia public schools. It was made retroactive to October 1, 1956, but included a restrictive clause stating that these amendments shall not apply in the case of teachers retired prior to the effective date, October 1, 1956. Since the passage of Public Law 85–46, there have been two increases, amounting to 15 percent, which have applied to persons retired before October 1, 1956. In spite of these increases, a sizable group of these older retired teachers is living on very small annuities, especially small when considered in the light of the increased cost of living.

The bill which I am introducing today would provide a minimum annuity of $4,000 to District of Columbia teachers who retired prior to October 1, 1956, and who had at least 20 years of creditable service. There are approximately 500 annuitants who would be affected by this bill. The age range for these teachers is 68 years and up. Very few are able to get any remunerative employment, so they must depend primarily on their retirement annuity. Some of these retired teachers gave more than 40 years service to the District of Columbia public schools; some are on the disability roll; and yet they are receiving an annuity of less than $4,000 per year—$333 per month. Many receive less than half that amount. In this group of teachers there are over 300 who taught for 30 years or more. That means they were teaching in 1926, when the beginning salary for an elementary teacher was $800, for a junior high teacher it was $1,000, and for a senior high school teacher it was $1,200. At the same time many of these teachers were paying as high as 8 percent into the teachers retirement fund. When the restrictive clause was written into Public Law 85–46, teachers who had taught while salaries were still very low were the ones who lost the benefit of the more liberal formula adopted for teachers who retired after October 1, 1956.

The number of teachers involved is a diminishing one. The cost to assure an adequate standard of living for them can never be more than on the day of enactment. The estimated cost of this legislation for the first year is in the neighborhood of $500,000—and it will always be decreasing. These teachers gave many years of loyal service in the field of education. If we are ever going to correct this inequitable situation, it must be now.

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

The bill (S. 1852) to increase the annuities of certain schoolteachers in the District of Columbia who retired prior to October 1, 1956, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REGULATION OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia.

The present law providing for regulation of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, namely, the act of Congress creating a Board of Accountancy in and for the District of Columbia, has been on the statute books without change since its passage in 1923, 40 years ago. Most of its provisions have been outmoded as a result of developments in the profession and of changes in economic, social, and political conditions during the period since its adoption. The primary purposes of the proposed new law are: First, to establish residence requirements for the taking of the examination for certified public accountant in the District of Columbia; second, to raise the education and experience requirements for eligibility to take such examination; third, to provide for the recognition of accounting experience gained in self-employment or with the Government; fourth, to provide for the certification of a certified public accountant in the District of Columbia by endorsement of his certificate from another jurisdiction; fifth, to provide for the biennial registration of practicing certified public accountants; and sixth, to provide for the licensing in the District of Columbia of partnerships of certified public accountants where the partners who reside in the District of Columbia are certified in this jurisdiction and the other partners are certified in some State.

A new law has been under consideration by the Board of Accountancy and others in the public accounting profession in the District of Columbia for several years. The Board of Governors of the District of Columbia Institute of Certified Public Accountants and its legislative committees participated in the present and in the several previous drafts of this legislation. Through the medium of a mail ballot it has been ascertained that this bill has the overwhelming support of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, this is very desirable legislation, and I am hopeful that the Committee on the District of Columbia can give it early and favorable consideration.

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

The bill (S. 1853) to provide for regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, including the examination, licensure, registration of certified public accountants, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 WITH RESPECT TO INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, when the Congress enacted the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, it was recognized that certain tax benefits would have to be offered to private investors to encourage their entrance into the SBIC program. Accordingly, the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 added three new provisions to the Internal Revenue Code. Section 243(b) gave SBIC's a 100-percent dividends-received deduction on dividends which they received from small business concerns to which such SBIC's provided equity capital. Section 1242 gave stockholders in SBIC's an unlimited ordinary loss deduction where they incurred losses on the sale or exchange of their stock in SBIC's. Section 1243 likewise gave SBIC's an unlimited ordinary loss deduction where they incurred losses on the sale or exchange of convertible debentures acquired by them from small business concerns to which they supplied equity capital. The same deduction applied to losses from the sale or exchange of stock acquired through the exercise of the conversion privilege.

Experience gained by the SBIC industry soon demonstrated that the tax features originally extended to the SBIC program, while of some limited benefit in encouraging private investment in the program, were either inadequate or not fully effective. Each Congress has, therefore, seen the introduction of bills designed to clarify or otherwise improve the tax features of the SBIC program.

Some of these bills have resulted in changes in the Internal Revenue Code or in the adoption of administrative rulings by the Internal Revenue Service, but much still remains to be done in the tax area to facilitate the organization and operation of SBIC's.

The SBIC tax bill which I am introducing today is designed to clarify and improve the tax climate for SBIC's. The bill addresses itself to those areas of the tax law which, in my opinion, and in the opinion of SBIC industry leaders, are most in need of clarification and correction.

LOSSES ON LOANS AND INVESTMENTS

Section 1 of the bill would authorize SBIC's to utilize either the specific write-off method or to establish reserves in anticipation of losses on any and all types of instruments used by SBIC's in their financing activities.

Section 166 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to bad debts, permits a taxpayer to charge off against ordinary income a loss attributable to a debt which becomes uncollectible. The taxpayer may claim the deduction when the debt becomes uncollectible, or, in the alternative, he may establish a "reasonable reserve" in anticipation of such losses. Then, when a loan goes bad, the taxpayer may charge it against the reserve.

In December of 1963, the Internal Revenue Service published a technical information release permitting SBIC's to establish reserves equal to 10 percent of their loans to borrowing small business concerns. Difficulties arose, however, under code section 166(e) which provides that the bad debt provisions of that section shall not apply to a debt which is evidenced by a "security as defined in section 165(g)(2)(C)."

The latter section in pertinent part defines a "security" as being "any evidence of indebtedness, issued by a corportation, with interest coupons or in registered form."

Since many debt instruments acquired by SBIC's are in fact in registered form the ordinary loss and reserve provisions of code section 166 are accordingly denied to them, and the otherwise admirable IRS administrative ruling authorizing 10-percent reserves is thus rendered ineffective.

The first section of my bill would eliminate this problem by qualifying any type of instrument acquired by an SBIC for both ordinary loss and reserve treatment under code section 166.

While the IRS action in authorizing 10-percent reserves for SBIC's on loans was most commendable, it is my view that such action falls short of the goal Congress had in mind in establishing the SBIC program. Bearing in mind that we wish to encourage the provision of equity captial as well as long-term loan funds to small business concerns, it seems to me that equity financing by SBIC's ought to be encouraged to the utmost. Authorizing SBIC's to take ordinary losses or to establish reserves on the equity instruments which they acquire from small business concerns would help to accomplish this.

PERSONAL HOLDING COMPANY SURTAX EXEMPTION

Section 542(c)(11) was added to the Internal Revenue Code by the Technical Amendments Act of 1959. It was the first substantive change in statutes relating to the SBIC program following the enactment of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

The 1959 provision was designed to insulate SBIC's from the prohibitive surtaxes applicable to personal holding companies. Late in 1960 a spokesman for the Internal Revenue Service informed the industry that it was the view of the Service that the attribution rules under the code applied to section 542(c)(11) with the result that it rendered that section virtually ineffective.

In the view of IRS, where an SBIC held an equity interest in a small business concern receiving financing from the SBIC, that interest was attributable to the shareholders of the SBIC in proportion to their ownership of stock of the SBIC. By way of example, where the stock of an SBIC was owned equally by two individuals, and the SBIC owned 10 percent of the stock of a small corporation receiving financing from the SBIC, then that 10-percent stock interest was attributed to the shareholders of the

SBIC with the result that each was regarded as owning 5 percent of the stock of the small business concern. By the terms of section 542(c)(11), the exemption provided by that section was therefore lost to the SBIC, and it was subject to the personal holding company surtax; namely, 75 percent on the first $2,000 of undistributed personal holding company income and 85 percent on the excess.

The second section of my bill would expressly nullify the application of the attribution rules under the fact situation which I have outlined. The exemption would apply except where a 10-percent shareholder in an SBIC owned directly a 10-percent proprietary interest in the small business concern receiving financing from the SBIC.

The exemption would also be lost where the SBIC and its shareholders in the aggregate held a proprietary interest of more than 50 percent in a small business concern receiving financing from the SBIC. In the latter case however the exemption would not be lost if the SBIC could establish that the proprietary interest in excess of 50 percent arose from an acquisition by the SBIC designed to protect its earlier investment.

To illustrate, assume an SBIC owned 40 percent of the stock of a small business concern, and one of the 10-percent shareholders of the SBIC owns directly a separate 5-percent interest in the same small business concern. At this point, the SBIC would not be subject to the personal holding company surtax.

But if the same shareholder of the SBIC or any other 10-percent shareholder of the SBIC acquired as much as an additional 6-percent direct interest in the stock of the small business concern, then the SBIC would lose its personal holding company surtax exemption.

But where the SBIC, under the same set of facts, was obliged to acquire an additional proprietary interest of 6 percent or more in the small business concern in order to protect its earlier investment, the exemption would not be destroyed.

I believe the language in this bill would accomplish the purpose we had in mind when section 542(c)(11) was first enacted in 1959. A virtually identical provision passed the Senate last year in H.R. 8050. That provision was agreed to by the Treasury Department. I am therefore hopeful that the second section of our new bill will receive early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANY TREATMENT

Section 3 of the bill would permit any SBIC, whether or not registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, to elect to be taxed as a regulated investment company, thereby permitting it to pass through to its shareholders both its ordinary income and its capital gains without the application of the intermediate corporate income tax.

This section would also substitute the diversification requirements of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 for those generally applicable to regulated investment companies.

The purpose of these two changes would be to encourage additional private investment in SBIC's and to increase the flexibility of their operations.

Permitting the smaller and privately owned SBIC's to elect to be taxed as regulated investment companies would have the effect of extending to such companies the "pass-through" benefits now extended to small business corporations electing to be taxed under subchapter S of the Internal Revenue Code. Such a provision would undoubtedly encourage a substantial increase in private investment in the SBIC program, a result which the Congress has sought to encourage from the very inception of the program.

With respect to the diversification provision of this section of the bill, it has been found that the diversification requirements for regulated investment companies now contained in section 851(b) of the code greatly inhibit the ability of SBIC's to function as Congress intended. The provisions of section 851(b) are, of course, designed to control the investment activities of mutual funds and other large pools of capital invested generally in listed securities. In my view, they have little application to the investment activities of SBIC's and should, therefore, not control their investment activities.

In enacting the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the Congress wrote into section 306 of that act a diversification requirement deemed suitable for SBIC's. Section 306 of the 1958 act provides in substance that without approval of the Small Business Administration, an SBIC may not invest or lend more than 20 percent of its capital and surplus in any single enterprise. In addition, the SBA has adopted regulations to restrict concentration of investments in particular industries.

It is my view that these limitations are sufficient to insure diversification by SBIC's in their financing activities to the end of spreading their risk, while at the same time it permits to them a desired flexibility in tailoring their financial assistance to the needs of small business concerns seeking SBIC financing.

In short, the diversification requirement which Congress agreed should be applicable to SBIC's, and the SBA's regulatory requirement relating to diversification, should be substituted for those now contained in the Internal Revenue Code with respect to companies electing to be taxed as regulated investment companies.

It should be pointed out that, under my bill, an SBIC would not be eligible to elect to be taxed as a regulated investment company if, first, it did not make at least 50 percent of its loans and investments in equity securities; or second, it is a personal holding company; or third, it fails to meet the investment diversification requirements of the Small Business Investment Act or those provided by SBA's regulations.

REPEAL OF SECTION 1243

The enactment of section 1 of my bill would render superfluous section 1243 which now grants to SBIC's an ordinary loss deduction on losses incurred through the sale or exchange of convertible debentures or stock acquired through exercise of the conversion privilege.

As previously pointed out, section 1 of the bill would extend both ordinary loss treatment and reserve treatment not only to convertible debentures but to all other types of financing instruments acquired by SBIC's, and thus section 1243 would no longer be necessary.

FINANCING SUBCHAPTER S CORPORATIONS

Sections 5 and 6 of the bill would permit SBIC's to become shareholders in small business corporations electing to be taxed under subchapter S of the Internal Revenue Code without granting to the SBIC shareholder the benefits of subchapter S flowing to other shareholders in an electing small business corporation.

One of the anomalies of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is the built-in bias encouraging SBIC financing of corporations.

The special tax features designed to implement the SBIC program are geared almost exclusively to the financing of corporations. The 100 percent dividends received deduction afforded SBIC's by section 243(b) of the code and the ordinary loss deduction afforded by section 1243 on losses on convertible debentures are available of course only where the SBIC is supplying financing to a corporation.

Of the 4.6 million small business concerns in this country, it is estimated that only 15 percent of them are in corporate form. Eighty-five percent of this Nation's small business entities are either sole proprietorships or partnerships.

Section 304(a) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 authorizes SBIC's to serve as a source of equity capital "for incorporated small business concerns." Section 305 authorizes them to make loans to "incorporated and unincorporated small business concerns."

Thus, the vast number of small business concerns operating in unincorporated form are effectively denied SBIC financing except in the form of long-term loan funds. Conversely, an SBIC seeking capital appreciation through its financing activities, cannot achieve such appreciation except where it furnishes financing to a corporation.

In order to make SBIC financing available to unincorporated businesses and to encourage SBIC financing of such concerns, sections 5 and 6 of my bill would permit SBIC's to become shareholders in business entities electing to be taxed as partnerships under subchapter S of the Internal Revenue Code.

We want to make it clear that in seeking this authorization for SBIC's, we do so primarily to benefit a much broader range of the small business economy. We do not seek for SBIC's those special tax benefits normally flowing to shareholders of subchapter S corporations.

Section 6 of my bill would provide expressly that distributions received by the SBIC from the subchapter S corporation shall be fully taxable and that the operating loss deductions normally available to shareholders in a subchapter S corporation shall not be available to the SBIC but shall be credited instead to all other shareholders of the electing small business corporation.

CONCLUSION

I earnestly believe that each and every provision of this tax bill is demonstrably necessary to the success of the SBIC program. I am confident that my colleagues have been heartened by the progress made to date under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and I am equally confident that they share with me my hope that we can lend further encouragement to the small business segment of our economy by enacting legislation to strengthen and assist the small business investment company program.

In my opinion, the tax bill which I am introducing today is admirably suited to this end. In a basically simple and straightforward manner, the bill will certainly encourage additional private investment in the program and thus increase the funds available to small business investment companies for the work that they are doing on behalf of small business.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and also a section-by-section analysis may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1854) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 166 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to bad debts) is amended by redesignating subsection (g) as (h), and by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

"(g) SPECIAL RULE FOR SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES.—Notwithstanding section 165(g)(1) and subsection (e) of this section, subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section shall apply in the case of a taxpayer which is a small business investment company operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to an obligation of a small business concern which is evidenced by a security as defined in section 165(g)(2)."

SEC. 2. Section 542(c)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exception of small business investment companies from definition of personal holding company) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) a small business investment company which is licensed by the Small Business Administration and operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and which is actively engaged in the business of providing funds to small business concerns under that Act. This paragraph shall not apply if—

"(A) at any time during the taxable year, any principal shareholder owns directly or indirectly (including, in the case of an individual, ownership by the members of his family as defined in section 544(a)(2)) a 10 percent or more proprietary interest in a small business concern to which funds are provided by the small business investment company or 10 percent or more in value of the outstanding stock of such concern; or

"(B) at any time during the taxable year, the small business investment company owns (or the small business investment company and one or more of the principal shareholders of such company own) directly or indirectly (including, in the case of an individual, ownership by the members of his family as defined in section 544(a)(2)) in the aggregate a proprietary interest of more than 50 percent in a small business concern to which funds are provided by the small business investment company or more than 50 percent in value of the outstanding stock of such concern. This subparagraph shall not apply if the small business investment company establishes that—

"(i) the proprietary interest in or stock of the small business concern owned in the aggregate by the small business investment company and its principal shareholders in excess of the ownership limitation described in this subparagraph is the result of an acquisition by the small business investment company of a proprietary interest in or stock of such small business concern; and

"(ii) the primary purpose of the acquisition and retention of such excess proprietary interest or stock is to prevent a substantial decrease in the value of the proprietary interest, stock, or evidence of indebtedness of such small business concern owned by such small business investment company before the acquisition described in clause (i).

For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'principal shareholder' means, with respect to any small business investment company, a shareholder owning directly or indirectly (including, in the case of an individual, ownership by the members of his family as defined in section 544(a)(2)) 10 percent or more of the value of the outstanding stock of such small business investment company. If the principal shareholder or a small business investment company has an option to acquire stock of a small business concern, such stock shall be considered owned by such shareholder or company if, but only if, the effect is to make a principal shareholder exceed the percentage limitation described in subparagraph (A), or the small business investment company and its principal shareholders in the aggregate exceed the percentage limitation described in subparagraph (B). An option to acquire such an option, and each one of a series of such options, shall be considered an option to acquire stock. If a principal shareholder or a small business investment company owns outstanding securities of a small business concern which are convertible into stock (whether or not convertible during the taxable year), the securities shall be considered as outstanding stock if, but only if, the effect of the inclusion of all such securities is to make a principal shareholder exceed the percentage limitation described in subparagraph (A), or the small business investment company and its principal shareholders in the aggregate exceed the limitation described in subparagraph (B). In determining stock ownership for purposes of this paragraph, a shareholder of a small business investment company shall not be considered as owning any proprietary interest in or stock of a small business concern by reason of his ownership of stock of such small business investment company."

SEC. 3. Section 851 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to definition of regulated investment company) is amended by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—If the Small Business Administration determines, in accordance with regulations issued by it, and certifies to the Secretary or his delegate not earlier than 60 days prior to the close of the taxable year that—

"(i) a small business investment company is duly licensed by the Small Business Administration under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended,

"(ii) such small business investment company has met the diversification requirements of said Act and all regulations relating to diversification of investments as promulgated under said Act,

"(iii) such small business investment company, irrespective of the provisions of section 542(c)(8), is not a personal holding company, and

"(iv) at least 50 percent of the funds loaned to or invested in small business concerns by such small business investment company are invested in equity securities pursuant to section 304 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended, and the regulations thereunder—

such small business investment company shall be exempt from the provisions of said subsection (b)(4).

"(2) A small business investment company certified by the Small Business Administration as provided in subparagraph (1) shall be exempt from the provisions of subsection (a)(1) of this section."

SEC. 4. Section 1243 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to loss of small business investment company) is repealed.

SEC. 5. Section 1371(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to small business corporation) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) have as a shareholder a person (other than an estate or a small business investment company operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958) who is not an individual;".

SEC. 6. Section 1375 (relating to special rules applicable to distributions of electing small business corporations) is amended by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES.—Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section, a small business investment company which is licensed by the Small Business Administration and operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 which is a shareholder of an electing small business corporation during any taxable year of the corporation shall include in its taxable income all amounts distributed or distributable from the electing small business corporation and in addition shall distribute to its shareholders on or before the end of its taxable year all such distributions received from, or distributable by, the electing small business corporation; *Provided, however,* That such small business investment company shall not be entitled to the net operating loss deduction provided under section 1374, and such net operating loss shall be credited instead to all other shareholders of the electing small business corporation on a pro-rata basis as provided under subsection 1374(c)."

SEC. 7. The amendments made by section 1 and section 4 of this Act shall apply to taxable years ending on or after June 11, 1960. The amendments made by section 2 of this Act shall apply to taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1958. All other amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending on or after March 31, 1965.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF SBIC TAX BILL

Section 1 of the bill would authorize SBIC's to utilize either the specific writeoff method or the reserve method under section 166 of the code on all loans or investments made by them in their financing of small business concerns.

This authority would extend not only to simple debt instruments as now authorized by code section 166 but also to any other type of financing instrument utilized by an

SBIC including shares of stock, rights to subscribe to stock, and instruments issued in registered form or with coupons attached.

Section 2 would clarify the personal holding company exemption for SBIC's to eliminate the application of the attribution rules under the Code in determining whether an SBIC is in fact a personal holding company.

The exemption provided by this section would not be available to an SBIC where any one of its 10 percent or more shareholders held a direct proprietary interest of 10 percent or more in a small business concern to which funds are provided by the SBIC, or where the SBIC and its shareholders in the aggregate have a proprietary interest of more than 50 percent in such a small business concern. In the latter case, however, the exemption would not be lost to the SBIC if it establishes that the proprietary interest in excess of the 50 percent limitation is the result of an acquisition by the SBIC to prevent a substantial decrease in the value of the proprietary interest owned by such SBIC.

Section 3 of the bill would permit any SBIC, whether or not registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, to elect to be taxed as a regulated investment company.

In addition, this section would exempt SBIC's from the diversification requirements now applicable to regulated investment companies under code section 851 and would substitute therefor the diversification requirements made applicable to all SBIC's by the terms of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended.

The election would not be available, however, to an SBIC which is a personal holding company, disregarding the provisions of section 2 of the bill, nor to an SBIC which fails to meet the diversification requirements of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and all SBA regulations on diversification of investments.

Section 4 would repeal section 1243 of the code. The latter section affords ordinary loss treatment to convertible debentures or stock acquired by SBIC's through exercise of the conversion privilege of such instruments. The enactment of section 1 of this bill would render section 1243 superfluous.

Section 5 would permit an SBIC to be a shareholder in a small business corporation electing to be taxed under the provisions of subchapter S of the code.

Section 6 would deny to an SBIC shareholder of an electing subchapter S corporation the benefits normally flowing to the shareholders of such a corporation and would instead allocate to the other shareholders the benefits that otherwise would accrue to the SBIC shareholder.

Section 7 would make the amendments provided by sections 1 and 4 of the bill effective for taxable years ending on or after June 11, 1960, the date of the enactment of the amendments to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 which authorized SBIC's to acquire equity securities other than convertible debentures.

The amendments made by section 2 of the bill would apply to taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1958, the effective date of the personal holding company exemption originally provided in code section 542(c)(11).

All other amendments made by this bill would apply to taxable years ending on or after March 31, 1965, the fiscal year for all SBIC's as set by the Small Business Administration.

ROGER WILLIAMS MEMORIAL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the establishment of a Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence.

This bill is of very special interest to my State and our capital city. It would, in the first place, commemorate our founding father, Roger Williams, who in 1636 established Rhode Island as a haven for a persecuted religious minority who fled the theocracy of Massachusetts Bay.

It is entirely fitting that the memorial by which we propose to commemorate him is both universal and forward-looking in concept. This bill would authorize the acquisition by the National Park Service of not more than 4 acres of land encompassing what was the heart of the original settlement of Providence. The area comprises the very neighborhood where Roger Williams lived and worked, and it includes the approximate site of the town spring which for a time was the center of community life.

The changing tides of city life have long since obscured most of the old landmarks and have in fact so deteriorated the area that it is now part of an urban renewal area. The Providence redevelopment agency, with admirable sensitivity to the historic and aesthetic structure of the city now proposes to preserve the area, not as a site for towering urban structures, but as a simple plot of peaceful green space in the center of a busy city. It seems to me a most appropriate way to commemorate a man who so long ago sought out that very spot as a haven of peace.

The bill I introduce today is not a new one. A somewhat similar measure was presented in the 86th Congress by my distinguished predecessor, Theodore Francis Green, and again in the 87th Congress. Last year, I introduced a perfected version of the bill, S. 2843, but the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was unable to schedule hearings.

This year we are confronted with a need for action. I am advised that the Providence redevelopment agency will move to acquire some of the property in the area of the proposed park in mid-1966. It will be necessary to know before then if the proposed national memorial is to be a reality.

I would point out that because the land involved falls within an urban renewal area, the land can be acquired by the National Park Service at a modest price, and that the entire project probably will cost under $1 million. Moreover, the bill specifies that the city of Providence and local historical and preservation societies may cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior in maintaining and operating the memorial park.

Finally, Mr. President, to avoid confusion, I should like to ask unanimous consent that this bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. On two previous occasions, predecessor bills have been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration on the mistaken assumption that this bill involved the construction of a statue or memorial structure. It does not. But because it in fact provides for the creation of a small park, it more properly belongs before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I call attention in this regard to the rereferral of the identical bill in the 88th Congress, S. 2843, on June 11, 1964, when chairmen of both the Rules and Administration Committee and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs agreed to the rereferral.

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

The bill (S. 1855) to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. PASTORE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERMS OF OFFICE OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the term of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years instead of 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 72) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I also send to the desk for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would reduce the term of U.S. Senators from 6 years to 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 73) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of U.S. Senators shall be 4 years, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would increase the term of U.S. Senators from 6 to 8 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 74) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of U.S. Senators shall be 8 years, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the purpose of these three joint resolutions is to attempt to bring national party policy to bear on Congress by requiring that all congressional elections should take place in presidential years.

The end result hopefully would be that candidates of both political parties for Congress would be far more likely to pay some meaningful attention to the party platforms of their respective parties and to the programs of their candidates for the Presidency of the United States.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that a column by the well-known writer, Kenneth Crawford, published in Newsweek for April 19, 1965, entitled "Founders Confounded," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FOUNDERS CONFOUNDED

(By Kenneth Crawford)

The Daughters of the American Revolution will have even more than usual to resolve against at their annual meeting this month. For this spring has been a season of fantastic achievement for the U.S. Government—the kind of achievement the Daughters most deplore. As self-appointed spokesmen for the Founding Fathers, the Daughters hold that the Constitution was intended to create a system so finely checked and balanced that none of its components—executive, legislative, or judicial—would have power of quick decision. What the founders failed to anticipate, if this was indeed their purpose, was the present situation, in which the three branches, instead of checking each other, are working together for common objectives.

The evil the Constitution makers knew and guarded against was the tyranny of monarchs. They couldn't and didn't foresee the tyrannies of circumstance in an industrialized, interdependent society—poverty in the midst of plenty, ignorance in the midst of education, neglect of health in the midst of medical knowledge.

These are the tyrannies the American Government now tries to mitigate and hopes eventually to eliminate. The tools it uses must be fashioned from a document now almost two centuries old. The remarkable thing about it is that these tools can be made to do the job. Until Roosevelt's New Deal there was no certainty that the imperatives of government in a modern society could be served by the Constitution. But ways were found, by stretching here and patting there, to reconcile contemporary need with the basic law, if the need was clear enough for public recognition. Unfortunately, it has not always been that clear. The consequence has been long periods of virtual stalemate.

DREAD OF CHANGE

Lyndon Johnson is the fourth President to sponsor Federal aid to education and the third to press for medicare. Until now, these measures languished because the legislative branch was checking the executive. In Roosevelt's time, the President and Congress agreed on certain innovations only to be checked by the Supreme Court. This was the founders' balance operating against change. Daring innovators themselves, they dreaded future change and made it difficult, because they feared reversion to monarchy, the familiar menace.

Last week the founders were confounded to an unprecedented degree. Congress advanced education and medicare bills with startling ease. Laws to deal with poverty in general and the poverty of the Appalachian region in particular already were operative. Last year's civil rights law was about to be supplemented by a firmer voting-rights guarantee. The economy was benefiting from tax cuts granted last year in an effort to reduce unemployment. State legislatures were being forced by Supreme Court decisions to revise electoral patterns on a one-man, one-vote basis.

PROGRESSIVE MINDS

All this had become possible because, for once, courts, Congress, and the executive were all of equally progressive mind. They were proceeding in the same direction at about the same speed. Moreover, they moved unprodded either by world war or domestic depression. Such a confluence of forces had never occurred before and might never again. Feeling that it should happen more often—that this is how American government should be in the atomic age—Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, proposes that Members of Congress, Senators as well as Representatives, be elected along with the President for 4-year terms instead of 6- and 2-year terms, as they are now. Under this system, the President's party would almost always command a majority in Congress, as it does now.

Americans who resent change will find CLARK's idea repulsive. They will contend that revision of the founders' balance already permits a reckless majority to tyrannize over helpless minorities. Some among the minorities seem to feel that it is their inalienable right to shoot and bomb Negroes, to import cheap Mexican labor, or to cast weightier votes than anybody else. This is how it has been; ergo, this is how it should always be. But things will never be that way again. Hard as it is normally to move forward under the Fathers' commandments, it is even harder to back up.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the three proposed constitutional amendments which I have sent to the desk be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXPLANATION OF CLARK CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE TERM OF OFFICE OF CONGRESSMEN AND SENATORS

Amendment 1. To create a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives coinciding with the term of President. This amendment would eliminate the off-year election for Representatives, extending the term of office from 2 to 4 years.

Amendment 2. To create a 4-year term for Members of the Senate coinciding with the term of President. This amendment would eliminate the class system which presently exists in the Senate whereby one-third of the Senate is elected every 2 years. Instead it would require the election of all Members of the Senate for 4-year terms in each presidential year.

Amendment 3. To create an 8-year term for Members of the Senate. Under this amendment, Members of the Senate would be divided evenly into two classes, so that one-half of the Senate would be elected every 4 years. Off-year elections would be eliminated, and all senatorial elections would be held in presidential years.

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

Mr. CLARK. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a most interesting article which appeared recently in the New York Times, written by William V. Shannon, one of the most able editorial writers on the editorial board of the New York Times, entitled "Reforming the House—A 4-Year Term?" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REFORMING THE HOUSE—A 4-YEAR TERM?

(By William V. Shannon)

As the 89th Congress gets underway, congressional reform is more a subject of controversy than it has been for nearly 20 years.

One reform proposal which has received relatively little attention but which could have far-reaching consequences has been put forward by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania. He intends to offer a constitutional amendment increasing the length of the term for House Members from 2 years to 4.

He will offer his amendment later this month, as soon as he has arranged for its sponsorship by a Member of the House. Senator CLARK could act alone, but since the amendment concerns the other body, he deems it wiser to let the House act first. The amendment is likely to be referred for hearings to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees. No action is probable this year because it takes time to develop support, but this proposal has already stirred wide interest. If approved by two-thirds of both Houses, it would become effective if ratified by three-quarters of the States.

"Two years is too short a term in which to represent effectively a congressional district," Senator CLARK says. "A newly elected Congressman has hardly warmed his seat before he must leave it to campaign for renomination and reelection. And if he comes from a noncompetitive district, he will remain a Representative for the rest of his political life. So what does it matter if he goes through the motions of getting reelected once every 4 years instead of once every 2?"

Representative FLORENCE DWYER, New Jersey Republican, offers support for the 4-year term from a slightly different angle: "Eight years in the House have convinced me that a longer term for Congressmen could greatly improve the quality of representation. Under the present 2-year system, most House Members must spend an excessive amount of time politicking and campaigning—simply to survive. A term of 3 or 4 years would give us time to think and plan and produce a more consistent and constructive legislative program."

Mrs. DWYER, who unseated Democrat HARRISON WILLIAMS, now New Jersey's junior Senator, in 1956, and has won reelection by increasing margins every 2 years, notes that her State has an April primary, which means that every other year she has to do at least some campaigning from April through November.

The proposal for a 4-year term is part of the larger struggle for reform of the House. At issue are two divergent views of how the House ideally should function. The traditional view is that the first duty of a Representative is to represent the particular interests of his constituents and pay the closest attention to their opinions.

The late Estes Kefauver, a congressional reformer himself, liked to tell of the advice he received on his first day in Congress in 1939 from Speaker William B. Bankhead when he asked for the secret of how Members get reelected term after term. Bankhead replied without hesitation: "It is a simple secret. Give close and prompt attention to your mail. Your votes and speeches may make you well known and give you a reputation, but it's the way you handle your mail that determines your reelection."

Most pragmatic observers of the congressional scene would not dissent from this well-worn wisdom. Fast, efficient service on requests from constituents builds a body of loyal supporters and has helped keep many otherwise mediocre members in Congress for decades. "Listen to the home folks and

answer your mail" is part of the conventional wisdom every Member of Congress knows, along with such hoary adages as "The way to get along is to go along," and "Vote your district," and "freshman Members should be seen and not heard."

These attitudes grow out of the present power arrangements of the House, in which most of the important work is done in committees; control of committees is governed by the automatic working of the seniority system, and favor trading among committee and subcommittee chairmen is one important way things get done.

Those observers who share Senator CLARK's dissenting view of how the congressional system should work, put forward a somewhat different view of reality. They point out that most of the work of servicing constituent requests is done by a Member's staff. Every Member has at least two or three employees devoting full time to what is known as "casework." Contrary to the Bankhead dictum, answering the mail is a task for a clerk, not a Congressman. Moreover, they note that there is no evidence that the dozens of Republican Congressmen swept out of office in last November's anti-Goldwater landslide had been dilatory or delinquent in answering their mail, sending out free "baby books" and other Government manuals, or processing requests for help in obtaining a veteran's pension or a social security benefit. Those Republicans lost simply because they were riding the wrong tide of public opinion.

In the view of Senator CLARK and his adherents, this is as it should be. The Members of the House, they argue, should not represent a network of petty political fiefdoms, each owing a nonideological loyalty to its Congressman for personal services rendered and for devotion to particular local interests. Members should instead represent—as the Presidency does—the changing national consensus on major issues. They see the ideal of what ought to be merging with the reality of what is, as major shifts in population in the last 30 years and the development of rapid transportation and communications destroy old parochialisms and make the Nation into a single great constituency.

How would a 4-year term for the House fit into this picture? Since Members would always run in presidential years, it would accentuate the coattail effect that the top of the national ticket usually exerts. Individual Congressmen and congressional candidates would become more dependent on the national party. In the same year as a presidential campaign, the voters would be more likely to cross-examine congressional candidates about their views on the national party platform and their agreement or disagreement with their party's national ticket. (Republican candidates in many districts last fall discovered only too clearly that extolling their own records was not sufficient to shake off the incubus of Mr. Goldwater's candidacy.) A 4-year term would eliminate the midterm election for the House, in which the party in power almost invariably loses seats. Since Presidents have enough trouble getting their programs through as it is, avoiding this drop in their political prestige at the midway point would represent clear gain for the White House.

In his recently published book, "Congress: The Sapless Branch," Senator CLARK puts the argument this way: "If (a Member) comes from a competitive district, he will be more of a statesman and less of an errand boy if he runs always at the same time and on the same ticket as the presidential candidate of his party. The strengthening of the national interest in terms of the effective dialog on issues which such a procedural change would bring about is substantial. The strengthening of the national parties is even more so. The strengthening of the hand of the President, who alone speaks for all Americans, is the most substantial of all."

It is an ironic footnote to this argument that Mr. CLARK was able to win his place in the Senate by unseating an Eisenhower Republican incumbent in 1956, although General Eisenhower swept the presidential election by 9,500,000 votes. That year, for the first time in a century, the party that won the White House failed to carry either House of Congress. Presumably even in the best reformed and well-ordered political system such anomalies would continue to occur occasionally.

When the framers of the Constitution provided that Members of the House should be popularly elected for 2 years and the Senators indirectly elected for 6, they anticipated that the Representatives would be immediately responsive to popular sentiment as the price of reelection. This was true until the Civil War. But over the past 100 years, the development of one-party strongholds across the country has meant that ordinarily fewer than 100 of the 435 Members need worry about reelection.

Democrats from Boston, New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, as well as from many rural districts of the South, have safe seats which they regularly win by upward of 65 percent of the vote. A sizable number of Republicans in rural and smalltown districts of the Middle West from Ohio to Kansas are equally well-entrenched. Meanwhile, the Senators, now elected by direct popular vote and running statewide, are more subject to volatile shifts in public sentiment.

"The framers thought that the Senate would consist of a conservative body of senior statesmen who would restrain the speed and radicalism of the House," Representative RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri Democrat and a leader in the long struggle for congressional reform, recently observed. "But history has taken the two Houses in the reverse directions. At present the Senate is often the more liberal body because it is more responsive to the social pressures of the big cities and the suburbs. The House, organized under the seniority principle, is the restraining influence."

Under these circumstances the historical argument for sharply differentiating between House and Senate has lost much of its validity.

If Members of the House were elected for 4 years, this might subtly undermine the gerontocracy in the House. Newly elected Members who know they may be swept out at the midterm election have neither the time nor the incentive to mount an attack on the House establishment, since if they were to fight and win a larger share of committee control they would have only 2 years in which to enjoy it—and most of the second year is necessarily spent back home campaigning for reelection. But with the security of a 4-year term the newcomers would feel more nearly on an equal footing with the oldtimers and could look forward to more than 3 years of uninterrupted service.

As matters now stand, the 71 newly elected Democrats in the House become junior members of committees, every one of which is chaired by a member who has been there a minimum of 20 years. These newcomers won election as partners and supporters of Lyndon Johnson, but the fresh wave of 1965 has to yield to the men elected in the time of Franklin D. Roosevelt and, in a few instances, to those first elected in the days of Harding and Hoover.

Those who favor congressional reform are convinced that the only hope for improving the quality of House membership and the level of House performance is to speed up the rotation of those in positions of control by finding ways to bring junior Members to positions of power. The security of a 4-year term would be one step in this direction.

The elimination of midterm elections for the House would not necessarily weaken Congress as against the Presidency under our constitutional system of checks and balances. When the House is more liberal than the President, as it was in 1931–32 during the last half of the Hoover administration and again in 1959–60 at the end of the Eisenhower administration, the President can with relative ease frustrate the legislative plans of his liberal opponents.

When the House is more conservative than the President, as it was in 1947–48 during the Truman administration, the conservatives fare only slightly better. The Taft-Hartley Labor Relations Act was the one major exception to 2 years of Republican frustration in the 80th Congress.

Leaving the political struggle aside and looking at the House in purely institutional terms, one can see that a 4-year term would conform with the growing trend toward the professionalization of government. As big government has developed over the last 30 years, the tendency in State capitals and in Washington has been steadily toward longer legislative sessions, higher salaries, more expert staff assistance, and—in the States—toward longer terms of office.

So many States have lengthened the terms of office for their Governors, for example, that there are now only 16 which provide only a 2-year term; of these, Michigan and Massachusetts will switch next year to 4 years. Similarly, a 1-year term for State legislators was still common before World War I. Now all States elect them for at least 2 years. New York is currently considering extending the terms of its State senators from 2 years to 4.

Two arguments have proved persuasive in advancing this trend toward longer tenure.

The first is that most people now regard frequent elections not as a democratic safeguard but as a waste of time, energy, and money for both the candidates and the electorate. Shorter campaigns and less frequent elections are now the vogue.

Secondly, government at all levels has obviously grown so much more complex than it was in 1787, or even in grandfather's day, that the public has concluded that its officeholders, both legislative and executive, need more time if they are to learn their jobs thoroughly and do them properly, free from campaigning and other extraneous pressures.

For these reasons many people who do not approve of Senator CLARK's broader program for more tightly structured political parties and a Congress more on the model of the British House of Commons do favor his proposal for a 4-year term for Members of the House. A recent meeting of the American Assembly endorsed it, which suggests that although the idea has not been widely discussed, it does have public support.

More important is the absence of any strong opposition. This makes it difficult to estimate the proposal's chances of practical success. It is not likely to be adopted this year, but if the study commission on congressional reform that Senator MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, has proposed is established, and were to make the 4-year term part of its package of recommendations, it might sail through with little controversy.

The chief arguments against a 4-year term are the force of tradition and the belief that the necessity of running every 2 years is desirable in keeping a Representative close to his constituency.

Dr. Charles Clapp, of the Brookings Institution, reports in his book "The Congressman" that when he discussed briefly the possibility of a 4-year term with Republican and Democratic House Members in 1959, they were overwhelmingly of the opinion that, although longer tenure would be delightful from their vantage point, it would never be adopted. Senators, they observed, were not likely to adopt a constitutional

amendment which would enable House Members to run for the Senate in midterm elections without risking their own seats.

The advocacy of this reform by Senator CLARK, who has never served in the House, suggests that these Congressmen may have judged their colleagues in the other Chamber too harshly. Notwithstanding the risks, ambitious House Members who want to enter the smaller and more prestigious Senate are usually willing to surrender their seats and make the attempt. The 4-year term would, in fact, not noticeably increase the number of Representatives running for the Senate. On the contrary, by lessening the difference between the two Chambers, it would encourage Members of the House to stay there.

In any event, Senator CLARK has one more reform to take care of this contingency as well. A second clause in his proposed constitutional amendment would reduce senatorial terms from 6 years to 4, thus eliminating midterm elections altogether. No one expects the Senate to adopt this self-denying innovation. Only a man of Senator CLARK's imperturbable spirit would propose it to his colleagues.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania on introducing his proposed constitutional amendments. I proposed such an amendment in the previous Congress. My proposed constitutional amendment sought to fix the length of the terms of Members of the House at 4 years, and the terms of U.S. Senators at 8 years. This would have provided, as the Senator brought out, that Members of Congress would run only in presidential election years. In that way, Members of Congress would not present the effect of going against the President in so-called off years.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am happy to welcome the support of my friend from Montana.

If the Senator from Montana would like to cosponsor my measures, I would, indeed, be happy to have the Senator listed as a cosponsor.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be listed as a cosponsor to the joint resolutions submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that comments which I made last year when I introduced my proposed amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR METCALF

Today I am introducing for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to extend to 4 years the terms of Members of the House of Representatives and to 8 years the terms of Senators.

The arguments in favor of this amendment to our Constitution are most persuasive. This is not a partisan proposal; it is a measure designed to strengthen our democratic processes and to make our National Government more sensitive to the wishes of its citizens.

As the distinguished political scientist and student of government, Stephen K. Bailey, has written, "The constitutional provisions for staggered elections are a significant cause of the pullings and haulings in our National Government." My amendment, Mr. President, would remove one obstacle to efficient and responsible National Government by eliminating the so-called off year election of U.S. Senators and Representatives.

Adoption of this constitutional amendment would represent a big step toward reducing much of the needless—and sometimes destructive—partisan bickering that has characterized our National Government when the executive branch is controlled by one political party and the legislative branch by the other. This situation is not unusual. The party of the President in office has lost control of the House in 17 midterm elections, out of the 44 off year elections held since the first one in 1790.

Under this amendment when fully operative, candidates seeking election to the House of Representatives and Senate—except in special circumstances—would run only in presidential election years.

When the people of this Nation go to the polls to elect a presidential candidate on the basis of a program he and his party have promised to implement, they should have the opportunity to vote for Senators and Representatives who will support that program.

Past experience indicates that election of a new Congress only in presidential election years would, in all probability, mean control of the executive and legislative branches of our National Government by the same party. In fact, there are only two clear-cut cases since the Constitution went into effect in 1789 when the newly elected President did not have a majority in the House of Representatives. If a President had dependable majorities, majorities identified with his program—in both Houses of Congress—for his full term, it would be much easier for the electorate to judge the performance of the party in power. The administration would be able to pursue its projects and plans unhampered by partisan prejudice, making possible a constructive, more nearly unified policy.

If the "in party" failed to meet its commitments, the electorate could unmistakably fix the responsibility and vote the President and his congressional supporters out at the next election. But the "in party" would have a full 4 years to fulfill its campaign pledges before going again to the voters for an expression of confidence.

The arguments in support of lengthening the terms of office for Members of the House of Representatives are familiar to all of us. Those of us who have served in the House as Representatives of two-party districts, need not be reminded how difficult it is to become familiar with the legislative process and become competent legislators when the next election is "just around the corner."

In recent years, Mr. President, it has become increasingly difficult to pass needed legislation through the other House. One of the reasons for this, I believe, is the preoccupation of House Members—especially the newer ones from two-party districts—with their reelection. A Representative is sent to Congress to give his constituency a voice in its relations with the Federal Government. But he is also expected to be a legislator—to understand and participate effectively in the legislative process. Under the present 2-year term, the new Representative finds it extremely difficult to become an effective legislator before he must face the electorate for a judgment on his performance. A 4-year term would give a Member of the House an opportunity to make a record before seeking a vote of confidence from his constituents.

When the Fathers of our Constitution settled on a 2-year term for Members of the House of Representatives, they anticipated that each session of Congress would be relatively short, leaving Representatives ample time to travel home and mix with the people. The first representatives proposed 142 bills of which they passed 111. During the 88th Congress, 15,299 bills and resolutions were introduced and 1,026 passed. Though figures tell far from the whole story, this is a strong indication that the 2-year term just can no longer adequately equip the Congress to do its job.

Adoption of this amendment also would mean substantial savings by eliminating the cost of participating in off-year elections.

Both primary and general election campaigns are becoming longer, more elaborate and more expensive. There appears to be no prospect of a change in this tendency. While modern methods of travel and communications are more expeditious, it costs thousands of dollars to cover a congressional district covering a large geographical area. Costs have increased in advertising, radio, and television time, printing and postage which are a necessary segment of a political campaign. The people have become accustomed to and expect extensive publicity as an informative means of a candidate's intentions. Electing Members of the House and Senate only during presidential election years would substantially reduce campaign costs as well as allow legislators to concentrate on legislation.

I believe this amendment deserves the serious consideration of this Congress. I recognize that it would represent a departure from our time tested election laws; but times are changing and we must change with them. The international and domestic challenges facing our Nation today and in the years ahead demand a responsible and responsive Congress. Adoption of this amendment would be a step in the direction of making the Congress more sensitive to the needs of our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert immediately following my remarks a section from "The Condition of Our National Political Parties" by Stephen K. Bailey.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"EXCERPT FROM ARTICLE 'CONGRESSIONAL TERMS'

"(By Stephen K. Bailey)

"The constitutional provisions for staggered elections are a significant cause of the pullings and haulings in our National Government. It is equally clear that a 2-year term for the House is too short to turn a freshman Member into an effective legislator or to avoid the harassing and expensive responsibilities of perpetual campaigning. The last election and the next election are often an indistinguishable blur. Furthermore, if a truly competitive two-party system should develop across the Nation, there will be more frequent alternation of victorious candidates between the parties, thus shortening the tenure of any one Congressman.

"A 4-year term for the House, if it coincides with the presidential term, should have a number of important effects. Under normal conditions, it would insure the same political complexion for the House as the President's. It would reduce the continuous campaign and constituency pressures which a 2-year term almost inevitably fosters. It would give Congressmen sufficient time to learn their trade and to make a substantial contribution to public life.

"Also, if an 8-year term were provided for Members of the Senate (half of them coming up for election every 4 years at the same time as the Presidency), the likelihood that the President would have a working majority in both Houses would be overwhelming. At the same time, the conservative utility of overlapping terms would be maintained with only a slight modification in the constitutional wish for continuity.

"Enhancing the possibility of one-party control of the Government would enhance the possibility of substantial governmental power and would unmistakably fix responsibility for governmental policy.

COMPREHENSIVE REVISION OF ALL SENATE RULES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, the same comprehensive revision of all the rules of the U.S. Senate, which I offered during the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 103) amending the Standing Rules of the Senate, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended to read as follows:

"RULE I

"Election of President pro tempore and selection of officers

"At the commencement of each Congress, the Senate shall elect a President pro tempore and shall choose its officers, the Secretary, the Sergeant at Arms, the Chaplain, the secretary to the majority, the secretary to the minority.

"RULE II

"Appointment of a Senator to the Chair

"1. The President pro tempore shall perform the duties of the Chair in the absence of the Vice President or vacancy in the office of Vice President.

"2. In the absence of the Vice President, and pending the election of a President pro tempore, a Senator designated by the majority leader, with the concurrence of the minority leader, shall perform the duties of the Chair.

"3. The President pro tempore shall have the right to name in open Senate, or, if absent, in writing, a Senator to perform the duties of the Chair. In the absence of such designation by the President pro tempore, the majority leader, with the concurrence of the minority leader, shall designate a Senator or Senators to perform the duties of the Chair; but in neither instance shall such substitution extend beyond an adjournment, except by unanimous consent.

"4. Whenever any Senator shall be designated to perform the duties of the Chair during the temporary absence of the President pro tempore, such Senator shall be empowered to sign, as acting President pro tempore, the enrolled bills and joint resolutions coming from the House of Representatives for presentation to the President of the United States.

"RULE III

"Presentation of credentials

"1. The presentation of credentials of Senators-elect and other questions of privilege shall always be in order, except while a question of order or a motion to adjourn is pending, or while the Senate is dividing; and all questions and motions arising or made upon the presentation of such credentials shall be proceeded with until disposed of.

"2. The Secretary shall keep a record of the certificates of election of Senators by entering in a well-bound book kept for that purpose the date of the election, the name of the person elected and the vote given at the election, the date of the certificate, the name of the governor and the secretary of state signing and countersigning the same, and the State from which such Senator is elected.

"RULE IV

"Oaths, etc.

"The oaths or affirmations required by the Constitution and prescribed by law shall be taken and subscribed by each Senator, in open Senate, before entering upon his duties.

"RULE V

"Commencement of daily sessions

"The Presiding Officer having taken the Chair, and a quorum being present, motions to correct any mistakes made in the entries of the Senate Journal of the preceding day shall be in order and proceeded with until disposed of, unless objected to. If objection is made, the Senator moving to correct the Senate Journal and the Senator objecting may file at the Clerk's desk briefs in support of their positions. Such briefs shall be printed in the Senate Journal for the calendar day on which the motion to correct was made, together with a notice that a vote on the motion will take place on the following calendar day on which the Senate is in session at a time certain to be set by the Presiding Officer. At the designated time, the motion to correct shall be submitted to the Senate and decided without debate.

"2. Unless a motion to read the Senate Journal of the preceding day, which shall be nondebatable, is made and passed by majority vote, the Senate Journal shall be deemed to have been read without actual recitation and approved.

"3. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn.

"RULE VI

"Senate Journal

"1. The proceedings of the Senate shall be accurately stated in the Senate Journal which shall be the Senate section of the Congressional Record. Messages of the President in full; titles of bills and joint resolutions, and such parts as shall be affected by proposed amendments; every vote, and a brief statement of the contents of each petition, memorial, or paper presented to the Senate; the legislative proceedings; and, the executive proceedings in open executive sessions, shall be entered.

"2. The executive proceedings in closed session, the confidential legislative proceedings, and the proceedings when sitting as a Court of Impeachment, shall each be recorded by the Journal Clerk in a separate book.

"RULE VII

"Quorum—Absent Senators may be sent for

"1. No Senator shall absent himself from the service of the Senate without leave.

"2. If, at any time during the daily sessions of the Senate, a question shall be raised by the Majority Leader or the Minority Leader, or, in their absence, by the Acting Majority Leader or the Acting Minority Leader, as to the presence of a quorum, the Presiding Officer shall forthwith direct the Secretary to call the roll and shall announce the result, and these proceedings shall be without debate.

"3. Any Senator may raise the question as to the presence of a quorum but only for the purpose of seeking recognition and calling for a vote on the pending business once the presence of a quorum has been ascertained; and, declaration of such intention shall be made by such Senator immediately prior to his raising the question as to the presence of a quorum. Immediately upon the statement of such intention and the raising of such question by any Senator, the Presiding Officer shall forthwith direct the Secretary to call the roll and proceed as above provided.

"4. Whenever, during any quorum call as provided for in paragraphs 2 and 3, the Presiding Officer ascertains that a majority of the Senators are present in the chamber, he shall direct that the quorum call be halted.

"5. Whenever upon such rollcall it shall be ascertained that a quorum is not present, a majority of the Senators present may direct the Sergeant at Arms to request, and, when necessary, to compel the attendance of the absent Senators, which order shall be determined without debate; and pending its execution, and until a quorum shall be present, no debate nor motion, except to adjourn, shall be in order.

"RULE VIII

"Order of recognition

"When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized; and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him, except that he shall first give recognition to the following Senators in the order prescribed if any of them shall also seek recognition:

"(1) The Majority Leader, or, in his absence, any Senator designated as Acting Majority Leader by the Majority Leader, and occupying the Majority Leader's desk.

"(2) The Minority Leader, or, in his absence, any Senator designated as Acting Minority Leader by the Minority Leader, and occupying the Minority Leader's desk.

"RULE IX

"Debate

"1. No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer; *Provided, however*, that such consent shall not be required where any Senator shall raise a germane point of order that the Senator in possession of the floor has transgressed the rules of the Senate. Unless submitted to the Senate, the germane point of order shall be decided by the Presiding Officer subject to an appeal to the Senate as provided in Rule X. Any Senator against whom a germane point of order shall have been raised and any Senator raising such point of order may appeal from the ruling of the Presiding Officer, which appeal shall be open to debate. If the Presiding Officer shall sustain the germane point of order and no appeal is taken, or if upon appeal the Senate shall sustain the germane point of order, the Senator against whom it has been made shall take his seat; otherwise he shall retain possession of the floor.

"A germane point of order may be raised in respect to enforcement of paragraphs 3 and 5 of this Rule.

"2. It shall not be in order to interrupt a Senator having the floor for the purpose of introducing any petition, memorial, report of a committee, resolution, or bill. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to enforce this Rule without any point of order hereunder being made by a Senator.

"3. No Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same legislative day without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate.

"4. Upon the request of any Senator who has been recognized, his remarks upon any subject may be delivered in writing, and if so delivered shall be printed in the Senate Journal in the same manner, and in the same size print, as if those remarks had been delivered orally. The Senate Journal shall contain a notation that the material was submitted but not delivered orally.

"5. Whenever a Senator has held the floor for three consecutive hours, he shall be required to yield the floor upon objection and any Senator may raise a point of order at any time thereafter that such Senator yield the floor.

"6. No Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly, by any form of words, impute to another Senator or to other Senators any

conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator, or refer offensively to any State of the Union.

"7. If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, in the opinion of the Presiding Officer transgresses the rules of the Senate by impugning the motives or integrity of another Senator, the Presiding Officer shall, either on his own motion or at the request of any other Senator, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall take his seat, and may not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate. Any Senator directed by the Presiding Officer to take his seat, and any Senator requesting the Presiding Officer to require a Senator to take his seat, may appeal from the ruling of the Chair, which appeal shall be open to debate.

"8. If a Senator be called to order for words spoken in debate, then, upon the demand of the Senator or of any other Senator, the exceptionable words shall be read by the Official Reporter for the information of the Senate.

"9. Whenever confusion arises in the Chamber or the galleries, or demonstrations of approval or disapproval are indulged in by the occupants of the galleries, it shall be the duty of the Chair to enforce order on his own initiative and without any point of order being made by a Senator.

"10. No Senator shall introduce to or bring to the attention of the Senate during its sessions any occupant in the galleries of the Senate. No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor may the Presiding Officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent.

"11. During the consideration of any measure, motion, or other matter, any Senator may move that all further debate under the order for pending business shall be germane to the subject matter before the Senate. If such a motion, which shall be nondebatable, is approved by the Senate, all further debate under the said order shall be germane to the subject matter before the Senate, and all questions of germaneness under this rule, when raised, including appeals, shall be decided by the Senate without debate.

"12. When the reading of a paper is called for, and objected to, it shall be determined by a vote of the Senate, without debate.

"13. No dilatory motion shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer. A Senator whose motion has been determined by the Presiding Officer to be dilatory may appeal from the decision of the Chair, which appeal shall be decided by the Senate without debate.

"14. Former Presidents of the United States shall be entitled to address the Senate upon appropriate notice to the Presiding Officer who shall thereupon make the necessary arrangements.

"RULE X

"Questions of order

"1. Subject to the limitations in Rule IX, a question of order may be raised at any stage of the proceedings, except when the Senate is dividing, and, unless submitted to the Senate, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate. When an appeal is taken, any subsequent question of order which may arise before the decision of such appeal shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate; and every appeal therefrom shall be decided at once, and without debate; and any appeal may be laid on the table without prejudice to the pending proposition, and thereupon shall be held as affirming the decision of the Presiding Officer.

"2. The Presiding Officer may submit any question of order for the decision of the Senate.

"3. When a question of order has been submitted to the Senate, or a debatable appeal has been taken on a decision of the Presiding Officer as provided herein, debate on such submission or appeal shall be limited, in all, to one hour, unless the Senate shall otherwise direct.

"RULE XI

"Morning business

"1. One hour, if that much time be needed, shall be set aside for the transaction of morning business as set forth in Rule XI, paragraph 2, on each legislative day at the opening of proceedings unless the Senate shall otherwise order by unanimous consent. The period for morning business may be extended for up to one additional hour, upon motion, which shall be nondebatable, approved by majority action.

"2. The Presiding Officer shall, during the period for morning business, lay before the Senate messages from the President, reports and communications from the heads of Departments, and other communications addressed to the Senate, and such bills, joint resolutions, and other messages from the House of Representatives as may remain upon his table from any previous day's session undisposed of. The Presiding Officer shall then call for:

"The presentation of petitions and memorials.

"Reports of standing and select committees.

"The introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

"Concurrent and other resolutions.

"Statements or comments not to exceed three minutes which may include requests for unanimous consent to insert articles and other printed matter in the Senate Journal and to submit statements.

"3. Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the Chair, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the Calendar shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer, unless by unanimous consent; and if such consent be given, the motion shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be decided without debate upon the merits of the subject proposed to be taken up.

"RULE XII

"Petitions and memorials

"1. Every petition or memorial shall be signed by the petitioner or memorialist and have endorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, and shall be presented and referred to the appropriate committee without debate. But no petition or memorial or other paper signed by citizens or subjects of a foreign power shall be received, unless the same be transmitted to the Senate by the President.

"2. Every petition or memorial shall be referred, without putting the question, unless objection to such reference is made; in which case all motions for the reception or reference of such petition, memorial, or other paper shall be put in the order in which the same shall be made, and shall not be open to amendment, except to add instructions.

"3. Only a brief statement of the contents of such communications as are presented under the order of business 'Presentation of petitions and memorials' shall be printed in the Senate Journal; and no other portion of such communications shall be inserted in the Senate Journal unless specifically so ordered by the Senate, as provided for in Rule XL, paragraph 1; except that communications from the legislatures or conventions, lawfully called, of the respective States and insular possessions shall be printed in full in the Senate Journal whenever presented, and the original copies of such communications shall be retained in the files of the Secretary of the Senate.

"4. Senators having petitions, memorials, or private bills to present after the conclusion of the morning business may deliver them to the Secretary of the Senate, indorsing upon them their names. Said petitions, memorials, or bills shall, with the approval of the Presiding Officer, be entered on the Senate Journal with the names of the Senators presenting them as having been read twice and referred to the appropriate committees.

"RULE XIII

"Calendar Monday

"1. At the conclusion of the morning business on each Monday, unless upon motion decided without debate the Senate shall otherwise order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Calendar of Bills and Resolutions, and bills and resolutions that are not objected to shall be taken up in their order. An objection may be interposed at any stage of the proceedings, but upon motion the Senate may continue such consideration; and this order shall commence immediately after the conclusion of morning business, and shall take precedence of the unfinished business and other special orders.

"RULE XIV

"Motions to consider

"1. All motions to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be debatable, unless otherwise provided in these Rules: *Provided, however,* That when any Senator shall file, at the desk of the Clerk, a notice of intention to move to consider any matter on the Senate Calendar on the following calendar day on which the Senate is in session, such motion for consideration when made by such Senator shall be decided without debate. The notice of intent shall be printed in the Senate Journal.

"RULE XV

"Special orders

"1. Any subject may, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present, be made a special order; and when the time so fixed for its consideration arrives the Presiding Officer shall lay it before the Senate, unless there be unfinished business of the preceding day, and if it is not finally disposed of on that day it shall take its place on the Calendar of Special Orders in the order of time in which it was made special, unless it shall become by adjournment the unfinished business.

"2. When two or more special orders have been made for the same time, they shall have precedence according to the order in which they were severally assigned, and that order shall only be changed by direction of the Senate.

"And all motions to make a subject a special order, or to change such order, or to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"RULE XVI

"Bills, joint resolutions, and resolutions

"1. Every bill and joint resolution shall receive three readings previous to its passage. The first reading and the second reading may be on the same calendar day, if the Senate by majority vote without debate, shall so direct; but the third reading must be on a different calendar day. The Presiding Officer shall give notice at each reading whether it be the first, second, or third. The first or second reading of each bill, or both, may be by title only, unless the Senate by majority vote without debate shall otherwise order.

"2. Every bill or joint resolution shall immediately after second reading be referred

by the Presiding Officer to the appropriate committee. Appeals from rulings of the Presiding Officer referring bills and joint resolutions to committee shall be decided by the Senate without debate. A motion to place a bill or joint resolution on the Senate Calendar immediately and not refer it to committee may be made by any Senator after such bill or joint resolution has been read twice but before it has been referred to committee, and such motion shall be decided by majority vote of the Senate after debate not to exceed a period of one hour.

"3. Every bill and joint resolution having been read twice and referred to a committee, shall, upon being reported by the committee, immediately be placed on the calendar. Every bill and joint resolution originating in a committee shall, upon being reported by the committee, be read twice and then placed on the calendar.

"4. The Secretary of the Senate shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and shall examine all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate.

"5. All resolutions shall lie over one calendar day for consideration, unless the Senate shall by majority vote otherwise direct.

"RULE XVII

"Reports of committees and motions to discharge to lie over

"All reports of committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of a subject, and all subjects from which a committee shall be discharged, shall lie over one calendar day for consideration, unless the Senate, without debate, by a majority vote shall otherwise direct, or unless otherwise provided in these Rules.

"RULE XVIII

"Reference to committees—amendments

"When motions are made for reference of a subject to a select committee or a standing committee, the question of reference to a standing committee shall be put first; and a motion simply to refer shall not be open to amendment, except to add instructions.

"RULE XIX

"Amendments to appropriation bills

"1. All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate submitted in accordance with law.

"2. The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any such restriction, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

"3. All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received.

"4. No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill; nor shall any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law be received if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency.

"5. No amendment, the object of which is to provide for a private claim, shall be received to any general appropriation bill, unless it be to carry out the provisions of an existing law or a treaty stipulation, which shall be cited on the face of the amendment.

"6. (a) Three members of the following-named committees, to be selected by their respective committees, shall be ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations, to serve on said committee when the annual appropriation bill making appropriations for the purposes specified in the following table opposite the name of the committee is being considered by the Committee on Appropriations:

"Name of committee	*Purpose of appropriation*
Committee on Agriculture and Forestry	For the Department of Agriculture.
Committee on Armed Services	For the Department of Defense.
Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.	For aeronautical and space activities and matters relating to the scientific aspects thereof, except those peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.
Committee on Commerce	For the Department of Commerce and related activities.
Committee on the District of Columbia	For the District of Columbia.
Committee on Finance, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.	For the Departments of the Treasury and the Post Office.
Committee on Foreign Relations	For the Department of State and related agencies, and for the foreign assistance programs.
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs	For the Department of the Interior and related agencies.
Committee on the Judiciary	For the Department of Justice and for the Judiciary.
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare	For the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare.
Committee on Public Works	For public works.
Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (to be selected by said members).	For the development and utilization of atomic energy.

"(b) At least one member of each committee enumerated in subparagraph (a), to be selected by his or their respective committees, shall be a member of any conference committee appointed to confer with the House upon the annual appropriation bill making appropriations for the purposes specified in the foregoing table opposite the name of his or their respective committee.

"7. When a point of order is made against any restriction on the expenditure of funds appropriated in a general appropriation bill on the ground that the restriction violates this rule, the rule shall be construed strictly and, in case of doubt, in favor of the point of order.

"RULE XX

"Amendments—germaneness

"No amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in a bill under consideration shall be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; and all questions of relevancy of amendments, when raised, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer, subject to appeal to the Senate to be decided without debate.

"RULE XXI

"Amendment may be laid on the table without prejudice to the bill

"When an amendment proposed to any pending measure is laid on the table, it shall not carry with it, or prejudice, such measure.

"RULE XXII

"Amendments—division of a question

"If the question in debate contains several propositions, any Senator may have the same divided, except a motion to strike out and insert, which shall not be divided; but the rejection of a motion to strike out and insert one proposition shall not prevent a motion to strike out and insert a different proposition; nor shall it prevent a motion simply to strike out; nor shall the rejection of a motion to strike out prevent a motion to strike out and insert. But pending a motion to strike out and insert, the part to be stricken out and the part to be inserted shall each be regarded for the purpose of amendment as a question; and motions to amend the part to be stricken out shall have precedence.

"RULE XXIII

"Amendments after third reading—Recommitment

"When a bill or resolution shall have been ordered to be read a third time, it shall not be in order to propose amendments, unless by unanimous consent, but it shall be in order at any time before the passage of any bill or resolution to move its commitment; and when the bill or resolution shall again be reported from the committee it shall be placed on the Calendar unless the Senate by majority vote shall otherwise direct.

"RULE XXIV

"Motions

"1. All motions shall be reduced to writing, if desired by the Presiding Officer or by any Senator, and shall be read before the same shall be debated.

"2. Any motion or resolution may be withdrawn or modified by the mover at any time before a decision, amendment, or ordering of the yeas and nays, except a motion to reconsider, which shall not be withdrawn without leave.

"RULE XXV

"Precedence of motions—Previous question

"1. When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

"To adjourn.

"To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

"To take a recess.

"To proceed to the consideration of executive business.
"To lay on the table.
"For the previous question.
"To postpone indefinitely.
"To postpone to a day certain.
"To commit.
"To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged, except that after the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution, no motion to lay on the table shall be in order; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, for the previous question, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate.

"2. (a) Whenever any motion or amendment to a measure pending before the Senate has received consideration for a total of not less than fifteen hours, during a total of not less than three calendar days, any Senator may move the previous question with respect to such motion or amendment.

"(b) Whenever any measure pending before the Senate, together with any motions or amendments relating to it, has received consideration for a total of not exceeding fifteen calendar days, any Senator may move the previous question with respect to such measure and any or all motions or amendments relating to it.

"(c) When such a motion is made and a quorum is ascertained to be present, it shall be submitted immediately to the Senate by the Presiding Officer, without debate and shall be determined by a "yea" and "nay" vote, a majority prevailing. A previous question may be asked and ordered with respect to one or more measures, motions, amendments, or matters, and may embrace one or more amendments to any pending measure, motion or matter described therein, and the passage or rejection of the pending bill or resolution: *Provided, however,* That any or all motions or amendments not so embraced by the motion for the previous question shall be deemed rejected. If the previous question is so ordered as to any measure, motion, amendment, or matter, that measure, motion, amendment, or matter shall be presented immediately to the Senate for determination. One hour of debate, equally divided between opponents and proponents shall be allowed on any motion, amendment, or matter, other than the passage or rejection of the measure, bill, or resolution on which the previous question has been ordered; and, four hours of debate, divided in the same manner, shall be allowed on the passage or rejection of the measure, bill, or resolution covered by such order.

"All incidental questions of order arising after a motion is made for the previous question, and pending such motion, shall be decided, whether on appeal or otherwise, without debate.

"RULE XXVI

"Preambles

"When a bill or resolution is accompanied by a preamble, the question shall first be put on the bill or resolution and then on the preamble, which may be withdrawn by a mover before an amendment of the same, on ordering of the yeas and nays; or it may be laid on the table without prejudice to the bill or resolution, and shall be a final disposition of such preamble.

"RULE XXVII

"Voting, etc.

"1. A demand for the yeas and nays, when seconded by eleven Senators, shall be sufficient to require a rollcall vote. When the yeas and nays are ordered, the names of Senators shall be called alphabetically; and each Senator shall, without debate, declare his assent or dissent to the question unless excused by the Senate. Senators entering the chamber after their names have been called may obtain recognition from the Presiding Officer and have their votes recorded prior to the announcement of the vote; but no Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the Presiding Officer, except that a Senator may, for sufficient reasons, with unanimous consent, change or withdraw his vote. No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor shall the Presiding Officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent.

"2. When a Senator declines a vote on call of his name, he shall be required to assign his reasons therefor, and having assigned them, the Presiding Officer shall submit the question to the Senate: 'Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?', which question shall be decided without debate; and these proceedings shall be had after the rollcall and before the result is announced; and any further proceedings in reference hereto shall be after such announcement.

"3. No request by a Senator for unanimous consent for the taking of a final vote on a specified date upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution shall be submitted to the Senate for agreement thereto until, upon a rollcall ordered for the purpose by the Presiding Officer, it shall be discovered that a quorum of the Senate is present; and when a unanimous consent is thus given, the same shall operate as the order of the Senate, but any unanimous consent may be revoked by another unanimous consent granted in the manner prescribed above upon one day's notice.

"RULE XXVIII

"Reconsideration

"1. When a question has been decided by the Senate, any Senator voting with the prevailing side or who has not voted may, on the same day or on either of the next two days of actual session thereafter, move a reconsideration; and if the Senate shall refuse to reconsider, or upon reconsideration shall affirm its first decision, no further motion to reconsider shall be in order unless by unanimous consent. Every motion to reconsider shall be decided by a majority vote, and may be laid on the table without affecting the question in reference to which the same is made, which shall be a final disposition of the motion.

"2. When a bill, resolution, report, amendment, order, or message, upon which a vote has been taken, shall have gone out of the possession of the Senate and been communicated to the House of Representatives, the motion to reconsider shall be accompanied by a motion to request the House to return the same; which last motion shall be acted upon immediately and without debate, and if determined in the negative shall be a final disposition of the motion to reconsider.

"RULE XXIX

"Appointment of committees

"1. At the beginning of each Congress the Senate shall proceed by ballot to appoint the members of each standing committee, and unless otherwise ordered, of each other committee of the Senate. All members of each such committee so appointed shall be appointed by one ballot. A plurality of the votes cast shall be required for the appointment of the members of each such committee.

"In the event a vacancy occurs for any reason in the membership of a standing committee and of any other committee of the Senate during a session of Congress, the Senate shall proceed by ballot to fill the vacancy. A plurality of the votes cast shall be required in the filling of a vacancy.

"2. Upon the appointment of the members of each such committee at the beginning of a Congress pursuant to paragraph 1, the majority Members thereof shall elect by secret ballot of the majority members of the committee one member of that committee to be chairman thereof. Such member shall be of the majority party of the Senate. A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be required for the election of a chairman of any such committee.

"No Senator shall be elected or shall continue to serve as chairman of a standing committee after he has attained the age of seventy years.

"When a permanent vacancy occurs for any reason in the chairmanship of a standing committee and of any other committee of the Senate, the vacancy in the membership shall first be filled (if necessary) as provided in paragraph 1 hereof, and a successor chairman thereafter elected as hereinabove provided.

"No Senator shall be chairman of more than one standing committee nor of more than one subcommittee of each committee of which he may be a member.

"RULE XXX

"Standing committees

"1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:

"(a)(1) Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating primarily to the following subjects:

"(A) Aeronautical and space activities, as that term is defined in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, except those which are peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

"(B) Matters relating generally to the scientific aspects of such aeronautical and space activities, except those which are peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

"(C) National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"(2) Such committee also shall have jurisdiction to survey and review, and to prepare studies and reports upon, aeronautical and space activities of all agencies of the United States, including such activities which are peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

"(b) Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to consist of fifteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Agriculture generally.
"2. Inspection of livestock and meat products.
"3. Animal industry and diseases of animals.
"4. Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.
"5. Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.
"6. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.
"7. Agricultural economies and research.
"8. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.
"9. Dairy industry.
"10. Entomology and plant quarantine.
"11. Human nutrition and home economics.
"12. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.
"13. Agricultural educational extension services.
"14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.
"15. Rural electrification.

"16. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.

"17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.

"(c) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of twenty-four Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

"(d) Committee on Armed Services, to consist of fifteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Common defense generally.

"2. The Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally.

"3. Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

"4. Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces.

"5. Selective service.

"6. Size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

"7. Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards.

"8. Ammunition depots.

"9. Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone.

"10. Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.

"11. Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

"12. Aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

"(e) Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Banking and currency generally.

"2. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

"3. Deposit insurance.

"4. Public and private housing.

"5. Federal Reserve System.

"6. Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.

"7. Issuance of notes and redemption thereof.

"8. Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.

"9. Control of prices of commodities, rents, or services.

"10. Bonded debt of the United States.

"11. Deposit of moneys.

"(f) Committee on Commerce, to consist of fifteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

"2. Regulation of interstate railroads, buses, trucks, and pipelines.

"3. Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television.

"4. Civil aeronautics, except aeronautical and space activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"5. Merchant marine generally.

"6. Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.

"7. Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage.

"8. Rules and international agreements to prevent collisions at sea.

"9. Merchant marine officers and seamen.

"10. Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, lifesaving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.

"11. Coast and Geodetic Survey.

"12. The Coast Guard, including lifesaving service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts.

"13. The United States Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.

"14. Weather Bureau.

"15. Except as provided in paragraph (d), the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally.

"16. Inland waterways.

"17. Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

"18. Bureau of Standards, including standardization of weights and measures and the metric system.

"19. Transportation of dutiable goods.

"(g) Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of seven Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. All measures relating to the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia in general, other than appropriations therefor, including—

"2. Public health and safety, sanitation, and quarantine regulations.

"3. Regulation of sale of intoxicating liquors.

"4. Adulteration of food and drugs.

"5. Taxes and tax sales.

"6. Insurance, executors, administrators, wills, and divorce.

"7. Municipal and juvenile courts.

"8. Incorporation and organization of societies.

"9. Municipal code and amendments to the criminal and corporation laws.

"(h) Committee on Finance, to consist of fifteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Revenue measures generally.

"2. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.

"3. Revenue measures relating to the insular possessions.

"4. Veterans' measures generally.

"5. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"6. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the armed forces.

"7. Compensation of veterans.

"(i) Committee on Foreign Relations, to consist of fifteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

"2. Treaties.

"3. Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.

"4. Protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation.

"5. Neutrality.

"6. International conferences and congresses.

"7. The American National Red Cross.

"8. Intervention abroad and declarations of war.

"9. Measures relating to the diplomatic service.

"10. Acquisition of land and buildings for embassies and legations in foreign countries.

"11. Measures to foster commercial and cultural intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.

"12. United Nations Organization and international financial and monetary organizations.

"13. Foreign loans and grants.

"14. Reciprocal trade agreements.

"15. Tariffs and import quotas and matters related thereto.

"(j) (1) Committee on Government Operations, to consist of fifteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

"(B) Reorganization in the executive branch of the Government.

"(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—

"(A) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;

"(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

"(C) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;

"(D) studying the intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities.

"(k) Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to consist of fifteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.

"2. Mineral resources of the public lands.

"3. Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownerships of mineral lands.

"4. Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.

"5. Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries.

"6. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.

"7. Measures relating generally to the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting their revenue and appropriations.

"8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects.

"9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

"10. Mining interests generally.

"11. Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.

"12. Geological survey.

"13. Mining schools and experimental stations.

"14. Petroleum conservation and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.

"15. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.

"16. Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

"(l) Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of fifteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal generally.

"2. Constitutional amendments.

"3. Federal courts and judges.

"4. Local courts in the Territories and possessions.

"5. Revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

"6. National penitentiaries.

"7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.

"8. Holidays and celebrations.

"9. Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting.

"10. State and Territorial boundary lines.

"11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices.

"12. Civil liberties.

"13. Patents, copyrights, and trademarks.

"14. Patent Office.

"15. Immigration and naturalization.

"16. Apportionment of Representatives.

"17. Measures relating to claims against the United States.

"18. Interstate compacts generally.

"(m) Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to consist of fifteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Measures relating to health, education, labor, or public welfare generally.

"2. Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.

"3. Wages and hours of labor.

"4. Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.

"5. Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract, and migratory labor generally.

"6. Child labor.

"7. Labor statistics.

"8. Labor standards.

"9. School-lunch program.

"10. Vocational rehabilitation.

"11. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.

"12. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

"13. Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital; and St. Elizabeths Hospital.

"14. Welfare of miners.

"15. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"16. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.

"17. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"18. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.

"19. National social security.

"20. Employment, unemployment and the utilization of manpower.

"(n) Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. The Federal civil service generally.

"2. The status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement.

"3. The postal service generally, including the railway mail service, and measures relating to ocean mail and pneumatic-tube service; but excluding post roads.

"4. Postal-savings banks.

"5. Census and the collection of statistics generally.

"6. The National Archives.

"(o) Committee on Public Works, to consist of fifteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

"2. Public works for the benefit of navigation, and bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).

"3. Water power.

"4. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

"5. Public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States generally.

"6. Measures relating to the purchase of sites and construction of post offices, customhouses, Federal courthouses, and Government buildings within ths District of Columbia.

"7. Measures relating to the Capitol building and the Senate and House Office Buildings.

"8. Measures relating to the construction or reconstruction, maintenance, and care of the buildings and grounds of the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution.

"9. Public reservations and parks within the District of Columbia, including Rock Creek Park and the Zoological Park.

"10. Measures relating to the construction or maintenance of roads and post roads.

"(p)(1) Committee on Rules and Administration, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"(A) Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same; except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

"(B) Except as provided in paragraph (o)(8), matters relating to the Library of Congress and the Senate Library; statuary and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress; purchase of books and manuscripts; erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.

"(C) Except as provided in paragraph (o)8, matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions.

"(D) Matters relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; Presidential succession.

"(E) Matters relating to parliamentary rules; floor and gallery rules; Senate Restaurant; administration of the Senate Office Buildings and the Senate wing of the Capitol; assignment of office space; and services to the Senate.

"(F) Matters relating to printing and correction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"(2) Such committee shall also have the duty of assigning office space in the Senate wing of the Capitol and in the Senate Office Buildings.

"(3) Such committee shall have jurisdiction to investigate every alleged violation of the rules of the Senate, and to make appropriate findings of fact and conclusions with respect thereto after according to any individual concerned due notice and opportunity for hearing. In any case in which the committee determines that any such violation has occurred, it shall be the duty of the committee to recommend to the Senate appropriate disciplinary action, including reprimand, censure, suspension from office or employment, or expulsion from office or employment.

"2. The said committees shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed.

"3. (a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this subsection, each standing committee, and each subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of its entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of such business as may be considered by said committee, subject to the provisions of section 133(d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

"(b) Each standing committee, and each subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to fix a lesser number than one-third of its entire membership who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

"4. Each Senator shall serve on two and no more of the following standing committees: Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; Committee on Appropriations; Committee on Armed Services; Committee on Banking and Currency; Committee on Commerce; Committee on Finance; Committee on Foreign Relations; Committee on Government Operations; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and the Committee on Public Works. No Senator shall serve on more than one of the following standing committees: Committee on the District of Columbia; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and the Committee on Rules and Administration. Each Senator shall serve on no more than two of the subcommittees of any standing committee of which he may be a member, except that he may serve on more than two subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be effective during any period when there are more than forty-six Senators of the minority party.

"5. No standing committee shall sit without special leave while the Senate is in session. A motion for leave for a standing committee to sit while the Senate is in session shall be a privileged motion and shall not be debatable.

"RULE XXXI

"Committee procedure

"1. Each standing committee shall meet at such time as it may prescribe by rule in accordance with provisions of section 133(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, upon the call of the chairman thereof, and at such other time as may be fixed by written notice signed by a majority of the members of the committee and filed with the committee clerk.

"2. The business to be considered at any meeting of a standing committee shall be determined in accordance with its rules. Any measure, motion, or matter within the jurisdiction of the committee which a majority of the members of the committee indicate their desire to consider by votes or by presentation or written notice filed with the committee clerk, shall be considered at such meeting.

"Action for the initiation, conduct, and termination of hearings by a standing committee upon any measure or matter within its jurisdiction shall be determined by majority vote of the members of the committee.

"3. Whenever any measure, motion, or other matter pending before a standing committee has received consideration in executive session or sessions of the committee for a total of not less than five hours, any Senator may move the previous question with respect thereto. When such a motion is made and seconded, or a petition signed by a majority of the committee is presented to the chairman, and a quorum as prescribed by committee rules pursuant to paragraph 3 of rule XXX is present, it shall be submitted immediately to the committee by the chairman, and shall be determined without debate by yea-and-nay vote. A motion for the previous question shall be decided by a majority vote of the Senators voting. A previous question may be asked and ordered

with respect to one or more pending measures, motions, or matters, and may embrace one or more pending amendments to any pending measure, motion, or matter described therein and final action by the committee on the pending bill or resolution. If the previous question is so ordered as to any measure, motion, or matter, that measure, motion, or matter shall be presented immediately to the committee for determination. Each member of the committee desiring to be heard on one or more of the measures, motions, or other matters on which the previous question has been ordered shall be allowed to speak thereon for a total of thirty minutes.

"4. The provisions of paragraph 1 herein, where applicable, and of paragraphs 2 and 3 herein shall be applicable to meetings and procedure thereat at any meeting of any subcommittee of any standing committee.

"RULE XXXII

"Instructions to report on major legislative matters

"1. It shall be in order at any time after the conclusion of morning business for any Senator to make a motion to denominate any measure then pending in any committee or subcommittee of the Senate as a 'major legislative matter,' and such motion shall be a privileged matter and subject to immediate consideration, provided that a notice of intention to make such a motion shall have been presented on the previous calendar day on which the Senate was in session, and printed in the Senate Journal.

"2. Debate upon such motion shall be limited to eight hours, the time to be evenly divided between the opponents and proponents of the motion.

"3. Such motion, when agreed to, shall constitute an instruction to the committee to which the measure denominated a 'major legislative matter' has been referred to report such measure to the Senate within 30 calendar days, by poll or otherwise, with the recommendation (a) that it be passed, or (b) that it not be passed, or (c) that it be passed with such amendments as shall be recommended.

"RULE XXXIII

"Session with closed doors

"On a motion made and carried by a vote of a majority of Senators present and voting to close the doors of the Senate on the discussion of any business which may, in the opinion of a Senator, require secrecy, the Presiding Officer shall direct the galleries to be cleared; and during the discussion of such motion the doors shall remain closed.

"RULE XXXIV

"Executive sessions

"1. When the President of the United States shall meet the Senate in the Senate Chamber for the consideration of Executive business, he shall have a seat on the right of the Presiding Officer. When the Senate shall be convened by the President of the United States to any other place, the Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Senators shall attend at the place appointed, with the necessary officers of the Senate.

"2. All business in the Senate shall be transacted in open session, unless the Senate in closed session by a majority vote shall determine that a particular nomination, treaty, or other matter shall be considered in closed executive session, in which case all subsequent proceedings with respect to said nomination, treaty, or other matter shall be kept secret: *Provided,* That the injunction of secrecy as to the whole or any part of proceedings in closed executive session may be removed on motion adopted by a majority vote of the Senate in closed executive session: *Provided further,* That rule XXXIII shall apply to open executive session: *And provided further,* That any Senator may make public his vote in closed executive session.

"3. When the Senate is acting in closed executive session, the Senate Chamber shall be cleared of all persons except the Secretary, the Chief Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Parliamentarian, and such other officers as the Presiding Officer shall think necessary; and all such officers shall be sworn to secrecy.

"4. All confidential communications made by the President of the United States to the Senate shall be by the Senators and the officers of the Senate kept secret until the Senate shall, by resolution, take off the injunction of secrecy, or unless the same shall be considered in open executive session.

"5. Any Senator or officer of the Senate who shall disclose the secret or confidential business or proceedings of the Senate (except for the disclosure by a Senator of his vote in closed executive session) shall be liable, if a Senator, to suffer expulsion from the body; and if an officer, to dismissal from the service of the Senate, and to punishment for contempt.

"6. Whenever, by the request of the Senate or any committee thereof, any documents or papers shall be communicated to the Senate by the President or the head of any Department relating to any matter pending in the Senate, the proceedings in regard to which are secret or confidential under the rules, said documents and papers shall be considered as confidential, and shall not be disclosed without leave of the Senate.

"RULE XXXV

"Executive sessions—Proceedings on treaties

"1. When a treaty shall be laid before the Senate for ratification, it shall be read a first time; and no motion in respect to it shall be in order except to refer it to a committee, or to consider it in open executive session.

"When a treaty is reported from a committee with or without amendment, it shall, unless the Senate shall otherwise direct, lie one day for consideration; after which it may be read a second time and considered as in Committee of the Whole, when it shall be proceeded with by articles, and the amendments reported by the committee shall be first acted upon, after which other amendments may be proposed; and when through with, the proceedings had as in Committee of the Whole shall be reported to the Senate, when the question shall be, if the treaty be amended, 'Will the Senate concur in the amendments made in Committee of the Whole?' And the amendments may be taken separately or in gross, if no Senator shall object; after which new amendments may be proposed.

"The decisions thus made shall be reduced to the form of a resolution of ratification, with or without amendments, as the case may be, which shall be proposed on a subsequent day, unless the Senate shall otherwise determine; at which stage no amendment shall be received unless by unanimous consent.

"On the final question to advise and consent to the ratification in the form agreed to, the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present shall be necessary to determine it in the affirmative; but all other motions and questions upon a treaty shall be decided by a majority vote, except a motion to postpone indefinitely, which shall be decided by a vote of two-thirds.

"2. Treaties transmitted by the President to the Senate for ratification shall be resumed at the second or any subsequent session of the same Congress at the stage in which they were left at the final adjournment of the session at which they were transmitted; but all proceedings on treaties shall terminate with the Congress, and they shall be resumed at the commencement of the next Congress as if no proceedings had previously been had thereon.

"RULE XXXVI

"Executive session—proceedings on nominations

"1. When nominations shall be made by the President of the United States to the Senate, they shall, unless otherwise ordered, be referred to appropriate committees; and the final question on every nomination shall be, 'Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?', which question shall not be put on the same day on which the nomination is received, nor on the day on which it may be reported by a committee, unless the Senate, by majority vote, should so direct.

"2. When a nomination is confirmed or rejected, any Senator voting in the majority may move for a reconsideration on the same day on which the vote was taken, or on either of the next two days of actual executive session of the Senate; but if a notification of the confirmation or rejection on a nomination shall have been sent to the President before the expiration of the time within which a motion to reconsider may be made, the motion to reconsider shall be accompanied by a motion to request the President to return such notification to the Senate. Any motion to reconsider the vote on a nomination may be laid on the table without prejudice to the nomination, and shall be a final disposition of such motion.

"3. Nominations confirmed or rejected by the Senate shall not be returned by the Secretary to the President until the expiration of the time limited for making a motion to reconsider the same, or while a motion to reconsider is pending, unless otherwise ordered by the Senate.

"4. When the Senate shall adjourn or take a recess for more than thirty days, all motions to reconsider a vote upon a nomination which has been confirmed or rejected by the Senate, which shall be pending at the time of taking such adjournment or recess, shall fail; and the Secretary shall return all such nominations to the President as confirmed or rejected by the Senate, as the case may be.

"5. Nominations neither confirmed nor rejected during the session at which they are made shall not be acted upon at any succeeding session without being again made to the Senate by the President; and if the Senate shall adjourn or take a recess for more than thirty days, all nominations pending and not finally acted upon at the time of taking such adjournment or recess shall be returned by the Secretary to the President, and shall not again be considered unless they shall again be made to the Senate by the President.

"RULE XXXVII

"The President furnished with copies of records of executive sessions

"The President of the United States shall, from time to time, be furnished with an authenticated transcript of the executive records of the Senate, but no further extract from the Executive Journal shall be furnished by the Secretary, except by special order of the Senate; and no paper, except original treaties transmitted to the Senate by the President of the United States, and finally acted upon by the Senate, shall be delivered from the office of the Secretary without an order of the Senate for that purpose.

"RULE XXXVIII

"Conference committees

"1. A majority of the Senate members of a committee of conference shall have indicated by their votes their sympathy with the bill as passed and their concurrence in the prevailing opinion of the Senate on the matters in disagreement with the House of Representatives which occasion the appointment of the committee.

"2. The presentation of reports of committees of conference shall always be in order except if a question of order or a motion to

adjourn is pending, or which the Senate is dividing; and when received, the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report, if raised, shall be immediately put, and shall be determined without debate.

"3. Conferees shall not insert in their report matter not committed to them by either House, nor shall they strike from the bill matter agreed to by both Houses. If new matter is inserted in the report, or if matter which was agreed to by both Houses is stricken from the bill, a point of order may be made against the report, and if the point of order is sustained, the report shall be recommitted to the committee of conference.

"4. Every report of a committee of conference shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the Senate conferees sufficiently explicit to inform the Senate what effect such amendments or propositions as the conference shall have agreed to will have upon the measures to which they relate. The statement shall be in writing and shall be signed by at least a majority of the Senate conferees.

"5. (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

"(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subsection (a), the conference report shall be subject to a point of order.

"RULE XXXIX

"Messages; matter from the President and the House of Representatives

"1. Messages from the President of the United States or from the House of Representatives may be received at any stage of proceedings, except while the Senate is dividing, or while a question of order or a motion to adjourn is pending.

"2. Messages shall be sent to the House of Representatives by the Secretary, who shall previously certify the determination of the Senate upon all bills, joint resolutions, and other resolutions which may be communicated to the House, or in which its concurrence may be requested; and the Secretary shall also certify and deliver to the President of the United States all resolutions and other communications which may be directed to him by the Senate.

"3. The Presiding Officer may at any time lay, and it shall be in order at any time for a Senator to move to lay, before the Senate, any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives, and any question pending at that time shall be suspended for this purpose. Any motion so made shall be determined without debate.

"RULE XL

"Printing of papers, etc.

"1. Every motion to print documents, reports, and other matter transmitted by any of the executive departments, or to print memorials, petitions, accompanying documents, or any other paper, except bills of the Senate or House of Representatives, resolutions submitted by a Senator, communications from the legislatures or conventions, lawfully called, of the respective States, and motion to print by order of the standing or select committees of the Senate, shall, unless the Senate shall otherwise order, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. When a motion is made to commit with instructions, it shall be in order to add thereto a motion to print.

"2. Motions to print additional numbers shall also be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and when the committee shall report favorably, the report shall be accompanied by an estimate of the probable cost thereof; and when the cost of printing such additional numbers shall exceed the sum of twelve hundred dollars, the concurrence of the House of Representatives shall be necessary for an order to print the same.

"3. Every bill and joint resolution introduced on leave or reported from a committee, and all bills and joint resolutions received from the House of Representatives, and all reports of committees, shall be printed, unless, for the dispatch of the business of the Senate, such printing may be dispensed with.

"4. Whenever a committee reports a bill or a joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof it shall make a report thereon and shall include in such report or in an accompanying document (to be prepared by the staff of such committee) (a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee. The subsection shall not apply to any such report in which it is stated that, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with the requirements of the subsection to expedite the business of the Senate.

"RULE XLI

"Withdrawal of papers

"1. No memorial or other paper presented to the Senate, except original treaties finally acted upon, shall be withdrawn from its files except by order of the Senate. But when an act may pass for the settlement of any private claim, the Secretary is authorized to transmit to the officer charged with the settlement the papers on file relating to the claim.

"2. No memorial or other paper upon which an adverse report has been made shall be withdrawn from the files of the Senate unless copies thereof shall be left in the office of the Secretary.

"RULE XLII

"Reference of claims cases and of claims adversely reported

"1. Whenever a private bill is under consideration, it shall be in order to move, as a substitute for it, a resolution of the Senate referring the case to the Court of Claims, under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, as amended.

"2. Whenever a committee of the Senate, to whom any claim has been referred, reports adversely, and the report is agreed to, it shall not be in order to move to take the papers from the files for the purpose of referring them at a subsequent session, unless the claimant shall present a petition therefor, stating that new evidence has been discovered since the report, and setting forth the substance of such new evidence. But when there has been no adverse report, it shall be the duty of the Secretary to transmit all such papers to the committee in which such claims are pending.

"RULE XLIII

"Business continued from session to session

"1. At the second or any subsequent session of a Congress, the legislative business of the Senate which remained undetermined at the close of the next preceding session of that Congress shall be resumed and proceeded with in the same manner as if no adjournment of the Senate had taken place.

"2. The rules of the Senate shall be adopted at the beginning of each Congress on a yea and nay vote, a quorum being present. A majority of the Senators voting and present shall prevail. They may be changed at any time as provided in these rules.

"RULE XLIV

"Privilege of the floor

"No person shall be admitted to the floor of the Senate while in session, except as follows:

"The President of the United States and his private secretary.

"The President elect and Vice President elect of the United States.

"Ex-Presidents and ex-Vice Presidents of the United States.

"Judges of the Supreme Court.

"Ex-Senators and Senators elect.

"The officers and employees of the Senate in the discharge of their official duties.

"Ex-Secretaries and ex-Sergeants at Arms of the Senate.

"Members of the House of Representatives and Members elect.

"Ex-Speakers of the House of Representatives.

"The Sergeant at Arms of the House and his chief deputy and the Clerk of the House and his deputy.

"Heads of the Executive Departments.

"Ambassadors and Ministers of the United States.

"Governors of States and Territories.

"Members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"Members of National Legislatures of foreign countries.

"Judges of the Court of Claims.

"Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"The Librarian of Congress and the Assistant Librarian in charge of the Law Library.

"The Architect of the Capitol.

"The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

"Clerks to Senate committees and clerks to Senators when in the actual discharge of their official duties. Clerks to Senators, to be admitted to the floor, must be regularly appointed and borne upon the rolls of the Secretary of the Senate as such.

"RULE XLV

"Regulation of the Senate wing of the Capitol

"1. The Senate Chamber shall not be granted for any other purpose than for the use of the Senate; no smoking shall be permitted at any time on the floor of the Senate, or lighted cigars be brought into the Chamber.

"2. It shall be the duty of the Committee on Rules and Administration to make all rules and regulations respecting such parts of the Capitol, its passages and galleries, including the restaurant and the Senate Office Building, as are or may be set apart for the use of the Senate and its officers, to be enforced under the direction of the Presiding Officer. They shall make such regulations respecting the reporters' galleries of the Senate, together with the adjoining rooms and facilities, as will confine their occupancy and use to bona fide reporters for daily newspapers and periodicals, to bona fide reporters of news or press associations requiring telegraph service to their membership, and to bona fide reporters for daily news dissemination through radio, television, wire, wireless, and similar media of transmission. These regulations shall so provide for the use of such space and facilities as fairly to distribute their use to all such media of news dissemination.

"RULE XLVI

"Suspension and amendment of the rules

"No motion to suspend, modify, or amend any rule, or any part thereof, shall be in order, except on one day's notice in writing, specifying precisely the rule or part proposed to be suspended, modified, or amended, and the purpose thereof. These rules may be

amended by a majority vote, but a two-thirds vote of the Senators present, a quorum being present, is required for their suspension. Any rule may be suspended without notice by the unanimous consent of the Senate, except as otherwise provided in clause 1, rule XXVII.

"RULE XLVII

"Disclosure of financial interests

"1. Each individual who at any time during any calendar year serves as a Member of the Senate, or as an officer or employee of the Senate compensated at a gross rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, shall file with the Secretary of the Senate for that calendar year a written report containing the following information:

"(a) The fair market value of each asset having a fair market value of $5,000 or more held by him or by his spouse or by him and his spouse jointly, exclusively of any dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family, at the end of that calendar year;

"(b) The amount of each liability in excess of $5,000 owed by him or by his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly at the end of that calendar year;

"(c) The total amount of all capital gains realized, and the source and amount of each capital gain realized in any amount exceeding $5,000, during that calendar year by him or by his spouse, by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on behalf or pursuant to the direction of him or his spouse, or him and his spouse jointly, as a result of any transaction or series of related transactions in securities or commodities, or any purchase or sale of real property or any interest therein other than a dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family;

"(d) The source and amount of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from any relative or his spouse) received by or accruing to him, his spouse, or from him and his spouse jointly from any source other than the United States during that calendar year, which exceeds $100 in amount or value; including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, or other facilities received by him in kind;

"(e) The name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States in which he has a financial interest; and the name, address, and a brief description of the principal business of any client of such firm for whom any services involving representation before any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States which were performed during that calendar year, together with a brief description of the services performed, and the total fees received or receivable by the firm as compensation for such services;

"(f) The name, address, and nature of the principal business or activity of each business or financial entity or enterprise with which he was associated at any time during that calendar year as an officer, director, or partner, or in any other managerial capacity.

"2. Each asset consisting of an interest in a business or financial entity or enterprise which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name of such entity or enterprise, the location of its principal office, and the nature of the business or activity in which it is principally engaged or with which it is principally concerned, except that an asset which is a security traded on any securities exchange subject to supervision by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States may be identified by a full and complete description of the security and the name of the issuer thereof. Each liability which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name and the address of the creditor to whom the obligation of such liability is owed.

"3. Except as otherwise hereinafter provided, each individual who is required by paragraph 1 to file a report for any calendar year shall file such report with the Secretary of the Senate not later than January 31 of the next following calendar year. No such report shall be required to be made for any calendar year beginning before January 1, 1964. The requirements of this rule shall apply only with respect to individuals who are Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate on or after the date of adoption of this rule. Any individual who ceases to serve as a Member of the Senate or as an officer or employee of the Senate, before the close of any calendar year shall file such report on the last day of such service, or on such date not more than three months thereafter as the Secretary of the Senate may prescribe, and the report so made shall be made for that portion of that calendar year during which such individual so served. Whenever there is on file with the Secretary of the Senate a report made by any individual in compliance with paragraph 1 for any calendar year, the Secretary may accept from that individual for any succeeding calendar year, in lieu of the report required by paragraph 1, a certificate containing an accurate recitation of the changes in such report which are required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year, or a statement to the effect that no change in such report is required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year.

"4. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be made upon forms which shall be prepared and provided by the Secretary of the Senate, and shall be made in such manner and detail as he shall prescribe. The Secretary may provide for the grouping within such reports and certificate of items which are required by paragraph 1 to be disclosed whenever he determines that separate itemization thereof is not feasible or is not required for accurate disclosure with respect to such items. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be retained by the Secretary as public records for not less than six years after the close of the calendar year for which they are made, and while so retained shall be available for inspection by members of the public under such reasonable regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe.

"5. As used in this rule—

"(a) the term 'asset' includes any beneficial interest held or possessed directly or indirectly in any business or financial entity or enterprise, or in any security or evidence of indebtedness, but does not include any interest in any organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

"(b) the term 'liability' includes any liability of any trust in which a beneficial interest is held or possessed directly or indirectly.

"(c) the term 'income' means gross income as defined by section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(d) the term 'security' means any security as defined by section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b).

"(e) the term 'commodity' means any commodity as defined by section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2).

"(f) the term 'dealing in securities or commodities' means any acquisition, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

"(g) the term 'officer or employee of the Senate' means (1) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of the Senate, (2) an employee of the Senate or any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, (3) the Legislative Counsel of the Senate and employees of his office, (4) an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and any person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties, (5) a member of the Capitol Police force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (6) an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (7) an employee of a Member of the Senate if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and (8) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

"RULE XLVIII

"Prohibited activities

"1. No Member of the Senate or any officer or employee of the Senate may engage or participate in any business or financial venture, enterprise, combination, or transaction with any person, firm, or corporation which is—

"(a) engaged in any lobbying activity;

"(b) engaged for compensation in the practice of rendering advisory or public relations services relating to the securing of contracts with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof; or

"(c) engaged in, or seeking to become engaged in, the performance of any construction, manufacturing, research, development, or service contract with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof.

"2. No Member of the Senate or any officer or employee of the Senate may accept—

"(a) at any time from any individual, entity, or enterprise which is engaged in lobbying activity any gift of money, property, entertainment, travel, or any other valuable consideration in an amount or having a value in excess of $100; or

"(b) within any calendar year from such individual, entity, or enterprise such gifts in an aggregate amount or having an aggregate value in excess of $100.

"3. No officer or employee of the Senate may be vested with or exercise any authority or responsibility for, or participate in any way in any consideration of or determination with respect to, the allocation among Members of the Senate of any funds available for use to defray expenses incurred or to be incurred by any individual for or in connection with any campaign for the nomination or election of any individual to be a Member of the Senate.

"4. As used in this rule—

"(a) the term 'officer or employee of the Senate' has the meaning given thereto by rule XLVII; and

"(b) the term 'lobbying activity' means any activity undertaken by any person other than a Member of the Congress to influence directly or indirectly the introduction, passage, defeat, amendment, or modification of any legislative measure in either House of the Congress.

"RULE XLIX

"Testimony of Members of the Senate before committees

"Whenever any standing, special, or select committee of the Senate or any joint committee of the Congress, which is engaged in

any investigation within its jurdisdiction, has reason to believe that the testimony of any Member of the Senate may be pertinent to such investigation, such committee, with the approval of a majority of its members (including at least one member of the minority party), by written communication may request such Member of the Senate to appear before the committee to give testimony concerning the subject matter under investigation. Such Member of the Senate shall appear before such committee in obedience to such request unless within ten days after receipt thereof he delivers to the chairman of such committee a written statement, duly signed by such Member of the Senate, stating that he is without knowledge of the subject matter under investigation.

"RULE L

"Outside employment

"1. No officer or employee of the Senate shall engage in any business, financial, or professional activity or employment for compensation or gain unless—

"(a) such activity or employment is not inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his official duties; and

"(b) express permission has been granted by the Member of the Senate charged with supervision of such officer or employee by this rule;

Provided, however, That in no event shall any officer or full-time employee of the Senate, without special leave of the Senate—

"(a) serve in any managerial capacity in any business or financial enterprise; or

"(b) engage in any regular professional or consulting practice, or maintain an association with any professional or consulting firm.

"2. For the purposes of this rule—

"(a) each Member of the Senate shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees;

"(b) each Member of the Senate who is the chairman of a Senate or joint committee or subcommittee shall be charged with the supervision of each employee of such committee or subcommittee;

"(c) the Majority Leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the Majority, and the Minority Leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the Minority;

"(d) the Vice President shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees; and

"(e) the President Pro Tempore shall be charged with the supervision of all other officers and employees of the Senate.

"3. As used in this rule, the term 'officer or employee of the Senate' has the meaning given thereto by rule XLVII.

"RULE LI

"The Presiding Officer shall construe these rules so as to give effect to their plain meaning. Precedents and rulings in force prior to the adoption of these rules shall not be binding in the construction of these rules."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as I explained at the time of offering this comprehensive revision of Senate rules during the 88th Congress, the revision was the result of more than 6 months' work by the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress, acting with some guidance from me and members of my staff.

These rules and the proposed constitutional amendments are, in my judgment, two far-reaching reforms aimed at strengthening, revitalizing, and upgrading the position of Congress.

The first comprehensive and thoroughgoing rewriting of the procedural rules of the Senate since the days of Thomas Jefferson is included in the resolution that I have just sent to the desk. The package of constitutional amendments is designed to reduce parochialism in national politics by eliminating congressional elections in nonpresidential years. The explanation of these measures has already been given. However, with respect to the rules revision, these changes, if adopted, would help carry out the pledge contained in the congressional reform plank of the 64th Democratic platform which reads:

The Congress of the United States should revise its rules and procedures to assure majority rule after reasonable debate and to guarantee that major legislative proposals of the President can be brought to a vote after reasonable consideration in committee.

There are 27 significant changes in the Senate rules contained in the proposed revision. The proposed changes would eliminate, in my judgment, archaic, obsolete, and undemocratic procedures, and permit a majority of the Senate to act when it is ready for action. As an example, the changes dealing with the obscure rules governing the morning hour—and I do not know whether we are presently in the morning hour or not; perhape the Presiding Officer or the Parliamentarian does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that the morning hour has closed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, since the morning hour has closed, I am happy to say that I am no longer limited to the 3-minute rule. Nevertheless, I shall, for the benefit of my friend, the Senator from Alaska, yield to him shortly.

With respect to the morning hour rule, the morning hour can be 2 hours long. It usually takes place in the afternoon. The rule dealing with germaneness of debate was changed last year by the senior Senator from Rhode Island. However, I am still of the view that we might have been a little more drastic than we were at that time.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, wishes to announce the appointment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration at Geneva from May 3 to May 7, 1965.

THE NATIONAL TEACHERS CORPS—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 122)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for proper referral, an amendment to the higher education bill (S. 600) to establish the National Teacher Corps. The amendment is introduced on behalf of myself and Senators CLARK of Pennsylvania and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks together with a fact sheet and an explanation of the operation and background of the Teacher Corps.

In February I proposed the Teacher Corps as an amendment to the elementary and secondary education bill, then pending. That bill, as you know, was approved by the Senate without modification.

The present amendment to S. 600, is a very carefully revised and refined version of my earlier proposal. In drawing it up members of my staff have consulted with a large number of experts and officials in education.

The support the Corps has received from students, educators, and ordinary citizens has been very encouraging.

I hope the Senators will find this amendment of interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment, fact sheet, and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 122) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

On page 71, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

"TITLE V—NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 501. The purpose of this title is to establish a National Teacher Corps to attract and train able teachers for the children in the Nation's most deprived urban and rural schools. The Corps will be composed of inexperienced elementary and secondary school teacher-interns and experienced elementary and secondary school teachers to be assigned in teams to (1) provide teaching assistance to local educational agencies having in their schools large numbers of children from low-income families and (2) to provide teacher training to such teacher-interns.

"Establishment

"SEC. 502. There is hereby established in the Office of Education a National Teacher Corps. The Corps shall be headed by a Director who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, and a Deputy Director who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 16 of such General Schedule. The Director and the Deputy Director shall perform such duties as are delegated to them by the Commissioner.

"Authorization

"SEC. 503. (a) In order to carry out the purpose of this title, the Commissioner is authorized to—

"(1) make arrangements with institutions of higher education, local educational agencies, or State educational agencies (as defined in section 601(k) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) to provide initial periods of not to exceed three months of training to individuals who have bachelor degrees or its equivalent and will serve as teacher-interns in elementary or secondary schools for the purposes of this title, and thereafter provide to such teacher-interns not to exceed two academic years of training while teaching in the elementary or secondary schools of local educational agencies pursuant to the provisions of this title;

"(2) make arrangements with institutions of higher education to provide training for experienced teachers who will guide and instruct teams of teacher-interns pursuant to this title;

"(3) make arrangements, including the payment of the costs of such arrangements, with local educational agencies having in their elementary and secondary schools large numbers of children from low-income families, under which a team consisting of a number of teacher-interns and an experienced teacher will be furnished to each such agency, without charge to such agency, to teach in the elementary or secondary schools of such agency, but with time available for a training program developed according to criteria established by the Commissioner for such interns to be carried out under the guidance and instruction of the experienced teacher in addition to teaching duties;

"(4) make arrangements, where appropriate, with State educational agencies (as defined in section 601(k) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) to participate in the arrangements made pursuant to the preceding clause;

"(5) make arrangements, where appropriate with agencies administering community action programs established pursuant to title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to participate in arrangements made pursuant to clause (3) of this subsection;

"(6) make such grants to local educational agencies as may be necessary to pay the salaries of teachers and teacher-interns while they are teaching in elementary or secondary schools of such agencies under the arrangements made pursuant to clause (3) of this subsection.

"(7) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof, to assist the Commissioner in carrying out his functions under this title, as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), compensate individuals so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed.

"(b) No arrangement pursuant to clause (3) of subsection (a) of this section shall be made by the Commissioner unless an institution of higher education is consulted and agrees to supervise such arrangement.

"(c) Arrangements with institutions of higher education to provide training for teacher-interns while teaching in schools for local educational agencies under the provisions of this title shall provide, whenever possible, for training leading to a graduate degree. The Commissioner is authorized to pay to such institution of higher education the costs of such training.

"Status of members of Teacher Corps

"SEC. 504. No teacher and no teacher-intern assigned to a local educational agency under this title shall be deemed to be a Federal employee.

"Compensation

"SEC. 505. (a) Arrangements made with local educational agencies pursuant to clause (3) of section 503(a) shall provide that an experienced teacher while teaching for a local educational agency under such arrangement shall be compensated by such agency at a rate not to exceed $10,000 per year and shall provide that a teacher-intern while teaching for such a local educational agency shall be compensated by such agency at a rate which is equal to the lowest rate paid by such agency for teaching full time in the same school and grade as such intern is teaching in as part of his training.

"(b) The Commissioner shall pay to an experienced teacher a stipend at a rate not to exceed $500 per month for any period of training prior to his being furnished to a local educational agency under clause (3) of section 503(a), plus an additional amount not to exceed $60 per month on account of each of his dependents. The Commissioner shall pay to a teacher-intern a stipend at a rate not to exceed $250 per month while he is receiving initial training under clause (1) of section 503(a), plus an additional amount not to exceed $60 per month on account of each of his dependents.

"(c) The Commissioner shall pay in advance or by reimbursement the necessary travel expenses under this title of teachers and teacher-interns and their dependents and for necessary expenses for the transportation of their household goods and personal effects.

"(d) The Commissioner is authorized to make such arrangements as may be practical, including the payment of any costs incident thereto, to protect the retirement rights and the participation in a medical insurance program of an experienced teacher while he is participating in any arrangement under clause (3) of section 503(a) of this title.

"Appropriation authorization

"SEC. 506. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and thereafter such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

"Maintenance of report

"SEC. 507. No teacher or teacher-intern shall be furnished to any local educational agency under the provisions of this title if such agency will use such teacher or teacher-intern to replace any teacher already employed by such agency.

"Administration

"SEC. 508. Whenever possible the Commissioner shall carry out the provisions of this title through such regional facilities for research as may be assisted by the Commissioner of Education under the Cooperative Research Act.

"Advisory Council on the National Teacher Corps

"SEC. 509. (a) The Commissioner may, without regard to the civil service laws, appoint an Advisory Council on the National Teacher Corps to advise and consult on the criteria for the selection of teachers and teacher-interns and on such other matters relating to his functions under this title as he deems appropriate. The Council shall consist of twelve persons chosen from teacher education, urban and rural school administration, universities, and representatives of the general public.

"(b) Members of such advisory council who are not regular full time employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of such council or otherwise engaged on business of such council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Definition of 'local educational agency' and 'elementary school'

"SEC. 510. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'local educational agency' means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

"(b) The term 'elementary school' means a school which provides elementary education as determined under State law."

On page 71, line 20, strike out "Title V" and insert in lieu thereof "Title VI".

Beginning on page 63, redesignate sections 501 through 504 as sections 601 through 604, respectively.

The fact sheet and explanation presented by Mr. NELSON are, as follows:

THE NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS BY SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON

Proposal: That S. 600, the higher education bill, be amended to include provisions establishing a National Teacher Corps.

Concept: That highly qualified, idealistic young Americans, like those who made the Peace Corps a success, would be eager to serve for 2 years in the crucial effort to improve educational opportunity for the children of poverty. Effective professional training for these young people can be provided in the most deprived rural and urban slum schools through cooperative arrangements between schools and local colleges and universities.

Specific objectives: To attract and train bright young people who might not otherwise enter the teaching profession or choose to teach in deprived schools; to bring able and spirited teaching help to our most deprived schools; to develop public awareness of the dramatic challenges faced by these schools; to encourage greater contact and cooperation between universities and deprived schools.

Operation of the Teacher Corps: The corps would consist of 1,000 experienced teachers and 5,000 college graduate teacher-interns. They would serve in teams consisting of one experienced teacher and approximately five interns.

Recruitment would be national in scope. Final selection and training would be done at the local level under arrangements approved by the Commissioner of Education.

Interns would begin with 3 months' intensive training. Practice teaching and personal acquaintance with the circumstances of poverty would be emphasized. Wherever possible the initial training would be carried out by a college or university in cooperation with the school in which the corps members would later serve.

After initial training, corps teams would go into schools requesting them through arrangement with the Commissioner of Education. Each member, experienced teacher and intern alike, would teach part time. Training in teaching technique, curriculum development, and other subjects would be carried on at seminars in the school led by the experienced teacher and university personnel.

Additional work at the cooperating college or university would lead to an advanced degree in education at the end of the 2 years for those completing the requirements.

The teams would operate under the supervision of the local public school authority and the college or university. Corps members would be employees of the local school authority.

All salary expenses and university costs would be paid by the Commissioner of Education.

An advisory council, representatives of rural and urban school administrators, professors of education, university professors, and the general public would advise the Commissioner on teacher qualifications and program standards.

Cost: A corps of 5,000 in the first year would cost approximately $40 million.

Salaries:	*Millions*
5,000 teacher-trainees—(maximum paid the beginning school salary of the local school)	$25
1,000 experienced teachers—(maximum paid $10,000 each)	10
University fees, administrative costs, etc.	5
Total	40

Background: Intern training programs have been successful at Harvard, Yale, Wesleyan, Wisconsin, and other universities. A project at Cardozo High School in Washington, D.C., demonstrates that the team method of intern training as provided by the National Teacher Corps can be successfully conducted in a difficult school setting.

MEMO ON THE NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS: OPERATION AND BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

The national focus on the problem of poverty is welcomed by educators. Particularly those who must deal with the dilemmas of urban education have long been aware of the need for new approaches and new programs to meet the challenge of poverty. Many new, creative ideas have been developed. But a chronic shortage of cash for the big city and poor rural systems has hampered putting these ideas into action * * * and the teacher shortage, felt throughout the world of education is most acute in the most needy schools.

The National Teacher Corps is a new program, but it does not present any new ideas. Rather it brings together the practical idealism of American young people and the best ideas for the training of teachers for the disadvantaged in a government-funded effort to make a significant assault on that most crucial domestic challenge: increased educational opportunity for the children of poverty.

OPERATION

Recruitment would be national in scope but the training of the teachers and the day-to-day operation of the program would be in local hands.

The National Teacher Corps would be established in the Office of Education with a Director and a Deputy Director at the GS–17 and GS–15 level, respectively.

A broadly representative Advisory Council (urban and rural schoolmen, university personnel, professors of education, and the general public) would advise the Commissioner of Education in setting up qualifications for Teacher Corps members and program standards.

The Commissioner would be responsible for initial recruitment on a nationwide basis and for helping local schools and universities set up programs.

All projects would require the enthusiastic participation of a local school and a local college or university. The legislation authorizes the Commissioner to work with schools, the universities, State educational agencies, or even local community action agencies in arranging for a project. The aim is maximum flexibility, maximum opportunity for local initiative.

Volunteers for teacher internships would apply to Washington. After being accepted on a central roster of candidates they would be assigned to a local participating university for further screening and 3 months of intensive training.

The intensive training would include instruction in education theory and practice teaching wherever possible. Equally important would be instruction in urban or rural sociology together with practical experience of the conditions of poverty. Interns might well spend time working with local welfare and recreation agencies during the training period.

In the fall interns would begin teaching and continue teacher training in the local school in teams of five led by an experienced teacher. Both interns and experienced Teacher Corps members would teach part time. Seminars under the guidance of the experienced teacher and university instructors would be held in the school during school hours.

Continued course work at the university would lead, after 2 years, to an advanced degree in education. The costs of this further training would be paid by the Government.

Interns would be paid stipends during their period of initial training, and the beginning salary for a full-time teacher after acceptance of the local school for teaching and further training.

Experienced teachers in the corps to guide and train the intern teams would be selected on a national basis as well. Wherever possible, however, gifted local teachers would be assigned to lead teams in their own schools. These outstanding professional educators would be paid substantial salaries—up to $10,000. The legislation is designed to protect their pension rights and medical benefits.

At the local level a public school and a university would enter into an arrangement with each other and the Commissioner to train and employ the Teacher Corps teams.

The local public school would employ the teachers under a grant from the Commissioner. The teachers would be under the direct control of the school authorities. The school would receive the benefit of spirited teaching help and also the advantages of a close association with a university.

The university or college would be responsible for screening corps candidates, setting up initial training programs, supervising the in-school seminars and providing additional course work on the campus. The costs would be paid by the Government.

BACKGROUND

Internships

Internship teacher instruction began in 1911 at Brown University. It is now used at the University of Wisconsin, Harvard, Wesleyan, Yale and very widely on the west coast. Usually designed to prepare college graduates with little formal education course background for teaching, the internship programs often include a summer of intensive study combined with practice teaching, then actual schoolteaching experience under close supervision in the fall with continued course work at the university.

Dean Lindley J. Stiles, of the University of Wisconsin School of Education, said of the intern approach used in the Teacher Corps bill: "The idea of a 3 months' pretraining period and the provision of an experienced teacher to continue the training on the job is sound in every respect."

The team approach

The team approach, endorsed by Dean Stiles, has had nearly 2 years of hard, practical testing at Cardozo High School in Washington, D.C.'s inner city. After some initial distrust by older faculty the program is now running smoothly.

Of the original 10 interns in the Cardozo project in urban teachings' 1-year program, 8 are staying in disadvantaged schoolteaching and 1 is seeking a Ph. D. in American studies. All but one of the original volunteers were returned Peace Corps people—a good source of personnel for the Teacher Corps.

At Cardozo the interns in their classes and seminars developed not only as teachers themselves but also came up with a number of valuable new ideas for teaching English and history to disadvantaged children.

Randall R. Evans, principal of Cardozo, said recently: "The project and the team approach has not only been effective in training teachers but has also made a real contribution to the whole Cardozo High School program."

SCHOOL—UNIVERSITY COOPERATION IN TEACHER TRAINING

The great cities program for school improvement formed by the superintendents of 10 major cities to tackle the problems of slum education has been working for several years under a Federal grant on a teacher training program.

The resulting program—or rather series of programs—has now been designed, researched, agreed to, and is ready for operation. It is built around the concept of a training center within a disadvantaged area school operated by a university and a school system working together.

The National Teacher Corps bill has been drafted in consultation with great cities staff members and is based in part on research done for the great cities teacher education project.

Intern training projects for teachers of the disadvantaged are now being carried out by New York University and Hunter College in New York, Temple University in Philadelphia, Coppin State Teachers College in Baltimore, and a number of other schools.

The National Teacher Corps concept has received support from:

Lindley J. Stiles, dean, School of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Richard A. Harvill, president, University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.

Edward H. Litchfield, chancellor, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Erwin R. Steinberg, dean, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Russell A. Hill, chairman, intern teaching program for college graduates, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

Samuel R. Keys, associate professor of education, New York University, New York, N.Y.

Glen G. Eye, chairman, Department of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Harold Hutcheson, dean, School of Education, Wisconsin State University—Platteville, Platteville, Wis.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 123)

Mr. STENNIS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, due to a printing error, S. 1690, which Senator DOMINICK introduced on April 1, 1965, contains an incomplete list of cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators ALLOTT, HOLLAND, FANNIN, and DIRKSEN be added as cosponsors at the next printing of the bill.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an omission in the printing of S. 1766, the Aiken bill, the rural water systems bill, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and cosponsored

by myself and 38 others. The name of the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL] was inadvertently left out.

I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill Senator RUSSELL of South Carolina's name be included, and that the name of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] likewise be added as a cosponsor.

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

PROMOTION OF RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 13, 1965, the names of Mr. BASS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. GORE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HILL, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio were added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1766) to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators) on April 13, 1965.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS RELATING TO REORGANIZATION OF BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations will hold public hearings on May 12 and 14, 1965, on Senate Resolution 102, relating to the proposed reorganization of the Bureau of Customs. The hearings will be held in room 3302 of the New Senate Office Building commencing at 10 a.m. Those interested in testifying should contact Jerome Sonosky in room 162, Old Senate Office Building, extension 2308, before May 6.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address delivered before Morgantown (W. Va.) High School in observance of Law Day, U.S.A.

ARMENIAN MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, we have listened to an emotional and patriotic prayer offered by Archbishop Khaichadourian of the Armenian Church.

Those of us who are the children of the 20th century have witnessed and participated in many great moments of achievement. Our lives have been enriched by technological, industrial, educational, medical, and cultural advances. But, at the same time, we have seen in our generation the development of instruments of war capable of the immediate annihilation of all civilization. And in the pages of our recent history are recorded at least two attempts at the deliberate and systematic destruction of a racial, political, or cultural group.

This year, 1965, marks the sorrowful 50th anniversary of the inhuman massacre of many Armenian men, women, and children by the Turks. This tragic period in Armenian history began with a heavy and unduly stringent war tax on the Armenian people, within their own territory as well as elsewhere in the Turkish Empire. A complete disarmament of the Armenians followed, in order to eliminate any organized resistance. Armed bands of soldiers searched the Armenian communities, plundering and looting as they went along. With the Armenians in a weakened position, the Turks proceeded with the extensive massacres. These mass killings of innocent, unarmed people began on April 24, 1915, and continued for several years, during which time a major part of the Armenian population was either slain or deported from their homeland.

The tactics used against the Armenians were brutal. The people were led on forced death marches. Those who survived the marches, if they were not immediately put to death, were conscripted into labor forces. Women and children were tortured and abused before being allowed the mercy of death. Most of Armenia's leading artists, writers, and musicians were eliminated during this period. Their extermination was a loss to the cultural heritage of the entire world.

The month of April has been declared a national month of mourning by the Armenian Apostolic Church in memory of those who lost their lives during this dark chapter of history. In the Greater Boston area, some 40,000 persons of Armenian extraction observed this sad anniversary with services in the area's churches. In addition, a memorial dinner was held on April 25.

We have listened today to the invocation delivered by Archbishop Hrant Khaichadourian, the prelate of the Armenian National Apostolic Church in America. His words are an inspiration to all of us.

It is appropriate for us to extend our sympathy to all of the Armenian people on this sad occasion of remembrance. Her people aided the Allied cause significantly during World War I, and have always shown themselves dedicated and stalwart champions of freedom.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the distinguished prayer which we heard in the Senate today referred to genocide. One can understand the profound feelings of the Armenian people on this subject. However, the Genocide Convention, promulgated by the United Nations and subscribed to by many nations in the world, has still not even had consideration for ratification in the Senate. There are four conventions which are open from the United Nations.

Mr. President, I do not know what we are afraid of. If the Senate chooses not to approve ratification of the Genocide Convention, we ought to face it and the world ought to face it. Personally, I believe such a course is unthinkable. Nevertheless, that is only my opinion as one Senator.

I believe it is time to come to grips with the issue. Many years have passed without action on this critical subject, of which we are reminded in this deeply spiritual way today. I think that is shocking.

The time has come to stop holding off on so critically important a problem as the Genocide Convention. I hope that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations will press for ratification of all four conventions. Even if the Senate turns down the Genocide Convention, it is high time that we met the issue and decided our real purpose with respect to this convention.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE BRITISH HOUSE OF COMMONS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, four distinguished Members of the British House of Commons are in the Chamber. I should like to present to the Senate our honored guests of the British House of Commons:

Mr. Alfred Morris, Member of Parliament for Manchester Wytheshane; Mr. John Biffen, Member of Parliament for Oswestry; Mr. Gordon Bagier, Member of Parliament for Sunderland; and Mr. Christopher Chattaway, Member of Parliament for Lewisham.

Mr. Chattaway is the English representative of the better-than-4-minute-mile group in his collegiate days. What groups the other gentlemen represent in Parliament, I do not know; but I do know that anyone who can run a mile in less than 4 minutes is welcome in political circles.

As a Republican, I might say that we have to watch the Democrats, so that we do not "get run away with"; but we certainly cannot run a mile in 4 minutes. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we cannot let our colleagues on the other side of the aisle take to themselves the sole honor of welcoming our English cousins. It is indeed a pleasure to have our fellow parliamentarians visit us. We are delighted to have them on the floor of the Senate.

You honor us with your visit. I hope we shall have a chance to make your acquaintance a little better and the

friendship between our two countries a little stronger.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we are always delighted to have legislators from all over the world come to see us. I am delighted to see your estimable athlete. I do not know whether his accomplishment qualifies him for the Olympic games. I never even got within hailing distance of the town in which you ran your mile, but as a trackman of a long time ago, I salute you.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for many years I have urged Congress to adopt a code of ethics, and last January 12 I introduced Senate Resolution 26 requiring the Select Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct to draft such a code for Senators and their employees.

The select committee was established last July under an amendment introduced by Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, and adopted by the Senate at the time that the Bobby Baker affair was being debated. This committee, I believe, will soon be appointed.

I urge prompt consideration of Senate Resolution 26 which would, first, specifically require the select committee to make its recommendations within 1 year; second, provide an interim code—based on disclosure of financial interests—until a permanent code of ethics is adopted by the Senate; and, third, authorize the select committee to render advisory opinions on questions of ethics when so requested by Senators or officers or employees of the Senate.

My proposal would set basic standards for the conduct of Senators and their staffs, taking into consideration the necessary differences between the responsibilities and financial requirements of members of the executive branch and Members of Congress. I feel it is completely incongruous for Senate committees rigorously to question executive appointees on their financial affairs when those of us in Congress and our staffs are not subject to similar standards and requirements.

Repeating my action of the last several years, therefore, I will today abide by the disclosure provision of the interim code of ethics embodied in Senate Resolution 26 as if it were law, and place in the RECORD a current statement of my financial holdings. My proposal would amend the resolution establishing the select committee to require that Members or officers or employees of the Senate "having a financial interest, direct or indirect, which has a value of $5,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency of the Federal Government," should make a matter of public record the nature of such interest by filing a statement with the Comptroller General. Since the Comptroller General does not now have the authority to receive and maintain such lists, I am now making a statement for the RECORD to demonstrate my concern with the matter. As of this date, my holdings of the described nature are as follows:

As trustee of a family trust I have a life interest in the following companies or their subsidiaries or affiliates, each in an amount exceeding $5,000. These are normal investments in publicly owned corporations and constitute no element of control, alone or in combination with others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

American & Foreign Securities Corp.
Cities Service Corp.
Criterion Insurance Co.
Government Employees Corp.
Government Employees Financial Corp.
Government Employees Insurance Co.
Government Employees Life Insurance Co.
South Carolina Electric & Gas Co.
Southern Co.
Transamerica Corp. of Delaware.
First National City Bank of New York.
U.S. Vitamin & Pharmaceutical Corp.

ELEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE OF DELINQUENT FEDERAL TAXES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I file the 11th annual report of delinquent Federal taxes. Prior to 1954 no such annual report was compiled by the Treasury Department, and when this point was called to my attention I discussed the question with the Secretary of the Treasury and suggested that an annual compilation of the delinquencies of the various offices would serve a constructive purpose from the standpoint of both the Department and the Congress. First, it would show up the extent of these delinquencies, and second, this report would point up the deficiencies in each of the various offices and emphasize their problems both to the Department and to the directors in the area.

As evidence that these annual reports have served a constructive purpose it is significant that between 1954 and 1964—the period in which these reports have been filed—total tax delinquencies have declined around $450 million, or from $1,614,494,000 in 1954 to $1,173,911,000 in 1964. This decline in total delinquencies is in the face of a substantial increase in total tax collections.

During the same 10-year period the number of delinquent taxpayers has declined from 1,725,474 in 1954 to 839,225 in 1964.

The importance in collecting these taxes cannot be overemphasized, nor should we ever lose sight of the fact that to the extent that certain taxpayers do not pay their taxes, other taxpayers assume the load.

I shall now review this 1964 report by regions.

Atlanta, Ga.: Total tax delinquencies in Atlanta declined from $20,972,000 in 1954 to $13,354,000 in 1964. It is significant that Atlanta's delinquencies declined 28 percent last year as compared with 1963.

Birmingham, Ala.: Total tax delinquencies in 1954 were $19,488,000. In 1964 these total delinquencies had been reduced to $9,424,000.

Columbia, S.C.: This office does not have such a good report. Delinquent accounts in Columbia, S.C., in 1954 were $7,201,000, and in 1962 these had been reduced to about one-half that amount or $3,619,000. But in 1964 they reached an alltime high of $23,180,000.

Greensboro, N.C.: This office during the past 10 years has reduced its total tax delinquencies approximately 50 percent, or from $26,395,000 in 1954 to $13,765,000 in 1964.

Jackson, Miss.: Jackson has reduced its total tax delinquencies from $4,717,000 in 1954 to $4,500,000 in 1964, but employment tax delinquencies in this same office have jumped from $636,000 in 1954 to $1,019,000 in 1964. For the past 4 years employment taxes have been running at an unnecessarily high level.

Jacksonville, Fla.: Delinquent taxes in Jacksonville are at an all-time high, or $50,334,000 in 1964 as compared with $47,883,000 in 1954. This increase is represented entirely by a 100-percent increase in delinquent employment taxes during the same 10-year period. In 1964 delinquent employment taxes were $9,743,000 as compared with $4,686,000 in 1954. We must not overlook the fact that these employment taxes represent money which is withheld by the employer from the employee's paycheck. These withheld taxes do not belong to the employer but are held in escrow by him, and he has no right to divert this money to his own use.

Nashville, Tenn.: Total tax delinquencies in this office were reduced from $12,463,000 in 1954 to $10,615,000 in 1964.

Augusta, Maine: This office has a good 10-year record. Delinquent employment taxes have been reduced from $665,000 in 1954 to $255,000 in 1964 while total tax delinquencies in this same office have been reduced from $2,582,000 in 1954 to $762,000 in 1964. This is an excellent record.

Boston, Mass.: Boston has during this 10-year period reduced its employment tax delinquencies from $11,226,000 in 1954 to $7,750,000 in 1964 while during the same period it reduced its total tax delinquencies from $41,306,000 in 1954 to $25,954,000 in 1964.

Burlington, Vt.: Total tax delinquencies were reduced from $644,000 in 1954 to $536,000 in 1964 while delinquent employment taxes during the same period were reduced from $241,000 in 1954 to $134,000 in 1964, both representing alltime lows.

Hartford, Conn.: Hartford has reduced its total tax delinquencies by approximately one-half, or from $15,271,000 in 1954 to $7,969,000 in 1964.

Portsmouth, N.H.: This office has a good report having reduced its total tax delinquencies from $3,252,000 in 1954 to $620,000 in 1964.

Providence, R.I.: This is another good report. Total tax delinquencies were reduced from $7,389,000 in 1954 to $2,363,000 in 1964, another record low.

Aberdeen, S. Dak.: Total tax delinquencies in this office reached $1,459,000

in 1964 as compared with total tax delinquencies of $1,255,000 in 1954.

Chicago, Ill.: Total tax delinquencies in this office were reduced from $81,659,000 in 1954 to $43,164,000 in 1964 while employment taxes in the same period were reduced from $12,802,000 in 1954 to $8,985,000 in 1964.

Des Moines, Iowa: Des Moines reduced its total delinquent taxes from $9,737,000 in 1954 to $3,506,000 in 1964. This is a good record, but the delinquent employment taxes in the same office have increased from $770,000 in 1954 to $988,000 in 1964.

Fargo, N. Dak.: Another good record. Total tax delinquencies in this office were reduced from $1,353,000 in 1954 to $637,000 in 1964 while in the same period delinquent employment taxes were reduced from $310,000 in 1954 to $115,000 in 1964.

Milwaukee, Wis.: Milwaukee reduced its total tax delinquencies from $16,592,000 in 1954 to $8,836,000 in 1964.

Omaha, Nebr.: Tax delinquencies in this office have increased from $4,180,000 in 1954 to $4,488,000 in 1964.

St. Louis, Mo.: Kansas City, Mo., has been merged with St. Louis. In 1954 the total tax delinquencies of these two offices were $21,288,000. In 1964 they had been reduced to $16,062,000, but during the same period total delinquencies on employment taxes jumped to $2,401,000 in 1964 from a combined total of $1,858,000 in 1954.

St. Paul, Minn.: This office reduced its total tax delinquencies from $9,725,000 in 1954 to $8,471,000 in 1964.

Springfield, Ill.: Springfield has a good record, having reduced its total tax delinquencies from $9,101,000 in 1954 to $3,984,000 in 1964 while during the same period it reduced its delinquent employment taxes from $1,903,000 in 1954 to $702,000 in 1964.

Cincinnati, Ohio: Columbus, Ohio, merged with the Cincinnati office in 1960. Total tax delinquencies of these two offices in 1954 were $21,780,000. In 1964 they had been reduced to $14,623,000.

Cleveland, Ohio: Toledo, Ohio, merged with the Cleveland office in 1960. In 1954 total tax delinquencies in Cleveland and Toledo were $46,280,000. In 1964 these delinquencies had been reduced to $19,962,000 while during the same period delinquent employment taxes were reduced from $5,664,000 to $2,954,000 in 1964. Another good report.

Detroit, Mich.: Total tax delinquencies were reduced from $44,787,000 in 1954 to $27,548,000 in 1964, but employment tax delinquencies rose from $7,782,000 in 1954 to $8,057,000 in 1964.

Indianapolis, Ind.: This office has a bad report. Total tax delinquencies jumped from $19,133,000 in 1954 to $29,717,000 in 1964 while employment tax delinquencies rose from $2,477,000 in 1954 to $2,675,000 in 1964.

Louisville, Ky.: Louisville reduced its total tax delinquencies from $11,834,000 in 1954 to $10,704,000 in 1964, but during the same period employment tax delinquencies rose from $1,035,000 in 1954 to $1,375,000 in 1964.

Parkersburg, W. Va.: This office has an excellent report. Total tax delinquencies in 1954 were $12,931,000. In 1964 these had been reduced to $3,304,000 while employment taxes were reduced from $1,952,000 in 1954 to $826,000 in 1964, both alltime lows.

Albuquerque, N. Mex.: The Albuquerque office has a bad report. Total tax delinquencies in this office rose from $2,824,000 in 1954 to $3,791,000 in 1964 while employment tax delinquencies in the same period rose from $741,000 in 1954 to $1,048,000 in 1964.

Austin, Tex.: This is another bad report. Total tax delinquencies in Austin have increased 100 percent in the last 10 years, or from $20,202,000 in 1954 to $40,319,000 in 1964. During the same period there has been a 60 percent increase in delinquencies of employment taxes from $3,021,000 in 1954 to $5,073,000 in 1964. Both accounts are near alltime highs.

Cheyenne, Wyo.: The Cheyenne office reduced its total tax delinquencies from $1,629,000 in 1954 to $1,057,000 in 1964, but its total employment tax delinquencies rose from $248,000 in 1954 to $363,000 in 1964.

Dallas, Tex.: Another office which has not kept pace with the national trend toward reducing its delinquent tax accounts. In 1954 the total tax delinquencies were $23,748,000. In 1964 they were $23,588,000, a slight reduction, but during the same period delinquent employment taxes jumped from $5,077,000 in 1954 to $5,971,000 in 1964.

Denver, Colo.: Employment tax delinquencies in Denver have risen from $1,319,000 in 1954 to $2,115,000 in 1964, but there has been a small decline in total tax delinquencies from $7,552,000 in 1954 to $7,261,000 in 1964.

Little Rock, Ark.: Little Rock has had a 400-percent rise in total tax delinquencies in the past 10 years, jumping from $2,315,000 in 1954 to $9,685,000 in 1964.

New Orleans, La.: This office has had a substantial reduction in total tax delinquencies but a large increase in the delinquent employment taxes. Total tax delinquencies were reduced from $17,472,000 in 1954 to $9,823,000 in 1964 while employment tax delinquencies rose from $1,948,000 in 1954 to $2,849,000 in 1964.

Oklahoma City, Okla.: Total tax delinquencies dropped from $9,043,000 in 1954 to $7,069,000 in 1964 while employment tax delinquencies had a slight increase.

Wichita, Kans.: Total tax delinquencies dropped from $7,316,000 in 1954 to $3,353,000 in 1964, a sizable decline.

Albany, N.Y.: Albany has a good report. Total tax delinquencies declined from $15,061,000 in 1954 to $4,744,000 in 1964 while employment tax delinquencies in the same 10-year period dropped from $3,559,000 to $1,737,000.

Brooklyn, N.Y.: Total tax delinquencies dropped from $106,522,000 in 1954 to $83,558,000 in 1964; while lower than 1954, this represents a substantial increase over the past 3 years.

Buffalo, N.Y.: Syracuse, N.Y., merged with Buffalo in 1964. In 1954 Buffalo and Syracuse combined had total tax delinquencies of $18,018,000. By 1964, these had been reduced to $11,607,000.

Manhattan, N.Y.: Lower Manhattan and Upper Manhattan, N.Y., merged in 1960 to form the office of Manhattan. In 1954 their combined delinquencies totaled $329,847,000. In 1964 this had been reduced to $132,398,000.

Baltimore, Md.: Baltimore has a good report. Total tax delinquencies were reduced from $68,663,000 in 1954 to $23,541,000 in 1964 while during the same period employment tax delinquencies were reduced from $6,296,000 to $4,935,000.

Newark, N.J.: Camden, N.J., was merged with Newark in 1964. In 1954 the tax delinquencies of both offices totaled $103,600,000. By 1964 this was reduced to $56,027,000 while during the same period employment tax delinquencies for the two offices were reduced from $26,173,000 to $13,856,000.

Scranton, Pa.: The accounts for this office were divided between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh in 1964. The Philadelphia and Pittsburgh 1954 figures do not reflect the Scranton accounts.

Philadelphia, Pa.: This office has a good report. Its total tax delinquencies were reduced from $63,450,000 in 1954 to $36,723,000 in 1964, while during the same period employment tax delinquencies were reduced from $15,700,000 to $8,309,000.

Pittsburgh, Pa.: Total tax delinquencies were reduced from $28,955,000 in 1954 to $15,915,000 in 1964, but there was a slight increase in employment tax delinquencies in this office.

Richmond, Va.: Total tax delinquencies were reduced from $20,986,000 in 1954 to $9,435,000 in 1964, but Richmond shows a slight increase in employment tax delinquencies.

Wilmington, Del.: Total tax delinquencies of this office are about one-fourth of what they were in 1954, having been reduced from $22,009,000 to $5,163,000 in 1964, although the 1964 figure does show an increase over the past 3 years.

Anchorage, Alaska: In 1954 Anchorage accounts were included in the Seattle figures, and therefore, we have no comparable data. However, since 1961 Anchorage has reduced its total tax delinquencies from $2,079,000 to $1,574,000 in 1964.

Boise, Idaho: Boise has reduced its tax delinquencies from $2,083,000 in 1954 to $1,641,000 in 1964, but its employment tax delinquencies in this period have risen from $470,000 in 1954 to $577,000 in 1964.

Helena, Mont.: This office has reduced its total tax delinquencies from $2,863,000 in 1954 to $1,961,000 in 1964, but employment tax delinquencies in this office have risen from $436,000 in 1954 to $572,000 in 1964.

Honolulu, Hawaii: This office has a good report. Total tax delinquencies have dropped from $4,620,000 in 1954 to $3,443,000 in 1964 while employment tax delinquencies during the same period have dropped from $898,000 to $385,000.

Los Angeles, Calif.: This office has a bad report. Total tax delinquencies in this office have jumped from $88,047,000 in 1954 to $100,825,000 in 1964 while during the same period employment tax delinquencies have risen from $13,396,000 to $17,506,000 in 1964.

Phoenix, Ariz.: In Phoenix, total tax delinquencies rose from $5,510,000 in 1954 to $5,935,000 in 1964 while employment

tax delinquencies rose from $1,384,000 in 1954 to $1,552,000 in 1964.

Portland, Oreg.: This office has a good report. Total tax delinquencies in this office dropped from $15,351,000 in 1954 to $7,099,000 in 1964 while during the same period employment tax delinquencies dropped from $2,053,000 to $1,544,000.

Reno, Nev.: Reno has not done so well. Total tax delinquencies rose from $6,043,000 in 1954 to $7,849,000 in 1964 while during the same period employment tax delinquencies have doubled, rising from $1,480,000 in 1954 to $2,808,000 in 1964.

Salt Lake City, Utah: This office has dropped its delinquent accounts from $4,649,000 in 1954 to $3,640,000 in 1964.

San Francisco, Calif.: San Francisco has not done so well. Total tax delinquencies in this office have risen from $66,858,000 in 1954 to $104,014,000 in 1964. This is nearly an all-time high.

Seattle, Wash.: This office has a good report. Total tax delinquencies have been reduced from $19,804,000 in 1954 to $6,282,000 in 1964 while during the same period employment tax delinquencies have been reduced by nearly two-thirds.

Puerto Rico: This office has a bad report. Total tax delinquencies are five times higher than they were 10 years ago, rising from $273,000 in 1954 to $1,380,000 in 1964 while during the same period there has been an increase of nearly 700 percent in employment tax delinquencies, rising from $147,000 in 1954 to $1,094,000 in 1964.

International operations—exclusive of Puerto Rico: This represents primarily taxes owed by American citizens who are living abroad. In this category there has been a spectacular increase with total tax delinquencies rising from $16,704,000 in 1956 to $83,371,000 in 1964 while during the same period employment tax delinquencies roses from $146,000 to $755,000.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the March 15, 1965, letter received from Mr. Sheldon S. Cohen, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, followed by the tables prepared to show the status of the various districts.

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

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1965.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your request of February 25, 1965, for a report on our taxpayer delinquent accounts and for a breakdown showing all tax accounts abated or classified as uncollectible during 1964.

The record of our collection activity for the past year is very gratifying. We have continued our stress on taxpayer education, and other measures designed to improve voluntary compliance followed by prompt and firm enforcement action in the case of those who do not respond. We have continued to emphasize prompt action in the case of employers who file their employment tax returns without the required payments. We are continuing our emphasis on collection of these accounts in notice status before they ever reach the status of delinquent accounts. Rather than simply mailing notices to the taxpayers, personal contact by telephone or by visit by a revenue officer is made in each case where the liability is in excess of $500. While there was a decline of over 17,000 closures in notice status, or 14.8 percent, the money thus collected was up $16.3 million, or 7.6 percent. As you know, depositary receipts validated by banks provide another indication of voluntary compliance. Depositary receipt purchases were up 444,000, or 4 percent, in number but down $813 million, or 2 percent, in amount as compared with the previous calendar year. This decrease in dollar value of depositary receipt purchases can be attributed to the decrease in withholding rates provided in the Revenue Act of 1964.

The trend of delinquent account issuances is down. Monthly issuances were falling off at the end of the year and show an annual reduction of 56,000, or 1.9 percent, in number and $16.4 million, or 1.1 percent, in amount from the figures for the previous year. We think this downward trend reflects the value of our continuing efforts to improve voluntary compliance. There was an accompanying numerical improvement in our year-end delinquent accounts inventory, which was down 15.5 percent in number, although up 2.9 percent in amount, over the previous calendar year.

The table which follows summarizes as of December 31, 1963 and 1964, the taxpayer delinquent accounts broken down as to active and inactive status. You will note there has been an increase in the number—and particularly in the dollar value—of inactive accounts. Accounts in this category are those on which collection has been deferred pending the outcome of audit examinations, court cases, or other contingent actions. Since these accounts are not subject to closure action, there is little the Service can do about the increase in the inactive category.

TDA inventory

[Dollars in thousands]

	Active	Inactive	Total
AMOUNT			
Dec. 31, 1963	$611,171	$530,032	$1,141,203
Dec. 31, 1964	607,186	566,725	1,173,911
Change from Dec. 31, 1963 to 1964	3,985	+36,693	+32,708
Percent of change	.65	+6.92	+2.87
NUMBER			
Dec. 31, 1963	880,013	113,096	993,109
Dec. 31, 1964	708,841	130,384	839,225
Change from Dec. 31, 1963 to 1964	171,172	+17,288	−153,884
Percent of change	19.45	+15.29	−15.50

Attached is a tabulation of our delinquent account inventory broken down by the various tax groups, the inactive accounts being shown in the columns to the right. As in previous years, the figures in the inactive category are also included in the figures appearing in the columns under the various tax groups. All offices were current in their issuances as of December 31, which means that the tabulation includes all accounts that were in a delinquent status as of that date.

In response to your request, we are attaching a district-by-district tabulation of uncollectible accounts and abatements for 1964. The same information for 1963 is included for convenient comparison. We are unable to give you a district-by-district breakdown by class of tax but on the basis of the best information available, we estimate that 56 percent of the dollar value of 1964 uncollectibles were income tax, 28 percent were employment taxes, and 16 percent other classes of tax. We do not have any reliable basis for estimating what the breakdown of abatements would be by class of tax.

As explained in last year's report with respect to uncollectible accounts, many accounts are assessed, even though it is known at the time that the prospects for collection are extremely poor. Nevertheless, the assessments must be made in order that the liabilities may be established and the interests of the Government fully protected. I might add, however, that the decision to classify these accounts, or any others, as uncollectible is not made until all reasonable efforts have been exerted to locate the delinquent taxpayer and any income or assets from which collection may be enforced. In other words, delinquent accounts are classified as uncollectible only after it becomes clear that the accounts truly qualify as uncollectible. Furthermore, even after a decision has been made that one or more delinquent accounts are uncollectible, collection action is merely suspended until such time as collection prospects are improved or the period of limitations has expired. Many such accounts are reactivated on the basis of improvement in the taxpayer's financial situation and subjected to collection action before expiration of the statute of limitations. Separate records on such reactivated accounts are not maintained and adjustments to the amount reported as uncollectible cannot be made so as to reflect the amount that is ultimately written off as uncollectible.

Abatements are, of course, entirely different from uncollectibles. Except in the case of offers in compromise, an assessment is abated only if it is in excess of the tax amount actually due and owing at the time. The following types of assessment qualify for abatement:

1. Assessments in excess of the amount legally due as determined by audit examination.

2. Assessments in excess of the amount accepted on an offer in compromise.

3. Jeopardy assessments later determined by court ruling to be excessive.

4. Jeopardy assessments where it is administratively determined that jeopardy does not exist.

5. Transferee assessments in excess of the basic transferor assessment.

6. 100-percent penalty assessments in excess of the basic corporate assessment.

Assessments made in transferee cases always duplicate an amount already assessed against the transferor, and in cases involving the 100-percent penalty, assessments made against officers or employees of the taxpayer always constitute a duplication of an amount already assessed against the taxpayer himself. In fact, transferee assessments, all representing the same basic transferor liability, may be made against several transferees, and the 10-percent penalty may be assessed against more than one person in respect of the same offense. However, no more is actually collected than is actually due, of course, and all assessments over and above the basic one must ultimately be abated.

In jeopardy cases, the situation differs in that the assessments made are usually against the taxpayer and the taxpayer only. However, the amounts involved are determined on the basis of such information, sometimes rather limited, as is immediately available to the Service. Jeopardy assessments may, therefore, be in excess of the true liability as subsequently determined when all the facts are disclosed. In such cases, the amount of the jeopardy assessment is adjusted to the true liability.

We appreciate your interest and are pleased to furnish the information requested.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner.

Enclosures.

Delinquent taxes

TOTALS

Year	Employment tax		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year	Total taxes		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year
	Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)	
1954	390,398	$254,062		1,725,474	$1,614,494	
1961	316,612	268,465		1,071,660	1,063,248	
1962	257,421	242,375	−9.7	976,147	1,100,780	+3.5
1963	246,297	225,613	−6.9	993,109	1,141,202	+3.9
1964	217,283	217,365	−3.7	839,225	1,173,911	+2.9

BY DISTRICT

District	Year	Employment tax		Percent change over previous year	Total taxes		Percent change over previous year
		Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)	
Southeast region:							
Atlanta, Ga.	1954	4,963	$2,947		26,021	$20,972	
	1961	5,410	2,539		18,469	11,386	
	1962	4,624	2,414	−4.9	19,071	12,437	+9.2
	1963	7,264	4,176	+73.0	30,124	18,608	+49.6
	1964	5,167	2,490	−40.4	21,388	13,354	−28.2
Birmingham, Ala.	1954	4,874	2,299		19,506	19,488	
	1961	3,604	2,183		15,121	13,156	
	1962	2,823	2,243	+2.7	14,847	9,947	−24.4
	1963	6,126	2,583	+15.2	22,768	12,633	+27.0
	1964	4,299	2,185	−15.4	19,014	9,424	−25.4
Columbia, S.C.	1954	3,727	1,078		14,246	7,201	
	1961	3,362	1,308		10,621	3,843	
	1962	2,050	951	−27.3	8,208	3,619	−5.8
	1963	3,339	1,459	+53.4	13,350	14,714	+306.6
	1964	2,444	990	−32.1	10,401	23,180	+57.5
Greensboro, N.C.	1954	5,332	2,016		22,459	26,395	
	1961	4,834	2,079		20,255	7,661	
	1962	3,578	1,662	−20.1	19,860	7,707	+.6
	1963	7,108	2,544	+53.1	31,253	13,538	+75.7
	1964	4,315	2,168	−14.8	19,729	13,765	+1.7
Jackson, Miss.	1954	1,500	636		5,563	4,717	
	1961	2,725	1,267		7,800	3,750	
	1962	1,884	1,357	+7.1	5,998	3,872	+3.3
	1963	3,053	1,046	−22.9	11,222	4,610	+19.1
	1964	2,283	1,019	−2.6	7,933	4,500	−2.4
Jacksonville, Fla.	1954	8,451	4,686		31,020	47,883	
	1961	14,095	10,436		38,359	34,787	
	1962	10,506	8,863	−15.1	29,995	34,129	−1.9
	1963	15,439	10,581	+19.4	49,434	45,577	+33.5
	1964	12,074	9,743	−7.9	39,739	50,334	+10.4
Nashville, Tenn.	1954	3,721	1,775		15,763	12,463	
	1961	4,065	1,993		16,756	11,043	
	1962	2,283	1,875	−5.9	13,063	9,083	−17.7
	1963	4,582	2,040	+8.8	21,930	11,917	+31.2
	1964	3,355	1,784	−12.5	14,029	10,615	−10.9
Northeast region:							
Augusta, Maine	1954	1,145	665		3,478	2,582	
	1961	1,715	977		4,361	3,857	
	1962	1,107	602	−38.4	3,563	3,329	−13.7
	1963	665	569	−5.5	2,505	1,364	−59.0
	1964	495	255	−55.2	1,882	762	−44.1
Boston, Mass.	1954	15,058	11,226		57,082	41,306	
	1961	12,411	13,455		35,486	36,658	
	1962	12,166	12,887	−4.2	35,530	42,996	+17.3
	1963	9,749	11,004	−14.6	32,071	33,895	−21.2
	1964	7,448	7,750	−29.6	24,358	25,954	−23.4
Burlington, Vt.	1954	619	241		1,424	644	
	1961	769	370		2,054	937	
	1962	575	281	−24.1	1,529	3,980	+324.8
	1963	464	181	−35.6	1,283	678	−83.0
	1964	333	134	−26.0	888	536	−20.9
Hartford, Conn.	1954	4,232	2,831		22,554	15,271	
	1961	6,771	5,313		20,977	13,920	
	1962	4,134	4,429	−16.6	17,432	12,322	−11.5
	1963	3,332	3,009	−32.1	14,774	10,152	−17.6
	1964	2,509	2,360	−21.6	8,250	7,969	−21.5
Portsmouth, N.H.	1954	1,017	460		2,854	3,252	
	1961	547	314		2,107	905	
	1962	376	334	+6.4	1,645	4,977	+449.9
	1963	313	403	+20.7	1,220	777	−84.4
	1964	344	321	+20.3	1,264	620	−20.2
Providence, R.I.	1954	1,847	1,204		8,060	7,389	
	1961	2,693	1,907		5,922	7,275	
	1962	2,269	1,698	−11.0	5,143	6,399	−12.0
	1963	1,750	1,509	−11.1	3,944	3,213	−49.8
	1964	1,224	1,047	−30.6	2,732	2,363	−26.5
Midwest region:							
Aberdeen, S. Dak.	1954	734	282		3,092	1,255	
	1961	665	277		2,006	1,420	
	1962	359	136	−50.9	1,447	1,097	−22.7
	1963	432	187	+37.5	1,631	1,400	+27.6
	1964	323	176	−5.9	1,389	1,459	+4.2
Chicago, Ill.	1954	21,439	12,802		136,532	81,659	
	1961	15,062	12,682		62,488	60,273	
	1962	12,249	11,742	−7.4	48,027	47,619	−21.0
	1963	9,243	9,348	−20.4	35,518	40,060	−15.9
	1964	8,640	8,985	−3.9	28,649	43,164	+7.7
Des Moines, Iowa	1954	1,781	770		5,810	9,737	
	1961	2,310	1,056		6,945	4,566	
	1962	1,342	747	−29.3	5,877	7,016	+53.7
	1963	1,519	805	+7.8	5,211	3,909	−44.3
	1964	1,219	988	+22.7	4,461	3,506	−10.3

Delinquent taxes—Continued

BY DISTRICT—Continued

District	Year	Employment tax		Percent change over previous year	Total taxes		Percent change over previous year
		Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)	
Midwest region—Continued							
Fargo, N. Dak	1954	843	$310		2,352	$1,353	
	1961	962	463		2,558	1,248	
	1962	406	277	−40.2	1,542	879	−29.6
	1963	316	190	−31.4	1,029	663	−24.6
	1964	278	115	−39.5	975	637	−3.9
Milwaukee, Wis	1954	3,759	1,704		16,962	16,592	
	1961	3,933	2,992		10,489	9,929	
	1962	2,903	2,512	−16.0	8,744	8,756	−11.8
	1963	2,284	2,161	−14.0	7,489	9,458	+8.0
	1964	2,274	1,863	−13.8	7,502	8,836	−6.6
Omaha, Nebr	1954	810	548		3,932	4,180	
	1961	919	640		2,721	2,071	
	1962	622	629	−1.7	1,900	1,318	−36.4
	1963	680	736	+17.0	2,014	2,140	+63.4
	1964	700	543	−26.2	2,300	4,488	+109.7
Kansas City, Kans.[1]	1954	1,783	884		8,155	9,021	
	1961	2,875	1,514		9,574	22,990	
	1962	1,155	844	−44.3	5,947	20,925	−9.0
	1963	886	549	−35.0	4,957	5,149	−75.4
St. Louis, Mo	1954	1,958	974		11,539	12,267	
	1961	2,483	1,247		10,745	6,096	
	1962	1,489	965	−22.6	8,599	5,293	−13.2
	1963	1,709	1,198	+24.1	7,777	16,122	+204.6
	1964	4,363	2,401	+37.4	18,797	16,062	−32.4
St. Paul, Minn	1954	3,096	1,929		10,916	9,725	
	1961	3,287	2,384		9,708	12,702	
	1962	2,421	1,878	−21.2	8,921	12,149	−4.4
	1963	2,121	1,387	−26.1	7,512	8,149	−32.9
	1964	2,462	1,689	+21.8	7,825	8,471	+4.0
Springfield, Ill	1954	4,563	1,903		19,192	9,101	
	1961	1,837	1,092		5,333	5,597	
	1962	1,409	871	−20.2	4,622	5,017	−10.4
	1963	1,146	776	−10.9	4,599	9,914	+97.6
	1964	1,301	702	−9.5	5,022	3,984	−59.8
Central region:							
Columbus, Ohio [2]	1954	1,207	594		13,054	6,652	
Cincinnati, Ohio	1954	3,431	1,784		26,545	15,128	
	1961	5,212	4,243		21,184	15,038	
	1962	3,966	3,085	−27.3	20,080	13,239	−12.0
	1963	3,598	2,593	−15.9	18,740	14,537	+9.8
	1964	3,156	2,670	+3.0	16,242	14,623	+.6
Toledo, Ohio [3]	1954	929	392		6,072	3,317	
Cleveland, Ohio	1954	7,958	5,272		49,841	42,963	
	1961	6,579	4,899		26,165	27,511	
	1962	4,131	4,194	−14.4	21,106	23,327	−15.2
	1963	3,750	3,359	−19.9	21,364	22,957	−1.6
	1964	3,619	2,954	−12.1	19,269	19,962	−13.0
Detroit, Mich	1954	11,891	7,782		68,809	44,787	
	1961	16,816	13,830		43,712	38,163	
	1962	12,334	9,896	−28.4	33,776	32,238	−15.5
	1963	8,038	7,422	−25.0	28,286	26,783	−16.9
	1964	8,227	8,057	+8.6	24,808	27,548	+2.9
Indianapolis, Ind	1954	3,420	2,477		23,475	19,133	
	1961	5,337	5,643		15,290	19,682	
	1962	3,557	5,010	−11.2	14,817	18,295	−7.0
	1963	2,982	3,790	−24.4	12,100	22,466	+22.8
	1964	2,840	2,675	−29.4	11,825	29,717	+32.3
Louisville, Ky	1954	2,019	1,035		12,161	11,834	
	1961	3,050	1,839		11,954	8,807	
	1962	2,818	2,019	+9.8	11,996	10,401	+18.1
	1963	2,882	1,915	−5.2	13,887	11,690	+12.4
	1964	1,917	1,375	−28.2	11,208	10,704	−8.4
Parkersburg, W. Va	1954	3,221	1,952		15,917	12,931	
	1961	2,114	1,188		6,674	3,581	
	1962	1,865	1,165	−1.9	6,361	3,904	+9.0
	1963	1,709	1,041	−10.6	5,270	3,483	−10.8
	1964	1,149	826	−20.7	4,594	3,304	−5.1
Southwest region:							
Albuquerque, N. Mex	1954	1,911	741		5,491	2,824	
	1961	1,954	1,434		5,104	3,671	
	1962	1,880	1,356	−5.4	4,962	5,595	+52.4
	1963	2,565	1,620	+19.5	5,651	4,458	−20.3
	1964	1,254	1,048	−35.3	3,444	3,791	−15.0
Austin, Tex	1954	5,609	3,021		22,355	20,202	
	1961	7,798	5,486		25,329	17,874	
	1962	5,995	4,062	−26.0	25,706	19,592	+9.6
	1963	9,065	5,101	+25.6	31,213	41,177	+110.2
	1964	5,027	5,073	−.5	20,376	40,319	−2.1
Cheyenne, Wyo	1954	688	248		2,445	1,629	
	1961	946	448		3,275	1,244	
	1962	570	279	−27.7	2,248	1,190	−4.3
	1963	600	298	+6.8	1,983	981	−17.6
	1964	614	363	+21.8	1,674	1,057	+7.7
Dallas, Tex	1954	9,311	5,077		31,244	23,748	
	1961	7,678	5,918		25,741	23,377	
	1962	6,859	5,139	−13.2	25,059	21,565	−7.8
	1963	7,095	4,909	−4.5	26,090	21,916	+1.6
	1964	5,068	5,971	+21.6	18,289	23,588	+7.6
Denver, Colo	1954	2,754	1,319		9,888	7,552	
	1961	3,420	1,983		11,772	8,605	
	1962	2,468	2,036	+2.7	9,124	7,480	−13.1
	1963	2,451	2,403	+18.0	9,263	8,602	+15.0
	1964	2,106	2,115	−12.0	7,731	7,261	−15.6
Little Rock, Ark	1954	1,801	462		5,431	2,315	
	1961	2,377	800		5,636	9,435	
	1962	1,867	614	−23.2	5,147	9,295	−1.5
	1963	1,694	668	+8.8	4,931	9,862	+6.1
	1964	1,073	471	−29.5	3,839	9,685	−1.8

See footnotes at end of table.

Delinquent taxes—Continued

BY DISTRICT—Continued

District	Year	Employment tax		Percent change over previous year	Total taxes		Percent change over previous year
		Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)	
Southwest region—Continued							
New Orleans, La.	1954	4,566	$1,948		19,566	$17,472	
	1961	5,140	3,041		15,077	9,534	
	1962	4,270	2,897	−4.7	12,453	8,566	−10.2
	1963	4,564	3,076	+6.2	13,623	8,857	+3.4
	1964	3,119	2,849	−7.4	10,988	9,823	+10.9
Oklahoma City, Okla.	1954	3,311	1,790		9,994	9,043	
	1961	3,255	2,177		10,052	5,976	
	1962	3,819	2,463	+13.1	10,704	6,974	+16.7
	1963	4,007	2,553	+3.7	12,402	7,812	+12.0
	1964	3,132	1,935	−24.2	9,361	7,069	−9.5
Wichita, Kans.	1954	2,405	939		10,542	7,316	
	1961	2,570	1,438		8,147	5,359	
	1962	1,488	845	−41.2	5,874	4,864	−9.2
	1963	1,459	840	−.6	5,720	3,478	−39.9
	1964	1,365	1,000	+19.0	5,319	3,353	−3.6
New York region:							
Albany, N.Y.	1954	4,679	3,559		13,822	15,061	
	1961	3,666	2,925		10,663	7,338	
	1962	2,616	2,059	−29.6	8,747	5,901	−19.6
	1963	1,801	1,798	−12.7	7,713	5,127	−13.1
	1964	1,538	1,737	−3.4	6,547	4,744	−7.5
Brooklyn, N.Y.	1954	28,903	18,534		88,274	106,522	
	1961	11,743	13,588		38,621	58,504	
	1962	9,913	14,703	+8.2	39,361	58,147	−.6
	1963	10,201	15,859	+7.9	47,178	66,611	+14.6
	1964	10,704	18,366	+15.8	40,964	83,558	+25.4
Syracuse, N.Y.[4]	1954	3,046	1,552		12,486	5,650	
	1961	3,270	2,146		9,649	5,338	
	1962	2,667	1,728	−19.5	8,881	5,411	+1.4
	1963	2,089	1,786	+3.4	9,246	5,086	−6.0
Buffalo, N.Y.	1954	4,664	2,351		21,869	12,368	
	1961	3,255	2,218		10,727	5,772	
	1962	2,679	1,892	−14.7	8,101	5,269	−8.7
	1963	2,226	1,835	−3.0	8,046	7,649	+45.2
	1964	4,184	3,796	+4.8	13,853	11,607	−8.9
Lower Manhattan, N.Y.[5]	1954	22,636	17,622		48,155	171,309	
Upper Manhattan, N.Y.[6]	1954	24,420	26,447		67,328	158,538	
Manhattan, N.Y.	1961	22,607	28,346		68,863	115,918	
	1962	17,181	24,150	−14.8	67,934	110,024	−5.1
	1963	16,872	27,697	+14.7	71,265	121,169	+10.1
	1964	18,650	32,027	+15.6	68,627	132,398	+9.3
Mid-Atlantic region:							
Baltimore, Md.	1954	12,249	6,296		120,870	68,663	
	1961	6,485	4,341		37,783	23,390	
	1962	4,845	3,626	−16.5	34,899	17,440	−25.4
	1963	4,308	3,498	−3.5	30,902	17,226	−1.2
	1964	4,109	4,935	+41.1	25,782	23,541	+36.7
Camden, N.J.[7]	1954	3,526	2,090		16,986	10,638	
	1961	4,070	3,308		14,654	11,883	
	1962	4,078	3,264	−1.3	14,263	11,490	−3.3
	1963	3,515	2,567	−21.4	13,384	12,535	+9.1
Newark, N.J.	1954	37,438	24,083		122,953	92,962	
	1961	10,347	12,441		37,028	37,905	
	1962	9,573	13,132	+5.6	33,068	38,350	+1.2
	1963	7,588	10,839	−17.5	32,564	35,915	−6.3
	1964	12,907	13,856	+3.4	49,727	56,027	+15.6
Scranton, Pa.[8]	1954	2,134	2,345		9,414	7,948	
	1961	2,016	1,907		5,439	5,192	
	1962	1,715	1,527	−19.9	4,868	5,068	−2.4
	1963	1,258	1,307	−14.4	4,631	4,893	−3.5
Philadelphia, Pa.	1954	18,014	15,700		95,824	63,450	
	1961	9,095	10,393		29,948	34,477	
	1962	7,840	10,100	−2.8	32,730	45,050	+30.3
	1963	6,508	7,977	−21.0	5,467	46,401	+3.0
	[9] 1963	7,245	8,667		37,455	47,938	
	1964	7,298	8,309	−4.1	31,467	36,723	−23.4
Pittsburgh, Pa.	1954	4,880	3,800		40,973	28,955	
	1961	7,179	6,091		26,104	19,934	
	1962	6,130	5,471	−10.2	21,852	17,901	−10.2
	1963	4,361	3,781	−30.9	18,810	17,199	−3.9
	[9] 1963	4,882	4,399		21,453	20,554	
	1964	4,466	4,181	−5.0	16,768	15,915	−22.6
Richmond, Va.	1954	4,692	2,239		32,611	20,986	
	1961	5,607	3,693		21,895	13,762	
	1962	4,618	3,050	−17.4	22,001	11,604	−15.7
	1963	3,865	2,599	−14.8	18,474	11,319	−2.5
	1964	3,190	2,458	−5.4	14,909	9,435	−16.6
Wilmington, Del.	1954	571	303		5,460	22,009	
	1961	516	248		3,717	2,591	
	1962	617	369	+48.8	4,053	2,835	+9.4
	1963	557	256	−30.6	3,305	3,331	+17.5
	1964	656	294	+14.8	3,313	5,163	+55.0
Western region:							
Anchorage, Alaska[10]	1961	851	996		2,314	2,079	
	1962	779	1,118	+12.2	2,087	2,363	+13.7
	1963	491	707	−36.8	2,048	1,732	−26.7
	1964	505	689	−2.5	1,556	1,574	−9.1
Boise, Idaho	1954	1,050	470		3,115	2,083	
	1961	1,066	659		3,059	1,546	
	1962	972	692	+5.0	3,165	1,576	+1.9
	1963	916	438	−36.7	2,964	1,697	+7.7
	1964	761	577	+31.7	2,702	1,641	−3.3
Helena, Mont.	1954	1,064	436		3,214	2,863	
	1961	1,835	1,022		5,031	2,368	
	1962	1,313	719	−29.6	4,243	2,671	+12.8
	1963	1,004	736	+2.4	3,779	2,200	−17.6
	1964	1,021	572	−22.3	3,501	1,961	−10.9

See footnotes at end of table.

Delinquent taxes—Continued

BY DISTRICT—Continued

District	Year	Employment tax		Percent change over previous year	Total taxes		Percent change over previous year
		Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)	
Western region—Continued							
Honolulu, Hawaii	1954	1,338	$898		4,682	$4,620	
	1961	873	950		2,565	5,102	
	1962	909	735	−22.6	2,480	4,944	−3.1
	1963	597	473	−35.6	1,897	3,985	−19.4
	1964	506	385	−18.6	1,624	3,443	−13.6
Los Angeles, Calif.	1954	16,989	13,396		86,733	88,047	
	1961	25,123	28,692		79,080	92,954	
	1962	21,804	27,920	−2.7	78,455	98,389	+5.9
	1963	15,281	20,392	−27.0	59,817	89,448	−9.1
	1964	13,852	17,506	−14.2	57,681	100,825	+12.7
Phoenix, Ariz.	1954	2,158	1,384		8,957	5,510	
	1961	2,823	2,218		8,263	7,076	
	1962	2,917	2,736	+23.4	7,938	7,834	+10.7
	1963	2,255	2,053	−25.0	7,424	6,728	−14.1
	1964	1,071	1,552	−24.4	4,837	5,935	−11.8
Portland, Oreg.	1954	4,059	2,053		14,799	15,351	
	1961	3,366	2,879		13,732	13,138	
	1962	3,725	2,306	−19.9	13,846	11,335	−13.7
	1963	2,396	1,878	−18.6	9,739	8,555	−24.5
	1964	2,280	1,544	−17.8	9,123	7,099	−17.0
Reno, Nev.	1954	1,455	1,480		4,576	6,043	
	1961	1,170	2,194		4,095	4,628	
	1962	1,107	2,076	−5.4	3,819	5,550	+19.9
	1963	1,330	2,423	+16.7	4,662	6,936	+25.0
	1964	1,204	2,808	+15.9	4,514	7,849	+13.2
Salt Lake City, Utah	1954	1,671	925		5,554	4,649	
	1961	1,849	1,122		5,022	3,334	
	1962	1,813	1,165	+3.8	4,939	2,912	−12.7
	1963	1,531	1,109	−4.8	4,692	3,539	+21.5
	1964	1,351	1,072	−3.3	3,917	3,640	+2.9
San Francisco, Calif.	1954	17,616	10,597		85,750	66,858	
	1961	11,763	9,480		43,675	57,977	
	1962	10,778	9,280	−2.1	44,853	104,359	+80.0
	1963	9,629	10,062	+8.4	43,460	106,939	+2.5
	1964	9,104	8,179	−18.7	39,701	104,014	−2.7
Seattle, Wash.	[11] 1954	5,932	4,324		27,707	19,804	
	1961	4,095	2,500		11,493	11,779	
	1962	3,486	2,221	−11.2	11,000	11,029	−6.4
	1963	2,824	1,884	−15.2	11,133	7,415	−32.8
	1964	2,487	1,586	−15.8	9,350	6,282	−15.3
International operations: Puerto Rico	1954	1,530	147		2,020	273	
	1961	1,850	565		2,622	951	
	1962	2,232	685	+21.2	3,517	1,344	+41.3
	1963	2,386	1,100	+60.6	3,412	1,395	+3.8
	1964	3,495	1,094	−.5	4,914	1,380	−1.1
International operations (exclusive of Puerto Rico)	1956	197	146		11,812	16,704	
	1961	512	689		19,651	44,280	
	1962	524	397	−42.4	14,124	60,597	+36.8
	1963	529	531	+38.8	12,959	68,474	+13.0
	1964	428	755	+42.2	6,354	83,371	+21.8

[1] Merged with St. Louis, 1964.
[2] Merged with Cincinnati, 1960.
[3] Merged with Cleveland, 1960.
[4] Merged with Buffalo, 1964.
[5] Merged with upper Manhattan to form Manhattan, 1960.
[6] Merged with lower Manhattan to form Manhattan, 1960.
[7] Merged with Newark, 1964.
[8] Accounts divided between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh offices, 1964.
[9] Figures include accounts transferred from Scranton.
[10] Was included in Seattle figures prior to January 1961.
[11] Includes Anchorage, Alaska, figures.

CONSUMER INTEREST AND PROTECTION

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting letter from a properly incensed mother and housewife. I am sure that many, many mothers and housewives share her reaction and concern.

I invite the attention of the President's Committee for Consumer Interest and Protection to this matter and hope that they contact this very intelligent and articulate young matron.

I ask unanimous consent to place her letter in the RECORD at this point.

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

DOWNERS GROVE, ILL.,
April 25, 1965.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM: Each time I buy sewing notions and toys, and look over price and quality, I threaten to write all the women in Congress to see if something can't be done about the exorbitant prices we are being charged.

First of all—notions: Bias tape and rickrack are now 3 yards for 19 cents and not long ago they were 5 yards for 10 cents—and I'm not remembering back to the gay nineties—I'm only 35. Plastic buttons which change shape in hot water and shrivel up when touched by a hot iron are usually 29 cents for four or six—and the paper to which the buttons are attached is more costly to manufacture. Some bias tapes are so poor, one is better off using the material cut on the bias. Zippers are now all plastic and constantly on the "fritz" and need changing before a garment could possibly even show wear. Thread is so terrible it splits and cuts and knots. It gets a trifle irritating when one has the thread break five and six times when making one button hole. Fabric prices are reasonable and one gets what one pays for; but, when one buys a piece of good quality cotton for a child's dress and the notions come to twice the price of the material, it's ridiculous, especially when one isn't using extraordinarily pretty trims. I thought it was me for a long time, but everyone I talk with that does sew has identical complaints.

Second—toys: Have you looked at some of the trash that is being advertised on TV at high prices? They get our children all worked up over a toy—granted their advertising pays for children's programs—of which we could use half less, especially at the dinner hour (or isn't it a family custom to eat together anymore?). One buys the toy and it breaks while Daddy is trying to assemble it. How could it possibly hold out with children—and our three aren't even particularly destructive—they just give the toys, that are advertised as unbreakable, normal use. I'd like to see something done on this issue before we get hung again this Christmas with a pile of junk which is half broken before we've finished the cold turkey.

Granted, you are not the Senator from my State, but I feel a woman has more heart for these particular problems.

We hope to see your name on a national ballot again—my husband and I both switched over to the Republican side to give you our support. We think you do a fabulous job in the Senate, and wish everyone there was as conscientious.

Sincerely,

BEATRICE N. MEYERS
Mrs. Beatrice N. Meyers.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF MASSACRE OF ARMENIANS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, April 24 marked the 50th anniversary of the

mass slaughter and deportation of the Armenians from their homeland.

On that date in 1915, a systematic plan of massacre of the Armenian Nation was set in motion by the Government of Turkey. Between the years 1915–18 more than 1 million Armenians lost their lives and another 1 million were permanently displaced. Untold wealth in properties were plundered or destroyed.

The 50th anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenian people brings to mind not only the self-sacrifice of this virile people in the interest of virtuous government and human rights but also the important contributions made by the Armenians to the Allied war effort as "the Little Ally" of the West. Of the Grand Alliance of 1915–18 Armenia was the smallest; and yet, she suffered more casualties than any other state of that alliance.

Such great sacrifice and devotion to the cause of liberty must not be forgotten.

As we pause now to honor those courageous Armenians who lost their lives during this tragic period, let us resolve to forever guard against the recurrence of such events.

EDWARD R. MURROW

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles which include most appropriate and sensitive comments on the life and service of Edward R. Murrow.

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

[Eric Sevareid–Cronkite News, Apr. 27, 1965]

This is not a normal day in this establishment. None of us here has worked easily or well. It is the day we knew was coming but for which we could not properly prepare, try as we would.

It is not my privilege to speak for all of Ed Murrow's colleagues and it is not possible for me to speak even for myself as I would wish to speak. One day someone may find the right words.

There are some of us here, and I am one, who owe their professional life to this man. There are many, working here and in other networks and stations, who owe to Ed Murrow their love of their work, their standards and sense of responsibility. He was a shooting star; we will live in his afterglow a very long time.

I never knew any person among those who worked in his realm to feel jealousy toward him. Not only because he made himself a refuge for those in trouble, a source of strength for those who were weak, but because there was no basis for comparison. He was an original and we shall not see his like again.

He was an artist, passionately alive, living each day as if it were his last, absorbing and radiating the glories and miseries of his generation; the men, the machines, the battles, the beauties. The poetry of America was in his bones. He believed in his family, his friends, his work, and his country. Himself, he often doubted.

Next to his own land, he loved England the most. Its people owe him much. I will presume to use the words of England's greatest poet about another brave and brooding figure who also died too young—"Now cracks a noble heart. Good night, sweet prince."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 28, 1965]

EDWARD R. MURROW: A STARTLINGLY DECENT MAN, HE SYMBOLIZED INTEGRITY

(By Mary McGrory)

A whole generation was brought up within the sound of his voice telling the truth. Yet what they remember best about Edward R. Murrow in Washington is how seldom he spoke during his 3 years as a public official.

He had always been reticent, although he made his living by talking. An old friend from broadcasting days said, "Ed communicated mainly in long pauses."

It was the same here. ROBERT F. KENNEDY recalls that at Cabinet and National Security Council meetings, "he never spoke unless spoken to."

"And," adds the junior Senator from New York, "I don't know anyone else in Government who made sense every time he talked."

Madison Avenue was openmouthed in astonishment when Murrow, in 1961, turned his back on its gold and glamor to take on the job of rescuing a Government agency that was the battered stepchild of Washington.

Murrow in broadcasting was a symbol of success and integrity. His reputation and performance were so preeminent that, as his grieving colleague, Eric Sevareid, said at the news of his death yesterday, he was "beyond jealousy." Around the offices of the Columbia Broadcasting System, which he ornamented for 25 years, he was known as a startlingly decent human being, who did battle with the brass, and unlike many great stars encouraged the young and obscure.

He came to Washington with few illusions about the world and himself. He referred to himself, his deputy, Donald L. Wilson, recalls, as "the Satchel Paige of the administration." Paige was almost 50 when he made it to the major leagues. Murrow was 53 when he took over the foundering fortunes of the U.S. Information Agency, which had had 5 names and 12 Directors in its stormy 21-year history and had suffered almost to death during the McCarthy era.

He came at a time when much Capitol Hill opinion held, in the words of former Senator Homer E. Capehart, Republican, of Indiana, that "America should be sold like Cadillacs."

Why did he come? He once told a friend: "I always felt that if a man had a choice to do what I was doing or to work for the Government, he had to work for the Government. Besides, I had been criticizing bureaucrats all my adult life, and it was my turn to try."

From the first, his very presence acted as a tonic and spur to the troubled Agency.

Just to be working under the same roof with a professional of such distinction raised the spirit of many who never even saw him.

Besides, he had only one directive. The Agency was to tell the truth, to play the news straight. When a State Department official protested early on that the Voice of America was giving too heavy coverage to the freedom rider violence in Alabama, Murrow replied that it was a big story and "we better tell our own bad news rather than leave it to the enemy."

Congressmen bleated at the news policy, but when it was explained to them in that vibrant voice issuing from the familiar cloud of cigarette smoke, they subsided.

Murrow's reserve quickly became a legend. The local press, many of them old comrades in arms, found it out first. Murrow initially would grant no interviews. When he did it was a strain. Across the desk from the famous face with the bloodhound furrows and the gray eyes peering dubiously and inquiringly from under the black brows, they found his principal contribution was a brooding silence.

At the White House, this quality was prized. In a field of rampaging egoes, Murrow was conspicuously self-effacing.

McGeorge Bundy, the White House foreign policy adviser, remembers that Murrow never once asked to go to a meeting. In time he never had to ask. President Kennedy increasingly said, "Let's find out what Ed thinks" or "Be sure Murrow is here."

Kennedy's regard for Murrow's always solicited advice began during the period of the Bay of Pigs. Too late to stop that fatal course, Murrow heard what was afoot and compellingly and eloquently spoke out against it.

"Yet," says one witness, "no one ever heard him say he had tried to prevent it. He worked harder than anyone to pick up the broken china."

From then on, he was in on every discussion of foreign policy. On occasion, he changed its course.

LIGHTER MOMENTS

"He never fought a problem," says Bundy. "He never tried to impose himself on it."

Murrow was not a glittering figure on the Washington social scene. The shyness that prevented him from calling up a subordinate at the Agency whom he didn't know, kept him home a great deal. In his lighter moments he enjoyed talk of the trade—no man knew more about the capacities and limitations of his colleagues—and he could do a creditable imitation of Winston Churchill, the central figure of the years of his greatest acclaim.

An old New Frontiersman said, "Murrow's legacy here is probably all intangible. It seems to me it's in the duty officer at USIA. He's crisper and prouder than the others, and I think that comes of once having had Murrow for a boss."

In his obscure years here, Murrow brought pride and prestige to a discouraged Agency and he gave counsel to a young President, who always had to wait for the sound of his voice.

WILLIAM P. LEAR, SR.—KANSAS AVIATION LEADER

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Kansas is the Nation's leader in the production of commercial light aircraft and through the efforts of a dynamic individual now is advancing into the ranks of States producing jetplanes for American businessmen.

It is largely through the efforts of William P. Lear, Sr., that this change has been made possible. An acknowledged leader in the aviation industry, he is genius in electronics and a man who has injected many new ideas into aviation. Three years ago, Mr. Lear established a new factory in Wichita, Kans., to build what he considered the twin-jetplane necessary to meet the price and capability needs of business.

In 3 short years this dream of Bill Lear's has been realized, and the new Lear-Jet aircraft are rolling from the production lines at the Wichita facility.

Mr. President, at his time I ask unanimous consent that an article from the April 8, Wichita Beacon, written by Mr. Joe McKnight of the Associated Press, outlining the accomplishments of William P. Lear, Sr., be inserted in the RECORD.

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

WILLIAM LEAR "MAN IN HURRY" TO BUILD ON-THE-GO PLANES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article was written by Joe McKnight, Wichita Associated Press correspondent, for newspapers throughout the United States.)

William (Bill) P. Lear, Sr., is a stocky, restless man in a hurry to provide businessmen on the go with their private airliners.

At 62, he feels he's just getting off the ground in the executive jetplane business but already he's branching into another of his plush twin-jet planes priced at $595,000 apiece.

Lear has spent more than 40 years running engineering, electronics, and aviation firms.

Born at Hannibal, Mo., in 1902, he lied about his age to serve in the Navy as a radio instructor during World War I.

In 1921 he developed a battery operated radio, forerunner of the automobile radio. From 1922 to 1924 he was president of Quincy Radio Laboratory, Quincy, Ill., a pioneer firm in developing aircraft communications.

During the next 6 years he set up radio and manufacturing firms in Tulsa, Okla., and Chicago.

In 1930 he founded Lear developments, later known as Lear, Inc., which built a variety of aircraft electronics systems and was the basis for a Lear airplane.

He stayed with the firm until 1962, the last 12 years as chairman of the board. Lear, Inc., is now merged and known as Lear Siegler, Inc., an electronics firm at Santa Monica, Calif.

Lear holds about 100 patents on equipment for aircraft communications and navigation.

His newest product is a sleek needlenosed eight-place craft that can hustle 1,800 miles at up to 570 miles per hour and altitudes to 41,000 feet.

"We're the only plane manufacturer I know that sells on a no return of deposit. I sell no options, but I get progress payments while the plane is being built. These planes are paid for when they leave the plant.

"That's the only basis I can operate on."

Lear charges about his plant interrupting assembly line or engineering work to talk with employees or to show a visitor the mechanism for some part of the plane.

"I've got a bunch of guys that stay here because they love to compete," Lear said. "Engineering is the most fun of the business."

Several key personnel on Lear's staff have come from competitors, a knack which has brought some grumbles—and envy—among other plane builders.

In 1940 Lear was awarded the Frank M. Hawks memorial award for the design of a compact aircraft navigation aid.

He later developed an advanced autopilot and progressed to systems by which jet planes could make automatic pilotless landings.

For this the National Aeronautic Association awarded him the Collier aviation trophy in 1950.

One of his pet projects at Lear, Inc., was to buy twin-engine transport planes used by the military during World War II. He overhauled them, put in new engines, plush interiors and sold them as executive planes dubed the Learstar.

Lear sold his interest in the California firm in 1962 and shortly after came here to start Lear Jet Corp.

He found the going tough from the start.

"I was never able to borrow a dollar from any bank in America for this business," Lear said.

Lear put his personal fortune into the business and got the city of Wichita to sell bonds (which he later bought) to finance his initial jet plant. Associates estimate his personal investment at from $7.5 million to $10 million.

He credits his customers' faith, good credit and a way of doing business with making the firm go.

Late last year the Securities and Exchange Commission approved a public stock issue. Of the 4 million shares authorized, 500,000 were sold to the public at $10 per share. Lear retains 1.5 million shares and the remaining two million have not been issued.

Lear's first jet was hardly airborne before he was shopping for another enterprise.

So he opened a factory in Detroit, Mich., to make radio-stereotape players for automobiles. He hopes to add a line of home stereo units which will accept the same tapes. The tape units are also available in his planes.

APPROVAL OF THE MEDICARE BILL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Independent, of Anderson, S.C., on April 12, 1965, published an editorial entitled "'Thank God' Chorus of Older People Is Nationwide." The editorial comments on the overwhelming approval by the House of the administration's medicare bill. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Independent, Apr. 12, 1965]

"THANK GOD" CHORUS OF OLDER PEOPLE IS NATIONWIDE

Overwhelming House approval of the Johnson administration's medicare bill was, as the President said, "a landmark day in the historic evolution of our social security system."

The measure, which provides hospital and nursing care through social security for persons over 65 years of age, is assured of passage in the Senate.

The bill also liberalizes present social security old-age, survivors, and disability benefits. It broadens medical assistance under existing welfare programs.

The 3-to-1 vote by which the House approved this legislation to provide more security and dignity for older citizens represents a smashing victory for the people over entrenched special interests.

The battle to achieve passage of medicare has been fought for almost a decade. It was approved last year by the Senate, but was narrowly defeated in the House.

President Johnson campaigned last year with medicare as the No. 1 plank in his platform. His landslide victory also swept into the House the large Democratic House majority that accounted for the medicare victory.

No longer will older people have to live out their autumnal years in fear that serious illness will wipe out all they have and leave them helpless, hapless, and suffering wards of niggling and negligent public charity.

ANOTHER ALASKA FIRST

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am proud to announce what is believed to be another first for the State of Alaska.

Students at the Manpower Development Training Center, at Anchorage Community College, have organized their own government, and have elected officers.

I have been informed by the U.S. Department of Labor that it has no record of a student government organization at any other such training center.

The effort which went into creating the organization indicates that the center has kindled among the students interest in becoming responsible, productive members of society. It is gratifying to learn that the program is progressing so well toward its goal.

Commendation should be given the news media of Alaska for giving their valuable support to the training program.

Also, I congratulate the officers of the center: Elfrain Romero, president; Angelo Deck, vice president; Susan Anderson, secretary; Evelyn Van Sickle, corresponding secretary; and Pedro Gaviria, treasurer.

A short description of the program is given in the Anchorage Daily News of April 2. I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) News, Apr. 2, 1965]

FIRST OF ITS KIND: COMMUNITY COLLEGE ELECTS STUDENT BODY

The Manpower Development Training Center of the Anchorage Community College has elected Efrain Romero as the first student president of the center.

Following a vigorous campaign other officers installed included Angela Deck, vice president; Susan Anderson, secretary; Evelyn Van Sickle, corresponding secretary; and Pedro Gaviria, treasurer.

The MDTA student government is the idea of the students and faculty of the training center which is located at 670 Fireweed Lane.

Instructors and students hope the new student government will not only meet actual needs of the students but also give a working practice of governmental and political functions.

The center says, as far as it knows, this is the first student organization of its kind in the Nation.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD R. MURROW

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a distinguished and intelligent voice has been stilled. A man who was no small part of America's conscience through times of turmoil is dead. Edward R. Murrow was a man who, as President Johnson has so aptly put it, "subscribed to the proposition that free men and free inquiry are inseparable," and who dedicated years of service as a broadcast newsman and as a servant of his Nation in that belief.

Millions of Americans never will forget, I am sure, the incisive voice of Edward R. Murrow from a London under seige, nor his supremely sane and often courageous ventures into the issues of the day on his "See It Now" program and others. In 1961 we applauded when another great American, President Kennedy, named Ed Murrow to head the U.S. Information Agency, a position which he filled admirably and at great sacrifice. For his talents had brought great financial reward to Edward R. Murrow, whose rise from a Carolina tenant farm to the pinnacle of his profession stands as a tribute to the Nation he

loved. He used to say of his job at USIA that he liked to think he was serving his country. He was. He was serving us all. He served us well.

THE POLITICS OF NATIONAL GREATNESS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the March-April edition of the Alumni magazine of the University of Maryland contains an article entitled "The Politics of National Greatness." This article was written by Prof. Franklin L. Burdette, director of the bureau of governmental research at the University of Maryland. Professor Burdette is a recognized authority, and I am confident that his comments on the current political scene will be of interest to my colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Professor Burdette's 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:

THE POLITICS OF NATIONAL GREATNESS

(By Franklin L. Burdette, professor and director, Bureau of Governmental Research, University of Maryland)

Can the Greaty Society that President Johnson proposes, that is both the slogan and the label of his leadership, become political reality? The simple and even obvious truth is that no one knows, that many hope and believe, that everyone in American will be vastly affected, and that the outcome will be greatly different from the pattern that anyone could now draw.

That a great society might need to be built is an implication which would have startled most Americans after World War I. A generation which had made the world safe for democracy was self-sufficient, isolationist, and complacent in temper. Had not America already attained its greatness, lasting and inevitable? It has always been and is now characteristic of Americans that no significant groups have really doubted the national greatness or the promise of the future. There is a new mode, however—less satisfied but touched with rising moral purpose—just over the national horizon, emergent but not yet triumphant. It has been nurtured by a great series of cataclysmic episodes: depression, the rise of totalitarianism abroad, war both hot and cold, new and almost unbelievable reaches in science and technology, unprecedented surges of cultural and political expectations everywhere in the world.

Americans have had a great society, but we must act to keep up with the times. That is the new imperative. But how shall we act? Seeing the need for action is an expression of national purpose. The nature and timing of action, the fixing of priorities and the allocation of resources are aspects of the grand strategy of deciding and guiding public policy.

STRATEGIES FOR THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Guidelines for political action, or programs that require political endorsement at the highest level for implementation were discernible in the campaign of 1964. They could be summarized by the campaign slogan, "peace, prosperity, preparedness." The first and last of the three are so closely linked as to be almost one. Peace through preparedness is an oversimplified way of putting a complex but overriding national demand. Two essential elements of recent programs for national security have been maintenance of the world's most powerful nuclear deterrent and of an effective Atlantic alliance. Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, advocates a third element in the strategy of national security—the building of modest and limited "bridges of accommodation with the Communist world, not because this approach is inherently more desirable than one of total victory for American interests but because there is no acceptable alternative in the nuclear age." Yet he favors continuance of the nuclear deterrent and the alliance. He said at Southern Methodist University in December: "These, I think, are the three bedrocks of our security: none would be an adequate policy by itself and each contributes to the effectiveness of the other." The Senator's suggestion about bridges of accommodation may presage changes in national policy. But it can also be incorporated in other long-range supplements to security to which the United States is already committed in principle: the evolution and refinement of the United Nations and the world rule of law without resort to a superstate.

Basic prosperity, with which the United States has been blessed in postwar years, is both a national demand and essential to the electoral survival of any administration or political party in office. It rests primarily on the productivity of the free enterprise system. As Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, has said of the development of world trade, "the results we achieve will depend more heavily upon private enterprise than upon Government." Maintenance of prosperity is highly complex, for it involves not only holding existing levels of achievement but also positive progress in economic growth. An insufficient rate of economic growth has been for more than a decade an important cause of pockets of poverty, deprivation, and unemployment. If a family income of $3,000 (or $1,500 for individuals) is used as a minimum standard, about 34 million people in the United States are living in poverty. Another 32 million, more or less, are living in deprivation by a standard of $5,000 for family income (or $2,500 for single person). Moreover, the unemployment rate has been persistently over 5 percent of the civilian labor force. These conditions have deterred economic growth by leaving a huge gap in the potential market for goods and services. The tax-reduction program of the National Government has been intended to stimulate both consumption and investment enterprise. The national antipoverty program has been planned as a means of education and training for employment and also as a way of increasing consumer income and demand.

President Johnson's budget, submitted to Congress on January 25, 1965, proposed: (1) increases of Federal funds for education, health, social security, the war on poverty, urban affairs, and conservation; (2) somewhat reduced expenses for defense, international and space programs, agriculture, and veterans' benefits; and (3) a reduction of about $1.75 billion in excise taxes. As could have been foreseen, the President has been criticized by some liberals for proposing expenditures too low to lift the economy rapidly upward, and by some conservatives for failing to effect possible economies in expenditure. The President's own sense of the politic has kept the budget below a $100 billion figure.

POLITICAL PARTIES AND THE STAKES OF POWER

The Democratic Party is now overwhelmingly the majority party in this country. Over half of American adults identify themselves in some degree with it. The latest polls report that only some 25 percent of Americans consider themselves Republicans. What we know of political behavior also suggests that party identification is the largest single factor in determining a voter's preference among candidates running for office in a partisan election. The dominance of the Democratic Party is likely to be changed only by a series of critical elections, as they are sometimes called, in which the primary allegiance of great numbers of voters is shifted. The election of 1896 brought a large change of voter allegiance from the Democratic to the Republican Party, which thereafter became basically dominant in American national politics for more than 30 years. The election of 1936 brought a mass shift in the other direction, although there are strong statistical evidences of growing voter preferences for the Democratic Party in the cities of the East, particularly in New England, as early as 1928. Even in a period of party dominance, the opposition may win a national election—and without a major change in voter allegiance. Woodrow Wilson was elected President in 1912 as a result of a split in Republican ranks, and reelected on his record as an advocate of peace and progress. Eisenhower was elected in 1952 by voters weary of military stalemate in Korea and in tribute to his personal image as a leader above petty partisanship, a major factor in his reelection in 1956.

In the past 70 years the major parties have had, in their respective periods of dominance, the primary loyalty of great numbers of industrial workers. As the modern Democratic Party has been the party of the New Deal and the Great Society, the Republican Party was once the party of the full dinner pail.

If the lessons of the past have validity, the dominant party must exert progressive leadership for economic opportunity and national development. If it loses that advantage, it loses the allegiance of its voter majority. The greatest peril to a party is that it may lose its image of leadership, that it may become ossified in times of changing conditions.

The United States is rapidly changing. Not only is population vastly expanding, it is becoming younger. The postwar birth rate is making the electorate, statistically, the youngest in the Nation's history. It is also an educated electorate, with relatively high job and income security. With the exception of pockets of poverty and deprivation, which may themselves give way to progress, economic issues are being pushed aside by demands for educational, recreational, and other cultural programs. The farm bloc and even organized labor, sure to remain politically important in decades to come, are relatively less numerous in the electorate as automation and other technological changes tend to supersede unskilled and semiskilled workers, whose electoral strength is being replaced by that of growing numbers of voters whose work is in middle management. As elemental economic considerations become less basic in predominant political motivation, moral and cultural aspirations become more so. It is surely no accident that the civil rights movement has come at such a time. Significant also is the fact that Negroes are turning from protest to politics. It is not lost in the minds of politicians that President Johnson's victory in four Southern States depended on the votes of Negroes.

Decisions of the Supreme Court on legislative apportionment and districting, widely affecting the politics of an urbanizing America, will have mixed repercussions for both majority and minority parties. The ultimate results may well force parties to be more rather than less adaptable to changing circumstances, less rather than more sure of stable majorities.

American mobility and the impact of mass communications media have tended to nationalize the appeals and activities of both parties. The decline of localism—especially in suburban areas and in spreading cities where voter identification with grassroots politics or even with community governmental services in minimal—has at the same time reduced the effective operation of permanent political organization.

With all the winds of change, there is no sound evidence that the Republican Party will disappear. On the contrary, the present

large majority of the Democrats holds a new invitation to factionalism and disunity, as did the large majority of the Republican Party in its day in power. The advantages of the two-party system, of the loyal opposition (to use a favorite expression of former President Eisenhower) are deeply rooted in law and custom. The task of each party is to recruit and maintain responsible leadership, sensitive to the claims of progress, and much of the vigor and contribution of each of the parties will depend on how well it is done. The number of Americans who put party above country, or even above a central issue, is very small indeed. For an increasingly large number of voters, partisanship is incidental. Voters not only hedge their partisanship by splitting tickets; many of them willingly support able candidates on individual merit. An educated electorate the more readily recognizes that the demagog appeals to fragments rather to the whole of man's nature. In a society open to the participation of all its citizens, a society that we may properly call both free and great, it is the function of electorally responsible leadership to engage in political education and in the engineering of consent. The electoral rewards of responsibility have become more and more apparent in American politics.

Comparing the Roosevelt and Johnson mandates

Year	Popular vote	Percent	Number of Representatives				Number of Senators		
			Year	Democrats	Republicans	Other	Democrats	Republicans	Other
1932:									
Roosevelt	22,821,857	57.41	1933	310	117	5	60	35	1
Hoover	15,761,841	39.65							
1936:									
Roosevelt	27,752,841	60.80	1937	331	89	13	76	16	4
Landon	16,679,491	36.54							
1940:									
Roosevelt	27,243,466	54.69	1941	268	162	5	66	28	2
Wilkie	22,334,413	44.83							
1944:									
Roosevelt	25,612,474	53.39	1945	242	190	2	56	38	1
Dewey	22,017,570	45.89							
1964:									
Johnson	[1] 41,523,172	61.40	1965	296	139		68	32	
Goldwater	[1] 26,171,832	38.60							

[1] Unofficial.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, through all the years of my life, it has been a source of satisfaction to me to participate in private and public efforts for conservation.

Personally, I have always been deeply interested in land and natural resources. Publicly, I have always done as much as I could for the constructive work of conservation in both State and Federal Government.

The word "conservation" has great meaning to me, however it is used. The word comes from "conserve," which, according to Webster, means "to keep in a safe and sound state." This is a high and worthy purpose, whether applied to natural resources or to political principles and institutions. The political definition of a conservative, again according to Webster, is one who "favors conservation of existing institutions and forms of government."

But it is not my purpose today to discuss political conservatism. April 27th was the 30th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service. The act establishing the Service was signed on April 27, 1935.

I am told that—with Senators CARL HAYDEN and RICHARD RUSSELL—I am one of three Members of the Senate who were here when the act was passed. This is a program I am pleased to have supported.

Since we are observing the anniversary of an act of Congress of 30 years ago, I shall take the liberty of indulging in a little reminiscing. Let me recall March 4, 1933, when President Franklin Roosevelt and I took the oath of office.

We Democrats in 1932 voted in the New Deal on a great platform that stirred my enthusiasm. I am still enthusiastic about that platform, and to this day I am the most loyal of the original New Dealers in the Democratic Party.

I shall quote just a few passages from that 1932 New Deal platform, to back me up in the statement I have just made. I quote directly from the platform:

> We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people, to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and the people are entitled to know in plain words the contract to which they are asked to subscribe.

Now I shall quote some of the plain words of that contract between the New Deal and the people who entrusted them with power. These plain words in the platform included these which I quote:

> We advocate immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent of the cost of the Federal Government.

There we old New Dealers stand. Admittedly, there is not much left to stand on; but, then, there are not many of us left standing. Just let me quote again. That platform said:

> We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced and a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards.

And to conclude these quotations from the original New Deal platform of 1932, it said we stood for—

> the removal of government from all fields of private enterprise, except where necessary to develop public works and natural resources in the common interest.

The Soil Conservation Service was one of the most productive agencies to spring from that platform; and for 30 years it has administered one of the most constructive programs of the Federal Government. This is a service to provide technical assistance in soil and water conservation, and watershed protection and flood prevention. Its primary job is to help farmers and ranchers individually, and in groups, to do conservation work on land.

It has been my great privilege to observe closely the development following this program in Virginia. There are 31 soil conservation districts in Virginia. There is reason to be proud of their accomplishments:

More than 30,000 farmers have developed conservation farm plans.

More than 1¼ million acres are under conservation cropping systems.

There are 14½ million feet of tile drains.

There are nearly 500 million feet of open drains.

More than 23,000 farm ponds have been built.

A quarter of a million acres have been planted in trees.

Nearly 25,000 acres have been established in wildlife development.

Landowners and operators in Virginia have invested well over $70 million of their money in applying conservation practices to the land, in connection with this program.

Nationwide, technicians of the Soil Conservation Service have helped some 2 million farmers and ranchers, whose farms and ranches cover more than half a billion acres.

It is a privilege and a pleasure for me to stand on the floor of the Senate and, from personal observations, to say here is a Federal agency and program which have earned the highest tribute described by the words—"Well done—in good, efficient, and constructive service."

"CONSERVATION AND THE GOOD LIFE"—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY UDALL

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, on April 20, the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, addressed the New Hampshire Governor's Conference on Outdoor Recreation. In view of the

increased focus of attention on preserving our natural resources throughout the Nation, I commend to my colleagues the Secretary's thoughful remarks on "Conservation and the Good Life."

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Udall's splendid speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CONSERVATION AND THE GOOD LIFE

(Remarks of Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, at the New Hampshire Governor's Conference on Outdoor Recreation, Concord, N.H., Tuesday evening, Apr. 20, 1965)

Less than 3 months ago President Johnson sent to Congress a message on the natural beauty of our country. The response has been overwhelming, and unprecedented. In the vernacular, the President struck a nerve. It was as if the entire Nation had been waiting for someone to point out that natural beauty and the good life go hand in hand.

And that is what I wish to talk about today—the good life.

For that is the meaning of the Great Society. The good life is the Great Society translated into individual terms. It seems to me that a man has a right to be able to open his eyes in the morning and see trees. His daily trip to work should be in pleasant surroundings. He should find satisfaction in his job, and in the physical atmosphere in which he works. He should enjoy his evenings at home, and his children should have been able to partake of the realm of nature after school. And on Saturdays and holidays and during vacations, he should find satisfactions, whether they derive of the primitive outdoors, the languor of a well-filled waterfront, or the excitement of the theater and its kindred pursuits.

These are the meanings of President Johnson's message on natural beauty. These are the implications of his discussions of beauty and our highways, or rivers, trails, pollution, urban needs, and much more.

These are the reasons he proposed new Federal recreation areas at Assateague Island down on the Maryland-Virginia coast, at Tocks Island on the Delaware in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and at 10 other specific locations throughout the Nation.

The quest for the good life is why he proposed a White House Conference on Natural Beauty and Conservation. This now has been set for May 24 and May 25 in Washington. Laurance Rockefeller will be Chairman to this illustrious gathering of perhaps 800 top business, Government, and conservation leaders. Some 15 small discussion panels will talk about automobile junkyards and burying unsightly electric power transmission lines and other new ideas and approaches.

We look for the White House Conference to serve as focal point for a larger public education effort. This is needed to alert Americans both to the dangers to our natural heritage and to the possibilities for action that will help produce the good life.

The charter contained in the message on natural beauty is broad, yet specific. For city problems, the open space program and the new land and water conservation fund are mentioned. So are more attention to architecture, roadbuilding, preservation of historical structures, careful suburban planning, programs of extending university resources to communities, and a series of local Federal park demonstration projects.

The object: to help make the good life an urban reality.

The message on natural beauty proposed landscaping certain Federal highways, more roadside rest, and recreation areas, attention to possibilities of a national system of scenic roads and parkways, billboard and junkyard control legislation.

The object, again: to help make urban and rural life a good life.

The far-reaching message on natural beauty proposed a cooperative Federal-State-local trail program for those who like to walk, ride horseback, or go bicycling. It sought clean water, clean air, better waste disposal, more care in use of pesticides, more environmental health research.

Why these recommendations? The search for the good life.

Outstanding in an outstanding message was support for the proposal that this Nation should establish a national system of wild rivers. We have dedicated rivers for navigation. We have set aside rivers for municipal and industrial water supply. We have preempted rivers for sewage disposal. We have earmarked rivers for irrigation. We have dammed rivers for hydroelectric power. Well and good; we have needed rivers for these purposes. We need rivers for recreation, just as much and often far more than we need them for these other purposes. Wild rivers legislation now pending before the Congress would dedicate to recreation a national system of wild rivers.

This legislation proposes that segments of six fine wild rivers be named now as National Wild Rivers. These are the Rogue of Oregon, the Salmon of Idaho, the Clearwater of Idaho, the Green of Wyoming, the Suwannee of Georgia and Florida, and Rio Grande of New Mexico.

The legislation suggests that nine other rivers, all wild in many aspects, be studied as possible later additions to the national system.

Three other rivers—the Allagash in your neighboring State of Maine, the St. Croix and its tributary, the Namekagon of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and the Buffalo of Arkansas will be the subjects of other legislation, similar to that which established the Ozark Scenic National Riverways in Missouri during the past Congress.

Wild rivers and the good life go hand in hand, particularly in a nation with the frontier heritage which profits us so much even today.

I shall return to a major aspect of the President's message on natural beauty in a few moments. First, though, I feel that I should mention two other bills relating to the kind of life we lead or want to lead. Both involve water. One is called the Federal water project recreation bill. This measure sets up prospective standard guidelines for allocating capital construction costs of Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects. Under this proposal, States or other public bodies could share part of the recreation costs of Federal water resource projects, thus making possible many projects that otherwise might not get built. This measure has passed the Senate and had hearings in the House.

The other measure which I have in mind is the Water Quality Act of 1965. Its purpose is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to set a national policy for prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution. Does this sound like the message on natural beauty? Indeed, it does; it goes to the root of one of our worst problems. New authorities under this measure would reside in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Waste treatment construction grants, on a matched-fund basis, are doubled, among other provisions. We need this measure to help achieve the good life. The Senate agrees; it has passed the bill. The House seems to feel the same; the bill has been reported out of committee.

Now let us devote ourselves for the remainder of our time exclusively to outdoor recreation, although I think I hardly have mentioned a subject yet that isn't outdoor recreation. Municipal open space involves outdoor recreation. Primitive back-country trails involve outdoor recreation. County parks and reservoirs involve outdoor recreation. Private resorts and motels and sports areas are involved in outdoor recreation.

At times I hear questions about the value of outdoor recreation. The arch typical question seems to be, "Sure a park would be wonderful, but we need the land on the tax rolls."

I say this here and now. Land in parks and forests may be and quite often is more valuable to a community than that same land is on the tax rolls. Most urban land still on the tax rolls goes into residential developments. Before accepting the tax roll argument, I suggest that we total costs of new schools, new roads, added police service, more sewage mains and all the other commitments necessary to any housing development. And contrast this with increased values in areas surrounding land dedicated to open spaces. Why is the highest priced land often around golf courses? Ask the city of Minneapolis about this. They will tell you that their magnificent park developments have increased surrounding land values several times more than the cost of the system. The New York City Planning Commission says open space brings more profit to cities than the floor space which it replaces.

In our own Federal experience we have seen this: at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, at Grand Teton National Park, around Lake Texhoma, we have seen values of surrounding property increase, tax rates lower, bank deposits increase, retail sales rise.

Outdoor recreation is big business, more than $20 billion per year in goods and services. I don't have to tell New Hampshire people this. What have the summer homes meant to the economy of this State? What about ski slopes, although this is a poor year to bring up this subject? These result in increases in goods and services that are vital to the economic life of this State. Keeping abreast and ahead of the demand for outdoor recreation is one of the prime necessities for this State, and every State.

You approved $10 million for recreation loans and State parks in 1961. Many of your neighboring States have taken similar action. You now are engaged in developing a comprehensive statewide plan, with a comprehensive outdoor recreation plan as an integral part.

This plan will consider public and private, State and local, recreation needs, demand, programs, and other factors.

It is my understanding that you are considering extending your bond issue to provide money needed to match Federal funds under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. According to our more recent calculations, New Hampshire might qualify for somewhere in the neighborhood of $900,000 per year of Federal funds under this new act. This could be used for recreation planning, acquisition, and development. Part of it could be reallocated to the State's political subdivisions.

I understand that you added 3,664 acres to your park system in 1964. Improved the existing physical plant at many locations, and entertained more than 2,700,000 recreation users. In addition, you operate some Federal recreation lands under lease and, I hear, have your eye on other land in the event that it becomes surplus to the needs of our Military Establishment.

We are delighted to see your emphasis on these matters. State action on recreation problems will be of far greater benefit and will be far easier to justify to the doubting

with comprehensive planning as a foundation.

Your support of outdoor recreation has parallels throughout the Nation. Indeed, it led Congress to pass the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. This measure for the first time gives us a continuing source of funds to use in meeting our National and State recreation needs. A continuing source, based largely on pay-as-you-go revenues.

The President has asked Congress to appropriate $125 million this year from this new fund, about 60 percent of it to the States in matching grants. We have worked to devise a reasonable and fair formula for allocating to the States whatever appropriations result. Under the statute, each State gets an equal share of two-fifths of the moneys available to the States, assuming that the State matches the Federal money as required.

The remaining 60 percent of the State's share is divided as follows: 40 percent on the basis of population. Five percent on the basis of out-of-State use. Ten percent in relation to Federal resources and programs in the State. Five percent reserved for contingency.

The folks at the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation can give you more details. I know that some of you have been disturbed at not having the Federal money in hand already, even though Congress has yet to complete action on appropriations. I would say to you that translating the land and water conservation fund into operating reality entails tremendous work by both administrating and benefiting agencies. It takes numerous legal interpretations. And reasonable amounts of time.

The land and water conservation fund was hailed as landmark legislation by President Johnson when he signed it into law last September. Nothing has developed to discount his statement. On the contrary, we are only now beginning to glimpse its real potential in many areas. It is mandatory to its long-range success that we get the fund off on the right foot during its initial year of operation. Much that all of us will acknowledge as being of the good life depends on how well we accomplish this task.

Now in conclusion I want to turn salesman. I am selling $7 recreation conservation stickers. It's the finest outdoor recreation bargain you'll ever get. For $7 you get to visit all the national park system, all the national forest system, the national wildlife refuges, the Nation's reservoirs, its seashores—any and every Federal recreation area where admission is charged. And you get more than this for your $7. You get to take your whole family—as many people as you can crowd into your car—into all these Federal areas for an entire year.

Yet no one is forced to buy this recreation/conservation sticker to get into the Federal recreation areas. You can pay the 1-day admission fees, if you desire. Or, if you use only one particular park or forest throughout the year, we have an individual permit available. This costs no more than five times the individual daily rate. Children under 16 and conducted educational touring groups don't have to pay.

Evidences of unhappiness and dissatisfaction with the $7 recreation/conservation sticker are developing in some localities. I find this understandable, for in many instances we are requiring entrance charges for the first time. I think most dissatisfaction will evaporate as the value and purposes of the recreation/conservation sticker become better known. Yet I ask your help now, as a salesman, in telling people what this sticker is for. I expect to see this little 3-inch-square pressure-sensitive label evolve into something bigger. I expect to see it become the symbol of our concern with outdoor recreation, a sign that the holder is willing to pay a share of the cost of the benefits he enjoys.

Certainly right now it is the index of public concern with outdoor recreation needs. We expect to sell possibly 5 million of these $7 stickers this year. This revenue, together with proceeds from sale of surplus Federal real property and Federal motorboat fuel taxes, is the nucleus of the land and water conservation fund. It is these three sources of revenues, together with any other moneys which Congress may advance to the fund, that provide the approximately $900,000 per year which may be available as grants-in-aid to New Hampshire. These same revenues will help to acquire recreation areas already authorized in Federal legislation, many of them in your vicinity.

The recreation conservation sticker will be on sale at or near entrances to all Federal recreation areas where it can be used for admission. Many offices of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture will maintain stocks of the sticker for sale. We are negotiating with several private associations and companies with vital travel interests to stock and sell the new $7 stickers.

If you don't think you can find any other place to buy a sticker, send a check or money order to me or to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior in Washington. We will send you a sticker by registered mail.

We are doing our best to sell the recreation/conservation sticker and to administer the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act in full harmony with the spirit of the President's message on national beauty. It is our intention to make creative contributions to carry out the conservation objectives which he holds before us.

In this message the President told us how to open a window on the good life. He said: "We must not only protect the countryside and save it from destruction, we must restore what has been destroyed and salvage the beauty and charm of our cities. Our conservation must not be just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare, but the dignity of man's spirit."

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE DAVID A. PINE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as part of these remarks, an article entitled "A Model for the Judiciary," written by the eminent journalist, Arthur Krock.

The article is devoted to the great work of Judge David A. Pine, an outstanding jurist of his time. I think the article should appear in the RECORD, because, in my opinion, it deserves the widest possible dissemination.

Not only does Mr. Krock describe the work of a great jurist; he also quotes directly from a speech by Judge Pine at the College of William and Mary, in Virginia, when the founding of two oldest law schools in the world—those at Oxford and at William and Mary—was being observed.

These statements should be read by every lawyer and every judge, every citizen and every student in the country.

The celebration at William and Mary was chaired by the Honorable Otto Lowe, an alumnus of the William and Mary Law School, and a distinguished member of the Virginia and the American Bar Associations.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 20, 1965]

IN THE NATION: A MODEL FOR THE JUDICIARY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 19.—"If conscientious, able, and independent men are put on the bench," wrote Charles Evans Hughes in his Columbia University lectures (1927), "you cannot predict their course as judges by reference either to partisan motives or personal or party loyalties." And no member of the American judiciary fits this description more closely than David A. Pine, who has just voluntarily changed his status from chief judge of the Federal courts of the District of Columbia to senior judge of this branch.

AUTHORIZED CHANGE

This change, authorized as an alternative to retiring by a recent act of Congress, enables Judge Pine to continue his service by sitting in a substantial number of cases of his own choosing. And this service has been most notably rendered in a number of judgments which are landmarks in the dispensing of impartial justice. For Hughes' adjective "conscientious," as applied to Judge Pine, especially fits his inflexible practice of deferring decision until both sides of a case have been fully presented. Also, in the concept that the standard of justice is the law of the case and not what he thinks would help formulate some new public policy he finds desirable.

Three celebrated rulings, and an address on the Constitution at William and Mary College, are sufficient examples of the contribution Judge Pine has made to the equitable administration of the law and the preservation of the American constitutional system since he was appointed by President F. D. Roosevelt, whom he had served in other legal posts. The first ruling grew out of the seizure of the steel industry by President Truman in 1952. This was done on a claim of inherent Presidential powers, under the Constitution to forestall an emergency to the national interest created by a contemplated strike.

The Youngstown Sheet & Tube companies, and other plants seized under the Executive order, sought an injunction. After stressing the principle that this is a government of limited, enumerated, and delegated powers, and taking note of the constitutional powers expressly granted to the President, Judge Pine rejected the argument that emergency situations permitted the President to expand them as in this instance.

"I believe," he wrote, "that the contemplated strike, if it came, with all its awful results, would be less injurious to the public interest than the injury which would flow from a timorous judicial recognition that there is some basis to this claim to unlimited and unrestrained Executive power, which would be implicit in a failure to grant the injunction."

U.S.S.R. EMBASSY CASE

Twelve years later three members of the Board of Zoning Adjustment in the District of Columbia, two of whom were minor Government employees, were secretly advised that high Federal officials wanted the Board to agree to permit the U.S.S.R. to erect an embassy office in a residential zone from which such structures are prohibited. The exception was ordered. Judge Pine vacated it, ruling that since there was no public record of any of these Government pressures on the Zoning Board members, the neighbors

who objected had been denied a fair and impartial hearing. They were, he said, "entitled to the same fairness * * * and impartiality as are expected in a court of law."

Consistent with the above was Judge Pine's action to protect those General Aniline stockholders who, or whose agents, were not present in court to express either approval or disapproval of a consent decree settlement of ownership which had been reached between the U.S. Government and the Swiss holding company. He refused to put his signature on a decree negotiated in such circumstances.

The William and Mary College speech was at the 175th anniversary of the establishment of the first chair of law in this country, and commemorated the institution's most famous graduate—Chief Justice Marshall. The following excerpt illustrates Judge Pine's constitutional philosophy:

RESIST USURPATIONS

"Follow the example of the Founding Fathers and be as alertly fearful * * * of usurpation of power [by any of the three Federal branches], the forerunner of tyranny and despotism. * * * What I ask you to fear are attacks on the flanks (of the Constitution) made in the cause of expediency and supported by vast popular demands of the moment. * * * If conditions require a change in the Constitution in its basic provisions, let it be done by the manner provided therein. * * * I believe Marshall * * * would be equally fervent in opposing a nationalism or liberalism in construction [as he was against] any narrow debilitating States rights doctrine of his day."

REPORT ON POPULATION RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION MEETING IN DUBLIN, IRELAND

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Economic and Social Committee of the Interparliamentary Union, meeting in Dublin on April 19–25, approved a far-reaching set of recommendations relating to the subject: "The Demographic Problem and the Forthcoming United Nations Conference on World Population." As one of the U.S. representatives on this committee, I am happy to report that all the recommendations submitted by the U.S. delegation were adopted by the committee.

Two of these recommendations are of particular interest to Congress:

The 54th Interparlimentary Conference:

2. Urges the governments of developed countries which are in a position to provide assistance for dealing with population problems to cooperate to the fullest extent possible with the United Nations and with the governments of interested developing countries in providing such assistance;

3. Calls upon the United Nations, interested governments, and appropriate nongovernmental scientific institutions and organizations to intensify research on all aspects of population problems, including medical research, and research on economic, social, educational, cultural, and organizational problems involved in implementing effective population programs;

Both of these recommendations were submitted by the U.S. group. Both were among the U.S. recommendations that were adopted by the committee.

There is presently before the Senate a bill which would put the U.S. Government into a position whereby it could begin to take action along the lines which it went on record as supporting at the Inter-Parliamentary Conference. Senate bill 1676, introduced by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and cosponsored by seven other Senators, of which I am honored to be one, would create an Assistant Secretary of State for Population Problems and an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Health, Medical Services, and Population Problems. These two Assistant Secretaries, with the support of the Offices for Population Problems, which would be set up under them, would provide the Federal Government with sub-Cabinet-level officials devoting full time to the domestic and international aspects of a problem which, along with the threat of nuclear annihilation, ranks as one of the two great problems facing mankind today. I urge early enactment of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the draft resolution presented by the United States and the final resolution approved by the Economic and Social Committee of the Inter-Parliamentary Union be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE DEMOGRAPHIC PROBLEM AND THE FORTHCOMING UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON WORLD POPULATION

(Item 2 of the agenda: Draft resolution submitted by the U.S. group)

Noting the recent declaration by the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization to the United Nations Population Commission that we must "take the fullest measures both to raise productivity and to stabilize population growth, or we will face disaster of an unprecedented magnitude";

Further noting the serious concern expressed in reply to an inquiry by the Secretary-General of the United Nations by many governments of developing countries about the slow rate of economic growth in their countries in relation to the high rate of their population growth;

Noting with appreciation the initiative of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East in convening the Asian Population Conference in December 1963 and the recommendations of that conference as endorsed by ECAFE in its resolution 54 (XX);

Noting with satisfaction the high priority given by the United Nations Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology, inter alia, to the "objective of a more complete understanding of population problems";

Taking into account the action of the United Nations Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1048 (XXXVII) in inviting "the General Assembly, the regional economic commissions and the Population Commission to make recommendations with a view to intensifying the work of the United Nations in assisting the governments of the interested developing countries to deal with the population problems confronting them," and urging "the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies concerned to explore ways and means of strengthening and expanding their work in the field of population";

Commending the United Nations for organizing a World Population Conference to be held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, in September 1965;

1. Recommends that the United Nations and the specialized agencies, including the World Health Organization, proceed as rapidly as is feasible in expanding the scope of the assistance which they are prepared to give, upon the request of Governments, in the development not only of statistics and research, but also of experimentation and action programs relating to population problems;

2. Urges the governments of developed countries which are in a position to provide assistance for dealing with population problems to cooperate to the fullest extent possible with the United Nations and with the Governments of interested developing countries in providing such assistance;

3. Calls upon the United Nations, interested governments, and appropriate nongovernmental scientific institutions and organizations to intensify research on all aspects of population problems, including medical research and research on economic, social, cultural, and organizational problems involved in implementing effective population programs.

4. Requests governments to facilitate participation in the forthcoming World Population Conference of outstanding scholars, scientists, and other experts in all relevant fields from both developing and developed countries.

THE DEMOGRAPHIC PROBLEM AND THE FORTHCOMING UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON WORLD POPULATION

(Draft resolution adopted by the Economic and Social Committee)

The 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Taking into consideration that, according to U.N. data, today's world population of approximately 3.3 billion people is expected to double by the year 2000;

Further taking into consideration that this growth of population will occur especially in the developing countries;

Noting that the decline in the high mortality rate, which is the result of the general advance in the application of medical science and an almost complete stop in the spread of epidemics which previously caused the death of millions, is the main reason for this future, rapid growth of world population;

Recognizing that, if any nation's population rises faster than its wealth, its standard of living must inevitably fall and therefore it follows that control of population, by whatever means acceptable, is as important as the increase of the national wealth;

Taking into consideration that measures to solve the population problem should be brought into effect with regard to the various specific conditions of the development of population in individual countries;

Taking further into account that, for the future number of world inhabitants and for the growth of their living standards, it is essential to insure a speedier growth of their vital resources in relation to the growth of population, that is, foodstuffs and other consumer goods, housing, etc.;

Believing that the growth of vital resources must be insured by a faster economic development, especially by the development of the underdeveloped regions;

Noting that, in the developing countries, favorable social conditions, such as political and economic sovereignty, economic growth, development of the public sector, solution of the agrarian problems, etc., are necessary for the solution of population problems;

Commending the United Nations for organizing a World Population Conference to be held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, in September 1965;

1. Recommends that the United Nations and the specialized agencies, including the World Health Organization, proceed as rapidly as is feasible in expanding the scope of the assistance which they are prepared to give, upon the request of governments, in the development not only of statistics and

research, but also of experimentation and action programs relating to population problems;

2. Urges the governments of developed countries which are in a position to provide assistance for dealing with population problems to cooperate to the fullest extent possible with the United Nations and with the governments of interested developing countries in providing such assistance;

3. Calls upon the United Nations, interested governments and appropriate nongovernmental scientific institutions and organizations to intensify research on all aspects of population problems, including medical research and research on economic, social, educational, cultural and organizational problems involved in implementing effective population programs;

4. Urges all parliaments to exercise influence on governments to facilitate participation in the forthcoming World Population Conference of outstanding scholars, scientists and other experts in all relevant fields from both developing and developed countries;

5. Calls on all countries to mobilize their resources for the growth and fairer distribution of the world's wealth and for the harmonious development of the world's population.

U.S. POLICY ON SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of April 21, Joseph Alsop set forth in his column a well-reasoned and much-needed explication of the wisdom of the Johnson administration's policy on South Vietnam.

Mr. Alsop discussed in detail the fallacies behind the wishful thinking of the critics of President Johnson who are arguing for peace at any price. He draws an interesting parallel between those who would retreat in the face of the threat of Chinese intervention and those who, a generation ago, counseled appeasement of Nazi Germany.

I commend this article to my colleagues, and 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:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 21, 1965]

POMPOUS IGNORANCE

(By Joseph Alsop)

One proof of the wisdom of President Johnson's Vietnamese policy is its marked success to date.

One must always be prepared for bad news. But it must also be said that since the Pleiku episode drove the President to take determined action, he and his policymakers have been calling the shots with quite unprecedented accuracy.

Another proof of the President's wisdom is the kind of criticism his policy has thus far invited. It is bad enough when Senator FULBRIGHT allows himself to ruminate in public on the desirability of "stopping the bombings." Apparently the Senator believes that this is the best way to promote negotiations on an acceptable basis. One can only reply that credulity is a cherished senatorial prerogative.

A more detailed reply is demanded, however, by the increasing barrage of such pieces as one just published by Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau, of the University of Chicago. Morgenthau is an interesting figure; for he plays almost the same key role among the modern appeasers that Geoffrey Damson, of the Times of London played in the be-nice-to-Hitler group in England before 1939.

The resemblance is curiously exact, moreover. "We are deluding ourselves in Vietnam," says Professor Morgenthau and he gives two main proofs for this assertion. First, he warns that we are getting Communist China's back up, which he thinks dangerous because he also thinks that the Chinese Communists are "the wave of the future."

He does not quite use that phrase from the old days. But his explanations of the need to recognize Communist China as "the dominant power in Asia" appear to have been borrowed, almost in toto, from the old Times of London leaders about the need to recognize Hitler's Germany as the dominant power in Europe.

But just as credulity must always be recognized as an inalienable senatorial prerogative, so the right of professors of political science to play at being realists must also be acknowledged. What is not pardonable in any serious academic figure is simple, pompous ignorance such as is revealed by Professor Morgenthau's statement that "the military conquest of Tibet" is an exceptional episode in Chinese history.

This statement is the key to the second Morgenthau argument, that if no one gets China's back up, China will leave her neighbors to "live peacefully in (her) shadow." But the central fact of Chinese history, its most impressive—indeed, awe inspiring—aspect, is the tirelessness with which the Chinese people have resumed the task of conquest whenever an opportunity offered.

China, properly so-called, appears when her history begins as a rather small region in the Yellow River Valley. Since then, China has regularly expanded whenever a strong central government possessed the means to do so. Even in this century, when China's government was weak for so long, the geographical area of ethnic China—the territory mainly inhabited by people of Chinese blood—has nonetheless more than doubled.

Manchuria is fully Sinified. Inner Mongolia is largely digested. The huge province of Sikang, where tribal peoples lived in effective independence until the end of the Second World War, is already being swallowed down. In one or two more generations the Tibetans, if they survive at all, are only likely to survive outside Tibet. And the ancient peoples of central Asia have heard their doom proclaimed.

Even in southeast Asia, both the Vietnamese and the Thais are refugee peoples, long ago pushed out of what is now China by Chinese pressure. In these circumstances, expecting the Chinese to let their neighbors alone, if everyone is just nice to them, is really a great deal sillier than the old be-nice-to-Hitler arguments.

That does not mean that the Chinese people are evil or perverted. On the contrary, they are enviably intelligent, industrious, courageous and in all ways talented. There is a grain of truth among Professor Morgenthau's silly chaff, in the sense that the formidable qualities of the Chinese people also make them a formidable problem.

One way to solve the problem, to be sure, is to recognize the Chinese as the Asian herrenvolk, and to allow them to gobble their neighbors at will, even though their neighbors happen to be our friends and allies. If Professor Morgenthau possessed enough forthrightness to recommend this solution, he could not be called ignorant, although he might perhaps be criticized on other grounds.

It seems a bit better, however, to stand fast by our allies; to defend our own vital position as a Pacific power, and to hope, with good reason, that the evolutionary power of time and the native strength of the Chinese people will eventually bring the present bout of Chinese governmental Stalinism to an end.

SENATOR McGEE HONORED BY WOOL INDUSTRY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a much-deserved honor that has come to one of our colleagues, Senator GALE MCGEE, of Wyoming, who on May 6 will receive the Golden Fleece Award of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

Senator MCGEE has been interested in the encouragement of the wool industry in the Nation and in his home State, throughout his career in the Senate, which actually started prior to his election to the Senate, when he served as assistant to the late, respected Senator Joseph P. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming.

He is currently the author of a bill to extend the Wool Act for a 7-year period.

I know that the Members of the Senate will join me in congratulating the National Association of Wool Manufacturers for the excellent selection they have made, for we all know the Wyoming Senator—and none better than I, these days—as an energetic exponent of every cause he undertakes.

Senator MCGEE's sponsorship of the Food Marketing Commission, last year, now holding hearings and making extensive studies of the food-marketing institutions of the Nation, is another splendid example of his effectiveness.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release issued by the National Wool Manufacturers, announcing its selection of Senator MCGEE as one of this year's recipients of its Golden Fleece Award.

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

NEW YORK, April 18.—Three men of accomplishment—a U.S. textile executive, an international wool promotion director and a U.S. Senator—will receive Golden Fleece Awards of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers at its 100th annual meeting dinner here on May 6 at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. The awards are given for achievement in the recipient's chosen field.

As announced by Roger D. Newell, Newell Textile Sales Co., arrangements committee chairman, the awards will go to:

Ely R. Callaway, Jr., 45, executive vice president of Burlington Industries, Inc., and a director of NAWM who is active in the continuing effort to obtain safeguards against low-wage wool textile and apparel imports.

U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, 50, of Wyoming, a major wool-producing State, who is one of the most active Senate leaders working on the wool product import problem, which President Johnson has publicly recognized, pledging that his administration will vigorously seek a solution.

William J. Vines, 48, managing director, International Wool Secretariat, London, which recently launched a worldwide wool market promotion program handled here by its U.S. office, the wool bureau.

Presenting the awards on behalf of NAWM, one of the oldest national trade organizations, will be Arlene Francis, famous actress and television personality. She performed the same function in 1960 when she herself received a Golden Fleece Award in a surprise ceremony.

Mr. Newell said that "the association is proud of its century of service but that NAWM and the wool textile industry are looking to the future and the Golden Fleece

recipients illustrate this point because they are young men with many years of achievement still ahead of them."

ARMENIAN DAY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, among the many nationalities which inhabit the area we refer to as the Middle East, few can claim as long a history as the Armenians. The Armenians enjoyed a long tradition of self-government, prosperity, and intellectual achievement.

Although Armenia became a part of the various multinational empires which have ruled much of the eastern Mediterranean area since antiquity, the Armenians were generally able to maintain their individuality and their traditions.

We recognize, today, the right of all nationality groups to independence; yet this was a new and dangerous philosophy in the 19th century, when the Armenians formed nationalist groups and began to agitate for such independence from the empire of which they then formed a part: the Ottoman. The Ottoman authorities tried to repress their movement, and began a brutal series of repressions in an attempt to convince the Armenians of the futility of their legitimate demands.

Beginning in 1895, and lasting for over two decades, the Ottoman Empire took nearly every opportunity to literally massacre the Armenians. In campaign after campaign, the armies of the empire slaughtered thousands upon thousands of men, women, and children in an effort to rid the empire, either by death or by exile, of the Armenians.

Now, 50 years after the most savage and inhuman of these campaigns began, the Armenians give us pause for reflection, for they provide us with reassuring and moving proof that the will of a people to self-determination and liberty can never be eradicated, no matter what the means.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MOSS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I believe that all public officeholders and those who seek public office should make full disclosure of their income, financial assets, business relationships, and every other matter which might be a basis for conflict of interest. I know of no conflict of interest on my part.

I receive an annual salary of $30,000 from the U.S. Senate.

Since coming to the Senate, I have earned approximately $1,000 as honorariums for speeches.

I receive no income from the practice of law or from any business. Upon my election to the Senate, I withdrew from the law practice entirely; and since then I have received no income of any kind—present or future—from the law practice. I resigned from the board of two corporations, and sold my stock, when elected to the Senate. I now have no connection with, or income from, any business corporation, partnership, or proprietorship.

My wife and I own an equity of about $4,660 in the home in which we live in Maryland. I also own an unimproved lot in Holladay, Utah, with a value of less than $500.

Besides our household and personal effects, we own a 1964 Ford and a 1965 Mustang. We own U.S. savings bonds of face value of $1,250, have a savings account of $3,288.13, and maintain a fluctuating checking account of between $900 and $3,300.

We have one son in college—at the University of Utah; one son on a mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; one son in junior high school, in Maryland; and our daughter is married.

COMPANY COMMANDER STATES NEED FOR COLD WAR GI BILL FOR HIS MEN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from a military officer, a company commander in the Army. As all know, few servicemen are closer to their men than is their commander; and this officer expresses deep concern for the future of his men when they return to civilian life.

To illustrate the types of educational needs which the servicemen in his company have, and to demonstrate the cogency of this young officer's argument for the cold war GI bill, I ask unanimous consent that this letter, from Capt. Harry C. Calvin, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COLUMBUS, GA.,
April 20, 1965.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HON. SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I am an officer (class of 1960 USMA) in the Army with a permanent home in Houston, Tex.

I am writing to you about the need for a cold war GI bill which will enable many of our deserving and capable citizens to attend vocational and technical schools so they will continue to be useful and contributing citizens to our Nation's economy.

At the present time I am a rifle company commander in an infantry battalion. Fifty-eight of my young men are draftees, many from Appalachia and its borders. They have all done good jobs for me in the past year and served their country well. Some have volunteered for Vietnam duty, but were not called to go because (fortunately) ground combat troops have not yet entered that conflict other than as advisers. More than 75 percent of these men are high school dropouts for various reasons. Many have taken the high school general educational development tests sponsored by the U.S. Armed Forces Institute and passed them, indicating their capability to learn. A few have good jobs to return to in 6 months when they are discharged, but most will be forced to look for work; some admit they will draw unemployment as they do not expect to find work available. If they could only attend some vocational or technical school with Government assistance, they would be able to contribute much more to our society than they probably will under the present conditions facing them.

Another problem along this line is that some of my senior noncommissioned officers will be retiring in a few years. They have served us well from World War II and the Korean conflict through the present crisis in Vietnam. They were entitled to the GI bill of rights from World War II and the Korean war but now that these have expired they face bleak prospects of finding suitable jobs to augment their retirement income. Because they stayed in for a career they have been penalized by loss of the GI bill education benefits. Last week it was brought to my attention that Government statistics revealed one out of five retired Army personnel were still unemployed 6 months after retirement. Don't you think they deserve some assistance to be taught a new avocation?

A personal example I would like to point out is that my executive officer, in for a career, enlisted in the Army shortly after finishing high school. He was honorably discharged, attended college under the Korean bill of rights (Public Law 533), was commissioned an officer in the Army and now contributes much more to our country than if he had been discharged only to face a hunt for a job or the difficult task of going to school without any monetary assistance from the Government. This is only one example from millions of veterans that are now contributing much more to the gross national product than they would had they not been able to attend schools with Government assistance.

I urge you to do everything in your power to correct this deficiency in our national program to increase the economic welfare of our Nation's citizens.

Sincerely,

HARRY C. CALVIN,
Captain, Infantry.

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in a recent editorial entitled "Reaping the Whirlwind," which was published in the New York Times, the problems of soil conservation and land cultivation in the Great Plains areas were discussed.

I do not feel that the New York Times editorial was written with a full understanding of the bionomics of the Great Plains. In the New York Times of April 25, 1965, there was published a letter which D. A. Williams, the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, wrote to the editor. In the letter, Mr. Williams explained the work being done by the Great Plains conservation program, and expressed the hope that a growing percentage of land will soon be safely kept in cultivation, with regular conservation practices. I congratulate the New York Times for printing his letter. Having lived in the Great Plains and a portion of my home State being within the Great Plains area, I have given some study to the Great Plains, its people, production, flora and fauna, and ecology. Mr. Williams' letter is very helpful to an understanding of that great area between the Mississippi Valley and the Rocky Mountains. Because this letter contributes greatly to our understanding of the problems and of what is being done to alleviate these problems in the Great Plains, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 25, 1965]

PROGRAM TO HALT GREAT PLAINS' SOIL EROSION

To the EDITOR:

Your recent editorial "Reaping the Whirlwind" excited considerable interest among those of us who are involved in the perplexing problems of Great Plains agriculture. The Times' interest in such matters is, in my opinion, entirely appropriate and extremely welcome.

This is the third year of below-normal rainfall in parts of the Great Plains. The result has been below-normal yields in these areas and below-normal crop residues (stubble) which furnish protection to cropland.

Surveys have shown that, although some of the cropland in the Great Plains is unsuitable for that use (9.6 percent), a great deal of it is in fact suited to cultivation.

Large-scale plowing of the native sod came with wartime urgency for crop production. We knew less about land capability in those years and had fewer tools for determining it. A part of this land became a problem in drought years. In the light of the new knowledge it should be returned to vegetation.

Getting the land back into grass has not been as easy as plowing it, and it was necessary to develop techniques, equipment and plant materials to match the problem. We have been able to do this, although getting grass cover established is always uncertain, even in years of average or better moisture.

It should be pointed out that there were dust storms in the Great Plains long before the first sod was broken out. The dust came from large areas where the soils were largely unprotected by vegetation.

DEALING WITH DROUGHT

In many respects the drought of the 1950's was worse than the one of the 1930's. It involved larger areas, lasted longer, and was more intense. But there was less land damage and human hardship because landowners were learning to deal with the problem.

We are making good progress in defining and revegetating of cropland that is unsuited to cropland use. Whereas in the early 1950's approximately 14 million acres of low-grade cropland was being cultivated in the Great Plains, that average is being rapidly reduced. By 1960 the Department of Agriculture's inventory of conservation needs showed the figure to be about 10,500,000 acres.

About 2 million acres of this ill-suited cropland has been revegetated in the relatively new Great Plains conservation program or is under contract for this treatment. This program was designed in 1956 as a new tool for the Soil Conservation Service in its assistance to soil conservation districts. The program operates in 392 counties and, although the Soil Conservation Service has leadership responsibility, it brings to bear all the resources of the Department of Agriculture.

It provides help in identifying the problem land, in developing conservation plans for the control of erosion and for the adjustments needed in land use, and for accelerated help in the form of technical assistance and cost-sharing to speed the job.

MARGINAL FARMS

There are human considerations, some from the days of homesteading. Families on too small holdings must often try to crop marginal land. Most of these farmers are trying to follow conservation practices that normally give the needed protection. The Department of Agriculture is helping many of the smaller landowners to solve their various problems, including that of too small holdings.

As to the matter of the "soil bomb" as a result of the pesticide residues, reflection indicates that this may be exaggerated. Pesticides and other chemical aids are used little in the production of wheat and other grains in the Great Plains. It is this land which is the primary source of dust in dry years.

Although large acreage will always be plowed in the Great Plains, our expectation is that a growing percentage will be land that can be safely kept in cultivation with regular conservation practices.

D. A. WILLIAMS,
Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
WASHINGTON, *April 16, 1965.*

"HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIERS IN MY COMMUNITY"—ESSAY BY MISS MARILYN DAUTRICH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, earlier today, I had the privilege of attending, in the departmental auditorium, the ceremonies at which Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz awarded the first prize of $1,000 in the 1965 ability counts contest to Miss Marilyn Dautrich, of Salt Lake City, Utah. The contest was sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Afterward, I had the pleasure of taking Miss Dautrich to the White House where she met President Johnson.

Miss Dautrich, who is an 18-year-old senior at Granite High School, competed with juniors and seniors from public, parochial, and private high schools in 49 States and territories in this annual community-survey contest, in which the $1,000 award is contributed by the Disabled American Veterans. The theme this year was "How the Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment in My Community."

Miss Dautrich reported on interviews with five handicapped workers: A blind attorney, a drill operator who is a double-leg amputee, a bookkeeper who is a polio victim, an assembly machine operator who has one arm, and a physician with muscular dystrophy.

Miss Dautrich also told how employment of the handicapped has affected her home. Her father—a laboratory technician at the Eimco Corp., and one of the States well-known basketball referees and baseball umpires—had his left arm mangled by bullets during the invasion of the Philippines during World War II. She said he has supported a family of seven, despite his limitations—"proof that the handicapped can overcome barriers to employment and lead independent lives."

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Miss Dautrich's award-winning essay be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY

(By Marilyn Dautrich, Granite High School, Salt Lake City, Utah)

This man is my father. His left arm, mangled twice by bullets in the invasion of the Philippines, is useless; but it doesn't seem to matter. He has won a threefold victory over employment barriers—as a laboratory technician at Eimco Corp., as an umpire, and as one of the top basketball officials in Utah. He has all the tools he needs to be a success in his work: a quick mind, sharp eyes, and an understanding personality. He has managed to support a family of seven, despite his limitations—proof that the handicapped can overcome barriers to employment and lead independent lives.

One of every 10 Americans is physically handicapped. Another one is 10 is mentally retarded or has suffered from mental illness. In Utah and in my community approximately 1,350 new cases every year join the backlog of 12,000 individuals that are significantly disabled. But with their weapons—sheer determination, willingness, and a desire to support themselves—the handicapped are developing inquiring minds and emotional stability, self-confidence, and enthusiasm for life. They have accepted the challenge to work for better goals to achieve an adequate living. Understanding their limitations, they do not take chances on the job and as a result have achieved a lower accident record than the able-bodied workers. They have compiled the lowest records of job turnover; and, since they want to stay with a position, they work harder at routine tasks. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, they have higher ratings of attendance, efficiency, and punctuality than has the average employee.

The following examples from my community are living proof that the handicapped are overcoming employment barriers and becoming independent, productive citizens.

Example 1: He is a lawyer, respected and admired for his achievements in a courtroom. It took 7 long years of study to acquire a degree, quite an accomplishment when one considers that he is totally blind. Though he cannot see his clients, he is sensitive to their problems. Unseeing eyes cannot bind the brilliance of this man's mind.

Example 2: He may not look up when a stranger enters, his powerful bench drill creates tremendous confusion when it is being used. When he does notice, he has a cheerful grin and friendly greeting—one does not mind that he cannot stand to meet him, for this man is a double amputee and two artificial legs make it difficult to move around. But his hands are quick and sure and his eyes are keen—all he needs to be a success at his occupation. He misses his legs but has learned to achieve without them.

Example 3: This man is a bookkeeper. His accounts are accurate and his manuals immaculate. Society considers him one of the finest and most efficient members of his profession in Utah. His legs and hands are twisted—polio. He is quick, however, with figures and can record his calculations by holding his right wrist with his left hand. Slow, one asks? His employer doesn't think so.

Example 4: The parts fly together with precision and accuracy. The man operating the assembling machine pumps the pedal rapidly with his foot, though the component parts assembler is usually run by hand. This operator doesn't have an arm—a punch press tore it from his body. Now, with courage, determination, and a slight modification in the assembler, he has been able to put his abilities to work.

Example 5: He meanders down the quiet halls of the Veterans' Administration hospital. His limbs are whole, but weakened and deteriorated by the crippling weapons of muscular dystrophy, a disease that proves fatal usually before the age of 20. He was told that he shouldn't go into medicine, that he was wasting his time. But with characteristic courage and determination, this man

entered premedical school and, after ignoring the pain of his disease for 11 years, completed his residency and became a full-time physician. Crutches? Wheelchair? He thinks they would limit his ability to serve those who need him and so manages alone.

Aristotle once said, "If liberty and equality are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost." The handicapped have accepted this challenge and are achieving victories over employment barriers in all fields of labor and in every community of the United States. It is only logical that our country can remain great by the full utilization of its manpower. The handicapped have proved that they are willing to help, all they ask for is a chance to show what they can do.

ED MURROW: THE VOICE OF MANKIND

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, few men who have left us in recent times will be missed by so many friends and admirers as will Edward R. Murrow.

The millions who were privileged to hear his voice will mourn the tragic loss which the dread disease, cancer, has again caused. None regret it more than I.

Modern communications—radio and television—made it possible for Ed Murrow to be a frequent visitor in millions of homes. Ed Murrow, perhaps more than any of his many skilled associates, projected his personality, his intense interest in events, and his compassion, so that the mechanical contrivances were forgotten, and his presence was felt. He made the events of the day come to life in our living rooms.

There was a genuineness about him, a concern about the fate of mankind, an insistence on a true portrayal of men and issues, that set a great objective for all of us—to find the facts and meet the issues of our times with humanity and good will.

Statesmen respected Ed Murrow for his great understanding and fine reporting. Rural America loved him, for he more than once portrayed their plight with an accuracy and understanding not always accorded them. The people he served—his listeners in all walks of life—identified themselves with him, because, as a man who had risen from a humble home to eminence, he remained unpretentious, devoted to serving his whole constituency and to increasing their understanding of the world and the affairs of their time.

He brought a new sense of dynamic direction to the U.S. Information Agency. The Voice of America always seemed more authentic to me when it came in the Ed Murrow style.

To Ed Murrow's wife, his son, and his associates, I offer my sympathy, for I keenly share their sense of loss. Ed Murrow was indeed a friend of all mankind.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by the brilliant Mary McGrory, and published in the Washington Star; and also a perceptive article written by Bernie Harrison, the television critic of the Washington Star.

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

[From the Washington Star]

EDWARD R. MURROW—A STARTLINGLY DECENT MAN, HE SYMBOLIZED INTEGRITY

(By Mary McGrory)

A whole generation was brought up within the sound of his voice telling the truth. Yet what they remember best about Edward R. Murrow in Washington is how seldom he spoke during his 3 years as a public official.

He had always been reticent although he made his living by talking. An old friend from broadcasting days said, "Ed communicated mainly in long pauses."

It was the same here. ROBERT F. KENNEDY recalls that at Cabinet and National Security Council meetings, "he never spoke unless spoken to."

"And," adds the junior Senator from New York, "I don't know anyone else in Government who made sense every time he talked."

Madison Avenue was openmouthed in astonishment when Murrow, in 1961, turned his back on its gold and glamor to take on the job of rescuing a Government agency that was the battered stepchild of Washington.

Murrow in broadcasting was a symbol of success and integrity. His reputation and performance were so preeminent that, as his grieving colleague, Eric Sevareid, said at the news of his death yesterday, he was "beyond jealousy." Around the offices of the Columbia Broadcasting System, which he ornamented for 25 years, he was known as a startlingly decent human being, who did battle with the brass and, unlike many great stars, encouraged the young and obscure.

He came to Washington with few illusions about the world and himself. He referred to himself, his deputy, Donald L. Wilson, recalls, as "the Satchel Paige of the administration." Paige was almost 50 when he made it to the major leagues. Murrow was 53 when he took over the foundering fortunes of the U.S. Information Agency, which had had 5 names and 12 Directors in its stormy 21-year history and had suffered almost to death during the McCarthy era.

He came at a time when much Capitol Hill opinion held, in the words of former Senator Homer E. Capehart, Republican, of Indiana, that "America should be sold like Cadillacs."

Why did he come? He once told a friend: "I always felt that if a man had a choice to do what I was doing or to work for the Government, he had to work for the Government. Besides, I had been criticizing bureaucrats all my adult life, and it was my turn to try."

From the first, his very presence acted as a tonic and spur to the troubled Agency. Just to be working under the same roof with a professional of such distinction raised the spirit of many who never even saw him.

Besides, he had only one directive. The Agency was to tell the truth, to play the news straight. When a State Department official protested early that the Voice of America was giving too heavy coverage to the freedom-rider violence in Alabama, Murrow replied that it was a big story and "we better tell our own bad news rather than leave it to the enemy."

Congressmen bleated at the news policy, but when it was explained to them in that vibrant voice issuing from the familiar cloud of cigarette smoke, they subsided.

Murrow's reserve quickly became a legend. The local press, many of them old comrades in arms, found it out first. Murrow initially would grant no interviews. When he did, it was a strain. Across the desk from the famous face with the bloodhound furrows and the grey eyes peering dubiously and inquiringly from under the black brows, they found his principal contribution was a brooding silence.

At the White House, this quality was prized. In a field of rampaging egoes, Murrow was conspicuously self-effacing.

McGeorge Bundy, the White House foreign policy adviser, remembers that Murrow never once asked to go to a meeting. In time he never had to ask. President Kennedy increasingly said, "Let's find out what Ed thinks" or "Be sure Murrow is here."

Kennedy's regard for Murrow's always solicited advice began during the period of the Bay of Pigs. Too late to stop that fatal course, Murrow heard what was afoot and compellingly and eloquently spoke out against it.

"Yet," said one witness, "no one ever heard him say he had tried to prevent it. He worked harder than anyone to pick up the broken china."

From then on, he was in on every discussion of foreign policy. On occasion, he changed its course.

"He never fought a problem," says Bundy. "He never tried to impose himself on it."

LIGHTER MOMENTS

Murrow was not a glittering figure on the Washington social scene. The shyness that prevented him from calling up a subordinate at the agency whom he didn't know, kept him home a great deal. In his lighter moments he enjoyed talk of the trade—no man knew more about the capacities and limitations of his colleagues—and he could do a creditable imitation of Winston Churchill, the central figure of the years of his greatest acclaim.

An old New Frontiersman said, "Murrow's legacy here is probably all intangible. It seems to me it's in the duty officer at USIA. He's crisper and prouder than the others, and I think that comes of once having had Murrow for a boss."

In his obscure years here, Murrow brought pride and prestige to a discouraged agency and he gave counsel to a young President, who always had to wait for the sound of his voice.

[From the Washington Star]

ED MURROW'S LONELIEST HOUR

(By Bernie Harrison)

I will always remember Edward R. Murrow for a speech I never heard him make.

It was a speech so typical of the man and his uncompromising honesty that you can almost "hear and see" him making it.

A word about the time and setting.

It was October 1958, and commercial television was already going sour. In mid-1958, CBS announced cancellation of the Murrow-Friendly series, "See It Now," and shortly after making this speech, Murrow asked for and was given a leave of absence, thus ending a 20-year association with the network going back to his memorable "This Is London" broadcasts during World War II and the London air raids.

His audience was the Association of Radio and Television News Directors, assembled in Chicago, and he began it in the forthright manner that was his hallmark. Here are the opening paragraphs. Close your eyes and you can see the cigarette smoke—and the TV industry's hair—curling.

HERETICAL THOUGHTS

"This just might do nobody any good. At the end of this discourse a few people may accuse this reporter of fouling his own comfortable nest; and your organization may be accused of having given hospitality to heretical and even dangerous thoughts.

"But the elaborate structure of networks, advertising agencies and sponsors will not be shaken or altered. It is my desire if not my duty to try to talk to you journeymen with some candor about what is happening to

radio and television in this generous and capacious land.

"I have no technical advice or counsel to offer those of you who labor in this vineyard that produces words and pictures. You will forgive me for not telling you that the instruments with which you work are miraculous; that your responsibility is unprecedented; or that your aspirations are frequently frustrated. It is not necessary to remind you that the mere fact your voice is amplified to the degree where it reaches from one end of the country to the other does not confer upon you greater wisdom or understanding than you possessed when your voice reached only from one end of the bar to the other. All of these things you know.

"You should also know at the outset that, in the manner of witnesses before congressional committees, I appear here voluntarily—by invitation—that I am an employee of the Columbia Broadcasting System—that I am neither an officer nor a director of that corporation—and that these remarks are of a 'do-it-yourself' nature. If what I have to say is responsible, then I alone am responsible, for the saying of it. Seeking neither approbation from my employers, nor new sponsors, nor acclaim from the critics of radio and television, I cannot well be disappointed. Believing that potentially the commercial system of broadcasting as practiced in this country is the best and freest yet devised, I have decided to express my concern about what I believe to be happening to radio and television. These instruments have been good to me beyond my due. There exists in my mind no reasonable grounds for personal complaint. I have no feud, either with my employers, any sponsors, or with the professional critics of radio and television. But I am seized with an abiding fear regarding what these two instruments are doing to our society, our culture, and our heritage."

IN MORTAL DANGER

"Our history will be what we make it. And if there are any historians about 50 or a 100 years from now, and there should be preserved the kinescopes for 1 week of all three networks, they will there find recorded in black and white, or color, evidence of decadence, escapism and insulation from the realities of the world in which we live. I invite your attention to the television schedules of all networks between the hours of 8 and 11 p.m., Eastern time. Here you will find only fleeting and sposmodic reference to the fact that this Nation is in mortal danger. There are, it is true, occasional informative programs presented in that intellectual ghetto on Sunday afternoon. But during the daily peak viewing periods, television in the main insulates us from the realities of the world in which we live. If this state of affairs continues, we may alter an advertising slogan to read: 'Look Now, Pay Later.' For surely we shall pay for using this most powerful instrument of communication to insulate the citizenry from the hard and demanding realities which must be faced if we are to survive. I mean the word—survive—literally. If there were to be a competition in indifference, or perhaps in insulation from reality, then Nero and his fiddle, Chamberlain and his umbrella, could not find a place on an early-afternoon sustaining show. If Hollywood were to run out of Indians, the program schedules would be mangled beyond all recognition. Then, some courageous soul with a small budget might be able to do a documentary telling what, in fact, we have done—and are still doing—to the Indians in this country. But that would be unpleasant. And, we must at all costs shield the sensitive citizens from anything that is unpleasant."

My how it needed saying:

Two years later, Newton Minow made his maiden speech as chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. His inspiration seems plain.

"VAST WASTELAND

"I invite you to sit down in front of your television set," he said, "when your station goes on the air and stay there without a book, magazine, newspaper, profit-and-loss sheet or rating book to distract you—and keep your eyes glued to that set until the station signs off. I can assure you that you will observe a vast wasteland."

To television's credit, the network and local news departments slowly began to get the manpower and the budgets and some time. Any critique of television today must necessarily except the efforts in the news field, network and local. They could do much better—but by comparison with the bleak picture a few years ago, the performance is splendid, as the Peabody Award Committee just noted with its citation to the industry for "inescapably confronting the American public with the realities of racial discontent." While chiding TV for "a dreary sameness and steady conformity," the committee also cited "CBS Reports" and ABC Reporter William Lawrence.

No memorials are necessary to Murrow. You will find his spirit in the best of news and documentary shows and the hundreds of working TV newsmen he influenced. The sharpest loss is theirs.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further morning business, I should like to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of certain bills on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXEMPTION OF OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH VESSELS FROM APPLICATION OF CERTAIN VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 155, S. 627.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 627) to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 627) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 627

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, as used in this Act—

(1) the term "oceanographic research vessel" means a vessel which the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating finds is operated in the public interest by being employed exclusively in scientific research, or instruction in oceanography or limnology, or both; and

(2) the term "scientific personnel" means persons who are aboard a vessel solely for the purpose of engaging in scientific research, instructing, or receiving instruction, in oceanography or limnology.

SEC. 2. An oceanographic research vessel shall not be considered a passenger vessel, a vessel carrying passengers, or a passenger-carrying vessel under the provisions of the laws relating to the inspection and manning of merchant vessels by reason of the carriage of scientific personnel.

SEC. 3. Scientific personnel on an oceanographic research vessel shall not be considered seamen under the provisions of title 53 of the Revised Statutes and Act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

SEC. 4. If the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating determines that the application to any oceanographic research vessel of any provision of title 52 or title 53 of the Revised Statutes, or Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, is not necessary in the public interest, he may by regulation exempt any such vessel from such provision, upon such terms and conditions as he may specify.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 168), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to encourage and facilitate oceanographic research and to remove several restrictions which have hampered the expansion of research in the marine sciences. This will be accomplished by exempting oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws.

CONTINUATION OF STUDY BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR OF THE EFFECTS OF INSECTICIDES, HERBICIDES, FUNGICIDES, AND OTHER PESTICIDES UPON FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 156, S. 1623.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1623) to amend the act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment on page 1, after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the provisions of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed $3,200,000, and not to exceed $5,000,000 for each of the two fiscal years immediately following each year.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of August 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 479), as amended by the Act of September 16, 1959 (73 Stat. 563), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. In order to carry out the provisions of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed $3,200,000, and not to exceed $5,000,000 for each of the two fiscal years immediately following such year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1623) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 169), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to increase the authorized annual appropriation for pesticide research by the Department of the Interior from $2,565,000 to $3.2 million for fiscal year 1966 and $5 million annually for fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nothing is pending at the moment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is their objection? The Chair hears none. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], numbered 82, to the committee substitute.

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

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

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Hon. Archibald Cox, Solicitor General of the United States, recently delivered a speech before the Student Bar Association of the University of Houston. This address will be printed soon in the Houston Law Review.

The address is entitled "The Constitutionality of the Proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965."

As one would expect from the very able and learned Solicitor General, I believe that there is food for much thought by Members of the Senate contained in this address.

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

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

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

(Address by Hon. Archibald Cox, Solicitor General of the United States, prepared for delivery before Student Bar Association of the University of Houston, Houston Club, Apr. 10, 1965)

When Robert H. Jackson was Solicitor General, he used to tell of a letter which arrived at the Washington Post Office addressed simply, the Celestial General, Washington, D.C. Within the hour, he used to boast, the letter was delivered to his office. I always enjoy lawyers, and especially law schools, but Texas, with its warm hospitality, makes me too feel like a celestial general.

Although its adjudication lies in the future, the most pressing constitutional questions today are probably those raised by the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965. One could feel quite certain a year ago that the Supreme Court would unanimously uphold the constitutionality of the Federal equal public accommodations law for its provisions were all within a line of settled precedents going back to the Labor Board cases of 1937. The new Voting Rights Act of 1965 raises novel and I suppose fairly arguable questions; yet when one studies them closely, the conviction grows that this bill too is constitutional. I shall try not to talk too much like a professor but it occurred to me that you might be interested in taking a few moments to consider these questions.

The proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 has two central features:

1. Provision for suspending under specified circumstances and for a substantial period the bundle of the State laws described as tests or devices, ranging from literacy tests to the more sophisticated requirements that a person seeking to vote demonstrate his understanding of the duties and obligations of citizenship, or his ability to interpret any provision of the State or Federal Constitution; and

2. Provision for the appointment of Federal examiners to register the victims of discrimination in areas in which local officials refuse to register qualified Negro voters even after the voiding of State laws establishing the tests or devices invalidated by the first feature of the act.

These provisions become operable upon three determinations made by the Attorney General and the Director of the Census without judicial review:

1. that the State has maintained laws establishing "interpretation" or "understanding" or "literacy" tests or other tests or devices;

2. that less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age in the State as a whole or an individual county have registered and voted;

3. that 20 percent of the population of voting age is nonwhite.

The authority to enact these provisions is conferred by section 2 of the 15th amendment. Section 1 guarantees all citizens against denial or abridgment of the right to vote by reason of race or color. Section 2 provides:

The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

It is beyond dispute, as a matter of history, that the 14th and 15th amendments were adopted with a view to enlarging the powers of Congress and providing for congressional enforcement of the substantive constitutional rights.[1] By one of those curious turns of history that defeat the expectations of men, in fact we have until recently left enforcement to the judicial process and nobody of precedent is available to delimit the scope of the power to enact appropriate legislation. The closest analogy seems to be the "necessary and proper" clause in article I. The decisions under that clause suggest (i) that what is "appropriate" is essentially a question of fact and (ii) that the judgments expressed by Congress upon the question of fact, while not conclusive, will not be lightly disturbed.[2]

The conclusion that the immediate suspension of all tests or devices is appropriate where the three determinations are made rests upon three facts well known to Congress.

First. The coincidence of (i) the use of "understanding," "interpretation" and literacy tests and other tests and devices with (ii) low registration and voting and (iii) a substantial Negro population creates a strong probability that the low registration and voting are the result of racial discrimination in the use of the test. This is especially true anywhere there is a substantial nonwhite population.

Second. Court decisions[3] as well as general history demonstrate that most of such tests and devices—notably the "interpretation" and "understanding" tests—were devised and administered for the purpose of denying Negroes the right to vote.

By 1860, all of the States in which discrimination in voting is currently a problem had abandoned property qualifications and had no literacy requirements; they admitted to suffrage all adult white male citizens except lunatics and certain convicts. All the "tests and devices" were adopted after 1890.[4] The

---

[1] See Mathews, "Legislative and Judicial History of the 15th Amendment," pp. 76–79. And see *Ex parte Virginia,* 100 U.S. 339, 345.

[2] See *McCulloch* v. *Maryland,* 4 Wheat. 316, 420; *Heart of Atlanta Motel Corp.* v. *United States,* 379 U.S. 241; *Katzenbach* v. *McClung,* 379 U.S. 294. See also *Norman* v. *Baltimore & O.R. Co.,* 294 U.S. 240, 311.

[3] *Davis* v. *Schnell,* 81 F. Supp. 872, affirmed, 336 U.S. 933 (Alabama); *Alabama* v. *United States,* 304 F. 2d 583, affirmed, 371 U.S. 37; *Louisiana* v. *United States,* No. 67, this term, decided March 8, 1965; brief for the United States in *United States* v. *Mississippi,* No. 73, this term.

[4] A partial history of the initial adoption of these tests and devices in the South is as follows:

Literacy: (a) by reading and/or writing a constitutional text: Miss. (1890); S.C. (1895); N.C. (1900); Ala. (1901); Va. (1902); Ga. (1908); La. (1921). And see Okla. (1910), (b) by completing an application form unaided: La. (1898); Va. (1902); La. (1921); Miss. (1954).

"interpretation" and "understanding" tests were frankly designed to enable local registrars to qualify all white applicants and disqualify all Negroes. Senator Bilbo explained in 1946, for example, that the real function of Mississippi's constitutional requirement that a voter should be able to read or explain the provisions of the constitution was to prevent Negroes from voting:

The circuit clerks are under oath to protect the provisions of that Constitution, and if there is a single man or woman serving in this office who cannot think up questions enough to disqualify "undesirables" then write Bilbo or any good lawyer and there are a hundred questions which can be furnished.

The record in suits brought by the Department of Justice reveals how the tests were administered. An "undesirable" would be asked the meaning of the clause which provides that judges may be removed "for cause not constituting grounds of impeachment," while a "desirable" would be asked to explain the meaning of the provision that "there shall be no imprisonment for debt." If the latter's answer should be inadequate, the registrar could still pass him. One applicant asked to explain the provision "there shall be no imprisonment for debt," replied "I think that a nigra should have 2 years in college before voting because he doesn't understand." He was promptly registered.

Similarly, State laws requiring proof of "good moral character" were avowedly adopted for the purpose of enabling registrars uninhibited power to choose whom to register and whom to reject.

Even simple literacy tests, which might be thought the least objectionable, were usually accompanied by exceptions like the grandfather clauses enabling white illiterates to vote.[5] Such clauses, of course, have long been invalidated, but the literacy test itself inevitably vests a wide degree of discretion in the registrar; and if he is minded to discriminate, it is easy for him to find fault with the performance of one set of applicants while passing others of far lower qualification. This has been amply demonstrated by the rulings of many county registrars upon the sufficiency of application forms, some being rejected because answers were too short, others because they were too long, and others being passed that were really not responsive to the question.

Third. Most of the States as to which the determinations can be made, and most of the counties, have in fact engaged in widespread violation of the 15th Amendment over a long period. This is amply shown by evidence in suits brought by the Department of Justice during the past 5 years and by the studies of the Civil Rights Commission.

These three facts, I suggest, are more than enough to warrant the Congress in concluding that wherever the circumstances recited in the determinations exist there is a prima facie case that violations of the 15th amendment have occurred through the tests or devices and that their suppression is therefore a necessary measure for enforcing the 15th amendment right to vote without distinction of race or color.

It is possible, of course, that there may be instances in which the circumstances covered by the three determinations exist, but there has been no racial discrimination violating the 15th amendment. That possibility, however, is covered by a provision in the bill which affords any State or county with respect to which the determinations have been made an opportunity to obtain an adjudication that the tests or devices have not been used to accomplish any substantial discrimination. This provision for overturning the presumption or inference created by the determinations gives assurance that no State or county will be treated unfairly and that the suppression of tests and devices will be limited to areas where that is indeed necessary to enforce the 15th amendment right.[6]

II

No one who wholeheartedly accepts the principle of equal voting rights embodied in the 15th amendment is likely to object to outlawing the continued use of tests or devices as engines of discrimination. Indeed, the Supreme Court has already decided that such a remedy is appropriate in an action to enjoin discrimination. *Louisiana* v. *United States*, No. 67 of this term; *United States* v. *Mississippi*, No. 73, this term. The argument against the constitutionality of the bill that can be most seriously pressed runs like this:

The Constitution assumes that the States shall have power to establish the qualifications of voters not only for the election of their own Governors and legislatures but even for the choice of Representatives and Senators. Article I, section 2, provides that those who elect the Federal House of Representatives "shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." The same language is found in the 17th amendment providing for the direct election of Senators. It is possible to administer a literacy test and perhaps even a "citizenship" or "understanding" test in a nondiscriminatory manner. The question is therefore asked: "How can the right to establish such qualifications be denied to States that have been engaged in the violation of the 15th amendment once they offer to demonstrate that they will administer them in a nondiscriminatory fashion?" Admittedly the bill does suspend the use of such laws for a substantial period after obvious discrimination has ceased.

The answer, in our judgment, is that the grant of power in section 2 of the 15th amendment to enact appropriate laws for its enforcement includes not only the power to strike down the strictly illegal but also the power to eliminate any substantial risk of evasion of the 15th amendment even to the point of prohibiting conduct that would be entirely legal if it had not once been entwined with the violation of constitutional rights. Let me remind you of three settled legal principles.

First. In many places the continuing effect of the previous unconstitutional discrimination can be eliminated only by prohibiting for a substantial period the use of the old, abused tests or devices. In those areas the white voters were granted permanent registration without actually being subjected to any test at all. To permit a test hereafter to be applied to everyone seeking to register would in fact operate almost entirely against the Negroes, most of whom had been discriminatorily barred from registration. Under such circumstances, the only way to give Negroes the equal opportunity to vote is to prohibit the use of all the tests for a substantial period so that Negroes may now register and vote on the same terms as the whites who have already been registered.

Let me illustrate the problem concretely. No one will deny that there are many counties in Alabama where there has been such widespread discrimination as virtually to exclude all Negroes from registration while registering all whites. In practice the tests of literacy and understanding of the duties of citizenship have not been applied to whites. Recently Alabama proposed to introduce a new test of an applicant's understanding of the duties and obligations of citizenship, which it was asserted would be administered in a nondiscriminatory fashion because it was written. Two of the questions were:

Whether members of Alabama jury commissions are elected or appointed;

Whether petit larceny or vagrancy conviction disqualifies one from voting.

Louisiana proposed multiple-choice examination. One question was:

The President of the Senate gets his office (a) by election of the people; (b) by election of the Senate; (c) by appointment by the President.

I suspect that less than 2 percent of the population could pass these questions. They could be fairly and impartially graded but Negroes—and theretofore unregistered whites—would remain ineligible to vote. Other whites—and substantially only whites—would continue to vote.

The Supreme Court has already held that it is proper to knock out such tests entirely in a State where their elimination is necessary to enable Negroes to vote on the same terms previously granted to others. *Louisiana* v. *United States*, No. 67 this term.[7]

Oral constitutional "understanding" and "interpretation tests for illiterates: Miss. (1890); S.C. (1895); Va. (1902); La. (1921).

Understanding of the duties and obligations of citizenship: Ala. (1901); Ga. (1908); La. (1921); Miss. (1954).

Good moral character requirement (other than nonconviction of a crime): Ala. (1901); Ga. (1908); La. (1921); Miss. (1960).

[5] Thus, in Louisiana, North Carolina, and Oklahoma, white voters were exempted from the literacy test by a "voting" "grandfather clause." See La. Const. 1898, Art. 197, § 5; N.C. Const. 1876, Art. VI, § 4, as amended in 1900; Okla. Const. 1907, Art. III, § 4a, as amended in 1910. The same result was accomplished in Alabama, Georgia, and Virginia by the so-called "fighting" "grandfather clause." See Ala. Const. 1901, § 180, First and Second; Ga. Const. 1877, Art. II, § I, ¶ IV (1–2), as amended in 1908; Va. Const. 1902, § 19, First and Second. Several of these States provided a separate exemption from the literacy requirement for property holders. See La. Const. 1898, Art. 197, § 4; Ala. Const. 1901, § 181, Second; Va. Const. 1902, § 19 Third; Ga. Const. 1877, Art. II, § I, ¶ IV(5). And Alabama and Georgia additionally exempted persons of "good moral character" who understood "the duties and obligations of citizenship under a republican form of government." Ala. Const. 1901, § 180, Third; Ga. Const. 1877, Art. II, § I, ¶ IV(3), as amended in 1908. Another device, invented by Mississippi, and followed, for a time, by South Carolina and Virginia (and later Louisiana) offered white illiterates an opportunity to qualify by satisfying the registrar that they could "understand" and "interpret" a constitutional text when it was read to them. Miss. Const. 1890, § 244; S.C. Const. 1895, Art. II, § 4(c); Va. Const. 1902, § 19, Fourth; La. Const. 1921, Art. VIII, § 1(d). For later registrants, South Carolina substituted a property alternative. S.C. Const. 1895, Art. II, § 4(d).

[6] It is no objection that the formula which governs initial coverage may sometimes catch the innocent. That is true of all rebuttable presumptions. It is enough if the inference is well founded in "common experience." That is the test even when the presumption operates against the defendant in a criminal case. *Luria* v. *United States*, 231 U.S. 9, 25–26; *Hawes* v. *Georgia*, 258 U.S. 1, 4; *Yee Hem* v. *United States*, 268 U.S. 178, 184; *Casey* v. *United States*, 276 U.S. 413, 418; *United States* v. *Gainey*, *supra*. Plainly, nothing more is required in the premises.

[7] There was nothing new in this pronouncement. The principle that what has been waived for one class must be waived for all (when there is no proper basis for distinguishing) is, of course, well settled. See, *e.g.*, *Iowa-Des Moines National Bank* v. *Bennett*, 284 U.S. 239. Cf. *Nashville, C & St. L.*

Surely the congressional power to formulate remedies for enforcing the 15th amendment is no less.

Second. A legislative body has power to adopt the most appropriate means for coping with an evil. The Congress may, where it finds it appropriate to enforcement, forbid otherwise lawful and unobjectionable conduct which is sufficiently related to the illegal conduct as to make its prohibition a reasonable measure for preventing the harmful conduct. Thus, in *Evarard's Breweries* v. *Day*, 265 U.S. 545, 560, the Court held that Congress, as a step in enforcing the prohibition of traffic in intoxicating liquors as a beverage, had power to forbid doctors from prescribing the use of malt liquors as bona fide medicine. And it has been held that the power to prohibit traffic in intoxicating liquors includes, as an appropriate means of making that prohibition effective, power to prohibit traffic in similar liquors, although nonintoxicating. *Purity Extract Co.* v. *Lynch*, 226 U.S. 192. See also *Ruppert* v. *Caffey*, 251 U.S. 264; *Currin* v. *Wallace*, 306 U.S. 1.

And so here, if Congress finds that forbidding all use of tests and devices is the most effective measure for preventing their unconstitutional use in violation of 15th-amendment rights, that would seem valid even though it trenches upon otherwise theoretically permissible action by a State or subdivision.

Third, It is a settled legal principle of general application that when important rights have been violated, the remedy may go beyond restraining the plainly unlawful conduct and prohibit associated acts which would be permissible at the hands of others or even the defendant if they had not been used to perpetrate the wrong. "Equity has power to eradicate the evils of a condemned scheme by prohibition of the use of admittedly valid parts of an invalid whole." (*United States* v. *Bausch & Lomb Co.*, 321 U.S. 707, 724.) In other words, one who has done wrong may, in order to eliminate all danger of repetition, be forbidden to engage in conduct open to others.[8] That principle runs through the whole body of our law. E.g., *Warner & Co.* v. *Lilly & Co.*, 265 U.S. 526, 532.[9]

Ry. v. *Browning*, 310 U.S. 362; *United States* v. *Bausch & Lomb Co.*, 321 U.S. 707; *United States* v. *Gypsum Co.*, 340 U.S. 76; *Ethyl Gasoline Corp.* v. *United States*, 309 U.S. 436, 461. Nor is there any novelty in applying the rule to correct violations of the 15th amendment. See *Lane* v. *Wilson*, 207 U.S. 268, 275–276. In the *Lassiter* v. *Northampton*, 360 U.S. 45, while upholding North Carolina's literacy law on its face, the Court was at pains to note that it was not condoning the application of the test to new applicants if some exempted by the grandfather clause were still voting: "If they were allowed to vote without taking a literacy test and if appellant were denied the right to vote unless she passed it, members of the white race would receive preferential privileges of the ballot contrary to the command of the 15th amendment." *Lassiter* v. *Northampton Election Board, supra*, 360 U.S. at 50.

[8] "Injunctions in broadest terms are granted even in acts of the widest content, when the court deems them essential to accomplish the purposes of the act." (*May Department Stores Co.* v. *Labor Board*, 326 U.S. 276, 390). See also *United States* v. *Crescent Amusement Co.*, 323 U.S. 173, 188; *United States* v. *United States Gypsum Co.*, 340 U.S. 76, 89; *Swift & Co.* v. *United States*, 276 U.S. 311. And see *Terry* v. *Adams*, 345 U.S. 461, 475–476 (opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter).

[9] See *Currin* v. *Wallace*, 306 U.S. 1; *United States* v. *Darby*, 312 U.S. 100, 121. What was said a few weeks ago in sustaining the constitutionality of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is fully applicable—albeit the present proposal rests on the 15th amendment rather than the commerce clause:

> Where we find that the legislators, in light of the facts and testimony before them, have a rational basis for finding a chosen regulatory scheme necessary to the protection of commerce, our investigation is at an end. * * * *Katzenbach* v. *McClung*, 379 U.S. 294, 303–304.

If the judiciary has that power, it is also possessed by Congress under its power to enforce. The legislature may paint with a broader brush than the courts.

The three foregoing principles establish that Congress has power in enforcing the 15th amendment to forbid the use of abused voter qualification laws where Congress reasonably finds that necessary as a matter of fact to meet the risk of continued or renewed violations. The evidence showing that the broad prohibition is necessary for a period of time as a matter of fact falls under three heads:

First. Such tests—as I suggested earlier—have in the States affected always been an integral part of a long history of intentional violations of the 15th amendment. Not only were most of the tests or devices designed for that purpose but most of them have not been used elsewhere.

Second. The States affected have demonstrated that their settled policy is to delay and frustrate the enforcement of the 15th amendment. Mississippi, for example, when it was held in 1951 that the State constitution required registration of anyone who could read or interpret a section of the constitution, promptly enacted an amendment requiring ability both to read and interpret. When the Civil Rights Act of 1960 was before the Congress, authorizing the inspection of voting records in the several States, Mississippi immediately passed a statute repealing its well-established practice of preserving registration and voting records and authorized their destruction in order to frustrate Federal investigation. In 1962, when an injunction was issued forbidding the registrars of Forrest County from engaging in racial discrimination, Mississippi enacted a new package of laws requiring applicants to pass stiffer tests and to have their names published in local newspapers for an extended period before they should be registered to vote.

Third. After generations of following a hardened policy of racial discrimination in the administration of these voting tests, it would be exceedingly difficult if not altogether impossible for the most well-intentioned State administration to see that the old devices of racial discrimination were now administered fairly and equitably on a local level. The point requires no elaboration.

Two other points should be noted that may have constitutional importance although I suspect that they go more to the wisdom of the choice.

Fourth. Until a substantial period of time has elapsed in which everyone is registered without discrimination, it is impossible to say what is the will of the people of a State with respect to a literacy test or some similar examination of qualification to vote. By hypothesis, the electorate in a place where there has been widespread and long-continued discrimination is not representative of whole people. Its expressed desire carries less weight than the expressed desire of an electorate made up without discrimination.

Is there not also grave danger of exaggerating the importance of a literacy test? You have none in Texas, but I would suppose that Texas voters are no less intelligent and no less qualified than the voters of Alabama or Virginia—or for that matter in my own State of Massachusetts, where a literacy test has long been in force. Unless a pretty substantial body of knowledge is required in order to qualify—which no one seriously proposes—it makes very little difference whether the voter can read and write a few simple sentences.

Fifth. The provisions for avoiding all such tests for a 5-year period also result from the desire to minimize Federal interference and maximize continued State administration of their own election laws in compliance with the 15th amendment. This may seem a startling assertion at first, but consider the problem. There is no assurance that any law defined as a test or device, including a literacy test, can be administered by State and county officials fairly and without discrimination in areas where the power structure has been dedicated for three-fourths of a century to denying Negroes the opportunity to vote. Everything points to the contrary. The choice, therefore, came down to this: (1) provision could be made for appointing Federal examiners who would replace State registrars and who could and would administer the States' own voting qualification laws in nondiscriminatory fashion; or (2) the Federal law might sweep the engines of discrimination aside in the hope that the appointment of Federal examiners could be avoided because the State and county officials would then act in accordance with their constitutional duties. Given this choice, I submit, sweeping aside the engines of discrimination and encouraging States to continue to use their own officials without the necessity of Federal examiners does more to preserve and encourage local self-government.

III

There will no doubt be some instances—perhaps many but perhaps relatively few—in which discrimination continues even after invalidation of tests and devices. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 provides that when the Attorney General finds, upon complaint or upon other evidence, that discrimination has continued, then Federal examiners shall be appointed by the Civil Service Commission to register those qualified to vote who were refused by the State or county officials. The local authorities will then be under a duty to honor the Federal registration in all Federal, State, and local elections.

The constitutionality of these provisions depends upon much the same analysis as the suspension of tests and devices. The question is: Is this an appropriate measure for enforcement of the plainly declared, but often-denied, constitutional right?

The necessity is demonstrated—unhappily—by the failure of less drastic measures. We have been struggling with them since the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. Their insufficiency and the need for stronger measures is demonstrated by the record in Dallas County, Ala., of which Selma is the county seat. Dallas County has a voting-age population of approximately 29,500, of whom 14,500 are white persons and 15,000 are Negroes. In 1961, 9,195 of the whites—64 percent of the voting-age total—and 156 Negroes—1 percent of the total—were registered to vote in Dallas County. An investigation by the Department of Justice substantiated the discriminatory practices that these statistics make obvious. A voter discrimination case was brought against the Dallas County board of registrars on April 13, 1961. It was 13 months before the case finally came to trial. We proved discrimination by prior registrars—that exactly 14 Negroes had been registered between 1954 and 1960. For whites, registration had been a simple corollary of citizenship. But the court found that the board of registrars then in office was not discriminating and refused

to issue an injunction against discrimination.

On September 30, 1963, 2½ years after the suit was originally filed, the court of appeals reversed the district court and ordered it to enter an injunction against discriminatory practices, but it refused to hold that Negro applicants must be judged by standards no different than the lenient ones that had been applied to white applicants during the long period of discrimination—so that the effects of past discrimination would be dissipated.

Two months later, the department photographed voter registration records at the Dallas County courthouse which showed that the new registrars whom the district court had earlier given a clean bill of health were engaging in blatant discrimination.

Of the 445 Negro applications rejected, 175 had been filed by Negroes with at least 12 years of education, including 21 with 16 years and 1 with a master's degree. Processing of applications was slowed to a snail's pace. In October 1963, when most of the applicants were Negroes, the average number of persons allowed to fill out forms each registration day was about one-fourth the average in previous years, when most of the applicants were white.

Since registration is permanent in Alabama, the great majority of white voters in Selma and Dallas County, already registered under easier standards, did not have to pass the tests that the local officials then devised. Under the new test, the applicant had to demonstrate his ability to spell and understand by writing individual words from the dictation of the registrar. Applicants in Selma were required to spell such difficult and technical words as "emolument," "impeachment," "apportionment," and "despotism." The Dallas County registrars also added a refinement not required by the terms of the State-prescribed form. Applicants were required to give a satisfactory interpretation of one of the excerpts of the Constitution printed on the form.

In March 1964 the department filed a motion in the original Dallas County case initiating a second full-scale attempt to end discriminatory practices in the registration process in that county. On February 4, 1965—nearly 4 years after we first brought suit—the district court finally enjoined use of the complicated literacy and knowledge-of-government tests and entered orders designed to deal with the serious problem of delay.

We hope that this most recent decree will be effective, but the Negroes of Dallas County are not unnaturally skeptical. After 4 years of litigation only 383 out of 15,000 Negroes in the county have been registered to vote.

The litigation in Dallas County took 4 years at a minimum to open the door to the exercise of constitutional rights conferred almost a century ago. The problem on a national scale is that the difficulties experienced in suits in Dallas County have been encountered over and over and over again under existing voting laws. Four years is too long. The burden is too heavy—the wrong to our citizens is too serious—the damage to our national conscience is too great not to adopt more effective measures than exist today.

Such is the essential justification for the pending bill.

IV

It is obvious that the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 introduces the possibility of major changes in present distribution of State and Federal responsibility for elections. Perhaps most of us regret the necessity, even though we earnestly support the measure because there is no alternative but the acceptance of an intolerable wrong contradicting the ideals to which we have professed devotion since the Declaration of Independence—and that is no alternative.

Whether the shift of responsibility proves great or small in the end depends entirely upon the willingness of the persons affected now to conform to the 15th amendment's declaration that the right of a citizen to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of race or color. The bill will have no effect upon the respective functions of State and Federal Governments—it will not bring one iota of Federal intervention—in those States and localities in which the 15th amendment is made a living reality as the Constitution directs. I can think of no conclusion more devoutly to be desired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island. I was hoping I would provoke him into a colloquy.

Mr. PASTORE. I suggest that the Senator from Pennsylvania is in violation of the germaneness rule at the moment.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed not in excess of 3 minutes in further violation of the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PASTORE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no objection; and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed for 3 minutes out of order.

Mr. CLARK. So I welcome the correction by my friend from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the proposed changes in the Senate rules and of certain proposals requiring concurrent action of both Houses may be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN COMPREHENSIVE REVISION OF SENATE RULES

(Proposed by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK)

1. Journal: The Senate Journal is nothing more than a quaint anachronism which is never looked at by anyone and is read only for purposes of delay. Its place has been taken, for practical purposes, by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The revision recognizes this fact, and satisfies article I, section 5, clause 3, of the Constitution, which requires each House to keep a journal of its proceedings, by stating that the Senate section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be the Senate Journal.

Since the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is printed and available to Senators each morning following a session, there is no need to have it read aloud, and the right to require that is abolished. Presumably any errors in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be corrected informally, or by unanimous consent, as they are today. But a procedure for correcting mistakes by motion, without debate, is provided for those cases in which unanimous consent cannot be obtained. Under this procedure, the Senator seeking to make the correction, and the Senator objecting to the correction may file written briefs in support of their positions for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in advance of the vote.

2. Quorums: The unrestricted right of any Senator to call for a quorum has frequently been the source of great harassment and delay. The revision circumscribes this right by requiring a Senator to declare his intention to call for a vote on the pending business once the presence of a quorum has been ascertained. Only on this condition could an individual Senator suggest the absence of a quorum. However the majority or minority leaders, or in their absence, the acting majority or minority leaders, could call for a quorum at any time. The Presiding Officer would have the duty to halt the quorum call once he ascertains the presence of a quorum in the Chamber.

3. Order of recognition: This provision codifies and elaborates the unwritten rule that the Chair will always give preference in recognition to the majority and minority leaders. In the absence of the leaders, it gives equivalent rights to any Senator designated to act in that capacity and occupying the leader's desk.

4. Germane points of order: The revision seeks to clear up the confusing situation which presently exists with regard to the right to interrupt a Senator who has the floor for the purpose of raising a point of order. It provides that a Senator may be interrupted without his consent for the purpose of raising a point of order that the Senator in possession of the floor has committed a transgression of the rules of the Senate germane to his possession of the floor.

5. Submission of speeches without delivery: Upon request, a Senator would be permitted to have his written remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in normal size print without the requirement of full oral delivery. However, the RECORD would contain a notation to the effect that the material was submitted but not delivered orally.

6. Three-hour rule: Whenever a Senator has held the floor for more than three consecutive hours, an objection to his continued possession of the floor, if made by any Senator, would compel him to yield the floor.

7. Germaneness of debate: The present rule, which provides for a daily 3-hour period of germane debate, would be made more flexible by the adoption of a procedure whereby a majority of the Senate, by nondebatable motion, could require further debate on the pending business to be germane to the subject matter before the Senate until the business was disposed of.

8. Points of order: This new provision would limit debate on questions of order submitted to the Senate, and debatable appeals from rulings of the Chair, to 1 hour, in all, unless the Senate orders otherwise.

9. Morning business: The morning hour rule has been revised extensively to abolish the confusing distinction between morning hour and morning business, and to dispense with the need for unanimous consent to make statements or comments of not more than 3 minutes duration. There would be a daily period of 1 hour, if that much time should be needed, set aside at the opening of each new legislative day for the conduct of morning business. The Senate, by majority vote without debate, could extend the period for up to 1 additional hour. During this period, under the regular order of business, Senators would have the privilege of making 3-minute statements and could seek unanimous consent to have printed matter inserted in the RECORD.

10. Motions to take up: This revision would provide a means by which a Senator could convert a motion to proceed to the consideration any measure on the Senate Calendar, which would ordinarily be debatable, into a nondebatable motion. This could be done by filing at the desk of the clerk a notice of intention to make such a motion on the following calendar day on which the Senate is in session. The notice of intention would be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. Procedure for bills, joint resolutions and resolutions: This rule has been extensively rewritten both to clarify its operation, and to reduce the potential for disruption of normal legislative procedures by the objection of a single Senator. The provision by which any Senator can prevent a bill from being referred to committee, and have it placed directly on the calendar after second reading, has been eliminated. However, this may be done on motion by a majority of the Senate after 1 hour of debate, equally divided between opponents and proponents. The section permitting any Senator to force a postponement of the introduction of any bill or joint resolution for 1 day has also been eliminated.

12. Ex officio members of Appropriations Committee: The Senate rules presently provide for the selection of three ex officio members of the Appropriations Committee from each of eight legislative committees. These ex officio members serve on the Appropriations Committee for the limited purpose of considering annual appropriations for programs within the jurisdiction of their particular legislative committee. The revision of this rule adds five more legislative committees to this list, on the ground that they have equally valid claims to participate in appropriations decisions affecting matters within their jurisdiction. These five additional committees are: Commerce, Finance, Interior and Insular Affairs, Judiciary, and Labor and Public Welfare.

13. Germaneness of amendments: This provision, which is similar to the present practice of the House of Representatives, incorporates a general prohibition against nongermane amendments. Questions of germaneness are to be decided by the presiding officer subject to appeal to the Senate without debate.

14. Previous question: The cumbersome and unwieldly cloture provisions of rule XXII would be deleted by this revision. In their place would be substituted a split-level motion for the previous question, by which a majority of Senators present and voting could terminate debate: (1) on any motion or amendment to a measure pending before the Senate after that motion or amendment has received 15 hours of consideration on not less than 3 calendar days; or (2) on the measure itself, together with any motions or amendments relating to it, after the measure plus all related motions and amendments has received consideration for 15 calendar days.

If the previous question is ordered, 1 hour of debate equally divided between opponents and proponents, would be allowed as to any motion or amendment encompassed by the motion for the previous question, and 4 hours, divided in the same manner, would be allowed on final passage. Unlike the cloture procedure under which Senators may call up for a vote after cloture any amendment which has previously been presented and read, this procedure would limit consideration after the previous question had been ordered to amendments embraced by the motion. All other amendments would be deemed rejected.

15. Voting: Two additions have been made to the existing rule, both for the purpose of codifying existing practice: (1) A demand for the yeas and nays, when seconded by 11 Senators, shall be sufficient to require a rollcall vote; and (2) Senators entering the Chamber after their names have been called may obtain recognition from the presiding officer and have their votes recorded prior to the announcement of the vote.

16. Selection and retirement of committee chairmen: Chairmen of standing committees would be chosen by secret ballot of the majority members of the committee at the beginning of each new Congress. In addition, no Senator would be permitted to serve as chairman of a standing committee after he has attained the age of 70.

17. Jurisdiction of committees: The jurisdiction of the Senate Committees on Finance, Banking and Currency, Foreign Relations, Commerce, and Labor and Public Welfare would be shifted to provide a more logical and equitable division of responsibility. In addition, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration would be enlarged in accordance with Senate Resolution 338, to include violations of the rules of the Senate. The Rules Committee would also be given the power to recommend appropriate disciplinary action, including reprimand, censure, suspension, or expulsion from office or employment after making findings of fact and conclusions and after according notice and an opportunity for a hearing to any individual concerned.

18. Limit on committee memberships: The present rule which limits Senators to membership on not more than two major and one minor committee contains a grandfather clause making an exception for members of the Government Operations and Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committees. As a result, some Senators serve on as many as four major and one minor committee. This revision would strike the exception, and make up the difference by reducing slightly committee memberships. The Appropriations Committee would be reduced from 27 to 24 members. Of the remaining major committees, 10 would be cut back from 17 to 15 members, and 2 would be cut back from 15 to 13 members.

19. Committee meetings during Senate sessions: Although standing committees may now sit without special leave during the period while morning business is conducted, a single Senator still has the power to prevent every standing committee and every subcommittee of a standing committee from meeting while the Senate is in session after the close of morning business. The sole purpose of this revision is to implement the intention of the drafters of the Legislative Reorganization Act by stating that a committee may obtain leave to sit while the Senate is in session by a privileged, nondebatable motion.

20. Committee bill of rights: A majority of the members of each standing committee would be authorized, in addition to the procedures now provided in individual committee rules, to convene meetings; to direct the initiation, conduct and termination of hearings; to call up bills for consideration; and to terminate debate in committee after a measure has received committee consideration in executive session for a total of 5 hours.

21. Instructions to report on major legislative matters: Although it is axiomatic that the committees of the Senate are its creatures and agents, no procedures presently exist by which the Senate can exercise its authority in a fair, orderly, and effective manner.

The rules do presently provide for a motion to discharge a committee from further consideration of a measure. But this motion cannot be used to secure committee consideration of a subject, nor does it provide a device for obtaining a committee's recommendations. Moreover, such a motion can be filibustered, since it is debatable.

This proposal remedies these defects by creating a privileged motion to denominate any measure pending in committee or subcommittee as a "major legislative matter." This motion would be nondebatable, provided that a notice of intention to make such a motion had been presented on the previous calendar day, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Debate on the motion would be limited to 8 hours, the time to be divided equally between opponents and proponents. Such motion, if carried by a majority of Senators present and voting, would constitute an instruction to the committee in which the measure was then pending to report it to the Senate within 30 calendar days, by poll or otherwise, with the recommendation (a) that it be passed, or (b) that it not be passed, or (c) that it be passed with amendments, stating the recommended amendments.

22. Selection of conferees and exploratory statement: A majority of the Senate members of a conference committee would have to be chosen from those who indicated by their votes their concurrence with the prevailing view in the Senate on matters in disagreement with the House. Senate conferees would be required to prepare a statement explaining the action of the conference, just as the managers on the part of the House are required to do under the House rules.

23. Adoption of rules for each Congress: The provision continuing the rules of the Senate from one Congress to the next Congress would be deleted, and a majority of Senators present and voting would be empowered to adopt rules at the beginning of each Congress.

24. Disclosure of financial interests: This new rule, which was offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the disclosure resolution favorably reported by the Rules Committee earlier in the year, would require every Senator and every Senate officer or employee compensated at a gross rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, to file a financial report each year. The report would contain the following kinds of information:

(a) Assets: The identity and fair market value of any asset having a fair market value of $5,000 or more.

(b) Liabilities: The amount of each liability in excess of $5,000, and the name and address of the creditor.

(c) Capital gains: Source and amount of all capital gains realized in the preceding calendar year in excess of $5,000.

(d) Income: Source and amount of every item of income for the calendar year in excess of $100, including gifts other than gifts from a relative.

(e) Assets belonging to a trust; assets, liabilities, capital gains, and income of a spouse; and capital gains earned through a strawman are all covered. Family homes and tax-exempt charitable entities are exempted.

(f) Association with a professional firm which practices before Federal Government agencies.

(g) Service as director, officer, or manager in a business enterprise.

25. Relations with lobbyists: This is another new rule which was offered as an amendment to the Rules Committee proposals. It prohibits Senators, and Senate officers and employees from engaging in joint ventures with lobbyists; and from accepting gifts worth more than $100 from lobbyists.

26. Testimony of Senators before committees: This new rule, also offered as an amendment to the Rules Committee conflict-of-interest resolution, would grant authority to any duly authorized committee of the Senate to request any Senator to come before it and give any pertinent testimony it has reason to believe he can give on the subject matter under investigation. A Senator receiving such a request would be required to appear and give testimony, unless within 10 days he delivers to the chairman of the committee a signed statement to the effect that he is without knowledge of the subject matter under investigation.

The Rules Committee would have the power to investigate breaches of this rule, and to recommend appropriate disciplinary action, including reprimand, censure, suspension or expulsion.

27. Moonlighting by Senate employees: This rule was also a part of the omnibus substitute amendment offered to the Rules Committee resolution. It would prohibit officers and full-time employees of the Senate from serving in any managerial capacity in any business or financial enterprise, or engaging in any regular professional or consulting practice, or maintaining an association with any professional or consulting firm without special leave of the Senate. In addition, it would permit moonlighting only if two conditions are met: (1) the activity or employment must not be inconsistent with the conscientious performance of the officer or employee's official duties; and (2) express permission must have been given by the Member of the Senate charged with the supervision of the officer or employee. For the purposes of this rule, each Senator would be responsible for supervising his own staff; chairmen of committees would supervise committee staffs; the majority and minority leaders and the Vice President would supervise their own employees; and the President pro tempore would be charged with the supervision of all other officers and employees of the Senate.

PROPOSALS REQUIRING CONCURRENT ACTION OF BOTH HOUSES

1. Appropriations Committee procedures: House and Senate Appropriations Committees would be authorized to hold joint hearings and half of the appropriations bills each year would originate in each Chamber to expedite congressional business. (S. Con. Res. 28, introduced by Senator CLARK on March 7, 1963, and pending in Rules Committee.)

2. Separate session for appropriations: (S. 2198, introduced by Senator MAGNUSON, and cosponsored by Senators CLARK, NEUBERGER, and HART; pending in Rules Committee.) This bill would divide the annual session of Congress into two parts: a "legislative session" which would begin on January 3 of each year and end not later than the first Monday in November; and a "fiscal session" beginning on the second Monday in November and ending not later than December 31. Under the proposed procedure, Congress would devote the early session to substantive legislation including authorizations. It could then recess for the summer and come back in November to deal with appropriations. The bill also changes the fiscal year to make it correspond with the calendar year, so that all appropriations bills will be enacted before the beginning of the fiscal year to which they pertain.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 7 minutes. The request is not necessary unless the Senator wishes to speak out of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

WELCOMING TO THE UNITED STATES THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 349, which was messaged to the Senate this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 349) welcoming to the United States the Inter-American Bar Association during its 14th conference to be held in Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution? There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the Inter-American Bar Association was organized at Washington, District of Columbia, May 16, 1940, and is now celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding; and

Whereas the Inter-American Bar Association will hold its fourteenth conference at San Juan, Puerto Rico, during the period May 22–29, 1965; and

Whereas this is the first time that the Inter-American Bar Association has planned a conference in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

Whereas three previous conferences of the association have been held in the United States; and

Whereas the purposes of the association, as stated in its constitution, are to establish and maintain relations between associations and organizations of lawyers, national and local, in the various countries of the Americas, to provide a forum for exchange of views, and to encourage cordial intercourse and fellowship among the lawyers of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the high character of this international association, its deliberations, and its members can do much to encourage understanding, friendship, and cordial relations among the countries of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas there were adopted by the Eightieth Congress, in its second session, and by the Eighty-sixth Congress, in its first session, concurrent resolutions of welcome and good wishes to the Inter-American Bar Association on the occasion of its holding conferences in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States welcomes the Inter-American Bar Association during its fourteenth conference to be held in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and wishes the association outstanding success in accomplishing its purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary General of the Inter-American Bar Association.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Alaska for yielding.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—XI: OUR POLICIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA ARE AIDING AND NOT THWARTING IMPERIALIST COMMUNISM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, during his press conference Tuesday, President Johnson commendably rebuked those columnists who, speaking not alone for themselves but for the underlings in the Federal bureaucracy intent on justifying their past errors, are attempting to stamp out any and all criticism, however justified, of our policies in Vietnam.

In answer to the question, do you think any of the participants in the national discussion on Vietnam could appropriately be likened to the appeasers of 25 or 30 years ago? President Johnson incisively reasserted the right of critics to bring out their point of view on the mess in Vietnam by replying:

I don't believe in characterizing people with labels. I think you do a great disservice when you engage in name calling. We want honest, forthright discussion in this country, and that will be a discussion with differences of views, and we welcome what our friends have to say, whether they agree with us or not. And I would not want to label people who agree with me or disagree with me.

I am gratified at the President's reply—as all right-thinking Americans should be—but not surprised. I would have expected no less from one nurtured in the finest traditions of the Congress where, in the Senate, the right to "take the floor" and speak out on any topic is assured. Of late, however, critics of our Vietnam policies have done so at the risk of vituperative comment in the press. Some of us who have done so have run the danger of being called beatniks, even though beardless.

I commend President Johnson, therefore, for his defense of his critics and in the same vein in which he said, "We want honest, forthright discussion in this country, and that will be a discussion with differences of views, and we welcome what our friends have to say, whether they agree or not." And I shall continue to criticize the current, unrealistic United States policies in Vietnam.

President Johnson's statements about Vietnam at his press conference yesterday sounded reasonable but were unrealistic.

Our administration's policy is unrealistic because it does not take into account the facts of life in Vietnam and of history.

It is unrealistic because it continues the past errors responsible for our being mired in the quagmire of Vietnam.

It is unrealistic because it does not take into account the fact that we are dealing in Vietnam with human beings and not machines.

It is unrealistic because it assumes a monolithic, absolute control of the Vietcong by Hanoi that simply does not exist.

By some sort of a process of self-mesmerization, those advising President Johnson have convinced themselves—and President Johnson, apparently—that the National Front of Liberation in South Vietnam is only a "front" for Hanoi.

Of course, it is in part.

But to say so does not mean that the National Front of Liberation has no entity of its own—that it has no aspirations of its own—that it has no will of its own.

The National Front of Liberation will accept from Hanoi direction and control in its efforts to conquer all of South Vietnam so long as Hanoi's objectives coincide with its own.

But, by excluding the National Front of Liberation from the groups with which he is willing to negotiate, the President is being entirely unrealistic.

Suppose we do go to the peace table with Hanoi and the latter should agree to discontinue its aid to the Vietcong.

Does anyone realistically believe that Hanoi could then issue orders to the Vietcong to lay down their arms and become part of the one big, happy family of peaceful Vietnamese?

Anyone who takes such an unrealistic position misreads history.

After Dienbienphu in 1954, Ho Chi Minh, leader of the Vietminh, agreed to the armistice terms at Geneva, which provided for the temporary partition of Vietnam at the 17th parallel only because those armistice terms contained the explicit agreement that free, supervised elections would be held by July 20, 1956, leading to the reunification of Vietnam.

In a separate declaration, the United States agreed to this reunification provision. Then in 1956 the United States acceded to and supported the breach of this provision of a solemn international undertaking.

In not even alluding at his press conference on Tuesday, April 27 and at Johns Hopkins on April 7 to this provision of the Geneva agreement—a return to which he called for in his March 25 remarks—by not holding out the smallest hope of ultimate reunification of all of Vietnam—President Johnson, despite his oft repeated offer of unconditional negotiations, is in effect saying that one of the conditions of negotiations is the agreement in advance that this provision of the Geneva agreement was nonnegotiable. In other words, while talking unconditional negotiation we are in fact asserting a condition precedent to any negotiations.

Such a condition precedent to negotiations ignores history. It conveniently slides under the rug not only the reunification provision of the Geneva agreement, but also the fact that for 800 years after it had ousted its Chinese conquerors and before it was colonized by force by France, the whole of Vietnam constituted one undivided, free, independent sovereign country.

I oppose U.S. policies in Vietnam—and have done so for over 13 months now—not alone because they are unrealistic and are leading us down the path to a full scale, major war, but also because they are playing right into the hands of Chinese imperialist communism.

Let us carefully and realistically examine the direction in which our present policies are headed.

We start out with the known fact that, having been a colony of China for over 1,000 years, and having expelled China by force of arms, North Vietnam is not anxious to be reconquered by China at this point in history.

We have now been bombing North Vietnam for nearly 3 months and the makers of policy in the Pentagon and some of the pundits in the press are pointing gleefully to the fact that neither the Red hordes from Communist China nor the forces from Communist Russia have poured across the 17th parallel.

But the fact remains that Hanoi does not need manpower either from Peiping or Moscow. It needs weapons and materiel and recent reports of the installation of missiles in Hanoi and elsewhere in North Vietnam indicate that it is or will be shortly obtaining Russian weapons and materiel. As for men, Hanoi has sufficient for the time being to maintain its infiltration of the civil war in South Vietnam.

Some may interpret the lack of Red Chinese fighting men in South Vietnam as restraint on the part of Red China.

One explanation is that the Chinese are anything but unhappy about the situation in which the United States finds itself.

They—the Chinese—see the United States entrapped in a war on the continent of Asia.

They see it realistically as a war in which we are losing American lives and spending vast sums of money.

They see the escalation of this war as an intensification of these two conditions—more American lives sacrificed, more dollars expended.

They see the Western white man—the United States—fighting all alone a small Asiatic nation on the continent of Asia and being held by that small nation at least to a standstill.

They note that the United States has been fighting this war all alone.

They see this war alienating from the United States the support of the neutrals and its allies.

Why should the Chinese not be more than content with this situation and let it develop without specific action on their part? For despite the allegations by some spokesmen for the administration—and indeed the President's own reference to Communist China—that China is behind the Vietcong it is more than evident that to date the Chinese have shown a complete self-restraint as far as any military action is concerned.

There is another explanation for Chinese inaction to date.

It is more plausible to interpret events as indicating that Hanoi has not invited Red Chinese troops into its country.

And for good reason.

Hanoi well remembers the last time Chinese hordes invaded Vietnam and how it took more than a thousand years to free itself.

Hanoi wants no repetition of that event.

But United States present policies may be driving Hanoi into the waiting arms of Peiping. If our war efforts are escalated and North Vietnam is laid bare, then Hanoi may be forced to call for aid from both Red China and Communist Russia. Once Red Chinese troops occupy North Vietnam, how many thousands of years will it take before they leave? It will be difficult to drive them out.

Our policies are also driving Peiping and Moscow closer whereas their deep split was a cause for rejoicing in the free world. Our policies are likewise estranging us from our allies and strengthening imperialist communism.

How are our policies in southeast Asia strengthening imperialist communism?

Because if we had adhered to the Geneva agreement and would adhere to it now, and announced our purpose to hold the elections promised in the Geneva agreement which we supported, a united Vietnam would inevitably firmly resist a takeover by the Chinese. This would be a complete accord with its past history.

The Vietnamese want to be independent. They objected to the presence of the French. They object to the presence of the United States. They would oppose the presence of the Chinese.

What would emerge in all probability judged by past history, both long time and recent, would be a Titoist form of government independent of Peiping.

To secure that type of independence from Moscow, the United States has invested $2 billion in foreign aid in Tito's Yugoslavia.

We could have pursued the same policy in southeast Asia, although in consequence of our aggressiveness there and now bombings of North Vietnam and our repeated declarations for an independent South Vietnam, this policy would now be more difficult to achieve than it would have been a year ago. But it is still possible.

In this policy we would have Russian support.

But if we escalate the war still further, go still farther north, continue to bait the Government of China, the Chinese may move in with ground troops into both North and South Vietnam. And once they occupy Vietnam it would be infinitely more difficult to get them out. It has been extremely difficult and as yet impossible to get Joseph Stalin's troops and tanks and their successors out of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland and Czechoslovakia. But we managed to assist Tito in proclaiming and maintaining a considerable degree of independence from Moscow. We are pleased with the result and consider the $2 billion dollars it cost the American taxpayers as a sound investment.

His government is Communist, but it is a communism independent of imperial control which Joseph Stalin sought to impose. It is not a communism which is exported for the purpose of dominating other nations.

Similarly, if we had pursued or could now pursue a corresponding policy in southeast Asia, a reunited Vietnam choosing its own government would in all likelihood maintain its independence from the Peiping rule of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai.

Unfortunately our present policy is likely to nullify that desirable solution.

Actually, our policy is leading to the very Chinese imperialist expansion which we declare it is our purpose to obviate.

I repeat my previous suggestions.

We should:

Stop the bombings in North Vietnam, at least for a limited period of time, so that negotiations can get underway without North Vietnam being dragged to the conference table with a pistol at its head.

Press for an immediate cease-fire in South Vietnam with international supervision.

Offer to go to the negotiating table with all the parties involved, including

the Vietcong, the real opposition to the South Vietnamese Government which the United States supports.

It has been said that all wars end at the negotiating table, so why not this one?

I fear that this statement may no longer be true. The thermonuclear capabilities of the major nations of the world mean that the next—the last world war—could end not in negotiations but in total destruction of the peoples of the world, leaving no one to negotiate.

Is it not time for the President to take another firm, hard look at the policies he has been advised to pursue?

It is not too late—yet—for reason and realism to prevail.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 117

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to amendment No. 82 of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, of the amendment numbered 82, change the period to a colon and add this additional sentence: *"Provided, however,* That this provision shall be applicable only to elections held for the selection of presidential electors, Members of the United States Senate, and Members of the United States House of Representatives."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, let me state briefly the reason why I offer my amendment to the pending amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

I am in favor of amendment No. 82. However, in my opinion amendment No. 82 in its present form is unconstitutional because it is not restricted to Federal elections. By the term "Federal elections", I mean elections in which presidential electors and Members of the U.S. Senate and Members of the U.S. House of Representatives are chosen.

The only effect of my amendment would be to confine the application of amendment No. 82 to Federal elections and thereby make it constitutional under the interpretation placed on the 15th amendment by the Supreme Court of the United States in a number of cases.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I concur in the statement just made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. I find his amendment to my amendment to be perfectly acceptable. In fact, I believe that it would make my amendment stronger, which is the objective we are trying to achieve.

Since the yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to modify my amendment to accept the provision of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], numbered 82 as amended by the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. The Chair will put the question.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMERICAN POLICY IN VIETNAM AND DEBATE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a great national debate on our policy in Vietnam has moved a considerable distance since it opened on the floor of the Senate on the 17th of February. It is with some reluctance that I take issue with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], who has just preceded me, but he and I have had rather strong differences on this question for some time. Let me add that we have likewise enjoyed the additional pleasure of exchanging those differences, not only in debate on the floor of the Senate, but also in debate on some of the campuses of the universities across this great land of ours.

It is that kind of debate which, it seems to me, is in the tradition of free inquiry and open discussion in the test of conflicting positions in the public forum. This helps to firm up the wisdom of policy positions.

Because of the debates which have taken place in the past 3 months, we can now point to a higher level of both discussion and debate, but now more often on the right questions for the right reasons instead of the wrong reasons, and with not quite so much misinformation as characterized the opening discussions.

This is all to the good. The country as a whole has become much more closely attuned to the tough issues which need to be resolved in southeast Asia. Much of the helpful delineation and consideration which plague our great country has come from high places in the administration, led by the President himself, aided and abetted by Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of Defense McNamara, as well as some of the President's closest personal advisers. Likewise, articulate voices in the Senate have continued to contribute to the discussion, and thus have contributed to the shaping of policy positions.

Not the least of the forces which have contributed to enlightened debate have been the voices that have come from the nongovernmental level, from town meetings, community seminars, and perhaps most of all from the campuses of our great educational institutions, both large and small.

The knowledge of the academic world in these matters has taken on new dimensions during this time of crisis. Perhaps more so than at any time since the 1930's, the college campuses have come forward to participate in a controversy with debate of high caliber and considerable magnitude.

As a former academic, I am delighted to see this manifestation of deep concern about an issue of such vital international and national significance.

Having said that, however, there is one aspect about it that remains disturbing to many of us. This is the seeming impression, which has come to us at least through the media of communication, that the campuses of the land are almost totally in the grasp of those who oppose the President's position in Vietnam that they are engaging in a monolog rather than a dialog. We are being led to believe that the teach-ins, the picketing activity, the marchings, and the public student demonstrations all reflect a cross section of the campus life today.

It is unfortunate that this impression has gotten abroad in the land—unfortunate because it is not only unrealistic, but also because it is untrue. Yet at this very moment the image of the intellectual world is a one-sided image. It suggests that the students and their professors and intellectuals are all automatically pacifists or troublemakers, whose loyalty to their country may be open to question.

In the interest of objectivity, as we seek to judge the academic world of our time, particularly on the issue of Vietnam, it is necessary that we bear in mind how such distortion could emerge in the first place.

At the outset we ought to recognize that if the campuses were to rally around a policy that was already invoked, if the campuses were to accept what already is a fact, it would be less newsworthy and it would not attract attention from off the campus, and therefore the protester against the existing situation has the advantage in headlines.

Second, campuses generally and understandably draw hangers-on, those who are professional protesters, even though not officially members of the intellectual community. These hangers-on should not be confused with bona fide academics.

Third, major segments of the academic world have contributed through their intellectual resources to the warp and woof of the present American policy in Vietnam. The President himself is a former teacher. The Secretary of State was a professor of political science and a Rhodes scholar. The Secretary of Defense is a distinguished scholar PBK. McGeorge Bundy, a key adviser to the President on defense matters, was dean of arts and science at Yale. And Walt Rostow, chairman of the policy planning staff shaping these questions, was a professor of economic history at MIT and a Rhodes scholar.

In other ways, through position papers, field studies, public debates, and community dialogs, other voices from the classroom have helped to shape and to

raise the level of understanding of the central issues in the Far East. On my own campus at the University of Wyoming my former colleagues in the department of history have taken the lead in this regard.

It is unfortunate in the light of this that only one side of the academic face is coming through—that which protests a strong policy in Indochina. One of the regrettable consequences is to give to the general public the wrong image of the intellectual in America—wrong only because it portrays him as being one-sided and with a closed mind. It is not that students and professors should not protest, for whatever else, protest should ever remain a hallmark of academia. Exploration of the unrealistic as well as the realistic, of the frowzy as well as the fundamental, should always be a way of life on the campus. The right to think otherwise or be otherwise should remain a cherished tradition in the halls of ivy.

On a question of the magnitude of American policy in Vietnam, it is important that the public image of the position of American intellectuals on it be brought back into balance. For all too long in our country's history academics were suspect, particularly in the public arena of politics. Among others, the Soviet Union frightened some of our countrymen into the realization that perhaps there was a proper place for intellect in a modern state. In any event, the intellectual has acquired a higher status and public respect today never before enjoyed—at least in this century. Thus, the campus is on the spot, and the urgency of getting through a balanced profile becomes even greater.

So I appeal to the currently silent segment of our campuses who support the President or who may agree with fundamental tenets implicit in a firm posture in Asia to declare themselves now in a public way. Let the professors speak out; let the students petition. It is time to stand up and be counted.

For several weeks, I have been meeting with groups of students and professors on the question of Vietnam. Their questions, their newspaper ads, and their picket signs generally center around half a dozen ideas. It has been my experience that the ideas often are noble but that the facts which led them to those ideas were often irrelevant. While ferment on the campus is to the good, we can ill afford campus monologs premised upon fermented facts, namely, facts that are old and out of date. How well I remember my own classroom days. It is with no thought of disparagement at all that I recall that Professor McGee had a lot more solutions to the problems of the world than does Senator McGee.

That may suggest, in capsule form, why President Truman, who may have held a different position until he became President, why President Eisenhower or President Johnson, too, came to about the same answers on this question. It is the difference between sheer speculation or posing theoretical postulates, and having to accept responsibility for taking a given policy position now on any given issue of the day.

Let us examine some of the questions and some of the answers to the questions which appear most frequently and most commonly in the student bodies with whom I have met, and many of the professors whom I know so well. These questions take into account the kinds of uncertainties that still prevail in many sincere and expert academic minds.

At the same time the answers take into account the radical changes in the status quo that have occurred in the last 6 to 8 months.

Perhaps one question that is put most often, or most frequently, is this: Why do we interfere in what is largely a simple civil war between two factions in South Vietnam?

Of course, the answer to that question lies in the developments which have occurred in recent months. In that interval of time the government in Hanoi has intensified its training of skilled guerrilla forces, recruited in North Vietnam, and they have likewise stepped up their infiltration of the territory south of the 17th parallel.

Also, in recent months Hanoi has begun to give direct radio signals—orders, if you will—to most of the units operating in South Vietnam. This has meant coordination of movement and a concentration of targets, and thus a greater effectiveness or a greater threat of their capability to disrupt and destroy in the south.

Third, we now have abundant evidence to suggest that even major regular army units from Hanoi are now operating across the border in the south. There has begun wholesale importation of supplies and armaments from outside Vietnam, which are then smuggled into the south on behalf of the guerrillas. We have learned that in recent battles the Vietcong has been armed with small arms of which more than 90 percent came from outside the area—notably arms from China, from Czechoslovakia. Almost 100 percent of the larger weapons were of Chinese manufacture.

Until 6 months or so ago, the guerrilla operations were largely endemic in their nature. Very often they were cannibals from the standpoint of arms, either converting arms that they captured or using arms that they had discovered in caches left over from the Japanese occupation or the war with the French.

But that has now changed; and this change is the point to which we ought to lend emphasis as we seek to respond to the academics who still call into question policies in Vietnam on the basis of outmoded and outdated fact.

Another question that is commonly raised in the campus discussions is as follows: Why do we remain in a land that wants no part of our presence there, where a large segment of the population is openly trying to throw us out, and is strongly supporting the position of the guerrillas or the Vietcong?

That item, I submit, is nonsensical on its face. In the first place, how do we measure the attitudes of the rural peasant population in South Vietnam? How do we determine the state of mind of the people in the hills and the mountain country north of Saigon?

Mr. Gallup has not been over there. There is no known standard of measurement that would stand up to the test of validity. But one of the students suggested to me on one occasion. "Whenever the guerrillas come into a village, the first thing they do is to get cooperation from the local villagers."

Mr. President, students have often suggested to me that the best evidence of the fact that Americans are not wanted in Vietnam is disclosed in the fact that villagers themselves often aid the Vietcong by giving them rice, where possible, by helping them repair weapons, and even by supplying them with manpower. This cannot be denied as a fact, but in my judgment it is a fact that very often stems from terrorism of the most extreme sort. I suggest that most villagers, wherever the village, confronted by the shooting in cold blood of their tribal leaders or of decimation of their ranks by firing squads or by other atrocities practiced upon selected leaders of their community, would more readily surrender to a guerrilla occupation, however small, than to try to resist them, only to suffer the same fate themselves.

The real point is that most of those people, being without adequate means to defend themselves, would find it easier to go along and cooperate, and perhaps spare the lives of the young ones or themselves, than to be mowed down by well-armed groups of terrorists from the ranks of the guerrillas.

On the other hand, terrorists have every advantage in some respects. In order to win, all that they have to do is to hit and run. All they have to do is to strike terror, not to deliver a program, and then fade away under cover of jungle or night, to strike again at some other place.

I reject, thus, the equation of the villagers cooperating with the terrorists with the opposition to the United States and our presence in Vietnam.

Another question that comes from the colleges suggests that, as a practical question, we are losing the war in Vietnam, anyway, and, therefore, we should not continue an effort to do better there; that we should get out while we can, and perhaps get out as gracefully as we can.

That point of view, too, is nonsense, as I see it. The war in Vietnam has been going on for 10 years. At the very beginning it was said that the war could not last for more than 6 months. That kind of warfare has almost become a way of life because of practices and policies designed to unsettle and terrorize that have plagued the Government in South Vietnam. This is not to make any apologies for the little game of "who is the president in South Vietnam" from time to time, for that in itself is another subject. But it is to say that the war is not lost and need not be lost in South Vietnam.

A noted correspondent for the Paris weekly, L'Express, Georges Chaffard, has filed a series of dispatches which indicates that there has been a serious shifting, a significant one, in Vietnam. That statement comes from a source which, in general, has been sharply crit-

ical not only of the American position there, but of the Saigon Government there as well. These articles report increasing cases of battle fatigue among the North Vietnamese and among guerrilla groups, whose ranks are no longer marching in a single step, as once was the case. It should be pointed out, as Joseph Alsop has mentioned in one of his columns, that Georges Chaffard is no friend of our present position there, but is merely recording a significant shift as he sees it on the spot. The correspondent does not predict, I hasten to add, an immediate end to the struggle. He has not pronounced that, therefore, in the wake of some depressing developments, there is suddenly to be a victory. What he is saying is that there has been a measurable shift, and it is the kind of shift that represents a basis for realistic judgment of the present policy that our Government has been pursuing in Vietnam.

Further, we now increasingly read in the press, reports of new cracks in the facade of intransigence, at Hanoi; cracks that suggest that the North Vietnamese themselves have become badly split due to the new pressures that have been imposed upon them.

Other correspondents write of vastly improved morale in South Vietnam, including the fact that 7,000 young men volunteered for military service in the South last month alone. A few months ago, the reports would likely have been that the same number of men had dodged the draft.

I would note that the picture is not all bright, and one would not find it wise to be overenthusiastic in the circumstances. There are those who still consider the conflict incapable of successful resolution, and they offer evidence to support their concept. But I insist that there has been a sufficient shift in the general complexion of affairs in South Vietnam today to sustain an attitude of guarded, cautious optimism, and a spirit of determination to continue the President's policy of a careful and planned use of force in North Vietnam.

We have also heard much of the idea that China represents the wave of the future in southeast Asia, that its power will inevitably dominate the entire area. I would agree that China will certainly be of increasing influence in that area in future years, but that is a totally different concept than actual domination of smaller, weaker nations. On this point I subscribe to what President Johnson said at Johns Hopkins that "there is no end to that argument until all of the nations of Asia are swallowed up."

Some of the comment from those who protest our involvement in Vietnam casts us in the role of blood-thirsty warmongers, unmoved by the slaughter of innocents, the deaths of women and children, and completely unaware of the issues causing their deaths.

On Tuesday I had printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Anguish of Power." That editorial pointed out that the responsibilities of world leadership, which cannot be ignored, present us with alternatives, all of which will result in bloodshed and human suffering. It noted:

> Each of our decisions to use force or to fail to use force is filled with potential pain and injury for millions. This is the anguish that goes with great power. No one can deliver us from it.

The last question from the academic world which I will discuss here today—although there are many others—is the charge that we are all but alone in the nations of the free world in our policy in Vietnam, that we are earning universal condemnation and further tarnishing whatever good image is left us around the globe.

Let me say, that we must win our own respect first. We start with ourselves, to acquire what we regard as the best educated guesses, and we realize what our obligation is to mankind and to the world of which we are a part. We have to live with our conscience. We have to do what we believe in our best judgment is right because it is right, not because we are trying to win a popularity poll with some of the governments of the globe.

Any time we weigh foreign policy on the basis of taking a straw vote around the nations of the world, at that time we will be in deep trouble. This is not to suggest that we should ignore them. We must weigh and assess world opinion, national opinion, and the opinion of our colleagues, at all times. These are factors which we need to fit into the total scale of values which will guide us in our judgments. It does not mean that they should become a determining factor.

Those who are the most powerful in this world are rarely the most loved. Need I remind the Senate of the traditional role in history of the British nation for so many centuries, which in some respects became probably the most hated country in the world. We know that was true up and down the east coast of the United States for a long time. Especially was it true in Chicago during the 1920's, when the Mayor of Chicago ran his political campaigns based upon vilification of the King of England. This should remind us that with great power goes great responsibility and a great deal of unpopularity in the world.

We can never conduct our policies on the basis of trying to be loved by everyone or trying to be the good guy. We must do what the times require, for the simple reason that this is a world made up mostly of anarchy, and no one has agreed upon what rules we are to play as a result. There are others who are willing to be the bad guys, to take advantage of the inhibitions of civilization, of culture, of decent people, in order to exploit their inclinations not to act.

We dare not surrender to the temptation on the other side to exploit our respect for human life, our respect for the high level of civilization, and our abhorrence of war. One of the great calculations in the East has been the conviction that although the United States is a great power, that because of its highly civilized inhibitions it would not be willing to use its power. They are gambling on our unwillingness to use it.

It is not sufficient to suggest that because we have some new answers to old questions that we have sufficient justification for our role in Vietnam. We must ask ourselves—regardless of the success of our role—what business do we have in Vietnam at all. I submit that there are several reasons why to forfeit our presence in this troubled area would be to forfeit our leadership of the free world.

In the recent history of mankind the only force which has been able to keep international relationships on a peaceful plane has been that of balance of power. The Pax Britannica is a demonstration of how this concept, if pursued skillfully, can eliminate international conflicts on a global scale. And I would point out that though international conflicts once could be resolved upon the battlefields of Europe, this is no longer the case.

It makes a real difference to southeast Asia where the line representing the balance of power is drawn. This line is fairly well determined across most of the globe but in Vietnam we have a soft spot that the Communists seek to exploit for the extension of their domination.

The nations of southeast Asia have adopted the concept of wait and see over this struggle. For it is evident that the future course of these nations will be determined by our success or failure in stopping this pattern of conquest. Already we see the revival of Communist activity in Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia, Laos, and Cambodia. The picture is clear: what can succeed in South Vietnam can succeed in these nations, too—and this applies for both sides in equal measure.

National independence is a concept for which peoples have died over the centuries. I am convinced that the independence of these nations from direct external control, no matter what is the nature or form of their government, best serves the interests of these nations and of world peace.

The policy of planned escalation of this conflict is the subject which began here in the Senate on February 17. That policy now is being carefully applied by the Johnson administration. These are what I consider to be the goals of this policy:

First, we seek to set the stage for negotiations between the parties involved in this dispute. We mean to convince those who thought we were summer soldiers that we will honor our commitments in South Vietnam regardless of the discomfort, regardless of the size of the effort. I believe this fact is now becoming apparent to Hanoi and I believe this fact is now becoming apparent and I believe the chances for meaningful negotiations are improving.

All of us readily admit, unless it be the most rabid militarist on the loose—and I trust there are none of those except in retirement—that there is no military solution to southeast Asia. We will not solve the southeast Asia problem with bullets, guns, and troops. We must reach the kind of stage at which it will be possible to sit down realistically and try to find some substitute for war there.

But in February we were in no position to negotiate. The other side was not disposed to negotiate. Why should they? They were convinced that they were going to get everything free. They would get all that they desired without sitting down with anyone. If they would only wait it out, the Americans would soon go home.

Thus, likewise, we had to acquire a position which would lead them to understand that we were there to stay, and that their only chance to realize some kind of settlement better than the drains on their resources that war was making is to talk.

So these, then, were the purposes of planned escalation.

Now, nearly 3 months later, it is possible to assess our Government's program with the advantage of hindsight. In spite of the attacks made by the critics of the President, in spite of the assaults on the part of those who thought that it would be suicide and that we ought to get out, it is now possible to note measurable progress through the policy of planned escalation.

Second, we seek to lessen the chances of accidental war. To those who believe that our policy is just the reverse, I would suggest that accidental wars are created by those who misread the intentions of their adversaries. A policy of uncertain response to aggression encourages that aggression and further aggression. At a certain point our alternatives would be exhausted and we would be at war. When the Communists understand our intentions, I believe the chances for accidental war will be materially lessened. We shall never be free of the threat of war, but we can reduce the risk as much as possible.

A third goal of this policy is the sealing off of the problem of South Vietnam. As George A. Carver, Jr., pointed out in an excellent article in the April issue of *Foreign Affairs*, there is a power struggle in South Vietnam, but neither of the two sides are connected with the Vietcong. The infiltration of men and arms from the North was stepped up in February in an attempt to solve all problems from the outside. The South Vietnamese should be given the chance to work out their own future and a closed border will help them do it. No one suggests that democracy as we know it can be installed there, but that is no reason to deny the South Vietnamese the right to plot their own future free from outside domination.

With these goals in mind, I firmly believe that we are making definite progress in this conflict. A cross section of press accounts indicates the morale is increasing in the South. The increase in military volunteers has already been referred to. More and more weapons are being captured by the South Vietnamese Army. The ranks of the guerrilla forces are being thinned by the failure to replace casualties and the increasing number of deserters. More and more of these South Vietnamese trained in the North for guerrilla warfare return to their homes and families immediately upon being infiltrated southward. In many places they have shifted from offense to defense.

Further stresses and strains are visible in the Moscow-Peiping Axis. Name calling between the two is increasing and some physical conflict has appeared in Chinese student attacks upon Soviet Embassies and reversed incidents in Moscow.

In Hanoi there are increasing reports of a split in the ranks of policymakers. Young officers are contesting the strategy of the old revolutionaries. Doubts about the wisdom of present policies are increasing.

The announcement this morning that a battalion of Australian infantrymen are being sent to South Vietnam is welcome news which indicates that our allies have confidence in our ability to carry out our program and that we do not stand alone in this troublesome endeavor.

Finally, the President's speech in Baltimore, following as it did in the wake of American escalation and in the wake of a dispatch of increased troop personnel from the United States to Vietnam, came as a gesture of strength and of a sincere desire for peace, rather than being subject, instead, to being considered a desperate porposal by a nation that was on the ropes in southeast Asia. That speech could not have been made in February with any dignity. That speech could not have received any kind of credence anywhere around the world 2 months before. But because of the acceleration that was planned in North Vietnam, it was possible to show to the rest of the world again the true face of America; namely, that we have no designs on anyone else's government, that we covet no other country's territory, and that our goal is peace wherever we can obtain it and in whatever proportions it can be achieved. We have shown to the world that we are willing to put our men, our money, our policy, and our hearts where our words have been. That is an important step forward.

None of these facts suggest that we shall be at the negotiating table next month, but they are signs that our policy is having the effect we wish it to have and that it should be continued.

The responsibilities we have accepted in Vietnam are ugly and unpleasant, filled with suffering, death, and dislocation. But we have accepted them in the hope that in the final tally mankind will have benefited, that as a result of what we do here this year and next some peoples will have a chance to seek and find independence and self-determination that otherwise would have been denied them.

Our policies, as a product of human endeavor, may not be perfect. They should be debated, discussed, analyzed, and criticized by those in our colleges and universities and by the man on the street. But it is my hope that these debates and discussions will be conducted with an objective view of the facts and in the context of honorable differences among honorable men. We have the choice of helping to steer the course of history or of muddying the waters with fruitless and irrational posturing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a series of columns and articles. First, an article from the Evening Star of April 27 on the war; second, an editorial from the Washington Post, issue of April 28, on the war; next, a column by William S. White that was published in the Washington Post on April 28 on the same question; still another by Roscoe Drummond, from the same issue of the Post; likewise, an editorial entitled "Two-Pronged Attack on Vietcong," published in Life magazine of April 30; and a reprint from Life magazine of April 30 of material that appeared in a French weekly, L'Express, to which I referred earlier in my remarks as reprinted in Life magazine.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 27, 1965]

"MCNAMARA'S WAR"

Secretary McNamara said he decided to hold his televised press conference on the war in Vietnam at the request of the reporters who cover the Pentagon. Undoubtedly there was a factual basis for this. Our guess is, however, that the Defense Secretary also wanted to let the people see how things have been going in which his critics call "McNamara's war."

They have been going rather well. Since the much-condemned bombing of North Vietnam got underway in February some 14 highway and railroad bridges have been knocked out. In addition, there has been substantial damage to military installations, radar stations, supply depots, truck convoys, and the like.

Mr. McNamara says that this has not halted the movement of arms, supplies, and men from the north to South Vietnam. It may not even have substantially slowed down this traffic. The essential point to bear in mind, however, is that we can keep up the bombings day after day after day. And to an appreciable extent, we can also interdict any similar movement along the sea routes.

The critics say that the bombings will never bring the Communists to the conference table and that, instead, they will merely stiffen the resistance of Ho Chi Minh. We do not believe it.

It is perfectly clear that American power in the air and in the China Sea cannot be successfully challenged. And as long as we control the air and the sea it is absurd to think there will be any massive introduction of Red Chinese or Russian troops into the combat area. They couldn't be supplied if they could get there. Meanwhile, it is also clear that the United States and the South Vietnamese Air Force can continue to chop away at every target of consequence in North Vietnam. It may take a long time, but these targets surely are doomed if Hanoi hangs on.

So what thoughts must be running through the mind of Ho Chi Minh? According to Mr. McNamara, some 89,000 Vietcong troops have been killed in the past 4½ years. The Communist sources of manpower in the south are drying up, and it is becoming increasingly necessary to send in reinforcements from the north. Ho Chi Minh is nobody's fool. As he sees the turn which the war is taking as he notes the absence of important aid from Peiping and Moscow, and as he surveys the mounting ruin in his own country, there must be times when he is a deeply discouraged man.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 28, 1965]

VIETNAM POLICY: CONSENSUS OF EXTREMES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is every reason to believe President Johnson will widen and hold a decisive consensus in support of a strong policy in Vietnam.

He has one special asset. He is occupying his usual stance at the center. His policy is wedded to neither extreme. He rests on two pillars—clear determination to defend as long as the aggression continues; clear willingness to talk whenever Hanoi will start talking.

His senatorial, newspaper, and professional critics can offer no acceptable alternative. They are prepared to accept Chinese Communist domination of all southeast Asia. This is an alternative the American people will not accept without trying to do something about it.

The President has the backing of many Democrats (his offer of unconditional discussions won the approval of the ADA) and most Republicans.

Despite the honest, emotional student pickets and the college teach-ins, this leaves Mr. Johnson in a strategic position. And here is the evidence:

The Gallup poll finds that 29 percent of the country would like to see the United States withdraw completely from Vietnam, stop the fighting whatever the effects, and start negotiations whatever the outcome. It also finds that 31 percent of the country favors stepping up military activity and going the full distance of declaring war.

The President embraces neither extreme. He does not propose to withdraw or even cease defending. But he will start talking even while defending. He does not seek a solution by military means alone, but he will use military means until Hanoi is willing to use the conference table.

Where does this leave Mr. Johnson with respect to a public consensus? To obtain further evidence of the public's attitudes toward the handling of the situation in Vietnam, Dr. Gallup put this question to people in the same survey cited above: "Do you think the United States is handling affairs in Vietnam as well as could be expected, or do you think we are handling affairs there badly?"

The result was that by a ratio of more than 2 to 1 the American people approve of the Government's handling of the situation.

If there is any threat to the President's expanding and holding this consensus on Vietnam, it would only come, I think, from any sign of weakening in his policy.

Republican support is crucial to the Johnson consensus. The President knows it.

But the President knows that any sign of appeasement, intended or accidental, Republican support would vanish like a rocket into outer politics. As they did to President Truman over Korea, the Republicans can never call this "Johnson's war," but they could fight and possibly win election if it ever turned into "Johnson's appeasement."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 28, 1965]

VIETNAM POLICY

President Johnson's press conference statements, added to those of Secretary McNamara earlier this week, make the American policy about as clear as it can be made with words. The policy enunciated at Baltimore stands. It is, as the President described it, a policy of "firmness with moderation."

The two press conferences have put at rest the alarms about nuclear weapons—if there ever was any justification for them. And that is a good thing. The situation is alarming enough without conjuring up risks that nothing but sheer folly could persuade this Government to take in the Vietnam war. Nuclear weapons would be about as useful in Vietnam as French 75s in a fly-swatting campaign. It is to be hoped that this will end this scare.

The President reemphasized that the American purpose is a "peaceful settlement." It is to be hoped that this strong reaffirmation has not been overlooked by Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow. The crisis in South Vietnam is one that admits of a peaceful solution. The United States has no purpose there inconsistent with the legitimate aims of North Vietnam or irreconcilable with the independence of South Vietnam. The President has pointed this out again in terms that can only be construed as an invitation to peace—if peace is desired.

The strong emphasis that the United States now is giving to the role of North Vietnam, evident in the President's press conference, the McNamara press conference, and in other public statements, makes the fact of North Vietnam's aggression a first premise of our position. The indicated scale of infiltration may be in conformity with the available statistics and intelligence. But our reports should not be so phrased as to suggest that there is no indigenous revolutionary force in South Vietnam. The country must not be misled in the belief that this is wholly a case of external aggression any more than it should allow itself to be misled by critics and enemies into the belief that we deal only with a civil war. It is both. If the infiltration from the North could be stopped, the internal struggle might be manageable, but it would not necessarily end at once. It would still be difficult.

Americans must resist the temptation to believe that the recent improvements in the military situation forecast any quick or easy solution. Our firmness and resolution will be the more believable if we make it plain that we know how troublesome and dangerous a trial we face, and that we nevertheless are determined to fulfill our commitments. Our professions of peace will be the more believable if we do not conceal our anxiety to bring to an end this struggle and the sacrifices it entails.

It is to be hoped that the President's plain speaking will be understood.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 28, 1965]

SCREECHING SPLINTER: ARTICULATE POLICY SUPPORT NEEDED

(By William S. White)

The frightening outlines of what could become an American tragedy without example can be seen in the feverish attacks of American citizens on the integrity of their own Government's course in resisting Communist aggression in Vietnam.

A small but screechingly articulate Democratic splinter in the Senate is day by day inviting the North Vietnamese and Chinese Communists to believe these monstrously dangerous falsehoods:

That the United States does not really mean it when it says we will not allow the Communist invaders a free run over South Vietnam on the way to eventual conquest of all southeast Asia.

That the Communists may safely persist in their attacks in the supposition that President Johnson's policy—which was also the policy of the Republican President Dwight Eisenhower and the Democratic President John Kennedy—is opposed by a great and possibly even a decisive part of the American political community.

That any number of Communist refusals to open honorable negotiations—that is, negotiations preconditioned by a halt in Communist assaults upon South Vietnam—will not stop the critics from ceaselessly demanding that the United States cease its own bombing; anyhow, and regardless of continued Communist aggression.

And what is to all accounts a small out screechingly articulate minority of college students and professors is contributing its bit. It is suggesting—and the Communist foreign press is lapping it up—that the real intellectuals and true friends of "peace" in this Nation are in total revolt against our cause in Vietnam.

Thus when the monumentally patient Secretary of State Dean Rusk at last speaks out plainly against all the bitter nonsense, all the blind rejection of the demonstrated facts of history about Communist aggression, what befalls him? Why, such a Senator as WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, calls for the head not only of Dean Rusk but also of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

To MORSE, our action in Vietnam, in which we are carrying out the solemn pledges of three American Presidents, is "immoral and godless." He rages at the word appeasement. But what else, in fact, is it when men in public positions persistently find so much that is wrong with us and so much that is right with the Communist invaders? Another Democratic Senator, RUSSELL LONG, of Louisiana, goes to the heart of it.

For, he says truthfully, "modern-day appeasers and isolationists" are leading the Communists to suppose "that we will surrender all Asia to them if they will just keep up the pressure. So long as our adversaries suspect that this may be the case, they are going to pay an increasingly greater price to test our will."

Criticism of any foreign policy is, of course, both right and useful, so long as critics do not distort the demonstrable facts of history beyond reason and beyond belief. But no decent dialog can be conducted with Senators who use hysterical venom in place of reason and shameful attacks upon devoted public men—from the privileged sanctuary of the Senate floor—in place of logic and persuasion.

Nor can such a dialog be held with students who openly threaten to resist the common obligation of military service "unless we get out of Vietnam," even while they are applauding motion picture propaganda openly made by the Communists in Vietnam. This is nothing less than sedition; and from men whose very status as students gives them right now a deferment from the draft while better young men are carrying rifles in Vietnam.

Why don't we hear more from the college students who do not go along with this sick and ugly thing? Where are the college professors who respect history and who do not believe in dishonoring the honorable commitments of this counrty? It is past time for every American to do his duty, so as not to allow these noisy and fatally foolish fringe groups to lead the Communists into some mortal underestimate of the real strength and the real resolve of the vast, sensible majority of the American people.

[From Life magazine, Apr. 30, 1965]

TWO-PRONGED ATTACK ON VIETCONG

It is quite possible for the forces of law and order to win a war against Communist-backed guerrillas. This has just been proved in the Congo, where the Tshombe government's mercenary-led army has swept the Simba rebels out of the crucial northeast. "The water has dried up in the Congo," said one Leopoldville observer, referring to Mao Tse-tung's famous textbook for guerrillas, which tells them to move among the villagers like fish.

The war in Vietnam is much vaster and more complicated than the Simba action, but

it is also a guerrilla war in which the Vietcong still move like fish. Its military objectives are not the bases and bridges our bombers have been clobbering in the north but the villages and rice fields where most of the 15 million South Vietnamese try to live and work. It is a political as well as a military war and "will be won or lost here in the provinces," as Joseph Grainger, the civilian AID man recently killed by the Vietcong, wrote his mother. Like hundreds of other U.S. civilians trying to improve the lot of the Vietnamese, he was fighting the political war. It is that war in which Ho Chi Minh still thinks he has the advantage and which our bombers alone cannot win.

There is nevertheless mounting evidence that the air raids in North Vietnam and the general firming up of the U.S. military commitment have had a marked effect on the decisive political equation in Vietnam. Our increased pressure has slowed the flow of supplies from Hanoi, boosted the morale of the Saigon government and armed forces, and increased the willingness of Vietnamese peasants to volunteer much needed information. The military and political wars interact on each other. It is therefore idle to criticize the "official theory of the war," which includes bombing, on the ground that the war can't be won by airplanes.

President Johnson is right to pursue his "official theory" until its full results are proved. He is right to ignore the untimely suggestion of Senator FULBRIGHT for suspending the air strikes. He is right to intensify U.S. support of the Vietnamese Army, to extend the sea patrols and to pursue other forms of action recommended by McNamara and Taylor after their meeting in Honolulu last week.

We even sympathize with the impulse, though not the method, of Johnson's impatient handling of Indian Prime Minister Shastri and other unhelpful critics of our policy in Vietnam. Johnson himself adopted the proposal of 17 neutralist nations meeting at Belgrade for unconditional discussions toward a cease-fire and peace. Since Moscow, Peiping and Hanoi have all spurned that proposal, the diplomatic ball is not in Johnson's court. He is right to pursue the tough side of his well balanced policy. He could report a fortnight ago that "news from the battlefront is improving;" he can legitimately hope to report better diplomatic news before too long.

The political war in the villages, meanwhile, needs beefing up along with the military war. Johnson has promised "a massive new effort to improve the lives of the people of southeast Asia" and appointed Eugene Black to work out details with the U.N. He has just sent rural electrification experts to Saigon. More effort along the same lines need not await a cease-fire. The villagers need more protection against Vietcong terrorism and they also need more tangible expectations against Vietcong promises. Apathy as well as fear compose the water in which the Vietcong swim.

As in the Congo, it can be dried up.

[From Life magazine, Apr. 30, 1965]

IS THE VIETCONG SUCH A SURE WINNER AFTER ALL?

(NOTE.—The following is excerpted from a four-part series in the liberal French weekly L'Express. It is by the respected French correspondent Georges Chaffard and is the first assessment from behind enemy lines of the effect of toughened U.S. policy on the Vietcong and North Vietnam.)

The American Air Force's show of strength, the encampment of marines in central Vietnam, the use of new weapons, China's and Russia's relatively passive attitude have tended to arrest pacifist trends which had begun to be rampant in Saigon. In the capital, one is no longer so sure the Vietcong will be the real winners; American determination makes one think. In short, a turn in public opinion has begun.

In the military domain, the influx of munitions and the new Marine units will force the Vietcong command to attempt a few decisive operations before the weight of the formidable American machine burdens them much longer. It would be no surprise, therefore, if an offensive were launched shortly by regular battalions against the Da Nang base, no matter what the cost.

However, such an increase in effort by the Vietcong will coincide with an appreciable decrease in the flow of aid by land and sea from the north. The heavy arms—105 cannons, antiaircraft weapons, 81-millimeter mortars—required to attack American troops head on and to neutralize their air support are scarce. There is no other choice than to chance supplies from the north. But only limited activity is possible on the infiltration routes along the Laotian border: first, because the American bombing raids occur almost daily; then, because the north-south trip lasts many weeks personnel is decimated from malaria and dysentery; finally, because the American-South Vietnamese Special Forces operating along the border have sophisticated detecting devices which allow them to pinpoint far in advance the truck convoys which sometimes try to come down the Ho Chi Minh trail.

The sea route is both shorter and more efficient. But the 7th Fleet's program to provide small boats will be accelerated and buttressed by the addition of small craft of a type similar to minesweepers.

A decrease in the flow of aid when the Vietcong needs it most, and the psychological repercussions of the American strikes in the north, will place the Vietcong in a difficult position in the weeks to come. This is not to say that those hardened fighters are ready to yield. They continue to voice confidence in the validity of their reasoning and to bet that Americans will not escalate the war beyond the fatal point. Moreover, some statements dropped by people in the Vietcong suggest that after all it is now up to the North to "sweat."

Since the first American air strike in August 1964 after the Gulf of Tonkin incident, the Government and the military leaders of North Vietnam have begun to prepare a new resistance on their own. Food and ammunition stocks have been replenished in the higher regions, in fortresses held at one time against the French. Military training for peasant and workers' militias has been intensified. An evacuation plan for the factories and their personnel has been developed. Since the Donghoi bombings in February, part of Hanoi's civilian population has been sent to the provinces, starting with the women and children—80,000 persons had left Hanoi by the beginning of March. The ministries are prepared to evacuate en masse the capital archives and government staff.

The principal danger for North Vietnam is not an invasion of American troops. But if American aircraft raze the factories around Hanoi, destroy the port of Haiphong, deactivate the coal mines of Hongay, flatten under their bombs the famous steel complex of Thai Nguyen—the pride of North Vietnamese industry—and, finally, sever the three railways which link Hanoi to Haiphong and to Red China (Langson and Yunnan), then the country is paralyzed—18 million North Vietnamese reduced to a subsistence economy, isolated from the rest of the world. "In that case, we would be done for," admitted a Hanoi official.

To avoid such a collapse, the Republic of North Vietnam needs antiaircraft weapons and planes capable of matching the American armada. It needs to rebuild its chain of radar stations methodically destroyed by American bombers. It does not need volunteers, Chinese or otherwise. It would have no use for them as long as it is not faced with the threat of land invasion. The presence of Chinese is, furthermore, unwanted because of the political debt that would be felt around North Vietnam.

But who will provide Vietcong Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap with the modern weapons he needs? China? It does not even have any of its own. Russia? The Russians would intervene in the Vietnamese trouble only reluctantly. Privately, the Russians explain that a Soviet-United States war would be a horrible thing and could not be accepted except for a stake more important than Vietnam. Let the leaders of Hanoi begin by helping themselves, and Moscow will give aid.

In this connection, one Soviet official cracked: "When a man is losing his pants, would you want someone to give him a belt? Let him pull up his pants first."

But one thing is certain: if the war were to spread to North Vietnam and the United States were to climb the last steps of an escalating war, Hanoi would not yield. North Vietnam's regular army would no longer hesitate to join hands openly with the resistance fighters in the South.

The French Communist Party delegation was in North Vietnam several months ago. In the course of lengthy discussion, the Hanoi leaders explained the substance of their objectives for South Vietnam: to obtain the withdrawal of American troops (but under conditions that would not cause the United States to lose face); to reestablish the traditional exchanges between the two zones (the North needs South Vietnamese rice urgently).

So far as negotiations are concerned, North Vietnam is more than willing to join in any peace talks which would give it a chance for the "diplomatic homecoming" dreamed of since 1954, and to appear at such talks as the prime Vietnamese spokesman. Ironically, the American bombings have increased the desire for negotiations (to spare the North from systematic destruction of its economic network), at the same time making the desire harder to articulate without appearing to give in to the "imperialist gangsters."

There have been a number of recent popular revolts in Namdinh, North Vietnam. They were put down quickly, but they showed that tightened police controls and the increased deprivations imposed by the shadow of war have been poorly received.

An interruption of aid from Hanoi to the Vietcong could only lead to bargaining. Even the Vietcong guerrillas, living under extremely difficult conditions in their hideouts, where they strut around in front of any foreign visitors, hope for peace. But the guerrillas make harsher demands than their allies in Hanoi. They are afraid of being duped by diplomatic maneuverings and are tired of playing the game of North Vietnam as well as that of the pro-American middle class of Saigon.

Finally, the National Liberation Front feels it can win the war with its own forces and doesn't need to accept a doubtful compromise.

My most interesting contact on this point has been a vice chairman of the NLF, Huynh Tanh Pat, a dry and smiling little man who fought with the Peace Movement before joining the Vietcong.

"Doesn't the increasingly serious nature of American intervention bother you?" I asked him. "We are convinced that the Americans won't go beyond certain limits," he replied. "That's why Hanoi hasn't retaliated by sending troops south."

"We're ready to fight for 10 years, 20 years or more," assures one NLF proclamation issued March 22. But at the same time, the

regular battalions and one section of the administrative personnel of South Vietnam were retreating to the mountains north of Saigon, leaving behind them farewell messages strongly reminiscent of 1954, epitomized in the slogan: "Provisional withdrawal to return another day."

Wasn't this the admission of defeat in South Vietnam? Certainly they hoped that by regrouping the major portion of their regular troops in a less accessible place, they could establish impenetrable citadels which would be assets in negotiations.

I often questioned my contacts in the NLF on aid extended by the North. The answer was never a flat denial. It was more an indirect admission that betrayed the inadequacy of this aid: "If you think it is easy to deliver men and cannons through the Laotion trails. * * *" one said to me.

Guerrillas in the southern areas sometimes have the impression of being left to their own resources. The situation is certainly different in central Vietnam and in the mountain regions, near the Laotian infiltration routes.

Up to the last few months, mostly South Vietnamese in the Vietcong were sent to the south. These men had retreated to the north after 1954 and volunteered to return to their native provinces. But now Tonkin (native northern) groups are taking part in the convoys—first because the veterans of 1954 have grown older and are not always capable of undertaking long treks through the underbrush; secondly, because once they arrive in the South, their first thought is to see their families. Some do not rejoin their units.

Progressively, as the war has escalated, the Vietcong administration itself has been forced to levy taxes—first in produce, then in money—and to draft soldiers. Taxes and the draft are, in normal times, considered by any peasant in the world to be a necessary evil. But when you have believed, in a moment of enthusiasm, that the new leaders are going to do away with one or the other and when, on top of it all, still another authority, Saigon, continues to get its cut and recruit its soldiers, you can understand the sort of pained resignation in the faces of the peasants. Certainly the arguments of the Vietcong are glib, letting everyone think anything bad that happens is the fault of the American aggressors. But the buildup evident in the air attacks and the all too obvious destructive powers of napalm and gas have thrown the country people into a state of mind close to rebellion. Now it isn't just the withdrawal of the Americans that they want. They want peace; no matter what the terms are and no matter who the leaders are.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Frequently when I hear discussions urging our withdrawal, the thought comes to me: To what area shall we withdraw? How far must we retreat to become freed of this threat to the security of the nations of the free world?

I have in mind that during the French Indochina war, the Geneva Pact was made. By that pact, it was determined that certain lands would be given to the Communists, certain southern parts would be assigned to the nations of the free world, and that that would bring tranquillity to that area. But we have found that that did not bring peace.

The Communists were not content with the creation of a dividing line. We had trouble in Laos, which was, of course, a part of French Indochina. In 1962 we made a pact declaring that Laos would be neutral. Many of us contended that a coalition government in Laos would not work. But the Government of the United States and the governments of other nations made an agreement to create a three-headed government, with a neutral in the middle, a Communist on the left, and a conservative on the right. That was 3 years ago.

The nations of the West pulled out their men. France did. The United States did. The Communists did not. If our position in South Vietnam is dangerous, it is partly as a consequence of what happened in Laos in 1962.

My question is: Where do we run to? Will we have quiet and tranquillity if we pull out? What will happen in Thailand? What will happen in Malaysia? What will be likely to happen in Taiwan? How far away must we go to appease the Communists? Has the Senator from Wyoming given any thought to that?

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his discerning question. He himself is an expert on this subject, being a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He has given deep study and thought to the problem.

We ought to have learned the hard way in history that the appetite of an aggressor is not satisfied by giving him a little; by giving him somebody else's food supply or somebody else's territory. We tried that with Mr. Hitler. We tried it in Austria. We tried it in Czechoslovakia. We tried it in Poland, hoping to succeed, but the only result was to intensify the hunger and ambition of a dictator.

There are those who seek to answer this question by saying that we still have our great power—our Navy and our Air Force—and that we should pull out and get off the mainland. But by pulling off the mainland of Asia we forfeit one of the great prizes in modern power structure; namely, southeast Asia to mainland China.

We could have pulled out of Western Europe in 1945, at the end of World War II. We alone had the atom bomb, and we could have defended ourselves in a very narrow way by maintaining our own defenses and leaving Europe to defend itself. But Europe is a great ally. She is a great source of strength. Europe wanted to know if we would pull out or whether we would stay and help her to become independent; to help resist the encroachment of the Soviet Union upon the West. Berlin answered that question. We answered with no uncertainty.

The same kind of question is argued today. We would not have the same power if we made our enemy more powerful by retreat. Our relative strength would be diminished.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations for 8 years. I have heard the advice of Secretaries of State, Secretaries of Defense, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and, indirectly, the advice of the Presidents who have held office since 1956. I have also heard the advice of President Truman.

The record will show that every President, beginning with Truman and continuing through Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson; every Secretary of State, every Secretary of Defense, and every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has taken the uniform position that the security of our country is wrapped up in keeping southeast Asia in the hands of people and governments that are friendly to the West.

Time and again, I have asked the question, If we should pull out of southeast Asia, what would happen? The answer has been that a vacuum would be created; that the Communists would step in; and that the first line of defense of the United States, instead of being 10,000 miles away, would be moved to the shores of California, or even, I suppose, to the shores of Hawaii.

The Senator from Wyoming touched on a subject that we have forgotten, that is, the history of what occurred in the days of Hitler, in 1933, when World War I had been concluded and the Versailles Treaty and other treaties were made. Two important provisions were included in those treaties. One was that Germany was not to have a military force; second, that the Rhineland was to be a neutral, nonmilitarized area.

That pact was kept until Hitler came into power. In 1933, in violation of the pact, Hitler began to conscript German youth. France and England protested: "You are violating the treaty." But that was as far as they went. Hitler built up his 500,000 men into stormtroops and then moved into the Rhineland. That was in 1935, as I recall. The United States protested the action in the Rhineland. We said: "You are violating the treaty." But that was all that was done. Hitler's maw was not appeased. He wanted Austria, so Chamberlain went to Austria with his umbrella. It is a pitiful and shameful episode to read how that great man trembled in the presence of Hitler. But he laid down the rule and surrendered Austria.

The world thought that that would satisfy Hitler. But no; he then asked for the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia. The same story was repeated. Hitler got Sudetenland and then said, "That is not enough. I now want Czechoslovakia." Mussolini went into Ethiopia. He took Albania, a nearby country. Then Hitler said, "I want the corridor to Poland up to Danzig." He demanded it. It was not given to him immediately.

Then, France and England said, "We cannot stand it any longer. We must fight." They decided to defend themselves at the time that was most dangerous, and at a time that insured that the loss of life would be tremendous compared to what it would have been if they had stopped him from militarizing the Rhineland, and developing his military forces.

What the property damage was and what the loss of life was through that program of appeasement can never be told.

All we know is that the lands of the earth contain the bodies of the men who died in the millions because freemen did not have the will to say, "You cannot continue to violate your pacts."

I commend the Senator from Wyoming for his statement. We all want peace. It would be calloused and wrong to think that there is anyone within our country, especially those with high responsibility, who does not want to insure that our youth shall be free from the ravages of war.

I am definitely of the conviction that we can never surrender enough to satisfy the Communists. Satisfaction will come to them only when their flag is on our dome and we are the slaves of the dictators. Those who argue retreat and withdrawal have no conception of what the eventual price might be.

I am not one who would say to the men who fought in World War I, World War II, and Korea, "Your valor has been forgotten." I am not one who would say to the families of soldiers who were killed, "We care not for those who died." We owe something to those who died and to the families of those who died.

President Johnson does not want this involvement. He has not brought it upon us. It is the Communists who have created this situation. The situation will grow worse if we show any sign or indication that we do not have faith in our country.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his contribution. I suggest to him that he should have been a professor of history in view of his recitation of the history of the thirties, which years produced Hitler and Mussolini. It is a history that ought not to be repeated now for any citizens of the world.

It is sometimes said that history repeats itself. But it was the great historian, Arnold Toynbee, who reminded us that history repeats itself only when men make the same mistakes again. It is no great disaster to make a mistake sometimes. But it can be a disaster if one makes the same mistake again.

We have the story of the thirties, as has been so ably related by the Senator from Ohio, to guide us now. There are those who raise the question, "What is the connection between the western and the eastern world? Their philosophy, standards, and priorities are different in the East." I say to those who raise those questions that there is one common denominator. That is the integrity, independence, and knowledge that an aggressor cannot be stopped by feeding him someone else's possessions. An aggressor must be stopped by our willingness to risk the use of force, if necessary, in order to withstand his continued pressure to move into new areas.

That is the issue in the East right now. I am not one who believes that our frontiers would be pushed back to Hawaii, San Francisco, New York, or Boston. I believe that we would still have Okinawa as a bastion of our defense there. We would still have some support at Taiwan. We would have the advantage of our Navy and air bases. However, the real point is that the moment a critical area is given to the other side in southeast Asia, at that time we diminish our relative power in the world. This part of southeast Asia has been a key goal of major powers throughout the history of our time. Japan started World War II in an effort to get southeast Asia, as I have said on another occasion. England fought a war to get it. So did the Dutch. So did the Germans. So did the Portuguese. The hard fact is that it makes a difference who has southeast Asia, as to what kind of balance exists in the world.

In my judgment, China, already with more people than it can feed and with its few resources to get its economy moving, is not a power which should be permitted to walk freely into this part of the world.

In southeast Asia are great repositories of rice, tin, oil, bauxite, and rubber. This indeed is a prize in the hard technique of power politics around the world. Why hand it over to the other side when, by the tide of history, we have placed upon us the responsibility of trying to make the world a little better, a more peaceful and stable place in which to live?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with respect to pulling out of southeast Asia, I do not feel that if we pull out of South Vietnam and wait to see what will happen, there will be an immediate pushing back of the line. However, if we pull out of South Vietnam, where will the next trouble spot be?

The next trouble spot will be in that area. There is no question about it. In my judgment, the next trouble spot will be in Thailand, and there will be increased trouble in Malaya. They will try to cause riots and demonstrations—some nonviolent and others violent—in Taiwan and Korea.

There will be no end to it. Many people are duped into the belief that we should pull out of South Vietnam or all will be over. It will not be over. There is not a chance in the world that it will be over. It is the old domino game. Knock one country over and the others fall successively.

I commend the Senator from Wyoming for his very fine presentation here and for the answers which he has given to the many people who are wondering why we should be present in southeast Asia.

No one wants to be there. I wish we could pull out. However, we cannot.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we are to buy the argument that because this nation borders on China, it is in China's sphere of influence and we must get out and let China take over, would not the same argument apply to every other country there, starting with Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, the Malay states, Burma, Pakistan, and Iran? Would not that argument in effect mean we should back out and let them take over 900 million people?

Mr. McGEE. That is correct; and when they take over the 900 million people, will they stop there? Perhaps we should have a "General Motors" for the world, and let it be operated that way. That is what the meaning of it is.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not hear the beginning of the Senator's speech, but is it not also correct that the Vietnamese are really doing the fighting? I saw a headline in one of our newspapers a day or so ago stating that one American was killed. When I read further in the story, I learned that there had been a battle between the Vietnamese and the Vietcong, and that the Vietnamese had killed 400 Vietcong. The headlines stated that one American had been killed.

Is it not true that the South Vietnamese have killed about 89,000 of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese? The South Vietnamese have paid a lesser price. They have paid about one-third of that price in lives.

Is it not correct to remind persons who say we should leave there and turn our tails and run and leave the 19 million people who are there that we are paying only a small price? The real fighting is being done by the South Vietnamese, whom we are trying to help to maintain their independence. When there is talk about an American being killed, about 200 or 300 of the Vietcong are being killed every day.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator for his contribution. We hear a great cry to the effect that American blood is being spilled and Americans are being involved. There is no alternative. If we pull out, there will be greater bloodshed. The question is, What should we do in a world in which we seek independence and peace; and are we right in paying the price required?

Not quite a year ago I was measuring the volume of mail that came into the office. That very month we had lost seven men in Vietnam. There was a basketful of mail protesting it as unnecessary. Within a month we were conducting a "play" war in Arizona, and in that activity a dozen to 15 men were killed. I did not receive a single letter of protest against that.

It seems to me we ought to get our "ducks in line," we ought to put our priorities in order. We must expect to pay a price, and remember that peace is not going to be handed over to us merely because we are "good guys." We must pay a price to achieve law and order. The alternative is to give up and go on the other side.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Some people do not seem to realize that it is a dangerous world we are living in, and it always has been. I was born at the end of World War I. There were some intervening years when people thought there would never be another great war, but

we have found that as long as we have to struggle with those who want to take over the whole world, as long as there is communism, they are not going to change their spots or their minds. They want to take over the whole world. So it is going to be a dangerous world. Even without that factor, it would be a dangerous world. We must accept the fact that it is better to accept the burden of fighting every attack on freedom. In that way we shall live longer and be happier than we would otherwise be. There is no place else for us to go. We have found out that the world is round, and that we are on the same planet together. Those who want to back away from Vietnam will find that we will have to stop them somewhere. We must confront them in Vietnam and all over the world; and it is going to be that way in our lifetime. We had better hope it will be that way, because the alternative would be to be under the domination of Communist China or Communist Russia.

Referring to the taking of a popularity poll, I recall so well, during the fighting in South Korea, when we were helping them to maintain their independence at a heavy cost in American lives, that I happened to be in Libya, inspecting a military installation. I asked their Defense Minister about the reaction of his people to what the United States was doing in South Korea, because it seemed to me that a small nation such as Libya would applaud America's efforts to help a small country defend itself against aggression.

His first reaction was: "It is far away." In other words, his country really did not care much, one way or the other.

I imagine that would be the first reaction we would get in Mali, Uganda, Ghana, or any one of the distant African nations, if we were to ask them what they thought about U.S. efforts to help South Vietnam defend itself. Whether they knew anything about the situation at all—which they probably do not—their probable reaction would be that it was none of their concern. This is understandable, because such countries have never had to carry such a burden, have never had to face such a problem. I am quite sure they are not particularly excited about our involvement there.

Someone was asking me how much concern the people of Louisiana have regarding this issue. To tell the truth, I am sure that the people of Louisiana are much more concerned about voting rights than they are about the war in Vietnam.

Mr. McGEE. I can understand that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They are very much more concerned about voting rights and civil rights matters. They discuss that subject a great deal more than they discuss the situation in Vietnam.

The Senator from Wyoming has well pointed out that if we are to take a poll to find out what someone in the Near East thinks about it, or what someone 2,000 miles away thinks about it, we will not get an informed opinion anyway, because those people do not have the responsibility to try to contain communism.

Mr. McGEE. If I might suggest a parallel, what might be true in New Orleans was probably also true in Cheyenne, Wyo., let us say in 1935, concerning the aggressions of Hitler in Western Europe. At that time, his depredations seemed a long way away. Our country had emerged from a rather short history with some fortunate experiences. Whenever war had broken out in Europe, there were two sides, of course, and we enjoyed the luxury of 3,000 miles of ocean between us and the combatants. We had the luxury of looking at the two sides and picking one, whenever one of those wars began—even though we may have had a stake in the war at some stage. We had the further luxury of being able to delay a decision while someone else held the frontline. During the First World War, France held the line, England held the line, as did the Belgians and the Dutch. That gave us time to dawdle and delay until we made up our minds.

Times have changed.

For the first time in our history, the United States is now one of two sides engaged in a war in the world. We have no choice.

Strangely, for the first time in history, we find ourselves on the frontline of the world with no one to hold the line for us until we make up our minds.

The burden rests upon us. We must do the job. This is not an obligation. This is our responsibility. This is the context in which we must view the requirements imposed upon us in regard to the relative position of the forces at stake in southeast Asia.

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

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. I compliment the Senator from Wyoming upon the scholarly and careful way in which he has treated a most difficult subject. I associate myself with his remarks.

Several times on the floor of the Senate, and most recently yesterday, I made two points which I think the Senator from Wyoming has again brought to mind. First, as the Vice President of the United States used to say when he was a Member of the Senate, "There is no such thing as instant peace; there is only instant annihilation."

Those who advocate either less activity on our part or more activity on our part in southeast Asia, with the hope that some immediate and dramatic solution of the problem can take place, hope in vain, because, as in human affairs, in international affairs much perseverance and patience are required to achieve a lasting peace.

The other point that I think is imperative is one which I also made yesterday; that is that he who takes risks now in order to secure a just and lasting peace is no less a peacemaker than he who asks for peace immediately without the assurance that it can later be defended, or can be enforced even at much greater price.

I commend the Senator from Wyoming for his astute observation of the situation in Vietnam, including the hopeful signs we now see, especially in Australia's increased effort in that area. We recognize that what is happening is not merely a small conflict involving the people of North and South Vietnam; it involves, indeed, the peace and security not only of southeast Asia, but of the whole world. The Senator from Wyoming has made this point very well.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the junior Senator from Oklahoma for his comments. Although he is very new in these Halls, he has quickly won a place for himself as a true specialist and scholar on questions involving the national interest. His contributions are always constructive and helpful as we seek to discuss the alternatives that confront us.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I commend the Senator from Wyoming upon a most eloquent and lucid exposition of the situation in southeast Asia. I should like to ask him several questions.

Does the United States have the power at this time to make an honorable peace in South Vietnam?

Mr. McGEE. Does the United States have the power?

Mr. ERVIN. The power to make an honorable peace at this time in South Vietnam.

Mr. McGEE. Peace is not achieved by decree. Peace is achieved when all the forces of power are available to produce agreement upon some stabilizing settlement. Therefore, a good bit more is required than what we could strike in the way of sheer power. Peace is not achieved with power; power merely affords an opportunity to achieve peace.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that the United States is without power to put an end to the hostilities at the present moment, except by way of appeasement or surrender?

Mr. McGEE. I suppose we could make a decisive change there if we were wantonly to use our great airpower and obliterate Hanoi and some of the other cities in North Vietnam, to start with. Fortunately, we have been much more restrained. Our goal is not to destroy people; our goal is not to obliterate the capital of another land. Our goal is to try to deliver a message that the aggressors can understand when it is presented to them in black and white. Although they may not understand it on paper, they are understanding it in action.

In my judgment, the President has been highly restrained in his application of escalation in the north because, again, we have selected the escalation. It is planned escalation to meet a specific target, at a specific time, for a specific purpose. There has not been wanton warfare with the destruction of people.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that the escalation has been deliberately planned in the hope that it might enable us to negotiate from strength and thus bring an end to hostilities in that part of the world?

Mr. McGEE. Indeed, it is. There is an old truism in the realm of diplomacy among the great powers, a truism that we need to understand fully: that a nation cannot win at the conference table what it is not willing to risk on the battlefield. That is a truism that is as old as politics itself. It is still true.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that the government which sits in Hanoi is the only government that could put an immediate end to hostilities at this moment?

Mr. McGEE. Hanoi could take the step right now that could terminate hostilities there in the almost immediate future. It is within their power to do so.

Mr. ERVIN. There is an old adage to the effect that even the most righteous man cannot live in peace unless his wicked neighbor is willing to have him do so. Is it not true that the war in South Vietnam exists because the government of Hanoi is encouraging what is called infiltration, but is really an invasion of South Vietnam by the Vietcong?

Mr. McGEE. I think it is true, because the policies emanate from Hanoi; and it is true because it is to the obvious advantage of Peiping to maintain uncertainty, pressure, and difficulty in North Vietnam.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Wyoming agree with the Senator from North Carolina that the Secretary of State has made it clear on a number of occasions that the only thing that is necessary to put an end to the unfortunate hostilities now is to have the North Vietnamese cease their penetration of South Vietnam?

Mr. McGEE. It seems to me that even in elementary language or at the elementary level, the most elementary person could understand that. The language has been clear and unadulterated.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that it is an impossibility for the United States to achieve peace by negotiation unless someone else is willing to negotiate?

Mr. McGEE. It takes two to negotiate.

Mr. ERVIN. Has not President Johnson made it as clear as the noonday sun that the United States stands willing to enter into negotiations with a view to bringing about peace in Vietnam with anyone who is willing to negotiate and who has the power to accomplish that purpose?

Mr. McGEE. I would qualify my answer by saying that it is as clear as the noonday sun in Wyoming, where the sun shines all day; I am not certain about the noonday sun in this area.

Mr. ERVIN. Has not the President iterated and reiterated that the United States stands willing to enter into negotiations with anyone who can offer any prospects of putting an end to hostilities in southeast Asia?

Mr. McGEE. Indeed, he has. All the world is watching because everyone understands the disposition of the President to sit down with anybody, at anytime, anywhere, to discuss a settlement of the problem in South Vietnam.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator for yielding. I again express to him my commendation upon an eloquent, lucid speech.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

(At this point, Mr. HARRIS assumed the chair.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I do not believe the President made it clear that he would be willing to conduct conversations with the Communists actually involved, the Vietcong. There are those who think that, for the conversations to be productive, all sides and factions would have to participate.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I believe that statement is correct. The President has not made it clear that he would talk with the Vietcong. However, there is very good reason for not agreeing to such conversations. The factor that is so upsetting and unbalancing is the force that is being generated from Hanoi.

The President has made it clear that he would not talk with the North and South Vietnamese Governments about what kind of government would be in Saigon, but would talk about what may happen between South Vietnam and North Vietnam.

What the President has expressed in his comments, it would seem to me, is that the conflict between Hanoi and South Vietnam is one kettle of fish and whatever endemic civil strife there is within South Vietnam is another.

These situations should not be confused. There is a much larger question that would have to be resolved over a much longer period of time. It would be a mistake to have these problems mixed up around the same conference table.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I very much hope that the Senator is correct and that the two problems can be kept separate.

Mr. McGEE. The effort in the general escalation is a genuine effort to try to separate them. In a measure, it is succeeding.

The first real measure of actual separation would be the realization and willingness of the Vietminh to stop the predatory activities across the lines.

That would lead us to the question, if we were to have such a conference, "What could we talk about?" We have a self-enforcing kind of arrangement that can be made right now. "We will stop bombing the north if you stop infiltrating into the south." That is the easiest kind of agreement to keep. We can measure their violation if the other side does not keep the agreement. Thus, there is an obvious beginning.

Second, such a discussion could lead to agreement upon a delineating line separating North Vietnam from South Vietnam.

The outcome of such an agreement, to have two Vietnams, is not the most desirable situation in that part of the world, any more than two Koreas, two Chinas, two Germanys, or two Berlins. However, this would provide a start. It would be a place at which to begin. It would make it possible to arrive at some sort of modified cease-fire, some small degree of arrangement which would win time. There would be less violent things done, and thus, through the use of time, we would erode some of the harsher emotions that now cloud the atmosphere in that part of the world.

To that extent, I think that it is helpful.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

During the delivery of Mr. McGEE's speech,

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

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor, and that his remarks will appear elsewhere in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Montana in recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a vote on the Williams amendment at 4:30 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have in mind the possibility of moving to amend the Williams amendment. A Member of the Senate could easily hold the floor from now until 4:30 p.m. and prevent any other amendment. Can the majority leader tell us what provision he would like to make with respect to allowing the Williams amendment to be debated and amended, if need be, so that Senators may have their rights protected?

Mr. MANSFIELD. As soon as the distinguished Senator from Wyoming completes his speech, which I am sure will not be too much longer, any Senator who wishes to take the floor to offer an amendment to the Williams amendment will be free to do so. We are trying to take this action as an accommodation to Senators on both sides.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the majority leader agree—and I do not wish to interfere with his proposal—that when any amendment to the amendment might be offered, a half hour be allowed for debate to each side, and if that results in extending the time beyond 4:30 p.m., the time should thereby be extended until such time as the amendments to the amendment are disposed of within that time limitation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would prefer to withdraw the unanimous-consent request and let nature take its course.

Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

THE U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SUPPORTS A STUDY OF THE METRIC SYSTEM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, yesterday, April 28, the delegates to the 53d annual meeting of the national chamber, U.S.

Chamber of Commerce, voted unanimously in support of a study of the feasibility of adopting the metric system in this country.

I am delighted that such a nationally prominent organization occupying a leadership role in our country and representing businessmen the length and breadth of our land support this idea and the efforts that Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER and I have been making in urging such a study.

The chamber's declaration noted that—

> Most of the world embraces the metric system of measurement. Adoption of the system in the United States is worthy of study, on the theory that adherence to the system might assist fulfillment of our international responsibilities and our goal for increasing sales of U.S. goods abroad. Because of the problems of conversion, however, actual adoption of the system should not be considered until there has been a comprehensive study of the feasibility of adopting the system generally, or in specific fields, in the United States. Such a study should determine clearly the costs and economic advantages and disadvantages of conversion. The chamber encourages the conduct of such a study by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. President, my bill S. 774 would accomplish exactly what the chamber supports in its declaration. I am hopeful that other equally prominent groups will now lend their support to such a study, for it is increasingly clear that it is in our national interest to do so.

I thank the senior Senator from Wyoming for his kindness in the past in holding hearings on the metric system, the study of which is being assisted by the National Chamber of Commerce. I hope very much that we shall have hearings before too long, depending upon the heavy pressure of business before the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I suggest that the country owes thanks to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for having taken the lead in this measure. It has taken some doing to arouse interest in this measure. The Senator has made a great contribution. He has performed an unusual service in bringing the measure to the attention of the country as a whole.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is because of the spontaneous and parallel action of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that I took the liberty of discussing the proposal at this time.

CLOSER RELATIONSHIP WITH THE VATICAN

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, now that it is apparent that Pope Paul VI is following the policy of Pope John XXIII in setting for himself the twin goals of peace in our world and closer relationships between our various Christian faiths and even between peace-seeking men of all beliefs, I believe we should take action to help further these objectives. Why? Because the objectives of peace and the general ecumenical movement coincide 100 percent with our own American national interests.

Since this is the case, I believe our administration should take steps to maintain a closer relationship with the Vatican. There is nothing new or novel in this idea. For 73 years, from 1797 to 1870, the United States had consular relations with the Vatican, and in fact maintained regular diplomatic relations with the Vatican from 1848 to 1868. These relations only ended when the kingdom of a united Italy took over the papal states in 1870.

Before and after World War II, from 1939 to 1951, Presidents Roosevelt and Truman sent Myron Taylor, complete with an official staff, as a personal representative to the Pope. I suggest that this latter approach, or one similar to it, would be of great advantage to us at this time.

The initiative of Pope John, which Pope Paul continues, puts the Vatican in the vanguard of peace. Pope Paul's historic tours of the Holy Land and India provided a dramatic demonstration of the profound influence for peace which his papacy holds. In this age of possible total and instant annihilation, the U.S. Government surely should be in daily, official contact with the Catholic Church's campaign to literally save the world from its own physical self-destruction.

Simply from the viewpoint of knowing all that is going on around the world and particularly behind the curtain, I believe we are at a serious disadvantage in not having direct access to the Vatican and its information and intelligence.

If such a strong Protestant country as the United Kingdom where Anglicanism is the established church in England and Wales and the Church of Scotland occupies the same role in Scotland, can maintain full diplomatic relations with the Vatican, as it has done since 1928, certainly we can afford to do so.

If reports are correct that the Vatican and the atheistic Soviet Union are considering the establishment of some sort of diplomatic relationship, the United States would even more seem able to afford to do so.

Cardinal Koenig of Austria, who at my suggestion, on April 7, 1964, opened our own Senate with prayer, has actually been named by the Vatican to establish contact with atheistic groups.

In fact, 50 countries, including Communist Cuba, presently maintain diplomatic relations and representatives at the Vatican. Only about half of these nations could be characterized as Roman Catholic nations. Moreover, more than half the members of the U.N. Security Council are among those nations maintaining diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

I am not unmindful of the sensitivities of my fellow Protestants. I am not asking for immediate diplomatic recognition. What I am asking is that the general question of our relationship with the Vatican be once again examined by our administration and that some sort of rapport or diplomatic relationship be established, perhaps in the form of a personal representative of the President.

THE CRISIS IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the crisis in the Dominican Republic will require the most intensive U.S. scrutiny and vigilance in the next few days.

President Johnson has already taken swift steps to protect the lives of Americans in that troubled island. Four hundred marines have been sent in by helicopter, and additional forces are standing by at sea.

I commend the President for his wise and prompt action in this crisis.

We do not yet know whether this pressure in the Caribbean has been fomented in conjunction with the crisis in Vietnam, to divert and distract the United States.

But we do know this—there is already evidence that among the rebels who seek to return Juan Bosch to power are known Communists who have recently returned from Cuba and Czechoslovakia.

We know that Fidel Castro was behind terrorist activity in the Dominican Republic in 1963—that he shifted his efforts to subvert the Caribbean to the nearby Dominican Republic after failing to shake Venezuela with guerrilla warfare tactics.

I said in 1963, after President Bosch was deposed, that I was more concerned about the Dominican Republic than any other country in Latin America.

Today, more than ever, this island may hold the important key to the future of the Caribbean, and we must therefore move quickly to prevent any break in the dike of hemispheric solidarity.

President Johnson has called in the leaders of Congress on this fast-developing situation and he has our unqualified support.

He has appealed for a cease-fire and advised the Council of the Organization of American States on all developments.

The Council is, at this very moment, reviewing this critical situation and I am confident that working together, this new threat can be met and peace restored to this area of the Caribbean.

The United States has learned from history and does not, I am sure, intend to let Castro widen his sphere of influence or to let the Dominican Republic become another Cuba.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to

the distinguished minority leader, without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. HART. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, which is extremely desirable and attractive in its general implications, raises many serious questions with respect to exactly how the language will be interpreted and what will be the ambit of its interpretation. The Senator has already accepted a modification with respect to confining it to Federal elections.

There are many other practices—for example, those practices engaged in normally by political parties and civic organizations, such as giving voters a ride from their homes to the polling places if they are physically unable to get there, and so forth. All these points are raised by the amendment.

The Senator from Michigan has a series of interrogatories on the amendment which, in my judgment, will determine my vote and will be the fulcrum upon which the program in this field will turn, as to whether it should be a part of the bill, remembering that it is in substitution for what we consider to be a strong antifraud provision which is presently in the bill.

I thank the Senator from Michigan for yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote be had at 4 o'clock on the pending Williams amendment, as modified, and that the time between now and 4 o'clock be equally divided between the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WLLIAMS] and the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? None being heard, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. HART. As much as is required.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 35 minutes on his side.

Mr. HART. I shall take 5 minutes at this time.

The Senator from Delaware, some weeks ago, filed an amendment which is now the pending amendment. It is No. 82. Subsequently, the Senator from Delaware appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary and stated very strongly his conviction that a provision to safeguard the purity of elections should be added to the bill. The committee felt that the original draft made adequate provision in that regard, but in our executive sessions, as is reflected by a copy of the bill, certain changes were made in line with the recommendation of the Senator from Delaware. These changes, as the earlier exchanges between the senior Senator from Delaware and me indicated, did not reach the point which the Senator from Delaware had in mind, and did not extend as far as he felt they should.

Along with some other Senators, I had concern that the amendment now pending, if adopted, could in a sense do more harm than good. I suggested that perhaps we did not understand fully the reach or the effect of all the consequences involved.

The Senator from Delaware has been most helpful in reviewing with those of us who had these concerns the purpose which he seeks to achieve by the amendment. In the discussion, we have exchanged points of view which, when we make them in the RECORD, I believe will tend to persuade all of us that the amendment as now modified is a desirable one and a worthwhile one.

In order to do that I should like to exchange some observations with the Senator from Delaware, if that is satisfactory to him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. HART. Would the amendment make it a crime for any group, be it a civil rights organization—I would not like to think of citizens councils—or any other organizations, such as a chamber of commerce, to transport persons to the office of the examiner or registrar, in order that they may register, or to the polls, to vote?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall answer that question in the same manner that I answered it when I was in colloquy with the Senator from Michigan earlier this week. It does not in any way affect a practice which has been recognized and has been accepted by both political parties and all organizations with respect to helping to transport people who do not have means of transportation to the polls in order to cast their ballots. The amendment does not in any way affect a practice which has been accepted and recognized throughout the country. This is not so intended.

Mr. HART. I do not want to exclude other organizations, but we would include the League of Women Voters and labor organizations. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. It includes any group which wishes to transport these people. It might be that the Senator or I would wish to pick up a neighbor and take him to the polling place. The amendment is aimed against transporting someone and paying him $5 or $10, perhaps, to cast his vote. It does not include the mere transportation of a voter. It does not in any way affect the existing practice.

Mr. HART. I believe that is a desirable clarification, and a helpful one.

The next question that concerned some of us, which we discussed with the Senator from Delaware, relates to the encouragement and the organized support of civil rights and other groups—I should emphasize the other groups—annually or periodically to encourage other persons to register and to vote. They do that by a series of devices. They employ staff workers who organize registration drives. They hire these workers and pay them, and they pay for the printing of pamphlets and for the distribution of pamphlets and sample ballots and registration forms, and they provide food and refreshments at registration meetings and rallies. These expenditures are traditional in our system. Our concern is this: Does the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware intend to prohibit any of that type of activity?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. This is a customary activity that is practiced by both political parties and has been established for a long time. In fact, last night I attended a somewhat similar function of my own political party. We heard some speeches for the good of the order, which I wish my friend from Michigan had been able to hear. This is a common practice. The amendment has nothing to do with the existing practice which has been accepted and practiced by both political parties as well as by other organizations throughout the entire election system.

Mr. HART. It emphasizes again that the reach of the Senator's amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HART. I yield myself 5 additional minutes. The aim of the Senator's amendment is specifically directed at my offering, for example, the Senator some money in consideration of his voting or registering; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. HART. That is the only purpose?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the sole purpose.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to pinpoint this matter. The idea is that the offer or the acceptance will be made by the person who is registering or voting. We are not dealing with this whole thicket of indirection of "for the benefit of" and so on, but are dealing specifically with passing money to the person who is registering or voting.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. That is what I have tried to emphasize throughout the whole debate. I wish to make it as clear as it is possible to make it that it is intended solely to prohibit the practice of offering or accepting money or a fifth of liquor, or something—some payment of some kind—for voting or registering.

Mr. JAVITS. Made to the person who is voting or registering.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Directly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Directly; yes.

Mr. JAVITS. In testimony before the Judiciary Committee it is a fact that statements were made that voters or registrants were paid wholesale and that they then were herded down to the polls. This we thought was a characteristic of another day, but perhaps some of it still exists today.

I wish to have it pinpointed. I think this is important.

Mr. HART. It is desirable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I told the Senator from New York privately and as I again state publicly, I am in no

way trying to restrict the right of a man to cast his legitimate vote. I believe in that. I am trying to prevent any paying or accepting of payment for such votes or for registration.

Mr. HART. In that connection, there are a number of States which require, as I understand it, that an employer release an employee for a certain period of time in order that the employee may register or vote. No deduction from the person's wage is made. Is it the intention of the Senator from Delaware to reach into and upset such local custom or law?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Most certainly not. That is a customary practice. It is an accepted part of our system. I will cite specifically an example of how this has been an accepted part of our system. Prior to the last election both the Senator from Michigan and I were on the payroll of the U.S. Government. We accepted our pay from the Government. Yet we were both out working in the election. It might be claimed that we had a conflict of interest, because we were trying to get ourselves elected.

Mr. HART. At least neither of us was openminded about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right. That has always been an accepted part of our system of government. I would encourage an employer to give his employees time off to vote. I believe that employers should and most do allow their people some time off in order to vote. The amendment has nothing to do with that practice. It is well to clear up that point. I am glad that the Senator has raised the question, because I wish to make that point as clear as I can.

Mr. HART. I think it has been made very clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, we have discussed it before.

Mr. HART. It has been made very clear. I take it from the Senator's prior answer that he does not intend to reach certain activities. State laws explicitly enumerate activities which may be engaged in in the promotion of registration and voting. I should like to name some of them and then inquire whether it is the intention of the Senator from Delaware to reach and, if possible, upset those State authorizations.

State laws in various regions of the country permit expenditures in connection with providing music and the hiring of halls. I believe we have already made the point explicitly that authorization is provided for conveying people to the polls, purchasing radio and television time, and printing and distributing sample ballots. I am sure that that is not a complete list. But in most States, by statute, activities of that character are enumerated and permitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HART. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Delaware whether his amendment is an attempt to prohibit such activities?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. My amendment would not touch those activities in any way. The purpose of the amendment is solely to prohibit the offer or the acceptance of pay for the purpose of registering or voting. It would not in any way affect any of the practices which have been accepted, such as the use of television, printing material, advertising material, et cetera. It would not affect those activities at all.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The answer was broader than the question. The question referred to nullification of State laws. The answer referred to activities not unlawful under State laws. I gather that it is the answer rather than the limitation of the question which would control the legislative history. It is both those items specified by State laws as well as other practices which are not held unlawful under State law. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. Both political parties hold meetings of the nature suggested. We rent halls. We invite the public to come together for educational purposes. We provide music and entertainment. They ofttimes enjoy the entertainment much better than they do our speeches, I regret to say. Nevertheless, that is a part of our election system. The amendment would not enter into that field at all or in any way restrict it. It does not attempt to deal with that subject.

Mr. HART. Whether it would be by political parties or others.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Whether it be by political parties or other groups. If it were the Barnum & Bailey Circus it would not make any difference. It would not affect them at all.

Mr. HART. The League of Women Voters, the NAACP, a trade union, or any other group of citizens.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would not make any difference.

Mr. HART. The Senator has, by his answers, indicated that he intends not to prohibit such activity as I am about to describe. I would hope that it would not occur, but conceive that in a community an individual has emerged as a leader in an effort to encourage groups heretofore not encouraged to enroll and to vote. He has marked himself in the eyes of the community. As a consequence, some economic retaliation is directed toward him. Perhaps it might not be even that clear a case. It might merely involve an individual who is registered, and who finds that he has offended the local mores, and economic retaliation is aimed at him. Would anything offered by the Senator in the amendment prohibit another individual or an organized group of individuals from providing that individual financial assistance?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That point may be dealt with in other sections of the bill. To the extent that it is so dealt with, the amendment would not affect it. The amendment would not touch that problem at all.

Mr. HART. I believe the Senator is correct that under another provision of the bill certain activities such as I have described may very well be subject to sanction. But the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware could not be construed as raising any question as to the propriety of any event of that sort.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would not touch on that problem at all.

I should like to read the amendment again, because I want it very clear that it does carry out exactly the purpose I have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes, and yield to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment provides as follows:

> Whoever knowingly or willfully gives false information as to his name, address, or period of residence in the voting district for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to register or vote, or conspires with another individual for the purpose of encouraging his false registration or illegal voting, or pays or offers to pay or accepts payment either for registration or for voting shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both: *Provided, however,* That this provision shall be applicable only to elections held for the selection of presidential electors, Members of the United States Senate, and Members of the United States House of Representatives.

That language includes the amendment which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] offered today, which spells out that the amendment applies to those elections in which there are national candidates including Members of Congress, Members of the Senate, or presidential electors appearing on the ballot. I believe that language would carry out the purpose of my amendment better than the way it was originally drafted. I was glad to accept the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina. I think that it makes it clearer.

I am delighted that the Senator from Michigan has asked his questions. I do not wish any misunderstanding about what we are trying to achieve. We are trying to deal with two subjects—false registration and payments for registration and voting. First, we want to make sure that a person in registering does not knowingly or willfully give false information; second, we wish to make sure that anyone who pays or offers to pay a person or anyone who accepts payment for casting his vote or for registering would be in violation of the law. But beyond that, we do not intend to touch any of the other activities the Senator described.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the responses that we have had from the Senator from Delaware enable all of us confidently to say that the amendment would indeed be a worthwhile addition to the bill. I hope very much that the Senate will adopt the amendment. I feel that having done so, the Senator from Delaware, who has already indicated his intention to support the bill, will feel

that he has made a major contribution to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Michigan. I believe that this amendment will make a constructive contribution to the bill. I have always supported whatever legislation is necessary to guarantee to any American citizen the right to vote, and if we do not have adequate laws to do it now I wish to support whatever measure is necessary. As I stated before, if we come back next year and find that the proposed legislation does not protect their right to vote I will help correct it. I cannot conceive of any circumstances in this country under which we could defend the principle that an American citizen could be deprived of his right to vote. However, if he does not desire to register or to vote without being paid he is not eligible to vote.

All I am trying to do under this amendment is to make sure that we have clean elections and that once a man gets the right to vote and casts his vote, he will have the assurance that his vote will not be nullified by someone who is casting an illegal ballot or by someone who is being paid to vote. That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Michigan. I certainly hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show the names of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], who has spent considerable time in helping the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and me to work out the language of the amendment, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] as cosponsors of the amendment.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Those Senators have spent considerable time in helping to work out the language of the amendment. I thank each of them for his contribution. We could not have achieved the result without their support.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, and that the time for the call be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS TO 4 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 4 o'clock; and, if consent is granted, that when the Senate reconvenes, at that time there be a quorum call before the vote on the Williams amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

At 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess until 4 o'clock p.m., the same day.

At 4 o'clock p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair).

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately prior to the vote on the amendment, which was approved, there appear a statement prepared by the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURPHY

I was pleased to cosponsor S. 1564. I did so because I believe unequivocally that every qualified American should have the right to vote. S. 1564 is aimed at the elimination of voting discrimination based on race or color. To me it is most deplorable that at this juncture in our Nation's history it is even necessary for the Congress to consider legislation on this subject.

The amendment being considered now is aimed at an equally important problem—the elimination of voting fraud in Federal elections. It is based on the premise that voting fraud is incompatible with our democratic system. It attempts to eradicate voting fraud whether it occurs in Chicago or in Selma. It attempts to purge the voting process in Federal elections in the North, in the South, in the East, and in the West.

Voting fraud, unlike voter discrimination, is not clearly confined to one area. Its ugly head pops up in different areas and at unsuspected times.

To me and all Americans, the right of franchise is a sacred and priceless heritage. Voting fraud is repulsive to the American conscience and tends to undermine our way of life.

By accepting this amendment we can insure that the votes of our people will be counted and counted properly. I urge the Senate to adopt this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] numbered 82, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] are absent on official business, and, if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 61 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Allott	Gruening	Mondale
Anderson	Harris	Montoya
Bartlett	Hart	Moss
Bayh	Hartke	Mundt
Bennett	Hayden	Muskie
Bible	Hickenlooper	Nelson
Boggs	Hill	Neuberger
Brewster	Holland	Pell
Burdick	Hruska	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Cannon	Javits	Ribicoff
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Robertson
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Russell, S.C.
Church	Kennedy, Mass.	Saltonstall
Clark	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott
Cooper	Kuchel	Simpson
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Curtis	Long, La.	Smith
Dirksen	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dominick	Mansfield	Stennis
Douglas	McCarthy	Talmadge
Eastland	McClellan	Thurmond
Ellender	McGee	Tower
Ervin	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Fannin	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Fong	McNamara	Yarborough
Fulbright	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Gore	Miller	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—14

Aiken	Morse	Russell, Ga.
Bass	Morton	Symington
Dodd	Murphy	Tydings
Lausche	Pastore	Young, N. Dak.
Monroney	Pearson	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, numbered 82, as modified, to the committee substitute, was agreed to.

COMMENDATION TO SENATOR WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE

Mr. MUNDT subsequently said: Mr. President, I do this because I think the Senate owes a debt of gratitude to the Senator from Delaware, who, with his customary diligence in examining into all important legislation, has come forth with an important amendment dealing with a vital part of this bill that has been adopted by unanimous vote. It is rare than an amendment to a civil rights bill is adopted by the Senate unanimously.

I think we owe a great debt of gratitude to the Senator from Delaware for an amendment which will be highly salutary and effective.

AMENDMENT NO. 83

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 83 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 12, line 15, change the figure "6" to the figure "5".

On pages 12 to 19, both inclusive, strike out sections 4 and 5 in their entirety and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 4. When he has reason to believe that any State or political subdivision of a State is engaged in denying or abridging the rights of citizens to vote on account of race or color, the Attorney General may institute an action in the name of the United States in the district court of the United States against such State or political subdivision in the district in which the capital of the State in question is located or in which the political subdivision in question is situated, against such State or political subdivision, alleging that it is engaging in denying or abridging the rights of citizens to vote on account of race or color. Upon demand of the Attorney General, such action shall be tried by a three-judge district court convened in the manner prescribed by Sixty-second Statutes at Large, page 968 (28 U.S.C. 2284). In case the court finds on the trial on such action that the State or political subdivision in question is denying or abridging the rights of citizens to vote on account of race or color, the court shall so adjudge and shall authorize the appointment of examiners by the Civil Service Commission in accordance with section 5 to serve for such period of time and in such political subdivisions of such State or such political subdivision as the court shall determine is appropriate to enforce the guaranties of the fifteenth amendment."

On page 19, strike out everything from the semicolon on line 7 through the word "amendment" on line 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following "or section 4".

On page 28, lines 23 and 24, strike out the words "any declaratory judgment pursuant to section 4".

Renumber sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 as sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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 the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7091) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 26, 28, and 30 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 27, and 29 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 10, 11, and 15 to the bill.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7091) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

I wish to make it clear that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who is chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill, is unavoidably absent from the city. He asked that the report be considered in his absence. It is for that reason that I am calling it up.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Apr. 29, 1965, pp. 8856–8858, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report? Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the report, and the question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, H.R. 7091, the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1965, was reported to the Senate on Friday, April 23, with its accompanying Report No. 167. The reported bill was passed, without amendment, on Tuesday, April 27. The budget estimates considered by the committee totaled $2,280,251,237; the House bill provided $2,118,333,083; the Senate version of the bill would provide a total of $2,257,869,415.

By way of explanation, I might proceed at this point to summarize the differences resolved in the conference.

An item of something over $400 million for the payment of Federal share to the States in the field of welfare was not in conference because there was no disagreement between the Houses.

The conferees agreed upon the provision of $150 million for veterans' compensation and pensions; an increase of $42 million over the original allowance of $108 million by the House.

The inclusion of $30 million for urban renewal funds, previously denied by the House, was approved.

The additional $10 million recommended in the Senate bill for the President's Disaster Relief Fund—at the urgent suggestion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]—was approved, providing a total of $35 million in lieu of the House allowance of $25 million.

Senators will understand this is tied to emergencies in the upper Mississippi area which have so recently occurred.

The amount for claims and judgments, originally requested and approved in the House bill for approximately $23 million, was approved for $31 million following the receipt of an additional budget estimate after the bill was received from the House.

Funds for Appalachian regional development—title II of the bill—were approved totaling $349,688,000, for an increase of $5,360,000 over the House allowance of $344,328,000, but a slight reduction from the $352,300,000 in the Senate version of the bill.

The conferees were unable to reach agreement with regard to an additional $942,000—a small amount, but on an important matter—for the Civil Aeronautics Board for payments to air carriers for helicopter subsidies for the balance of the current fiscal year, and also unable to reach agreement on the provisions of $5,050,000 for Federal-State training programs and $515,000 for fellowships for city planning and urban studies—activities authorized under title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964. These items had been considered by the House and denied, and, as I say, were reported in disagreement by the conferees.

On the veterans language transferring funds for the reopened insurance fund the conferees had agreed that the motion would be made to concur in Senate amendment No. 15. I understand that by a division vote the House refused to concur, after which the House voted to further insist on the disagreement.

The Veterans' Administration has advised that they will be able to work out the problem of starting the insurance fund, in connection with the regular bill which is soon to be reported from the House.

House Members have said it will report that bill early next week and schedule it for early action thereafter.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that this item was included to avoid new appropriations. The House is about to act on a new appropriation very quickly, and it struck out the language, even though the House conferees agreed. Under the circumstances, I do not think we can do anything but accept the House action. I do not think it will have any injurious effect on veterans.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree.

Incidentally, before leaving, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]

asked me to handle the conference report. I regret that I may not be able to answer all questions, because I was taking testimony on agricultural appropriations at the time Senator PASTORE was taking testimony on these items. He asked me to state that if the House refused to agree to any of the items in disagreement, he would take the position that we should have the rest of the bill and that the Senate should recede, and I intend to make a motion to recede on those amendments still in disagreement.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I refer to the helicopter appropriation, which is of interest to New York and a number of other areas of the country. As I understand, the Senate conferees sought to insist on the Senate amendment, which allowed $942,000. The House conferees refused to take it, so that it is a matter in disagreement. I understand the House voted it down by a vote of 228 to 144.

Is this a question which could be raised in the independent offices appropriation bill for fiscal year 1966? Am I correct in that?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. There is authorization and there is so-called contract authority outstanding. While the members of our committee are by no means in agreement on the subject, the conferees stood stoutly by our position in conference. The House stood stoutly by its former position, which is the reason for reporting the item in disagreement, which ended in the House action on the rollcall the Senator just referred to, in which the House refused to recede from its former position.

Mr. JAVITS. Is there any desire on the part of the committee to endeavor to have this matter taken up in a later measure?

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as I am concerned, I expect all Senators to stick more or less as they were recorded in the first place and were recorded the other day. There would not be a unanimous position in committee. A majority was for the inclusion of this item. I cannot recall the number, but I believe the Senator from California may remember it, for he was so ardently in support of this item.

Mr. KUCHEL. I will say to my friend that with absences, there were 11 in favor of the budget item and 9 against it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that is correst. The Senator is correct that there were a good many absences. However, a quorum of the committee was present. I believe that there will still be a substantial difference of opinion in that committee as to the wisdom of continuing the program, but it will be carefully investigated again and passed upon, I am sure. Judging by what has happened in the past, those who have supported the continuation of the helicopter program—I believe without exception, if my recollection is correct—have always prevailed in the Senate committee, although there has always been a substantial division.

Mr. JAVITS. Did the testimony indicate whether the helicopter services can survive during this period before the issue again comes up?

Mr. HOLLAND. That was not gone into in that specific way. It was understood that the present annual budget as submitted was for the end of this program to come at the end of this calendar year. This item had nothing to do with that. It had to do with the payment up to the end of the fiscal year, on contracts already made and the carrying on of the helicopter services at the three great terminals where that service now prevails.

Mr. JAVITS. So it is fair to say that the Senate in approving the action of the Appropriations Committee has opted to continue the service, and the House refuses to go along, but both Houses will have another opportunity to act on the matter in the independent offices appropriation bill which will come along before June 30.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is completely correct. Aside from that, it was claimed by supporters of this particular appropriation in the nature of a subsidy, that the contract existing was so binding that an action in the Court of Claims would even prevail.

I express no opinion on this issue. I have no definite information upon it, but this is not the end. There is in the budget, I am told, an amount to carry the program to the period of termination now recommended by the administration, which I understand is at the end of this calendar year.

I ask the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] if I am correct in that understanding?

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me say to my able friend the Senator from Florida that the CAB has recommended a phasing out over a 5-year period, commencing with the next fiscal year. If I am correct, my understanding is that the Budget Bureau has approved the request for an appropriation for the ensuing fiscal year, but does not look with favor on any additional subsidy thereafter.

Mr. HOLLAND. The matter is in a state of uncertainty. That is perfectly clear from what we have all said. But it is not dead. That is what I believe the Senator is really concerned about.

Mr. JAVITS. It is not dead, if the lines can survive between now and the time when the appropriation is passed—if it is passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me finish my thought, and I shall be glad then to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

I might say, because I do not wish to be left in an unfortunate position, that I have always opposed the subsidy. I support the action of the Senate in the conference, of course. I have desisted from any action now. The concentration of this effort in three places—whereas there are so many other places, such as the National Capital with three airports; namely, Friendship, National, and Dulles without this subsidized service, to cite only one example—has brought on argument in this field, aside from the question as to whether any subsidy at all should be granted. So that it is an arguable matter.

But I assure all concerned that the action today will not terminate it. Some Senators might be sorry that it would not terminate it, but I am perfectly willing to reexamine the situation. I am sure that other Senators are, also. If history teaches me anything, I am sure that a majority of the Appropriations Committee will approve the appropriation for this objective.

Mr. JAVITS. Never have any of us who are supporting the helicopter subsidy contended that there should be only three lines. We have always been anxious that it should be widely used. And that other cities throughout the Nation utilize the experience and tested equipment of the existing lines.

We have always maintained that the only justification for the three at this time was to prove that it is practicable, feasible, and ultimately sound and economical. We are anxious to have other States and cities participate in the use of this medium of air travel including Washington, D.C., which I believe is now exploring the use of helicopter services.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say, in order that the record may be made quite clear, that in spite of my own feelings, if the House action had been otherwise today, I would have requested Senate approval and confirmation because we have all got to treat the great group of objectives in this bill as a whole, when we get to this stage of the proceeding where there has been a conference report—and it was a good, sturdy one—and the Senate conferees all stuck together; but when we finally come to the end of the road, we have to enact a bill.

I believe that we should enact this bill in the form in which it is at present, as it comes out of conference, and accept as graciously as we can the action taken by the other body today.

After all, the House has yielded to us in probably three instances to one instance in which we have yielded to them, as will be noted from the report of the conference committee.

I am glad now to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me add to what the Senator from Florida has said, if the Senator from New York will listen for a moment. We certainly do not wish to deceive the Senator from New York or the Senator from California. The House report, led by Representative THOMAS, of Texas, made it clear in its report last year that it was going to stop the subsidies as of June 30 this year, that there would be no further subsidies. He was emphatic in conference yesterday on that subject. We voted—and I voted—for the helicopter subsidy last year, and again this year.

I believe that it is only fair to point out to the Senator from California and the Senator from New York that there is divided opinion in the Appropriations Committee as to whether the CAB carried forward any possibilities of legally stopping the subsidies, so that we voted this year to keep those subsidies up be-

cause otherwise the Government would be liable to a suit.

I do not believe that we can say to the distinguished Senators from New York and California what the action will be in next year's budget, even if the Senate includes it, as I believe it will, and certainly in committee, although the committee is divided, because the House, led by Representative THOMAS, of Texas, is adamant that these subsidies shall be stopped. I believe that it is only fair to point this out to the Senators from New York and California at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the matters which we have been discussing relate to something that should come after the adoption of the conference report, if it should be adopted.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for the fine work which he has performed, especially in regard to the $10 million in the President's disaster relief fund which will be sent to those people suffering from tornadoes and flood damage in the Midwest.

I also thank the members of the committee, including the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who has worked so diligently for the success of this program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, for the whole committee, I am glad to accept the Senator's kind remarks, because there was not a dissenting vote in committee. All members of the committee felt that in view of the immensity of the disaster it should build up the President's fund a little more than had been contemplated before the recent unfortunate conditions developed along the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say to the Senator from California that this does not include the matter in which he is interested, which will come up separately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there are three amendments of the Senate which were reported in technical disagreement but which have been now amended and passed in the House. They bear no reference to the helicopter matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 26, 28, and 30 to the bill (H.R. 7091) entitled "An Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "and including $100,000 for the purpose of extending the screw worm barter zone on a limited basis to Arizona and California with cost-sharing from State and local sources of at least 50 per centum of the expenses of production, irradiation and release of the screw worm flies;".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"Amounts available for any activity under appropriations under this head in the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, shall also be available for any other activity thereunder to the extent needed in preparing for the programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

"SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

"Limitation on Salaries and Expenses

"Amounts available for any activity under appropriations under this head in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, shall also be available for any other activity thereunder to the extent needed in preparing for the programs authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965."

Resolved, That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 10, 11 and 15 to aforesaid bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. The amendments are numbered 3, 27, and 29. If I may have the attention of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], these amendments which I propose to call up now still do not involve the matter which is in contention and in which the Senator from California is interested.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Florida for that information.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate, amendments Nos. 3, 27, and 29.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 10, 11, and 15.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield in a moment. Did the clerk include in his reading all three of the amendments, or only the first one?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments 3, 27, and 29.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the clerk for his expeditious handling of the amendments.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I invite the attention of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Illinois to what I am about to say. Two of the three items which the senior Senator from Florida has just moved, in connection with which the Senate should recede, have to do with matters of considerable concern to those of us interested in metropolitan areas which are interested in the development of competent individuals to engage in metropolitan area planning.

I desire to make a little legislative history on these matters, so that when we consider the independent offices bill for the next fiscal year, the attitude of some Members of the Senate may be made clear.

The history is as follows: For 9 years the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, and I as a member of the Subcommittee on Housing—although I am no longer a member of the subcommittee—have done our level best to have some Federal money appropriated to pay for the necessary amount of training, with matching State funds, to provide necessary scholarships and fellowships to further that highly important skill, which is in very short supply, of competent metropolitan area planners and competent city planners, and competent individuals in various areas of urban renewal and urban rehabilitation, and to encourage the training of those who are in such short supply.

In the Housing Act of 1964 we finally prevailed, after 8 years of effort. I shall not go into any detail in that regard. The Budget Bureau and the President of the United States recommended that fellowships for training programs be funded. The House Appropriations Committee last year, however, refused to appropriate any part of the money that had been authorized by Congress and requested by the President of the United States. They took the position that they did not approve of the program, and therefore, as members of the Appropriations Committee, they would nullify and negate the intention of Congress as indicated by the action taken in the Housing Act of 1964.

When the supplemental appropriation bill came before the Senate Appropriation Committee I consulted Senator SPARKMAN and was authorized by him to request that the Senate committee add the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget, which is $5,050,000 for item No. 10, which is the training program, and $515,000 for the fellowships and scholarships.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], as chairman of the subcommittee, was most gracious. He heard our program. He agreed with it. He requested the amount in the supplemental appropriation bill. In conference the House was adamant in its position against it.

Mr. HOLLAND. So was the Senate. These amendments were in disagreement.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for being adamant, as the Senator from Alabama and I would have been had we been in conference.

The House again refused to fund the programs authorized by the act of 1964, recommended by the President, on the

sole ground that the members of the House Appropriations Committee do not approve of the program. Congress has approved it. I hope very much, I say to my friend, the senior Senator from Florida, that when the appropriation bill comes up for the next fiscal year, we shall be able to persuade our brothers in the House, particularly the members of the House Appropriations Committee, that when Congress authorizes a program and the President requests that it be funded, there is some obligation on the part of the Appropriations Committee to carry out the will of Congress. They do not have to fund it for the same amount that the President requested, but they should not merely say, "We do not approve of this program and therefore we will not give one cent for it."

I suggest that that is not proper procedure by the other body.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield in a moment. These things happen from time to time. The acid test is when amendments are reported in disagreement. The two amendments to which the Senator refers, 10 and 11, were reported in disagreement. Some of the Members of the House who voted to authorize these programs stood by their conferees in the Appropriations Committee and refused to recede from their position.

Mr. CLARK. I have no doubt that they did. I do not believe that any Member of the Senate is deceived by that action. When a powerful group such as the Appropriations Committee comes in with an item, in a $2 billion bill which amounts to very little, by comparison, it would be rather odd for the Appropriations Committee to be reversed.

I say two things to the Senator from Florida. First, I thank him for his strenuous effort to maintain the position of the Senate; and, second, we hope to have better luck next time.

Mr. HOLLAND. There was not one Senator in the conference who did not stick with the action of the Senate, whether he had been in accord with it or not.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his efforts.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I say to the Senator from Florida that we have had this problem before. I am convinced of the helicopter program's worth, and desirability. We always have the problem of being caught in the middle between two millstones, consisting of things that people think are urgently needed, and critical things left out, which others find offensive. I hope very much, although this may not be the ultimate ground to stand on to fight—as with respect to the helicopter appropriation that we shall find a ground upon which to stand on and fight. That will be the basic annual appropriation bill. I pledge to the Senator from Pennsylvania my support in putting up that fight in every way that is open to us.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from New York and his colleague from New York. I am confident that if there were more than a handful of Senators on the floor we would have additional support from a number of the other industrial States and other States with metropolitan areas where there is a requirement for the necessary skills to do the planning and administration of these important programs.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand that provisions for annual contributions for public housing differed by approximately $4.7 million in the Senate and House bills. Can the Senator tell us about that?

Mr. HOLLAND. As I said, I did not hear all the testimony on this bill. I was conducting other hearings. I can give the Senator the information in a moment. The amount for the Public Housing Administration was $8,320,000, as agreed to by the conferees of both Houses.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I also understand that there was a difference in the Senate and House bills with respect to urban renewal in the amount of $30 million.

Mr. HOLLAND. The House accepted the Senate amendment for $30 million for an allied subject, for urban renewal, so the objectives which the Senator has in mind did not go——

Mr. JAVITS. Down the drain.

Mr. HOLLAND. Unmentioned.

I move that the Senate recede in each case, on the first amendment, No. 6, on helicopter subsidies; on the second amendment, No. 10, the Federal-State training program; on No. 11, fellowships for city planning and urban studies; and on No. 15, for the veterans reopened insurance fund, which was the one in which the House turned down the conference action, which happens sometimes even in the Senate, and apparently does happen in the House as well.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. What is the amendment number of the proposed appropriation related to the CAB helicopter subsidy?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is No. 6.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment be submitted to the Senate for a separate vote. I wish to vote "no" on it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on amendment No. 6.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 6.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rise merely to express my vigorous objection to the action which the Senate is about to take. For many years the law of our land has directed the Civil Aeronautics Board to hold hearings and to determine whether or not public convenience and necessity would be served by granting an applicant a certificate to engage in transportation by use of helicopters. The Congress has provided by law for the Civil Aeronautics Board, having made such a decision, to determine the amount of Federal assistance or subsidy which the successful applicant should have in order to conduct its business operations. That law is on the books today. No one has attempted to repeal it. If the Civil Aeronautics Board does its duty and follows the law, that is what it must do.

So with the approval of the President of the United States and the Budget Bureau, there came to the Senate a request for a little less than $1 million to continue the subsidy operations for the remainder of the present fiscal year. The House Appropriations Committee knocked out the provision. The item went to the House and came to the Senate. The Senate Appropriations Committee put it back in. The Senate concurred in that judgment.

Then this afternoon, led by some of our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee in the House, out again went an item which, under the law of our land, the Civil Aeronautics Board is required to determine is necessary and is in the public interest.

Orderly procedure in American Government took a kick in the stomach today.

In the State from which I come 900 citizens became stockholders in a helicopter organization some 17 years ago. They have never received a nickel in dividends. They put their money in, and about 750 people are working day in and day out to provide a modern, a new, and unique form of transportation all over the great Los Angeles metropolitan area. In the years ahead Congress will continue to grant great amounts of subsidy to certain airlines in this country. The Congress will provide a means through the appropriation process by which, in the city of the Acting President pro tempore or my own, the Federal Government will assist in building airports.

That cannot be done in a helicopter operation. I ask Senators to consider my home community of Anaheim. Since Disneyland located there, there has been a great deal of interest in my hometown. Only the other day 500 people used the helicopter to fly from the Los Angeles Airport to the city which I call my home.

Approximately 70 miles away from the Los Angeles Airport is San Bernardino, a great, thriving metropolitan area which is not served by an airline. But one can travel from San Bernardino into the airport or into the community by a helicopter operation. It is supported by the cities which themselves have used their money to build heliports over the years. By the aid of the Government of the United States the cost factor has gone down to a point at which it is believed that in a very few more years there will be an example, or perhaps two examples, or maybe three examples, of how people can provide this new form of transportation and enter that field for profit. That was the basis upon which the subsidy was originally created.

I shall not speak very much longer, but I desire, with the consent of the Senate, to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of pages 140 and 141 of the Senate hearings on the measure, which demonstrates that the Civil Aeronautics Board issued formal orders to

the three helicopter lines—one in Los Angeles, one in Chicago, and one in New York—to come before them and show cause why their certificate should not be amended so that 5 years hence, all Federal assistance would be eliminated. But during those 5 years the people of the United States would continue to have an active interest in and a growing hope that helicopter transportation would be available in any community in this land where there was a demand for use of that rapid type of transportation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excerpt from the hearings to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OPERATING AUTHORITY OF CARRIERS

1. On February 16, 1965, the Board issued formal orders to show cause with regard to Chicago Helicopter Airways, Inc., Los Angeles Airways, Inc., and New York Airways, Inc., which formally placed in issue the matter of the amendment, modification, renewal, and/or termination of the operating authority of each of the three carriers. Those orders proposed, on a tentative basis and subject to the required formal hearings before appropriate hearing examiners and thereafter the Board, to insert clauses in the certificates of the carriers which would, in effect, make them ineligible for subsidy exceeding the following aggregate amount:

Maximum subsidy eligibility

Fiscal year:	*Thousands*
1966	$4.2
1967	3.6
1968	2.7
1969	1.9
1970	1.1
1971	0

2. The institution of these formal hearing steps, which are required by both section 401 of the Federal Aviation Act and by the Administrative Procedure Act, were preceded by the following:

(*a*) Early in 1964, the Board appointed a staff task force to study the various phases of helicopter operations, and this staff task force—after study at the home bases of the helicopter operators on the east coast, in Chicago, and on the west coast—reported the results of its investigation to the Board on May 8, 1964.

(*b*) On June 18, 1964, Chairman Boyd, at the request of Senator MAGNUSON, presented to the Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations a report setting forth the program for the phasing out of helicopter subsidy in the amounts and for the periods set forth in 1, above (Hearings on Independent Offices Appropriations, 1965, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 1018–1020).

(*c*) A Board staff task force scheduled and conducted extensive informal meetings beginning in August 1964 and concluding in September 1964 with all interested parties including governmental agencies, the domestic trunkline carriers, manufacturers, the local service carriers, and the helicopter operators.

(*d*) Petitions by the helicopter carriers proposing amendment of their certificates to phase out helicopter subsidy in the manner described in the report referred to in subparagraph (b) above, were filed on November 4 and 12, 1964, and amended by the carriers on January 8, 11, 15, and 21, 1965.

3. Formal prehearing conferences before the hearing examiners are scheduled for each carrier on April 13, 14, and 15, respectively. Thereafter formal written exhibits will be exchanged and an evidentiary record will be made before the hearing examiners.

Mr. KUCHEL. I take little comfort from the statement of my friend the Senator from Florida that, "The action today will not terminate Federal assistance to helicopters." I utter a fond hope that such may be the fact. I recall what my friend the Senator from Massachusetts said subsequently. But I say to my friend that it would be a sad thing in this nuclear age, in this age of outer space, if the Congress should turn its back on an active interest in rapid transportation by air in these amazing new devices which we call helicopters.

So when the President of the United States once again sends to us his recommendations for Federal assistance next year—and I am told that we shall have that request before the Senate Committee on Appropriations shortly—I express the fond hope that my friend the Senator from Florida will be vindicated in what he has said today, and that the action today will not terminate Federal assistance to this program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and, before him, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] made forceful statements of their case. I have great sympathy with their case. I do not see what we can do about it, however. The Senate decided with them. Their conferees stood with them. Their eloquence is really needed over in the other body rather than in the Senate. We are in a situation in which, it seems to me, they must look to another day, and I am sure that day will be open to the Senator. As I have stated, I do not see how it could be otherwise, because the President's spending budget requests that the program continue until the end of this calendar year, and that involves a substantial additional sum.

Mr. KUCHEL. The next fiscal year.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that is correct.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, as an addition to what has already been inserted in the RECORD, the question and answer which appear at the top of page 142 of the record of hearings of the Appropriations Committee at which point Vice Chairman Robert T. Murphy, of the Civil Aeronautics Board, gives the opinion that legally these subsidies are owing, and that in order to cancel out that obligation it will be necessary to amend the Federal Aviation Act, which, of course, the Congress has not done.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection.

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

LEGISLATIVE ACTION REQUIRED

Senator PASTORE. How do you bring this thing to an end? That is the question I am asking.

Mr. MURPHY. Really the only legal way to bring it to an end, as we see it, is to amend the basic Federal Aviation Act, the basic statute, from which the licenses or certificates are derived. It was amended at one time to forbid payment of subsidies to supplemental carriers. If this is the policy and will of the Congress, it will take a simple amendment to section 406(b) of the Federal Aviation Act to do that. This would not only alleviate the potential liability in the future, but it would deliver us at the Civil Aeronautics Board from a perplexing dilemma.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 6, which relates to the proposed helicopter subsidy.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, unless there is objection, I move that the Senate recede from amendments numbered 10, 11, and 15, and that they be considered en bloc.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has indicated, there are no items in disagreement between the two Houses insofar as Appalachian regional development moneys under title II are concerned. All title II items were resolved, and I think, on the whole, that the Appalachian programs came through the conference in good condition. The original budget estimate was $362,636,000. The House bill allowed $344,328,000. The Senate restored $7,972,000. Of the amount restored by the Senate, the House conferees receded on items amounting to $5,360,000. The Senate conferees receded on items amounting to $2,612,000. The total appropriation for Appalachian regional development activities, as agreed upon by both Houses in conference, is $349,688,000 which, as I have stated, is $5,360,000 above the original House bill. The appropriation for Appalachian regional development activities, therefore, represents only about a 3.5-percent cut in the original budget estimate of $362,636,000. I believe that this appropriation will be amply sufficient to get the programs off to a good start and an early start, and the minute reduction which was made in the original budget estimate is indicative of the strong congressional support of the programs. I am grateful to Senator PASTORE, for his having requested that I be appointed to serve as a Senate conferee, and I am glad for the progress that was made in the conference on yesterday with regard to the appropriation for Appalachian regional development activities.

On Tuesday of this week, April 27, I enumerated the items in the appropriation bill which dealt with Appalachian regional development activities, I gave a brief explanation of each item, and I indicated the action taken by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

At this time, I shall explain the action taken by the Senate and House conferees on those Appalachian aid items which were before the conference for consideration and resolution.

For the Agricultural Research Service, the budget estimate was $520,000, the

House had allowed $100,000, the Senate added $100,000 to make a total of $200,000. The Senate yielded in conference, and the appropriation stands at $100,000.

For the Cooperative State Research Service, the budget estimate was $1 million, the House appropriated $100,000, the Senate restored $400,000, making the total appropriation $500,000. The conferees agreed on a total of $300,000.

For the Extension Service, the budget estimate was $2 million, the House allowed $500,000, the Senate restored $1 million, making a total of $1.5 million. The conferees agreed on a total of $750,000.

For "Conservation operations," Soil Conservation Service, the budget estimate was $1,950,000, the House appropriated $1.5 million, the Senate added $150,000. The conferees agreed on a total of $1,575,000.

For "Watershed planning," the budget estimate was $600,000, the House bill allowed $400,000, and the Senate restored $200,000, making a total of $600,000. In conference the House receded from its position, leaving the total for "Watershed planning" at $600,000.

For "Watershed protection," the budget estimate was $10,220,000, the House bill allowed $8 million, and the Senate restored $2,220,000, for the full budget estimate. In conference, the House receded, and the full budget estimate of $10,220,000 stands. Of this amount, $3.1 million is for the funding of applications for loans for small watersheds in the Appalachian region.

For the Economic Research Service, the budget estimate was $400,000, the House allowed $200,000, and the Senate restored the $200,000 back to the full budget estimate. The conferees agreed on a total appropriation of $300,000.

For the Farmers Home Administration, salaries and expenses, the budget estimate was $500,000, the House bill allowed $250,000, and the Senate restored $150,000, bringing the amount up to $400,000. The Senate and House conferees agreed on a total appropriation of $325,000.

For the "Direct loan account," Farmers Home Administration, the budget estimate was $8.6 million, the House appropriated $6 million, and the Senate restored $1.1 million. The conference agreed on the Senate-appropriated amount of $7.1 million.

For the Rural Community Development Service, the budget estimate was $65,000, the House bill allowed $35,000, the Senate-passed bill restored $30,000. The conferees agreed on a total of $50,000.

For Forest Service acquisition of depleted lands in Kentucky and West Virginia, the budget estimate was $1.1 million, the House bill allowed $500,000, and the Senate restored $500,000 to bring the amount up to the full budget estimate. The House receded on this item, so the appropriation for land acquisition stands at $1 million, of which appropriation $900,000 will be used to purchase depleted lands in Kentucky and $100,000 shall be used for the purchase of such lands in Pocahontas, Randolph, and Webster Counties, W. Va.

The next item before the conference was the appropriation for "Forest Research." The budget estimate was in the amount of $1,785,000, the House had allowed $1,125,000, and the Senate restored $200,000, making a total of $1,325,000. The Senate-House conference agreed on an appropriation of $1,225,000. This is $100,000 above the House-passed bill, and the additional $100,000 is for forest engineering research at Morgantown, W. Va.

For "Construction, general," Corps of Engineers, the budget estimate was $15 million, the House bill appropriated $13,778,000, the Senate restored $922,000. The Senate-House conference agreed on a total appropriation, for this item, of $14,153,000.

For "Appalachian region mining area restoration," Bureau of Mines, the budget estimate was $16,250,000, the House bill allowed $15,850,000, and the Senate restored $400,000, making a total of $16,250,000. The conferees reached an agreement on a total appropriation of $16 million.

The final item in disagreement between the two Houses insofar as the Appalachian regional development items were concerned, was a Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife item. The President had requested $1,750,000 for Appalachian region fish and wildlife restoration projects, the House bill had allowed $1,350,000, and the Senate restored $400,000. In conference, the Senate receded and the total appropriation for this item stands at $1,350,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does this complete action on the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. This concludes action upon the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Acting President pro tempore. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the supplemental budget estimates of the House and Senate versions of the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1965 and the final amounts agreed to in conference.

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

The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1965 (H.R. 7091)

SUMMARY RECAPITULATION BY TITLE

Chapter	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	TITLE I				
I	Agriculture	$22,563,000	$22,083,000	$22,663,000	$22,473,000
II	District of Columbia	(1,563,600)	(1,563,600)	(1,563,600)	(1,563,600)
III	Foreign operations	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000
IV	Independent offices	268,972,500	188,925,400	276,038,400	267,913,900
V	Interior	72,527,000	69,602,000	72,412,000	70,602,000
VI	Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare	527,900,000	496,900,000	521,900,000	507,900,000
VII	Legislative	130,000	130,000	168,000	168,000
VIII	Public works	14,229,000	13,369,000	13,604,000	13,604,000
IX	State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary	141,769,000	129,390,000	133,983,938	130,415,000
X	Treasury and Post Office	271,000	271,000	271,000	271,000
	Total, title I	1,298,361,500	1,170,670,400	1,291,040,338	1,263,346,900
	TITLE II				
	APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT				
	(H. Doc. No. 110)				
	Agriculture	42,840,000	30,560,000	36,810,000	35,395,000
	Commerce	248,000,000	247,500,000	247,500,000	247,500,000
	Defense—Civil functions	17,271,000	15,778,000	16,700,000	16,153,000
	Health, Education, and Welfare	34,775,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
	Interior	19,250,000	18,000,000	18,800,000	18,150,000
	Appalachian Regional Commission	500,000	490,000	490,000	490,000
	Total, title II	362,636,000	344,328,000	352,300,000	349,688,000
	TITLE III				
	Increased pay costs (H. Doc. No. 98)	587,842,383	579,691,188	583,117,633	583,117,633
	TITLE IV				
	Claims and judgments (H. Doc. No. 113 and S. Doc. No. 19)	31,411,444	23,643,495	31,411,444	31,411,444
	Grand total	2,280,251,327	2,118,333,083	2,257,869,415	2,227,563,977

The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1965 (H.R. 7091)—Continued

TITLE I

H. Doc.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	CHAPTER I				
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	Agricultural Research Service:				
	Salaries and expenses:				
80	Research (pay costs)	$3,109,000	$2,860,000	$3,109,000	$2,960,000
80	Plant and animal disease and pest control:				
	Pay costs	1,767,000	1,626,000	2,417,000	2,376,000
	Screw-worm eradication	550,000	550,000		
	Arizona-California control			(100,000)	(100,000)
80	Meat inspection (pay costs)	1,137,000	1,047,000	1,137,000	1,137,000
	Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:				
80	Sugar Act program	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
80	Emergency conservation measures	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	Total, chapter I	22,563,000	22,083,000	22,663,000	22,473,000
	CHAPTER II				
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS				
	Operating expenses:				
80	General operating expenses	(80,000)	(80,000)	(585,800)	(585,800)
	Pay costs	(505,800)	(505,800)		
80	Settlement of claims and suits	(6,800)	(6,800)	(6,800)	(6,800)
114	Capital outlay	(971,000)	(971,000)	(971,000)	(971,000)
	Total, chapter II	(1,563,600)	(1,563,600)	(1,563,600)	(1,563,600)
	CHAPTER III				
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS				
	Funds appropriated to the President:				
112	Investment in Inter-American Development Bank	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000
80	Peace Corps (limitation increase)	(1,200,000)		(1,858,000)	(1,858,000)
	Pay costs	(658,000)			
	Total, chapter III	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000
	CHAPTER IV				
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
	CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD				
80	Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization)	2,874,000	1,932,000	2,874,000	1,932,000
	CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION				
80	Government payments for annuitants, employees' health benefits fund	1,560,000	1,560,000	1,560,000	1,560,000
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
80	Disaster relief	25,000,000	25,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000
80	Alaska mortgage indemnity grants	5,500,000			
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION				
	Construction, public buildings projects		7,245,900	7,245,900	7,245,900
80	IRS building at Ogden	4,506,000	4,055,000	4,506,000	4,305,000
80	Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	2,835,000		4,166,500	2,750,000
	Pay costs	1,331,500	1,331,500		
	HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY				
	Office of the Administrator:				
80	Rehabilitation loan fund	10,180,000	10,180,000	10,180,000	10,180,000
80	Federal-State training programs	5,050,000		5,050,000	
80	Fellowships for city planning and urban studies	515,000		515,000	
119	Urban renewal fund (liquidation of contract authorization)	30,000,000		30,000,000	30,000,000
119	Public Housing Administration: Annual contributions	13,000,000	13,000,000	8,320,000	8,320,000
	VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION				
80	General operating expenses	2,809,000	2,809,000	7,745,000	7,745,000
80	Pay costs	4,936,000	4,936,000		
80	Compensation and pensions	108,000,000	108,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000
S. 18	Compensation and pensions	42,000,000			
80	Readjustment benefits	8,800,000	8,800,000	8,800,000	8,800,000
80	Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	76,000	76,000	76,000	76,000
80	Veterans' reopened insurance fund	Language		Language	
	Total, chapter IV	268,972,500	188,925,400	276,038,400	267,913,900
	CHAPTER V				
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
	Bureau of Land Management:				
80	Management of lands and resources	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,950,000	3,950,000
	Pay costs	750,000	750,000		
111	Public land development roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
111	Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
	Bureau of Indian Affairs:				
111	Education and welfare services	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
80	Resources management	307,000	307,000	1,031,000	1,031,000
	Pay costs	724,000	724,000		
111	Construction	1,910,000	1,910,000	1,910,000	1,910,000
111	Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	1,115,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	National Park Service:				
80	Management and protection	265,000	265,000	897,000	897,000
	Pay costs	632,000	632,000		
111	Construction	1,300,000	580,000	1,300,000	580,000

The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1965 (H.R. 7091)—Continued

TITLE I—Continued

H. Doc.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	CHAPTER V—Continued				
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued				
80	Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: Land and water conservation (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	$16,000,000	$16,000,000	$16,000,000	$16,000,000
80	Office of Territories: Claims of inhabitants of Rongelap Atoll	950,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
111	The Alaska Railroad: Payment to the Alaska Railroad revolving fund	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
111	Geological Survey: Surveys, investigations, and research	800,000	550,000	800,000	550,000
	Fish and Wildlife Service:				
111	Bureau of Commercial Fisheries: Construction	1,125,000	1,125,000	1,125,000	1,125,000
111	Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: Construction	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
80	Office of Saline Water: Salaries and expenses	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
80	Office of Water Resources Research: Salaries and expenses	2,825,000	985,000	2,825,000	1,985,000
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	Forest Service:				
	Forest protection and utilization:				
80	Forest land management	14,000,000	14,000,000		
	Pay costs	3,162,000	3,162,000	21,362,000	21,362,000
111	Forest land management	4,200,000	4,200,000		
80	Forest research (pay costs)	704,000	704,000	704,000	704,000
80	State and private forestry cooperation (pay costs)	58,000	58,000	58,000	58,000
111	Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
111	Public Health Service: Construction of Indian health facilities	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	Total, chapter V	72,527,000	69,602,000	72,412,000	70,602,000
	CHAPTER VI				
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
	Manpower Administration:				
80	Manpower develop and training activities	103,000,000	75,000,000	103,000,000	89,000,000
80	Limitation on grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration	(560,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)
80	Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen	17,000,000	14,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
80	Limitation on salaries and expenses, Bureau of Employment Security (increase)	(178,000)	(178,000)	(627,500)	(627,500)
	Pay costs	(449,500)	(449,500)		
	Total, Labor	120,000,000	89,000,000	114,000,000	100,000,000
	HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	Office of Education:				
80	Defense educational activities (limitation)	(627,500)	(627,500)	(627,500)	(627,500)
	Salaries and expenses (limitation)			Language	Language
	Social Security Administration:				
	Limitation on salaries and expenses			Language	Language
	Welfare Administration:				
	Bureau of Family Services:				
80	Grants to States for public assistance	407,900,000	407,900,000	407,900,000	407,900,000
	Total, Health, Education, and Welfare	407,900,000	407,900,000	407,900,000	407,900,000
	RELATED AGENCIES				
	NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD				
80	Salaries and expenses (limitation)	(2,460,000)	(2,460,000)	(2,460,000)	(2,460,000)
	NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD				
80	Salaries and expenses (limitation)	(845,000)	(845,000)	(845,000)	(845,000)
	RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD				
80	Limitation on salaries and expenses	(343,000)	(343,000)	(343,000)	(343,000)
	Total, chapter VI	527,900,000	496,900,000	521,900,000	507,900,000
	CHAPTER VII				
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH				
	SENATE				
	Payment to the widow of Senator Johnston			30,000	30,000
	Contingent expenses of the Senate:				
	Folding documents			8,000	8,000
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
	Capitol Buildings and Grounds:				
80	Capitol Buildings	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000
	Total, chapter VII	130,000	130,000	168,000	168,000
	CHAPTER VIII				
	PUBLIC WORKS				
	Department of the Army:				
	Cemeterial expenses:				
80	Salaries and expenses	1,770,000	1,770,000	1,869,000	1,869,000
	Pay costs	99,000	99,000		
	Corps of Engineers—Civil:				
111	General investigations	25,000			
80	Construction, general: Lower Granite project, Washington	600,000			
111	Operation and maintenance, general	1,735,000	1,500,000	1,735,000	1,735,000
111	Flood control, hurricane, and shore-protection emergencies	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	Total, chapter VIII	14,229,000	13,369,000	13,604,000	13,604,000

The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1965 (H.R. 7091)—Continued

TITLE I—Continued

H. Doc.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	CHAPTER IX				
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
80	Salaries and expenses	$900,000	$400,000	$6,255,000	$6,255,000
	Pay costs:				
	Appropriation	5,855,000	5,855,000		
	By transfer	(890,000)	(890,000)	(890,000)	(890,000)
80	Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	Total, State	7,255,000	6,755,000	6,755,000	6,755,000
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
119	Legal activities and general administration: Fees and expenses of witnesses (limitation increase)	(75,000)	(65,000)	(65,000)	(65,000)
	Federal Bureau of Investigation:				
80	Salaries and expenses	5,030,000	5,030,000	10,635,000	10,635,000
	Pay costs	5,605,000	5,605,000		
80	Federal Prison System: Buildings and facilities	4,300,000	3,750,000	4,300,000	3,750,000
	Total, Justice	14,935,000	14,385,000	14,935,000	14,385,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
80	Bureau of the Census: Registration and voting statistics	7,500,000		293,000	
80	Bureau of Public Roads: Federal-aid highways (trust fund)	(250,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(250,000,000)
	Total, Commerce	7,500,000		293,000	
	THE JUDICIARY				
	Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services				
80	Fees of jurors and commissioners	300,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
	RELATED AGENCIES				
	COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE				
80	Salaries and expenses	79,000		50,938	25,000
	SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION				
80	Revolving fund	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
	U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY				
80	Special international exhibitions	11,700,000	8,000,000	11,700,000	9,000,000
	Total, chapter IX	141,769,000	129,390,000	133,983,938	130,415,000
	CHAPTER X				
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
	U.S. Secret Service:				
119	Salaries and expenses	56,000	56,000	271,000	271,000
	By transfer	(539,000)	(539,000)	(539,000)	(539,000)
	Pay costs	215,000	215,000		
	Total, chapter X	271,000	271,000	271,000	271,000
	Total, all chapters, title I	[1] 1,298,361,500	[2] 1,170,670,400	[1] 1,291,040,338	[3] 1,263,346,900

TITLE II—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT (H. DOC. No. 110)

	Budget estimate (1)	House version of bill (2)	Senate version of bill (3)	Conference action (4)
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
Agricultural Research Service: Salaries and expenses	$520,000	$100,000	$200,000	$100,000
Cooperative State Research Service: Payments and expenses	1,000,000	100,000	500,000	300,000
Extension Service: Cooperative extension work, payments, and expenses	2,000,000	500,000	1,500,000	750,000
Soil Conservation Service:				
Conservation operations	1,950,000	1,500,000	1,650,000	1,575,000
Watershed planning	600,000	400,000	600,000	600,000
Watershed protection	10,220,000	8,000,000	10,220,000	10,220,000
Loan limitations	(3,100,000)	(2,500,000)	(3,100,000)	(3,100,000)
Economic Research Service: Salaries and expenses	400,000	200,000	400,000	300,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: Appalachian region conservation program	8,500,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Farmers Home Administration:				
Salaries and expenses	500,000	250,000	400,000	325,000
Direct loan account	8,600,000	6,000,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
Rural Community Development Service: Salaries and expenses	65,000	35,000	65,000	50,000
Forest Service:				
Forest protection and utilization:				
Forest land management	2,500,000	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Forest research	1,785,000	1,125,000	1,325,000	1,225,000
State and private forestry cooperation	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Timber development organization loans and technical assistance	1,350,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total, Agriculture	42,840,000	30,560,000	36,810,000	35,395,000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
Grants for local development districts and for research and demonstration	3,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Supplemental grants-in-aid	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000
Bureau of Public Roads: Appalachian development highway system	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000
Total, Commerce	248,000,000	247,500,000	247,500,000	247,500,000

See footnotes at end of table.

The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1965 (H.R. 7091)—Continued

TITLE II—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT (H. DOC. No. 110)—Continued

	Budget estimate (1)	House version of bill (2)	Senate version of bill (3)	Conference action (4)
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL				
Department of the Army:				
Corps of Engineers—Civil:				
General investigations	$2,271,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000
Construction, general	15,000,000	13,778,000	14,700,000	14,153,000
Total, Defense—Civil	17,271,000	15,778,000	16,700,000	16,153,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
Office of Education:				
Expansion and improvement of vocational education	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Public Health Service:				
Hospital construction activities	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000
Air pollution	975,000			
Water supply and water pollution control	1,800,000			
Grants for waste treatment works construction	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare	34,775,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
Geological Survey:				
Surveys, investigations, and research	750,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Bureau of Mines:				
Conservation and development of mineral resources	500,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Appalachian region mining area restoration	16,250,000	15,850,000	16,250,000	16,000,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:				
Appalachian region fish and wildlife restoration projects	1,750,000	1,350,000	1,750,000	1,350,000
Total, Interior	19,250,000	18,000,000	18,800,000	18,150,000
OTHER INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
Appalachian Regional Commission:				
Salaries and expenses	500,000	490,000	490,000	490,000
Total, title II	362,636,000	344,328,000	352,300,000	349,688,000

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS (H. DOC. 98)

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH				
SENATE				
Compensation of the Vice President and Senators	$406,120		$406,120	$406,120
Salaries, officers and employees	2,857,110		2,357,110	2,357,110
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate	40,845		40,845	40,845
Contingent expenses of the Senate:				
Senate policy committees	42,880		42,880	42,880
Automobiles and maintenance	2,700		2,700	2,700
Inquiries and investigations	501,630		401,630	401,630
Folding documents	2,275		2,275	2,275
Miscellaneous items	122,885		122,885	122,885
Total, Senate items	3,976,445		3,376,445	3,376,445
Joint items:				
Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures	4,915	$4,915	4,915	4,915
Contingent expenses of the Senate:				
Joint Economic Committee	30,080	30,080	30,080	30,080
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy	36,510	36,510	36,510	36,510
Joint Committee on Printing	19,845	19,845	19,845	19,845
Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation	45,560	45,560	45,560	45,560
Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100
Joint Committee on Defense Production (includes $10,000 in H. Doc. 119)	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Capitol Police Board	130,566	130,566	130,566	130,566
Education of pages	5,787	5,787	5,787	5,787
Total, joint items	292,363	292,363	292,363	292,363
HOUSE				
Compensation of Members	1,759,000	1,759,000	1,759,000	1,759,000
Office of the Speaker	20,225	20,225	20,225	20,225
Office of the Parliamentarian	26,495	26,495	26,495	26,495
Office of the Chaplain	3,070	3,070	3,070	3,070
Office of the Clerk	154,500	100,000	100,000	100,000
Committee employees	600,000	575,000	575,000	575,000
Sergeant at Arms	98,500			
Doorkeeper	106,800	80,000	80,000	80,000
6 minority employees	17,635	17,635	17,635	17,635
Majority floor leader	7,240	7,240	7,240	7,240
Minority floor leader	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
Majority whip	5,815	5,815	5,815	5,815
Minority whip	5,815	5,815	5,815	5,815
Printing clerks	1,385	1,385	1,385	1,385
Technical assistant to attending physician	1,790	1,790	1,790	1,790
Postmaster	81,550	66,000	66,000	66,000
Official Reporters of Debates	37,650	37,650	37,650	37,650
Official reporters to committees	37,605	37,605	37,605	37,605
Legislative Counsel	42,000	32,000	32,000	32,000
Members' clerk hire	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Special and select committees	575,000	575,000	575,000	575,000
Coordinator of information	18,400	18,400	18,400	18,400
Folding documents	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Revision of the laws	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100
Speaker's auto	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100
Majority leader's auto	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100
Minority leader's auto	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100
Total, House items	6,840,875	6,610,525	6,610,525	6,610,525

The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1965 (H.R. 7091)—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS (H. DOC. 98)—Continued

	Budget estimate (1)	House version of bill (2)	Senate version of bill (3)	Conference action (4)
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Continued				
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
Office of Architect of the Capitol:				
Salaries	$40,000	$40,000	$40,000	$40,000
Capitol buildings	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Senate office buildings	50,000		50,000	50,000
Capitol Buildings and Grounds: Legislative garage	800	800	800	800
Total, Architect	100,800	50,800	100,800	100,800
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS				
Salaries and expenses	415,800	375,800	375,800	375,800
Copyright office: Salaries and expenses	86,200	86,200	86,200	86,200
Legislative Reference Service: Salaries and expenses	172,800	167,800	167,800	167,800
Distribution of catalog cards: Salaries and expenses	106,300	106,300	106,300	106,300
Books for the blind: Salaries and expenses	14,000	12,600	12,600	12,600
Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)	5,700			
Total, Library of Congress	800,800	748,700	748,700	748,700
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE				
Office of the Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses	128,300	(125,000)	(125,000)	(125,000)
Total, legislative	12,139,583	7,702,388	11,128,833	11,128,833
THE JUDICIARY				
Supreme Court of the United States:				
Salaries	79,000	79,000	79,000	79,000
Automobile for the Chief Justice	400	400	400	400
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: Salaries and expenses	43,000	43,000	43,000	43,000
Customs Court: Salaries and expenses	91,000	91,000	91,000	91,000
Court of Claims: Salaries and expenses	132,000	132,000	132,000	132,000
Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:				
Salaries of judges	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
Salaries of supporting personnel	1,105,000	1,105,000	1,105,000	1,105,000
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	81,500	81,500	81,500	81,500
Salaries of referees (special account)	1,230,000	1,230,000	1,230,000	1,230,000
Expenses of referees (special account)	205,000	205,000	205,000	205,000
Total, the Judiciary	6,366,900	6,366,900	6,366,900	6,366,900
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
The White House Office: Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(125,000)	(125,000)	(125,000)	(125,000)
Bureau of the Budget: Salaries and expenses	453,800	453,800	453,900	453,800
Council of Economic Advisers: Salaries and expenses	52,000	52,000	52,000	52,000
National Security Council: Salaries and expenses	62,900	62,900	62,900	62,900
Office of Emergency Planning:				
Salaries and expenses	241,000	241,000	241,000	241,000
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies	174,900	174,900	174,900	174,900
Office of Science and Technology: Salaries and expenses	76,500	76,500	76,500	76,500
Special representative for trade negotiations: Salaries and expenses	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
Total, Executive Office of the President	1,092,100	1,092,100	1,092,100	1,092,100
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
Economic assistance:				
Administrative expenses, Agency for International Development (by transfer)	(2,400,000)	(2,400,000)	(2,400,000)	(2,400,000)
Administrative and other expenses, Department of State (by transfer)	(129,100)	(129,100)	(129,100)	(129,100)
Total, funds appropriated to the President	(2,529,100)	(2,529,100)	(2,529,100)	(2,529,100)
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
Cooperative States Research Service: Payments and expenses (by transfer)	(67,000)	(67,000)	(67,000)	(67,000)
Extension Service: Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses (transfer)	(114,000)	(114,000)	(114,000)	(114,000)
Farmer Cooperative Service: Salaries and expenses	39,000	39,000	39,000	39,000
Soil Conservation Service:				
Conservation operations	4,050,000	4,050,000	4,050,000	4,050,000
Watershed planning	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Watershed protection	735,000	735,000	735,000	735,000
Great Plains conservation program	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000
Resource conservation and development	43,000	43,000	43,000	43,000
Economic Research: Salaries and expenses	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000
Statistical Reporting Service: Salaries and expenses	406,000	406,000	406,000	406,000
Agricultural Marketing Service: Marketing services	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Foreign Agricultural Service: Salaries and expenses	305,000	305,000	305,000	305,000
Commodity Exchange Authority: Salaries and expenses	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:				
Expenses:				
Appropriation	2,950,000	2,950,000	2,950,000	2,950,000
By transfer	(1,756,100)	(1,756,100)	(1,756,100)	(1,756,100)
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Administrative and operating expenses	291,000	291,000	291,000	291,000
Rural Electrification Administration: Salaries and expenses	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000
Farmers Home Administration: Salaries and expenses	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
Rural Community Development Service: Salaries and expenses	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
Office of the Inspector General: Salaries and expenses	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Office of the General Counsel: Salaries and expenses	186,000	186,000	186,000	186,000
Office of Information: Salaries and expenses	41,000	41,000	41,000	41,000
National Agricultural Library: Salaries and expenses	52,000	52,000	52,000	52,000
Office of Management Services: Salaries and expenses	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
General administration: Salaries and expenses	239,000	239,000	239,000	239,000
Forest Service: Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)	1,172,000	1,172,000	1,172,000	1,172,000
Total, Agriculture	14,578,000	14,578,000	14,578,000	14,578,000

The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1965 (H.R. 7091)—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS (H. DOC. 98)—Continued

	Budget estimate (1)	House version of bill (2)	Senate version of bill (3)	Conference action (4)
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
General administration: Salaries and expenses	$270,000	$270,000	$270,000	$270,000
Office of Business Economics: Salaries and expenses	101,000	101,000	101,000	101,000
Bureau of the Census:				
Salaries and expenses	509,000	509,000	509,000	509,000
1964 Census of Agriculture	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Preparation for the 19th Decennial Census	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
Business and Defense Services Administration: Salaries and expenses	209,000	209,000	209,000	209,000
International activities:				
Salaries and expenses	247,000	247,000	247,000	247,000
Export control	160,000	160,000	160,000	160,000
Transfer to Customs	(58,000)	(58,000)	(58,000)	(58,000)
Office of Field Services: Salaries and expenses	131,000	131,000	131,000	131,000
Coast and Geodetic Survey: Salaries and expenses	250,000	205,000	205,000	205,000
Patent Office: Salaries and expenses	995,000	995,000	995,000	995,000
National Bureau of Standards:				
Research and technical services	843,000	843,000	843,000	843,000
Office of Technical Services: Salaries and expenses	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000
Weather Bureau: Salaries and expenses	1,841,000	1,841,000	1,841,000	1,841,000
Maritime Administration:				
Research and development (limitation increase)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)
Salaries and expenses	311,000	311,000	311,000	311,000
Administrative expenses (limitation)	(282,000)	(282,000)	(282,000)	(282,000)
Reserve fleet expenses (limitation)	(29,000)	(29,000)	(29,000)	(29,000)
Maritime training	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000
Bureau of Public Roads: Limitation on general administrative expenses	(1,350,000)	(1,350,000)	(1,350,000)	(1,350,000)
Total, Commerce	6,055,000	6,055,000	6,055,000	6,055,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY				
Military personnel:				
Military personnel, Navy	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
Military personnel, Air Force	59,500,000	59,500,000	59,500,000	59,500,000
Operation and maintenance:				
Operation and maintenance, Army	43,910,000	43,910,000	43,910,000	43,910,000
Operation and maintenance, Navy	34,122,000	34,122,000	34,122,000	34,122,000
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	1,621,000	1,621,000	1,621,000	1,621,000
Operation and maintenance, Air Force	47,716,000	47,716,000	47,716,000	47,716,000
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard	3,424,000	3,424,000	3,424,000	3,424,000
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard	1,552,000	1,552,000	1,552,000	1,552,000
Court of military appeals, Defense	49,000	49,000	49,000	49,000
Total, Defense—Military	230,394,000	230,394,000	230,394,000	230,394,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL				
Department of the Army:				
Corps of Engineers—Civil:				
Operation and maintenance, general	2,012,000	2,012,000	2,012,000	2,012,000
General expenses	588,000	588,000	588,000	588,000
U.S. Soldiers' Home' Limitation on operation and maintenance and capital outlay (increase)	(130,000)	(130,000)	(130,000)	(130,000)
The Panama Canal:				
Canal Zone Government:				
Operating expenses	872,000	872,000	872,000	872,000
Panama Canal Company:				
Limitation on general and administrative expenses (increase)	(185,000)	(185,000)	(185,000)	(185,000)
Total, Defense—Civil	3,472,000	3,472,000	3,472,000	3,472,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
Food and Drug Administration: Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(1,170,000)	(1,170,000)	(1,170,000)	(1,170,000)
Office of Education:				
Salaries and expenses:				
Appropriation	308,500	308,500	308,500	308,500
By transfer	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration: Salaries and expenses	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000
Public Health Service:				
Accident prevention	63,000	63,000	63,000	63,000
Chronic diseases and health of the aged	186,000	186,000	186,000	186,000
Communicable disease activities	146,000	146,000	146,000	146,000
Community health practice and research	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
Control of tuberculosis	81,000	18,000	18,000	18,000
Control of veneral diseases	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Dental services and resources	57,000	57,000	57,000	57,000
Nursing services and resources	29,000	29,000	29,000	29,000
Hospital construction activities	61,000	61,000	61,000	61,000
Environmental health sciences	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Air pollution	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000
Environmental engineering and sanitation	53,000	53,000	53,000	53,000
Occupational health	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
Radiological health	122,000	122,000	122,000	122,000
Water supply and water pollution control	117,000	117,000	117,000	117,000
Hospital and medical care:				
Appropriation	427,000	427,000	427,000	427,000
By transfer	(1,299,000)	(1,299,000)	(1,299,000)	(1,299,000)
Foreign quarantine activities	158,000	158,000	158,000	158,000
Indian health activities	1,320,000	1,320,000	1,320,000	1,320,000
National Institute of Mental Health (transfer)	(341,000)	(341,000)	(341,000)	(341,000)
National Heart Institute (by transfers)	(347,000)	(347,000)	(347,000)	(347,000)
National Institute of Dental Research (transfer)	(107,000)	(107,000)	(107,000)	(107,000)
National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases (transfer)	(294,000)	(294,000)	(294,000)	(294,000)
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (transfer)	(253,000)	(253,000)	(253,000)	(253,000)
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness (transfer)	(268,000)	(268,000)	(268,000)	(268,000)
National health statistics	152,000	152,000	152,000	152,000
National Library of Medicine	66,000	66,000	66,000	66,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Surgeon General	208,000	208,000	208,000	208,000

The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1965 (H.R. 7091)—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS (H. DOC. 98)—Continued

	Budget estimate (1)	House version of bill (2)	Senate version of bill (3)	Conference action (4)
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued				
St. Elizabeths Hospital: Salaries and expenses	$968,000	$968,000	$968,000	$968,000
Social Security Administration: Limitation on salaries and expenses	(5,216,000)	(5,216,000)	(5,216,000)	(5,216,000)
Welfare Administration:				
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Family Services	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau	103,000	103,000	103,000	103,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Aging	21,000	21,000	21,000	21,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000
Special institutions:				
Freedmen's Hospital	165,000	165,000	165,000	165,000
Salaries and expenses, Howard University	183,000	183,000	183,000	183,000
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	211,000	211,000	211,000	211,000
Office of Field Administration:				
Appropriation	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
Transfer	(52,000)	(52,000)	(52,000)	(52,000)
Surplus property utilization	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
Office of the General Counsel	100,500	100,500	100,500	100,500
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare	5,974,000	5,974,000	5,974,000	5,974,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
Bureau of Indian Affairs:				
Education and welfare services	1,497,000	1,497,000	1,497,000	1,497,000
General administrative expenses	189,000	189,000	189,000	189,000
National Park Service:				
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	550,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
General administrative expenses	97,000	97,000	97,000	97,000
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: Salaries and expenses	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
Office of Territories: Administration of territories	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
Geological Survey: Surveys, investigations, and research	2,079,000	1,079,000	2,079,000	2,079,000
Bureau of Mines:				
Conservation and development of mineral resources	798,000	798,000	798,000	798,000
Health and safety	237,000	237,000	237,000	237,000
General administrative expenses	59,000	59,000	59,000	59,000
Office of Oil and Gas: Salaries and expenses	44,000	44,000	44,000	44,000
Fish and Wildlife Service:				
Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife: Salaries and expenses	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:				
Management and investigations of resources	288,000	288,000	288,000	288,000
General administrative expenses	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000
Administration of Pribilof Islands (appropriation of receipts)	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:				
Management and investigations of resources	470,000	470,000	470,000	470,000
General administrative expenses	59,000	59,000	59,000	59,000
Bureau of Reclamation: General administrative expenses (transfer)	(374,800)	(374,800)	(374,800)	(374,800)
Bonneville Power Administration: Operations and maintenance	280,000	280,000	280,000	280,000
Office of the Solicitor: Salaries and expenses	170,000	170,000	170,000	170,000
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	254,500	254,500	254,500	254,500
Total, Interior	7,264,500	7,264,500	7,264,500	7,264,500
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
Legal activities and general administration:				
Salaries and expenses, general administration	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division	218,000	218,000	218,000	218,000
Salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service: Salaries and expenses	2,064,000	2,064,000	2,064,000	2,064,000
Federal prison system: Salaries and expenses	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
Federal Prison Industries, Inc.: Limitation on vocational training expenses	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)
Total, Justice	5,482,000	5,482,000	5,482,000	5,482,000
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
Bureau of Labor Statistics: Salaries and expenses	617,000	617,000	617,000	617,000
Bureau of International Labor Affairs: Salaries and expenses	25,500	25,500	25,500	25,500
Manpower Administration: Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training	181,000	181,000	181,000	181,000
Labor-management relations:				
Labor-Management Services Administration	241,300	241,300	241,300	241,300
Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights	29,700	29,700	29,700	29,700
Wage and labor standards:				
Bureau of Labor Standards	118,600	118,600	118,600	118,600
Women's Bureau	27,200	27,200	27,200	27,200
Wage and Hour Division	574,000	574,000	574,000	574,000
Employees' Compensation: Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Employees Compensation:				
Appropriation	166,200	166,200	166,200	166,200
Transfers	(2,100)	(2,100)	(2,100)	(2,100)
Office of the Solicitor: Salaries and expenses:				
Appropriation	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000
Transfers	(152,000)	(152,000)	(152,000)	(152,000)
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses (transfer)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)
Total, Labor	2,022,500	2,022,500	2,022,500	2,022,500
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT				
Administration and regional operation (transfer)	(1,941,000)	(1,941,000)	(1,941,000)	(1,941,000)
Operations:				
Appropriation	203,714,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000
Transfer	(4,059,000)	(4,059,000)	(4,059,000)	(4,059,000)
Total, Post Office	203,714,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000

The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1965 (H.R. 7091)—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS (H. DOC. 98)—Continued

	Budget estimate (1)	House version of bill (2)	Senate version of bill (3)	Conference action (4)
DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
International organizations and conferences: Missions to international organizations (transfer)	($180,000)	($180,000)	($180,000)	($180,000)
International commissions:				
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:				
Salaries and expenses (transfer)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)
Operation and maintenance (transfer)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(24,000)
American sections, international commissions (transfer)	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)
Educational exchange: Mutual educational and cultural exchange (limitation decrease)	(375,000)	(375,000)	(375,000)	(375,000)
TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	357,000	357,000	357,000	357,000
Bureau of Customs: Salaries and expenses	2,304,000	2,304,000	2,304,000	2,304,000
Bureau of the Mint: Salaries and expenses	179,000	179,000	179,000	179,000
Bureau of Narcotics: Salaries and expenses (transfer)	(107,000)	(107,000)	(107,000)	(107,000)
Bureau of the Public Debt: Administering the public debt	667,000	667,000	667,000	667,000
Coast Guard:				
Operating expenses	2,652,000	2,652,000	2,652,000	2,652,000
Reserve training	239,000	239,000	239,000	239,000
Internal Revenue Service:				
Salaries and expenses	595,000	595,000	595,000	595,000
Revenue accounting and processing	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
Compliance	11,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000
Office of the Treasurer: Salaries and expenses	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000
U.S. Secret Service:				
Salaries and expenses, White House Police (transfer)	(129,000)	(129,000)	(129,000)	(129,000)
Salaries and expenses, guard force	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000
Total, Treasury	21,984,000	21,984,000	21,984,000	21,984,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
Federal Aviation Agency:				
Operations	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport	58,000	58,000	58,000	58,000
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
General Services Administration:				
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	4,055,000	4,055,000	4,055,000	4,055,000
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	542,000	542,000	542,000	542,000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service	225,000	225,000	225,000	225,000
Strategic and critical materials	118,500	118,500	118,500	118,500
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	110,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency:				
Office of the Administrator:				
Salaries and expenses	660,000	660,000	660,000	660,000
Urban studies and housing research	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Open-space land grants (limitation)	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)
Low-income housing demonstration program (limitation)	(2,300)	(2,300)	(2,300)	(2,300)
Limitation on administrative expenses, Office of the Administrator, college housing loans	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)
Limitation on administrative expenses, Office of the Administrator, public facility loans	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)
Limitation on administrative expenses, Office of the Administrator, revolving fund (liquidating programs)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)
Administrative expenses, urban transportation activities	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500
Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Office of the Administrator, housing for the elderly	(35,000)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(35,000)
Federal Housing Administration:				
Limitation increase:				
Administrative expenses	(397,000)	(397,000)	(397,000)	(397,000)
Nonadministrative expenses	(1,775,000)	(1,775,000)	(1,775,000)	(1,775,000)
Public Housing Administration:				
Administrative expenses	568,000	568,000	568,000	568,000
Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses	(568,000)	(568,000)	(568,000)	(568,000)
Veterans' Administration:				
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	696,000	696,000	696,000	696,000
Medical and prosthetic research	783,000	783,000	783,000	783,000
Medical care	38,474,000	38,474,000	38,474,000	38,474,000
OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: Salaries and expenses	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
American Battle Monuments Commission: Salaries and expenses	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000
Civil Aeronautics Board: Salaries and expenses	488,000	488,000	488,000	488,000
Civil Service Commission: Salaries and expenses	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Export-Import Bank of Washington: Limitation on administrative expenses	(134,000)	(134,000)	(134,000)	(134,000)
Farm Credit Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses	(55,000)	(55,000)	(55,000)	(55,000)
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review: Salaries and expenses	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:				
Limitation on administrative expenses	(81,000)	(81,000)	(81,000)	(81,000)
Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	(7,800)	(7,800)	(7,800)	(7,800)
Federal Maritime Commission: Salaries and expenses	183,000	183,000	183,000	183,000
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: Salaries and expenses	234,000	234,000	234,000	234,000
Federal Power Commission: Salaries and expenses	535,000	535,000	535,000	535,000
Federal Trade Commission: Salaries and expenses	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission: Salaries and expenses	64,000	64,000	64,000	64,000
Indian Claims Commission: Salaries and expenses	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Interstate Commerce Commission: Salaries and expenses	1,230,000	1,230,000	1,230,000	1,230,000
National Capital Planning Commission: Salaries and expenses	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
National Labor Relations Board: Salaries and expenses	1,157,500	1,157,500	1,157,500	1,157,500
National Mediation Board: Salaries and expenses	52,000	52,000	52,000	52,000
Participation in Interstate-Federal Commissions: Delaware River Basin Commission: Salaries and expenses	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Railroad Retirement Board: Limitation on salaries and expenses	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Limitation on administrative expenses	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)
Securities and Exchange Commission: Salaries and expenses	612,000	612,000	612,000	612,000
Selective Service System: Salaries and expenses	1,353,000	1,353,000	1,353,000	1,353,000
Small Business Administration: Salaries and expenses	336,000	336,000	336,000	336,000
Smithsonian Institution:				
Salaries and expenses	540,000	540,000	540,000	540,000
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000

The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1965 (H.R. 7091)—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS (H. DOC. 98)—Continued

	Budget estimate (1)	House version of bill (2)	Senate version of bill (3)	Conference action (4)
OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—Continued				
Tariff Commission: Salaries and expenses	$95,000	$95,000	$95,000	$95,000
Tax Court of the United States: Salaries and expenses	223,300	223,300	223,300	223,300
U.S. Information Agency: Salaries and expenses	2,454,000	2,454,000	2,454,000	2,454,000
Total, independent agencies	67,303,800	67,303,800	67,303,800	67,303,800
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
(Out of District of Columbia funds)				
Operating expenses:				
Public safety	(4,499,800)	(4,499,800)	(4,499,800)	(4,499,800)
Education	(3,522,500)	(3,522,500)	(3,522,500)	(3,522,500)
Parks and recreation	(244,200)	(244,200)	(244,200)	(244,200)
Health and welfare	(1,294,500)	(1,294,500)	(1,294,500)	(1,294,500)
Highways and traffic	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)
Sanitary engineering	(255,900)	(255,900)	(255,900)	(255,900)
Total	(9,866,900)	(9,866,900)	(9,866,900)	(9,866,900)
Total, title III	587,842,383	579,691,188	583,117,633	583,117,633
TITLE IV				
CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS				
Claims and judgments (H. Doc. 113)	23,643,495	23,643,495	31,411,444	31,411,444
Claims and judgments (S. Doc. 19)	7,767,949			
Total, titles I, II, III, and IV	2,280,251,327	2,118,333,083	2,257,869,415	2,227,563,977

[1] Includes $30,084,500 increased pay costs.
[2] Includes $29,604,500 increased pay costs.
[3] Includes $29,894,500 increased pay costs.

OPPOSITION TO RETURN TO POWER IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC OF FORMER DOMINICAN PRESIDENT JUAN BOSCH

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, and speaking also on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], I wish to call for a firm stand by the United States against the return to power in the Dominican Republic of former Dominican President Juan Bosch.

We have today, in Cuba, one Communist-type government subservient to the world Communist conspiracy.

Establishment in the Western Hemisphere of a second Castro-type government, similarly subservient to the world Communist conspiracy, is the eminent threat which confronts the United States today in the Dominican Republic.

If Juan Bosch, former President of the Dominican Republic, is permitted to return to power the Communists will have won another major victory. Bosch will prove to be, in effect, a second Fidel Castro.

Juan Bosch himself is probably not a Communist Party member. He definitely is an ideological Trotskyite, and therefore, by definition, an ideological Communist. Evidence of his softness toward communism is ample and convincing.

While Bosch was President of the Dominican Republic, not only were the Communists allowed free rein for all their activities, but real power was exercised by known Communists whom Bosch obviously either could not or did not wish to control. Exiled Communist leaders from all over Latin America flocked to the Dominican Republic under the Bosch regime, and the Communists began a drive having as its long-range objective not only a complete Communist takeover in Santo Domingo, but also the conditioning of the people of that island republic to such an extent that this Communist takeover would have majority support among the people themselves. This drive was along two main lines: First, indoctrination of the military, and establishment of Communist cadres in military units; and second, indoctrination of youths, from the ages 16 up, especially in colleges and secondary schools.

The success of this Communist campaign is demonstrated by the course of recent events in the Dominican Republic, and by the situation which confronts us there today.

For the purpose of providing additional details with respect to these matters, we are releasing with this statement important excerpts from a memorandum prepared by the research staff of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

Protection of the security of the United States demands that the United States stand firm against the Communist-directed, Castro-supported drive to bring Juan Bosch back to power in the Dominican Republic. Not only must this country resolutely use whatever force is necessary to protect American lives and property; we must just as resolutely take whatever action is required to prevent the establishment in Santo Domingo of another Communist bastion in the Western Hemisphere.

That is the gist of the crises we face. Now let me fill in a little background.

There was plenty of warning, more than a year before he first came to power in the Dominican Republic, of the coming takeover by Juan Bosch, and of his pro-Communist predilections. For instance, the Charleston News and Courier of July 12, 1961, printed an editorial which began:

> Unless the United States is alert, communism will take over the Domincian Republic as it captured Cuba.

The editorial continued:

> The Dominican Revolutionary Party headed by Juan Bosch, an exiled group with headquarters in Venezuela, is agitating for so-called democratic reforms. If the existing Dominican government of President Joaquin Balaguer refuses to accept change, Bosch warns that his group will start a revolution.
>
> Bosch is on record as saying he is not anti-Communist. Revolt in the Dominican Republic led by Bosch would be another Red victory in the Caribbean.
>
> Congress should keep a close watch on Dominican developments as the State Department is notoriously sympathetic to Latin leftists.

That warning, and similar warnings, went substantially unheeded.

It is doubtful that Juan Bosch is a Communist Party member. Most probably he is not. Certainly he is an ideological Trotskyite. His whole record proves it. Juan Bosch even named his son Leon Trotsky Bosch, and no attempt ever was made to change that name.

In his campaign for the Dominican presidency, Juan Bosch accepted political support from all quarters. He refused to renounce leftwing elements or the Communist Party. There were reports from reliable sources, even then, that he had received support from the 26th of July Movement, controlled by Fidel Castro.

Jules DuBois, veteran Latin American correspondent for major American newspapers, in his book "Operation America,"

speaking of the election which put Juan Bosch in power, declared:

> This election was not held without an 11th-hour drama. A Spanish Jesuit priest accused Juan Bosch, head of the Partido Revolucionario Dominicano, of being Marxist-Leninist, because, in an article published while he was in exile in Venezuela in 1959, Bosch had called Lenin "the archetype of a revolutionary."

According to DuBois:

> Bosch challenged the priest to a television and radio debate. The accusation and the resulting debate, in which Bosch proved to be a master of polemic, helped seal his landslide victory over Dr. Viriato Fiallo in a 6-man race. The Partido Revolucionario Dominicano also won 52 of 72 seats in the Chamber of Deputies, and 22 of 27 seats in the senate. Victories were scored in most of the municipalities as well.

Juan Bosch was elected President of the Dominican Republic in December 1962. Early the next month, he came to the United States, and went also to Europe, seeking financial support for his administration. Both in this country and in Europe, Bosch showed reluctance to make any public statement against Communist Cuba.

When Bosch came to the United States early in January 1963, as President-elect of the Dominican Republic, he met what the Washington Star described as "a wave of enthusiasm inside the Kennedy administration for this blossoming 'showcase of democracy' in the Caribbean."

According to the Washington Star of January 3, 1963, unnamed "U.S. officials" were said to "admit that Mr. Bosch has often been critical of U.S. policy in Latin America" but to "maintain" that Bosch was "ripe for conversion." The same unnamed officials, according to the Star, "flatly reject charges that Mr. Bosch is a Communist in disguise."

There is danger today that a similar attitude may tend to lead us, through inaction, into another major defeat, just as great, and just as deadly as the establishment of Castro communism in Cuba.

According to Jules DuBois, writing in his book "Operation America":

> It was obvious that he [Juan Bosch] had made a campaign deal with the Communists, who ordered their partisans to vote for him. The intermediary for the deal was reported to have been Angel Miolan, who had served as Secretary to Vicente Lombardo-Toledano in the early 1940's and had taught at Lombardo's Universidad Obrero de Mexico. Miolan was Bosch's campaign manager.

While in Europe, Bosch introduced a comprehensive constitutional reform which raised conflict with the Roman Catholic Church as well as with certain sectors of the labor movement. Msgr. Eliseo Perez-Sanchez, a member of the Council of State, made a public statement expressing "profound consternation." Objected to by both the church and conservative labor elements were several constitutional articles proposed by Bosch, including:

First. A provision that the school system would be "absolutely subject to the organization and supervision of the state";

Second. A provision that the state would not allow religious education;

Third. A provision making divorce easier, and putting common-law marriages on the same footing as civil marriages;

Fourth. A provision authorizing conversion of the economy, and of all property rights—both agricultural and non-agricultural—to a collective basis;

Fifth. A provision against ownership of land by legally constituted societies—which presumably included churches;

Sixth. A provision against allowing any foreigner to file a protest even with his Embassy against confiscation of his property;

Seventh. A provision banning parallel trade unions within a single factory, and putting all labor under the "supervision and protection of the state."

Bosch was installed as President of the Dominican Republic in February 1963, and had a short regime of continual crises. There were various causes for this. His plans for his regime appeared fuzzy. He had been too long an antagonist to be able to slip readily into the role of government administrator. His party—PRD—did not have enough competent people at various levels to form a viable government. There were other problems. But the Communist issue overshadowed all others. While few political observers believed Juan Bosch to be a member of the Communist Party, nearly all were gravely worried by his leniency toward communism, and by the eventualities they foresaw in the fact that Bosch was allowing communism to thrive, to indoctrinate and subvert youth, to build stocks of arms, and to strengthen and consolidate its power in other ways.

During his regime, Bosch refused to denounce Castro. Communist Party groups had complete freedom of action. On various occasions the Communist Party put paid advertisements in the newspapers supporting Bosch or his regime.

When Juan Bosch came into power in the Dominican Republic, Communists from all over the hemisphere flocked there, as I said earlier; and the principal Communist objectives were indoctrination of the young people in the schools, and indoctrination of members of the armed forces.

These are general statements. Now let me cite specific facts which support them. These facts, and others touched upon in his speech, are from records gathered and compiled by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

One of Bosch's strong supporters when he took power was Telma Frias, a Senator of the PRD, and a known Communist. She was one of the founders of the Movimiento Popular Dominicano, which was headed by Maximo Lopez Molina. Molina himself also returned to the Dominican Republic after a long period spent in Cuba. Molina has a long Communist record, including a record of arrest in the United States as a Communist agitator.

Lopez Molina has been openly allied with Fidel Castro and during Bosch's period of power in the Dominican Republic he was actively campaigning in favor of Castroism.

Maximo Lopez Molina was the foremost Dominican Communist during the Cuban crisis. He is back in the Dominican Republic today among the leaders of the present revolution.

In the spring of 1953, Bosch brought to the Dominican Republic one Sacha Vollman, a onetime Russian of Rumanian origin, who later became a naturalized citizen of the United States. Vollman was secretary of the Instituto de Capacitacion Politica (Institute of Political Training) at San Jose, Costa Rica, which was attended by President Bosch of the Dominican Republic.

Vollman became Bosch's constant companion and adviser, and was said to wield considerable power. Cubans who attended the institute at one time or another have reported that Vollman was known for his pro-Communist tendencies.

Among the full-time pro-Soviet agitators who returned to the Dominican Republic after years of exile, when Bosch came to power, were Pericles Franco Ornes, Tulio Arvelo, Tobias Cabral, and Edna Moore. Miss Moore operated in Santiago, the second largest city of the Dominican Republic, as head of a woman's front organization.

At the time Bosch took over the Presidency of the Dominican Republic, the secretary-general of the PRD—Bosch's party—was Washington de Pena, a lifetime Communist. President of the PRD was Angel Miolan Reynoso, who was in Cuba until Perez Jiminez fell, and then went to Venezuela to help organize the pro-Castro group there.

At the beginning of the Bosch regime all appointments to see Bosch, and all jobs in the Dominican Government under Bosch, had to be cleared by Miolan.

By the spring of 1963, a prominent Communist known as "Corpito" Cabral—real name Manual Perez Cabral—formerly resident in Cuba who at the time was president of the Partido Nacionalista Revolucionario—official name for the Communist Party of the Dominican Republic—emerged as apparently in charge of training armed forces cadres.

Training among schoolboys of 16 years of age appeared to be under the charge of one, Dato Pagan, secretary of Cabral's PNR, and a longtime Communist, who was assisted by a number of university and college instructors, prominent among them Jose del Carmen Rodriguez, a professor at the Juan Pablo Durate School, who was openly indoctrinating young people in Communist organizational activity.

Bosch's philosophy was described by him as "revolutionary democracy," and he spent a good deal of time talking about it to the campesinos; but he seemed oblivious to what the Communists were doing to his democracy and to those democratic institutions in the island which had survived.

Inroads of the Communist Party were counteracted in part during the late spring and summer of 1963 by so-called "Christian reaffirmation rallies," which

were a major factor in bringing about an anti-Communist general strike, which led to Bosch's ouster in September 1963.

Anti-Bosch forces in the Dominican Republic today—not counting U.S. marines—are believed to be both outnumbered, and out-gunned by the revolutionary forces seeking to return Bosch to power.

The first provisional government, set up by pro-Bosch forces, was headed by Rafael Molinza Urena. Provisional President Urena was chosen by the rebels because of his extreme leftist orientation.

This "first provisional government" was succeeded by a "second provisional government" set up by anti-Bosch forces, and composed of Col. Pedro Bartolome Benoit—Air Force—Col. Enrique Apolinario Casado Saladin—Army—and Capt. Manuel Santana Carosco—Navy. An announcement attributed to Antonio Martinez Francisco, secretary of the PRD, broadcast yesterday by Radio San Isidro, said this supposedly "anti-Bosch" three-man junta had negotiated a deal with Juan Bosch's revoluntionary democratic party—PRD. It was greeted with considerable skepticism in diplomatic circles, as there is no known evidence of any Communist tinge in the record of any of these three junta members.

Commander of the anti-Bosch forces is Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, supporting the government of Donald Reid Cabral—who is no relation to the Communist Cabral.

Military field commanders of the pro-Bosch rebel forces are reported to be Col. Hernando Ramirez and Col. Francisco Caamano. Militia units under these two officers, augmented by armed civilians, seemed solidly established in the center of the capital city this morning. These forces were heavily armed, having ordnance able to repel a tank attack. That is the situation into which our Marines moved, on orders of President Johnson.

Intercepts of radio broadcasts from Havana indicate the Castro radio currently is giving Bosch's revolutionary forces full backing. The implications of this fact were clearly pointed out by Dr. Carlos Prio Socarras, who preceded Batista as President of Cuba, in a statement made today at his home in Miami Beach, Fla., to a staff member of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

Said Dr. Prio:

Juan Bosch had been my secretary for 12 years. I do not think he is an out-and-out Communist, but I would not doubt that he would enter into a pact with the Reds in order to return to the presidency of the Dominican Republic.

Proof of it is that Castro defended him, something that he did not do when he (Castro) organized the invasion of the Dominican Republic in June 1959. At that time, Castro utilized outright Communists, but now that Bosch can be a vehicle for a Communist takeover, he did not hesitate to give Bosch his backing. There is other proof that this is a very serious attempt at a Communist takeover, because the fact is that the insurgents burned the headquarters of the Vangisardia, a democratic political organization not connected with the government, and of left-of-center political orientation.

Mr. President, those are the facts.

It seems clear that we are in danger of repeating, in the case of the Dominican Republic, the same disastrous cycle we experienced in the case of Cuba: First tolerance, then endorsement of a candidate who professes to be anti-Communist, but who nevertheless is supported by the Communists and who permits them free rein; finally debacle when this same candidate proves himself to be openly pro-Communist and pro-Soviet.

How many times must we be bamboozled before we learn from bitter experience?

Do we dare endanger our national security by permitting the enlargement of the Communist Latin American bridgehead to another country just a stone's throw from our shores? The strategic importance of Santo Domingo, as an island bastion of communism, is apparent from one look at the map. The propaganda importance of the establishment of another Communist base of operations on the Caribbean can hardly be overvalued.

Mr. President, the islands in the Caribbean are the soft underbelly of the United States. Once they were occupied, or once missiles were placed there by the Soviet Union, in my judgment, this country would be defenseless. We must prevent a step-by-step attempt by the Soviet Union to control the islands of the Caribbean, because those islands, armed with modern weapons, control the defense of the United States.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. The information contained in the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, in the main, have been gathered from records and the archives of the Internal Security Subcommittee although, of course, other sources have also been utilized in compiling these facts.

This data reveals a remarkable parallel between the careers of Bosch in the Dominican Republic and of Castro in Cuba as they developed prior to Castro's absolute takeover of the Cuban island itself. This parallel is found not only in the ideological backgrounds of these two men but also in their activities and the programs they espouse.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not apparent that once the Dominican Republic is taken over, from that very second, Haiti will fall?

Mr. HRUSKA. That would be an inescapable development. With a hostile government established on one side of the mountains which separate the two countries, a takeover of the shaky government in Haiti would be inevitable and would come in short order.

Mr. EASTLAND. And from there the whole island of Hispanola?

Mr. HRUSKA. Once the dominoes started to fall in that area further exploitation and further occupation would surely follow.

I ask the Senator from Mississippi if it is not true there is also a clear parallel to be found between Bosch and Castro in that while each has frequently denied that he was a Communist, or a member of the Communist Party, nevertheless, each has surrrounded himself with close associates who are hard-core, well-trained, and well-known Communist leaders? The Senator from Mississippi has documented these facts with reference to Bosch in his statement and history affirms them regarding Castro.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is exactly right. It is apparent that the Communist leaders are not there for nothing. They are there for a purpose.

What is that purpose?

The purpose is to take over the government of the Dominican Republic exactly as it took over Cuba and took over Castro at the same time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Bosch as a figurehead will provide an excellent instrumentality behind which the Communists can accomplish their purpose.

It is clear that it does not matter whether Bosch is a Communist or not. If he surrenders himself to those who are subject to the discipline of the Communist Party, and if he allows them to implement a program similar to the one which he outlined when he was in Europe prior to his inauguration as President in 1963, the damage will have been done. The control will have passed into Communist hands. Then we shall have a second Castro-style government, working hand in hand with Cuba, working not only to subvert the Caribbean area but Central and South America, too. Is that not about the way it would work out?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, that is exactly what is at issue. He is a man who is controlled by the Communists. It was evident that he was heading in that direction when he was overthrown in the Dominican Republic. According to Radio Havana, it is evident what Mr. Castro's intentions are: to take over the Dominican Republic.

Mr. HRUSKA. There is another aspect of the situation, I am sure, which has occurred to the Senator from Mississippi. This would be an opportune time, for the Communists to capitalize on this kind of action for our attention and our resources are directed toward the situation in Vietnam. We are now building up our own forces in South Vietnam. This represents a most opportune time for the Communists to commence an operation of this kind in the Dominican Republic. History should have impressed us all with the opportunistic ruthlessness of the Communists. The timing of the action in the Dominican Republic is ideal for their purpose and does not appear coincidental.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska is exactly correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. Our experiences in the past should alert us to the pitfall which the Senator has referred to in the concluding paragraphs of his statement:

It seems clear that we are in danger of repeating, in the case of the Dominican Republic, the same disastrous cycle we experienced in the case of Cuba: First tolerance,

then endorsement of a candidate who professes to be anti-Communist, but who nevertheless is supported by the Communists and who permits them free rein; finally debacle when this same candidate proves himself to be openly pro-Communist and pro-Soviet.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not true that the Soviet Union desires to outflank the defenses of the United States? There is one way to do it; namely, to place missile bases on those islands in the Caribbean. Is that not their ultimate objective? Was that not their intention when they moved missiles into Cuba?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is undoubtedly one of their major objectives. A look at the map drives home some appreciation of the strategic locations of Cuba on one side of Florida and the Dominican Republic and Haiti on the other side. This must convince anyone who wishes to be realistic in his thinking, that we cannot allow the Dominican Republic and then Haiti to go by default as we did in the case of Cuba. The future of not only the United States but all of the Americas is involved, for to allow Bosch to regain control is to give the Communists another base in our hemisphere not only for their missiles but also for their ideologies which are equally lethal for freemen.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator from Nebraska realize that this is a fight in the Dominican Republic today against communism and against a Communist takeover of the country? That is exactly what it is. Bosch is a man who is a tool of the Communists. He has always been a tool of the Communists.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator has documented the situation very clearly and the evidence is convincing. While there has been no proof of open support by Castro, we have learned of the use of high-powered weapons in the fighting which occurred yesterday and today in the central part of the city. This equipment could come from only one source. Its origin undoubtedly can be traced and will be traced in due time.

It would come as a distinct surprise to this Senator if these weapons were not from a care package, Communist style. The presence of heavy armament in the hands of the rebels serves to further document the conclusions of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have noticed one thing, that the Soviet Union and its satellites do not give away weapons for nothing. It is absolutely obvious that they have armed Bosch's people in the Dominican Republic. They have better arms and better equipment and can outgun the opposition down there. Those weapons were put down there for one purpose and one purpose only; namely, to take over that country.

To take over that country for what purpose?

To take it over for communism.

Mr. HRUSKA. I was interested in the Senator's observation that when Bosch visited this country after his election and prior to his inauguration, it was denied by unnamed officials in this country that Bosch was a Communist. Those statements were reminiscent of the assurances given when Castro visited this country prior to his takeover of Cuba.

It is my belief that in the last analysis, whether Bosch is or is not a Communist is academic. Experience indicates that the ultimate outcome can be no different than it was with Castro. The fellow traveler cannot get off the train once he turns control of the engine of government over to the Communists. The evidence indicates that Bosch has surrounded himself with hard-core Communists. He has left himself no recourse but to endorse their plans.

That day will come for Bosch for this is the pattern set by the Communists and the one which is always followed.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator for yielding to me and to make these comments.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I return, as I began, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], to a call for firmness and fearlessness in handling this situation. The United States must do whatever is necessary to prevent the threatened Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic.

INDONESIA—LAXITY IN FOREIGN AID

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the United States, through fiscal year 1964, furnished Indonesia $937.7 million in assistance under our foreign aid program.

In fiscal year 1964 alone, this aid totaled $56.7 million.

Indonesia's President Sukarno has used the money to purchase ships, to develop harbors, to modernize railroads, to rebuild plants, to shore up consumer industries, to build cement and paper pulp plants and mills, to train air technicians, to train propagandists—though this was politely termed "mass media education."

And I notice, from various Agency for International Development reports, that there are many active projects within Indonesia for which we are apparently still committed to expend funds for some time.

These include that country's national agriculture program, completion date set for June 1968; an industrial and mining program, completion date set for June 1967; two transportation programs, involving maritime operations and air transportation maintenance, both set for completion this June; two programs involving labor leadership and training, the first scheduled to be completed June 1967, the second June of this year; two health and sanitation programs, to be completed next year and in 1967; two programs relating to education, one set for completion in June 1967, the other in June of this year; a public administration program, to be completed in June; and three programs for improving technical information services, to be completed June 1965, civic action activities, to be completed July 1966, and one for technical support, to end in June 1979.

And now that we have poured nearly a billion dollars of aid into his country, what has been the return from Sukarno?

First. He has told us to go to hell with our aid.

Second. He is and has been pushing efforts to force the United States out of South Vietnam, to drive the Western Powers from southeast Asia.

Third. He has directed his guerrillas to invade Malaysia.

Fourth. He is openly in collusion with Red China and other Communist nations, and he has pulled his country out of the United Nations with a view to organizing a Communist bloc organization.

Fifth. He has seized three U.S. owned oil companies.

Sixth. He has forced closing of USIA libraries.

Seventh. His Communist labor unions cut off gas and electricity to U.S. facilities.

Eighth. His Communist postal workers' union has imposed a mail and telegraph boycott on the U.S. Embassy.

Ninth. He has made it nearly impossible for U.S. news correspondents to send out dispatches.

Tenth. He has issued orders requiring all U.S. diplomatic personnel in Indonesia to inform his Government in advance of any travel plans within the country.

Additionally, there are now reports that he would like to force a break in diplomatic relations with the United States.

I, for one, would have no objection if diplomatic relations were severed.

How much Indonesia has taken us for is revealed in a report by the Comptroller General dated April 15. This report is one of the most disturbing indictments of the State Department's "let us get along with everyone and hang the cost" policies I have seen.

In an examination of what can only be described as "unusual favoritism" toward a nation which has long used the United States as a whipping boy, the Comptroller General reported:

As of June 30, 1963, the United States had sold Indonesia $345.8 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities under the provisions of Public Law 480. Sales provisions provided for varying percentages of rupiah proceeds to be set aside for U.S. use, the latest Public Law 480 agreement entered into in February 1962 providing 10 percent for this purpose.

Under the terms of the agreements, rupiah sales proceeds have been deposited at "official" rates of exchange that bear no realistic relationship to the actual internal purchasing power of the rupiah. Thus, the 1962 agreement provided for an official average exchange of 52.03 rupiahs to the dollar, compared with unofficial average rupiah rates to the dollar of from 985 to 1,259 during 1963. It is thus evident that little financial benefit has accrued to the United States from Public Law 480 sales in Indonesia.

Let me repeat two sentences:

Under the terms of the agreements, rupiah sales proceeds have been deposited at "official" rates of exchange that bear no realistic relationship to the actual internal purchasing power of the rupiah. * * * It is thus evident that little financial benefit has accrued to the United States from Public Law 480 sales in Indonesia.

These two sentences should be weighed in the context of another paragraph in that same report:

> A recent change in the official exchange rates in Indonesia has resulted in an exchange loss of $130 million on the U.S. rupiah proceeds from Public Law 480 sales.

In other words, Mr. President, that $130 million has been now written off as a bad investment—to the detriment of the American taxpayer.

This raises several questions:

First. Why did the U.S. Government enter into such an agreement with Indonesia, an agreement which is considered to have been so unrealistic?

Second. In what other countries have we entered into such agreements "that bear no realistic relationship" to the internal foreign currencies?

Third. How much aid are we still furnishing Indonesia, especially in view of the continued provocations by that country?

Fourth. Have we written off all aid to that country as a bad investment or do we hold out a possibility of collecting the money it owes to us?

I think answers should be provided the American people by the administration.

There is another area of that report which is also bothersome. It relates to the question of our balance of payments.

Earlier this year, President Johnson, taking note of the $3 billion deficit last year, promised to reduce U.S. Government expenditures abroad, to increase foreign investment in the United States, encouraged Americans to see America, rather than go abroad, urged voluntary action on the part of businessmen to refrain from lending money abroad or making investment in developed nations.

But this problem can only be solved with the fullest cooperation of all, including governmental agencies.

I would like to quote further from the Comptroller General's report of April 15:

> U.S. agencies are or have been unnecessarily expending dollars in an amount that we estimate at about $2.3 million annually to buy air tickets for official travel to or from eight countries instead of utilizing the excess foreign currencies which the United States owns in those countries.

The report goes on to say that—and I quote:

> About $1.2 million of this amount is being unnecessarily expended annually because U.S. agencies either have failed to develop or have not adhered to administrative regulations requiring maximum use of available foreign currency.

At this point in the report, our old friend, Indonesia, crops up again:

> About $1.1 million has been spent annually which could have been paid from excess United States-owned Indonesian rupiah if the State Department had obtained an agreement with Indonesia similar to the agreements with the other countries included in this review.

The report noted in all the cases that "this failure has occurred despite the expressed intent of the Congress and the policy of the executive branch that maximum use be made of U.S.-owned foreign currency." These instructions go back as far as 1961.

The Comptroller General cited these agencies as failing to effectively utilize excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies: The Department of State, Department of Defense, Agency for International Development, U.S. Information Agency.

This laxity also related to currencies owned in Burma, India, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, United Arab Republic, and Yugoslavia.

In the case of Indonesia, the Comptroller General found that the Department of State had failed to "aggressively" pursue the matter of an agreement covering these currencies after the Government of Indonesia had objected.

If we are to resolve our balance-of-payments problem, then everyone, including Government agencies, must cooperate fully.

I think it is about time that we stop accepting excuses and see to it that agencies of this administration comply with instructions and regulations and get rid of the officials who have not been doing so.

OUR RARE AND ENDANGERED SPECIES OF WILDLIFE NEED HELP NOW

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for many years I have been deeply interested in wildlife conservation. As long ago as 1929, I served as State president of the Izaak Walton League in South Dakota. In 1931, I was appointed to a 6-year term on the South Dakota Game and Fish Commission; and in 1937, I served as national vice president of the Izaak Walton League, and was a member of the national executive board, in 1938, when elected to Congress.

Through the years, as I have served, first in the House of Representatives and then in the Senate, I have maintained my interest in all fields of conservation.

A few years ago, I was able to restore funds in the Interior Department appropriation bill, so as to enable the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to continue its propagation work with sandhill cranes—work which was preliminary to work with the endangered whooping crane. Each year since, our subcommittee has included in the Interior bill a small amount earmarked for work with endangered species.

This year, I had a discussion at our appropriation hearings with John S. Gottschalk, Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, concerning the immediate problem. As a result, I submitted an amendment to provide $350,000 for headquartering in southern Maryland a wildlife research project to save from extinction rare and endangered American wildlife species. I can report that only this morning the Senate Appropriations Committee approved this amendment, as part of the funding bill for the Department of the Interior.

Mr. President, this project should have unanimous backing. It is in line with the President's program of increasing emphasis on all forms of conservation. The people of this country want a program of this type. The program needs to be done.

This program should be done. We owe future generations of Americans a chance to be able to see these rare and endangered species of wildlife in the flesh, rather than as pictures preserved in the archives.

Director John Gottschalk and his staff have been most helpful to me as I have tried to develop this program. They always stand ready to answer questions or to provide technical information. Dr. Ray C. Erickson, of the Division of Wildlife Research, has been most considerate and helpful in answering the multitude of questions which have come up during the past several years.

I wish to go into some detail in connection with the background of the endangered species program:

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Department of the Interior, is the Federal agency to which has been delegated the responsibility for the preservation and enhancement of wildlife occurring in the United States. For migratory birds, the Bureau goals include the maintenance of traditional seasonal migrations in the United States and the prevention of the extinction of any species. The extension of security from extinction to all species and subspecies, or, from the affirmative side, restoring to safe numbers, for public enjoyment, species whose populations have seriously declined, is the ultimate goal of the Nation's wildlife conservation program.

The preservation of rare and endangered species is a problem which has long held the interest of many private and public organizations, as well as that of individuals, with diverse interests and conservation objectives, but united in their dedication to the common goal of preventing the loss of any additional kinds of our native wildlife fauna. For some species, such as the great auk, passenger pigeon, the heath hen, the Labrador duck, and the Carolina parakeet, this mounting awareness has come too late, and the Eskimo curlew and the ivory-billed woodpecker may already be at the point of no return, if they are not already gone. The whooping crane, Attwater's prairie chicken, the masked bobwhite, the Everglades kite, the California condor, the Aleutian Canadian goose, and the black-footed ferret are among those which, while precariously balanced, are not yet beyond the possibility of restoration. The trumpeter swan and the Hawaiian goose, or nene, are showing heartening response to management measures on their behalf. Many other rare species will require close and continuing attention and action, to insure their future.

The perpetuation of a species requires that its year-round needs be met; and, for migratory kinds, this means not only on the breeding and wintering grounds, but also at stopover locations between these points. Rapidly changing habitat conditions, brought about by progressively more intense land use and other human-related adverse factors, can be expected to increase the obstacles to the survival of many forms of wildlife. With others, the relatively adverse conditions may be temporary. It may be

necessary only to provide alternate habitats in place of those disadvantageously altered or destroyed, or to tide species through interim periods of adversely.

When a species must be protected from excessive hunting, more intensive enforcement of regulations may be advisable; and if the problem includes killing by the uninformed, but well-meaning, public, more extensive informational programs may be a necessary companion measure.

The Bureau's current program for rare and endangered wildlife includes four principal categories; namely, first, habitat preservation and management; second, promulgation and enforcement of protective regulations; third, public information dissemination; and, fourth, research on the biology and status of individual species.

HABITAT PRESERVATION AND MANAGEMENT

The philosophy that each species must have a satisfactory place in which to live and to reproduce, in order to survive, led to the setting aside, in 1903, of the first Federal refuge, on Pelican Island, off the coast of Florida. Nearly 300 other Federal refuges have been established since that time. In some areas, all that was necessary was protection of land, waters, and the associated flora and fauna from disturbance. In others, a major habitat restoration effort was in order, or the elimination of adverse factors, such as hunting or other human disturbances, excessive predation, or disease-producing conditions. The presence of a resident staff at most of the refuges has served to deter vandalism, and has enabled the continuing study of wildlife characteristics and the correction of problems as they develop. The acquisition of additional areas, including several key tracts adjoining existing refuges, is needed and may be facilitated by the recently passed Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

PROMULGATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTIVE REGULATIONS

Regulations are an important means of permitting the harvest of game species which can tolerate cropping, or protecting those which need this type of assistance. With others, it may be necessary to make periodical removals of a part of the population, in order to prevent deterioration of the habitat by overuse. International treaties and Federal and State legislation have virtually eliminated market hunting, and have strictly controlled the use of animals and their parts in the clothing trade. Many game species can be readily identified by the hunter; and these can be given protection, as needed, by excluding them from the list of species which may be taken. Others, similar in appearance, habits, or the habitats which they occupy, must be protected by various means—such as area closures—which take into account more subtle differences.

Two important protective measures are based on control over the time and the place at which hunting is allowed. For example, the hunting of a species may be delayed, moved up, or interrupted, in order to protect a similar-appearing, but rarer, type during the time that it is passing through, or resident in, an area. An example is a delay in opening the hunting season on white—snow—geese in a province of Canada, to permit most Ross' geese to pass through safely. By restricting the places where hunting is permitted, the more common species can be taken with minimal risk to rare or endangered forms. One example is the protection given the greater snow goose on its wintering grounds along the coasts of Virginia and North Carolina, which the similarly marked lesser snow goose ordinarily does not frequent. Another example is the limitations in areas where lesser sandhill cranes may be hunted in western Texas and northeastern New Mexico, in order to protect the endangered whooping crane and the rare greater sandhill crane. Other restrictive actions to regulate the take of certain wildlife include special seasons, limitations on equipment or methods used, reductions in restrictions on the daily or seasonal bag, hunter participation by permit requirements, and provision for sanctuaries or refuges where hunting is curtailed or prohibited, and where purposeful habitat management is carried out to favor those with reduced or declining numbers. Many regulations operate in favor of rare wildlife by reducing predator or competitive species which share limited habitats.

PUBLIC INFORMATION PROGRAMS

Universal stewardship of wildlife by the public is essential in order to give maximum protection, because most species are off refuges and are not under continuing surveillance most of each year. To establish and maintain this sense of responsibility requires that the conservation program for rare and endangered wildlife be explained and demonstrated at every opportunity. The dissemination of newsworthy items, photographs, posters, and similar material among the various news media at strategic times, as well as on a perennial basis, appears to have been effective in reducing to a minimum the hunting mortality of migrating whooping cranes. A similar program pointed to the California condor may also be helpful for that species. Popular bulletins, including illustrated identification guides, have carried the conservation story to all segments of public interest; and television and radio wildlife programs on this subject are well received. The entire conservation information program and the observed reaction of wildlife to it demonstrate that public awareness and interest in rare and endangered species are indispensable to their welfare.

RESEARCH AND STATUS SURVEYS

Biological studies and population surveys have been important in pointing the way for the application of habitat acquisition and management and the development of protective regulations for all wildlife. To know best how to meet the needs of a species, its characteristics must be known intimately. For some species, taxonomic studies have been necessary, to clarify their identity. Others have been studied in detail, and their life histories and ecology carefully documented. Management must be carried out, to capitalize on the strong traits, and to minimize or compensate for the weak ones. Limiting factors must be recognized, and solutions to such conditions must be devised. Continuing population surveys of each threatened species and its habitat are the best way to detect significant changes, so that remedial action can be carried out in time. Action on behalf of the trumpeter swan, the American bison, the key deer, the desert bighorn, and other wildlife was begun before these species had passed beyond recoverable limits; and they now seem secure. The same, unfortunately, has not been true for the heath hen, the passenger pigeon, the Carolina parakeet, and others.

ADDITIONAL MEASURES NEEDED

Despite major management efforts on their behalf, prospects for the survival of certain species are bleak, particularly those with narrow ranges of adaptability or with special habits and requirements. The acquisition and management of refuges, the enforcement of regulations, public information programs, and current research efforts have been effective for most wildlife species, and should be continued and expanded wherever necessary. However, many forms, particularly migratory species, range widely, free to come and go. It is not possible to keep them on managed habitats or under protective observation much of each year, so other measures are needed. The alternative is to consider them expendable, become resigned to the continuing attrition of adverse factors, and accept the progressive loss of more elements of our faunal wealth.

The recently enacted land and water conservation fund legislation was an indication of congressional intent to provide the means for obtaining additional properties with which to meet the needs of endangered species. The passage of this act coincided with accelerated interest in the Department of the Interior's activities on behalf of disappearing wildlife. This interest was reflected in the program of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, by the appointment of a committee of biologists to advise the Director on animals which should be included in a list of rare and endangered species, and on other related information. The committee has been gathering data from many authoritative sources, for the compilation of a publication summarizing most of what is known about this group of vertebrates, including mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, and fishes. Preliminary findings of the committee reveal extensive voids in knowledge about many of the animals listed.

The species which have become extinct during the past century did not disappear because of a lack of knowledge of how to save them. Absent was a technical staff and a stable facility, with assured continuity and coordination of interest, and assigned the exclusive responsibility of keeping abreast of the status of all declining species, management measures, research findings for each species, and of recommending remedial measures needed in order to assure their survival. A description of the means of assuring this increased

security to all American wildlife is as follows:

PROPOSED PROGRAM

A research facility is needed for the primary purpose of studying the needs and devising solutions to the problems of rare and endangered wildlife in the United States. It should engage in a progressive dual approach, as follows: First, distributional, ecological, physiological, and behavioral studies of rare and endangered species in the wild and in captivity, to determine their characteristics and requirements, so as to identify factors reducing them or preventing their increase in numbers, and to devise solutions to adverse conditions; and, second, the maintenance of captive flocks of all rare and endangered species, so as to produce stock with which to bolster or restore populations in the wild, or, when this is not feasible, to perpetuate them in captivity. The program of the proposed research station would be divisible into three major areas of endeavor, as follows:

First. The propagation facility would consist of incubation and brooder buildings, shelters, and outdoor pounds, pastures, and enclosures for hatching, rearing, and prerelease conditioning of all species and subspecies of rare and endangered wildlife in North America, bird and mammal, migratory and nonmigratory. Work with endangered species would be preceded by experimentation with closely related, but more numerous, kinds of wildlife.

Second. The field investigations phase of this program would be staffed with biologists who would study the requirements and limiting factors of disappearing species, and would coordinate surveys to determine their abundance and distribution. They would obtain stock from the wild, for propagation purposes, when this course is determined to be necessary; they would inventory candidate areas where stock reared in captivity could be released; and they would carry out actual releases of birds within their previously occupied range where former decimating factors had disappeared, or in new locations where their survival prospects are good. Followup observations, in order to determine the fate of the transplantings, would also be necessary.

Third. The laboratory facility, located near the propagation facility, would consist of a fully equipped building, staffed with specialists engaged in studies of avian and mammalian nutrition, physiology, pathology, behavior, genetics, and related scientific disciplines. These specialists would provide supporting services for the propagation and field-investigations programs. In addition, they would carry out studies in areas of basic research essential to this program, but not now of active interest to other research organizations. These investigations are of a distinctly different nature, and would not duplicate work now in progress at other wildlife research centers of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife or other agencies.

The propagation phase of this program was commenced 4 years ago at the Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge, in southern Colorado. It was realized at that time that the severe climate and the distance from consultative, advanced educational, and other essential services precluded establishing a permanent station at this location. Developments, accordingly, were of a temporary nature, and were kept to a minimum, to avoid monetary losses that otherwise would be occasioned by the eventual transfer of stock and equipment. Moving to a more satisfactory location was to be done when funds for this purpose could be obtained.

The use of captive propagation and release methods, to restore wildlife population in natural habitats, is endorsed by the principal conservation organizations interested in endangered species. As would be expected, there are some differences of opinion on technical procedural details and time schedules with certain species of critical, international interest, such as the whooping crane. Authority to purchase land, build facilities, employ a staff, and carry out research on waterfowl and other migratory wildlife is contained in the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, July 3, 1918—40 Stat. 755, section 9; the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, Public Law No. 770, February 18, 1929, section 12; the Duck Stamp Act, Public Law No. 124 of March 16, 1934, section 4(a); the Coordination Act, Public Law No. 121 of March 10, 1934, section 5; and the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, Public Law No. 1024, chapter 1036, 2d session, section 7(a), 70 Stat. 1119.

The dedication of a principal research station to the proposed program is a particularly efficient method of meeting the needs of endangered wildlife, because many different species can be accommodated on a relatively small acreage of land, and can be maintained under the surveillance or supervision of a single staff. Also, it is one of the best insurance measures against the extinction of a species, in the event of natural catastrophes. In captivity, mortality factors are under more complete control, and much greater productivity by each pair is possible. As the program unfolds, one or more satellite propagation stations in other parts of the country may be necessary, in order to meet the living requirements characterizing the great variety of wildlife found within the 50 States.

Mr. President, the response to my proposal has been enthusiastic. The following is a list of some of the persons and organizations who have contacted me and have indicated their support of the program:

Donald F. Hoffmeister, president, American Society of Mammalogists, Urbana, Ill.; Harvey Broome, president, the Wilderness Society, Knoxville, Tenn.; Terrence N. Ingram, editor, Inland Bird Banding Association, Apple River, Ill.; Jerome J. Pratt, secretary, Whooping Crane Conservation Association, Sierra Vista, Ariz.; Dr. Warren D. Thomas, Omaha Zoological Society, Omaha, Nebr.; Claude Harris, chairman, Virginia Division, IWLA, Alexandria, Va.; Royal B. McClelland, Washington, D.C.; Philip A. Douglas, executive secretary, Sport Fishing Institute, Washington, D.C.; George J. Eicher, president, Portland General Electric Co., Portland, Oreg.; Robert T. Dennis, Assistant Conservation Director, IWLA, Washington, D.C.; John A. Gustafson, treasurer, the American Nature Study Society, Homer, N.Y.; George Shields, director, Department of Game and Inland Fish, Annapolis, Md.; William Metzger, Jr., chairman, conservation committee, Maryland State Game and Fish Protective Association, Baltimore, Md.; Phil Campbell, commissioner, Department of Agriculture, Atlanta, Ga.; M. J. Golden, executive director, Pennsylvania Game Commission, Harrisburg, Pa.; Laurence R. Jahn, Horicon, Wis.; C. R. Gutermuth, vice president, Wildlife Management Institute, Washington, D.C.; Everett R. Brue, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Harold J. Gordon, Jr., Amherst, Mass.; Walter J. Fillmore, director, South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks, Pierre, S. Dak.; L. P. Voigt, conservation director, Madison, Wis.; John F. Reed, chairman, Ecology Study Committee, Durango, Colo.; Henry S. Mosby, president of the Wildlife Society, Department of Forestry and Wildlife, College of Agriculture, Blacksburg, Va.; Marion S. Monk, Jr., president, National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Batchelor, La.; Phillip Alampi, secretary, Department of Agriculture, Trenton, N.J.; Ira N. Gabrielson, president, World Wildlife Fund, Washington, D.C.; George H. Pournelle, curator, San Diego Zoological Garden, San Diego, Calif.; Richard Adrian, White River, S. Dak.; James L. Ruos, chairman, Prairie Grouse Technical Council, Warroad, Minn.; Lewis W. Walker, associate director, Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum, Tucson, Ariz.; Donald M. Christisen, Missouri Conservation Commission, Jefferson City, Mo.; Dr. S. Glidden Baldwin, Vermilion County Audubon Society, Danville, Ill.; Hugo Fisher, administrator, the Resources Agency of California, Sacramento, Calif.; W. Harley Webster, assistant director, the Nature Conservancy, Washington, D.C.; Clarence Cottam, director, Welder Wildlife Foundation, Sinton, Tex.; and Doran E. Perry, Pasadena, Calif.

Mr. President, since I announced sponsorship of the amendment to provide funds for the preservation of endangered species, there has been considerable comment in the newspapers of the country.

Two of these articles—one by Lee Weishaar, wildlife editor of the American-News, in Aberdeen, S. Dak.; and the other by Jim Johnson, of the Daily Plainsman, of Huron, S. Dak.—illustrate the tenor of most of the comments. I ask that these two articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News, Apr. 4, 1965]

OUTDOORS IN THE DAKOTAS

(By Lee Weishaar)

Early in March, South Dakota Senator KARL MUNDT called for a proposal to provide $350,000 for a wildlife research project in southern Maryland "to save from extinction rare and endangered American wildlife species."

John S. Gottschalk, director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife commented on the proposal: "The immediate need" (to insure success of the propagation of endangered species program) "is to move our present activities from the Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge in southern Colorado to a location where this work can be carried out under more favorable conditions."

The Monte Vista operation is presently concerned primarily with sandhill and whooping crane studies.

Gottschalk said that "Monte Vista is too isolated and the winter climate too severe for this critical work."

This research center, located at Patuxent Wildlife Research Center about midway between Washington and Baltimore, would be a positive step in the right direction in an effort to save our endangered wildlife species. Only the two species of crane are mentioned in the news release from Senator MUNDT's office. However, a single research center such as this would be able to collect specimens of remnants of wildlife species and study them to discover the best methods to save what populations we have and effect restoration of various species.

The Department of the Interior has also issued a call for help from conservation groups, professional organizations and individual experts throughout the United States to help in the fight to save endangered wildlife species.

The Department estimates that 16 kinds of mammals and 30 to 40 types of birds are in the endangered category. Somewhere in the vicinity of 40 wildlife species have disappeared from the American scene in the past 150 years. About half of the extinct species have vanished since 1900.

Some of the endangered species are game animals, hunted to near extinction by the sporting gunner. Others are simply animals of beauty. Some combination of the two. The graceful trumpeter swan, the huge and beautiful whooping crane, the wood duck, the prairie chicken, and the passenger pigeon are just some of the birds that are in trouble or have completely disappeared. This writer does not know what a great auk looks like, except from pictures. The penguinlike bird once thrived in the north of our continent, and is now gone forever. The passenger pigeon is another bird that disappeared before I was born.

Will the children of today and the next generation have to rely on pictures to know what the whooping crane or trumpeter swan looked like? Will a description from grandfather have to suffice in the case of the great California condor? All people interested in the outdoors and its wonderful creatures hope not. Through research and careful control, the government agencies charged with preservation of North American creatures have managed to halt the downward growth of many species and have started some of them on the long, slow climb back to abundance.

South Dakota has had part of the loss. The Badlands bighorn sheep and the Plains grizzly bear have been gone since about the turn of the century. The passenger pigeon, once prolific and covering the North American continent, was part of South Dakota before the bird's decline and total destruction in the early 1920's.

The black-footed ferret, which lived off of prairie dog towns, has nearly disappeared from the scene in South Dakota and neighboring States.

The degree of danger to the various species in the 50 United States, Canada, and Mexico varies greatly. Some scientists disagree that certain species are really in danger. Others would add more to the list.

The pressure of high population and other factors responsible in many States for wildlife losses have not yet hit South Dakota. Our game, fish, and parks department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, along with private clubs and groups, have done much to preserve and propagate wildlife in South Dakota.

But the danger looms just ahead. No one thought the great buffalo herds of the 1800's would dwindle to a mere handful, but it happened. Without careful control and research, the same can and will happen to more species. The proposed Maryland research center is just one of the many things people can support to insure a healthy and stable wildlife population for years to come.

[From the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman, Apr. 11, 1965]

PRESERVATION OF WILDLIFE—STUDIES, FUNDS ARE NEEDED

(By Jim Johnson)

With wildlife, as other things, sometimes a situation gets bad enough that something gets done about it, possibly not too late.

A project, long past due, to save from extinction rare and endangered American wildlife species should have general and nonpartisan support. Being proposed as a committee amendment to the budget request for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, it has just been announced by the Senator, ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Testimony before this subscommittee shows what has long been of common concern with students of wildlife, that the greatest need is for knowledge. And the research must now include the urgency of a crash program if it is to be more than a post mortem on another series of wildlife species allowed by ignorance, greed, and indifference to go the way of the great auk, the passenger pigeon, and the heath hen, to mention only a few of the scores lost in the past century.

Species most in need of help now are the whooping crane, the tule white-fronted goose (larger and darker edition of our white-fronted goose), the Everglades kite, the masked bobwhite quail (that used to be so common in the Southwest), and the ivory-billed woodpecker. And we hardly know enough of their life histories to decide the best place to start.

"The most immediate need," the subcommittee was told by John S. Gottschalk, Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, "is to move our present activities from Monte Vista, in southern Colorado, to a location where the work can be carried out under more favorable conditions."

Sandhill and whooping crane studies are currently underway at Monte Vista. "Too isolated and the winter climate too severe for this critical work," Gottschalk told the subcommittee.

The plan now hopefully proposed is to move the project to a tract of land at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, which is about halfway between Washington and Baltimore.

The program visualized would start with a propagation phase in which techniques must be learned and perfected to produce the endangered species in workable numbers.

This would be followed by a laboratory phase in which specialists in physiology, nutrition, pathology, and other fields would join in supporting studies of the species. In a field study phase, which must start quickly, wildlife research biologists would study the species in the wild and learn their needs, assist in gathering breeding stock, and find the best sites for the release of captive reared stock into the wild.

Aside from the mild weather mentioned as an important element in the selected location is the unspoken but probably no less important local climate of biological knowledge and concern for the endangered species available for consultation about the research center and in the Washington-Baltimore area. If they can be saved from extinction, these people are most likely to come up with a method.

And the cost? For the early and vital work that is already too late. Needed are incubation-brooder building and its essential facilities, a couple of maintenance-patrolmen, a supervising biologist and secretary, the bringing of the present stock from Monte Vista and elsewhere, the development of plans for the later laboratory building, and four field biologists' salaries and expenses to start field studies on the species at once. Their numbers are already too low to allow the latter to wait on the other phases. The total is estimated at $350,000, a figure so small it may well be in danger of getting lost among the hundreds of millions it takes to get attention these days.

"We need to locate the remnant populations and study the factors affecting their survival as the starting point for restoration measures," explained Gottschalk.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in connection with the work on endangered species, just last Sunday, April 25, the Omaha World-Herald published in its Sunday magazine section an article—written by Ralph J. Smith—dealing with the discovery in South Dakota of a family of black-footed ferrets. Mr. Smith outlined the research work on the black-footed ferret, being conducted at South Dakota State University by the South Dakota Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, which was established as a result of an amendment I proposed in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

In addition to the research at South Dakota State University, it should be noted that the proposed activity in Maryland would also give emphasis to saving this important mammal, along with other endangered species.

The article by Mr. Smith provides an excellent example of just one of the rare wildlife species that are endangered; and I request permission to have his article printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Apr. 25, 1965]

THE BLACK-FOOTED FERRET: "PHANTOM OF THE PLAINS"

(By Ralph J. Smith)

Ever heard of the black-footed ferret? Few people have. Even fewer have seen one. This includes the naturalists, to whom it has been a biological will-o-the-wisp for 115 years.

They call it the Phantom of the Plains. It is certainly Nebraska's, possibly the Great Plains' and perhaps the Nation's rarest mammal. The last all-out search for this elusive animal could account for only 60, give or take a few, in the Nation. It is on the danger list of creatures threatened with extinction, an unhappy classification that it shares with the ivory-billed woodpecker, the whooping crane and the grizzly bear.

The black-footed ferret is an animal about 24 inches long that in appearance looks like a dry-land mink. Buff-yellow, it is most distinguishable by its black feet, a black-tipped tail and a black bandit's mask across the face. It has the sinuous, flowing movement that is characteristic of the weasel family, of which it is a member, and a quickness of movement so incredible as to be almost sinister.

The mystery that has long veiled the animal now promises to be torn away. And so, if luck holds, does the threat to the ferret's continuance.

A group has been located in South Dakota. The animals are under study to learn their life history, ecology, behavior, and movements. Once these are known, naturalists hope they can manage things to assure the survival and multiplication of the creature.

The study is a joint effort headed by the South Dakota Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, of which Dr. Paul F. Springer is leader, headquartered at South Dakota State University at Brookings. Taking part are the university, the National Park Service, the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Wildlife Management Institute. In addition, funds are being contributed by the Welder Wildlife Foundation.

The National Park Service hopes its participation eventually will lead to reestablishing the animal in national parks and monuments, said Research Biologist Walter H. Kittams of Omaha. So far as is known, there is not a single ferret in any of the installations—Yellowstone, Theodore Roosevelt, Badlands, Wind Cave, Devil's Tower—in the Midwest region's jurisdiction.

As a byproduct of its participation, the National Park Service hopes to advance scientific knowledge, Mr. Kittams said.

The difficulty of the job ahead, as well as its nature, is indicated by naturalists' inability in the past to find the answers.

What are regarded as facts about the black-footed ferret prove, on close examination, to be only assumptions; even these are hedged by question marks.

In overwhelming number of cases the ferret is found in prairie dog towns, which is part of the problem. Control programs are carried out to poison off prairie dogs when they reach destructive numbers. (Thirty-two prairie dogs consume as much grass as one sheep; 256 as much as a cow.)

Biologists' concern is that the ferret may become a victim of prairie dog eradication, either through eating poisoned carcasses or by the resultant radical change in environment.

One of the frustrating things about the ferret is that for every seeming fact there is a contradiction. Although the link with prairie dogs is so close that the association is part of Sioux Indian legends, they also are found on occasion in haystacks and around deserted buildings; one lived under a wooden sidewalk at Hays, Kans., where it reportedly caught rats.

The ferret has been observed mainly in association with the black-tailed prairie dog. There have been only a very few instances of it occurring with the white-tailed prairie dog. The significance is that the black-tailed dog lives in towns of fairly dense concentration while his cousin occurs in widely scattered colonies.

Ground squirrels, field mice, ground-nesting birds, gophers and the like exist in prairie dog colonies as a potential source of food. In Custer County, Nebr., a ferret was seen carrying a ground squirrel it had killed.

The scarcity of solid information on the ferret is surprising in view of the length of time that the animal has been known to natural science.

The black-footed ferret was first described by naturalists John J. Audubon and John Bachman in 1851. Their description was based on an imperfect skin sent them by Alexander Culbertson, the famed American Fur Co. factor.

Thereafter 25 years passed during which naturalists began to question whether there even was such an animal, before it was reported again.

Down through the years since, scientists' encounters with the ferret have been tenuous and uncertain.

In 1952 the executive committee of the American Committee for International Wild Life Protection made an all-out survey to find out how many animals there were. Over a 7-year period it came up with reports of 50 to 70 animals in 42 locations.

Several years ago Walt Disney and his staff were able to trap three ferrets in central South Dakota for the film, "The Vanishing Prairie." Subsequently they were released in Wind Cave National Park.

In 1961, American Museum of Natural History scientists made a pilgrimage to Wind Cave to study this natural history rarity. They could find no traces of the animal.

In 1962 a South Dakota youth spotted a ferret by the beam of his car's headlights and captured it. Fortunately he was the son of a mink rancher and knew how to handle the animal; the savage ferret is not a creature to tackle casually.

The animal eventually was turned over to South Dakota State University, which kept it in a pen until it died last spring. While some basic information was gained, the artificial environment limited the scope of the observations.

Then, last summer, the jackpot. Several ferrets were spotted in a prairie dog town in South Dakota and the cooperative study was organized. Location of the dog town is being guarded as a precaution against curiosity seekers or poachers who might imperil the observations, Dr. Springer and Mr. Kittams said.

Now that chance has delivered the opportunity that so long eluded them, the naturalists don't intend to imperil it by hasty or casual action. The study of the ferret group, Dr. Springer said, probably will require 3 years. A biologist has moved into the field to live with the ferrets for the study's duration.

To disturb the creatures as little as possible, the initial phase of the study is being limited to field observation. When this has yielded its full harvest of facts, the study will move into a closer-range relationship with the animals.

They may be marked, using a dye of some kind, to enable the pinpointing of an individual animal's activities. The final phases likely will require live trapping of the animals, Dr. Springer said.

The nocturnal nature of the animals posed an initial problem. Originally the field observer used a white spotlight to follow the animals' movements when they came out of their holes.

The ferrets reacted to the light beam with a distressed behavior that threatened to interfere with the field observation.

The study group turned to the military for help. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service arranged for the loan and modification of a snooperscope.

This is a spotting device which has proved its value in the guerrilla conditions of the jungle war in Vietnam. It uses an infrared beam, invisible to the person or animal upon which it is being shown, to light up an image on a screen. With this, the field biologist is carrying out the observations without the animals' knowledge.

It's hell on privacy but it's wonderful for science, Dr. Springer conceded.

Mr. MUNDT. Finally, Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a booklet, entitled "Protecting Our Endangered Birds," prepared by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior. This booklet, prepared several years ago, still applies, except for the fact that since it was published, the whooping crane population has increased from 38 to 50.

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

PROTECTING OUR ENDANGERED BIRDS

Twelve valuable and interesting birds have disappeared from America in the less than 200 years of its existence as a nation—the great auk, passenger pigeon, heath hen, Labrador duck, and Carolina parakeet, to name a few. Still others are endangered and may vanish within a few years. This is a matter of grave concern to the Federal Government. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is working in close cooperation with the State and private conservation agencies to do what can be done to stem this tide of extinction.

WHAT CAUSES AN ANIMAL TO DISAPPEAR?

Whenever a species is reduced to a small number of individuals it is in danger of extinction; a catastrophe such as destruction of important habitat, a severe winter, an outbreak of disease, or excessive shooting, can easily wipe it out. In America, a number of species were greatly reduced or destroyed during settlement of the country. The building of cities, roads, dams, draining of marshes, and cultivation of large areas literally pushed many species from their homes. During the 19th century, market-hunters, killing thousands of birds for feathers and meat, destroyed or nearly destroyed some species before the American people realized what was happening.

Today, the drainage of vast marshes and thousands of potholes throughout the country is destroying habitat essential to certain wildlife species. These wetlands are sorely needed by our waterfowl, shorebirds, and many other birds and fur animals.

Pollution is another problem facing us today. Sewage from our cities and wastes from our factories, mines, and ships, are turning many of our lakes and streams into open sewers.

SOME ENDANGERED BIRDS

Several American birds are in immediate danger of disappearing: the Eskimo curlew, ivory-billed woodpecker, whooping crane, Attwater's prairie chicken, Everglade kite, California condor, and nene or Hawaiian goose.

The Eskimo curlew once migrated through the coastal prairies of Texas and the Great Plains in countless numbers. In spring, immense flocks of the long-legged shorebirds stopped to feed on insects in freshly plowed fields and burned-over prairies. Hunting for the fine-flavored birds was a popular sport and thousands were shot for city markets. The curlews were easily killed because of the habit of a flock staying with a wounded companion. By 1892 the great flocks were nearly gone, and the species has never recoverd. The last record was a sighting in Argentina in 1937, but hope still remains that a few birds survive.

Too few people living have ever had an opportunity to see the magnificent ivory-billed woodpecker with its shining black plumage and great scarlet crest. It is a shy, wild bird that lives in mature, broad-leaved forests of our southern swamps and river valleys. It was doomed when loggers began cutting the great trees in the river swamps, as its chief food, a beetle grub, lives under the bark of very old trees. There have been no authentic records for several years.

Former numbers of the whooping crane are a matter of speculation. These magnificent birds, nearly as tall as a man and with a wingspread of almost 7 feet, may not have exceeded 1,400 at the time America was discovered. Traveling in small flocks or family groups, they made their 2,500-mile flights each year through the Great Plains between Arctic nesting grounds and winter quarters on the gulf coast. By 1938 only 14 remained. They could not cope with the draining of the prairie potholes, plowing under the grasslands, and excessive shooting along their migration routes. Public concern for the future existence of these cranes led to the creation of the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge in Texas on their hereditary wintering grounds. In the fall of 1958 23 adults and 9 rusty-colored youngsters returned to

the refuge from northern nesting areas. In all, the whoopers now number 38 birds, including 6 held in zoos.

At one time a million Attwater's prairie chickens are thought to have ranged over the coastal prairies of Louisiana and Texas. Today, as the result of pollution from oil drilling, rice farming that destroys their grasslands, and drought, only a few thousand remain. The future existence of this splendid game bird demands that it be provided soon with a permanent refuge area in which it will have the tall grasses, fresh water, and protection from shooting that it needs.

The Everglade kite and California condor are endangered by dwindling food supplies. The gentle and graceful kite lives in the fresh water marshes of Florida and feeds only on a fresh water snail. As extensive marshes are drained, the snail becomes increasingly scarce. Looking much like a marsh hawk, this very rare bird is often shot by hunters. The growing shortage in its food and needless killings by hunters make the future of the harmless Everglade kite very dark.

The once common California condor ranged from Lower California to the Columbia River. Today not more than 60 birds remain. This remnant of a great race lives within the Los Padres National Forest in California. Because of modern ranching methods and the trend toward grain farming, carrion is no longer as abundant as in the days of the old Spanish ranches. Ranging widely for food, the condor risks being shot or feeding on poisoned meat placed on the ranges for coyotes and rodents.

Encroachment of men on its living areas has greatly endangered the nene, a Hawaiian goose. At one time rather common, the nene regularly migrated from the seacoasts to the uplands to nest in the kapukas or islands of low vegetation on the open lava flows at the higher elevations. The development of beach resorts, construction of military roads through the uplands, and introduction of domestic animals, particularly dogs and pigs, rats and the weasel-like mongoose, have nearly destroyed the nene. Probably not more than 50 wild birds remain today. Fortunately, the nene can be raised in captivity. Some 150 birds live on the Severn Wildfowl Trust in England and a couple of smaller captive flocks are in Hawaii. Recognizing the threat to the nene, the Congress in 1958 instructed the Department of the Interior to try to save this endangered bird. Consequently, a program of research, breeding, and protection of the nene (which is the State bird of Hawaii) in its own habitat has been developed. This work is being done in cooperation with the board of commissioners of agriculture and forestry, the agency responsible for the State of Hawaii's wildlife.

PROTECTING OUR RARE BIRDS

Future generations of Americans will enjoy such beautiful and rare birds as the trumpeter swan, great white heron, American and snowy egrets, wood duck, and Hudsonian godwit because of the foresight of past generations. In many parts of the United States we have set aside refuge areas for the protection of our wildlife. Sometimes endangered animals are saved simply by the setting up of a protected area with the type of habitat they need where they can rest and feed and bear their young. The operation or management of a refuge insures that food supplies are sufficient, and that living conditions are right, too, for the arrival of the new generations that the adults will produce. This means the land must have good plant cover of the particular kind needed by a species. Overgrazed lands are returned to native grasses and shrubs; marshes, with their great variety of plantlife, are restored. Water is important, especially in arid regions. In desert areas wells are dug, springs opened up, and new waterholes developed. On some refuges it is necessary to protect endangered species by controlling predators such as snakes, coyotes, and bobcats. Heavy losses of young animals during the breeding season will help destroy a species already on the danger list.

Frequently a refuge is established on an area that has the last survivors of a species, as the Aransas Refuge in Texas on the wintering grounds of the whooping crane. By using a remnant group as breeding stock, every effort is made to restore the species, as for example, the trumpeter swan on the Red Rock Lakes National Wildlife Refuge in Montana. The trumpeter swan was thought to be extinct by 1900, the result of excessive shooting by trappers and early settlers for their feathers and meat. But in the early 1930's a small flock of about 33 swans was found in the vicinity of Yellowstone National Park. To save these rare birds, many of which nested and wintered on unprotected lands near the park, the Red Rock Lakes Refuge was created in 1935. By 1958 the trumpeter has increased to more than 700 birds. Its recovery is the story of conservation in action: complete protection from shooting and from intrusion of men and cattle on its nesting areas. What has been done for the trumpeter swan it is hoped can be done for the whooping crane.

At the turn of the century, the American egret, snowy egret, and great white heron were in great danger of extinction. Feather hunters persistently raided the rookeries, killing the adults for their beautiful plumes and leaving the young to starve. Today, you can visit many refuges in the Southern States and see large rookeries of these beautiful birds.

Seeing a roseate spoonbill in its natural environment is a thrilling experience, but in a few years this rare bird probably will not be found outside of refuge areas. It is decreasing in Florida, and in Texas drilling for oil is destroying its habitat. National wildlife refuges and Audubon sanctuaries in Florida, Louisiana, and Texas protect several colonies of these beautiful pink birds. The future existence of the spoonbill seems assured as long as it remains on these protected lands.

Formerly an abundant bird, the wood duck was reduced almost to extinction in this century. Not only was it widely hunted but it was also steadily losing places to live. Many of its swamps were being drained and the woods in which its nesting trees stood were being cut. So much concern was felt for the wood duck that in 1918 it was placed on the protected list and hunters could not legally kill it. By 1941 this duck had become numerous enough again that hunters were permitted to take a limited number. Since the 1930's, several national wildlife refuges have been developed in its range. Protected from overshooting and given permanent and suitable places to live, the wood duck is once more becoming a common bird in many of our inland, swampy woodlands and tree-bordered streams.

The Hudsonian godwit, one of our rarer shorebirds, also was a casualty of market-hunting days. Considering the continuous and heavy shooting of the birds in those early days as they migrated through our Great Plains, it is a wonder any survived. Only in recent years has this long-legged, long-billed bird begun to show an increase in its numbers. In 1956, several hundred were seen on national wildlife refuges in the Great Plains. The birds stopped over to feed and rest before resuming their long flight to northern nesting grounds. In common with other shorebirds, the godwits are of great value to the farmer. They feed heavily on mosquitoes, grasshoppers, crane-fly larvae, and other insect pests of farm animals and crops.

The future of our wildlife is in the hands of the American people. Constant vigilance and concerted action by all conservationists and conservation organizations are necessary if we are to succeed in saving and restoring our endangered species of wildlife.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PORT ORFORD, OREG., DUNGENESS CRAB

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the cool coastal waters of the Pacific Ocean off the coast of Port Orford, Oreg., range some of the finest ocean crabs known as the Dungeness variety.

The succulent meat from this shellfish is served fresh throughout the Northwest at the finest restaurants and hotels. I recommend this delicacy to my colleagues whenever they are fortunate enough to visit the State of Oregon.

Last Friday officials of the port of Port Orford, the city of Port Orford, and Curry County visited in Washington, D.C. The occasion for their visit was to present testimony before the Senate Committee on Public Works for authorization on a meritorious project at Port Orford of importance to the economy of that area. These visitors were the Honorable Lloyd Bates, mayor of Port Orford; the Honorable Fels Campbell, county judge, Curry County Court; Mr. Ray Reinke, president of port of Port Orford; Ryce Wilson, commissioner of Curry County; and Ira Tucker, secretary of port of Port Orford.

These officials brought with them to Washington a very generous quantity of frozen Port Orford crabmeat and tomorrow in the Senate restaurant, my Senate colleagues will be able to enjoy this treat.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 30, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, April 29, 1965:

U.S. MARSHAL

Covell H. Meek, of Iowa, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 13, 1965.

THE JUDICIARY

James E. Doyle, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Wisconsin, vice Patrick T. Stone, deceased.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Warsaw Ghetto Uprising: A Commemoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, April and May this year mark the 22d anniversary of a great and tragic event. It was during this period in 1943, from April 19 to the end of May, that a few thousand Jewish survivors of the Warsaw ghetto staged a desperate last-ditch resistance to the Nazi campaign of extermination and for a brief time and against overwhelming odds demonstrated a type of courage and heroism that the world has not very often seen.

When the Nazis and Russians moved into Poland at the opening of World War II, Poland was divided for another time. Forthwith the Nazis rounded up the Jewish population and forced many of them into the Warsaw ghetto, swelling its numbers to about 450,000. In the summer of 1942 the Germans began their campaign to exterminate the Jews. And during July and August of that year they systematically removed the Jews from the ghetto, placed them in prisons, and eventually destroyed them in their crematoriums.

As the numbers of the imprisoned Jews dwindled, the survivors were determined to stage a last-ditch resistance against the Nazis. Open resistance began in January 1943, but on April 19, the eve of the Jewish Passover, the Nazis attacked en masse and in desperate fury, and with tanks, artillery, and troops, they set out to destroy the ghetto completely. For a month the battle raged and even in the summer token resistance could still be detected, but the ghetto was reduced to rubble by the end of May and most of its inhabitants either killed or shipped off to concentration camps.

It is well for us to commemorate the anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising; for here is a tragic demonstration of man's courage in the face of a fearful and overpowering enemy. But more important, Mr. Speaker, such commemorations can serve as a continuing reminder to us all of the extremes to which man can go when his soul has become filled with racial prejudice and racial hatred.

In recognition of this fact, the Essex County Warsaw Ghetto Commemoration Committee has arranged a memorable commemoration for Sunday evening, May 2, at the Weequahic High School Auditorium in Newark, N.J. The event is being sponsored by 55 Jewish and non-Jewish organizations and will be attended by 2,000 persons, including State and local officials and representatives of religious groups. Among the distinguished speakers will be Dr. Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress; Mr. I. Goldberg, director of the New Jersey Service Bureau for Jewish Education; and Mr. Kenneth Gibson, cochairman of the Business and Industrial Coordinating Council. Three local choral groups will participate. There will be a dramatic presentation of "The Witness" followed by a candlelighting and memorial service.

As we mourn this tragedy, may we be inspired to a greater dedication to our Judeo-Christian ethic.

Law Day, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, our American history has been marked by a valiant struggle for equal justice under law and the preservation of individual liberty and dignity.

Recent events throughout the world and within our own borders make it clear that this struggle is far from over—that our commitment to the concept of individual liberty and freedom under law is constantly being challenged.

The American legal profession, of which I am proud to be a part, is making an outstanding effort to give citizens a deeper awareness of this continuing challenge and to alert us to our responsibilities as free, law-abiding people.

One means of doing this is the annual observance of Law Day, U.S.A. on May 1. The theme of this year's observance, "Uphold the Law—A Citizen's First Duty," is designed to direct public attention to the rights and duties of citizenship.

As Americans, we enjoy wide freedoms, guaranteed by law, which distinguish our society from a totalitarian system. But with these rights and freedoms go individual responsibility which all Americans must exercise.

While we enjoy the right to equal protection of laws, equal justice in the courts, and the right to be free from arbitrary search or arrest, we are bound to obey the laws which give us these rights and to respect the rights of our fellow Americans.

We are privileged to be able to choose our public officers in free elections, but as members of a democratic nation, we are charged with the responsibility of voting in elections.

We are indeed fortunate that we live by a government of laws, where legislation is subject to the perfecting process of judicial review.

The eighth annual observance of Law Day, U.S.A. will focus national attention on our rights and responsibilities as citizens of the greatest Nation in the world—a Nation whose greatness stems from our dedication to rule of law.

The legal profession is to be commended for its work in helping Americans to understand more fully the value of our system of liberty under law. As we observe Law Day, let each of us commit ourselves to the fulfillment of our responsibilities as beneficiaries of that liberty.

An American Basketball at Moscow University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read a United Press International report today from Indianapolis, Ind., that the U.S. All Stars defeated the Soviet Union Nationals by a score of 78 to 73 in a basketball game that attracted nearly 14,000 fans. It was also noteworthy that last night's victory gave the American team a 4-to-1 edge in the five games played with the touring Russians.

I call this to the attention of my colleagues because of a pleasant experience which developed from a meeting I had with an American student at the University of Moscow when I was in Russia last November on a study mission with the Europe Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I enjoyed a pleasant conversation at the Prague Restaurant in Moscow with Mr. Edward Milton Ifft, of 239 Alameda Road, Butler, Pa., a member of the University of Moscow basketball team who informed me that the pleasure of his association with the university team was alloyed by the fact that the team played with a basketball produced in Red China.

Upon my return to the United States I related this experience to Mr. John B. Colt, export manager of A. G. Spalding & Bros., Inc., Chicopee, Mass., who agreed with me that it is not fit and proper for an American to be playing the American game of basketball with equipment produced in China and he thereafter forwarded as a gift a "Made in America" basketball to Mr. Ifft.

This week I have received from Mr. Ifft a very interesting letter which gives evidence that this basketball is being worked into a game of good will which could, ultimately, lead to possible exclusion of Red Chinese-made balls from the basketball courts of Moscow. I presume that in the current series of exhibition games here between Russian and American teams, American-made equipment is used exclusively and I suggest that Russian coaches should be encouraged to advocate greater use of American equipment in practice sessions.

Given a choice I would prefer to play ball with the Russians than with the Chinese, under American rules and with

American equipment and it is conceivable that out of this relatively minor experience there could develop a new phase in East-West relations. I have expressed my thanks to Mr. Colt and to Mr. Ifft for their participation and I am sure that all of us would welcome the opportunity to encourage and to develop a familiarity with American equipment on the part of Russian athletes.

Mr. Ifft has assured me that the American-made basketball which was sent to him by Mr. Colt will have a "long and useful career here at the Moscow University" in spite of the fact that his initial effort to have it used was not successful because of the reluctance of the opposing team to use an unfamiliar ball.

I am including here the letter I received this week from Mr. Ifft, together with my initial letter to Mr. Colt and his reply:

FEBRUARY 10, 1965.

A. G. SPALDING & BROS., INC.,
Meadow Street, Chicopee, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: During a recent trip to Moscow I made the acquaintance of one of our American students who is studying at the University of Moscow. He is a basketball player and a member of the University of Moscow team. However, in describing his experiences with that group he told me that his pleasure was alloyed by the fact that they were playing with a basketball produced by the Red Chinese.

It occurred to me that under the circumstances you might consider making a good American basketball available to Mr. Edward Milton Ifft, APO 664, Box M, New York, N.Y., not only to give him satisfaction, but to prove the superiority of American-produced athletic equipment.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

A. G. SPALDING & BROS. INC.,
Chicopee, Mass., February 19, 1965.

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: Thank you very much for your interesting letter of February 10th telling us of one of our American students studying at the University of Moscow.

I agree with you entirely that it is not fit and proper for an American to be playing the American game of basketball with equipment produced in China.

We are going to send to him a contribution of a really fine basketball just as soon as we determine from him whether their sport is played indoors or outdoors, as this would make a difference in the type of ball which we would supply.

My sincere thanks to you for bringing this matter to our attention.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. COLT,
Export Manager.

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MONAGAN: I am one of the American students you met at the Prague Restaurant in Moscow several months ago. At your suggestion, the Spalding Co. has sent me, free of charge, one of their basketballs to present to the Moscow University team, of which I am a member. I presented the ball to the team just before a game last week. Our players were quite impressed and were ready to use it immediately as the game ball. Interestingly enough, the visiting team was a bit afraid of a new and unfamiliar ball and we ended up using one of the usual Chinese balls. Nevertheless I have no doubt our basketball will have a long and useful career here at Moscow University.

I am very glad you followed up your idea, as it was indeed a fine gesture. Thank you very much for allowing me to join with you and the Spalding people in helping, in some small way, to increase the considerable reservoir of good will toward us which exists among the ordinary Soviet people.

Yours truly,

EDWARD M. IFFT.

Our Continuing Struggle in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, today it was my sad duty to write a letter of condolence to the widow of one of my constituents killed recently in Vietnam—Capt. Kenneth L. Dean, Jr., U.S. Army.

This morning, Captain Dean was laid to rest at his alma mater—the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He was killed on April 20 as a result of gunshot wounds while accompanying a Vietnamese Army unit engaged in a fight with the Vietcong. When he attempted to move a Vietnamese soldier, he was hit by hostile small arms fire. At the time of his death, he was a first lieutenant and was recently posthumously promoted to the rank of captain. His widow, Mrs. Sheila Dean of Dobbs Ferry, has received two Government citations—one from the President and an Army Honorary Service Award.

Captain Dean died defending freedom and honoring our commitments to free nations to protect them from the spread of world communism. While his death is a deep loss to all of us, his widow and other Americans can find some comfort in knowing that he did not die in vain. His life, and those of other American servicemen killed in Vietnam, were given to afford the people of Vietnam the opportunity to once again become free from intimidation and harassment by the forces of aggression. He died so that one day the Vietnamese will be able to decide their own future.

His tragic death could have been prevented if the Vietcong and the Chinese Communists had accepted President Johnson's offer to achieve peace in that strife-torn area through unconditional negotiations. The gauntlet has been tossed and for the moment it appears that world communism will accept nothing less than the total destruction and control of their smaller and peaceful neighbors.

The President, in his speech at Johns Hopkins University earlier this month, placed the responsibility for the quest for peace squarely upon the Communists. Their failure to respond clearly indicates their desire for continued hostilities. These forces have been accurately identified as the perpetrators of continued bloodshed in Vietnam and their unwillingness to discuss this matter at a bargaining table demonstrates their continuing desire to establish a totalitarian empire in southeast Asia.

There is so much which can be done in this area to assist all peoples to gain a healthier, better educated, and more prosperous and peaceful life. As I stated in this distinguished body earlier this month, this war certainly grows as much as anything from the frustrations of hunger and deprivation. The responsibilities of all nations in southeast Asia, and most particularly in Vietnam, are to build rather than destroy, to educate rather than subvert, to heal rather than wound, to cultivate rather than plow under. The quest for peace is the goal for which we are all fighting.

Mr. Speaker, let us never forget the sacrifice of Captain Dean and the other gallant Americans who have shed their blood in this quest for peace. All Americans, and all the peoples of the free world, should stand in honor to Captain Dean and his comrades and pay tribute to their enduring contribution to world peace through the giving of their lives.

Estes Kefauver Memorial Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD FULTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago this body lost one of its most distinguished former Members and the people of the State of Tennessee lost one of their ablest and most outstanding Senators at the death of Estes Kefauver.

He left the Congress with an excellent record as a legislator and champion of the common man. He left Tennessee a better place in which to live, do business, and raise a family because of his efforts in our behalf.

Estes Kefauver was a man of many talents and interests. One of these interests was in the field of conservation and water resource development. Much of the work that has been done for Tennessee by the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Corps of Engineers, and other waterway programs was advanced significantly by Senator Kefauver.

He was especially valuable in securing congressional approval for the J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir named in honor of the late Member of this body from Nashville.

Today the Corps of Engineers is developing a 416-square-acre park on the Priest Reservoir in Davidson County, Tenn., on the Hamilton Creek embayment between the communities of Una and Smith Springs. This park will be developed for picknicking, boating, fishing, and other recreational activities.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to name this park the "Estes Kefauver Memorial Park" in honor of the late Senator from Tennessee who did so much for this project in Nashville and similar projects across Tennessee.

Senator Randolph Stresses Strength of Citizenship Responsibility in Address to Student Body in Law Day, U.S.A., Commemoration at Morgantown, W. Va., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Friday, April 23, it was my privilege and challenge to speak before the student body of the Morgantown, W. Va., High School in observance of Law Day, U.S.A. Scott Davis, dedicated principal, and his capable teaching staff, were also present.

Established in 1958, Law Day is celebrated on May 1 and is now a permanent national event. It is a time for Americans to reaffirm their loyalties to the United States and rededicate themselves to the ideals of equality and justice. It has been said that "the trouble seems to be that too many people think the law should be enforced, and not enough think it should be observed." The purpose of Law Day is to change this idea.

In our country May Day is a commemoration of the laws which make us free men, a contrast to the communistic celebration which emphasizes military force.

Mr. President, I addressed 1,600 high school students assembled by the Key Club, of Morgantown High School, in coordination with the Monongalia County Bar Association. The program included remarks by Key Club President-Elect Sam Marino, current President Roger Warsewich, and Vice President Gary George.

Representing the Morgantown civic leaders and the Monongalia legal group were: Mayor Arthur Buehler; Albert Morgan, president of the bar association; Robert Goodwin, chairman, Law Day committee, bar association; Robert Creel, vice president, Kiwanis; Steve Gatrell and Albert Tennant, faculty advisers of the Key Club; and Rev. Jerry Rector, campus minister, of West Virginia University.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this address, "Citizenship and the Rule of Law," to the Morgantown High School students be printed in the RECORD.

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

CITIZENSHIP AND THE RULE OF LAW

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, Morgantown High School, Law Day, Morgantown, W. Va., Apr. 23, 1965)

It is indeed a pleasure to be here in your high school to join in your observance of Law Day.

This is a relatively young celebration—younger than any of you. May 1, 1958, was the first time that Law Day was observed. President Dwight D. Eisenhower issued the first proclamation designating May 1 as Law Day, U.S.A.

Because the leaders of our country felt that Law Day was a day worthy of commemoration, Congress passed a joint resolution in 1961 designating the first day of May as a permanent national observance. This resolution stated that Law Day, U.S.A. "* * * is set aside as a special day of celebration by the American people in appreciation of their liberties and the reaffirmation of their loyalty to the United States of America: of their rededication to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other as well as with other nations; and for the cultivation of that respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life."

May Day itself has traditionally been a notable occasion for centuries—dating back to pagan celebrations. The Maypole and the Maypole dance date back further than some of the codes of law which are forerunners of the law to which we pay tribute today. Perhaps some of you would prefer the traditional dances of yesteryear to the speechmaking of today—but, if it were not for the rule of law which exists in our land today, even dancing, traditional or otherwise, might be impossible. Many of you have read that the "twist" was outlawed by the Communist leaders, along with Western jazz. As Americans we do not believe in such arbitrary restrictions. Can you imagine the President and the Government of the United States denying you the right to do the frug and the watusi?

And dancing is but one of many individual activities which is regulated behind the Iron Curtain. I have no doubt that if our President did seek to outlaw social dancing, considerable opposition could be found within the White House itself with his two daughters as its leaders.

On May 1 we express formal tribute throughout our land to the faith of every American in the rule of law and its supremacy in the lives of all freemen. One of the reasons that Law Day, U.S.A., came into being was to provide a dramatic contrast to communism's May Day. What better contrast can be made to the missiles and troops parading past Red Square in the Communist celebration of May Day than the peaceful observances, such as ours, that will take place throughout the country? The Communist rule is a rule of force. Under Red rule the rights and liberties of the individual seem to be secondary to the interests of the all-powerful state and the few men who govern it.

What is the rule of law that we commemorate? It is our system of laws that protects the rights of people, assures the freedom and dignity of the individual, and enables impartial courts to settle disputes fairly. The rule of law derives its principles from our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and our legal system created by our Constitution to safeguard the rights set forth in these documents.

What are the first words that come to your mind when you think of the United States of America? Democracy? Freedom? Government by law? What is government by law? Do we need it? Let's imagine a football game where there are no rules. It would be havoc.

So in everyday life we must have rules and laws and penalties for their violation. Suppose in this same football game the referee made his own rules, judging each player by his own whims? It wouldn't be much of a game. Government without law can result in dictatorship, with each leader determining what is lawful. The same rules might not apply equally to everyone. With each new leader there might be a change of law. The result would be instability. Citizens would have no standards to guide them.

Our laws come from the people, and through our legislatures. They reflect the belief of most of us as to what is right and necessary for the orderly conduct of our society. If we don't like a law, we can attempt to change it. I receive letters every day from people who want to change laws; yet, they abide by them until they can be changed. The rights of all Americans depend on our respect for the law. You cannot play a football game without rules nor can we have a working society without laws and respect for the rule of law.

We live under a system, fortunately, where supremacy of the law exists. Our unique constitutional structure in which the separation of powers is accomplished and the rights of our individual citizens are defined, has resulted in the elevation of law to a position of supremacy as a component of our democracy. The supremacy of law has great significance today at the international level.

Destruction, in this nuclear age, could conceivably be accomplished in a matter of minutes—by pushing a button. The world and the hope for world peace seems now to have only one hope of survival and that survival can only be accomplished if we turn to the rule of law as a means for bringing peaceful solutions to problems between nations.

The theme for this year's Law Day is "Uphold the Law—A Citizen's First Duty." You, as students, may be able to accomplish little as arbiters of the international crises we face today; you can, however, contribute individually to a greater society in the exercise of your responsibilities as citizens.

What do your duties as a citizen include? First, the duty to obey the laws, the duty to respect the rights of others, the duty to inform yourself on issues of government and community welfare, the duty to vote and to serve on juries (when you are old enough), to serve and defend your country, to assist those that enforce the law, and the duty to practice and teach the principles of good citizenship.

As young citizens you may have unfortunately given the rule of law a negative emphasis, thinking of it as a series of prohibitions. But, law can be an instrumentality of man and a positive force for social order. The law prohibits you—yes—but it also protects you. For example, it protects you here at school; your cafeteria is regulated by certain health and sanitation laws applying to public eating places. You are protected as you sleep at night by building codes and fire prevention laws. Law can be restrictive, but its values far outweigh its restrictions.

It is essential under our system of government that we abide by the restrictions of law which are protective and essential and we must assume the responsibilities of citizenship. Every American citizen, including each student in this high school, should make every day Law Day by doing whatever he can each day to foster respect for law and order and insure the many blessings of liberty we enjoy in this Republic.

Polish Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 2, 1965, Americans in communities throughout the Nation will celebrate the 174th anniversary of Polish independence. I join my colleagues in paying special tribute to the framers of the Polish Constitution of 1791. The people of Poland and those Americans of Polish

descent can be proud of this rich heritage of freedom which stemmed from the adoption of their Constitution. This document was inspired by the American Declaration of Independence and it included within its framework the fundamentals of freedom written into the U.S. Constitution several years earlier. It is fitting and proper that we remember each year this document of freedom which symbolizes with our own the will of man to achieve liberty.

While the people of Poland have been less fortunate than we in preserving their freedom in their homeland, they have persevered in their efforts to regain liberty each time it was taken from them by war and political partitions. In addition to their brave resistance to tyranny at home, they have sent to our own shores their sons and daughters who have made a major contribution in our own struggle to maintain the institutions of democracy. Americans of Polish descent who live in Cleveland as well as in other American communities, have been stable, prudent, and reliable citizens. They have contributed in every line of endeavor. They have been a part of the greatness of our country.

It is to be hoped that a relaxation of artificial barriers which exist in Europe will permit greater communication between citizens of the free world and Iron Curtain countries. Communism cannot long survive in its present tyrannical form if it is thus exposed to the free exchange of ideas which would result from increased personal contacts between citizens of our countries.

The 40th Anniversary of the Lions Club, Miami Beach, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Lions Club of Miami, I am only one of hundreds who will offer their congratulations and tribute to the Miami Beach Lions Club on the occasion of its 40th anniversary.

As an example of the spirit that animates those who hold dear the purple and gold banner of Lionism, I may cite the resolution of Florida's Lions which I had the honor to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives on March 26. The resolution "recommended and requested that all Lions, Lions Clubs, and Lions districts in the State of Florida, and Florida Lions while assembled in the next Florida Lions State convention, do favorably consider the adoption of this active program of American citizenship and patriotism. We pledge ourselves individually and collectively to take vigorous and positive action by encouraging, participating, and helping to develop educational programs designed to emphasize the American way of life to include our traditions, ideals, and religious freedoms, as well as our political and economic rights as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and to insure that our children, and the public are informed of the nature of the international Communist conspiracy to conquer the world."

The Lions Club of Miami Beach is only 10 years younger than Miami Beach itself, which celebrated the 50 years since its incorporation as a city on March 27. Of course, Miami Beach was already a going concern when the incorporation papers were signed in 1915. At that time there were plenty of hotels and bathhouses and a furious activity in construction. The man behind much of the activity was Carl G. Fisher who had planned and was building this beautiful resort city. He put up hotels, golf courses, polo fields, and playgrounds. Miami Beach has developed in 50 years from Fisher's plans and plats to a lovely city which entertains 2 million vacationers each year. For its own citizens it provides the services and joys of a true community.

The Lions Club of Miami Beach has had more than its share in the growth and development of this community. How could it have been otherwise, since Lions are men who are interested in good will and good fellowship, instead of distrust, fear, and hate. As the largest service club organization in the world, Lions International has achieved a truly outstanding record everywhere, but it is its achievements here in Miami Beach that we wish to honor on the 40th anniversary of our own Lions club.

Some of the entries for the early years in "The Lion" show how busy the Lions club of Miami Beach was, and describe the nature of the activities that it undertook in those days so long ago. In the April 1926, issue, it was noted that the club "arranged for the extension of streetcar lines; placed two signs of 'welcome' at the city's entrances, and assisted in the collection of subscriptions for the Miami University."

In the May 1926, issue, there was reported "a joint meeting with Miami club to meet President Benjamin F. Jones. Continuing the investigation of the school system with the idea of having the schools taken from county control and placed in the hands of a local board. Assisting the chamber of commerce in their advertising campaign."

The same spirit of dedication to country, community, and human welfare that inspired the founders of the Miami Beach Lions club remains part of the club's greatness today. It deserves every salute that it will receive on its 40th anniversary.

Cutting Costs With Carpets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have been most impressed with the tremendous technological gains our carpet industry has made in the last few years. Carpets are no longer considered a luxury item but are now recognized by experts as a desirable and economical floor covering. The manufacture of floor coverings which wear longer, look better, absorb noise and reduce cost of maintenance has enabled this industry to expand their markets to many new areas thought impossible only a short time ago.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend our distinguished leader, Mr. McCORMACK, his special committee, and the Architect of the Capitol for their foresight in authorizing the installation of carpet in the new Rayburn Office Building. These carpets have created a dignified and wonderful environment, but most important of all, the Government can maintain these floors at a higher appearance level and at the same time save money on maintenance costs. You will be interested to know that they have installed the carpets over concrete slab, thereby eliminating the necessity of installing other expensive types of floor covering. I am convinced that the savings in maintenance costs alone will be more than enough to pay for the carpets and installation within a very short period, and in addition, the carpets have made each office a more efficient and desirable place in which to work.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the dynamic progress which the carpet mills in my district have made. Our research and development programs have been fascinating and the end results have been fantastic. South Carolina is considered one of the leading carpet centers in the world and our plants there are providing employment for thousands of people. They are making a lasting contribution to the industrial growth and welfare of my district and my State.

The installation of carpeting has been for many years an accepted practice in hotels, motels, and many offices, but in the last few years research has proved beyond any reasonable doubt that carpets are an economical and desirable floor covering in schools, hospitals, dining rooms and many other public areas. You will be interested to know that a carpeting is now being designed especially for kitchens. Research conducted at schools where carpeting has been installed shows that the carpeted area cost approximately half as much to maintain at a higher appearance level when compared to other types of floor covering. The savings derived from the use of carpeting in schools throughout the Nation has been most impressive.

The Bender Building, here in Washington, D.C., has installed carpeting in all its corridors and elevators consisting of approximately 1,729 square yards. Based on their own study, the owners estimate their maintenance costs alone have been reduced by $10,000 annually. On the basis of the desirable results obtained from this pilot project, this corporation is installing carpeting in their new office building located at 18th and G Streets NW. Carpeting will be placed in the corridors, elevators and all office space. It is my understanding that a substantial savings in maintenance costs

will be made through this use of carpeting.

Acoustical qualities of carpet are another important factor which have gained recognition in the past few years. Dr. Harris of Columbia University, who has performed extensive acoustical research on carpeting, found that controlling noise at its source was far better than allowing noise to be created and then trying to control it with acoustical tile. He estimated that noise could be reduced in a room by as much as 50 percent through the use of carpet. The U.S. Bureau of Standards has estimated that sound-conditioning properties of carpet were not only 10 times greater than any other flooring product, but actually increased the efficiency of many acoustical products used on ceilings.

The Federal Housing Administration has given carpeted floors a higher rating for their ability to reduce impact noise in apartment buildings. A publication by the Federal Housing Administration points out that the rapid rate of apartment buildings currently in progress in cities throughout the Nation, plus the trend to lightweight structures and increasing noisiness of our environment, "have led to a growing number of complaints to the FHA of inadequate sound isolation in multifamily dwellings." In every series of tests reproduced in the report, the floorings using carpeting—with and without padding—surpassed other floor and ceiling combinations in their ability to reduce impact noise. Also, the carpeted floors tested exceeded the FHA recommendations for minimum noise control in every case.

You will also be interested to know that leading architects throughout the Nation are recommending carpeting in schools, hospitals, apartments and other public areas as a desirable and economical floor covering.

I have been intrigued with the expanded use of carpeting in public schools and the favorable reaction by pupils and teachers as well as the tremendous savings made through reducing maintenance costs. I would like to insert an excerpt from the American Carpet Institute's newsletter concerning a maintenance contract for schools:

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES LABORATORIES, INC., NEWSLETTER REPORTS ON CARPET PLAN NOW OPERATING IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

The current issue of EFL College Newsletter, fifth in a series published for college administrators by Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., reports on a carpeting program developed and operated by the School Research & Service Corp., 5201 Kenwood Avenue, Buena Vista, Calif.

Erwin Somogyi is president of the corporation which offers carpet to schools and colleges at no initial cost with a 5-year maintenance contract.

The newsletter reports: "Via the wonders of American enterprise, seven California public schools opened this fall, their interiors graced by 30,000 square yards, or almost 6 acres, of wall-to-wall carpeting that won't set them back a nickel initially. The carpet is not a gift. The secret ingredient—as they say in the soap commercials—is maintenance."

The report explains that schools contracting for 5 years of maintenance services get carpeting, installation, and service in the same package. This is made possible, the newsletter states, by two factors:

"(a) With carpeting, less maintenance is required than when the schools had hard surface flooring; (b) the contractor, using special equipment and techniques, is able to perform the work with greater efficiency than the schools' custodial staffs. Where a school formerly required eight men to do the job, the contractor can cut it to five. The savings on the cost of the three men amortizes the carpeting. The arrangement, therefore, is not possible without the carpeting."

The report explains that carpets used are of a high quality of the same type installed in Shaker High School, Newtonville, N.Y., and that colors, quality, installation, and care conform to specifications set up by the schools. Arrangements are made for renewal of the 5-year contracts, an option to buy the carpet, or termination of the contract after 2 years with carpet leasing or purchasing.

The newsletter quotes Frank L. Mattox, assistant superintendent of business, La Puente Union High School District: "A thorough cost study was made prior to entering into the carpet and custodial services contract * * *. We found that there would be no material increase in cost by contracting the service. We have been in operation in a new high school under this contract for about 1 month and our experience so far has been in line with our estimates. It would appear that by contracting this service, including the carpeting, we will experience no increase in cost of any significance. We plan to evaluate this program during each of the 5 years of the contract period."

This is impressive evidence of the overwhelming merits of carpeting and is full justification for expanded use of carpet in all Government buildings including hospitals, rehabilitation centers, nursing homes, housing for senior citizens and housing financed by FHA.

I have outlined only a few of the outstanding features of carpet which justify it as an economical floor covering. I am indeed pleased that carpeting has been installed in the new Rayburn Office Building and I would like to commend the carpet industry for the outstanding progress they are making in designing and manufacturing carpets which will contribute to making the new Rayburn Office Building a beautiful and more desirable place in which to conduct our business.

George Washington Good Government Award to Hon. Oren Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, April 25, at the annual George Washington dinner given by the American Good Government Society, celebrating the 176th anniversary of the inauguration of the first President of the United States, the society's 1965 George Washington Awards were presented to the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HRUSKA, and our distinguished colleague in the House, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable OREN HARRIS.

The award, in the form of a scroll, was presented to Congressman HARRIS by former Congressman Harold O. Lovre, a trustee of the American Good Government Society. In making the ward, Mr. Lovre hailed him as one of the greatest legislators and public servants of our time. Said Mr. Lovre:

He has achieved this high standing largely because of his unswerving dedication to the principles laid out for us long ago by the revered founders of this glorious Republic. He is sincere of purpose. He is loyal to his people and his country. He drives himself to the limits of his endurance, and he has an uncommon capacity for looking objectively and in great depth, at all sides of an issue. His judgments, when finally passed, reflect logic, a keen sense of fair play and, above all, the courage of his convictions.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the inscription on the scroll presented to Congressman HARRIS and his acceptance remarks at this point in the RECORD:

Lawyer and statesman, has served the people of Arkansas and the United States almost 30 years: first as prosecuting attorney, and then as Representative in Congress for 25 years, and the last 8 of these as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

His broad knowledge and clear understanding of commerce, gained in long years of work with his able colleagues, have made him an outstanding committee chairman. This all-important work includes such diverse elements as transportation of every kind; public safety in trade, in food and drugs, and in less air pollution; financial underwriting and stock exchanges; communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and TV; and interstate movement of natural gas, oil, and electric power.

Representative HARRIS' character, ability, industry and judgment have won him the high regard of his colleagues, and of the host of citizens whose affairs make up the work of his committee.

Arkansas can be justly proud of her illustrious son.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN OREN HARRIS ON ACCEPTANCE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD, AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 25, 1965

Mr. Lovre, Mr. Chairman, fellow colleagues, honored guests at the head table, and friends all, let me express my deep and sincere appreciation for being here tonight as one of the recipients of the George Washington Award of the American Good Government Society.

I don't know whether or not it is simple coincidence but it's interesting to note that this is the 13th annual awards banquet. It honors a man who originally started out leading 13 Colonies. I started my political career as prosecuting attorney for the 13th Judicial District of Arkansas. I am looking forward to my 13th term in Congress, and as if that weren't enough, my lovely wife Ruth, who is here with me this evening, celebrates her birthday on the 13th. Another interesting fact about tonight's awards presentation, and I am sure that it, too, is coincidental, has to do with my good friend, Senator HRUSKA, and the State from which he comes. Although we appear here tonight as equals, I am mighty happy to say that was not the way things ended up in the Cotton Bowl last January between Arkansas and Nebraska.

After those introductory remarks by my good friend and former colleague, I thought of the story of the widow upon hearing the remarks of the preacher at her husband's funeral. She leaned over and said to her son, "Boy, step up there and see if that is your paw in that wooden box."

At any rate, I feel like the confused and excited recipient of an award who said, "I don't know whether I appreciate it or not but I sure deserve it."

Seriously, to be selected as the recipient of this George Washington Award is a tribute and honor I shall ever cherish. To be included with so many great and distinguished Americans honored by this patriotic organization, one of whom is seated at the head table tonight—my close personal friend, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, of my State—and a third member of our Arkansas team, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, who was unable to be here tonight, but who sends his regards in a nice telegram, is a recognition I have never expected or dreamed of.

I am deeply grateful and humbly accept your generous accolade in recognition of 25 years of service as a Member of the Congress of the United States. It is my fervent hope and prayer that I may continue to serve our country during this pathway of life that will justify your confidence.

As Harold has already told you, back in 1940, a lot of good people in Arkansas elected a young district attorney as their Congressman. I suppose they thought that anyone who had made it through the depression, survived the confrontations of a district attorney, and who had the nerve to proclaim that he could be elected to Congress ought to have a fling at it for them in Washington.

Regardless of the reasons, however, I am profoundly grateful that they gave me the opportunity and that they have done me the signal honor of serving in this great institution during these years.

Many of those same good folks have come to Washington and are here tonight to share this occasion with me. As I look out over this gathering, I see so many friends from Arkansas, and permit me to express my thanks and appreciation for your being here.

I fully recognize that whatever success I may have had, or the contributions I may have made toward better government, have come through the assistance, cooperation, and confidence of the people from my district. This occasion tonight must in a large measure be shared with my lovely wife, Ruth, other members of the family, and the people of my district and State. It is to them that I give the major credit.

I want to pay my compliment to the American Good Government Society, an organization whose heritage and contribution to our Nation, the principle of constitutional government, and the strength of our society, speak for themselves.

The problems of government are always intense and, therefore, in need of constant concern on the part of the people. By constantly calling attention to these problems, your organization provides a practical service of great consequence to all Americans.

As a student of government, I am convinced that the most exceptional governmental system yet conceived by man is ours as originally established under the Federal Constitution in 1787. Prime Minister Gladstone, perhaps the greatest in the history of Great Britain, said of our Constitution that it was "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

As observers of political events, we are familiar with the fact that controversy has raged for 177 years, since the adoption of our Constitution, over the question of its basic purposes.

And yet, the fact is clear to us all that the supreme issue in American life today as in the past is whether or not our political system with its remarkable institutions and their traditions shall be maintained in the face of great and continuous pressure from without, as well as from within.

If we are to resist these pressures, we must first insure a basis of stability without which all government is subject to division, confusion, and turmoil. The first step—the primary consideration—toward stable conditions is, of course, good government, the constant guarantee of law and order, and freedom from chaos.

To Americans good government is better known perhaps than to any other people in the world. Yet, even here there are examples of the opposite from time to time in all levels of our system.

Moreover, to us—to all Americans—good government has come to mean far more than honesty, efficiency, and competence on the part of public officials, which is important and imperative. In the eyes of our people the true measure is in terms of achievement, achievement along the lines on which our Government was organized, instituted, and ordained.

Under our unique governmental arrangement, the people chose to create a Federal authority to whom they granted certain powers, dividing the rest between the State governments and the people themselves—the last retaining full sovereignty in the moral realm of personal liberty.

And yet, no sooner was the vehicle of American democracy in motion than disputes arose as to the interpretation of the rules set forth in the Federal Constitution. In consequence of this, the struggle over constitutional interpretation has raged along endlessly from the foundation of the country until this present day.

The voice of the Federal Government is louder today in the operation of our national tasks than ever before in history. There is always a need to keep the balance between Federal, State, and personal authority, and when the scales tip too far in one direction, there must arise a force to strike and rectify the condition.

To such a purpose we must be dedicated in order to preserve democratic tradition. Let us in our day have cause to rejoice in the fullness of our service, knowing full well the value of vigilance to the cause of freedom.

It is with this profound sense of humility and deep appreciation that I receive this token of esteem, which I shall cherish throughout my life.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 30, 1965

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

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

Eternal God, who art behind the enshrouding shadows, and in them, and who in all life's crises art a shelter from the stormy blasts, and as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land: Thou hast called us to play our part in tragic and decisive years which are determining the shape of tomorrow's life for Thy children on this earth which is our home.

Undisturbed by the shattering events which fling their angry fury across our troubled world, we would maintain an inner sanctuary inviolate and still.

As increasing tests await this dear land of our hope and prayer, we pray that we may not shirk facing the issues of these creative days as we discharge the stewardship of world leadership, or lose our victorious faith in the final overthrow of evil and the coronation of righteousness and truth, but that solemnly committing ourselves and our cause unto Thee who knoweth the way we take, we may come forth like gold tried in the fire.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. STENNIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 29, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(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, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 4714) to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriation therein, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 4714) to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriation therein, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to