from the communication media were becoming generally noticeable. However, our latest studies on this matter have not been very reassuring. I have in my office a report that shows some interesting facts that I would like to share with you today. The report, in essence, shows that if the trends continue, Republicans on television will be as scarce as hen's teeth as the voice of the Great Society is heard in the land. (By the way, my teenage daughter who is with me at this convention, told me this morning that she thinks you fellows ought to be allowed to broadcast a few regular programs between Johnson speeches.)

But, back to this report—did you realize that as of the first of May, CBS has not presented one single Republican on a public affairs program in 1965? It is true, of course that since that time, as the summer reruns create a dwindling audience, there have been a couple of Republican appearances. Still it is difficult for me to believe that no Republican had anything worthwhile to contribute to "Face the Nation" until Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS was a guest May 30.

And, just so CBS won't accuse me of picking on them, the record of the National Broadcasting Co.—as of May 1, the "Today Show" had introduced many potitical guests to its viewing audience, but less than 20 percent of them were speaking for the Republican Party. Why, Barry Goldwater had a higher percentage than that in Johnson City, Tex. And, for those who delight in picturing the Republican Party as a group of tired old men, may I say that any Republican who starts each morning with the "Today Show" and the Washington Post gets grey in a hurry. On "Meet the Press," in the first 5 months of this year, only three Republicans crossed Lawrence Spivak's path. And the last time a member of my party was seen on the American Broadcasting Co.'s "Issues and Answers" the calendar read February 21.

Now, since the election a number of proposals have been made to assure that presidential candidates in future years will have a chance to meet face to face in debate. Most noticeable of the proposals came from former chairman of the FCC, Mr. Minow, who requested that networks be released from equal time provisions and that instead they be required to make available 4 hours of prime free time to each of the major political parties the month preceding election day. I think that if something like this is done, the month before election will be in excellent hands. But, as you can see, it is the 47 months that follow an election about which I am concerned. This is not a sour grapes comment. It is a very sincere plea that your industry which prides itself on high standards, which has often been the model of self-regulation, to hear the implication in these words. It would certainly be ironic if it were the Republicans, traditionally opposed to Federal intrusion into any part of the private sector, who should take steps which would make the "Fairness Doctrine" a stiff legislative reality. At the present time, the only enforcement of the doctrine occurs when a station's license is up for renewal. But, you know and I know who appoints the members of the FCC—and, when was the last time you heard of anyone losing their license for mistreating a Republican.

Finding a solution that will satisfy all parties concerned is not going to come easily, of course, but if the broadcasting industry is willing to admit that a problem does exist, then perhaps we are already fitting the last pieces into the puzzle.

I can think of a dozen reasons why the British rules of governing political broadcasting won't work here in the United States, but I think it is rather significant that during the first quarter of 1965, BBC presented 70 speakers from the Labor Party, 70 from the Conservative Party and 14 liberals. Latest polls taken to see if the people feel that British broadcasting is really impartial came up with affirmative responses that ranged from 66 to 85 percent. By contrast, the results of a nationwide poll conducted by Harold Stern and Jack Boyle were carried in the Washington Star on May 24. It found that only 38 percent approved of the content of news broadcasting, while 54 percent found them unsatisfactory. News was attacked as slanted, nonfactual, and lacking adequate expression of conflicting viewpoints.

And, by the way, in view of all these above statistics, it may come as a surprise to you that I am still an ardent voice in the vast congressional wilderness in favor of allowing radio and television editorializing. And, this is because I still have great faith that your industry is going to have the maturity and the responsibility to work out its problems in this field, not only because you are inspired by the ever-present threat of Federal regulation, but because you know that unless we protect the independence of our communications media we open up additional opportunities for the management of news by the State.

You have many good friends in Congress on both side of the aisle. One very good friend, Congressman WALTER ROGERS, had hoped to be with you at this meeting, but as you know, he had a conflicting engagement. However, I did talk to Congressman ROGERS before I left about the several bills pending in Congress that you have discussed in your panel this morning. For one thing, he asked me to tell you that extensive hearings on the "Fairness Doctrine" will quite probably start sometime in early August. In our conversation, we reaffirmed our mutual belief that the airwaves should be policed only to avoid chaos. We want to avoid attempts at roundabout censorship by the Federal Government and will do all we can to keep communications-controlled decisions in Congress because this is the best way to serve public interest in that we are the elected representatives of the public.

We are anxious to work out the problems of CATV, of the "fairness doctrine" and other matters without setting foot-in-the-door precedents for Government control of program content, but unless you in your industry meet your responsibilities you dull the weapons of your congressional friends who must fight on the frontlines against pressures from people who don't understand the basic law.

In conclusion, may I ask your indulgence in allowing me to rewrite my prescription of advice that I gave last year:

1. Wherever you can in your industry, root out the problems, correct them, and prevent their recurrence. This is the best possible way to keep your enterprises free of public criticisms, unwarranted restraints and justification for the use of the Federal shillelagh.

2. Remember how disheartening and confusing it is to your friends in public life when the broadcasting industry comes to us with a babble of conflicting voices. I understand how difficult it is to achieve harmony on some issues that cut across a great complex of differing interests—but, again, where and when you can, strive for unity on the overriding issues. For only then can your views become clearly comprehended by people in Government; only then can your combined power and influence be brought fully to bear. And, finally, do your best, your very best, all the time to pinpoint the areas that invite criticism, and then move with a kind of boldness and decisiveness you have so commendably demonstrated in creating the ever-improving world of the broadcasting industry.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1801, "In every country where man is free to think and to speak, differences of opinion will arise from differences of perception, and the imperfection of reason; but these differences when permitted, as in this happy country, to purify themselves by free discussion, are but as passing clouds overspreading our land transiently and leaving our horizon more bright and serene." Some things never really change—ideas mainly. Even in Jefferson's time, success (and freedom) demanded responsibility, and responsibility required maturity. Through your wonderful industry every idea can be judged upon its own merit and every man should have his say. I thank you for having let me have mine.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1965

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

O Thou God of all grace, the author of liberty: We pray that Thou wilt enable with the strength of Thy might those who in these fear-haunted times are here entrusted with the stewardship of the Nation's life.

It is our honor to belong to the company of all those who in the yesterdays condemned oppression and fought the good fight for freedom. In the present, while the tempest still is high, we feel our kinship with those who, across all frontiers and borders, and despising all shackles of the mind, however imposed, strive to enthrone the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Before turning now to waiting tasks, we pause for Thy benediction. We are grateful for a heritage worth living for and dying for, and for a deathless cause that no weapon that has been formed can ever finally defeat.

In the Redeemer's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 30, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 30, 1965, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1796) to amend the Small Business Act to provide additional assistance for disaster victims.

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.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

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

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

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur H. Behrens, of Washington, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

A MONTANA GIRL LIVES AS A MEMBER OF A FRENCH FAMILY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a Montana girl, Thora Hanson, of Miles City, has recently spent a most enjoyable year living with a French family and going to a French university.

I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press story from Paris published in the Washington Evening Star for June 25, 1965, which gives a résumé of the type of activity in which she was engaged, and which, I believe, would furnish a good example for other students who go to Europe, who want to be good ambassadors, good neighbors, and really understand the countries in which they happen to be located.

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

"AU PAIR" GIVES U.S. GIRL YEAR OF THE REAL PARIS

PARIS.—For any girl who dreams of living a year or so in Paris, a Montana high graduate offers this advice: Join a French family under the time-honored "au pair" system.

"Au pair" means literally "as equals," and in practice means a foreign girl lives as a member of a French family—with room, board and pocket money—in return for a few hours' work per day.

"It's really a fun experience," says Thora Hanson, 18, of Miles City.

Miss Hanson has been an "au pair" girl most of the year, following a custom popularized by European lassies.

CULTURAL ADVANTAGES

Besides giving them the best possible opportunity to learn the language, the system also provides a cultural experience that may otherwise remain out of reach financially.

In the family of a doctor in the upper middle class 16th Arrondissement (ward), Miss Hanson's typical day starts at 6 a.m. so she can attend early language classes at the Sorbonne. She comes home and meets two of the three children when their school is out at 11:30 a.m. The doctor's wife prepares lunch, Miss Hanson readies the children, makes the salad, and washes the dishes.

She has an hour or so to herself during the children's naps, then takes them for a walk in the park and prepares them an afternoon snack. Sometimes the mother takes the children out, and Miss Hanson runs the old-fashioned washing machine instead. Later she gives the children supper and puts them to bed, much as a big sister would do in a large family.

SEVEN HOURS DAILY AT MOST

"Au pair" duties often include some shopping, vacuuming, and scrubbing of the kitchen floor after dinner. Miss Hanson also answers the door to admit the doctor's patients. It is decreed by law, however, that a girl's duties must not exceed 7 hours a day, mealtime included. She also is supposed to have enough free time for language studies, and a minimum of 150 francs ($30) a month spending money.

Miss Hanson has three or four evenings free each week, plus a full day. She often sees old friends from Montana—her sister and two other Miles City girls worked "au pair" through much of the year.

Some girls are overworked and undernourished, however. The key is in finding the right family, says Miss Hanson. She interviewed about five before taking her last job, and the careful choice has paid off. "Madame confides in me," she says, "and even the 10-year-old corrects my French."

CAN SWITCH FAMILIES

If it turns out the girl dislikes the family, she is free to seek another. The Sorbonne and Alliance Francaise, a less academic language school, both have placement services. So do several agencies. In general, the demand for girls exceeds the supply.

This kind of work sounds unusual for an American girl and, indeed, said Miss Hanson, "My family at first didn't want an American girl, and many of them don't. They have a bad opinion of American girls."

But, she added, once American girls undertake "au pair" jobs, "it does them a lot of good."

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate, by resolution, called for the establishment of a Select Committee on Ethics on July 24, 1964.

That was toward the end of the last session. An election of a new Congress was imminent. And the Rules Committee which had been designated, along with its many other duties, to inquire into the question had not yet been discharged from its responsibilities by the Senate. Moreover, even after the passage of Senate Resolution 338, there was still talk of referring the ethics question to the Government Operations Committee. In light of considerations such as these, the leadership on both sides came to the conclusion that it would be best to withhold recommendations with respect to the constitution of the Committee on Ethics until the new Congress was convened.

Early this year, the leadership conferred on the matter again. Recommendations with respect to the constitution of the Select Committee on Ethics were prepared for submission to the Presiding Officer. At that point the joint leadership was proceeding on the assumption that the Rules Committee would soon complete its work on the Baker question and make a final report. However, new questions were opened at about that time on the floor of the Senate which were pertinent to the inquiry of the Rules Committee. So, again, the leadership withheld its recommendations with respect to the constitution of the Select Committee on Ethics

On yesterday, however, the Rules Committee did make a final report on the Baker matter. And this morning the leadership gave to the Presiding Officer its recommendations with respect to the Select Committee on Ethics, I may say that these recommendations are contained in a memorandum dated March 4, 1965. It was on that date that they were actually readied for presentation but they were held in abeyance pending the completion of the work of the Rules Committee.

I make these remarks, Mr. President, solely for the RECORD. There have been reports in the press to the effect that the leadership was evading or avoiding this matter. That was an incorrect inference but an understandable one in view of the way in which the situation developed and in view of the leadership's determination not to act until it felt the time was appropriate to act.

The reasons for the delay on the part of the joint leadership in responding to Senate Resolution 338 were as I have just stated. It was the judgment of the leadership—right or wrong—that this new Committee on Ethics would be in a better position to discharge its great and continuing responsibilities, if it did not begin its work until after the Rules Committee had completed the task which had been assigned to it by the Senate.

The leadership regards this new committee's functions as of the highest importance, involving a most delicate area of government, where the rights of individuals are interwoven with the special responsibilities of public officials. Its establishment is, in a sense, a pioneer effort because, so far as I am aware there is no group of comparable importance in any of the other branches of the Federal Government.

It seemed to the leadership, therefore, that every effort should be made—even at the price of personal criticism—to guard its silence and await an appropriate moment to the end that the group might get off on the right foot, so to speak. I hope that the judgment which was made to postpone, until now, the establishment of this committee was a correct one. But in any event, it is one for which the leadership accepts full responsibility. The Senators who have been recommended to the Chair would bring to this committee the highest degree of integrity and discretion. I have every confidence that they would work together judiciously and without partisanship with respect for the rights of individuals who compose the Senate and its staff as well as with a deep dedication to the rights of the public and to the good name of this institution.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rise merely to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], for it was the Senator from Kentucky who offered to the Senate his proposal that a Select Committee on Ethics be established. I well remember the day when that subject was debated. I remember that many Senators opposed the proposal of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. I am glad that the resolution was adopted, and speaking for the minority, I am glad today that the majority leader, representing the views of the leadership in both parties, has made the statement that he has, and has sent recommendations to the President of the Senate.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CANADA ON HER 98TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on July 1, 1867, Canada became a nation. Therefore, it seems fitting at this time to extend congratulations to our neighbor on her 98th birthday.

I must say that Canada does not act at all like a 98-year-old lady but seems to be more like an attractive growing girl—and while we are congratulating Canada on her birthday, we should also congratulate ourselves upon having such a good neighbor.

At this time I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Happy Birthday, Neighbor."

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

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, NEIGHBOR

On July 1, 1867, the British North America Act united the provinces which now form the Dominion of Canada. Today, on Canada's 98th birthday, is a good occasion for the United States to voice its congratulations and acknowledge its good fortune in its northern neighbor.

Not only are the two nations' birthdays near, so are the two peoples. Canadian English is indistinguishable from American English. The two peoples share the same pioneering gusto, the same delight in wide-open space. The unpoliced mutual frontier—and it is a long one—is a model for neighborly coexistence.

Since the United States is greater in numbered years, in population, and in developed resources, there long has been a tendency to just assume that nice northernly neighbor is up there without thinking much more of it.

The Canadians, like any people proud of their sovereignty, don't like being taken for granted and don't relish being condemned to living in the U.S. shadow.

Economically, when the domestic pressures build up, they have had to assert their bargaining rights with the United States. Politically, they have felt impelled to remind their big neighbor that while they are in basic agreement on international problems, they are not the U.S. yes-man.

When they are gifted with outstanding statesmen, as is the case with the current Prime Minister, Lester Pearson, Canada is able to take soundings in such ticklish areas as Vietnam and help this country in its quest for a someday solution to its southeast Asian troubles.

All in all, it's good to be reminded of that friendly, soft-spoken northern neighbor. Congratulations on your birthday, Canada, and may you have many more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Republican in this body and the chairman of the U.S. Senate delegation to the Canadian-United States Interparliamentary Meetings since the beginning. Senator AIKEN has done much to foster continued good relations between Canada and the United States, to bring about a better understanding of that which keeps us together and that which at times brings about differences between us. I am honored to join him in expressing our best wishes and congratulations to Canada on this, its 98th birthday and to wish for Canada many, many, many more happy anniversaries in the years ahead. From one good neighbor to another we say, "Good luck, and God bless you."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on Wednesday, June 30, 1965, he had signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 3415. An act to equalize certain penalties in the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933;

H.R. 4493. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap;

H.R. 4525. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the continuation of authority to develop American-flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs;

H.R. 5283. An act to provide for the 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;

H.R. 7105. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8131. An act to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; and

H.R. 8147. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the exemption from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON ON GUARANTEE IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN SALE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that that Bank had issued a guarantee in connection with a contract of sale in the amount of $39,501, covering the export of three bevel gear manufacturing machines to Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other firms, for the period July 1964–April 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe stipends to be paid patients and residents employed in institutions of or under programs sponsored by the Government of the District of Columbia as an aid to their rehabilitation or for training purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the District of Columbia to advance funds to the National Park Service and the National Zoological Park (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1011 OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further section 1011 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EQUIPMENT TITLED IN NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND OTHER NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on equipment titled in nonprofit educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RETIREMENT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, announcing his retirement for physical disability, as of July 31, 1965; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on ineffective and inefficient administration of the training of foreign personnel under the military

assistance program for Greece (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on audit of Southeastern Power System and related activities, fiscal years 1961, 1962, and 1963, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army and Southeastern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, dated June 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on erroneous dislocation allowance payments to military personnel who moved their house trailers at Government expense, Department of Defense, dated June 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF A CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIEN

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order entered granting admission into the United States of Andor Bors, a defector alien (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Yee Min Yow, also known as Gin Shew Ngin, and Isabel Correa de Soto, from reports relating to suspension of deportation, transmitted to the Senate on February 1, 1965, and August 1, 1964, respectively, on account of their deaths; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF PACIFIC TROPICAL BOTANICAL GARDEN

A letter from the General Counsel, Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting, pursuant to law, financial statements of that organization, for the period August 19, 1964 to December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON THE OLDER AMERICAN WORKER, AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the older American worker, discrimination in employment, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INTERIM REPORT OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the ninth interim report of that Commission, dated June 18, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 16

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to incorporate or charter the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerks of the house and senate transmit copies of this resolution to the Presiding Officer and Clerk of each House of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member thereof from the State of Connecticut.

"DAVID GIL PROCTOR,
"Clerk of the Senate.
"JOHN L. GERARDO,
"Clerk of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 42

"Joint resolution relative to continuing the U.S. rice research program

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the legislature that Federal financial support of rice research is to be discontinued; and

"Whereas the support of the research facilities at Albany, Calif., and New Orleans, La., has cost comparatively little and has been supplemented to a substantial degree by funds contributed by the rice growers; and

"Whereas the research carried on under this program has resulted in important accomplishments ranging from new rice products for domestic markets to detailed studies on such basic operations as drying and milling and has also resulted in approximately 65 technical publications and reports and 12 patents; and

"Whereas the value to the industry resulting from the adoption of these developments has been estimated at many millions of dollars; and

"Whereas these developments have had a stabilizing influence on the rice industry and thereby on the U.S. economy: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the 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 restore and continue the financial support of the rice research program; 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, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 46

"Joint resolution relative to the California fishing industry

"Whereas the California commercial fishing industry has historically provided a significant annual contribution to the State's economy; and

"Whereas the value of commercial fish landings in 1963 exceeded $60 million in direct payments to California fishermen; and

"Whereas the actual benefit to the State's economy is estimated to be 3 to 5 times as great as the amount paid directly to the fishermen; and

"Whereas the value of the 1963 commercial fish landings were the lowest since 1946 and the total weight of such landings the lowest in the last 23 years; and

"Whereas the annual landings of commercially valuable fish have been steadily decreasing over the past 2 decades; and

"Whereas among the world's nations the relative position of the United States as a fish-producing nation has declined from second in 1948 to fifth in 1963; and

"Whereas since World War II the U.S. Government has given more than $100 million in aid to foreign fisheries which are in direct competition with the American fishing industry; and

"Whereas imported fish and fish products have increased from 20 percent of the U.S. market in 1949 to where they comprised 58 percent of the U.S. market in 1963; and

"Whereas many countries in recognition of the importance of developing their fishing industries have established substantial fishery aid programs; and

"Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States legislation designed to assist the American commercial fishing industry through fisheries loans and through an expanded marine research program: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Congress of the United States is requested to enact legislation which will assist the American commercial fishing industry; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce and the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 34

"Joint resolution relating to the income earned by youths of families receiving assistance under the aid to families with dependent children program

"Whereas the basic purpose of the aid to families with dependent children program is to assist children deprived of parental support and to enable these children to grow into self-supporting, independent, and responsible members of the community; and

"Whereas the purpose is now frustrated by the Federal Social Security Act which requires that the earnings of employed youths receiving aid to families with dependent children either be deducted in computing their aid grants or be retained for future educational, employment, or other needs, thus discouraging them from seeking suitable part-time and summer employment; and

"Whereas modification of this requirement would enable the youths to justly derive some immediate personal benefit from their employment in addition to learning the values of employment, self-support, and independence; and

"Whereas such a modification would also, by assisting needy families to achieve self-support, ease the burden on the taxpayers, who are now compelled to support families who are potentially capable of supporting themselves: Now, therefore, be it,

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to amend the Social Security Act to exempt 50 percent of the earnings of youths receiving aid to families with dependent children from deductions from aid grants, and to permit them to keep for their own immediate use such exempted income; 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, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative in this State's delegation to the Congress, and to the Secretary of the U.S.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 44

"Joint resolution relative to erecting of an animal-proof fence along the international border

"Whereas, since September 1962, when rabies first appeared in the southern part of Imperial and San Diego Counties and in Mexicali and Tijuana, Baja California, Mexico, there have been many laboratory-identified rabies cases and countless human as well as animal exposures to rabies; and

"Whereas rabies is a virus infection of the brain and spinal cord capable of infecting human and animal population all along the international border; and

"Whereas effective rabies control requires immunization of dogs and the elimination of stray dogs and other rabies-carrying animals; and although there has been an effective program of immunization of dogs in the counties in California adjacent to the border, there is a continuing migration of stray dogs and other animals from Baja California, Mexico; and

"Whereas an uncontrolled rabies epidemic exists in the northern border area of Baja California in Mexico; and the majority of the cases of laboratory-confirmed rabies in Imperial and San Diego Counties and the many rabid dogs which have been captured, examined, and found to be rabid indicate that the rabies problem extends from the Pacific Ocean to the Colorado River; and

"Whereas an animal-proof fence from the Pacific Ocean to the Colorado River along the international boundary would effectively bar the passage of rabid animals into most populous parts of Imperial and San Diego Counties from Mexico; and

"Whereas the control of the United States-Mexican border is within the jurisdiction of many Federal agencies, including but not limited to the International Boundary and Water Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Public Health Service, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

"Whereas there is existing legislation that authorizes these agencies to erect fences along the United States-Mexican border (sec. 22 U.S.C., sec. 2778, International Boundary Commission; 21 U.S.C. 141, Department of Agriculture; 42 U.S.C., sec. 264, Public Health Service): 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 construct an animal-proof fence along the international border between the United States and Mexico in California and take all other appropriate action in order to eliminate the crossing of the border by rabid animals, and thereby alleviate the rabies epidemic in adjacent areas of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 26

"Joint resolution relative to the San Felipe Division of the Central Valley project

"Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Felipe Division, Central Valley project, California; and

"Whereas the proposed construction has had extensive study and review and has been determined to have engineering and financial feasibility and a most favorable cost-benefit ratio; and

"Whereas it is the purpose of the San Felipe Division to provide, among other things, irrigation and municipal and industrial water supplies, conservation of fish and wildlife resources, and enhancement of outdoor recreation opportunities within the counties of Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey; and

"Whereas the proposed San Felipe Division will make use of a tunnel to be constructed from San Luis Reservoir westward under Pacheco Pass into said service area and will, by reason of its location, harmonize with and assist the State of California's water plan: 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 enact legislation, as soon as possible and appropriate, to authorize construction of the San Felipe Division, Central Valley project, California, and legislation appropriating such sums as may be necessary therefor; 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 the chairmen of the Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 43

"Joint resolution relating to the Federal-Aid Highway Program

"Whereas the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways is being carried rapidly toward completion by the scheduled date of October 1, 1972; and

"Whereas the Federal Highway Trust Fund expires on that date; and

"Whereas the continuing growth of the Nation's population and economy, and of its related transportation needs, gives evidence of need for continuing highway programs after that date; and

"Whereas the Federal-Aid Highway Program because of sound financing, long-range planning and orderly construction has been a vital force in the dramatic expansion of the Nation's productive capacity and in enhancing the well-being of the citizens of this State and the Nation for over 40 years; and

"Whereas it is in the national interest that the Federal-State relationship that has made this program possible be not terminated in 1972 but rather continued and strengthened: 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 authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce, with the cooperation of the State highway departments and through them with the cooperation of the cities and counties, to undertake immediately a study to be completed and reported to the Congress of the United States no later than January 1, 1967, to determine highway needs after 1972, and to recommend to the Congress a Federal policy with respect to highways to meet these needs most effectively; and be it further

"Resolved, That the study include, but not be limited to, a review of the desirable extent of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, the requirements by States of Federal-aid primary and secondary or other systems of highways, the street and highway needs in urban areas, the most appropriate basis of sharing the costs among the several levels of government in relation to the interests of each in the several highway systems, the problem of reimbursement for toll or other roads included in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and such other matters as the Secretary or the States believe appropriate; 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, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION E

"Resolution commending members of the North Dakota congressional delegation for their efforts in behalf of the Pembina River development plan

"Whereas the proposed Pembina River Basin development plan on the Pembina River near Walhalla, N. Dak., has now advanced to the point where final approval of an adoption of the plan appears possible within the near future; and

"Whereas there appear to be potential irrigable areas of up to 26,000 acres or more susceptible of development in connection with such project, plus additional benefits including a resulting reservoir which would insure a municipal and industrial water supply adequate to care for present needs, and insure a supply for developments in the immediate future; and

"Whereas the International Joint Commission has devoted much time and study to this proposal to develop the water resources of the Pembina River Basin in the province of Manitoba and the State of North Dakota; and

"Whereas much of the credit for the progress that has been made to date on this project so important to northeastern North Dakota should be given to all members of the North Dakota congressional delegation for their unceasing efforts on behalf of such project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota convening in special session, That it hereby extends its gratitude and commendation to all members of the North Dakota congressional delegation for its wise advice, counsel, and assistance in bringing near to completion this long-sought project for the State of North Dakota and the Province of Manitoba; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies hereof will be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the U.S. Senate; the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the chairmen of the Committees on Public Works; the Chief of Engineers; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; the district engineer, St. Paul office of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation; Chairman of the Canadian and United States sections, International Joint Commission; to Senators MILTON R. YOUNG, and QUENTIN N. BURDICK, and Representatives MARK ANDREWS and ROLLAND REDLIN; and to Gov. William L. Guy, of North Dakota.

"ARTHUR A. LINK,
"Speaker of the House.
"DONNELL HANGEN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution adopted at the convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, relating to equal opportunity in

housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted at a gathering of Americans of Estonian origin in the areas of Albany, Schenectady, and mid-Hudson, N.Y., meeting at Feura-Bush, N.Y., relating to the bringing of the Baltic States question before the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the Virginia Bankers Association, at Hot Springs, Va., favoring prompt consideration by the Congress of a constitutional amendment which would return to the States the power to apportion the membership of one house of a bicameral legislature on a basis other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by certain members of the Legislature of the State of Florida, remonstrating against any constitutional amendment authorizing a State with a bicameral legislature to utilize factors other than population in apportioning either house of such legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Ohio Higher Education Assistance Commission, Columbus, Ohio, protesting against any program of Federal assistance programs for higher education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the Sallas, Tex., AFL–CIO Council; the Wichita Mailers Union, No. 85; the Topeka, Kans., Typographical Union No. 121; the Marathon County, Wis., Labor Council; the Birmingham, Ala., Typographical Union; the San Francisco, Calif., Typographical Union No. 21; the Dayton, Ohio, Typographical Union No. 57; the Worcester, Mass., Typographical Union No. 165; the Tulsa, Okla., Typographical Union No. 403; and the Clearwater-Largo, Fla., Typographical Union No. 891, all favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, to prohibit interstate trafficking in strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Two resolutions adopted by the National Joint Trade Board of the Painting and Decorating Industry, Washington, D.C., favoring the enactment of House bill 6363, legalizing situs picketing, and favoring the repeal of section 14(b) of the Labor Management Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the Virginia Bankers Association, at Hot Springs, Va., protesting against the enactment of legislation to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft Hartley Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Los Angeles, Calif., Cloak Joint Board, favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 2235. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Ingram; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2236. A bill to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (by request):

S. 2237. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manohar U. Hasrajani; and

S. 2238. A bill for ther relief of Fan Keng Yuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 2239. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John W. Cassell, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2240. A bill for the relief of Joseph Marcelino Javier; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

S. 2241. A bill to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States during peacetime; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. MONDALE):

S. 2242. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and other acts so as to provide improved returns to farmers for manufacturing milk and milk fat in cream, to encourage the reduction of excess marketing of milk, to promote the increased consumption of dairy products, to facilitate exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

CLARIFICATION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR MARKING OF OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters. I ask unanimous consent to have a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the proposed legislation, printed in the RECORD, together with a comparative type showing changes in existing law made by the proposed bill.

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

The bill (S. 2236) to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and comparative type presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, June 9, 1965.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is submitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters."

Present law requires the owner of any vessel which is wrecked and sunk in a navigable channel to mark the wreck and to maintain that marking until it is removed or its abandonment accepted by the Department of the Army or otherwise legally established. If the owner fails to mark a wreck, the Coast Guard is authorized to mark it for him at the owner's expense. Once the abandonment of a wreck has been established, the Department of the Army has the responsibility of marking it pending its removal. The law provides that the Coast Guard may mark the wreck during this period at the request of the Army.

The Department of the Army has interpreted existing law as meaning that it has no responsibility or authority to mark a wreck once it has been decided not to remove it. Nor is there any specific authority for the Coast Guard to do so. Thus, under present law there is no provision for the marking of a wreck once it has been decided not to remove it. This creates a potential hazard, since in many cases these wrecks are a danger to navigation. In such cases, even though it may not be feasible to remove them, they should continue to be marked for the protection of mariners.

The purposes of the proposed bill are to eliminate the dual responsibility for wreck marking and to provide for marking of a wreck following a decision not to remove it. The bill would vest sole responsibility for wreck marking in the Coast Guard. It would give the Secretary of the Treasury discretionary authority to mark wrecks or other similar obstructions for so long as in his judgment the needs for maritime navigation may require. Thus, under this authority the Coast Guard could, as at present, mark a wreck before its abandonment if the owner failed to do so. It could also mark the wreck after abandonment and, additionally, would have the authority to continue to mark it even though the Army had decided not to remove it.

The bill would give the Secretary authority to terminate an owner's liability to pay for the cost of marking a wreck. If this authority were not exercised in a particular case, the owner's liability would terminate when the wreck was removed or abandoned as is the case under the present statute. This authority would add flexibility to the administration of this law.

The bill would make no changes in an owner's statutory duty to mark and to remove a wreck or other obstruction. It would not change an owner's liability for damages occasioned by the obstruction, nor his responsibility to pay for its marking.

Enactment of the bill would clarify the law in this area and result in greater efficiency in its administration. It would end the division of authority and responsibility between the Coast Guard and the Army and enable each service to handle its responsibilities in this area more efficiently. It would increase protection for the mariner by providing clear authority for the marking of wrecks at any time the needs of navigation may require.

The bill would have only a minimal impact on costs. Some costs which are now paid from Army appropriations would be assumed by the Coast Guard. Increased costs would only result in those cases where the authority is exercised to mark wrecks which the Army has determined are not required to be removed.

A comparative type showing changes in existing law made by the proposed bill is attached.

Similar legislation was submitted to the 88th Congress by this Department. It was introduced as S. 2991 and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, but no action was taken prior to adjournment.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

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

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

COMPARATIVE TYPE SHOWING CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE PROPOSED BILL

[Matter proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets; new matter is in italic]

SECTION 86 OF TITLE 14 UNITED STATES CODE

§ 86. Marking of obstructions

The [Coast Guard] *Secretary* may mark for the protection of navigation any sunken vessel or other [similar] obstruction existing on any navigable waters of the United States [, whenever the owner thereof has, in the

judgment of the Coast Guard, failed suitably to mark the same in accordance with the provisions of section 409 of title 33. Until the abandonment of any such obstruction has been established in accordance with the provisions of section 414 of title 33, the owner thereof shall pay to the Coast Guard the cost of such marking. As soon as the abandonment of any such obstruction has been so established, the Secretary of the Army shall keep the same so marked pending removal thereof in accordance with the provisions of section 414 of title 33, but the Coast Guard may at the request of the Department of the Army continue the suitable marking of any such obstruction for and on behalf of that Department; and] *in such manner and for so long as, in his sole discretion and judgment, the needs of maritime navigation require. The owner of such an obstruction shall be liable to the United States for* the cost of [any] such marking [shall be borne by the Department of the Army.] *until such time as the obstruction is removed or its abandonment legally established or until such earlier time as the Secretary may determine.* All moneys received by the [Coast Guard] *United States* from the owners of obstructions, in accordance with [the provisions of] this section, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. [No provision of this] *This* section shall *not* be construed so as to relieve the owner of any such obstruction from the duty and responsibility suitably to mark the same [in accordance with the provisions of section 409 of title 33.] *and remove it as required by law.*

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO MILK PRODUCTS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, for myself and my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1937, as amended, and other acts so as to provide improved returns to farmers for manufacturing milk and milk fat in cream, to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, to promote the increased consumption of dairy products, and to facilitate exports of dairy products.

Mr. President, the Congress has not enacted any new dairy legislation since 1961, and we had not enacted any significant dairy legislation for several years before that. During this period there have been regular reviews of many farm programs and substantial changes in wheat, feed grain, and cotton programs, but none in dairy programs.

This could mean that the old dairy programs are working effectively. I regret that this is not the case. Dairy producers have been in serious economic difficulties for several years and the situation is not improving.

Since 1959, as in earlier years, dairy farmers and their families have earned considerably less for their labor than have farmers generally. Hourly returns to the dairy farmer and his family are only one-half to two-thirds as large as hourly earnings from farming generally. Furthermore, hourly earnings of dairymen from their dairy operations have shown a decline over the past 5 years, whereas hourly earnings of farmers generally have increased by about one-fourth. For all the farms in the United States the return to operator and family labor, after deducting operating expenses and charges for capital at current rates, was only $1.06 per hour in 1964. The return for dairy operator and family labor was 61 cents per hour in some areas and dropped to as low as 17 cents in another region. These facts are an example of the disastrous economic condition of many dairymen.

Of course, annual earnings vary among individual dairymen depending upon a number of factors. Operators with large herds have enjoyed higher net incomes than those with small herds. Dairy producers who are able to sell in a Federal market order often have an advantage over those producers whose marketings go largely into manufactured dairy products; but the overall level of labor earnings in the dairy industry as a whole has been below that in most other types of agriculture.

This condition exists despite the fact that dairymen have made major advances in improving their efficiency. Over the past 5 years the annual output of milk per cow has been increased by more than 1,000 pounds, or 16 percent. There have been marked improvements in equipment and in housing for dairy herds. The average output per dairy farm has increased substantially. In 1964 the approximately 600,000 dairy farms in the United States marketed 8.2 billion pounds more milk than did the 1 million dairy farms in 1959.

The dairy program, which provides a basic price support of 75 percent of parity, has kept prices from going even lower and maintained a degree of price stability. This is some consolation to dairy farmers, but it is insufficient, and new legislation is badly needed.

In many dairy areas, particularly where milk is marketed for butter and other dairy products, the price-support floor has become a ceiling. In 1962 when the price support dropped to 75 percent of parity, many predicted that production would drop and the market price would rise. This has not been the case The milk market continues to be depressed by large surpluses which prevent the dairy farmer from receiving a fair return in the market. The surplus was 8.8 billion pounds of the 125.7 billion pounds produced in the 1962–63 marketing year. The surpluses was 8.2 billion pounds in the 1964–65 marketing year. For several years milk production has continued to exceed the supply that can be moved into commercial usage at the price-support level by 6 to 8 percent annually. Government costs have been high, without being as effective as they should be. The annual cost of the dairy program was reduced from over $500 million in 1962 to $360 million last year, but costs could rise with future increases in milk production—increases which may take place despite the low level of earnings of dairymen.

We need to review the dairy situation carefully and to develop new procedures. In the 87th and again in the 88th Congress I proposed a voluntary dairy program to provide direct payments to co-operators—a program which would operate somewhat along the lines of the feed grain program. The Department estimates at that time were that the voluntary program I proposed would reduce Government costs by $37 million, cut the surplus in half and increase net income of dairymen by $150 million. In my judgment this proposal would have provided the most effective program, but the Senate failed to adopt it and I have had no indications that the measure would be any more successful at this session. I plan to keep this proposal in reserve, and I believe that some time in the future we may have to enact legislation of this type if the farm family dairy industry is to survive. Meantime, some action is necessary, and the bill I and Senator MONDALE are introducing today will provide several legislative changes to give greater program flexibility in the effort to improve dairy income.

In the absence of a voluntary program with incentives to restrict production, efforts to increase returns to dairymen will probably have more immediate than long-run impact, because of the extent to which milk production may increase over the longer term. Nevertheless, the changes proposed in this bill would provide additional means of attacking the dairy income problem and of utilizing more effectively the national production of milk and dairy products. They would provide a broader range of methods to deal with the special problems and situations as well as those of a continuing nature.

First. Authority to issue marketing orders for manufacturing milk.

The first change would be to establish more clearly the authority and procedures for marketing orders for milk used for manufacturing purposes.

The pricing standards prescribed in section 608c(18) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 establish standards to be used in pricing milk for fluid use. To make an order effective for manufacturing milk a different standard—such as the parity standard—is needed. The bill I am introducing provides that the price objectives set forth in 602 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, rather than the more restrictive provisions of 608c (18), would govern pricing milk for manufacturing under a marketing order. This change would provide a basis under which higher order prices could be established for manufacturing milk than would be possible under existing law.

Marketing orders for manufacturing milk could take many different forms and be used to accomplish a number of different objectives. It would give the dairy industry itself a greater degree of program responsibility and a means of achieving at least some increase in income, with perhaps some reduction in Government costs. In general, enactment of this provision would give producers a wider range of choice in determining programs best fitted to their needs.

Second. Class I base plan. This section of the bill is almost identical to S. 1915 which passed the Senate in the

88th Congress but was not voted on in the House of Representatives. It would permit producers in a Federal market order to eliminate the blend price. The provision has limited value, I believe, but it should remove one incentive for increasing production in markets where the plan is adopted. The bill contains language to assure that new producers would have the same entry conditions as at present.

Third. Butter consumption subsidy. This section of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments at the processing level on butterfat used in making butter and other manufactured dairy products for which butter can be used, as a means of reducing prices to consumers and thereby increasing consumer purchases.

Under the present price support program the Department frequently has encountered problems in reducing stocks of butter, unless they are made available at substantial price discounts. The Department has incurred high handling and storing costs when large surpluses accumulate.

Enactment of this provision would enable the Department under some circumstances to carry out its program responsibilities more effectively. If programs are developed to increase exports of nonfat dry milk significantly, the problem of disposing of surplus butter would become even more critical than at present.

The Canadian Government initiated a butter subsidy program similar to this in 1962. It appears to have stopped the downward trend and to have increased butter consumption, although it was found that a 10-percent decrease in price produced only a 7-percent increase in per capita consumption. The immediate benefits of a butter subsidy program would go to consumers, in the form of lower prices for butter, but it would help reduce surpluses of butter and improve the general dairy situation. In the beginning a butter subsidy program would likely increase Government costs, but it would give the Secretary greater flexibility in meeting special problems and benefit the dairy industry as well as consumers.

Fourth. Authorize purchase of dairy products at above support prices when needed to maintain greater continuity in foreign distribution of dairy products.

This provision would amend part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. It would permit the President, whenever he determines that there is a reasonable prospect for the development of commercial exports of dairy products, to enter into agreements with foreign governments or with international organizations or nonprofit voluntary agencies to supply dairy products by grant or at concessional prices. The products would go to friendly nations to assist needy persons and social welfare and nonprofit school lunch programs. The agreements would involve only surplus commodities and would be for a maximum of 5 years. The bill authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to fulfill the agreements from its inventories and under certain circumstances by purchases in the market.

One of the principal difficulties under existing law is that distribution through grants or at concessional prices is limited by periodic irregularity in surpluses and by uncertainty about surpluses available at any given time. For the program to have greatest success there is a need to have continuity, which can be provided by agreements on longer terms.

The benefits to needy people around the world and to American foreign policy which have resulted from Public Law 480 are a matter of record. But in addition, the surplus food distribution programs have resulted in longer term gains for American farmers and for the U.S. economy generally. The experience with Japan, Greece, Israel, and other countries has demonstrated that donations and concessional sales of American farm products have created larger commercial markets for our agricultural products, as these nations achieve economic growth. The export records show that commercial exports of butter and nonfat dry milk were much greater in 1964 than in 1960.

Mr. President, this bill will not solve all the dairy problems, but it will provide authority for a substantially broader dairy program than now exists and be a constructive step in assisting dairymen to overcome their serious economic difficulties.

I ask unanimous consent that three tables related to first, hourly returns of dairy farmers; second, data on the dairy price support program; and third, U.S. exports of dairy products under government-financed programs, other exports and total exports, 1960–64, be printed in the RECORD along with my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2242) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and other acts so as to provide improved returns to farmers for manufacturing milk and milk fat in cream, to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, to promote the increased consumption of dairy products, to facilitate exports, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself and Mr. MONDALE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The tables presented by Mr. MCCARTHY are as follows:

TABLE I.—*Return to operator and family labor per hour of labor after deducting operating expenses and charge for capital at current rate*

[Cents per hour]

	1957–59	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Dairy farms:							
Central northeast	66	60	50	57	28	42	41
Grade A, east Wisconsin	69	77	57	88	72	56	61
Grade B, east Wisconsin	21	22	[1] 11	37	22	21	18
Grade B, west Wisconsin	52	49	46	69	68	69	[1] 17
All farms, U.S. average [2]	86	81	89	102	105	105	106

[1] Particularly low because of sharp changes in inventory values or interest charges.
[2] Includes hired labor as well as operator and family labor.

TABLE II.—*Dairy price support programs, 1962–63, 1963–64, and 1964–65 marketing years (April–March)*

Item	Unit	1962–63	1963–64	1964–54 [1]
Support level: By purchases	Hundredweight	3.11	3.14	3.15
Milk production	Billion pounds	125.7	125.7	126.7
Marketing (M.E.):				
Fluid milk and cream	do	53.9	55.1	55.5
Manufacturing milk and cream	do	64.3	63.7	64.9
Total	do	118.2	118.8	120.4
Commercial demand (M.E.):				
Fluid milk and cream	do	53.9	55.1	55.5
Manufacturing milk and cream	do	55.5	56.2	56.7
Total	do	109.4	111.3	112.2
Surplus [2]	do	8.8	7.5	8.2
CCC purchases and PIK exports:				
Butter	Million pounds	347	293	317
Cheese	do	137	122	135
Nonfat dry milk	do	1,303	1,175	1,223
CCC purchase price:				
Butter	Cents per pound	58.0	58.0	58.0
Cheese	do	34.6	35.6	35.6
Nonfat dry milk	do	14.4	14.4	14.4
CCC net expenditures: Purchases (gross), PIK and military milk.	Million dollars	521	448	423
Total outlay	do	521	448	423
Sales proceeds	do	31	71	63
Total net program expenditures	do	490	377	360
Dairy farm cash receipts:				
From marketings	do	4,805	4,910	5,041
Payments	do			
Total receipts	do	4,805	4,910	5,041

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Milk equivalent milkfat basis.

TABLE III.—*Dairy products—U.S. exports of specified products under specified Government-financed programs, other exports, and total, 1960–64*

[In thousands of pounds]

Commodity and year	Public Law 480					AID programs [1]	Total exports Public Law 480 and AID financed	Exports outside Public Law 480 and AID financed [2]	Total exports [3]
	Title I: Sales for Foreign Currency	Title II: Famine and Emergency Relief	Title III		Title IV: Long-Term Credit Sales				
			Donations	Barter					
Butter: [4]									
1960 [5]				294			294	7,726	8,020
1961 [5]				314			314	6,349	6,663
1962 [5]		2,080	22,808	2,000			26,888	8,009	34,897
1963 [5]	1,505	4,547	117,676	127	2,623	59	126,537	67,943	194,480
1964 [6]	4,081	9,243	135,284	12,572	2,233	1,278	164,691	132,593	297,284
Cheese:									
1960				1,113			1,113	7,908	9,021
1961								8,821	8,821
1962 [5]			12,128				12,128	6,959	19,087
1963 [5]	575	978	24,362				25,915	7,677	33,592
1963 [6]	1,058		769			24	1,851	7,235	9,086
Canned milk:									
1960						41,920	41,920	101,500	143,420
1961 [5]						47,576	47,576	91,951	139,527
1962 [5]	32,539		251			18,585	51,375	62,629	114,004
1963 [5]	79,417		864		4,700	1,735	86,716	36,252	122,968
1964 [6]	62,442		427			76	62,945	37,605	100,550
Dry whole milk:									
1960						39	39	25,474	25,513
1961						406	406	15,203	15,609
1962 [5]	2,641					158	2,799	10,615	13,414
1963 [5]	10,306					89	10,395	19,415	29,810
1964 [6]	1,054				44	52	1,150	12,748	13,898
Nonfat dry milk:									
1960	22,162	24,746	300,098	10,924		2,794	360,724	146,164	506,888
1961	17,749	21,018	569,869	22,062		28	630,726	109,288	740,014
1962 [5]	11,016	42,212	623,555	15,889			692,672	180,885	873,557
1963 [5]	26,923	74,066	626,232	21,964	2,200		751,385	367,805	1,119,190
1964 [6]	16,871	40,125	476,439	37,899		303	571,637	739,265	1,310,902

[1] Formerly shown under Public Law 665, sec. 402.
[2] Includes sales at concessional prices for restricted uses, mainly school lunch programs.
[3] Data from Bureau of Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.
[4] Includes butter equivalent of anhydrous milk fat, butter oil, and ghee.
[5] Revised.
[6] Preliminary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] be listed as a cosponsor of Senate bill 99 in any subsequent printings of the bill.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], at the next printing of S. 2196 and S. 2197, be included as a cosponsor.

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

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I announce that hearings have been scheduled for July 22 by the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels, of which I am chairman, on Senate bill 1674, sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of the geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources. The hearings will be held in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building, and will begin at 10 a.m.

The Minerals Subcommittee held hearings on a measure for similar purposes in the 88th Congress—Senate bill 883, which also was sponsored by the Senator from Nevada. That measure was reported favorably to the Senate by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and was passed by the Senate on August 21, 1964. Unfortunately, it did not receive the approval of the other body.

Senate bill 1674 provides authority for the Secretary of the Interior to issue leases for the development and utilization of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, largely found on the public domain.

While the development and use of geothermal steam is certainly an infant industry, it is potentially a very valuable natural resource; and there has been enough activity to warrant still further development. One of the most important probable uses of this resource is for the production of electric power. In addition, in many localities, geothermal steam is known to contain mineral byproducts, such as gold, silver, rare metals, and salts. The production of electric power from geothermal steam has proved commercially feasible, and is in operation at installations in other countries—notably, Italy, New Zealand, and Iceland, as well as in certain areas in California.

The subcommittee will be happy to hear any interested Member of Congress.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have read with the greatest of interest an excellent and timely editorial entitled "A Decision for Senator ROBERTSON," published in the Roanoke Times. The substance of the editorial is that another call for service has been made by the people of Virginia to our esteemed and valuable colleague, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON. Senator ROBERTSON is urged by the editorial writer to continue his outstanding services in the Senate to the State and Nation for another 6-year term.

I believe the editorial represents the sentiment as well as the wishes of an overwhelming majority of the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia. This sentiment is shared by Senator ROBERTSON'S colleagues in the Senate, where we have the daily benefits of his vigorous mind, his active participation in debates, his long experience, and his position of leadership.

I commend the esteemed and valuable newspaper, the Roanoke Times, for the fine content of the editorial as they have spoken for the people of Virginia.

I hope he heeds this call to continued service beyond his present term.

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

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

A DECISION FOR SENATOR ROBERTSON

The recent convention of the Virginia Bankers Association paid Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON the compliment of urging him to seek reelection. We think the sentiment is predominant among Virginians who are familiar with the Senator's half century of service in public office.

Nearly a score of those years has been spent by Mr. ROBERTSON in the Senate. When he turned 78 last month, he received many tributes of esteem and affection from his colleagues and from admirers all over the country. His contributions have been rec-

ognized by numerous awards and citations. The high regard in which Senator ROBERTSON is held transcends political ideologies. Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY once described him as "one of the most able and conscientious Members" of the Senate.

Age has not diminished the Senator's vigor of mind. He is a man of conservative and independent judgment, capable of seeing the Nation's interest as a whole rather than from the narrow view of partisanship. In a time when there is much indifference to fiscal responsibility in Government, Mr. ROBERTSON, from his position of prestige as chairman of the Banking Committee, has never neglected opportunity to counsel caution and discipline in management of monetary and economic policies.

A distinguished constitutional authority and an articulate exponent of moderation in the affairs of Government, Mr. ROBERTSON has displayed genuine qualities of statesmanship.

Virginia and the Nation can use men of his caliber in public office. It is our sincere hope—and we are confident that we reflect the view of the great majority of Virginians—that Senator ROBERTSON weigh the natural inclination to take it easier at his period of life against the opportunity for further valuable service to the country. Given physical fitness and retention of those endowments of intellect which are a mark of his character, there is no reason why age should disqualify him from running again.

SENATOR CARLSON'S SERVICE TO 4–H CLUB YOUTH WORK

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] recently received a special tribute in recognition of his many years of service to 4–H Club youth work.

The Kansas 4–H Foundation honored him for his vision and leadership and for his outstanding service to the Kansas 4–H Foundation in helping to raise funds to support the State 4–H Club program.

As one who knows firsthand the valuable contribution that the 4–H clubs of our country continue to make to the training for leadership of our young people, the efforts of our esteemed colleague are to be commended as a contribution to the entire Nation, as well as to his own State. No person could be more deserving of this honor—and it is an honor, indeed.

I congratulate the Senator from Kansas upon his fine work. I ask unanimous consent that the citation awarded him and the remarks which he made following the presentation be printed in the RECORD.

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

KANSAS 4–H FOUNDATION CITATION TO SENATOR FRANK CARLSON

In recognition of your many years of service to the people of Kansas and the Nation, your very deep interest and participation in 4–H youth work; and further, because of the splendid example of spiritual and citizenship values you have set for young people, the Kansas 4–H Foundation takes sincere pleasure in awarding you this certificate of its appreciation and gratitude.

Because of your vision and leadership the youth of Kansas, through the 4–H Club program, have enjoyed greater opportunity and more lasting results from their efforts.

Your willingness to cooperate beyond the requirements of office made possible in 1948 the formation of the Kansas committee on 4–H Club work, the forerunner of the Kansas 4–H Foundation; the establishment of a State highway into Rock Springs Ranch; and many other accomplishments of real importance to Kansas youth.

Your giving of self as a public official, but more especially as a citizen of Kansas, has made a lasting impression on the future leaders of this State. In becoming the good and faithful servant of others, you have endeared yourself to millions. We in the 4–H Club program of Kansas salute you.

May this certificate frequently remind you of friendships made, and may your outstanding service meriting this recognition continue to be a source of satisfaction to you. Presented this 9th day of June 1965, at Rock Springs Ranch.

SPEECH BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON, FRIENDS OF 4–H CLUB DAY, ROCK SPRINGS RANCH, JUNE 9, 1965

Chairman Critser, It is an honor and privilege to meet with this fine group of citizens who are devoted and dedicated to the promotion of 4–H Club work.

We pay tribute to those men and women who have contributed so generously of their means—their time and their talents.

Today those of us who are present are privileged to observe the great progress that has been made in developing Rock Springs into one of the outstanding training centers for our youth in the Middle West.

The Good Book reads, "Where there is no vision people perish." Certainly Rock Springs Ranch is evidence that those agricultural, educational, religious, and civic leaders of 20 years ago were men and women with vision as they planned this beautiful meeting place for our youth. But it took more than vision to bring into fruition this million dollar plant—it also took courage and hard work.

It was my pleasure as Governor of the State of Kansas in 1947 to recommend to the legislature that we proceed with the expansion and improvement of this outstanding facility "based on voluntary contributions."

The contributions of our citizens have been most generous and to them we express our deep gratitude and sincere thanks.

Calvin Coolidge once stated: "No person was ever honored for what he received—honor has been the reward for what he gave."

Your contributions to the foundation have made possible many of the fine programs that are carried through in 4–H Club work.

The foundation's five-point working program was established in 1952 and was based on the premise that 4–H Club work is an educational, developmental program that will help mature our boys and girls into positive-thinking, progressive, self-reliant citizens.

As a result of 4–H Club work, these boys and girls will be better prepared to shape their own lives and to help develop a better world for others. Investments in 4–H youth pay dividends permanently for the good of all mankind. Each dollar invested helps some 4–H'er or leader to higher achievement by providing incentives—improving leadership training facilities—or promoting international understanding.

It has been said that "the youth of our Nation are the trustees of our posterity."

We in this Nation have a great heritage, but we cannot live in the past. We cannot build just for today—we must look to the future. In fact, we must look to our youth. I ask, what finer group can we look to than our 4–H Club boys and girls.

The story of advancing civilization is mainly the record of mankind's enlarging capacity to cooperate. Today as people think in planetary terms, we can mark the changes that are becoming evident in an age of cooperation.

In our time the whole structure of life has become so inextricably interdependent that the problem of cooperation has become the No. 1 question of the world.

As a result of modern transportation and modern communications, the world has literally shrunk in size.

There is nothing any of us desire more wistfully—yea—more passionately, than for folks to understand us.

To be misunderstood—to be misrepresented—whether intentionally or not—sends a sword through our souls. Does it not follow—since we ourselves have such a ruling passion to be understood by others—that we ought to make an honest and determined effort to understand others?

Certainly there can be no finer program for stressing cooperation and friendly relations and contacts with other nations than that carried on by the International Farm Youth Exchange. This program is privately financed in the United States—combining nationwide contributions made through the National 4–H Sponsors Council with the local support of 4–H members and others. The Kansas 4–H Club Foundation participates actively in this program.

This exchange of students and young people through this program began in 1947 and since that time more than 1,400 delegates from the United States have visited European countries and more than 1,600 young people have come from foreign countries to the United States.

The International Farm Youth Exchange Program now includes 63 countries in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin and South America, the Pacific and the Middle East.

The project is dedicated to understanding as the foundation for world peace. Opportunity to learn other ways of life by living them promotes this understanding. Participants share in their host family living and—at the same time—do all they can in contributing to a better understanding of the customs, life, and culture of their home countries.

While we fully realize the problems confronting your youth and the Nation in the international field, we must not overlook some of our pressing domestic problems.

Our youth—as they assume their responsibilities in Government—will be confronted with the ever-increasing movement of our Government from local and State levels to the Federal Government in Washington. This trend moves quietly, but effectively, and must be of concern to those of us who believe in a strong democracy. Sometimes figures tell a story more graphically than words. Consider these figures, for example:

One dollar out of every five spent in the United States and one job out of every eight now flow from the Federal Government.

In 30 of the 50 States, the Federal Government has more civilian employees on its payrolls than the State governments.

Federal grants to States and localities have more than tripled in the past decade.

This trend toward a planned economy and the elimination of local government can mean only one thing—less freedom and less individualism.

Another great issue facing Americans in this space age is how to get off the launching pad of moral and spiritual deterioration—how to be strong so we can continue to be free—strong not only economically, politically, and militarily, but more especially—morally and spiritually.

We cannot ignore what is happening to those basic fundamental principles and philosophies upon which this great Nation of ours was founded.

One of our great poets stated in one of his poems:

"God help the land—where every day
Its wealth increases—but its morals decay."

We must be concerned about the widespread mass lawbreaking and juvenile delinquency in our Nation today. We must effect

some drastic changes—changes in our behavior patterns—changes in our thought processes—changes in our moral values, if we are to reverse this trend.

Our 4–H Club young people with their background and training are a leavening influence in this period of moral and spiritual deterioration.

The 4–H Club Foundation can be proud of the young men and women who have had the benefit and influence of the 4–H Club leadership. These young people flow into the stream of society with a sound background of moral and spiritual values.

B. FRANK HEINTZLEMAN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, B. Frank Heintzleman, who died in Juneau, Alaska's capital, after a heart attack on June 24, was a native Pennsylvanian who dedicated his adult life to Alaska. A graduate of the Yale School of Forestry, he came to Alaska at the age of 30, in 1918, as an employee of the Forest Service. His professional training and his subsequent experience in that field led to his gradual promotion, so that in 1937 he was elevated to the position of regional forester of Alaska.

Among his lasting achievements was the establishment of Alaska's first pulp mill in Ketchikan, utilizing the vast and theretofore largely unutilized timber resources of the Great Tongas National Forest, which virtually blankets all of southeastern Alaska, a region colloquially known as the Panhandle. In due course, a second pulp mill was established, at Sitka. Both have continued to function at full capacity, and have been essential both to Alaska's economy and to a wiser use of Alaska's great timber resources, which were dying on the stump.

These two were really the first and only major industries established in Alaska, whose principal other economic resources were fisheries and mining. Both of these, as a result of Federal action, had almost disappeared when statehood became a reality in 1959—gold mining, because of the Federal Government's persistence in keeping the price of gold at the price established in 1934 while all costs have risen; and the fisheries, which were principally salmon, because of the mismanagement by the Federal agency which had sole responsibility for its conservation. Consequently, the utilization for the first time, to a considerable degree, of Alaska's timber resources was a most welcome turn of events. The credit largely belongs to Frank Heintzleman.

Upon retiring from the Forest Service, he was appointed Governor of Alaska by President Eisenhower, for a 4-year term. He served from 1953 to 1957. In his private life thereafter, he persisted in his efforts to do all that he could to make Alaska a better place in which to live. He spent the remaining years of his life in working for that purpose. Among his great contributions was the Juneau Public Library, for which he was one of the three principal fundraisers. It and the two pulpmills are, indeed, lasting monuments to him.

A funeral service was held for Frank Heintzleman in the Lutheran Church in his birthplace, at Fayetteville, Pa., on yesterday, June 30. The Alaskans who attended were Mary Lee Council, who represented Senator BARTLETT; Henry W. Clark, born in Wrangell; George Sundborg; and I. Don Greeley was there, representing Alaska's Representative in Congress, the Honorable RALPH RIVERS. Also there was Arthur Greeley, Deputy Chief of National Forest Resource Management, who succeeded Frank Heintzleman as Alaska's regional forester. The honorary pallbearers were E. L. BARTLETT, Samuel R. Broadbent, Allen R. Brumbaugh, Henry W. Clark, Robert A. Events, ERNEST GRUENING, D. Elmer Hawbaker, Enos, H. Horst, RALPH RIVERS, Craig Truax, J. Irving Whalley, and Richard P. Zimmerman.

Frank Heintzleman's service to Alaska will be remembered by all who knew him, and will also be remembered after they pass from the scene, for both the cultural and the economic contributions whose benefits will continue long thereafter.

So I join in the affectionate tribute of my fellow Alaskans in saying. "Well done, thou good and faithful public servant."

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN CIVIL RIGHTS GROUPS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate two articles giving further proof of the infiltration of and influence of Communists and Communist sympathizers in the so-called civil rights groups and their riots and demonstrations in this country. One is an article from the July 1, 1965, issue of the Chicago Tribune entitled "Reds Foment School Row, Daley Claims—Assails Imported Troublemakers." The other is an Associated Press dispatch from Montgomery, Ala., as printed in the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., on June 30, 1965. The headline reads "Alabama Legislative Probers Say Two Rights Groups Are Red-Inspired."

Mr. President, the assertion by the mayor of Chicago, the Honorable Richard Daley, that Communists and Communist funds are involved in the antischool demonstrations in Chicago cannot be tossed aside as coming from "another biased southern source." His attempts to help Negroes is beyond question.

The Chicago Tribune article reports that the deputy police superintendent, Joseph Morris, said that he had turned over to Mayor Daley's office information indicating that Communists are taking part in the demonstrations. The article quotes Mr. Morris as stating that police have checked more than 150 names of demonstrators, and at least 11 are Communists or members of Communist-front organizations.

The Alabama legislative report concludes that two so-called civil rights groups, the Congress of Racial Equality and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee are Communist inspired and that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is actively engaged in promoting the Communist line.

Mr. President, time and again I have presented evidence on the floor of the U.S. Senate and also in the Commerce Committee which shows that there is Communist infiltration of and influence in the so-called civil rights groups and their demonstrations. The FBI Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, has warned the Congress and the public about this danger. The President of the United States is aware of this problem. Even some of the liberal news columnists have admitted that there is Communist influence and infiltration of some of these groups and their demonstrations. Still, no action is taken by either the administration or the Congress to deal effectively with this danger. Why? Because the administration, and too many Members of the Congress, are playing too much politics with the so-called civil rights issue.

I urge again, Mr. President, that the President and the Congress immediately make this question of Communist infiltration and influence in the so-called civil rights groups the subject of a full and impartial investigation and let the chips fall where they may.

In closing my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks the articles from the Chicago Tribune and also from the Greenville News.

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

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 1, 1965]

REDS FOMENT SCHOOL ROW, DALEY CLAIMS—ASSAILS IMPORTED TROUBLEMAKERS

Mayor Daley said yesterday that police files show that many marchers in Chicago's civil rights demonstrations are Communists and charged that Communist funds were helping finance the demonstrations.

He said that some of the troublemakers were drawn here by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which held hearings in Chicago in May.

"You know, those people take part in any disturbing thing they can," Daley said.

RABY LASHES BACK

Albert Raby, convenor of the Coordinating Council of Community Organizations and a prime mover of the demonstrations, accused Daley of "witch hunting."

"He's probably taking lessons from Governor Wallace," Raby said in an apparent reference to Gov. George Wallace, of Alabama. "I wish the mayor were as resolved to settle the school crisis as he is to participate in witch hunting."

The mayor defended his abrupt departure on Tuesday from a meeting he arranged between Raby's groups and the board of education. His leavetaking, in the middle of the 2-hour meeting, brought a blast of criticism from Raby.

"You must recognize that the mayor has appointments made in advance, and we sat with these people for 3 hours on Monday," Daley said.

He said that Raby's group, if they carry out their announced intention to hold night demonstrations, must observe the law.

VOWS OF LAW AND ORDER

"There will always be law and order in Chicago as long as Daley is mayor," he said.

When a reporter read excerpts from a Tribune editorial criticizing the demonstrations

and stating that Chicago cannot put up with a government by ultimatum, Daley said:

"It is interesting to note that over 50 percent of the people in these marches are not Negroes, and yet Negroes are accused of this. I appeal to all decent people and to their religious leaders to set the proper example by following the law. Without law we have anarchy."

Asked if he thought Communists dominate the marches, Daley said he could not answer the question. Observers have noted uniformed policemen taking pictures of the demonstrators every day.

Deputy Police Supt. Joseph Morris said he has turned over to the mayor's office information indicating that Communists are taking part in the demonstrations. He said police have "checked more than 50 names of demonstrators, and at least 11 are Communists or members of Communist-front organizations."

ADD TO POLICE LOAD

Meanwhile, Police Supt. O. W. Wilson disclosed that from June 10 through June 28 the demonstrations have taken up 31,856 man-hours of policemen's time.

If policemen were paid for this time the cost to the city would be $109,287 for policing the demonstrations for the 19 days, Wilson said.

He said that days off canceled must be repaid to policemen, and this impairs the department's overall effectiveness in fighting crime.

Ninety pickets started a new march yesterday afternoon from Buckingham fountain in Grant Park to city hall to protest the school board's granting of a new contract to School Supt. Benjamin C. Willis.

Asked if there were Communists among the demonstrators, Raby said, "Not that I know of."

"But there are no political tests for membership in the civil rights movement," he said. "I don't ask people if they are Democrats or Republicans or Fascists or Communists."

AGREE WITH EDITORIAL

Three school board members—Thomas J. Murray, Cyrus H. Adams III, and Mrs. Wendell E. Green—said they agreed with the sentiments of the Tribune's editorial.

"They apparently came to Tuesday's meeting with the purpose of giving the board a good dressing down," said Murray. "I don't think they improved relationships between themselves and the board."

"I would hope that the leaders would finally decide this is not the type of example helpful to children," Mrs. Green said. "Children are supposed to be the beneficiaries of all this. I would hope these people would seek more constructive ways to resolve the problems."

Frank Whiston, school board president, said he was hopeful "some good will come out of sitting down and talking together."

The Lincoln Dental Society representing more than 150 Negro dentists in Chicago, issued a statement supporting the demonstrations and criticizing a "callous lack of sympathy by city officials regarding our city's long neglected school crisis."

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, June 30, 1965]

ALABAMA LEGISLATIVE PROBERS SAY TWO RIGHTS GROUPS ARE RED-INSPIRED

MONTGOMERY, ALA.—A special legislative committee charged Tuesday that two civil rights organizations are Communist-inspired and that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is "actively engaged in promoting the Communist line."

King and another spokesman called the accusations witchhunting and typical southern reaction.

The five-member commission to preserve the peace made the allegations in a 39-page report to the Alabama Legislature—the body which created it 2 years ago after Birmingham's bloody racial demonstrations.

King, his Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Congress of Racial Equality, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, were accused of promoting the Communist cause and being a threat to State and national sovereignty.

SNCC, the commission charged, is the most dangerous and is involved in a tug-of-war with King for control of the civil rights movement.

"Currently, the trend seems to be that King is in control of the older groups who have the money, but SNCC is getting the campus support and trying to force King to either get out or to lean further to the left," the report said.

It charged that SNCC is "extensively Communist dominated" and ultimately "must be smashed by legal action or we will court a major disaster."

SNCC, the commission charged, is "an extremely dangerous, irresponsible group which tends to promote acts of violence" to gain support for its own goals.

The commission cited paid SNCC performers as stating the organization "wanted violence—preferably to get some of its demonstrators killed in Alabama."

The commission, headed by Representative John Hawkins, said it obtained its information from staff members, part-time investigators, voluntary witnesses, and police.

PRAISE FOR SENATOR FULBRIGHT'S SPEECH ON VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Senator FULBRIGHT'S fine speech on Vietnam recently has evoked much favorable editorial comment around the country. Representative of this comment is an excellent editorial written by Lee Ester, which was published on June 22 in the Idaho State Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TOWARD A SOLUTION

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT has proposed a sensible course for conducting war and seeking peace in South Vietnam. His proposals were set forth in a speech delivered in the Senate last Tuesday after a discussion the day before with President Johnson. They are worth study, therefore, not only for their own sake but for what they might reveal about the administration's intentions.

The Senator from Arkansas opened his speech by declaring his opposition to, first, unconditional American withdrawal from South Vietnam, and second, to further escalation of the war. He opposes withdrawal, he said, "because such action would betray our obligation to people we have promised to defend, because it would weaken or destroy the credibility of American guarantees to other countries, and because such a withdrawal would encourage the view in Peiping and elsewhere that guerrilla wars supported from outside are a relatively safe and inexpensive way of expanding Communist power." He opposes escalation because the bombing thus far of North Vietnam has failed to weaken the military capacity of the Vietcong in any visible way; because escalation would invite the intervention—or infiltration—on a large scale in great numbers of North Vietnamese troops; because this in turn would probably draw the United States into a bloody and protracted jungle war in which the strategic advantage would be with the other side; and, finally, because the only available alternative to such a land war would then be the further expansion of the air war to such an extent as to invite either massive Chinese military intervention in many vulnerable areas in southeast Asia or general nuclear war."

All of these are valid reasons for not pulling out of South Vietnam and for not intensifying the war there. These observations, however, do nothing to point the way to disengagement, which should be the long range aim of our policy in South Vietnam.

On that score, Senator FULBRIGHT offered two proposals. They will not, of course, satisfy those who want the United States to get out of Vietnam immediately or those who believe we could and should bring the Vietcong and North Vietnam to their knees, but they are sensible and realistic nonetheless. First, the Senator said, we must "sustain the South Vietnamese Army so as to persuade the Communists that Saigon cannot be crushed and that the United States will not be driven from South Vietnam by force," and second, "we must continue to offer the Communists a reasonable and attractive alternative to military victory. For the time being, it seems likely that the focus of our efforts will have to be on persuading the Communists that they cannot win a complete military victory; only when this has become clear is it likely they will respond to our proposals for unconditional negotiations."

The Senator sees the short-term outlook as by no means bright but neither is it without hope. He believes that if we are resolute but also restrained in the conduct of the war, the Communists may take a different view of our standing proposal for unconditional negotiations when the current Vietcong offensive has run its course without decisive result. When it becomes clear that neither side can expect to win a complete victory, "I would think it appropriate and desirable for the United States to reiterate forcefully and explicitly its willingness to negotiate a compromise peace and thereafter to join with other countries in mounting a large-scale program for the economic and social development of southeast Asia."

As if to remind the Nation—and possibly President Johnson, too—that the issues are not all black and white, Senator FULBRIGHT included this significant paragraph in his speech:

"The most striking characteristic of a great nation is not the mere possession of power but the wisdom and restraint and largeness of view with which power is exercised. A great nation is one which is capable of looking beyond its view of the world, or recognizing that, however convenient it may be of the beneficence of its own role and aims, other nations may be equally persuaded of their benevolence and good intent. It is a mark of both greatness and maturity when a nation like the United States, without abandoning its convictions and commitments, is capable at the same time of acknowledging that there may be some merit and even good intent in the views and aims of its adversaries."

We can only hope that in the months ahead our power will be exercised with wisdom, restraint, and largeness of view, that the forces of communism can be contained, and that when the opportunity arises, we will again express our willingness to negotiate. As matters now stand, that seems to be the best hope for peace.

AIR FORCE INVENTORY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I would like to address the Senate today on a matter which I consider of utmost importance to the future of this Nation's aerial military capability.

During the past 48 hours, a portion of our mighty B–52 bomber fleet celebrated its 10th anniversary in the inventory of the Air Force. Although the Department of Defense during hearings earlier this year indicated the 10-year-old bombers would be phased out of service within a short time, I am concerned that those later model B–52 aircraft not scheduled for early phaseout are not being modified rapidly enough to assure their retention in the force throughout their programed life of 10 additional years.

Overlooking the controversy of whether or not the high-altitude bombing raid in Vietnam last week actually proved successful, I would point to the fact that these long-range aircraft were used on a "milk run" where no fighter aircraft were expected and with no anticipation of antiaircraft defensive fire. Yet, in spite of this lack of opposition, we lost two aircraft destroyed while a third was forced to return to base because of mechanical problems.

My point, Mr. President, is whether these B–52 aircraft used in the Vietnam raid were our late model jet bombers or were they some of our 10-year-old aircraft? In testimony earlier this year, the Secretary of Defense indicated that 30 B–52A models—the earliest B–52 model—had been sent to Guam to replace B–47 jets scheduled for phaseout. The bombing raid originated from Guam. I repeat that I am not concerning myself today with the controversy over success or failure of the mission, I am only asking whether the aircraft we used were being maintained as well as they should when we lose approximately 10 percent to either flight error or mechanical failure.

We are relentlessly informed by the Department of Defense that the B–52 aircraft will remain in the Air Force inventory until some time in the 1970's, yet the plane actually has been given no mission performance assignment. Testimony presented to the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee earlier this year corroborates that no specific mission has been programed for the B–52. I question, then, how it is possible to program any modification money for the aircraft if the specific mission isn't known by the Department of Defense.

The aircraft must be kept flying for another 10 years since our reluctance to proceed with other manned bomber designs leaves us with a gap in aerial bomber reserves.

Mr. President, what I have said is predicated upon the proposition that there is and shall continue to exist a need for the manned bomber in our aerial arsenal. This is the subject of continuing debate, but I would submit that the militaristic forces in the world today have required us to develop an armed force with the greatest possible flexibility. We have seen once again the need for conventional troops and conventional weapons. And, this is so, so that we may have the greatest number of options to face the multitude of military actions we may be required to face—whether it be guerrilla warfare, police action, conventional warfare, or nuclear devastation.

This same principle, it seems to me, should equally apply to the development of our aerial weapons systems. The course of the Pentagon today with the phasing out of the manned bomber and the complete reliance upon missiles leaves us in an all or nothing situation and removes from our use in aerial warfare one of the vital weapons we may need. This, in a word, is a powerful argument for the continued use of the manned bomber. More simply stated, it gives us that additional option which may by its very existence preclude and prevent nuclear destruction.

Mr. President, I submit today that our B–52 bombers are not being modified adequately enough to maintain their readiness through the programed period of their so-called useful life. It is my considered judgment that we used unsafe aircraft on the Vietnam raid and that, daily, our B–52 pilots are flying obsolete aircraft, made so by needless pruning of modification money glossed over by such terms as "unjustified expenditures."

If we authorized the necessary modification for B–52 bombers today at noon, it would take a minimum of 5 years to complete the full modification of the fleet. The plane must have new engines, structural additions, changes in avionics, and all the necessary measures required to keep the plane operating safely and effectively for whatever mission might ultimately be assigned.

There must be a change in our aircraft policy within the Pentagon, or we shall awake one day in the early 1970's and find that other countries have passed us by in new bomber development, maintenance, and upgrading of operational planes. The B–52 must be kept more operational than is programed, or I fear our military posture in the next 5 years will be weakened to the point where we will have manned bombers more susceptible to mechanical failure than to enemy retaliation.

LUNCHES FOR NEEDY CHILDREN—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, next Tuesday I intend to send to the desk an amendment to the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (H.R. 8370). The amendment would restore $2 million cut by the House—money which would add to the school lunch program special help for schools in acutely needy areas.

We are all interested in the war against poverty. I submit that a quick, relatively inexpensive and effective step in that war would be to initiate the program authorized by the Congress in 1962 to see that the children in these needy areas have a decent lunch.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that material explaining this issue, supplied to me by the Department of Agriculture at my request, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

APPROPRIATION OF $2 MILLION UNDER SECTION 11 OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT TO MAKE LUNCHES AVAILABLE TO ADDITIONAL NEEDY CHILDREN

1. LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

In 1962, Congress enacted section 11 of the National School Lunch Act to provide special assistance to schools serving children from low-income families. Thus far, Congress has not met budget requests under this authority.

2. NATURE OF PROBLEM

Three out of four school children are enrolled in schools participating in the national school lunch program. Each day, about one-half of these children are eating lunches which assure them of at least one-third of their nutritional requirements. Approximately 17 million lunches are served daily under the program.

The record of the national school lunch program is one of rapid and sustained expansion since enactment of legislation in 1946. Last year participation increased by nearly 1 million children.

Despite these gains, however, the program is not meeting its full potential in providing school lunches for needy children. Many of these children attend schools in economically depressed neighborhoods where no lunch services are offered. Others do not have the means to buy the nutritious lunch which is offered, and the community does not have the resources to provide lunches for them.

Under the program, the local community has the responsibility for providing needy children with lunches free or at reduced price. In most communities, where the percentage of needy children is low, the cost involved in providing free lunches is not burdensome. However, when the proportion of needy children is high, a local financial hardship is created. We are placed in the paradoxical situation of making communities least able to afford any extra costs bear the greatest financial burden in feeding these needy schoolchildren.

Where the local community is unable to finance free lunches for its needy children, outside assistance will be required, if the job is to be done. Current aid-to-education legislative proposals include funds for assisting in the financing of school kitchens and lunchrooms. This will be beneficial. However, in areas of greatest need, facility grants must be supplemented by special assistance in financing free lunches if needy children are to be assured a nutritious noonday meal.

Localities having the greatest need for special assistance are found in our metropolitan areas as well as in depressed rural counties. In large cities the problem is primarily one of encouraging expansion of the program to more schools in low-income areas. Many older schools in the central-core sections have never offered lunch services. In rural development areas, by contrast, the problem is primarily one of low participation by needy children in existing programs.

3. WHY REGULAR APPROPRIATION CANNOT MEET NEED

(a) Under the School Lunch Act, the authority to select schools for participation in the program is vested in the State educational agency. With few exceptions, the States have accepted all applicant schools agreeing to operate nonprofit feeding programs. As the program expanded, most States have distributed available Federal funds to all participating schools at the same rate per meal. Some States distribute the funds on a variable basis under which needier schools may receive 2 to 3 cents more

per meal than the other schools. However, the Federal cash payment from the regular appropriation will amount, on the average, to about 4.5 cents for each of the nearly 3 billion meals to be served next year. As between States, the average rate will range from about 3.5 cents in the States of higher per capita income up to about 6.5 cents in the lower income States. To divert any substantial amount from the regular funds to especially needy schools would simply reduce the cash assistance to other schools, many of which are now barely able to meet needs for free lunches.

(b) An increase in the regular appropriation would not be an effective approach in this situation. States would, in accordance with their normal practice, distribute the additional money among all participating schools. In contrast, additional funds appropriated under section 11 could only be spent in schools specifically selected in accordance with the rigid criteria of need set forth in that section of the law. In this manner, the additional funds would be focused only upon areas of acute need.

4. EXTENT OF NEED

A nationwide survey of school food services conducted in March 1962, by the Department's Economic Research Service, revealed that approximately 1.4 million children were eligible for but are not receiving free or reduced-price lunches at school. About 500,000 of these children were attending schools with an operating lunch program. The other 900,000 children attended schools without lunch services. These statistics, broken down by public and private schools, are shown in the table below:

Needy pupils not receiving school lunches free or at reduced prices, March 1962 [1]

[In thousands of pupils]

Item	Pupils in elementary and secondary schools		
	Public	Private	Total
Pupils attending—			
Schools with lunch services:			
Under national school lunch program	470	38	408
Other plate lunch or a la carte services	19	2	21
Schools without lunch services:			
Planning a lunch program [2]	135	12	147
No plans	553	201	754
Total	1,177	253	1,430

[1] Estimates by local school administrators.
[2] By 1963-64 school year.

Source: Based upon information from a national sample of approximately 5 percent of all elementary and secondary schools.

Needy children not receiving free or reduced price lunches, in most instances, are attending schools where needy children constitute a high percentage of total enrollment—the neediest schools. These schools comprise only a small proportion of all schools. The problem to which special assistance is directed is a highly concentrated and localized one.

Let us look at the 470,000 needy children attending program public schools who were not receiving free or reduced price lunches. Nearly one-half of these children were attending about 4,500 schools—about 7 percent of total program public schools. These schools have only about 4 percent of the total enrollment in participating schools.

A similar situation is found among public schools without lunch services. Approximately three out of four children who were unable to purchase a 25-cent lunch were attending 8 percent of the schools without lunch services—or about 2,500 schools.

This concentration of need is reflected in preliminary results from a special study of data from the 1962 survey shown below:

Concentration of needy children not receiving lunches free or at reduced price in the neediest public schools, March 1962

Schools—Lunch service offered and level of need [1]	Needy pupils	School enrollment	Number of schools
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Participating in the national school lunch program:			
Neediest	49	4	7
Needy	29	7	8
Limited need	20	11	11
No problem	2	78	78
Total	100	100	100
With no lunch service: [2]			
Neediest	76	6	8
Needy	14	4	3
Limited need	7	5	3
No problem	3	85	86
Total	100	100	100

[1] Levels of need based upon percentage of needy children not receiving lunches free or at reduced price to total school enrollment:

Neediest ..... 10 percent or over.
Needy ..... 5 to 9.9 percent.
Limited need ..... 2 to 4.9 percent.
No problem ..... Less than 2 percent.

[2] Level of need based upon assumed 25-cent lunch price.

These measures of unmet need, however, do not describe fully the difficulties encountered in many program schools. In several thousand schools listed as needy, or with limited need, the total number of needy children, receiving and not receiving free or reduced priced lunches, exceeds 10 percent of total enrollment.

It is estimated that as many as 10,000 schools may be qualified for special assistance. This is a small portion, however, of the 115,000 schools in the Nation.

Extent of need in urban areas

To provide lunches for more needy urban children, primary emphasis must be given to making these lunches available in additional schools. A survey was conducted by the Consumer and Marketing Service last December of food services in 51 of the largest U.S. cities. In these cities, there were nearly 1.3 million children attending public schools (29.1 percent) which lacked lunch services.

In many of the large metropolitan areas, the older schools in the central cores of major cities provide no lunch service. It is a safe presumption that a large percentage of children attending such schools would be unable to pay for their lunches. The presence of large numbers of needy children in a school, will tend to discourage the inauguration of a lunch operation which will create a heavy financial burden upon a citywide lunch program.

The secondary problem is assuring that needy urban children will receive the nutritious lunch which is available. Participation in lunch programs operating in low-income neighborhoods, in some instances, have been low relative to citywide and national averages.

The need for special assistance in urban areas is typified by experiences in Detroit, Mich., and St. Louis, Mo.

(a) Detroit, Mich.: A special study was made of schools included in Detroit's community action project "area A." The study was concerned with 14 schools in a low-income area with an attendance of 10,800 children. In 9 schools with about 60 percent of total attendance, no lunch services were offered. In the 5 schools with lunch services, only 28 percent of the children were obtaining plate lunches.

(b) St. Louis, Mo.: In November 1964, a St. Louis newspaper published a report containing a charge by a Washington University sociologist, who helped prepare a confidential report on school lunches for welfare authorities, that thousands of children in St. Louis public schools were going without lunches and were too hungry to learn.

During January 1965, a study was made of five elementary schools in the Pruitt-Igoe public housing project area. More than half of the children attending these schools were from families receiving public welfare. At that time only about 250 children of about 4,300 attending these schools were receiving lunches. The lunch was priced at 30 cents and only a very small percentage of the neediest children were receiving free lunches.

The State and city authorities worked out arrangements for special assistance on a pilot basis for these schools which permitted a substantial reduction in the lunch price with special prices for families with more than one child in school. Currently, more than 2,000 children are participating regularly.

Extent of need in rural areas

The need for special assistance in low-income rural areas is the reverse of the urban situation. Particularly in the South, most schools have lunch programs. In some of the more isolated areas, however, there are still considerable numbers of small one- and two-teacher schools which have been unable to finance a lunch program.

A study was made in the 300 most depressed rural counties as identified by the Office of Economic Opportunity—located in 20 States. A total of 851 public schools in 123 of these counties lack lunch services. An estimated 85,000 children attend these schools. They constitute about 7 percent of total school enrollment in the 300-county area.

The primary rural problem is assuring that children in impoverished areas who cannot buy the lunch which is offered can obtain it free or at a reduced price he or she can pay. In Georgia, participation in three low-income rural counties was compared with statewide average participation in the lunch program. In the 3-county area, participation was 20 percent less than the State average. In Alabama and Arkansas, similar comparisons also showed lower participation, by approximately 15 percent and 10 percent, respectively.

In each of these low-income areas, the proportions of free lunches served were substantial—approximating the statewide average in each instance. This shows that these depressed communities are working at the task of providing free lunches to their needy children.

5. SPECIAL ASSISTANCE APPROACH

Our experience indicates that the most effective way to assure school lunches for needy children is through special cash assistance. This assistance should be offered to schools in economically depressed areas where a large proportion of the children would be qualified to receive free or substantially reduced-price meals if an adequate school lunch program were to be operated.

Section 11 of the National School Lunch Act provides the authority and sets forth the mechanics for satisfactorily carrying out this special assistance program. Section 11 has been in effect since 1962, but no funds have been appropriated in response to budget requests.

Funds appropriated under section 11 are separate from the regular appropriation for the national school lunch program. Section 11 funds are apportioned among the States under a separate formula. The approximate initial distribution among the States of a $2 million appropriation is attached. The legislation provides that in the event certain States are unable to use the funds apportioned to them, such funds may be reapportioned to other States.

Section 11 sets up controls needed to assure that funds reach the local schools having the greatest need. In order to approve individual schools for special assistance, State agencies are required to consider: (1) The economic conditions of the area from which the school draws attendance, (2) the number of free lunches already being served and the additional number required, (3) the price charged to paying pupils compared with the average lunch price paid in the State, and (4) the current financial position of the school.

During the past several years in the absence of any section 11 funds, efforts have been made to meet problems posed by needy children through the regular school lunch assistance program. The Department has encouraged State school lunch agencies to provide special assistance funds to very needy schools, from their current resources of Federal funds and commodities. Specifically, States have been urged to provide up to 15 cents per lunch to schools in this category. Also, they have been requested to provide supplemental quantities of available commodities, particularly those in limited supply.

Results have demonstrated that the amount of funds generated through the regular school lunch assistance program is not sufficient to meet the problem. Special assistance could be carried out only on a pilot or very limited basis.

Progress has been limited in relation to the total problem. However, results of the special efforts graphically illustrate what can be attained through the special assistance approach.

Experience with special assistance

Kentucky

In impoverished areas of Appalachian Kentucky, through special assistance, the national school lunch program was extended to 385 small schools. Nearly 10,000 children now are receiving nutritious school lunches for the first time. We are informed that school attendance has increased, and improvements in health have been noted. Also, local food purchases account for an additional $28,000 each month moving into commercial channels.

Few of the children now participating in the Kentucky project could afford to pay more than 10 to 15 cents per lunch. Many could not pay anything. Without special assistance, this expansion of the program could not have occurred.

Virginia

Special assistance in the form of a 15-cent reimbursement per lunch was made available in schools in coal mining areas. Now, 7,000 children in 77 one- and two-room schools can obtain a school lunch.

Georgia

In Columbia County, Ga., special assistance was offered to four schools with lunch services which were located in low-income areas. When lunch prices were reduced sharply, participation increased from 43 percent to more than 70 percent of total enrollment.

Colorado

In two private schools in Denver, Colo., which receive special assistance reimbursement (15 cents), all of the pupils in attendance are participating in the program.

Texas

The Encinal School in south Texas received special assistance at the rate of 10 cents per lunch. This enabled the school to offer lunches at 10 cents and to meet free lunch requirements adequately. Participation has risen from 55 children last year to 96 children during the current school year.

North Carolina

In North Carolina, 87 schools received special assistance. Of these, 32 schools received reimbursement of 8 to 9 cents per lunch, and 55 schools were granted above 9 cents. Average participation increased 15 percent—from 48 to 63 percent. Total attendance in these 87 schools increased by 10 percent.

Illinois

In Cairo, Ill., a special reimbursement of 15 cents was provided to one school. Lunch prices were reduced from 25 cents to 10 cents. Participation increased by 57 percent.

Estimated apportionment of special cash assistance budgeted for fiscal year 1966 (sec. 11, NSLA)

State	Number of free lunches, fiscal year 1964	Assistance need rate	State index in units of 100	State quotient	Based on estimate of $2,000,000	
					Initial apportionment of 50 percent	Apportionment of 100 percent of amount estimated
Alabama	5,231,174	7.5	3,923,380	3.06794	$29,759	$59,518
Alaska	643,185	5.0	321,592	.25147	2,439	4,879
Arizona	2,027,942	5.6	1,135,648	.88804	8,614	17,228
Arkansas	3,150,624	7.8	2,457,487	1.92167	18,640	37,280
California	5,549,270	5.0	2,774,635	2.16966	21,046	42,091
Colorado	1,396,607	5.0	698,304	.54605	5,297	10,593
Connecticut	717,088	5.0	358,544	.28037	2,720	5,439
Delaware	134,036	5.0	67,018	.05241	508	1,017
District of Columbia	1,453,870	5.0	726,935	.56844	5,514	11,028
Florida	8,037,977	5.8	4,662,027	3.64554	35,362	70,723
Georgia	8,093,606	6.7	5,422,716	4.24037	41,132	82,263
Guam	(101,864)			(.21142)	127	127
Hawaii	807,518	5.0	403,759	.31572	3,062	6,125
Idaho	293,561	6.2	182,008	.14232	1,380	2,761
Illinois	3,814,895	5.0	1,907,448	1.49155	14,468	28,936
Indiana	2,211,639	5.0	1,105,820	.86471	8,388	16,775
Iowa	1,823,204	5.4	984,530	.76987	7,468	14,935
Kansas	763,905	5.4	412,509	.32257	3,129	6,258
Kentucky	9,675,165	6.9	6,675,864	5.22028	50,637	101,273
Louisiana	12,578,156	7.0	8,804,709	6.88496	66,784	133,568
Maine	1,334,973	6.1	814,334	.63678	6,177	12,354
Maryland	1,384,125	5.0	692,062	.54117	5,249	10,499
Massachusetts	3,501,521	5.0	1,750,760	1.36903	13,280	26,559
Michigan	4,177,672	5.0	2,088,836	1.63339	15,844	31,688
Minnesota	2,690,193	5.3	1,425,802	1.11493	10,815	21,630
Mississippi	4,354,287	9.0	3,918,858	3.06441	29,725	59,450
Missouri	3,128,514	5.0	1,564,257	1.22319	11,865	23,730
Montana	1,081,781	5.5	594,980	.46525	4,513	9,026
Nebraska	1,380,463	5.2	717,841	.56133	$5,445	$10,890
Nevada	216,933	5.0	108,466	.08482	823	1,646
New Hampshire	526,418	5.3	279,002	.21817	2,116	4,232
New Jersey	2,138,185	5.0	1,069,092	.83599	8,109	16,218
New Mexico	2,961,652	6.4	1,895,457	1.48218	14,377	28,754
New York	51,822,194	5.0	25,911,097	20.26154	196,537	393,074
North Carolina	6,312,128	6.8	4,292,247	3.35638	32,557	65,114
North Dakota	852,804	6.0	511,682	.40012	3,881	7,762
Ohio	6,267,326	5.0	3,133,663	2.45041	23,769	47,538
Oklahoma	3,934,378	6.2	2,439,314	1.90746	18,502	37,005
Oregon	630,340	5.0	315,170	.24645	2,390	4,781
Pennsylvania	9,728,145	5.0	4,864,072	3.80353	36,894	73,788
Puerto Rico	(46,305,813)			(96.10946)	57,666	57,666
Rhode Island	201,277	5.1	102,651	.08027	779	1,557
South Carolina	6,627,933	7.8	5,169,788	4.04259	39,213	78,426
South Dakota	895,403	6.1	546,196	.42711	4,143	8,286
Tennessee	9,307,040	7.0	6,514,928	5.09444	49,416	98,832
Texas	8,897,698	5.9	5,249,642	4.10503	39,819	79,638
Utah	1,084,069	5.7	617,919	.48319	4,687	9,374
Vermont	434,234	5.8	251,856	.19694	1,910	3,821
Virginia	4,438,506	6.0	2,663,104	2.08245	20,200	40,400
Virgin Islands	(1,237,041)			(2.56753)	1,540	1,540
Washington	1,643,184	5.0	821,592	.64245	6,232	12,464
West Virginia	4,600,078	6.6	3,036,051	2.37408	23,028	46,057
Wisconsin	2,802,019	5.1	1,429,030	1.11745	10,839	21,679
Wyoming	136,906	5.0	68,453	.05353	519	1,038
American Samoa	(535,567)			(1.11159)	667	667
Total	266,076,086		127,883,135		1,030,000	2,000,000

CIVIL RIGHTS—COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we are accustomed to reading in the daily newspapers about incidents here and there brought about by passions connected with the current civil rights situation. Yet few have seen fit to comment upon the many more successful occasions of community leaders working together to bring about compliance with the law through reasons and understanding. In cities and towns across America the law is being given effect. And it is being given effect against a peaceful background because reasonable men of different backgrounds have decided that cooperation and understanding should replace mistrust and suspicion. For every ugly incident there are hundreds of examples of integration without incident. We have not solved all our problems by any means, but administration efforts to smooth the transition brought about by civil rights legislation certainly auger well for the future.

The administration very wisely foresaw its responsibilities in this area and it has met them in a variety of ways. None more effective than the Community Relations Service. This organization has quite unobtrusively brought about hundreds of peaceful solutions to community problems. It has worked hard on every front, North and South, to build mutual confidence among community leaders

and to create an atmosphere where constructive ideas can be substituted for the blind passion of earlier days.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not think we have fully measured the tremendous job that has been done in this area. President Johnson has given top priority to the task. He made a remarkably good appointment in picking Governor Collins to take charge of the effort. And he has given it his closest attention and support.

Now the President has seen fit to elevate Governor Collins to a position of even wider responsibility. He has gotten us well on the road to an appropriate solution of community civil rights problems. I am confident that the President will provide the American people with still another excellent leader in this area.

Mr. President, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Daily News of June 24, 1965, expressing appreciation for the noteworthy accomplishments of Governor Collins and more generally for the way the problem of civil rights is being solved.

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

A GOOD MIDDLEMAN

It is always difficult to judge a man by what didn't happen.

But those in the front line in the most serious civil rights conflicts know that but for LeRoy Collins and the people who worked for him in the Community Relations Service, some situations that could have become tragic never got completely out of hand.

Wherever there was bad trouble, there were Collins' men—almost completely anonymous—going from one group of antagonists to the other trying to get them together.

Mr. Collins himself played this role on more than one occasion—notably on the second attempt of Dr. Martin Luther King and his followers to make the Selma-to-Montgomery march with Alabama highway patrolmen barring their path.

There are few spots in which it is as difficult to be a middleman as civil rights, but LeRoy Collins succeeded in winning and keeping the confidence of both sides.

Now the President has named Mr. Collins Under Secretary of Commerce. He merits this promotion and should do well in it.

The trouble is that it's going to be hard to find a man to take Mr. Collins place.

SENATE BILL 2069, TO FACILITATE REPLACEMENT OF OBSOLETE VESSELS WITH MORE MODERN VESSELS FROM THE U.S. RESERVE FLEET

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in support of Senate bill 2069, which is designed to facilitate the replacement of obsolete vessels with more modern vessels from the U.S. Reserve fleet.

I need not stress the importance to the United States of a strong merchant marine. The Soviet Union and many of the nations of Western Europe, as well, have recently been engaged in a strong effort to build up their commercial fleets. Unless this country takes action to encourage the modernization and replacement of the obsolete vessels in the private merchant marine, we may find ourselves the low man on the totem pole of international shipping.

Senate bill 2069 will broaden the provisions which enable private, nonsubsidized shippers to exchange their old vessels for more modern vessels from the U.S. reserve fleet.

Such a program means more modern and efficient vessels for our commercial shippers, additional ship-conversion work for American shipyards, more jobs for shipyard workers; and, even more important, increased capacity to handle our share of international commercial shipping. Enactment of this bill, moreover, will involve no additional cost to the Government.

The passage of this bill will be a step toward fuller achievement of the objectives of our national maritime policy. Therefore, I urge the enactment of Senate bill 2069.

CANADA DAY, JULY 1, 1965

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, today our friends to the north are celebrating their annual "Canada Day," marking 98 years as a federal state. As we approach our Fourth of July commemoration, it seems appropriate that we call attention to the long history of friendship and mutual cooperation that has existed between the United States and Canada.

The enduring partnership between the two nations is dramatically represented by an unguarded border, which in over 150 years has never been menaced by threats of war. In recognition of the continual harmony between the two Governments, the State of North Dakota and the Province of Manitoba 33 years ago created the International Peace Garden. It is the only garden dedicated to this friendship along the 3,986 miles of border between the two nations. The elegantly landscaped gardens, nestled in the Turtle Mountains between North Dakota and Manitoba, provide tourists from both countries an opportunity to meet and renew this old friendship.

Another example of the spirit of good neighborliness is the International Joint Commission, established in 1909 to consider boundary water questions arising between the United States and Canada. Earlier this month the Commission met at Walhalla, N. Dak., and Manitu, Manitoba, to take public testimony on the proposed Pembina River Basin development project. This $35 million multiple-purpose project will provide flood control, irrigation, recreation, municipal and industrial water supplies, and fish and wildlife development. When completed the project will stand as another demonstration of the mutual spirit of cooperation that exists between the United States and Canada.

The pledge inscribed at the International Peace Garden Monument, "That as long as men shall live, we will not take up arms against one another," is particularly meaningful as we share in celebrating our Independence Days.

I salute the people of Canada on this day and on behalf of the people of North Dakota extend warm greetings to our neighbors to the north on the occasion of Canada Day.

APPLICABILITY OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964 TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WITH FRATERNITIES WHICH PRACTICE DE FACTO SEGREGATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, last Friday the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] called our attention to a recent statement by Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, in reference to the applicability of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to colleges and universities with fraternities which practice de facto segregation. The distinguished Senator read into the RECORD two of the many public comments on Mr. Keppel's action. His selection was limited to statements made by David Lawrence and the National Observer.

Since those two statements did not include the text of Mr. Keppel's statement and other important factual data pertinent to the issue, I ask unanimous consent, first, that the original correspondence in which Mr. Keppel's statement was made be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Alpha Omega—Stanford chapter of Sigma Chi, addressed to its alumni, be inserted in the RECORD. This letter is a defense of the local chapter's right to select its members without encroachment from the national chapter. This is local autonomy, which should meet with the approval of many Senators.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD samples of some of the wide press coverage and reaction to the controversy. Included in this selection are two factual articles which were published in the New York Times, which has been following the situation from the beginning—one article on April 14, and the other on June 18; Time magazine published an excellent summary on page 52 of its June 25 edition; an early editorial—on April 19—in the Palo Alto, Calif., Times defends the Stanford chapter's position; and an editorial praising Mr. Keppel's decision was published on June 21 by a distinguished southern newspaper, the St. Petersburg Times.

I hope these samples will provide a more objective and factual view of the matter.

There being no objection, the correspondence, articles, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 7, 1965.

Hon. FRANCIS KEPPEL,
Commissioner, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER KEPPEL: Recent events involving my college chapter of Sigma Chi prompt me to ask what position your office would take on the continued distribution of Federal funds to educational institutions recognizing any national fraternity shown to practice de facto racial or religious discrimination.

This question arises from title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the administrative regulations pursuant to it, issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the approval of the White House. In particular, it relates to questions

8 and 9, as stated in the explanation of HEW form 441, which reads in part as follows:

"Question. What effect will the regulation have on a college or university's admission practices or other practices related to the treatment of students?

"Answer. An institution of higher education which applies for any Federal financial assistance of any kind must agree that it will make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in the admission practices or any other practices of the institution relating to the treatment of students.

"(c) 'Other practices relating to the treatment of students' include the affording to students of opportunities to participate in any educational, research, cultural, athletic, recreational, social, or other program or activity; * * * making available to students any housing, eating, health, or recreational service; * * * and making available for the use of students any building, room, space, materials, equipment, or other facility or property.

"Question. Does the assurance of nondiscrimination apply to the entire operation of any institution?

"Answer. Insofar as the assurance given by the applicant relates to the admission or other treatment of individuals as students, patients * * * or to the opportunity to participate in the provision of services, financial aid, or other benefits to such individuals, the assurance applies to the entire institution."

As you no doubt are aware, several national fraternities have removed racial and religious clauses from their constitution, ritual and other published materials. Some, however, have substituted so-called social acceptability clauses which may be used to continue de facto discrimination in the selection of their members.

Recognizing the difficulty of establishing the fact that any fraternity does, in effect, practice racial or religious discrimination, and understanding that the precise relationship of national fraternities to educational institutions may vary from one campus to another, I would appreciate your comments on whether your office would recommend the continued allocation of funds to institutions receiving aid under the National Defense Education Act, for example, where these institutions officially recognized or in any way supported fraternities or other organizations shown to practice de facto racial or religious discrimination.

Very truly yours,

LEE METCALF.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1965.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Thank you for your letter inquiring about the impact of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 on educational institutions recognizing any national organization practicing racial or religious discrimination.

As you know, title VI, section 601, reads very clearly:

"No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

As you note in your letter, the explanation of the assurance of compliance issued pursuant to title VI by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is quite explicit, reading in part as follows:

"An institution of higher education which applies for any Federal financial assistance of any kind must agree that it will make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in the admission practices or any other practices of the institution relating to the treatment of students. * * *

"Other practices * * * include the affording to students of opportunities to participate in any educational, research, cultural, athletic, recreational, social, or other program or activity * * * making available to students any housing, eating, health, or recreational service * * * and making available for the use of students any building, room, space, materials, equipment, or other facility or property."

This language makes it apparent that an institution which maintains a fraternity system as a part of its activities and overall program is responsible under the Civil Rights Act requirements for assuring that discrimination is not practiced by the fraternities in the system.

To my knowledge, the suspension of Sigma Chi at Stanford by the fraternity's national executive committee is the first major test involving de facto discrimination within a national fraternity to develop since passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As such, it seems certain to attract wide public interest.

Of prime importance to me, however, is the fact that the chapter, the university, and prominent fraternity alumni like yourself have united in an effort to eliminate any discriminatory practices from within the national organization on a wholly voluntary basis.

This kind of enlightened leadership not only hastens the day when all Americans will enjoy equality of opportunity, it also enhances the best long-term interests of all our voluntary organizations.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS KEPPEL,
U.S. Commissioner of Education.

SIGMA CHI FRATERNITY, ALPHA OMEGA CHAPTER, STANFORD UNIVERSITY,
Stanford, Calif., April 16, 1965.

DEAR ALPHA OMEGA ALUMNUS: As an alumnus of this chapter you no doubt have felt a sincere interest in the turmoil recently generated by the decision of the grand consul and the executive committee to temporarily suspend our charter. Through past communications, our own, as well as those of several interested alumni, you are probably aware of our longstanding controversy with the national concerning a local chapter's right to pledge an individual regardless of race, creed, or color. We have long desired to be able to enter our spring quarter rush on a nondiscriminatory basis and, accordingly, made this intention clear to the national.

The active members of Alpha Omega feel justified in standing up for that which we believe to be right for both ourselves and the national fraternity. We are very appreciative of the many positive responses we have already received strongly supporting our position.

Our efforts to resolve this question throughout the past 3 years have yielded various suggestions. The most frequent response has been that we continue to work within the framework of the national fraternity, and we are attempting to fulfill that wish. We are very proud of our affiliation with Sigma Chi and hope to continue to remain an active, positively contributing member in the best traditions of the fraternity.

However, we do not intend to sacrifice our own moral principles to the power of the executive committee to veto an initiate due to his "personal unacceptability" when a criterion for his "acceptability" is his race, color, or creed. We intend to continue to work on this problem within the national framework and are hopeful that we can soon obtain a fair and unbiased hearing from the national officers, at which time we will be allowed to present what we feel to be the real facts and issues of this controversy.

Certainly we have been somewhat lax in our observance of some aspects of fraternity ritual involved with chapter meetings. From what we find in the records, you might recall a similar situation when you were living in the house. However, we have taken definite steps to rectify any such grievances the national might have with us, and we are now holding formal chapter meetings regularly. As you are probably aware, our initiations have always been held in strict accordance with Sigma Chi ritual and we have received compliments for the excellence of these ceremonies.

Grand Consul Harry Wade's other alleged reasons for suspending our chapter (i.e., "seething with animosity toward the national," "having a dirty house," and that Stanford University is opposed to national fraternities) are even more ill-founded. We feel that our present suspension is directly the result of our opposition to de facto discrimination within Sigma Chi.

The following excerpts from relevant correspondence might prove interesting to you:

On February 18, 1964, Wade wrote to Alpha Omega: "Generally speaking it would seem to me that your group is in pretty good shape from the physical sense but the main difficulty is your attitude toward the general fraternity. Having been an undergraduate member of the Cornell chapter back in the 1920's this attitude is not exactly unfamiliar to me. In fact, I probably was as guilty a culprit as anybody could be in the pose of 'pooh-pooh' to the national. In other words, I would challenge any undergraduate to be more flippant toward the national fraternity than was the present grand consul—so under the circumstances I have been there, Charlie."

On February 4, 1965, the chapter wrote Wade: "Therefore, we of Alpha Omega Chapter at Stanford University wish to go on record in affirming our belief that—in evaluating a student for membership we should not be influenced in any way by his race, color, creed, or national origin."

Wade replied on February 8, 1965: "As you well know, Sigma Chi has nothing in the public constitution, statutes, or other laws or in secret ritual that keeps anyone out of our fraternity because of his race, creed, or ethnic background."

On February 17, 1965, Wade stated: "You can't hang a man or should not, just for talking, although it has been done. However, if you take the slightest illegal step, which I don't think you will, I shall endeavor to get the executive committee to move most promptly in dealing with your case."

In the few weeks preceding our suspension we were under the impression from conversations and communication with national officers that at present there was no serious criticism of our chapter's behavior other than our announced views regarding membership policies of Sigma Chi.

The issue seems clear cut to us. We have never attempted, nor will we ever attempt to defy any of the rules contained in the constitution, statutes, or ritual of Sigma Chi with which we can comply as men of honor and integrity.

We hope that you and all alumni of Alpha Omega and Sigma Chi as a whole realize that we are not trying to destroy the fraternity, but rather to improve it. As members of the active chapter of Alpha Omega, we hope we have proven ourselves worthy of the strong support we are receiving from Stanford University, prominent alumni, and many others in our attempt to stay within Sigma Chi.

We hope that you, as well, are sympathetic to our position, and we would very much like

to hear from you if you have any questions or wish to discuss this issue with us.

Fraternally yours,

BROTHERS OF ALPHA OMEGA.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 14, 1965]

STANFORD FRATERNITY THAT PLEDGED NEGRO FIGHTS SUSPENSION

PALO ALTO, CALIF., April 13.—The Stanford University chapter of Sigma Chi fraternity has pledged a Negro to membership and has been suspended by the national organization.

Chapter members, believing the two actions are directly related, have voted to resist the suspension order.

"We plan to fight this thing within the fraternity. We have violated no constitutional provisions or regulations and we have no intention to get out," Frank Olrich, of Auburn, Calif., the retiring chapter president, declared today.

NATIONAL OFFICER REPLIES

Harry V. Wade, an Indianapolis insurance man who is grand consul, or national president, of Sigma Chi, said in a telephone interview that neither he, nor to his knowledge the fraternity's national executive committee, knew whom the chapter had pledged. He attributed the suspension to the chapter's "contemptuousness for the fraternity and its ritual."

Mr. Olrich wrote Mr. Wade in February expressing concern over de facto discrimination by the fraternity nationally. He declared:

"Not only are we losing many outstanding Negro athletes and scholars, but many well qualified Caucasian students are avoiding our house because of their overt distaste for our discriminatory policy."

Mr. Olrich said that minority group members able to meet Stanford's entrance requirements were "outstanding representatives of their race or creed." He added:

"It is difficult for us to find reasons why they would not also make outstanding brothers. When such men outdo us on the athletic field and surpass our efforts in the classroom we find it impossible to consider them inferior to ourselves."

Mr. Wade replied that the organization had "nothing in its public constitution, statutes, or other laws, or in secret ritual, that keeps anyone out of our fraternity because of his race, creed, or national background."

As a result the chapter conducted its rush program for the spring quarter on a nondiscriminatory basis. Its 21 pledges included a Negro freshman, Kenneth M. Washington, of Denver, son of a physician.

It became known that the fraternity's national executive committee ordered the Stanford chapter temporarily suspended on April 2. The chapter was notified on April 10 by Mr. Wade, who said the action was taken because it was "crystal clear" that the chapter was "not particularly interested in carrying on the ritual, standards, and traditions of the fraternity."

Dr. J. E. Wallace Sterling, president of Stanford, expressed the university's support of the campus chapter. The chapter's alumni include 2 of the 11 Sigma Chi's in Congress. They are Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, and Representative BURT L. TALCOTT, Republican, of California.

The chapter's members include two Mississippi freedom project volunteers.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, June 18, 1965]

COLLEGES FACE U.S. AID CUTOFF IF THEY PERMIT FRATERNITY BIAS

(By Wallace Turner)

DENVER, June 17.—The terms of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 require individual colleges to make certain that fraternities do not discriminate on racial grounds, Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, declared today.

Under the legislation, Mr. Keppel could cut off all Federal funds to the colleges if they allowed the fraternities to continue discriminating.

His statement was in a letter to Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, who had asked about the situation involved in the suspension last April of the Sigma Chi Chapter at Stanford University.

The suspension came in a letter from the national fraternity dated 4 days after a Negro student had accepted a bid to pledge the Stanford chapter.

The issue touches on the entire system of Federal grants to colleges and universities.

If Mr. Keppel found that a fraternity was practicing racial discrimination, he would then question the "assurances of compliance" filed by the schools under title VI of the Civil Rights Act, which empowers Federal agencies to withhold funds from any recipients practicing discrimination. The schools would be required to end the discrimination, either by changing the practices of the fraternity or by removing the offending chapter from the campus.

The alternative would be a procedure initiated by Mr. Keppel under which all Federal grants could be shut off to the colleges where the fraternity operated chapters.

Harry V. Wade, national president of Sigma Chi, has denied that the pledging of Kenneth M. Washington, a Negro freshman who is the son of a Denver physician, was the reason for the suspension of the Stanford chapter.

He said recently that "the reason we suspended the chapter was because of its contemptuous attitude toward the fraternity and other Sigma Chi chapters in its area."

Mr. Wade is an executive of the Standard Life Insurance Co. of Indiana.

After the national Sigma Chi fraternity acted against the Stanford chapter, the board of regents at the University of Colorado voted to place the Sigma Chi Chapter at Boulder on probation.

Sigma Chi's national convention opened here last night. A delegation from the Stanford chapter is in attendance, accompanied by legal advisers.

The Stanford students refused today to discuss their situation. They have made it clear, however, that they believe the chapter was suspended because it pledged Mr. Washington.

Senator METCALF recently called Mr. Keppel's attention to the dispute between the national fraternity and its Stanford chapter of which the Senator is an alumnus.

It was pointed out that while the fraternity has no discriminatory clause in its constitution, it does have a clause that forbids a chapter to propose for membership anyone "who for any reason is likely to be considered personally unacceptable as a brother by any chapter or any member anywhere."

Senator METCALF said the national fraternity's action "may endanger Sigma Chi on every campus in America."

Mr. Keppel's letter appeared to bear this out. He pointed out that regulations issued under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 require schools to give assurances that there is no racial discrimination "in admission practices or any other practices of the institution relating to the treatment of students."

The schools are also required to assure the Federal Government that no other university practices are discriminatory in "making available for the use of students any building, room, space, materials, equipment, or other facility or property.

"This language makes it apparent that an institution which maintains a fraternity system as a part of its activities and overall program is responsible under the Civil Rights Act requirements for assuring that discrimination is not practiced by the fraternities in the system," Mr. Keppel wrote to Senator METCALF.

The Commissioner also said:

"To my knowledge the suspension of Sigma Chi at Stanford by the fraternity's national executive committee is the first major test involving de facto discrimination within a national fraternity to develop since passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As such, it seems certain to attract wide public interest."

[From Time magazine, June 25, 1965]

STUDENTS—FRATERNITIES GET THE GRIP

How deeply does the 1964 Civil Rights Act's title VI—the provision that empowers the Federal Government to withhold funds from recipients practicing racial discrimination—cut into the social texture of U.S. academic life? Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel last week provided a measurement by ruling that any fraternity's refusal to admit a Negro on racial ground could imperil the many millions of dollars that a university might be getting from the Government.

SWEETHEART OF SIGMA CHI

It was a sweetheart deal of Sigma Chi that spurred the ruling. In the late 1930's, nearly all of the 61 major social fraternities carried exclusion clauses in their constitutions, typically limiting membership to "whites of full Aryan blood" or "Christian Caucasians," and banning "the black, Malay, Mongolian, or Semitic races." Discrimination first became a hot campus issue in 1946 when Amherst College bluntly ordered its 13 fraternity chapters to purge themselves of bias or close their doors. By 1955, largely because of pressure from college administrations, only 10 specific discrimination clauses remained. By 1964, at least 125 colleges had adopted policies condemning such discrimination, and more than 50 had ordered local chapters not only to get rid of bias clauses but to stop racial or religious discrimination in actual practice. The barriers generally have fallen first for Jews, then Negroes.

But to this day at least four fraternities—Sigma Chi, Phi Gamma Delta, Alpha Tau Omega, and Phi Delta Theta—either have switched to constitutional euphemisms or have reached unwritten "gentlemen's agreements" that require members to be "socially acceptable" to all other members. A member pledged in California, for example, must not be likely to offend a member in Alabama. A fifth, Sigma Nu, still retains a "whites only" clause, but has permitted chapters, if pressured by college officials, to request special dispensation to admit Negroes. Sigma Chi requires national approval of every member by a screening committee supplied with racial and religious information on each applicant—and a photograph to boot.

A HIGH-CLASS CHINESE?

Last April Sigma Chi suspended its Stanford chapter after the local asked Negro Student Kenneth M. Washington, son of a Denver urologist, to join. Sigma Chi's national grand consul, Harry V. Wade, an Indianapolis insurance executive, said in a letter to the Stanford chapter: "I personally would not resent having a high-class Chinese or Japanese boy admitted to Sigma Chi. But I know full well that his presence would be highly resented on the west coast."

"Therefore, I must submerge any personal feeling and refrain from proposing a Japanese or Chinese boy because of the reaction it would cause among your alumni." Sigma Chi's attitude so irked Montana Senator LEE METCALF, who joined Sigma Chi at Stanford, that he asked Keppel whether such discrimination violated the Civil Rights Act.

Keppel timed his reply to coincide with last week's national Sigma Chi convention in Denver, where Stanford and other delegates fought to gain local autonomy on member selection. The convention left Stanford

still suspended, but authorized a commission to study "relationships with local colleges." All the same, the Stanford case had inspired a landmark ruling certain to affect fraternity life profoundly.

[From the Palo Alto (Calif.) Times, Apr. 19, 1965]

FARM SIGMA CHI'S TAKE RIGHT STAND

The Stanford Chapter of Sigma Chi social fraternity deserves encouragement in its effort to bring about racial integration of Sigma Chi nationally.

The Stanford unit temporarily lost its national affiliation after charging the national with de facto discrimination. Then, on April 12, the chapter pledged Kenneth M. Washington, a Negro, the son of a Denver physician.

In keeping with a policy set in 1957, Stanford's administration is supporting the chapter in its struggle to burst unwritten racial barriers in the national fraternity.

Social fraternities exist at colleges to serve the students who become their members and aid the colleges in their educational purposes. When they function to perpetuate racial prejudice they erode their reason for being.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, June 21, 1965]

ANOTHER BARRIER DOWN

A dozen or so times in recent years, chapters of various college fraternities have been suspended or had their charters lifted by their national, alumni-controlled organizations because they pledged Negroes.

There'll be an end to that sort of thing now—or an end to national fraternities.

The Stanford University Sigma Chi chapter last April underwent this type of "discipline" by its national officers. The incident came to the attention of Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, who asked U.S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel how this action comported with the Civil Rights Act.

Commissioner Keppell has now ruled that any college or university which permits fraternities to practice racial discrimination is liable to forfeit its right to any Federal funds.

A good many colleges of late have seriously questioned the desirability of fraternities and sororities anyway. Some of the best—Williams College and Randolph-Macon Woman's College, for example—have recently abolished these social institutions.

Faced with the alternative of losing all Federal finances, there are few institutions of higher learning which now will hesitate to do away with any of the Greek letter societies which attempt to maintain discrimination.

This new order of things will dismay only a minority of the fraternity "actives"—those still in college. It is the alumni hierarchy which will have to adjust itself to mid-20th century realities or see their fraternities virtually wiped out.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT SPEAKS TO RHODES SCHOLARS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in Senator FULBRIGHT, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, this country possesses a political philosopher and foreign affairs analyst unexcelled among those who have held political office in the modern history of our Republic. Senator FULBRIGHT again demonstrated his highly developed intellectual qualities in a speech he delivered to the Rhodes scholar reunion at Swarthmore College on June 19. Senator FULBRIGHT had some stark, but accurate, thoughts about the contemporary world situation:

In recent months events have taken an ominous turn. For varied and complex reasons the nations are sliding back into the self-righteous and crusading spirit of the cold war.

It is clear in any case that the cold war detente is at best in suspension. The crises in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are affecting matters far beyond the frontiers of the countries concerned.

Somewhat like the great powers of 1914, the Soviet Union and the United States appear to have lost much of their former control of events; like the great powers of 1914 they appear to be more preoccupied with commitments to others than with their own interests and preferences in relations with each other.

Under these conditions the prognosis for peace with freedom is hardly favorable.

But Senator FULBRIGHT is not wholly pessimistic about our chances to preserve the peace. In his concluding lines, he noted:

But existing conditions are not permanent conditions, and prevailing tendencies are not irreversible. Our capacity to shape events is as great as our capacity to understand them. The national and constructive conduct of public affairs is not man's most conspicuous talent, to be sure; but it has been done before, and it can be done again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator FULBRIGHT's thoughtful address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PROSPECTS FOR PEACE WITH FREEDOM

(By Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT)

As an objective of foreign policy "peace with freedom" is a dubious concept. The difficulty about peace is that practically everybody wants it but practically everybody wants something else more. The difficulty about freedom is that the form of it most desired in the world is the freedom to work one's will upon others. And the difficulty about any noble objective in human affairs is that there are likely to be as many versions of it—usually conflicting versions—as there are advocates.

I do not suggest that "peace with freedom" is an unworthy object of our foreign policy but only that the pursuit of it with too much zeal is the surest way to lose it. Of all the faculties of man none is more perfectly developed than the talent for cutting general principles to the specifications of personal interest and ambition. We Americans sincerely believe that our policies are designed to secure peace with freedom for all men. But the Russians and the Chinese may be just as sincere in believing that their policies are the way to peace with freedom. Under these conditions the prospects for peace with freedom in the world would seem to depend on the restraint with which everybody pursues his own particular concept of it.

Of all the dangers that beset humanity perhaps the greatest is man's abiding dissatisfaction with his own nature. Through the ages men have constantly tried and constantly succeeded in efforts to control their natural environment. Just as constantly men have tried and failed to alter their own nature. For reasons not easily understood we have never been at peace with our human appetites and instincts and irrationalities and have striven, at a disastrous price in violence and self-hate, to make ourselves into a race of angels. The product of all this striving to be better than we are or can be is that self-deceiving righteousness which enables men in pristine conscience to commit unspeakable acts of cruelty.

I believe that the world has suffered far less from overt wickedness than from too much passion for virtue and too much conviction about how to achieve it. These sentiments, rooted in man's hatred of his own human nature, lead not to virtue but to the macabre entreaty of Mark Twain's "War Prayer": "for our sakes who adore Thee, Lord," the mysterious stranger prays before battle, "blast their hopes, blight their lives, protract their bitter pilgrimage, make heavy their steps, water their way with their tears, stain the white snow with the blood of their wounded feet. We ask it, in the spirit of love, of Him who is the source of love, and who is the ever-faithful refuge and friend of all that are sore beset and seek His aid with humble and contrite hearts. Amen."

I think that the prospects for peace with freedom would be much improved if we could come to terms with our imperfections and modify our ambitions. "Human nature will not change," said Abraham Lincoln. "In any future great national trial, compared with the men of this, we shall have as weak and as strong, as silly and as wise, as bad and as good."[1] If only we could learn to live with this prospect and could make our peace with the imperfections of human nature, we might then be able to develop the respect for ourselves and the compassion for others which are the conditions of peace with freedom.

The world is not at present moving in this direction. Until a short time ago it seemed that it might be, but in recent months events have taken an ominous turn. For varied and complex reasons the nations are sliding back into the self-righteous and crusading spirit of the cold war. We are hearing very much more these days about honor and principles and peace and freedom and national liberation and it is all being accompanied by rising tensions and violence. It is too soon to say whether the trend toward more stable world relations which seemed to be developing a short time ago is merely being interrupted or whether a whole new tendency is taking hold in world politics.

It is clear in any case that the cold war detente is at best in suspension. The crises in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are affecting matters far beyond the frontiers of the countries concerned. The Alliance for Progress, for example, was regarded as progressing hopefully until April of this year, but its future is now uncertain. The steady improvement of our relations with the neutralist countries and with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe has been interrupted by the spreading belief that the United States is no longer in sympathy with the nationalism of small and struggling nations.

Most important and ominous of all, events in southeast Asia and in the Caribbean are greatly complicating relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Their detente has not been destroyed but it is in abeyance and a renewed atmosphere of harshness is developing. Neither of the great powers appears to welcome this deterioration in relations and neither has deliberately brought it about, but, powerful though they are, they seem powerless to arrest it. Somewhat like the great powers of 1914, the Soviet Union and the United States appear to have lost much of their former control of events; like the great powers of 1914, they appear to be more preoccupied with commitments to others than with their own interests and preferences in relations with each other.

---

[1] "Response to a Serenade," Nov. 10, 1864.

Under these conditions the prognosis for peace with freedom is hardly favorable. But existing conditions are not permanent conditions and prevailing tendencies are not irreversible. Our capacity to shape events is as great as our capacity to understand them. The rational and constructive conduct of public affairs is not man's most conspiculous talent, to be sure, but it has been done before and it can be done again.

I have no prescription to offer as to how to improve the prospects for peace and freedom in the world beyond the general proposition that they are most successfully pursued when they are pursued without excess of zeal. "All this struggling and striving to make the world better is a great mistake," wrote Shaw: "not because it isn't a good thing to improve the world if you know how to do it, but because striving and struggling is the worst way you could set about doing anything." [2]

The prospects for peace with freedom depend very largely on the ability of nations to recognize that "peace with freedom" means different things to different people and that, however deeply one may believe in one's own version of it, it is just possible that someone else's version is as good or even better. Without taking the words quite literally, I think there is wisdom—at least as a corrective to prevailing views—in Alexander Pope's lines on government:

"For forms of government let fools contest;
Whate'er is best administer'd is best;
For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight;
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right.
In faith and hope the world will disagree,
But all mankind's concern is charity." [3]

VIETNAM DIALOG: MR. BUNDY AND THE PROFESSORS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on June 21, between 10 and 11 p.m., what I consider to be the most important program of the television year was presented by CBS. I am referring, of course, to the special report entitled "Vietnam Dialog: Mr. Bundy and the Professors."

This program was a pleasant contrast to the unruly, disorganized, and one-sided all-day "teach-in" which was televised on May 15.

It was conducted as a debate on Vietnam should be; it was moderated by Eric Sevareid, one of the best news analysts in the country; and the proponents and the opponents of the President's policy on Vietnam each had the same fair chance to state and to defend their point of view.

The program was a clear victory for the proponents. The long-awaited appearance of McGeorge Bundy, who was ably assisted by Dr. Zbygniew Brzezinski and Dr. Guy Pauker, was a solid success for him and for the administration.

I think most people will agree with this evaluation.

But more important than who won or who lost is the fact that the American public finally had a chance to view and listen to a balanced, reasonable debate on what is the single most important and most difficult foreign policy problem the United States faces at the present time.

For this public service, I commend CBS, Eric Sevareid, and the six participants in "Vietnam Dialog."

[2] "Cashel Byron's Profession" (1886), ch. 6.
[3] "Essay on Man," Epistle III, line 303.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] placed into the RECORD, yesterday, the transcript of the program. That gave me a chance to read through the debate a second time; and I hope Senators and other people will also avail themselves of this opportunity to review that excellent exchange of ideas and views.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senate Rules Committee report which has just been released points up some of the many conflicts of interest in which Mr. Bobby Baker was involved while serving as an employee of the U.S. Senate, and the committee in effect recommends his indictment.

I commend them on this phase of their report and support their conclusions; however, I regret that the committee did not see fit to explore further some of the other obvious angles involving Mr. Baker and perhaps other employees.

For example:

Only one aspect of the so-called freight forwarders case was explored by the committee. Even the majority members of the committee recognized this case as unfinished business when in their report they said:

> The committee is aware of the fact that the Department of Justice has accumulated a considerable amount of information on other aspects of this subject matter.

An investigation involving solicitations from and the handling by the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. of certain political contributions was conspicuously sidestepped.

Failure to call the numerous witnesses requested by the minority members leaves a serious question in the minds of many as to what would or could have been developed.

As is pointed out in the minority views, it is obvious to all who have examined Mr. Baker's activities that until such time as national defense contractors, such as North American Aviation and Northrop, decide they no longer want or need to do business with Mr. Baker his complex financial empire may continue to prosper. Why was not a more thorough examination made to ascertain why these major defense contractors felt it advantageous to discontinue their contractual arrangements with the vending companies who had been providing their services and give their business to Mr. Baker's newly organized Serv-U Corp.? Who helped Mr. Baker get his confidential security clearance through the Defense Department so expeditiously to make it possible for his company to establish eligibility for access in these defense plants?

What services was Mr. Baker rendering to the Murchison interests that would cause one of their top officials to cut Mr. Baker in on exceptionally profitable speculations without Mr. Baker's having to put up any capital or share any risk?

From what source did Mr. Baker obtain the approximately $100,000 in cash that he had so conveniently stashed away in his file cabinet?

These are but a few of the many unanswered questions concerning the operations of this former employee of the U.S. Senate who, while drawing a $19,000 Government salary, was, in the brief span of less than 5 years, able to pyramid his net worth from around $80,000 to approximately $2¼ million while at the same time reporting a comparatively negligible tax liability.

In its report the committee makes several recommendations toward the establishment of new rules in the Senate and the enactment of new legislation, the purpose of which will be to prevent a recurrence of such an episode.

I support these recommendations to the extent that they go; however, as is pointed out by some members of both the majority and the minority in the supplemental views, I question that the committee's recommendations go far enough. Later, when these proposals come before the Senate, I shall outline in greater detail my own views as to what further steps are necessary.

As I stated when this investigation first started in 1963, the Senate itself is on trial, and under no circumstances can this investigation be allowed to stop short of a full disclosure and adequate steps being taken to safeguard against such an episode ever happening again.

EDUCATION AND ITS RELATION TO THE COST OF ELECTRICITY IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial about education and its relation to the cost of electricity in the State of California. The editorial was published in the June 4, 1965, issue of the Oceanside, Calif., Blade-Tribune.

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

A MATTER OF PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

The board of regents of the University of California is faced with another controversial decision. At the end of last year, the university's contract with Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for electric power supplied the Berkeley campus expired. The regents must now either renew this agreement or make plans to switch to electricity purchased from the Central Valley project of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

At stake is the sum of $21,817,000. This amount could be saved the Berkeley administration over the next 10 years by a Central Valley project contract, according to estimates prepared by the university's vice president for business affairs.

Looking into the future there will be, within the State of California, an ample supply of Federal power. Congress intended, via the reclamation statutes, that this low-cost energy should go first to public or "preference" agencies. Unfortunately, there is sometimes a difficulty in getting the power from the point of generation or from a Federal transmission net, such as the Central Valley project, to the site of demand. The CVP substation closest to Berkeley is located at Tracy, 50 miles to the east.

In the present instance, Pacific Gas & Electric has flatly refused to transfer the Federal power over P.G. & E. lines from Tracy to Berkeley. However, the University of California campus at Davis has already converted from private to public power brought to the campus via P.G. & E. lines. How the

private utility can refuse to carry energy to Berkeley when it is already wheeling power to Davis is not clear.

Perhaps the answer can be found in the savings public power makes possible at Davis. In February 1965, the Davis campus paid the Government 4.932 mills per kilowatt-hour for its electricity. Had the university continued with P.G. & E. service, the cost would have been 9.954 mills per kilowatt-hour. Thus the cost of electricity at Davis has been more than cut in two. These figures have been given the Blade-Tribune by F. K. Crouch, the university's engineer for planning and construction.

The power report to the regents has indicated that substantial savings could be put into effect if the university built its own lines between Tracy and Berkeley to carry Government power to the campus. This reduction would be smaller than would be possible with P.G. & E. carrying the load on its existing lines. But the capital investment required could be quickly amortized and thereafter electricity costs at Berkeley would be cut by $1,356,000 per year.

The board of regents is now contemplating the institution of a $50 per term tuition fee for students. The optimum power saving to be made possible by the change to public sources would aggregate more than $100 per year for every undergraduate at Berkeley. The Blade-Tribune urges the regents to look carefully and hopefully into the recommendations made by its own administration report.

APPEASEMENT OF NASSER

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is shocking and disappointing that, despite the overwhelming expression of sentiment in Congress on more than one occasion, the administration still continues to appease Nasser, whose every action has been hostile to all the purposes which the United States seeks in the Middle East, who has been guilty of aggression and threatened aggression over and over again, and who is the greatest menace to the peace and progress of the Middle East.

An appropriate comment is found in an article entitled: "The Tie That Binds," written by Henry J. Taylor, and published in the June 30 issue of the Washington Daily News. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, June 30, 1965]

THE TIE THAT BINDS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

When President Johnson lifted the suspension on aid to Nasser he did exactly what a Senate majority had intended to prevent.

The outraged Members tried to stop the golden flow after Nasser's thugs burned our Cairo libraries and heaped contempt—again—on American aid. A wiser U.S. policy was as much at stake as the money.

Yet, behind the scenes, Mr. Johnson engineered the defeat of the aid ban in the Senate. He repeated the same old, tired contention that is promoted whenever commonsense catches up with our foreign aid—"You mustn't tie the President's hands in foreign affairs."

Senate Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, nursing his image as a statesman (Oh, Mamma Mia), caves in like a hollow egg whenever the White House pronounces it.

All other responsible governments in free countries require various parliamentary approvals in foreign matters. In fact, much confirmation of the American President's foreign affairs intentions is required, of course, in our Constitution, even his choice of ambassadors.

Some foreign aid remains essential. For example, what would happen if we eliminated our economic aid in South Korea? But Nasser, never our friend, has already picked up more than $1.2 billion from our taxpayers. He has also added immensely to our global costs, and those of our allies, by relentless disrupting the peace.

This aggressive demagog was a prime factor in equipping the Stanleyville and Paulis massacre units advancing from the Sudan, Uganda and Burundi. Much of the horror we've seen, and the treasury we have spent in the Congo, is directly traceable to Gamal Abdel Nasser.

The Israel intelligence service believes that Nasser is preparing for aggression against Israel at this very moment. In any case, he is a chief reason for the heavy rearming in Israel and we underwrite most of the cost of the U.N. peacekeeping patrol in the Gaza strip.

Nasser has doublecrossed the United States many times and part of the present issue arose when he doublecrossed us again in his 1964 loan commitment.

We sent Nasser about $170 million in food by its terms. These prohibited his equivalent sale to Red countries that the United States officially boycotts. Nasser, however, sold almost 40 percent of Egypt's domestic rice crop to Red China and Castro's Cuba—both under our boycott.

Such deals play right into the hands of Moscow and Peiping since it lightens their economic load.

FARM LABOR SHORTAGE HAS NOT CAUSED HIGHER RETAIL PRICES

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, over the past few weeks, much has been said concerning the high retail prices of agricultural products. In several articles which have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the situation has been blamed, in part, on the lack of an adequate supply of American farmworkers. It has been claimed that Secretary Wirtz, by not allowing the massive importation of foreign farm labor under Public Law 414, has caused a curtailment of farm production, which has caused crops to rot in the fields. It has been claimed that this has caused the housewife to pay higher prices for groceries.

The Packer, the national weekly business newspaper of growers, shippers, receivers, distributors, and retailers of fresh fruits and vegetables, is certainly in a position to know the true facts concerning this matter. In the past, this newspaper has criticized Secretary of Labor Wirtz for not allowing the importation of foreign farmworkers; and certainly it cannot be considered biased in his behalf.

In an editorial published on June 12, which I am sure will be of great interest to all Members of this body, the Packer stated that it had recently conducted an investigation into this situation, and found that potatoes have been in short supply this season. Furthermore, far western lettuce production has been adversely affected by unfavorable weather. The editorial writer, in refuting charges that the lack of farm labor has caused retail prices of farm products to rise, stated:

Up to now it cannot fairly be contended that the farm labor shortage has been responsible for widely spread shortages, quality deterioration, and high prices for the produce list.

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

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

[From the Packer, June 12, 1965]

WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?

High retail prices on fresh fruits and vegetables have gotten to be quite a conversation piece throughout the country. You hear it over the back fence, and in the neighborhood bank as the housewife steps up to cash a good-sized check for the week's grocery purchases.

Is there any danger of a serious reaction that might hurt consumption of "the fresh" over the long pull?

The Packer felt that this ought to be looked into, and so conducted a spot check, with results as indicated in this week's first-page story.

We don't pretend to have come up with an authoritative answer. The whole subject is one that needs extended, careful study. However, in this week's investigation by Packer representatives, some interesting points have been raised.

High prices of a number of items are coming in for a lot of conversation, and volume of purchases is being affected. But there doesn't appear to be any general consumer resentment that is likely to affect buying habits for the future.

On the contrary, the present experience seems to be disproving the old theory that volume sales of fresh fruits and vegetables can be accomplished only through low prices. It now appears evident that consumers will buy these products at higher prices—if the quality is acceptable. The latter is the big problem with several items at the present time.

Sharply higher prices are mostly confined to a few items like potatoes, lettuce, strawberries. Potatoes have been notoriously in short supply this past season. Far western lettuce has been affected by unfavorable weather. The labor shortage has been a serious problem in the strawberry deal, affecting both quality and price of harvested berries.

Up to now it cannot fairly be contended that the farm labor shortage has been responsible for widely spread shortages, quality deterioration, and high prices for the produce list.

But don't be complacent about it, Mr. Wirtz! The experience with strawberries shows what can happen. Lettuce and celery have also been affected. A potentially dangerous situation appears to be shaping up with cantaloupes. Other crops, quite vulnerable to labor shortages, will be coming along through the summer and fall.

The industry, too, can't afford any complacency. A long extended pattern of spotted quality and condition, with high prices, could hurt produce consumption for the long pull. There is more at stake than immediate profits. The industry's progressive merchandisers, at shipping point, on terminal markets, and at retail, will need to be on the lookout more sharply than ever for signs of trouble. And they will need to strive with even greater energy toward the total mer-

chandising job that needs to be done for fresh fruits and vegetables.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the latest information from the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture also supports the Packer's editorial position.

According to these Departments, the May Consumer Price Index has not yet been released. The rise of 0.3 points, which has been widely attributed by the press to the May index, actually relates to price rises which occurred between March and April.

In the fruit and vegetable segment of the index, the greatest increase was caused by higher retail prices for Irish potatoes and apples. Since the harvest of potatoes has not yet begun in areas where foreign workers were employed last year, mostly in Maine, this price increase could hardly have been the result of a lack of American farmworkers. The real reason for the increase in the price of potatoes is last year's poor crop, which was 242,869,000 hundredweight, as compared to 271,730,000 hundredweight in 1963.

In apple production, foreign workers were employed in large numbers only in certain areas of Virginia and West Virginia. In these areas the harvest has not yet begun; and, therefore, as in the case of potatoes, the price increase in apples cannot be attributed to any lack of American labor.

In the case of strawberries, the Department of Agriculture predicts that production for 1965 will be approximately 16 percent less than the production last year. Part of the decrease is attributed to an 8-percent reduction in acreage. However, the Department of Agriculture explains as follows the decline in yield per acre:

> In California there was a considerable loss of the bloom and early set during April following heavy rains.

The progress of the strawberry harvest has not fallen much behind that of last year. As of June 12, 42.6 percent of this year's crop had been harvested, compared with 47.6 percent on June 12, 1964. Again, this is not surprising, considering the fact that unusually bad weather in April delayed the start of the harvest.

In the case of California lemons, the same situation exists. On June 12, the Department of Agriculture predicted lemon production for the entire 1965 season at 13,500,000 boxes, 17 percent less than last year's production. However, this decrease is attributed to unseasonable cold, wet weather during the period of the bloom, which resulted in a poor set of fruit, and is not due to a lack of farm labor. Because of poor weather conditions, production figures as of June 13 show a 38-percent decline from those for a corresponding period in the preceding year. However, this lag has been decreasing in recent weeks, as the weather has improved. Production during the last week of May and the first week in June was only 20 percent below that of last year. During the second week in June, this figure was reduced to 9 percent. The prediction for the last week in June is that production for this week will exceed that in 1964. On May 24, L. N. Gardner, head of the Department of Agriculture Market News Bureau at Los Angeles, in discussing the California lemon harvest, stated:

> It is too soon to say that there will be any substantial number of lemons left on the trees unharvested.

In the Rio Grande Valley of Texas, during the last week, the National Commission on Food Marketing has been holding hearings concerning prices in the fruit and vegetable industry. The hearings covered, among other things, the retail cost of fruits and vegetables and the effects on cost of the termination of Public Law 78.

The June 19 edition of the Packer showed great insight in its detailed articles on these hearings, which, I believe, will be of great interest to this body.

In its articles, the Packer quotes R. C. Jones, a Mercedes, Tex., grower, as saying:

> Consumer prices paid for farm products, notably vegetables, seem to bear no relationship whatsoever with prices paid to the grower.

Mr. Jones was also critical of retail pricing which realized $300 to $380 a ton for carrots, while growers in south Texas receive $5 to $10 a ton.

Henry L. Van De Walle, manager of Van De Walle & Sons, Inc., a San Antonio, Tex., shipper, stated that it was his opinion that retail stores were charging too much for fruits and vegetables:

> The markup is greater on fresh fruits and vegetables than on staple items because of their perishable nature. However, under present-day transportation, packaging, and refrigeration methods, produce is not nearly so perishable as it was years ago, losses are small, and the excessive, high markups are outdated.

Othal E. Brand, president of Griffin & Brand, of McAllen, Tex., the world's largest grower and shipper of onions, stated that the elimination of the bracero program would be of tremendous value to the fruit and vegetable industry in eliminating overproduction.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Grower Gloom in Texas Hearing; Shippers See More Hopeful Outlook."

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

[From the Packer, June 19, 1965]

GROWER GLOOM IN TEXAS HEARING; SHIPPERS SEE MORE HOPEFUL OUTLOOK

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This coverage of the June 11 and 12 hearings of the National Commission on Food Marketing investigation of the fruit and vegetable industry was written by Packer staff member Bill Mansfield, stationed in the Texas lower valley. It is handled in separate segments: growers, Friday; shippers, Saturday.)

GROWERS

McALLEN, TEX.—An air of doom and gloom hung over the McAllen Civic Center last Friday, June 11, the first day of the 2-day hearing by the National Commission on Food Marketing, when most of the 10 testifying witnesses were Rio Grande Valley growers. Valley shippers had their day in court Saturday.

The aim of the Commission is to obtain a complete picture of fruit and vegetable production and marketing in the United States, and to inform itself as to the causes behind the big spread between the high prices paid by the consumer for fresh fruit and vegetables, and the small return to the growers of produce.

In the words of Representative GRAHAM PURCELL, Democrat, of Texas, who presided, "The Commission's job is to search for the true facts as fairly and objectively as human nature allows, and after having found and established these facts, to make such recommendations to the President and to the Congress as, in our judgment, will help assure both equity and efficiency in the marketing process."

Friday's witnesses, in direct testimony and under cross-examination by commission members and counsel, listed overproduction, weak selling, inadequate financing, competition from Mexican and Canadian imports, a deficient advertising and promotion program, chainstore buying power, overpricing at retail level, the reduction in the number of buyers, cutthroat competition by shippers, high production and packing costs, taxes, and the power of unionism as the major cause of the valley's depressed conditions.

Sharp lecture

After listening to the complaints of several of the grower witnesses, Representative PURCELL took the time to lecture the south Texas industry in sharp terms for its lack of direction, cohesion, and cooperation. "You should try harder to promote and publicize fruits and vegetables," he said. "If you spent one-tenth of 1 percent of the amount the beer and cigarette industries spend, there would be no problem," he said.

C. E. Marcum, general manager of the Valley Production Credit Association, Harlingen, designated growers' increased operating costs, coupled with reduced per-acre yields and lower per-unit sales return on agricultural products in the Rio Grande Valley during the past 5 years as the cause of the financial distress of the farmer-members and the credit position of the association.

Mr. Marcum concluded, "There appears to be nothing in sight on the economic horizon that will reverse or relieve the present serious economic situation here in the Rio Grande Valley and it appears the situation may get worse before it gets better. I have no solution to offer, I am merely trying to supply some pertinent facts that may be of benefit to the commission."

Land Values

Gordon B. Morrow, president of the Cameron County Farm Bureau, of Rangerville, mentioned the paradox of declining land values in the Rio Grande Valley in a booming national economy. "Usually a man who owns land automatically gains in credit potential because of increasing land values. This has not happened in the Rio Grande Valley; but the reverse has happened and I can't see the reason for it. As I understand it, there is a lot of outside money coming in and being invested in valley land. I have often wondered if an 'Oliver Warbucks' type of power or powers could cause such a situation."

Mr. Morrow, who, in addition to vegetables, is a producer of cotton and grain, told of his successful marketing of these products through cooperatives. This prompted Representative PURCELL to ask why, if cooperatives were such a great advantage to cotton and grain growers, this system of marketing has not been applied to citrus and vegetables. At this time, and later when the subject was brought up again, the same answer was given that the growers are not financially able to set up cooperatives in the lower Rio Grande Valley.

Discusses contracts

Mike Frost, of McAllen, a member of the Hidalgo County Farm Bureau, in his testimony discussed contracts between grower and handler (everything should be in writing

to avoid later misunderstandings); the effect of Mexican imports on the citrus and vegetable industry in the Rio Grande Valley (detrimental).

Lack of sufficient research and promotion has been a hindrance to progress by Rio Grande Valley citrus and vegetables, he said. And he hit at consignments as a major contributing cause to depressed prices to farmers in this area.

He was speaking of local consignments as when a grower gives his produce to the shipper to be handled as the shipper sees fit. "The grower has placed himself at the mercy of the shipper," said Mr. Frost. "There are many shippers in this area for each commodity and it usually only takes one of them cutting the price to force the whole market down. He (the shipper) will still make his profit and the farmer just gets a little less, or as has happened quite often, the farmer gets a bill because there was a loss incurred after the expenses were deducted."

R. C. Jones, a Mercedes grower, said the grower finds it increasingly difficult to relate the worth of his produce to the worth it assumes on the consumer level. "What the grower needs urgently to know is whether or not he is producing for a free and flexible supply and demand market," he said. "Or, is it regulated? Is it possible that in some instances in our peak season prices are predetermined?"

Price relations

He went on to say that consumer prices paid for farm products, notably vegetables, seem to bear no relationship whatsoever with prices paid to the grower. He was critical of retail pricing which realized the equivalent of $300 to $380 per ton for carrots while growers in south Texas were receiving from $5 to $10 per ton.

Mexican imports

He cited the flow of Mexican fruits and vegetables into the United States when Texas produce is available, or about ready to move to market as having a serious effect on the position of the Texas producer, and asked for Government protection, by law, against this.

Following the stream of criticism which was directed throughout the day at the effect Mexican imports are having on valley agriculture, Representative PURCELL asked, "Why haven't you done something about it? It seems to me that all you have done is complain. Why not at least get caught trying? If you are really concerned about the importation of fruit and vegetables, you have the numbers to speak in Washington in a loud voice. But do it now. If you wait until there is more American money invested in Mexico it will be too late to turn the tide."

SHIPPERS

MCALLEN, TEX.—Saturday was mainly "packer and shipper" day as the National Commission on Food Marketing wound up its 2-day stand in McAllen.

Representative GRAHAM PURCELL, Democrat, of Texas, continued as chairman for the hearings, and throughout the day heard and questioned representatives of south Texas shipping organizations, as the Commission sought information which would guide it in making recommendations to the President and the Congress for the benefit of both grower and consumer.

All the Saturday witnesses were agreed that overproduction of vegetables is a major cause of present valley difficulties; and while recommendations for change were made by each of the speakers, it was a decidedly different and more hopeful picture of the fruit and vegetable industry than was presented by growers in Friday's session.

Othal E. Brand, president of Griffin & Brand of McAllen, raised some official hackles when he laid the blame for valley overproduction at the door of Government lending agencies, Farm Home Administration and the Small Business Administration. Mr. Brand contended that the Government is treating the symptoms and not the cause by underwriting the operations of marginal and submarginal growers and inefficient packer-shippers, and in so doing is only adding to the chaos already existing in the marketing pattern. "Growers thus subsidized," asserted Mr. Brand, "are producing crops for which there is no market and which nobody wants to buy. We have to get supply and demand back in balance."

Mexican imports

Representative PURCELL asked some probing questions concerning the Griffin & Brand Mexican operation, in which the firm has been engaged for the past 17 years. Mr. Brand replied that trade is a two-way street and that Mexico is one of this country's largest buyers of consumer goods and machines. And, he said, since Mexico is an agricultural economy, all they have to export are the raw materials, or agricultural products. In justification of his firm's position, he said that their operations in Mexico are making an important and permanent contribution to that country's economy.

Answering other critical comment made by previous witnesses, he said that imports of Mexican fruits and vegetables actually create a better market for the same produce when it becomes available in the United States, rather than "taking the bloom off the market" as has been charged.

"We import Mexican white onions at a period when good white onions are not available in the United States, and there is a demand for them. We bring in Mexican cantaloupes during the winter months, before Texas cantaloupes are ready for market, and in so doing establish a market structure and create acceptance for Texas cantaloupes when they are ready for market."

He drew some blood when he seriously questioned the wisdom of producing citrus in south Texas, contending that the certainty of periodic freezes makes it an impracticable gamble.

Favors Wirtz policy

Under questioning, he expressed hope that Secretary Wirtz would remain firm in his stand on bracero labor. "Complete elimination of the bracero program will be of tremendous value to the industry," said Mr. Brand. "Labor is the one variable in overproduction that we can control and I hope the program will never be reactivated."

Orginially scheduled to testify with other shippers on Saturday, Henry L. Van De Walle, manager of Van De Walle & Sons, Inc., San Antonio, asked for and was granted permission to appear on Friday.

In his prepared statement Mr. Van De Walle declared that the key to the whole problem lies with the retailer, with whom a closer relationship is needed. Also, more intensive research is needed both at the grower level and the retail level.

It is his opinion that the retail stores are charging too much for fruits and vegetables. "The markup is greater on fresh fruits and vegetables than on staple items," he said, "because of their perishable nature. However, under present-day transportation, packaging and refrigeration methods produce is not nearly so perishable as it was years ago, losses are smaller, and the excessive, high markups are outdated.

He also recommended an expansion of research on marketing and that it be coordinated with research being done at the retail level. He also is of the opinion that PACA could be improved by removing the exemptions of intrastate canners and processors. "The grower deserves protection from everyone who handles his produce," he said.

Retail markup

Eugene M. Goodwin II, of the Goodwin Citrus Association, Mission, Tex., asked the Commission to decide what constitutes a reasonable retail markup, and establish guidelines for the industry. He took a positive view on the outlook for the future of the citrus industry in Texas. "After analyzing our industry and its problems," he said, "we feel it would be safe to say there is nothing really wrong with our industry over which we have any control except marketing."

He, too, singled out excessive retail markups as a contributing cause to oversupply. "In my opinion, citrus should not carry as high or as large a markup as highly perishable produce, such as cantaloupes, cucumbers, tomatoes, avocados, lettuce, or mangoes, for example."

John L. Couch

John Lake Couch, president of the Gulf Distributing Co. at Weslaco, Tex., testified that during the past 15 years his firm has grown to be more of a grower-shipper organization. This has been brought about by the necessity of producing much of its own vegetables so as to be assured of steady supplies during the shipping season. The firm also works closely with a number of growers located over the entire lower Rio Grande Valley growing area. Planting of vegetables is coordinated with the programs of the growers with whom Gulf Distributing Co. works and with the plantings of other vegetable growers.

Production and packing costs have increased, he went on to say. Often a price at the destination level seems to be rather high but when it is broken down it shows that the grower is receiving a price which barely covers, and in many instances, does not cover his growing cost. The growers' costs have increased each year, the same as the shippers' while the selling price has remained more or less constant.

Pattern changes

Vale Mayes, president of Vale Mayes & Co., Inc., Edinburg, Tex., referred to the trend, established during the past 8 to 10 years, in which many acres, particularly in the Southeastern States, have been diverted to commercial production of vegetables, creating an oversupply.

Mr. Mayes took strong exception to previous criticism of the so-called consignment deals between grower and shipper, which in his opinion are to the advantage of the grower who consigns his produce to a reliable shipper.

He also took a strong position in opposing onion and melon imports from Mexico just prior to the start of the Texas shipping season. "All markets are filled with these Mexican products and we must therefore sell at lower prices. With our high cost of production, materials, and labor, which are continually increasing, much of the production is being transferred across the border into Mexico where Mexican-made materials are utilized and ample labor at rates of as low as $1 per day are available. Our low import duties do little to slow down this increasing production." He submitted charts to show the extent of the increased competition from Mexico.

As a major grower and shipper of carrots, Mr. Mayes said he has tried during the past few years to have the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 amended to require carrots shipped into the United States to conform to the Texas marketing order regulations. Opposition has been met from the State Department and from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In the meantime, unrestricted shipments of Canadian carrots out of storage appear, particularly on the eastern markets, until late in the Texas season, he said, having the effect of blocking these important markets to Texas carrots.

Tariffs as inadequate

S. Ernest Hyde, general manager of the Edinburg Citrus Association, the largest

citrus cooperative in Texas, contended that tariffs on Mexican citrus fruit are inadequate protection of the interest of Texas producers.

Mr. Hyde, under questioning by commission members, listed among the advantages to cooperative members the savings on packing costs and the savings of the profit gained by cash buyers of citrus. It is his opinion that the market could be better controlled if the selling were in fewer and stronger hands.

Frank Gross, manager of the Texas Valley Citrus and Tomato Committees, gave testimony as spokesman for the five marketing orders in effect in south Texas. He was accompanied to the witness table by Ken Warden, manager of the South Texas Onion and Lettuce Committees, and Ken Martin, manager of the South Texas Carrot Committee.

Committee proposals

Their joint statement made the following recommendations:

1. That the committees be given authority to use committee funds for advertising and sales promotions.

2. That the committees be given authority to do research at the production level, if in their judgment, it would be in the best interests of the producer.

3. That committees be allowed to authorize expenditures of committee funds in any way that, in their judgment, would increase returns to the growers.

4. That provisions be made which would allow the committees to establish a central sales agency to act for the producers with established handlers.

The committees are in agreement that duties on all imported commodities be established at a level sufficient to give the producers in the United States an even break with imports from foreign countries which have an abundance of cheap labor.

There is a real need for more and better marketing information, condensed and made available to growers and handlers. This points up the need, he said, for more market research and a marketing specialist qualified to interpret the market so that the average grower and shipper can make use of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Packer. The letter, dated June 11, 1965, was written by Mr. Brand. In his letter, Mr. Brand commended Secretary Wirtz on his firm stand and his realistic appraisal of the bracero program and its effect on the national economy. Mr. Brand stated:

As the world's largest growers and shippers of onions, we have been able to operate without bracero labor for the past 4 years. Since 1962, we have made exclusive use of citizen labor, found it more than adequate, and during that period have never experienced a labor shortage. In fact, during the 1964–65 season we had an average of two applicants for every job available.

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

[From the Packer, June 19, 1965]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: BRAND SEES END OF FOREIGN LABOR AS OVERALL BENEFIT TO INDUSTRY

McALLEN, TEX.,
June 11, 1965.

To the EDITOR:

I would like to express my appreciation to the Packer on behalf of our company, and I am sure I speak for the industry as well, for the excellent coverage given to the bracero situation.

Much has been said and written about the termination of the bracero program. I would like to present my views in support of Secretary Wirtz, all or part of which you may use in your publication should you see fit to do so.

Our industry has faced many challenges in the past and found solutions. I have every confidence that through new machinery development and labor recruitment and distribution, the industry will meet its challenge today.

GRIFFIN & BRAND OF McALLEN, INC.,
O. E. BRAND, *President.*

To the Packer: Secretary Wirtz is to be commended for his firm stand on and realistic appraisal of the bracero program and its effect on the national economy. His action may well have turned the tide of overproduction which, for many years, has plagued the produce industry.

Contributing causes to overproduction are the availability of land and water, favorable weather and, finally but certainly not the least in importance, a ready supply of cheap labor. We, in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas have had all of these, and the same is generally true of Florida and the extreme Southwest vegetable producing areas of the United States. In this area we have a surplus of land, and at no time since the completion of Falcon Dam have we been in short supply of water; and, as a rule, we have enjoyed beneficial weather.

The most important single factor in encouraging overproduction has been the availability of an almost unlimited supply of braceros which stimulated ever-increasing planting among the big operators who were in a position to produce thousands of acres of vegetables through the importation of hordes of foreign labor. This has been true, while at the same time the United States has hundreds of thousands of unemployed. No section of the country, including those areas now clamoring for foreign labor, is an exception.

As the world's largest growers and shippers of onions, we have been able to operate without bracero labor for the past 4 years. Since 1962, we have made exclusive use of citizen labor, found it more than adequate, and during that period, have never experienced a labor shortage. In fact, during the 1964-65 season we had an average of two applicants for every job available.

There are many reasons why the unemployed in some parts of the country do not choose to work in the fields. First of all, the wage scale has been too low. There is something disgraceful in a system which makes it more profitable to an individual to go on, and stay on relief rather than resort to labor for his livelihood. Second, industry has not been forced, by simple economics, to use the unemployed, and has failed to develop machines which would reduce the number of men required for fieldwork; and, at the same time, pay these workers a just and reasonable wage. And, personally, I don't believe the industry will make the effort and the investment to develop such machinery until compelled to do so.

Since the amount of labor available exerts such a profound influence on production, a vastly reduced number on hand ready and willing to work in the fields will compel growers to take another look at their operations and plant only such acreages as they can harvest and sell at a profit.

Without a doubt the termination of the bracero program has brought on some severe dislocations in certain areas, and will require readjustments, particularly on the part of large operators who depended mainly on foreign labor. But, in the long run, the end of imported labor on a large scale will work to the benefit of the industry.

GRIFFIN & BRAND OF McALLEN, INC.,
O. E. BRAND.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in view of this factual information, I sincerely hope that we have once and for all put to rest the myth that the rise in food prices is attributable to the ending of the importation of foreign workers or a lack of American farmworkers to harvest our Nation's crops.

KENTUCKIANS PROTEST STRIP MINING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, there are many who feel that the natural beauty of our Nation is threatened today by practices such as strip mining which destroy the surface of the land in order to more speedily extract its mineral wealth.

This morning, an article by Ben A. Franklin appeared in the New York Times which described some of the effects of strip mining, and told of the efforts of some of the people in Kentucky to save their homes from its ravages.

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

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

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1965]

KENTUCKY STRIP MINING: MOUNTAINEERS SAY IT KILLS THEIR LAND

(By Ben A. Franklin)

SASSAFRAS, KY.—Coal is fueling another angry uprising here in eastern Kentucky, where it is virtually the only industry in the most chronically depressed section of Appalachia.

A group of mountain people here say that hillside strip mining for coal is ruining their land, their homes, and their lives—and even disturbing their dead.

Although they are opposing a politically powerful, multimillion-dollar business, they have already scored some early tactical points. Their fight to end strip mining on the steep slopes of the Kentucky mountains is far from over, however. The stripping goes on.

The growth of strip, or surface, mining has been dramatic in the last 5 years. A few mountain tops have been removed, whole. Other mountains—including Big Black Mountain, the highest point in Kentucky—have been girdled just below their peaks by wide haul roads and by sheer walls as tall as seven-story buildings, laying bare the horizontal bituminous seams.

TVA ROLE CITED

One strip-mining company here, which already has 30 miles of exposed mountaintop high wall, has just received a 15-year, 37.5 million-ton contract from the Tennessee Valley Authority. The company will deliver $112.5 million worth of coal from the Knott County mountainsides at the rate of 50,000 tons a week, enough to fill 10 trains of 200 hopper cars each.

TVA officials say strip mining is inevitable and would occur even if the Federal power agency were not a major factor in the coal market. It is the single largest purchaser of coal in the country.

However, critics here believe there is irony in a Government agency's consumption of strip-mined coal at a time when President Johnson is seeking to preserve natural beauty and is spending $36 million under the Appalachia recovery program for strip-mine reclamation.

The resistance comes from plain people in the shady hollows, little seen from the twisting roads. A few members say they are determined not to be "buried alive" by strip mine "spoil" banks that are cast over the high mountainsides, pushing timber, roads, gardens, and even houses off the sloping land.

COFFIN WAS DISLODGED

Mrs. Bige Ritchie, a hill woman from the head of Sassafras Creek, said that when she saw a strip-mine bulldozer uproot the coffin of her infant son from the backyard family cemetery and pitch it down the mountainside "I like to lost my mind over it."

That was about five years ago, and she and her husband, a retired underground miner did nothing about it. For generations, proud, silent—and largely illiterate—suffering has been a salient characteristic of the people here.

Now, however, the coal operator's enormously expanding strip-mining operations have produced a revolt of the normally apathetic people of the Cumberland Mountains. They have enlisted a few major allies and are looking for more—in Washington.

Mrs. Ritchie told her story for the first time at a recent mass meeting of the Appalachian Group To Save the Land and the People, a citizens committee organized on June 8 by two Kentucky schoolteachers from the Clear Creek area of Knott County.

MEET WITH GOVERNOR

There was another mass meeting June 16 and an unusual one last Tuesday in the office of Gov. Edward T. Breathitt, Jr., in Frankfort.

Herman Ritchie, a 30-year-old said that his wife and two children "had to get out or be killed when they started rolling rocks on the house, splitting the trees up behind us on the slope—one rock rolled right up to the front porch."

Residents of Clear Creek and Lott's Creek also complained that the vacant home of Enos Ritchie, a U.S. Marine "fighting for his country in Vietnam," had been knocked from its foundation by a spoil bank slide.

In the contour strip-mining method used on the mountainous terrain here, bulldozers cut a wide, winding "bench," a highwaylike level footing on the high slopes over the hollows for power shovels. The shovels and bulldozers then remove the overburden by dumping it over the downhill edge of the cut.

SEAM IS THEN MINED

The exposed seam of coal is then mined by loading it into trucks or by augering. The diesel-powered auger is a relatively new device that can bore horizontally into a seam for up to 200 feet, extracting the broken coal in the same way a carpenter's serpentine bit removes woodchips from a drilled hole.

Where it remains stable, the "outslope" of discarded rock and rubble destroys and buries the trees for hundreds of yards below the mine cut. When there is a "slip" or slide, as after a rainfall or freeze, the steep spoil banks shift farther into the hollows below, covering more timber and filling roads, streams, and houses with rocks, shale, and a carpet of ooze.

Because the Kentucky Court of Appeals ruled as recently as 1960 that strip-mine operators were exempt from liability or the consequences of stripping there is no ordinary recourse here to the courts.

Those at the two mass meetings in June listened—and were angry. Without the help of Eldon Davidson, the high school principal in Jenkins who summers in the Clear Creek community, and Leroy Martin, a Knott County high school teacher, their protest might not have been heard without resort to the violence that is endemic in this hard countryside.

ENLIST CIVIC LEADERS

The teachers organized the Appalachian Group to Save the Land and the People, and enlisted in it county officials, lawyers, miners and merchants from the towns.

The sponsors include Tolbert Combs, the Perry County Commonwealth's (prosecuting) attorney; George Wooten, county judge (administrative officer) of Leslie County, and Sam Webb, Letcher County tax assessor.

Mr. Webb complained that strip mining was depleting the meager tax base of his county.

The relative luster of this membership obtained the protest audience with the Governor and has tended to deflect the charges of some coal operators that the protest movement is composed of radicals, Communists, or persons seeking personal gain.

The group's chief spokesman is Harry M. Caudill, a Whitesburg lawyer who is known as "the mountain muckraker." In 1963, he wrote the book "Night Comes to the Cumberlands," a sardonic chronology of the frontier in Kentucky and the discovery of coal and poverty.

Recently, Mr. Caudill said he has been warned by friends of possible threats against his life.

GOVERNOR ISSUES WARNING

After the conference Governor Breathitt warned the strip-mining industry that "we do not intend to permit this industry or any other industry to destroy the beauty of Kentucky's countryside or the usefulness of its earth for future generations."

At that meeting were 10 of about 75 persons who had staged the first march on the State Capitol in memory from counties among the poorest in all of Appalachia. Many said that they had never ventured to Frankfort before, or out of the mountains.

They demanded a special session of the legislature to prohibit strip mining on the mountains, where they said the growing number of precarious outslopes of excavated dirt and rock "threatens to ruin the region within a decade."

COURT DECISION APPEALED

One matter that remains to be worked out is the Kentucky Court of Appeals' long history of denial of protection to surface landowners against the effects of strip mining.

Under the "broad-form deeds" common throughout the coalfields, the court has held that the owners of subterranean mineral rights, under deeds negotiated nearly 100 years ago, have unlimited rights to remove the coal by any methods—including destroying the surface—that does not involve wanton, arbitrary or malicious conduct. In its 1960 decision, the court held that the dislodgement of a boulder through a Kentucky mountain home below a strip mine was an ordinary and nonliable consequence of mining under a broad-form deed.

Mr. Caudill last week filed a suit seeking to challenge the court's rulings on the ground that the equity of the surface owners was being violated, even if the law was not.

Under Kentucky's new strip-mine law, the coal companies here are planting fruit trees and bushes on the spoil banks and benches, and there are forecasts by industry spokesmen of a new apple- and berry-packing industry, with packinghouses and canneries.

Both William B. Sturgill, an executive of the Kentucky Oak Mining Co., the concern whose stripping activities here triggered the protest movement, and Aubrey J. Wagner, chairman of the board of the TVA, defend the Knott County operations.

Mr. Sturgill said that the surface owners knew, or should have known, the provisions of their deeds when they bought their land. He said that his company was paying 50 cents a linear foot to persons whose surface property is crossed by the strip mines.

"But it's purely for public relations," he declared. "We can go over the land without paying them a thing anytime we want."

Mr. Wagner said the TVA was considering placing a price penalty on coal from the three States that have no strip-mine regulation at all—Alabama, Tennessee, and Virginia. He praised Kentucky's strip-mine regulation.

Mr. Wagner asserted that the hundreds of miles of strip-mine haul roads and mountain cuts on the Kentucky landscape constituted a new resource in themselves, giving access for fire control and future recreational purposes.

"Strip mining, while it is going on, looks like the devil," he said, "but what comes out of it has done wonders for this area. If you look at what those mountains were doing before this stripping, they were just growing trees that were not being harvested."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

UNITED STATES IS LEADING MANKIND TO THE ABYSS OF A THIRD WORLD WAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, hour by hour, day by day, and week by week, the United States is leading mankind to the abyss of a third world war as a result of our outlawry in southeast Asia. I speak once again on the floor of the Senate with a sad heart with regard to this great threat to the peace of the world. I speak with deep disappointment that my country is writing such a black page in history, which future generations will read, that we did not resort to the substitution of the rule of law for the jungle law of military might when this threat to the peace reared its ugly head.

In addressing the 20th anniversary observance of the United Nations, President Johnson unfortunately honored the charter of the organization more in the breach than in the observance. Perhaps it marks some advance in the administration's position that the President expressed the willingness of the United States to accept whatever effective action the U.N. might take in Vietnam. But there was nothing in the President's speech to indicate that the United States is willing to accept the obligations for international behavior placed upon us by our signature on that charter.

United States policies toward Vietnam should encompass at least the following essentials:

First, they should command widespread support and respect throughout the world and throughout the United States. This is not presently the case. It is not the case primarily because our actions not only in South Vietnam but in carrying the war into North Vietnam cut straight across the exhortations we have preached to others to observe and respect the rule of law in relations with other nations. Hardly a month has passed since the end of World War II that we have not pleaded with some nation to settle through peaceful procedures its disputes with others. Time and again we have cited the obligation of members of the United Nations to refrain from the use of force against other countries, and to utilize regional agencies, the good offices of the Secretary General of the U.N., direct negotiations, or any other peaceful means to handle these disputes. And we have urged country after country to accept United Nations jurisdiction over those issues they cannot settle peacefully themselves.

But in Vietnam we have not followed our own advice. In Vietnam we have scorned the rule of law, we have used

force on a steadily rising level, and we have thrown out excuse after excuse for not following the procedures of the United Nations Charter to which we are bound as much as any other member nation.

It is the total separation of the policy we follow ourselves from the policy we recommend to others that has brought the American war in Vietnam into so much disrepute especially among the nations of the world whose approval and support we most desire in the world.

This is no matter of some American compulsion to be loved. This is a matter of winning the war against communism. Our whole justification for what we are doing in Asia relies on the contention that we are saving Asia from communism.

How wrong we are, for our course of action is creating sympathizers with the Communist position by the hundreds of thousands, week by week. Yet justification for our policy relies on keeping nations and people out of the Communist bloc, and out from under the domination of Communist China.

We are waging a war for loyalties and opinions in Asia. If we save the ground in Indochina and continue to lose the support and backing of India, Pakistan, Japan, and Indonesia—the truly great powers of Asia—then what have we really saved? Nothing. We will have lost infinitely more than we could ever gain in South Vietnam.

It is time we stopped thinking in the parochial terms of the small parcels of land the United States can actually occupy and control, at great cost in life and money, and start thinking in terms of what the United States must stand for in order to impress the great masses of people in Asia that our way of life is better than the Communist way.

We do not have to abandon our commitment to South Vietnam in order to do that. But we do have to do something more than what we are now doing.

We must stop making war and follow rule-of-law procedures that will cause others to join us in our quest for peace in Asia. That is the difference between high noon and black midnight.

The second essential that our policy must include is the cost of "victory" as well as defeat. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], explored the consequences of our policy in terms of cost here on the Senate floor some days ago. As he pointed out, the cost to the United States of our present policy is already high, and shows signs of going only higher. Yet no "victory" is in sight, and no ultimate victory will ever be won. Many military victories, yes; but ultimately we shall be leaving a legacy to future generations of Americans of utter danger in Asia, for Asians, no matter how many decades it will take, will make it perfectly clear to the United States and to the Western Powers that they will not be allowed to dominate an acre of Asia.

Third, our policy in Vietnam must encompass an appreciation of what kind of war will be supported by the American people. I believe we will make a profound mistake if we do no more than prosecute the war with the idea that if we fight a stalemated ground war long enough the Vietcong and North Vietnam will eventually give up and ask for negotiations.

Again, in my judgment, we could not be more wrong, for I think it is inevitable that we shall have to learn the lesson that the Asians will not participate in bilateral negotiations with the United States. They now consider us an enemy with whom there can be no truce, so far as a bilateral negotiated settlement is concerned.

In my judgment, the only hope for saving mankind from a third world war is to have our allies move, and move quickly, to carry out their obligations under the United Nations Charter and to take jurisdiction over the war in Asia. That will mean issuing rules of law to be complied with, not only by the Asians, but by the United States.

The United States must be brought to the bar of international justice, along with the Communists, and the United States and the Communists must have the law laid down to them, and the other nations of the world must make it perfectly clear to the United States and to the Communists that this war must stop; that this unjustifiable killing, that will extend in the months ahead to thousands and thousands, unless it is stopped, must be brought to an end by the other nations of the world proceeding to live up to the obligations placed upon them as a result of their signing the United Nations Charter.

The senior Senator from Oregon will continue to pray and hope that our country will recognize that it has a moral obligation to abide by its signature to the United Nations Charter and proceed, as I shall say in the course of this speech, to lay this threat to the peace of the world before the United Nations for full and binding determination without further delay.

It is coming to be a rather popular theory in some quarters that a stalemated ground war in Asia will be necessary to bring the Vietcong and the Vietnamese to the bargaining table, now that the policy of bombing North Vietnam into negotiations has proved a failure. That is why we have the policy of bombing North Vietnam. It is thought that by bombing North Vietnam, the North Vietnamese will be brought into negotiations. But that has already proved to be a failure. The evidence is already clear that it will never be possible to bomb North Vietnam into the kind of surrender that will bring her to the bilateral negotiating table with the United States. We are hearing that instead of trying to grind the north into seeing the wisdom of bargaining, we should put the hundred thousand or more Americans into the south that would be needed to fight the Vietcong to a draw and convince them after enough fighting and enough losses that they cannot win and therefore should negotiate.

But I think the theorists who are greatly taken with the intellectual concept that the new white man's burden calls for drawn-out, low-level, and inconclusive fighting over great areas and great periods of time totally ignore the factor of what the American people will support. The ideology of this concept is widely favored among military and diplomatic people who envision the United States taking the place of the British Empire in policing the world for our own ends as we see them. They keep telling us that the Communists excel in protracted operations that seek to wear down an opponent until he gives up out of sheer exasperation and disgust. We are told that we must meet this challenge by outlasting the Vietcong in low-level, indecisive fighting, and that to do this, we must overcome our natural American proclivity for fast results and neat conclusions.

I disagree with this theory because I do not believe there is anything inherently wrong with the American proclivity for fast results and near conclusions. Surely we know from history that disputes that fester and drag on for years not only leave bitter divisions among people but they also furnish a continuing spark that can ignite widespread war.

It was for this very reason that the United Nations was created. Did we not help create it because we know perfectly well that a long drawn-out dispute can suck in nation after nation into general war? Did we not help create the United Nations so there would be some means of controlling and settling disputes by peaceful procedures so they would not provide the seedbed for total war?

In an era of ideological conflict such as we have today, it is more urgent than ever before that disputes be controlled by international procedures. At a time when purely national interests dictated the foreign policies of the great powers, it was possible for one of them to stay out of a small war on the other side of the world. Today, we have merged our concept of national interest with ideology so that we and the Communists both see every conflict everywhere as one deserving our full attention and intervention.

It was bad enough that at the beginning of the century the world allowed perpetual Balkan wars and recurring colonial rivalries to simmer and grow until most of the world was entangled in a massive network of interlocking alliances, all armed to the teeth, merely waiting for the spark to set the tinderbox afire.

It was bad enough that, two decades later, the Spanish Civil War was allowed to accumulate participants and become a focal point for the great ideological war between fascism and communism that finally culminated in World War II.

There is much talk in the halls of Congress these days about Munich and about how one unmet aggression only leads to more aggression. I digress to state that I have yet to hear it proposed that the United States should have unilaterally proceeded to war at the time of Munich. I have yet to hear it proposed in these halls that the United States should have unilaterally moved into Hungary in 1956.

Mistakes are made sometimes—by the United States, too. Mistakes were made at the time of Munich, and at the time of Hungary. However, the mistake then was that, as is true now, the United

States was not exercising the leadership that it ought to have exercised in urging then, as it should urge now, a substitution of the rule of law for the jungle law of military might. Do not forget also, Mr. President, that the time of Munich was not time of nuclear power.

The world of today is as different from the world at the time of Munich as opposites can be. But the real problem is not inducing the United States of America to meet every aggression everywhere in the world. We must face up to our limitations. We have neither the manpower nor the resources to meet every threat around the world. We must insist that the threats must be met on a multilateral basis, on a United Nations basis, and not on an American solo basis.

The problem is bringing some procedures to bear upon an act of aggression, or a civil war, or any disturbance, that will bring it under control before every leading nation feels obliged to act unilaterally on behalf of its own interest. Wars do not start with some single, spectacular, and unexpected action although many people labor under that false impression.

They develop over issues and incidents that go unsettled until they escalate into general conflict, or cause some dramatic incident that is then cited as the cause of the war. However, the causes of major war are usually of long standing. The cause should be eradicated before some dramatic incident throws powers into mortal combat.

To cope with these disturbances before they lead to general war is what the United Nations is for. It is not really for anything else, although most of its members would prefer that it deal with everything else and not with keeping the peace.

UNITED STATES CANNOT SUBSTITUTE ITSELF FOR UNITED NATIONS

If we have learned anything yet from the war in Vietnam, it is that the United States, acting alone, cannot end the war. At worst, we can help it develop into a nuclear holocaust; at best, we can assure that it drags on indefinitely, while the people of South Vietnam and North Vietnam to pay the price of being caught between the world's leading ideologies.

But as I have indicated, I do not believe the United States itself would long support a war that continued indefinitely without conclusion. We have already tried that course in Vietnam, and the escalation of the bombing into the north was the answer. The longer the war drags out, the more escalating there will be.

But we are not the only nation that stands ready to escalate, rather than lose. North Vietnam, China, and the Soviet Union also have an interest in the outcome that could bring them all in to some degree, any one of which would require a further step-up in the American war effort.

It is the judgment of the senior Senator from Oregon—and I believe, Mr. President, that there is ample indication of the soundness of my observation—that if this administration would seek to determine what Red Russia and Red China will do if we continue to escalate the war, it would discover that a bombing of Hanoi and/or a bombing of the nuclear installations of Red China would bring Russia into the war immediately, and she would not confine her fighting of that war to Asia.

I believe that warning is important for the American people to contemplate and for the leaders of our Government to note that I repeat it.

It is the judgment of the senior Senator from Oregon that a bombing of Hanoi and of the nuclear installations of Red China by the United States would bring Russia into the war, and she would not confine her fighting to Asia.

That means that the third world war would be on. That is the reason why, in my opinion, we have not much time in which to save mankind from the scourge of a war, out of which would come no victors and from which mankind would not recover for many centuries.

That is the reason why I believe it is so important that the American people speak up. It is important that this administration proceed now to hear from the American people before the tens of thousands of coffins start coming back—and they will come back if we escalate this war into a massive war in Asia.

There is no question as to where the senior Senator from Oregon will stand once that war is declared; but, as I have said on this floor so many times during the past few years, and I will repeat again this morning, so long as I believe there is any hope of changing the course of my country from one of outlawry to one of legality, the senior Senator from Oregon will continue to plead for peace and for the substitution of the peaceful procedures available to us for the jungle law procedures we are now following.

Even now we are not the only nation that stands ready to escalate. Nations on the other side are watching our every move. The moment we make the move that leaves what they feel is no choice but to make war against us, they will move their battalions, they will move their air power, they will fire their missiles.

Nor has our unilateral action accomplished our avowed objectives in Vietnam. They are to forestall the spread of communism, and to preserve world peace. But since our entry into the war, both the war and the degree of Communist control of the area have spread.

That is why I believe it is in our interest to stop the war, and to exhaust every possible means of doing that through the United Nations. We cannot stop the war alone. But the United Nations could, if it would, and the United States has more to gain from a U.N.-imposed peace than from a continuation of the fighting that can lead anywhere but to a victory on our terms.

OBJECTIONS TO U.N. ACTION NOT VALID

Some rather peculiar objections have already been placed before the public for disregarding the United Nations Charter. Prominent among them is the assertion that North Vietnam has rejected the feeler for U.N. action apparently put out by the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant. In the same category are objections that North Vietnam is not a U.N. member, that Red China is not a U.N. member, and South Vietnam is not a U.N. member.

Every one of these assertions is true, but completely irrelevant—completely irrelevant.

Worse than that, they amount to giving these nonmembers a total and very effective veto power over the U.N. action. Because North Vietnam—a nonmember—said U.N. action was "inappropriate" in no way affects the jurisdiction of the Security Council or the General Assembly over any situation that threatens the peace.

It in no way reduced by one iota the obligations of the signatories to the United Nations to act in concert, as they are obliged to do, to put a stop to the threat to the peace anywhere in the world. The United Nations Charter does not provide that the United Nations signatories shall ignore a war because some nation that is making war is not a member of the United Nations. Thus we see that the apologists for non-United Nations action are really saying, "We cannot take or should not take it to the United Nations because North Vietnam is not a member of the United Nations." Therefore, in effect, they are saying we ought to let North Vietnam, a warmaker, veto the action of the United Nations. What nonsense. What a nonsequitur. And yet there are those high in the U.S. State Department and Pentagon who are advancing that rationalization.

I repudiate that, as I have so many times in the past. Membership or nonmembership in the United Nations does not affect a single bit of duty and obligation of members of the United Nations to act in concert to prevent a war from spreading.

What a travesty on the powers of the United Nations, and upon American objections to the use of the veto, to accord to North Vietnam and China a veto over what the organization may do in southeast Asia. It is especially ironic to hear people who object to giving Red China the Chinese seat on the Security Council also object to putting this dispute before the organization on the ground that Red China is not a member. They are giving Red China a more effective veto over the United Nations than she could ever exercise on the Security Council.

Those of us who were here when President Truman rallied the United Nations in 1950 to throw back aggression in Korea remember that even the opposition of the Soviet Union did not stop the United Nations from acting.

In Russia's absence—and we remember how Russia left the Security Council—while Russia was away from the Security Council, the Security Council took jurisdiction over the breach of the peace in Korea.

And when Russia came back and began vetoing the implementation of that decision to intervene, the issue was taken to the General Assembly, and it acted.

May I say once again that, although it is most desirable to have the Security Council take jurisdiction, the United Na-

tions does not become impotent if some member of the Security Council vetoes the taking of the jurisdiction.

North Korea was not a U.N. member and she was not invited to take part in the discussions, and she did not ask to take part; that did not deter the U.N. from acting and preventing the Korean conflict from escalating into world war III.

None of these nonmember countries should be accorded a veto over prospective United Nations action in southeast Asia, either by declining to take part in its discussion or by opposing what is proposed.

A few days ago, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] spoke on the necessity to bring the United Nations into Vietnam. As he put it, he proposed "that we abandon our unilateral posture in Vietnam by soliciting the services of the United Nations in the search for a peaceful settlement."

The senior Senator from Oregon completely agrees with the Senator from Idaho. The senior Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] have been making that proposal for 2 years here on the floor of the Senate. We have been urging for 2 years that the United States resort to the carrying out of its obligations under the United Nations and lay this threat to the peace of the world before the United Nations for its jurisdiction. We applaud the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. Those who supported him on the floor of the Senate include the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

It is highly significant that increasing numbers of voices in the Congress, and increasing tens of thousands of voices across America, are urging that our country resort to the United Nations and fulfill its obligations as a member of the United Nations, rather than continue to act as an outlaw in defiance of its obligations under the United Nations.

Mr. President, the ways in which we can go to the United Nations are clear, because they are set forth in the United Nations Charter itself.

One of the main purposes of my speech today is to outline once again the steps that the United States should follow in resorting to the procedures of the United Nations as the vehicle and the means for seeking to keep the peace in Asia and to stop the war which is now being waged and which promises to kill human beings by the tens of thousands in the months ahead.

FIRST OBLIGATION IS TO NEGOTIATE WITH OTHER PARTIES

We could request the Vietcong to join us, South Vietnam, and possibly North Vietnam in negotiations. The use of acceptable mediators and conciliators could be discussed.

It has been said, and it is probably true, that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese are not going to come to a negotiating table controlled by the United States. Possibly that is so. But we have not determined whether it is so, or not. We have not sought the participation of the Vietcong in any negotiations, even though they are a major party to the dispute.

The terms of the charter provide certain steps to be taken when breaches of the peace occur. The first is article XXXIII:

1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

Mr. President, the speech made by the President at Johns Hopkins, in which he stated that we are ready to engage in unconditional discussion, does not meet the requirements of that article.

Spokesmen for the Government, including the President himself, say from time to time that we are ready to negotiate, but we have not taken the official, formal steps to request negotiations with the parties to the dispute, as article 33 requires that we do.

Talk is no substitute for action.

Until my President acts, I shall continue, sad though it makes me, to express my differences with the President in connection with the undeclared, unconstitutional war that he is fighting in Asia.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I congratulate the senior Senator from Oregon on this extremely important, comprehensive, and masterly presentation, in great detail, and with unanswerable logic and wisdom, of what the policy of the United States should have been and should now be, in order to extricate it from the unjustified, undeclared, bloody, and disastrous war in southeast Asia.

His presentation continues to amplify what he has been urging day in and day out on the floor of the Senate before public forums for nearly 2 years.

I have been proud, and I am proud today, to associate myself with every point in his remarks.

I wish that every American citizen could read his speech and realize that it is a truly statesmanlike and patriotic effort to save the American people and, indeed, the people of many other nations, from the great folly that has been committed by our Government in involving itself militarily in southeast Asia.

The Senator from Oregon has well pointed out that our mistaken policy in southeast Asia is aiding and abetting imperialist communism and defeating the very purposes for which we allegedly are there, and on behalf of which we are sacrificing untold—and will increasingly sacrifice—young American lives.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Alaska always fills me with humility when he is kind enough to endorse anything that I say in regard to the crisis in Asia.

I have said many times on the floor of the Senate, and repeat now, that the leadership the Senator from Alaska has provided during the past 2 years to the point of view which has sought to stop the United States from its course of action in Asia has been a great inspiration to me.

I have nothing but the greatest of admiration for the intelligence and erudition of the Senator from Alaska in the field of foreign affairs.

The great interest in the grassroots of America in regard to the foreign policy of the United States in Asia is due in no small measure to the leadership that the Senator from Alaska has been giving to the people of this country during the past 2 years.

On platform after platform across this Nation, he has spoken out fearlessly, intelligently, unanswerably, in opposition to the administration's war in Asia.

I thank him very much for his support.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I have listened intently to the statesmanlike address of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. It is my hope that every Senator who is not present in the Chamber will read the speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is my hope that this statesmanlike utterance, which is pointed toward avoiding a third world war, which would devastate the world, will be disseminated and read throughout the free world, and also behind the Iron Curtain, as I believe it will be.

I believe that the Senator from Oregon has made a distinct contribution toward permanent peace in this world. The majority of Americans, I am sure, wish to make maximum use of the United Nations to help us negotiate the Vietnam war in an honorable manner at the conference table, where all the parties to the present horrible conflict in southeast Asia will try to work out an agreement, so that our finest young American manhood will not lose their lives in the jungle warfare in southeast Asia so many thousands of miles from our shores.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish words could adequately express my appreciation for the support which I have received from the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. I am sure he will not object to my saying that the Senator from Ohio is my senior both in age and in depth of great experience and knowledge. I feel toward him as I feel toward the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. When men like the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] share at least the objective that I am seeking—they may very well differ with the details of some of my proposals—namely, the application of the rules of international law to the war in southeast Asia, I take great heart, and I find renewed strength from their endorsement.

I wish to finish the thought I was stating at the time the Senator from Alaska intervened—that I want to support my President. My criticisms of the President and his handling of the war indicate no lack of support for him, in that I want to join him in carrying out the intentions of peace which flow from his heart. My criticisms are criticisms that flow from a basic difference of opinion with the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and his other war advisers.

Mr. President, we must take formal action within the framework of the United Nations if we are to keep faith with our professings about our ideals of peace.

What I am saying most respectfully is that all the words that the President of the United States utters cannot be a substitute for the formal action which is the obligation of the United States under the United Nations Charter. We have not fulfilled that obligation. All the excuses that are given by the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense are no substitute for our duty to proceed to follow the provisions of the charter. Further, I repeat that the President has no justification for sending American boys to their death in Vietnam, in the absence of a formal declaration of war by Congress. The President is making war.

It is well known by my colleagues in the Senate that it is my judgment that Congress cannot delegate to the President of the United States the power to make war in the absence of a declaration of war.

The President of the United States has no legal authority under the Constitution of the United States to send a single American boy into battle without a declaration of war. Why does he not ask for it? There are a good many reasons, in my opinion, why he does not ask for a declaration of war.

A proposal for a declaration of war would arouse the American people at the grassroots of this Republic, and the President would soon find such a division among our people that there would be serious question as to whether that war would meet with the approval of the people. A declaration of war immediately changes our international law relations with every country in the world. Speaking hypothetically for the moment, let us assume that we have a formal declaration of war tomorrow. Let us contemplate the great changes in international law relations with country after country. Of course, there is only one country on which we can make any possible prima facie case for a declaration of war, and that is North Vietnam. Let me make perfectly clear—and I do not intend to evade the major question—that if such a declaration of war came before the Senate, I would vote against it. I would do so because on the basis of the facts there would be no justification for the United States to declare war against North Vietnam. We might just as well declare war against ourselves. Along with North Vietnam we are jointly guilty of violating one international law after another in our war in Vietnam. We have flouted the Geneva accords of 1954 ever since 1954. We proceeded immediately to violate the Geneva accords in incident after incident that I have documented here on the floor time and time again.

There is not a basis or a justification for a declaration of war against North Vietnam, and there is not a justification for our continuing to make war in South Vietnam and North Vietnam. However, there is a clear duty on the part of this Republic, through its Commander in Chief, to lay the threat to the peace of the world in Asia before the Security Council without further delay.

Let us see what they will do. When the Secretary of State tells the American people, as he has time and time again, that he thinks Russia would veto it in the Security Council, and therefore nothing could be accomplished, how does he know, until he tries? I want to put Russia on the spot.

I wish to put her in a position in which she has got to show whether or not she will join with other members of the United Nations in enforcing the peace in Asia, or whether she will seek to prevent by her veto in the Security Council the taking of jurisdiction by the Security Council over the war in Asia.

But if she vetoes it, then take it to the General Assembly. Line up, as I am satisfied we can line up, a minimum of 90 nations, and probably 100, which will agree to join forces in taking multilateral action in Asia to prevent a continuation of this war. That is a legal duty of the United States, may I say to the President and the Secretary of State once again. They have not carried out that obligation. They have made fine-sounding speeches about our peaceful intentions. The test of our peaceful intentions is whether or not we will carry out our treaty commitments. In my judgment, this is a solemn treaty commitment that we ought to carry out. We ought to exhaust every possibility of using the rules of law for the maintenance of peace in Asia before we resort, on any basis whatsoever, to the use of military might.

I point out that our offers to negotiate with North Vietnam and with China have not been accepted. But they are unilateral offers; they do not include a principal party to the dispute.

Until we offer to negotiate with them or undertake with them any of the other means of settlement above, we have not really explored the possibilities of this article nor fulfilled our obligation under it.

Unfortunately, the American people are not fully informed. Many of them are not informed at all in regard to the organization and the operations of the Vietcong in parts of South Vietnam which they control—and they control about three-quarters of the land area of South Vietnam.

Yesterday I spent more than 2 hours talking with a civilian airline pilot who has flown for the past 2 years over all of South Vietnam into Cambodia and has been a party to forays into North Vietnam.

All I wish to say on this occasion is that this airplane pilot, a man of mature years, verified the contentions which the senior Senator from Oregon has made in regard to the lack of justification of the unilateral war that the United States is conducting in South Vietnam. He pointed out to me in this conversation that not even the South Vietnamese will ever stay with us. He pointed out what other briefings and other intelligence reports that we have received, often at variance with the propaganda that is issued to the American people by the State Department and the Pentagon, have shown that the South Vietnamese want a united Vietnam. He found that a majority of the South Vietnamese never were supporters, for example, of the first puppet government that the United States established in South Vietnam, in clear violation of the Geneva accords, which provided not for a Vietnam split into two governments, but provided for a Vietnam temporarily separated at the 17th parallel until elections could be held to reunite Vietnam under a common government, with the principle of self-determination rendering the verdict.

And who stopped it? Our country stopped it.

How did we do it? We took an exile out of New York City and Washington, D.C., financed him, militarized him, sent him to South Vietnam, and built him up into a puppet military dictator; and he stamped out any hope for the rise of freedom during his regime, as every puppet that we supported that has succeeded him has stamped out freedom in South Vietnam.

Yet, our Government talks about freedom in South Vietnam, and that we are there to protect freedom.

Mr. President, we have been there to protect a military dictatorship, corrupt to the core, puppet by puppet.

Finally the American people will come to understand that. Let me say to my President, "When they do, your program will be repudiated."

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I ask the Senator from Oregon whether he thinks the present government of Ky, which has just abolished all newspapers, and which has ordered the shooting of people without trial, is likely to engender any more support than the support which Mr. Diem was able to mobilize.

Mr. MORSE. So far as I can see, it is an even worse, more horrendous, and more shocking dictatorship than that of the puppets who preceded him. Here we have the building up of sandbag walls against which Ky says he will shoot as many as 10,000, and without a trial. That is the kind of freedom we are supporting with American blood in South Vietnam.

Wait until the American people fully comprehend the significance of our program in South Vietnam. In my judgment, they will repudiate it.

We have not really explored all the possibilities of article XXXIII of the charter, and they will not be explored until we invite the representatives of the Vietcong to join in some form of negotiation or mediation.

CHARTER THEN REQUIRES WE GO TO SECURITY COUNCIL

I should like to move to the next article of the charter, which requires that the United States go to the Security Council.

Article 34 describes the jurisdiction of the Security Council:

> The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

Obviously, the war in Vietnam qualifies for at least "investigation" by the Security Council.

We have not made use of the article, and it will not be used until the President requests that the Secretary of State or our Ambassador to the United Nations formally file a resolution calling for Security Council takeover.

Article 35 continues:

> 1. Any member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly.
>
> 2. A state which is not a member of the United Nations may bring to the attention of the General Assembly any dispute to which it is a party if it accepts in advance, for the purposes of the dispute, the obligations to pacific settlement provided in the present charter.
>
> 3. The proceedings of the General Assembly in respect of matters brought to its attention under this article will be subject to the provisions of articles 11 and 12.

There is a considerable movement afoot among members of the British Labor Party to induce the British Government to act under this article to put the Vietnam war before the Security Council. Article 99 of the charter also empowers the Secretary General to bring before the Security Council a dispute he regards as a potential threat to peace. Since members, nonmembers, and the Secretary General all have the right to do it, the United States would be in the best position if it acts to seek U.N. jurisdiction before someone else does it and, in effect, makes the United States a defendant in the matter.

If we fail to get discussions, we should invite the Vietcong and North and South Vietnam to join us in laying the dispute before the Security Council.

Article 37 is a clear statement of American obligation if we fail to settle the Vietnam problem by peaceful means of our own choosing:

> 1. Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that article, they shall refer it to the Security Council.
>
> 2. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute in fact is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security it shall decide whether to take action under article 36 or to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

The discussions thus far have all been informal. There has been talk that would lead one to believe that U Thant has laid the matter before the United Nations. Formally, he has not. There has been talk that would lead one to believe that there has been some formal consideration of the total issue of the threat to the peace of the world by the United Nations. There has not.

The plea of the senior Senator from Oregon this morning is that we delay no longer in complying with the formal procedures available to us under the various articles of the United Nations.

Very likely the Vietcong and North Vietnam will never join us in referring the war to the Security Council. But they are not U.N. members. We are. They do not claim to stand for the rule of law in the world. We do. They could not muster anything like the support in the U.N. that we could.

Like North Korea, they probably would not appear at all. But it is their objective to take control of territory they do not now control; and it is our objective to keep them out. A peacekeeping mission of the U.N. could very likely do more to achieve our stated objective than we are doing.

Suppose the armed representatives of 90 nations were stationed in South Vietnam along the 17th parallel, along the Cambodian border, and at strategic lines crisscrossing South Vietnam itself. Do Senators believe the Communists would not be concerned about that? Do they really believe that the chances of keeping the peace would not be improved? The United Nations forces would be there not to make war, but to keep the peace; to resort to military action only in case they were fired upon. They would have the same obligation that the United Nations forces in the Gaza strip have maintained for years. By being there, they have prevented a war in the Middle East for years. They would have the same obligation that the United Nations forces are fulfilling in Cyprus, thus preventing a war in the Mediterranean; the same obligation that the United Nations forces were under in the Congo. Do not forget that when the United Nations forces went into the Congo, they drove Russia out, for Russia was already there. It was a small contingent, it is true—some 750 to 1,000 armed personnel. But several thousand more were poised on the border, ready to go in. Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations, made it clear to Khrushchev that either he would take his forces out or the United Nations forces would move them out. Khrushchev took his forces out.

I do not have many precedents, but I at least have some. The administration has none to support its outlawry in South Vietnam as an instrumentality for obtaining peace. It will never obtain peace by following its present procedure. It will only assure the world of more and more war. We have entered an era in the history of mankind when every nation, including the United States, had better recognize that the way to peace is not through war.

We can place the issue before the U.N. very simply, by means of a letter addressed to the President of the Security Council by our Government. That is our primary duty. In so doing, we do not necessarily have to propose a specific action to be taken. But I believe the U.S. Ambassador should address to the President of the Council a letter, declaring that acting under these articles of the United Nations Charter, the United States requests an urgent and immediate meeting of the Security Council to discuss the matter of the war in Vietnam and the extent of the threat it poses to international peace and security.

That would put the issue where it belongs—before the United Nations Security Council in the first instance. I hope that is as far as we would have to go.

That would achieve what the Senator from Idaho calls soliciting the help of the United Nations in finding a peaceful solution.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS THAT COULD BE PROPOSED BY THE UNITED STATES

What about possible solutions that could be proposed by the United States? I shall mention only a few for illustrative purposes.

It could well be that Security Council members who are not directly involved in Vietnam as yet could come up with some proposals for handling the problem that would be more successful than what the United States could promote. But we could offer some resolutions, and I think we should.

One of them might take the form of calling upon the Secretary General to bring together the participants in the Geneva Conference of 1954, to discuss the means by which a cease-fire may be obtained and steps which may be taken to maintain the future independence of and peace among the states of Indochina.

The procedure is important. Senators have heard me say for many years that the procedure that is followed in a controversy determines the substantive rights that are adjudicated under that procedure. The time has come to formalize our attempts to seek peace by way of negotiation in Asia. As I have said, we cannot do it, in my judgment, by whistling by graveyards. The sad thing is that our administration is not only whistling by graveyards; it is filling graveyards through war. I want the killing stopped. By formalizing the procedure, there will be a better chance to have negotiations under the auspices of the United Nations than there will ever be by the President of the United States merely saying, as he did at San Francisco the other day, in effect, that we are perfectly willing to go along with any effective intervention or intercession or procedure of the United Nations.

The President made it perfectly clear in his Johns Hopkins speech, and in many other speeches, that he seeks peace, and that he recommends any attempt on the part of any of our friendly allies to reach a negotiated settlement or a format for a negotiated settlement. He has made it perfectly clear that he wishes to reach a peaceful settlement. He recommends Prime Minister Wilson's attempt to work out at least a more healthy atmosphere for negotiations. He recommends the good offices of the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Pearson.

I say to the American press, let there be no room for doubt that the senior Senator from Oregon is satisfied that

the President seeks peace. My criticism of the President is not that he seeks peace. My criticism of the President is that he is not making use of the formal procedure that raised the issue so clearly as to what help we can expect from our alleged allies and from the signatories to the United Nations Charter, which they have a mutual obligation, along with us, to honor. The President has not followed the procedures that I am outlining in this address.

We could suggest that the United States give the issue to the United Nations Security Council and that it reconvene the Geneva convention or conference of 1954. If followed, that procedure would be under the cloak and jurisdiction of the Security Council.

That is not a unilateral proposal for negotiations made by the United States. North Vietnam and China and the Vietcong might take quite a different view of negotiations under the directions of the Security Council. It is only a recommendation, along with others that I propose, that we make the suggestion to the United Nations for the consideration of the Security Council, with the decision to be made by the Security Council as to what should be finally adopted as policy. In the meantime, members of the Security Council and of the United Nations may make recommendations to the Security Council and come forward with proposals quite different from the proposals that I respectfully suggest in my address today. That would be a better course and would offer more chance for the United Nations to bring the war in South Vietnam to an end.

In regard to the suggestion that I have made that the Security Council might give consideration to seeking to reconvene the participants in the Geneva Conference of 1954, it would provide a means of seeking a political solution and settlement.

It is even more important that we call upon the Security Council to take action to stop the fighting, and send to Vietnam a peace mission. We could do that through a resolution taking note that the Geneva Agreement of 1954 has been widely violated by signatories and nonsignatories alike, and that, as a result, a condition of war exists in South Vietnam, North Vietnam, and Laos that constitutes a breach of the peace and threatens international peace and security, and which directs the Secretary General to call upon member states to furnish forces and equipment for a United Nations force to separate the belligerents and maintain a cease-fire in South Vietnam, North Vietnam, and Laos pending a political settlement of their dispute.

This course of action might very well lead—and I hope that it would lead—to a solution somewhat similar to Franklin Delano Roosevelt's proposal of 20 years ago at Cairo and Tehran for an international trusteeship for a troubled area that presents a threat to the peace of the world. At that time, he spoke before Indochina, and even before the United Nations came into being. However, even without the existence of the United Nations as an instrumentality for an international trusteeship, Franklin Roosevelt proposed a trusteeship, international in character, for all of Indochina. He forewarned then—and read his warning—20 years ago, that Asia would become the war area of the world unless steps were taken to prevent the development of the conflict that would end in war.

It might very well be that out of a suggestion such as I make today, an expansion of the suggestion could be developed within the Security Council and they might work out a format for a temporary trusteeship under the jurisdiction of the United Nations until the people could be prepared for self-government, and self-determination could be expressed by them through a free ballot.

Quite possibly the sending of a peace force, and the effort to negotiate through a reconvening of the Geneva Conference could both be proposed. They are not inconsistent.

OBLIGATIONS TO SOUTH VIETNAM SECONDARY TO THOSE OF U.N. CHARTER

What about our obligations to South Vietnam? They are secondary to our obligations to the United Nations Charter.

But there is nothing in what I have discussed that would be inconsistent with our commitment of support to South Vietnam.

Article 51 of the charter affirms the right of individual or collective self-defense—until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

> Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

That is my answer to the excuse given by some of the apologists for the war in Vietnam, that, after all, we are in with South Vietnam on what we consider to be a self-defense operation, and that, therefore, the Security Council has no right to intervene. That is not so, Mr. President.

The charter is crystal clear and unequivocal on the point. If the Security Council would not act, it would follow that the United Nations as a whole would have the residual power to act as the authority to move in at any time that it might will to move in.

My plea is it ought to move in. It ought to have moved in 2 years ago. It is long overdue. But better now than not moving in at all, for if no effort is made to try to bring the war to an end by the intervention of multilateral peacekeeping forces in the war, that war will lead, in my judgment, to a third world war holocaust, and it will become nuclear in nature, out of which there will be no survival of the United States or Russia, and many other nations will be in shambles.

That is why it is such a solemn hour in history. That is why I think we have such a moral obligation to history to return to the great moral principles the United States espouses, to the unanswerable ideals we have taught. That is why I believe we must reverse our course, go to New York, call for an extraordinary session of the United Nations, and make our formal petition for multilateral jurisdiction, under the procedures of the United Nations, to maintain peace in southeast Asia.

As I have said, there is nothing in what I have discussed that would be inconsistent with our commitment of support to South Vietnam.

If the Security Council declines to take jurisdiction, or if it fails to take action that effectively stops the war, the United States is free to come to the support of South Vietnam, just as other nations are free to come to the support of North Vietnam. Remember that China and the Soviet Union have the same right to come to the aid of North Vietnam unless and until the U.N. takes what the President called effective action to stop the war. But, unfortunately, if our course becomes everyone's answer, the result is total war.

We can continue to help South Vietnam until the U.N. acts to restore peace. But let us not forget that our 1954 commitment to South Vietnam was no treaty, and it pledged only American aid in the form of goods. Even that was to be in return for certain actions on the part of the South Vietnam Government, actions which it has not to this day ever carried out. Our commitment was contained, not in a treaty, but in a letter from our President to President Diem, and it extended our foreign aid "provided your Government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid were supplied."

The Government of South Vietnam has been unable to fulfill its obligations. Yet we have gone infinitely beyond our obligation, into cobelligerency. By so doing, we have become involved in a situation that brings us under those provisions of the United Nations Charter, to which we are treatybound.

Until we carry out our obligations under that treaty, we do not practice what we preach. And until we carry out those obligations, we cannot expect to enlist the respect or support of those nations of the world whose respect is vital to the future security of our own Nation.

Yes, I know that three Presidents have followed our current unilateral policy. That is supposed to end the debate. But what is proved is only that the policy has been a colossal failure. It has not worked, it is not working, and it is not going to lead us anywhere but into more war.

On the Saturday night before the election in 1964, after I had closed my participation in that election with a major speech in my home town, I received a telephone call from one of the most brilliant advisers of the late President Kennedy. He had spoken elsewhere in my State. He was some miles away. He asked if he could come to see me, even though it was late at night, stating that he had to catch a plane early the next morning out of Portland.

I said, "By all means, come." He said, "There is something I must tell you."

He came to my home and, after the salutations, he said, "You must be a very lonely man." I said, "I am not lonely. Why should I be lonely?" He said, "If you are not lonely, you must be discouraged." I said, "I am not discouraged. Why should I be discouraged? I may be a little disillusioned, but I am neither lonely nor discouraged."

I said, "Why should I be discouraged?" He said, "Because of the position you have taken on foreign policy." I said, "I want you to know, Mr. Ambassador, that I am anything but lonely or discouraged, because there are millions of Americans who stand with me, and I am satisfied that, in due course of time, my Government will understand it, too."

He then told me he had been sent by the late President Kennedy to Vietnam to make a confidential study of the situation in Vietnam, because, as he said, the President was disturbed. He made his study. He said, "Senator, that study verified the positions you have taken many times on South Vietnam in your many speeches."

A couple of weeks ago, before I prepared a certain memorandum that I have been asked to prepare dealing with my position on the United Nations aspect of the war in Asia, I called that individual and recalled for him our conversation in the living room of my home in Eugene, Oreg., on the Saturday night before election. I said:

I want to know to what extent you have modified the views you expressed to me on that evening.

He said:

Senator, I am not going to express my views to the same vigorous extent that you from time to time express your views, but I want you to know I completely agree with your conclusions.

That was reassuring. I mention it, Mr. President, because these are dark hours in which it is very important, in this historic debate, that the American people understand that it is not true that only a few of us are opposed to the present procedures our Government is following. There is rising day by day increasing support within the body politic of this country, urging that our Government proceed to make use of every form of procedure available to it with the presentation of this threat to the peace of the world, within the rules of law and the procedures that are now available under the Charter of the United Nations, as I have sought to outline them today.

Although it is said that what we are doing is carrying out the commitment of three Presidents, the fact is that that does not end the debate. Although it is supposed to, in the minds of some persons, it does not end the debate to say, "Oh, but the President is for this." Under this Government of ours, and under our system of checks and balances, we have a trust to express disagreement with the President when we think he is wrong. I believe the President is so greatly wrong in the procedures he is following in handling this threat to the peace of the world that I shall continue to express my disagreement with him as long as the ugly facts remain what they are at the present time.

What is proved by the argument that three Presidents have committed themselves to this policy? Only that the policy has been a colossal failure. It has not worked. It is not working. It is not going to lead us anywhere but into more war.

In July 1954, the chief of the U.S. military aid mission in Saigon declared:

The war in Indochina can still be won without bringing in one single American soldier to fight.

The Vietnamese have ample manpower and even today outnumber the enemy by 100,000 with superior firepower at least in a ratio of 2 to 1, and probably more. And we are ready to assist them in training an adequate national army for the security of their homeland.

Only 2 years ago, the Secretary of Defense told us that 1965 was the year in which American soldiers could come home.

This sounds like the prediction the French military made for so many years as the French people lost the flower of its manhood in the Indochina war, with approximately 290,000 casualties—more than 90,000 fatalities.

The French people finally answered its Government at home.

I seek to avoid such a thing happening in my own country. However, I am satisfied that as our casualties mount, and irrespective of the spectacular military victories our forces may win, nevertheless, we shall be bogged down for decades to come in Asia. Future administrations of our Government will hear from the people of their time, just as the French people made clear to Mendes-France that they demanded that war in Indochina be brought to an end.

Mendes-France wrote a great chapter in French history by ending the war in Geneva in 1954. Instead of French prestige toppling, it is higher today than it has been at any time for decades.

No dissents of the kind I am making will please the opposition in this country that feels we should continue to make war. I must expect to be charged with encouraging the Communists, with encouraging the Vietcong, but I intend to be no party to the shocking war philosophy of certain spokesmen in American politics of recent days who are openly asking for an all-out war effort in Asia, who are asking for a bombing of Hanoi, who are asking for a bombing of China, and who are really asking for the beginning of the third world war.

I said earlier in my remarks that I am satisfied, if we follow such a course of action, that it will mean nuclear war in the not too distant future.

My speeches will not encourage the Communists, for the Communists do not wish to have the nations of the world rally around the banner of the rule of law. For if they do, they know that for the first time they must negotiate and stop their threats to the peace of the world, for they cannot stand up against an organized world of 90 to 100 nations in opposition to their warmaking. However, they will stand up indefinitely against the warmaking of the United States.

I am still waiting for the administration to produce a single responsible military authority to rebut the military advice of a General Marshall, a General Collins, a General Bradley, a General Eisenhower or a General MacArthur, all of whom from time to time have warned their country against the danger of committing American ground forces in a massive war in Asia.

We are on our way to doing that.

I am satisfied that not too many months in the future, if we continue our course of action, there will be a minimum of 300,000 American troops in Asia. I am satisfied that the plans are already prepared and the logistics are already on paper, ready to move a minimum of 300,000 troops into Asia, if China starts to move.

If we continue our course of action, I believe it is a certainty that China will move.

Do these objections raised on this floor to American policy encourage the Communists?

Surely, the entire Communist world must be encouraged that our leading military figures have been so totally wrong about Vietnam, and even more encouraged to know that $2 billion, 70,000 U.S. troops, the U.S. 7th Fleet, the Tactical Air Force and the Strategic Air Command have all had to be thrown into a war in which the major force of no Communist country is yet on the move. Ho Chi Minh has not even started to move his equipped and ready-to-fight 350,000 troops.

This country, and the entire world, let me respectfully say, stand to gain more from a United Nations jurisdiction over this war than from a continuation of the fighting caused by the escalation of the war. It is in that direction that we must ultimately turn.

Mr. President, as we read the newspapers this morning, we know now that it is no longer a South Vietnamese war, that it has become an American war, with American troops being dropped from the air, with American drops being massed on the ground, and with American airmen and American naval men conducting aggressive and belligerent attacks, as cobelligerents in a war that tends to become such a serious threat to the peace of mankind, that unless mankind rises up now—through the existing procedures available to it—and calls for the intervention of the rule of law, I fear that in the not too distant future we shall be in world war III.

However, I shall continue to plead for the avoidance of such a catastrophe, as long as there is any hope to substitute peace for war in Asia.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

During the delivery of Mr. Moss' speech on natural resources:

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am about to make a unanimous consent request. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of

the motion to reconsider the vote by which S. 602, a bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the motion.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed. Without objection, the motion is agreed to and the passage of the bill is reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the third reading of the bill, S. 602, to amend the Small Reclamations and Projects Act, be reconsidered; that a proviso on page 6, line 22 be stricken, and that the bill as amended be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was the one who asked for the reconsideration of the passage of the bill, because I felt it was not right to establish the precedent of changing the interest rates on projects already constructed.

As I understand the bill—and I would like to be corrected if I am in error—any landowner with 160 acres or less pays no interest on these projects.

Mr. MOSS. Yes. That is the general rule under long-established reclamation law.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that the repayment period for the loan extends over 40 or 50 years without interest; and that interest is charged only in the event the owner has irrigation land in excess of 160 acres.

Mr. MOSS. Or when the use of water is for other than irrigation, such as domestic, municipal, or industrial purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, many of these projects are located in areas where the Federal Government has already spent money on a Federal reclamation project to bring water to the area and where the landowner is now paying off that indebtedness, on a no-interest basis, over a period of 40 to 50 years.

Mr. MOSS. That is true in some cases. In others, loans are made to conservancy districts, private groups, or local entities to develop the sources of irrigation water from the beginning. But the rule the Senator has stated applies in any event, and would continue to be applicable to projects currently in operation as well as to new projects.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have pointed out on many occasions, the farmers of the West have been generously treated by the Government for many years past. I felt it was not correct for us to reduce interest charges on projects that were already in operation and that had been in effect for quite some time.

With the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana, I have no further objection to the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana that the third reading of the bill be reconsidered, and that a proviso on page 6, line 22, be stricken, and that the bill as amended be passed?

Without objection, it is so ordered, and the bill as amended is passed.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed the last time.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. MOSS subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement to follow the action which was taken on S. 602, the bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act, during the course of my earlier remarks.

I point out that the action taken today on S. 602 eliminates a proviso from the bill that would have enabled entities which now have a small project loan on which they are paying interest at the rate established by the 1956 act to recompute their interest charges on the basis of the rate established by the Water Supply Act of 1958; thereby many struggling small landowners who are members of small irrigation districts and ditch companies would have saved themselves some much-needed money. I have asked for a computation of the amount involved, and I am informed that altogether there is a total of only approximately $5 million or so. This $5 million that would have been saved would be divided among many small entities, and the amount saved on each individual loan would have been relatively small.

But it would have been only equitable to permit the small entities in the West, which have received loans to participate on the same basis as those who have benefited from advancement of Federal funds under the regular reclamation program, under the flood control program, and under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, among other federally aided water resource development programs. The bill, before it was amended, would have made retroactive to Small Reclamation Act projects the same rate of interest enjoyed by projects under these existing laws. The retroactive feature has now been eliminated.

However, from now on, small project borrowers will be able to participate on the same basis as those who receive funds under other programs, and those who have 160 acres or less will, of course, receive a loan of funds for irrigation purposes without a charge for interest. As I have said, this is in accord with long-established law. But interest will be charged on loans that would be used for domestic municipal and industrial water supplies, or commercial power.

Mr. President, a small-reclamation-projects bill, similar to the one we have passed today, was approved by the Senate 2 years ago. It was not acted on by the House. So I, early in January this year, introduced my small-projects bill again. The feature that has now been eliminated was in the original text of S. 602 as it was introduced 6 months ago and as public hearings were held on it. The departments reported favorably on the bill and recommended it. The Irrigation Subcommittee and the full Interior Committee gave full and careful consideration to the measure after the hearings. Not a single witness came before either the subcommittee or the full committee to object to this retroactive provision.

Notice was given by the majority leader last week on the day before S. 602 was called up for consideration in the Senate. The bill was called up in the regular way by motion of the majority leader; it was not taken up on the unanimous-consent calendar. After S. 602 was placed before the Senate last Friday, the discussion on the floor shows that there was no opposition whatever to the interest provision during the regular time for consideration.

Because of certain circumstances, the bill was called back, and this amendment now has been made. I hope that Members of the other body, in their consideration of the bill, will take these facts into account, because the provision is most equitable. Simple justice to the small water users of the West demands it. I deeply regret that it was necessary to sacrifice this equitable provision in order to have the bill moved along.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me once more before he yields to my colleagues, I announce that there will be no further legislative business in the Senate today.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Ohio is recognized.

NUCLEAR WAR—LET UNITED STATES SEEK TO AVOID THIS PERIL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, without a doubt every Senator agrees that the peace of the world is gravely endangered unless the production of nuclear warheads and nuclear bombs by various nations is curtailed or banned by solemn treaties entered into by heads of nations freely and in good faith. We realize the great dangers inherent in the proliferation and increasing production and multiplication of nuclear weapons among nations and recognize that action should be taken to fix limits and enforceable ground rules. This threat to peace—indeed to the very existence of mankind—is the overriding problem facing the leaders of the world.

I report, Mr. President, two items which I wrote for my newsletter, one in August 1961, entitled "Armament Races Lead to War," and the other in June 1962, entitled "Danger?—Not by Intent,

but Mischance." I repeat what I stated in August 1961:

Americans sincerely hope that definite disarmament agreements, with adequate safeguards, can be achieved. To be effective, such agreements must include Red China as well as the Soviet Union. For more than 10 years, the world has teetered on the edge of nuclear disaster. As more nations acquire nuclear weapons, the likelihood of war is multiplied. Unless the arms race is stopped, weapons even more terrifying than atomic and hydrogen bombs will be developed. Someday, almost inevitably, they will be used. A war might commence by mischance or accident rather than by intent. History, since the turn of the century, proves that every arms race has led to war. To speak disarmament is easier than to achieve it. We must be prepared for long, often discouraging, negotiations. We must be willing to compromise to end the arms race and reduce cold-war tension.

Again, in June of 1962, I spoke out on this subject saying then, as I say now:

It is significant that Secretary-General U Thant, of the U.N., in a recent statement announced his view that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States would deliberately launch a nuclear war. Nuclear missiles are not weapons of war but are means of indiscriminate destruction. He stated that "the risk of war by accident is becoming greater and greater. Both the nuclear giants have rockets ready to be triggered in a few minutes, and the risk of a nuclear warhead leaving the launching pad unintentionally is very great." The small powers of Europe, such as the Scandinavian countries, Belgium, Holland, Spain, and Portugal, and the larger nations—Italy and France—could contribute to removing distrust and bitterness on the part of the leaders of the Soviet Union against the Nation. They should. In this manner they would work toward permanent peace. Unfortunately, these smaller nations, and particularly France and Italy, are seeking to develop nuclear weapons. If they succeed—and France has succeeded—then the chance that a nuclear war would be triggered by accident or mischance instead of by design would be greatly increased.

At those times I wrote of the menace to world peace caused by the spread of nuclear weapons among nations, a threat that has since loomed much, much larger.

For more than a decade the world has teetered on the edge of nuclear disaster. Vast arsenals of the most devastating weapons made by man have been stockpiled by the Soviet Union and the United States. The list of nations with a potential nuclear capacity grows constantly. Nuclear weapons are no longer a monopoly of the major powers. Today, five nations, including Communist China, have the capacity to explode nuclear bombs, and a dozen others could develop nuclear weapons within 3 years. At the same time delivery systems are within the budget of any nation that can produce these terrifying weapons.

Weapons of such a devastating nature—weapons which indeed could wipe out the world—cannot be broadly distributed and possessed by diverse nations without vastly increasing the risk of a conflict dreadful beyond imagination.

My view is that atomic war is less likely to be thrust upon us by a hostile dictatorship than through a grimly strange accident touched off by a drunk, a fool, an irresponsible madman, or a militarist bent and determined on war at any price or risk. An all-out nuclear war is far more likely to be touched off by human error than by human intention. With the nationals of more countries handling such lethal weapons, the possibilities of their use by some trigger-happy subordinates are enhanced.

Unless this futile arms race is stopped even more terrifying weapons will be developed and some day, almost inevitably, they will be used. History of the 20th century to this good hour demonstrates that every arms race has eventually resulted in war. We must end this nuclear arms race with the Soviet Union and Red China by definite agreements, with adequate safeguards, before the most terrible of all wars—perhaps the final war—is precipitated. We must find a common language with our antagonists to limit nuclear testing both above ground and underground, and the spread of nuclear weapons.

The longer we wait, the greater becomes the possibility of a war no one wants. Man has outgrown war. Science has made it both impracticable and impossible, if mankind is to endure on this planet. If this nuclear arms race is permitted to continue then inevitably West Germany, Japan, Nasser's Arab Republic, Israel, and other nations will within a few years be detonating nuclear bombs and joining the other powers with nuclear weapons.

Citizens generally know that time and events have turned the Soviet Union from a "have not" nation to a "have" nation. The great changes since Stalin's era have resulted in hostility to the Red Chinese regime, and a direct turn toward the capitalist system and friendship toward the United States and the West. The threat of a nuclear war waged against us by the Russian becomes more remote as time goes on.

Of the many remarks and wisecracks of Nikita Khrushchev, the one which most Americans will probably remember best is his threat "we will bury you." Khrushchev made it crystal clear at the time and afterward that he did not mean war. He said, "I don't mean war. I mean competition. You say your system is the best. We say our system is the best. Let's compete and see which is the best." Khrushchev represents the new order of Russians voted out of power and to affluent retirement instead of being liquidated. This is another illustration of the fact that the Soviet Union, now a "have" nation, is definitely veering away from Red China, a "have not" nation. Former Senator Barry Goldwater may have been correct in his prediction that 10 years hence Russia would be our ally in any conflict with Red China, which the Senator considered a threat to the peace of the world.

Mr. President, in view of the threat posed by the Communist Chinese to the Soviet Union as well as to the free world, it is very probable that behind the bluster and bombast of Soviet leaders lies an earnest desire to end the increased production of nuclear weapons and to halt the arms race. I assert Soviet leaders know full well there can be no victory in nuclear war, for the spoils of victory would be nothingness. They know we have the retaliatory nuclear capacity to destroy installations and a hundred cities within the Soviet Union and kill many millions of Russian men and women and children in a matter of only hours.

Now is the time to invite the Soviet Union, Red China, England, France, and all nations with a potential nuclear capability to join in an effort to formulate a treaty which would halt the spread of nuclear weapons. Just recently former British Foreign Secretary Patrick Gordon Walker, repeatedly recommended that the only way to avoid this dangerous proliferation of nuclear weapons is to create an international organization which would be run by an authority on which the nonnuclear powers would have equal control.

Despite some statements to the contrary, the facts are that the Communist leaders of the Soviet Union have kept their agreements when it was to their advantage to do so. Austria was neutralized and has remained neutral. Laos was neutralized, and open warfare has been avoided there. The limited nuclear test ban treaty was ratified following patient and frequently most discouraging negotiations by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, and has not been violated by the Communists. Our late great President John F. Kennedy and Averell Harriman will long be remembered by peace-loving people the world over for the signing and ratification of the limited nuclear test ban treaty. In fact, we have conducted more underground tests than has the Soviet Union. The time is at hand to negotiate to amend the limited nuclear test ban treaty to ban underground nuclear testing. It is to their advantage as well as to ours to limit the spread of nuclear weapons. Such a treaty would be in the national interest of every nation and important for permanent peace in this world.

The sixfold plan recently suggested by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is an excellent blueprint for bringing such a treaty to end the proliferation of nuclear warheads and weapons into being and on which to commence conferences by leaders of the world's great nations.

Our President is a man of peace, and I am sure that this problem is uppermost in his mind. I am hopeful that in the near future definite steps will be taken toward exploring the possibility of securing such a treaty, with adequate safeguards.

To speak disarmament is easier than to achieve it. We must be prepared for long, tedious—often discouraging—negotiations. However, the effort must be made. Should it succeed, we will be repaid a thousandfold with relief, with security, with safety, and with the comforting assurance that mankind will not commit the final and irrevocable insanity of self-destruction in nuclear war.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] for yielding to me.

LET US PROTECT OUR NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in discussing a nation's essentials, the poet Robert Frost observed, "what makes a nation in the beginning is a good piece of geography."

We in the Congress recognize the vital importance of the resources of our own good piece of geography. We recognize the necessity of protecting those resources. The 88th Congress enacted many measures for this purpose. The name applied to the 88th—"The Conservation Congress"—reflects great credit on this body and on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under the leadership of its distinguished chairman, Senator JACKSON.

Additional conservation measures lie before us. These, too, will receive enlightened and prudent consideration. But—for the most part—these measures, like those enacted in the 88th Congress, attack our problems piecemeal. More urgently needed is an examination of our natural resource problem as a whole. We must decide whether the measures we are taking are fully effective in meeting the Nation's need.

Two dynamic forces are placing unprecedented pressure on all our natural resources. The first force is the expansion of population about which so much is being said.

Projections for rates of births, deaths, and immigration indicate that our population will rise from the present 192 million to 245 million by 1980 and perhaps to 350 million by the year 2000. Superimposed on this population expansion is the second force—a constantly rising standard of living. We are enjoying unprecedented prosperity. Prosperity is simply a state in which we consume more goods—in which consumption of resources rises per person. And if the goals we have set as a nation are to be realized, the consumption of resources per person must continue to rise steadily.

A parallel trend to a rising living standard is the movement to metropolitan areas. The proportion of our population that is rural is static or declining. In terms of natural resources, urban living is much costlier than rural living.

In the past two decades we have reached what may be called a "new plateau" in our need for resource conservation and management. In bygone years, it may have been considered adequate to attack conservation and development problems on an individual resource or a regional basis. But we have now reached a point at which our responsibility is nothing less than the maintenance of sufficient quantity and quality of all our natural resources.

Fortunately, there is a growing understanding in the Nation of the need for conservation.

President Johnson spoke of it eloquently in his message to the Congress on natural beauty, Mr. Johnson pointed out the dangers to our natural heritage which are imposed by increasing demands for living space. He stated that the accelerating tempo of urbanization and growth is crowding the countryside and destroying streams and meadows. He noted that modern technology is creating uncontrolled waste products which blight soil, water, wildlife, and the air we breathe.

And the President said:

> To deal with these new problems will require a new conservation. 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 be not 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.

In every resource category, America's demand is tremendous. Each year we lose one million acres of farmland to urban expansion, super highways, and construction of facilities to support them.

In 1952, the President's Material Policy Commission noted that American consumption of most of the fuels and other minerals had been greater since the beginning of the First World War than total world consumption for all the centuries before.

Resources for the Future states:

> The projections indicate * * * a tripling of requirements for both energy and metals by the year 2000, almost a tripling for timber, and almost a doubling for farm products and for withdrawal depletions of fresh water. * * *
>
> Increasing demands on land space for outdoor recreation, urban growth, highways, airports, and perhaps forests by the year 2000 will far exceed any relief provided by possible reduction in land needed for crops and the amounts of now unused land that can be pressed into service. * * * land requirements, if each use is counted separately, would add up to 50 million more acres than the country has, and this assumes no increase whatsoever in forest land.

The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources reported that the Nation would need to double its usable water supplies by 1980.

Per capita use of water has increased from 530 gallons per day in 1900 to about 1,900 gallons per day in 1965, more than triple.

While about 1 gallon of water a day will take care of an individual's physical need, the average American city dweller is using 110 gallons a day.

Of this, his home uses some 60 gallons each day for cooking, cleaning, laundering, lawn and garden watering, and the rising new use—air-cooling.

Another 26 gallons a day per person is used by his community's offices, restaurants, and stores. And the municipality takes about the same amount for its services such as firefighting and cleaning.

Urbanization not only expands the demand for water use—it sharply reduces the water-holding proclivities of the land. Bricks and concrete hold heat and intensify evaporation, while reducing infiltration into the underground water table.

Modern industrial processes make use of tremendous quantities of water. The National Water Institute states that industry used 560 gallons of water daily per capita in 1950, 849 gallons per capita in 1960, and is expected to use 1,193 gallons per capita by 1975.

As population rises, so will water use for agriculture. The use of water for irrigation today is seven times as great as in 1900. Although irrigation has been supplanted by industry as our largest volume use, consumptive use of water for agriculture will always exceed consumptive use for other purposes.

By the year 2000, demand for domestic forest products is projected at 29 billion cubic feet with net growth less than half of that. U.S. Forest Service calculations, which show that some 55 cubic feet of realizable growth can be harvested per acre of commercial forest land, indicate that 300 million acres would have to be planted to meet the deficiency.

A dramatic example of the demand for forest products is our prodigal use of paper. Gross annual consumption of paper and paperboard in America is now close to 1 ton per family. Altogether we utilize almost 40 million tons a year, a spectacular increase from the 30 million tons used in 1950 and 15 million used in 1929.

Resources for the Future says that limitations of domestic supply are more likely to be a barrier to meeting demand for forest products than for any other major category of resource materials.

Improved technology may help, but not substantially. We must continue to seek reduction of losses from insects, diseases, and fire, which are equivalent to a quarter of the annual cut. Further, losses of growth that otherwise would have taken place exceed by twice the actual timber destruction.

The Nation's wildlife resources are fighting a losing battle against the encroachments of civilization. Many of our programs for increasing yields of forest and farm products are taking an increasing toll of wildlife and fishery populations. If we are to retain any semblance of this resource for the continued enjoyment of man, as well as the commercial benefits which are derived from our fishery and fur industries, a halt must be called to some of the most destructive practices.

Together, the four resources I have mentioned, the land, the water, the forests, and the wildlife, combine to form another resource indispensable to modern living—the outdoor recreation resource.

Following its monumental study, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission declared:

> The demand is surging. Whatever the measuring rod—visits to Federal and State recreation areas, number of fishing license holders, number of outboard motors in use—it is clear that Americans are seeking the outdoors as never before. And this is only a foretaste of what is to come. Not only will there be many more people, they will want to do more, and they will have more money and time to do it with. By 2000 the population should double; the demand for recreation should triple.

The Commission estimates that individual outdoor recreation activity could show an increase of 184 percent from 1960 to the year 2000.

To meet these prodigious demands on our resources, we have in the past two

decades assigned unprecedented tasks to the agencies of the Federal Government.

At the same time, we are expecting all other units of government—our States, our counties, our cities—to take on heavier responsibilities in all resource fields. We have authorized and funded many programs of assistance to help them perform these tasks.

Yet—through inertia—we have left virtually unchanged the bureaucratic structure of the agencies dealing with natural resources.

In so doing, we have failed to provide them the tools of authority and organization without which they cannot execute our programs either efficiently or effectively.

An illuminating example is water resource development. In this field, we have four Departments with primary responsibility: The Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

All four Departments have other large and complex tasks to perform. All would benefit if water resources development and management were assigned to one agency.

The second Hoover Commission listed 10 agencies in the Department of the Interior having water resource responsibilities: The Bureau of Reclamation, three power-marketing agencies, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Mines, and the Geological Survey. Since that time the Office of Saline Water, the Office of Water Resources Research, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation have been added, and the Fish and Wildlife Service has been split into two bureaus. Water resources functions are coordinated through the Assistant Secretary for Water and Power, but the Assistant Secretaries for Mineral Resources, Public Land Management, and Fish and Wildlife are also involved in decisions involving water resources.

Most water resource project construction and management, however, is carried out by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the Department of Defense. The responsibility of the corps in this field "just growed" from the time when it was the only effective engineering organization in the Federal Government and was therefore utilized for river and harbor improvement operations, and, more recently, for flood control projects.

Except for a few uniformed officers, the work of the corps in the water resources field is carried out by civilian engineering personnel, just as it is in the Bureau of Reclamation.

As our rivers have become more contaminated, the pollution abatement work of the Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has had an increasingly significant effect on overall water resources planning and management. Under legislation recently passed by the Senate, water pollution control activities will be established under a new Federal Water Pollution Control Administration reporting to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through a new Assistant Secretary.

In addition to these three Departments, the Department of Agriculture has substantial water resources programs; the Soil Conservation Service conducts a small watersheds program which requires the building of small dams and watershed treatment measures; the Forest Service is concerned with water resources activities in the national forests; the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service and the Farmers Home Administration are involved in providing assistance to farmers for projects related to water resources; Agricultural Research Service and Economic Research Service conduct research on matters pertaining to water, while the Rural Electrification Administration is concerned with hydroelectric power generation and marketing.

Many other Federal agencies in other departments as well as independent agencies, have water resources responsibilities. For example, the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, under the Department of State, have responsibilities affecting the boundary waters of the United States. All water regulation works in the Tennessee River Basin are built and managed by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Finally, the Federal Power Commission grants licenses for the building of river dams which produce hydroelectric power. As these must be coordinated with other river regulating works, the Commission engages in major river basin planning activities.

The need for coordination of the efforts of these bureau heads and their staffs has been recognized. We have established interagency committees to coordinate work for each river basin, an Interagency Committee on Water Resources in Washington, and an ad hoc Committee of the Secretaries of the four major departments referred to earlier.

At the start the Kennedy administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers executed a treaty which designated zones in which the corps would construct projects planned by the Bureau and vice versa.

Further recognition of the need for coordination of the many agencies involved in water resources work is shown in the Water Resources Planning Act which is now before Congress.

The act creates a Water Resources Council, composed of the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Army, HEW, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The Council will have a staff, whose job will be to coordinate and examine the work of all the other staffs in this field, but the important decisions in the water resources field will have to be made in the Council itself.

What a waste of administrative talent and staff manpower. Why should water resources development be in the area of competence of the Secretary of the Army? Why should the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be forced to add decisionmaking in the water resources field to his already onerous responsibilities?

In addition to the National Water Resources Council, the Water Resources Planning Act bill authorizes numerous river basin commissions which will report annually to the Council. How much time will the Council members have to devote to the task of evaluating such reports? I am aware that the basic work will be done by the staff. But, if the Council is to fulfill its function, the members must inform themselves on the characteristics of every river basin in the Nation. One secretary might be expected to do that. But we cannot properly require the heads of five major entities of the Federal Government to devote time to this problem.

Lest you think I am opposed to this bill and its Council aspect, let me make it clear that I am a strong supporter. I am, in fact, a cosponsor. I have urged its passage both in committee and here on this floor. Under present circumstances, it is essential.

The coordinated planning of our water resources is long overdue. As the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico pointed out when public hearings opened on an identical basin planning bill in 1963, the United States has been struggling for 55 years to initiate comprehensive river basin planning. Senator ANDERSON said:

> In February 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt's Inland Waterways Commission recommended prompt and vigorous action by the States and Federal Government to develop comprehensive plans for all our river basins.

I believe that there can be little doubt that such comprehensive planning would now be far advanced had we one department charged with this task. As it stands, we are only now moving to set up the machinery for such planning, and are doing so with the cumbersome mechanism of interdepartmental committees—a method that will place unwarranted burdens on the Secretaries, slow the task, and raise the cost.

Water resources planning is only one instance. Admittedly, we must have coordination not only here but in all aspects of resources management. We cannot get it by creating additional committees and more staffs to coordinate the work of various departments and their staffs.

What is called for is a reorganization of the executive branch to bring all major resource management functions into one department. Such an idea is not new. It was proposed by the Hoover Commission. Last year, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon eloquently advocated this step in a speech in this Chamber.

There are three principal areas in which administrative duplication is most serious.

I have already discussed water resources.

The second area lies in the management of the public lands. Two large agencies, the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior

and the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, are engaged in this function.

Their separation was deliberate. Because the predecessor of the BLM was thought to be in the business of divesting the Federal Government of land holdings, a new agency—the Forest Service—was created for custodial management and was located in the Department of Agriculture.

Since the emergence of the modern concept of a national land reserve, however, the functions of the two agencies are almost identical. Both manage lands for multiple use. Both deal with problems of range protection, range use, and range rehabilitation. Both build roads and trails. Both have participated in a tremendous expansion of recreation activity, and so on.

The National Park Service and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife are also major land management agencies in the Department of the Interior.

Forest Service employees work more closely with those in the Interior Department who promote land rehabilitation, develop picnic grounds, process mining claims, and propagate fish than they do with those in the Department of Agriculture who deal with price supports, agricultural extension service, marketing, and farm loans.

In Congress, we have long recognized this de facto status of the Forest Service as an Interior agency through our consideration of its budget with Interior agencies, not with those of agriculture.

There are differences, of course, in the character of the lands managed by the Forest Service, and Interior's Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. But these differences should be recognized at the Bureau level. One assistant secretary and one secretary should have responsibility for all major land management functions and for the submission of top policy recommendations to the President and the Congress.

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

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I have had the privilege and opportunity of reading the magnificent address which the Senator from Utah is now making. It shows a vast amount of study and insight into the workings of our Government and the great need for the conservation and development of our natural resources. It is a speech which should have the widest attention and interest, not merely among our colleagues, but among the public.

Every paragraph in the speech is significant. It is really a sort of Magna Carta of resource development, in the light of present-day needs. I cannot commend the Senator from Utah too highly for the many aspects he has covered in his speech. Early in his speech to single out one of his many perceptive approaches, he makes this constructive suggestion, in quoting the President:

> To deal with these new problems will require a new conservation. 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.

Then this important sentence:

> Our conservation must be not 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.

I should like to ask the Senator from Utah whether this has not been exemplified by the creation of Lake Powell back of Glen Canyon Dam, where the beauties of nature have been enhanced and made accessible at the same time we were developing a useful, natural resource, with great economic benefits.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator from Alaska. In answer to his question, I affirm that Lake Powell, having been created as a useful economic project, has given us the added attribute of great natural beauty that did not exist before. Now that the Canyon Gorge is partly filled, it is no longer true. I went down the Canyon Gorge in a boat, and know that it was beautiful then, but compared with the beauty of the blue water lake which is now in the Canyon Gorge—which is only partly filled; there are still vast colored cliffs above the water—we have created an area of recreation which thousands and hundreds of thousands of people will be able to enjoy out of doors, when before only the barest handful could enjoy floating down the muddy river.

It was a different kind of stream. Now it is beautiful blue water, abounding with fish, with sandbars on the side for people to camp, whereas before it was a rather muddy stream, rather interesting to run down in a boat, but with very little fish in it and of little use.

The Senator from Alaska has put his finger on a wonderful example of how we have advanced and created a great natural beauty through a manmade effort. The Glen Canyon Dam did it.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Alaska on my speech. He is one of the leaders in the Senate in the resource field. He serves on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works, both of which in this body deal with resources. He has been a great leader in this field. I am most happy for him to comment on my speech. I know he will be in the vanguard in this body in pressing for needed changes in this field.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator. In addition to the recreational activities created by Lake Powell and the increase in fishery resources, is it not an interesting fact that the beauty of the area has actually been enhanced by the mirroring and duplication effect of the scenery? We can look down at the reflection and we can look up at the wonderful cliffs, which was not possible before. In other words there is a doubling of beauty.

Mr. MOSS. That is true. It is remarkable how much beauty is now there. People can look at the beautiful mirror lake to which the Senator has referred. It now extends into deep isles, canyon areas, and gorges where no one could venture heretofore. It has opened up a vast area. The shoreline along Lake Powell is 186 miles. It travels such an irregular course that there is more shoreline along Lake Powell than there is between San Diego, Calif., and Seattle, Wash.

Mr. GRUENING. That is a fascinating point.

Does not the Senator believe that we have really discovered and created a new bonanza? Previously we have talked about the enhancement of natural resources, meaning fish and wildlife resources, and now we have a specific example of the enhancement and beautification of scenery?

Mr. MOSS. Indeed we have. This is an excellent example from which to choose, but there are many others. I believe that Lake Powell is the one receiving the most attention at the present time, but there are many other areas.

There is another interesting aspect to the situation. The committee held hearings on recreation when we were setting the recreation pattern of how much had to be contributed by the local community. One of the witnesses testifying before the committee—and there were many—had an interesting figure for me. He testified that there was one State in the Union which had the greatest per capita ownership of boats. We were talking about water resources recreation at that time. We all racked our brains as to what State it could be. I first thought of Maryland, because of the Chesapeake Bay and the many rivers running through it, or perhaps Massachusetts, with the Cape Cod area, Martha's Vineyard, and other places.

However, the State turned out to be Arizona, a State which everyone thinks of as being a desert State. Of course, it is a desert State.

Mr. GRUENING. The name "Arizona" means an arid zone.

Mr. MOSS. The Senator is correct. Arizona has the greatest per capita ownership of small recreational craft, because of the many reservoirs within the State. The building of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam and the lakes which were created there, Havasu Lake, and Lake Mead, all of them manmade lakes, contributed great beauty. They are not only a source of water for the use of the people, but also a large recreational resource.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Did not certain conservationist groups fight the creation of Lake Powell on the ground that it was destructive and anticonservationist?

Mr. MOSS. Indeed they did. The fight against the whole Colorado River storage project was most intense. Even since that time, there are groups who have constantly complained that resources have been destroyed because the canyon has been filled. They have printed pictures and published all kinds of propaganda to show that something bad has been done in creating that great lake. But exactly the opposite is true. Rather than destroying something, it has created a resource which is much greater, more useful, and more beautiful than what existed there before.

Mr. GRUENING. I agree with the Senator. Is the Senator aware of the excellent brochure issued by the Bureau of Reclamation which illustrates with colored photographs how beautiful Lake Powell is?

Mr. MOSS. I am, indeed. Its title is "Lake Powell, Jewel of the Colorado." I wish I had a copy at hand because I believe it is one of the most spectacular, small picture booklets I have ever seen. The photographs are breathtaking.

Mr. GRUENING. It certainly tells the story more effectively in pictures than it could in thousands of words.

Mr. MOSS. Indeed, the Senator is correct. Words could not begin to describe its beauty.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me ask the Senator whether he knows, in view of the obvious improvement and enhancement of beauty which have taken place in the area, whether any of the earlier conservationist opponents of the creation of Lake Powell have begun to modify their views, or do they still persist in their old contentions?

Mr. MOSS. I am sure that some have modified their views but, unfortunately, there is still a small and vocal group which continues to be critical of the creation of Lake Powell.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator may be aware that we are faced with the same problem in Alaska where there has been a concerted drive against the Rampart Dam because of the lake which will be developed behind it. Those of us who feel strongly that the Rampart Dam will not only be of inestimable value economically but will also actually enhance the area and its resources, believe that the lake will be far more beautiful than the ugly mudflats, silty sloughs, and swamps which are now mosquito ridden and most unattractive, all of which will be covered by this beautiful lake.

Mr. MOSS. I agree with the Senator. I had the opportunity to fly over the Rampart site with the Senator, so I have seen the area. As he describes it, it is low lying, with many willow trees and rushes, and undoubtedly swarms of insects, although I have not been on the ground to know that. It is not an attractive area at present.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MOSS. If this river valley were to be filled with water, the wide expanse of water would mean the creation of a great northern lake which would be wonderful in which to fish, to hunt for moose in the area, and for other wild game which would come to the lake for water and which live in the area surrounding the lake. It would, of course, mean another recreational resource for Alaska. In addition to the economic value which would come from building the dam, and generating power, it would of course control the river.

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct. Nevertheless, this project is being fought by the same people who fought the creation of Lake Powell—I am glad to say unsuccessfully. But we face that same situation. It is sometimes difficult to understand how people can be so persistent in opposing a project that is not only of economic benefit but will actually preserve and increase the natural resources.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his comments. I am sure that there is no better friend of resources than the Senator. I agree with his philosophy that the beauty of nature can often be enhanced and expanded with manmade effort; that certainly to be a conservationist one must not subscribe to the doctrine that nothing is ever touched and no structure is ever razed. There are some who would not permit even firebreaks to be built in a place where, if a fire should sweep a whole forest, it could be destroyed. I believe it is destructive to take a view as extreme as that.

Mr. GRUENING. I agree with the Senator. I should like to ask him another question: At the end of his remarks, he points out what is apparent, that making the reorganization, which is implicit in his speech, will be difficult, because it will mean the consolidation or transfer of numerous agencies that may not wish to be consolidated or transferred. Does the Senator visualize introducing legislation to bring that about?

Mr. MOSS. I do. I propose to introduce a bill within a short time, as soon as I have refined it to the point which will accomplish the purpose I have in mind in this speech. It should then be a focal point on which we could begin discussion. I would hope that the Senator from Alaska would examine the bill critically, and offer amendments or any refinements which may be needed. But I am hopeful that we could accomplish the overall objective of centralizing and bringing into rational order our dealings concerning the natural resources of this country.

Mr. GRUENING. That would be a most desirable project. It is obvious now that one of the departments which has the responsibility for most of our resources, the Department of the Interior, also has within it other agencies which bear no relationship to resources. The Senator has pointed out that some come under the Department of Agriculture. I hope the hearings will take place as soon as the Senator has perfected his bill. I suppose it will be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but I suspect that the Committee on Public Works will also have something to do with it.

The Senator and I are both members of those two important committees, to say nothing of the Government Operations Committee, of which I am also a member. I am taking a keen interest in this proposal and look forward to the introduction of the proposed legislation. I am sure that the hearings will prove interesting and worthwhile and will have a lot of support.

I congratulate the Senator from Utah on his constructive and far-reaching proposal.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I continue with my remarks and say we can hardly suppose that their views will be identical. On wilderness, as on other land management matters, the responsibility should lie with one Secretary.

The third principal area of conflict is in recreation.

Here, again, we have responded to the need for coordination of the agencies with recreation programs. Carrying out the recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, we have created a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior. Incidentally, an official in the Department of Agriculture was chosen and transferred to be its first Chief.

One of its responsibilities is to coordinate the work in the field of outdoor recreation of the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Fish and Wildlife, as well as numerous other Federal agencies conducting less extensive recreation programs.

As Senator MORSE pointed out, there are two non-Interior agencies that serve more recreation seekers than does the Department of the Interior. These are the Corps of Engineers in the Department of Defense and the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture.

Yet we recognize the logic of utilizing the Department of the Interior to conduct our recreation programs when we established the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in it. And in this field we are once more expecting the coordinating agency to work through an interdepartmental council of Cabinet officers. In so doing, we have charged the Secretary of the Army with heavy responsibilities for the management of recreation facilities just as we have charged him with heavy responsibilities in the management of water resources.

Correction of these duplications can be effected only by a functional reorganization of the executive departments to establish a Department of Natural Resources. In the near future, I will introduce a bill for this purpose. It will provide for these specific changes:

First. The assignment of all water resource functions to one Assistant Secretary for Water Resources. This would include the Bureau of Reclamation, the Office of Water Resources Research, the Office of Saline Water, the water data services of the Geological Survey, the civil works functions now exercised by the Corps of Engineers, the water pollution abatement services of the Public Health Service or the new Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the water resources planning functions of the Federal Power Commission, the small watershed program of the Soil Conservation Service, and the water resource activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Second. The assignment of all electric power generation and transmission functions to one Assistant Secretary for Power. This would include the power activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern and the Southwestern Power Administrations—all in Interior—the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Federal Power Commission.

Third. The assignment of land management activities in nondefense areas to one Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Land Management. This would include the National Park Service, the

Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service.

There are two other agencies with important land management functions, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. I favor continuing Fish and Wildlife as a separate entity under its own Assistant Secretary as at present.

Outdoor recreation entails significant activities affecting both land management and water resources use. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation now functions along with other bureaus under an Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management. BOR could be established under a new Assistant Secretary for Recreation or made one of the land management agencies. In either case, all its activities would be coordinated under the Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources.

Fourth. The assignment of all nonresource functions now in the Department of the Interior to other departments. Two Interior agencies, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Territories, are more concerned with education and human relationships than with resource management. Except for irrigation activities, they could be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The adoption of such a proposal is long overdue. The task of protecting and wisely utilizing the land, the water, the forests, the wildlife, is one task. All these resources are interdependent. There is not one which today does not require wise management on a national basis if it is to be maintained in needed scope and vigor.

Today, we are looking even beyond our borders for the solution of major resource problems. We have long dealt with other nations on the division of waterway rights, on fisheries, and on protection of wildlife. Now being proposed is a means of providing great new water supplies that will entail a major cooperative effort with Canada. It is called the North American Water & Power Alliance—NAWAPA.

The concept is a continent-long diversion of surplus water from arctic rivers to western Canada, Western and Midwestern United States, and Mexico.

In Alaska, the Yukon Territory, and British Columbia, tremendous quantities of fresh water flow unused to the sea. The use of only a fifth of this supply could transform the water picture of large areas of Canada and at least 25 of our 50 States.

Keystone of the concept is the use of a 900-mile-long Rocky Mountain Trench in Canada. The altitude of this natural storage reservoir is 3,000 feet.

A series of dams and power stations will provide the energy to pump the Arctic's fresh water up into the trench. From the trench reservoir, it would then be pumped to a reservoir in the Sawtooth Mountains. From there, the water would flow southward by gravity via lined canals and tunnels throughout the system, passing the Sawtooth Mountain barrier through a tunnel 80 feet in diameter and 50 miles in length.

Continuing its gravity flow, the water will help meet the needs of the western part of the continent. Water for irrigation, power, recreational facilities and other uses would flow for distribution to eastern Oregon, Utah, Nevada, California, Arizona, New Mexico, and northern Mexico.

On the east slope of the Rocky Mountains, water would be pumped into the Canadian and Purgatoire Rivers through which it could be distributed east of the Continental Divide. This water would be drawn upon by New Mexico, Texas, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma.

The Peace River Reservoir outflow, and diverted flows from several streams on the east slope of the Rocky Mountains, would supply the Canadian-Great Lakes Canal. In excess of 40 million acre-feet per year would reach Lake Superior and provide for irrigation and other water demands of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and western Ontario. This important part of the system would also yield considerable power.

The NAWAPA concept includes a seaway between Lake Winnipeg and Hudson Bay via the Nelson River. Another seaway would connect Georgian Bay with James Bay. A navigation canal would connect the ore fields of Labrador and Quebec with the Great Lakes. These waterways would provide Canada with cheap ship and barge transport, thereby opening its iron ore, coal, potash, sulfur, forestry, and agricultural resources to extensive development. The waterways would also contribute to the economic welfare of Ontario and Quebec, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York, which are closely and historically associated with the Great Lakes.

Branching off from the Canadian-Great Lakes Canal, another canal, large enough for barges, connects with the Missouri and Minnesota River systems to serve the needs of Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa. Actually, all the Central Plains States and all those bordering the Mississippi River would benefit.

The overriding significance of this concept is that it offers a means of solving problems otherwise insoluble.

It would provide an adequate supply of water for 100 years to the great southwest quadrant of the Nation.

The Canadian-Great Lakes Canal would alleviate falling levels and pollution of the Great Lakes as well as augment the power potential of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers.

Good quality water in bulk could be supplied to those States currently using Colorado River water, some of it excessively high in minerals in its lower area. The excess salinity of the Colorado River water delivered to Mexico under treaty would be reduced, thus removing periodic friction.

The NAWAPA system will not interfere with any existing, programed, or planned water and power development projects. As a bulk supplier of water it would support and augment other projects.

With the exception of Alaska, it would not utilize water from any State or river basin in the United States for the benefit of any other State or river basin.

This magnificent concept would require no new technological know-how. It would be necessary only to do what we have done many times before, but on a much grander scale.

Yet there is not an agency of the Federal Government that has the authority or the means to evaluate this proposal in terms of the interest of the United States. All that we have been able to do so far is to assemble from various governmental agencies information on their water resource plans and programs and present them in a committee print.

This was made possible through the foresight of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. MCNAMARA], who appointed the Special Subcommittee on Western Water Development, which I head. The work to date on this concept has been done by a private engineering firm and this subcommittee.

Development of resources involves long leadtime. It took the Congress 8 years to enact the Wilderness Act. It will take a like period to evaluate the primitive areas of the national forests and complete work on the system.

The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources was appointed in 1960. Now—in 1965—we are hopeful of creating the National Water Resources Council and authorizing the river basin commissions that committee recommended. Many more years will be needed to organize the commissions and plan the basin programs. Meanwhile, the two forces I have previously mentioned—expanding population and rising standard of living—will be making our tasks harder and more expensive.

I do not say these things to disparage the work of the Congress. Several years may be necessary to consider and enact such far-reaching legislation which affects major regions of the Nation for years to come. But since we must give much time to the authorization and execution of these programs, we must streamline the planning and management functions as far as we can.

The President has made clear his intention of consolidating functions and services. He is phasing out installations which have completed performance of the functions they were assigned. He is transferring financing from projects of lower priority to those of higher. This would be an ideal time to consolidate our resource management functions.

An additional gain will be in the efficiency of State operations. The States cannot protect their resources without Federal cooperation. Our river basins, our forests, our watersheds, our lakes, our waterfowl, do not recognize State boundaries. The responsibilities of the States in these fields are vast. We should make it as easy as possible for them to carry out their responsibilities. This means reducing the number of Federal agencies with which they must deal.

Such consolidation will also make easier the tasks of county and city governments, and private industry—whose contacts with the Federal Government in the resource field run into hundreds of thousands every year.

In his presentation, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] discussed two re-

source program needs which I wish to reemphasize—long-range planning and capital budgeting.

The President's call for a more beautiful America envisions lovelier cities, further development of parks and other recreation areas, including seashores, preservation of stretches of unspoiled waterway, attractive landscaping for highways, and clean air.

Such a dream cannot be realized without long-range plans.

Lack of planning is responsible for the ugliness, pollution, and waste that we seek to end.

Despite much planning activity in the Federal Government, the plans of our resource agencies often are inadequate to an expanding future.

There exists nowhere a comprehensive plan that states our resource requirements and delineates a program for meeting them.

A first priority of the Department of Natural Resources should be the preparation of such a plan. The plan should set forth the national goals, projected alternative programs for reaching those goals, and the costs involved.

This will present the President and the Congress with the facts upon which wise decisions can be made.

This, in general, is the method utilized so successfully by great industrial enterprises and by our Department of Defense. It combines maximum efficiency with maximum flexibility.

Contrast it with our present plethora of agencies, plans, and programs in the natural resource field.

The budget of the Federal Government fails to present a clear picture of where our tax money goes and what it accomplishes. Yet accounting which presents such a picture is an indispensable tool of business management.

Federal accounting utilizes what amounts to a cash flow sheet and a statement of liabilities. There is no genuine balance sheet. There is no statement of assets. There is no attempt to separate operating expenses from capital investments.

To look at the books of the Federal Government, the highway system, on which the Government has spent upward of $28 billion since 1956, has no present value. In the words of some critics, this money has "gone for taxes."

Moreover, the taxes that maintain our road system amount to a charge for a necessary service, exactly as does a telephone bill for communications service and a light bill for electric service. The only difference is that government is responsible for the financing of roads, while most telephone and electric services are provided by utilities financed through private sources.

Not only does our road system provide an essential service, it is a capital asset, exactly as the roadbed and rolling stock of a railroad are capital assets.

Technically, the highway system is owned by the individual States rather than the United States. But it has value, just as do all of the capital assets in which we have invested tax dollars. The budget should show that value. The budget should also show the portion of each annual expenditure that goes for construction of capital items—dams, buildings, canals, and roads.

A business which starves capital assets—its buildings and equipment—is on the road to bankruptcy. Our natural resources are capital assets upon which the Nation itself and every industry in it are dependent. It is essential that we invest sufficient capital to sustain those assets.

While the operations of government and business are only partly analogous, both must utilize information-budgeting procedures to plan as well as control operations.

Separate presentation of the capital items in the Federal budget is essential to determine whether the level of investment in natural resources is sufficient, as well as to evaluate total annual expenditures.

Mr. President, we recognize, I am sure, the greater challenges that lie ahead in the resource field. Meeting these challenges will require far-reaching programs. The consolidation of functions and the use of modern management methods have become necessities.

The responsibility for adopting improvements lies here in Congress. National policy is made here. Programs are authorized and funded here. More efficient resource management arrangements are in our power—and only in our power—to initiate.

Effecting the needed changes will not be easy. But we can no longer ask our executive agencies and the States of this Nation to perform the essential tasks of conservation and wise management of our resources unless we are willing to provide the tools.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the recent action of the House in passing the President's proposal for a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development has been hailed throughout the country as positive and needed action.

An editorial published in the New York Journal-American of June 18 pointed out the support of this legislation.

"The complexity and immensity of the problems of cities and suburbs demand a department with Cabinet rank to help solve them," the Journal-American editorial makes clear.

I agree with those comments and urge every Member of the Senate to join me in supporting President Johnson in this effort.

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

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

[From the New York Journal-American, June 18, 1965]

A BIG WIN

President Johnson is well on the way to another major congressional victory with passage by the House of a bill creating a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The fact that the House killed a similar proposal by President Kennedy 3 years ago is an indication of L.B.J.'s influence in Congress.

The bill now goes to the Senate, where it must churn through a subcommittee and a full committee before it reaches the floor, probably next month. The expectations are it will pass.

We hope the expectations are realized. The Hearst newspapers for a long time have supported the concept of Cabinet status for dealing with the problem of cities and suburbs.

A Department of Agriculture was established long ago to concern itself with rural problems. Up to now the metropolitan planning has been left to a lower than Cabinet level administration, despite the phenomenon of enormous urban growth. In fact, the tendency among experts is to consider great stretches of cities and suburbs along both coasts and in the Midwest as joined in supra-metropolitan areas. Or, to use the fancy word, each is a megalopolis.

The complexity and immensity of the problems of cities and suburbs demand a department with Cabinet rank to help solve them. It looks as if residents of suburbs and city cliff dwellers are at last to get proper recognition. And high time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I agree with those comments. I urge every Senator to join me in supporting President Johnson in this long overdue effort to give the urban population of the Nation some representation at the Cabinet level, as the farmers of the country have had it for more than 100 years.

RENT SUBSIDY PROGRAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the President and the House of Representatives are to be commended for the action taken yesterday by the House in passing the excellent housing bill. I am indeed gratified that the rent subsidy program survived an attack by the conservative Members of both parties in the other body, and will be in the bill as it comes to the Senate and as it is in the bill reported by the Senate committee within the past few days.

The rent subsidy program has been attacked as socialistic. It is nothing of the sort. The housing to which the rent subsidy program will apply is private housing. The housing will be rented on a private enterprise basis. The net result of the program will move us somewhat closer to the ideal first expressed by the late great Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; namely, a decent home for every American family.

The newspapers report that the close but successful vote was influenced to no small extent by the strong urging of the administration to all of its supporters to rally around this important part of the Johnson Great Society program.

So I congratulate both the majority of the House and the President on a significant achievement.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. As the Senator well knows, I do not agree with his analysis of yesterday's action; however, I shall discuss it from my viewpoint when the Senate begins to debate the bill.

Mr. CLARK. I have no doubt about the attitude of the Senator from Colorado on the subject.

REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, shortly after the Fourth of July recess, it is hoped that the proposed constitutional amendment on reapportionment will be reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary and placed on the calendar. I hope that not long thereafter the Senate can start to debate this extremely important proposal which I have the honor to cosponsor. Almost all Senators have had some experience with this problem in their own States and know the dilemma in which State legislators and the citizens of the States have been caught. The most graphic example of this has occurred in Colorado. One of the most drastic examples of this dilemma has been in the State of Colorado.

Recently there appeared in the American Legion magazine an excellent article on this subject written by Neal R. Peirce. I congratulate him and ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD together with an excellent news column on the same subject written by Ray Moley and appearing in the Newsweek magazine of June 14, 1965.

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

[From the American Legion magazine, June 1965]

THE BIG SHAKEUP IN STATE GOVERNMENTS

(A look at the strange events which have followed the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote rulings)

(By Neal R. Peirce)

Never in history have State political leaders across the Nation been in such a quandry over a single matter as they have been in the last 3 years as a result of the Supreme Court's "reapportionment" decisions.

These decisions have led to conflict, confusion, resistance and political consternation in many States.

"Reapportionment," of course, refers to court rulings that:

(1) The States must redesign their voting districts so that each member of a State's legislature will represent the same number of people as each other member, and

(2) The one-man, one-vote principle must apply both to the lower house and the senate in each State.

The consequences of reapportionment are sure to be far reaching. It could hardly be otherwise, for the traditional balance of power in most of the States will be permanently altered.

The influence of rural areas, long dominant in most of the country's legislatures, will be radically reduced. The big winners will be the fast-growing suburban areas of the country, now the most under-represented on the State level. Some center city areas will also register gains in the State capitals.

Experts expect to see more pressure in the legislatures for State spending on education, welfare and commuter problems—with higher taxes to match. Labor unions may have more power, exerting it for ends like higher minimum wages. Possibly the State governments, made more sensitive to the demands of the metropolitan areas, will expand their activities so much that the trend of taking all problems to Washington may be retarded.

In the South, rural legislators, long in control, have been most hostile to expanded civil rights for Negroes. Southern cities, on the other hand, have been more anxious to find accommodations on the racial issue, and now their power in Dixie's State capitals will be sharply increased.

On a party basis, the net gain in the North will be for the Democrats. They are far stronger in the cities and suburbs than in the rural areas, which will be losing seats. Republicans have some major suburban strongholds, however, so that the shifts in legislative seats may work to their advantage in certain areas.

In the South, where Republican strength in the cities has begun to dilute the once solid Democratic grasp on the region, the revolution in reapportionment may advance the day when the region will have a true two-party system.

Further consequences, beyond the imagination of present-day analysts, are likely, for the reapportionment rulings have turned the inner workings of many of the States upside down. In 3 years, their shock-effect has been evident on all sides.

The Supreme Court made the basic reapportionment decisions in two findings in 1962 and 1964. Orders to carry them out, in States that have lagged or parried, have come from Federal courts within the States, while State courts on occasion have opposed the Federal courts, and on other occasions have judged some reapportionment bills to be contrary to State constitutions.

No two States and no two Federal courts appear to have followed exactly the same pattern. In many States, bitter controversy has raged. Reactions to reapportionment have included outright resistance, criticism of the Federal courts, the promulgation of novel voting arrangements, and demands for constitutional amendments.

In New York, Democrats rode into control of the State legislature last November for the first time in three decades, benefiting from the national sweep of their party. But instead of holding office for full terms, they will apparently have to run again next November, this time without benefit of a presidential landslide, because they were elected last fall under the old system which the Supreme Court threw out. For a while they seemed doomed to run under one of four reapportionment laws designed by the outgoing Republican legislature to give the Republicans the best break in the future. Then, with the election only 8 months away, a New York court held all four of the proposed plans in violation of the State constitution. In mid-April of this year nobody had any idea of the voting-district basis on which the new election would be held, or whether, indeed, it would be possible to hold them at all.

In California, serious proposals have been put forth to break up into two States—northern California and southern California—because of the reapportionment rulings. If the California Senate, as well as the House, is based on population, northern California feels that densely populated southern California will outvote it in both houses of the State legislature. In the north they are particularly sensitive to the south voting itself as much of northern California's water as it pleases.

This is a classic illustration of the protests from the States over the Supreme Court decision that State senates must be based on population rather than areas.

The Federal Government, they argue, recognizes that areas and interests have vital stakes in lawmaking, quite apart from headcounts. They note that every State, regardless of population, has exactly two Senators in the U.S. Senate, be it sparsely settled Nevada or densely populated New York, while the interests of population masses are protected in the House of Representatives. This argument, in favor of one house or the other based on geography, is called "the Federal analogy." States with legislatures that parallel the Federal structure in this way are said to follow a "little Federal plan." But the Supreme Court has specifically ruled that the Federal analogy does not apply to the States.

In 1962, a majority of the voters in every county of Colorado voted in favor of a "little Federal plan"' for Colorado, with the State senate to be weighted by areas and the house apportioned by population. The U.S. Supreme Court rejected the result of the Colorado referendum in 1964, specifically noting its opinion that the question is a constitutional matter for the courts and not subject to vote within the States.

In Illinois, when political leaders could not agree on how to reapportion the House before last November's elections, they temporarily met the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote dictum by having every candidate for the House run at large. Thus Chicago's huge population was voting not only on its own State representatives, but on those from areas at the other end of the State. With 177 members to be elected, the Republicans and Democrats agreed to run exactly 118 candidates each. Each voter in Illinois was presented with 236 candidates on the ballot, with instructions to vote for 177 of them. All 118 Democrats and 59 of the Republicans were elected.

Both New Jersey and New Mexico attempted to keep their old voting districts the same as before, and instead give legislature members a number of votes proportional to the number of constituents in their districts. Courts ruled out both of these propositions.

In Connecticut, the 1964 legislature refused to draw new election plans as ordered by the local Federal court. The court responded by invalidating the laws the lawmakers had passed in 1964. But as it wouldn't recognize the elections of last November, the court consented to keep in office the same legislators whose acts it had invalidated—for 2 years beyond their regular terms. Meanwhile, a new apportionment plan, to go into effect in 1966, was finally agreed upon by the two parties and the legislature early this year.

Most of the protest against the courts' involvement in reapportionment has not questioned the need for some reform. In some States one legislator has represented as many as a thousand times as many people as another, hence each of his constituents has had less than one one-thousandth of the influence of other voters in the same State. In some States, the imbalance of voter representation was legal before the court rulings. In others it has been clearly in violation of State constitutions. But State officials have variously protested:

(1) That, regardless of merit, the question is not a Federal court matter;

(2) That it is too political for the Federal courts;

(3) That the States should have more leeway in making the adjustment;

(4) That the courts should not prevent the people in each State from deciding the issue, and

(5) That the various Federal courts which are ordering changes are pushing too fast, while they have no plan for a proper remedy and are running off in all directions.

C. Farris Bryant, the Governor of Florida, said: "I defy anyone, anywhere, to tell me what the Federal courts will approve on apportionment. They have been wandering in a political wilderness. They have no compass. They don't know where they started. They don't know where they are going. We can only do the best we can and hope it meets approval from high olympus."

In Vermont and Washington, when the lawmakers delayed reapportioning, the Federal courts in those States ruled that they

could only transact certain limited types of business until they reapportioned. Vermont's Gov. Philip H. Hoff said the court's action was "arbitrary and unjust and involved a serious abuse of discretion which the Supreme Court should correct." The Vermont case is currently back on appeal to the Supreme Court.

In Oklahoma, reapportionment brought on an involved, many-sided battle with State and Federal courts, the legislature and the people all participating. Following the first Supreme Court decision in 1962, a local Federal court ordered the State to reapportion but the Oklahoma Legislature, long controlled by rural areas, refused to act. In 1963, the legislature devised a "little Federal plan" for a House based on population and a Senate based on areas, to be voted on by the people in May 1964. But in June 1963, a three-judge Federal court took the matter into its own hands, declared the old voting districts dead, and announced that voting lines drawn by the judges would take effect.

This was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, and in January 1964, the Oklahoma State Supreme Court stepped in with a "standby" reapportionment plan to be used pending the appeal to the Supreme Court. The local Federal court retaliated within 10 days by invalidating the "standby" plan, and ordering the appealed plan into effect. Then in May the people went to the polls and endorsed the "little Federal plan" that the legislature had drawn up. Within a month that plan went by the boards when, on June 15, 1964, the Supreme Court issued its decision that a State could not have a Senate not based on population, whether or not the people voted for it. Then the Federal panel in Oklahoma invalidated the State primaries that had been held in May under the old voting district lines, and Gov. Harry Bellmon had to call new primary elections. Before the new primary could be held, the Federal panel revised its own plan. Finally, new elections under the Federal court plan were held last November. Even then the revised plan was being appealed back to the Supreme Court.

Today, every State except Nebraska has imitated the Federal structure and has two houses. Thus 49 State legislatures are "bicameral" (2-housed) and only 1 is "unicameral" (1-housed). Each of the 49 calls its upper house "the senate," and Nebraska calls its 1-house legislators "senators." Most States call their combined houses "the legislature," though 19 call them "the general assembly," 3 call them "the legislative assembly," and 2 call them "the general court." Of the 49 States with 2 houses, all but 4 call the lower house "the house." Nevada, New Jersey, New York, and Wisconsin call theirs "the assembly."

In the 49 bicameral States there are 1,895 State senators. In the 49 lower houses there are 5,908 State representatives or assemblymen, while Nebraska's single house has 49 "senators," for a grand total of 7,852 seats in 50 State legislatures that are affected by the reapportionment orders.

The reapportionment revolution grew out of charges by citizens that State legislatures refused to clean house of malapportionment, while State courts refused to hear citizens' complaints on the question.

Between 1900 and 1950, the rural areas of the United States expanded 16 million in population while the urban areas were growing by an astounding 59 million. But many State legislature apportionment schemes still left rural areas in firm control of the State governments. Members of the rurally dominated legislatures were understandably reluctant to reapportion themselves out of office.

The 1960 population figures of districts in a few States illustrated the immensity of the problem at the start of this decade. In Vermont, where each town is guaranteed a House seat by the 1793 State constitution, Stratton had the same representation as Burlington. But only 24 people lived in Stratton, compared to 35,531 in Burlington—making a vote in Stratton 1,480 times as powerful as one in Burlington.

The 1960 population figures showed that in every house of every State legislature the largest district had more than twice the number of inhabitants of the smallest. The disparity was 424 to 1 in the Connecticut House, 99 to 1 in the Georgia House, 141 to 1 in the Rhode Island House.

It was against this background that Charles Baker, a "citizen and voter" of Tennessee, in May 1959, filed a suit in the U.S. Federal court against Joe C. Carr, the Tennessee Secretary of State. Baker claimed that he and other city dwellers were being deprived of "equal protection" of the laws because of malapportionment of the Tennessee Legislature.

Baker's suit pointed out that despite a provision of the Tennessee Constitution requiring population-based reapportionment of both the senate and house every 10 years, the district lines had not been changed since 1901. In the meantime, the population of the State had grown tremendously and shifted substantially to the urban areas. By 1960, Tennessee's House districts ranged from 3,454 to 79,301 in population—a disparity of 23 to 1—while senate districts ranged from 39,727 to 237,905—a 6-fold disparity.

Baker pointed out that he had first sought relief in the State courts of Tennessee, but had been turned down on the grounds that courts ought to stay out of legislative matters. Moreover, attempts to call a State constitutional convention had failed because the call must come from the legislature itself. In addition, Tennessee had no laws by which issues could be carried directly to the people.

Baker and his coplaintiffs said that there was "a debasement of their votes by virtue of the incorrect, obsolete and unconstitutional apportionment" to such an extent that they were being deprived of their right to "equal protection of the laws" under the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. (The 14th amendment reads, in part: "No State shall * * * deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.")

On the first round, Baker lost his case, as other attempts to force reapportionment through court action had failed in earlier years. A three-judge Federal court in Tennessee dismissed the case, citing as authority a 1946 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on a reapportionment complaint in which Justice Felix Frankfurter had declared that "courts ought not to enter this political thicket."

Baker then took his case to the U.S. Supreme Court. In March 1961, the U.S. Justice Department entered the case on Baker's side, arguing that "numerous States have done nothing with regard to apportionment of their legislatures for 25 or 50 years. The only realistic remedy is Federal judicial action."

The Justice Department brief went beyond essential points of law, arguing that the State legislatures "have, in very large part, failed to adapt themselves to modern problems and majority needs, and this failure has resulted in public cynicism, disillusionment, and loss of confidence." The brief said that "lack of effective Government action at the State level had led to the situation in which big city governments tend to bypass the States and to enter directly into * * * arrangements with the National Government in such areas as housing, urban development, airports and defense community facilities."

The Baker case found a favorable hearing in the Supreme Court, which had been steadily expanding the role of the courts in every field from school segregation to criminal court procedures. When the decision in *Baker* v. *Carr* was handed down March 26, 1962, the vote was 6 to 2 in favor of Baker.

The Supreme Court defined its decision narrowly, saying only that apportionment matters might be considered by the courts where citizens claimed that their constitutional rights were being abridged. But opponents as well as supporters of the decision quickly grasped its import. In a strong dissent, Justice Frankfurter said the majority decision constituted "a massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past" and was an assertion of "destructively novel judicial power." Frankfurter warned that the courts would find themselves in a "mathematical quagmire" in trying to enforce the decision.

Baker v. *Carr* had a national impact virtually unprecedented in U.S. history. In State after State, citizens began to file suits to force the legislatures to undertake long-delayed reapportionment actions. Within 2 years, court cases demanding an end to malapportionment has been filed or prosecuted in 41 of the 50 States. In 26 of those States, courts found apportionment of one or both bodies of the legislature unconstitutional, or intimated that they were about to make such a finding. New apportionment plans were actually approved in 26 States, though in many cases the new plans fell far short of the "one man, one vote" standard the Court would eventually demand.

The initial Baker decision, however, left numerous questions unanswered, and the courts found themselves without any reliable standards by which to judge various State apportionment plans. The Supreme Court, for instance, had not indicated what degree of malapportionment would make a State's districting illegal. Would it be a maximum 10 percent deviation from average, or 25 percent or 50 percent or what?

Nor had the Court made it clear whether both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned on a population base. A number of States, including Illinois, Colorado, and Wyoming, turned to the "little Federal plan"—apportioning one body by population and the other by geography.

Another question unresolved by the Court was whether it would make any difference if an apportionment plan, even if it varied from population to some degree, were approved by a vote of the people of the State. Michigan voters had approved a "little Federal plan" in 1952 and again in 1963, and the voters of Colorado adopted their plan by an overwhelming margin in the 1962 elections.

More than anything else, the Baker decision and court devisions based on it created confusion. A Michigan court knocked out an apportionment because it included variations of more than 2 to 1 between district populations, while a court in New Jersey approved a plan with variations of more than 90 to 1.

Inevitably, the welter of conflicting opinions by lower courts made it necessary for the Supreme Court to clarify just what it had meant in the Baker case. The answer came June 15, 1964, when the Court decided apportionment cases from six States—Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Virginia. In these cases, the Court made it clear:

That the 14th amendment's equal protection clause "requires that the seats in both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned on a population basis."

That the "so-called Federal analogy is inapplicable as a sustaining precedent."

That "mathematical exactness of precision" in carving out legislative districts may be impossible, but that apportionment must be "based substantially on population," and

That it means nothing that the people of a State approve an apportionment based on

any other principle than population, because "a citizen's constitutional rights can hardly be infringed upon because a majority of the people chooses to do so."

In his sweeping decision, Chief Justice Earl Warren, joined by five of his colleagues, wrote: "Legislators represent people, not trees or acres. Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests. To the extent that a citizen's right to vote is debased, he is that much less a citizen."

Three Justices—John Marshall Harlan, Potter Stewart, and Tom C. Clark—dissented in some or all of the cases decided in 1964. Stewart and Clark, who had approved of the Baker decision, declared that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment did indeed put limits on districting plans—but that an apportionment plan, to be acceptable, need only be "rational."

Said Stewart: "* * * the Court's Draconian pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court or in the 175-year history of the United States."

The 1962 Baker decision, though it came as a shock to the States, had caused scarcely a ripple of protest in the U.S. Congress. But the 1964 decision stirred up a storm of criticism there.

Many Congressmen felt that the "Federal analogy" was entirely reasonable and valid, and that within reasonable limits the States had a right, under the republican form of government, to apportion their legislatures as they wished.

There was special resentment expressed in Congress against the Colorado decision in view of the sweeping popular vote for the "little Federal plan" in that State.

The 1964 decisions gave new life to other criticisms of the Supreme Court. Southerners had claimed that in its earlier segregation decisions the Court was writing law, not interpreting it, and they held up the new reapportionment rulings as further evidence of their charge that the Court was usurping the role of the legislature. Meanwhile, Congressmen from other parts of the country were under pressure from their home State legislatures to help preserve existing legislative districts.

Congressional opponents of the Supreme Court decisions made an all-out effort late in 1964 to pass a stopgap bill to slow down the impact of the Court's decrees. A measure actually removing all court authority in the apportionment field passed the House. But a filibuster by Senate liberals prevented any meaningful congressional action on the issue.

Since Congress reconvened this past January, opponents of the Court's position have been concentrating on passage of a constitutional amendment which would permit a State to apportion one house of its legislature on nonpopulation factors—like geography—provided such a move were approved by the people of the State at the polls.

This proposal, backed by Reublican leaders in both Houses and many Democrats, has also been endorsed by the American Bar Association.

In addition, numerous State legislatures have petitioned Congress to call a constitutional convention—a procedure provided for in the Constitution but never yet employed—to consider an amendment on the reapportionment issue.

However, the political climate has become increasingly hostile to any change in the Supreme Court's decision. The 1964 elections resulted in liberal democratic majorities in most of the State legislatures as well as Congress. The liberal Democrats, with their main power base in the cities, may be counted on to oppose any dilution of the Court rulings.

Moreover, since courts have already forced more and more of the State legislatures to move onto a straight population basis, the new State legislatures, elected under the new plans, are unlikely to approve a constitutional amendment which would bring back the old order. A Congressional Quarterly survey showed that just in the interval between the 1964 Supreme Court decisions and the end of last year, new apportionment lawsuits were filed or actual reapportionment bills were passed in 33 States.

At the start of 1965, 24 of the 50 States were under Court orders to reapportion before the next legislative elections. If you live in one of these States, you can count on your State being forced to approve new districts in 1965 or 1966: Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming.

In addition, early reapportionment action is also anticipated in Alaska, Arkansas, Georgia, Missouri, New Mexico, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and South Dakota.

Yet regardless of how irreversible opponents may find the trend, reapportionment is not as simple as it may seem, and the Court has not yet overcome Justice Frankfurter's warning that it deals with a "political thicket" and a "mathematical quagmire." While Washington Attorney Charles S. Rhyne, who argued the Baker case, has lauded the decisions as "a correct application of the great principles which have made our Nation and its system of government the greatest on earth," others see dire consequences and years of litigation ahead.

"The effect of these decisions should be obvious to even the most elementary student of history," says Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio. "The whole structure of our form of government shall be transformed and the unique system of checks and balances undermined. There shall be substituted the dominance of mass rule." Critics like MCCULLOCH fear that big city political bosses will be in a position to control entire State governments.

Even political analysts who are standing out of the line of fire see a host of new and difficult problems yet to arise.

For one thing, a careful study of representative government suggests that mere mathematical equality in the sizes of districts is no guarantee that a legislature represents a majority of the people.

Actually, all that it really takes to control a legislature is 51 percent of the vote in 51 percent of the districts. Thus, only 26 percent of the people could technically control a legislature—even with perfectly equal populated districts.

Thus, if a ruling party or group is clever enough, it can so arrange the districts that it is permanently locked into control. One of the tools most frequently used is the "gerrymander"—a legislative district weirdly shaped to embrace a voting majority for one party. But even without obvious gerrymandering, ruling cliques can maximize their strength far beyond their actual numbers. The Supreme Court will some day have to decide whether the complex reapportionment schemes of many States are in fact devices to deny the constitutional rights the Court seeks to protect.

Another problem is the multimember district, often used to include an entire metropolitan area. This device shows that politics is not simply a matter of country versus city. If a city entitled to 15 representatives runs them all at large from 1 big district, instead of carving the city up into 15 districts, the majority population of the entire city can elect all 15 representatives. Then major areas within the city, or substantial minority groups within it, can be deprived of any effective representation at all, even under the one man, one vote rule.

Another factor is the very complexity of representation. Whether carefully or casually drawn, legislative districts can either over- or under-represent important racial, religious, ethnic and economic groups. Inevitably, the groups which feel they have been mistreated are going to be appealing more and more for redress through the courts—and since the Baker case the courts are open to them.

Thus the current round of apportionment cases, all centered on relatively simple arguments about unequal populations, may simply be the prelude to years of extended litigation in which the courts will need the wisdom of Solomon to decide what really adds up to "equal protection of the laws."

[From Newsweek, June 14, 1965]

PERSPECTIVE: BACK TO BOSSISM

(By Raymond Moley)

The powerful dissenting argument of Justice Frankfurter in the first of the reapportionment cases, his last and best opinion, seems to have left a majority of his colleagues unimpressed. For since then, the Court has moved far beyond its original position, holding that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned on the basis of what is somewhat loosely called "one man, one vote." Wide criticism and the opposition in Congress to this judicial intervention in a political question have not deterred the Court, liberal Democrats and union labor from pressing on for a full application of this representational revolution throughout the Nation.

Perhaps the effort to stem the tide relies too heavily upon tradition. For it is impossible to escape the conclusion that in the torrent of reform which has been sweeping the country since the election in 1964, tradition has been rejected as reactionary, and benighted. I shall therefore refrain from an appeal to history. The Supreme Court is determined not only to interpret the law, but to create an institutional revolution.

BALANCE IS NEEDED

The effect of the sort of representation now decreed by the Court and apparently supported by the proadministration majority in Congress will, if successful, subject the legislatures of every big industrial State to control by the major cities. This will be most marked in such States as Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York and Massachusetts.

Because of the drift of population, great urban masses have a preponderance of the voting strength in their States. If we are to believe that pure democracy is the way to enlightenment, justice and progress, it follows that we shall want these great masses of voters to dominate the legislative bodies of the States, to work their will and promote their interests without check or restraint. The suggestion of the necessity of countervailing forces to assure deliberation of debate and legislative calm these days may be excoriated by the gentle knights of change. But sober reflections on the motives and habits of people in the mass must tell us of the need for balance.

When power is given without limitation to people in the mass, they do not make their decisions by individual and rational choice. They move as a unit, dominated by their social and economic environment—and their leaders. The rule is, as the late Prof. V. O. Key pointed out after a monumental study of polling, that mass opinion represents an "interaction" between what he called "influentials" and the bulk of the

people. The people, he said, are moved by their leaders' "cues" and "proposals." Those leaders are the "activists." Thus, what we call the "democratic order" depends upon the beliefs, standards and interests of its leaders.

DOMINATE STATE CAPITALS

In the industrial centers the leaders are the political bosses and the labor leaders. The masses are told how to vote, not directly and arbitrarily in all cases, but by clever devices, deluding the minds and emotions of the voters. In short, a great majority in every urban area is controlled.

For more than a century these urban areas were boss controlled. Some still are. But as Federal welfare grew after the middle 1930's, the bosses became mere proconsuls under the Federal establishment which had unlimited funds to supplant the machine's beneficial treasury. This, it seemed, meant the twilight of the boss and the machine. Like Othello, they found their "occupation gone."

Reapportionment, which will throw control of the legislatures to these city machines and unions, will mark a revival of the old order. For in many States the urban organizations, mostly Democratic, will dominate the State capitals. Through control of the legislatures, the urban legislative stooges will next redraw the congressional districts and thus assure in the House of Representatives a majority capable of perpetuating what we have now.

That is the prospect before us. And unless some constitutional means is devised and enacted to assure some semblance of geographical representation in at least one house of the State legislatures, there may well be indeterminate domination of national affairs by the political and labor leaders in the great cities.

THE VIETNAMESE SITUATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is heartening to me to see that the congressional debate on Vietnam is continuing in a spirited manner. There can be no limitation of discussion on so critical a subject as this without impinging upon the necessary political rights of Americans as members of a democratic, pluralistic society.

Last week, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] made an extremely able analysis of the situation in Vietnam. Time made it impossible for me to indicate the extent to which I agree with his view. Accordingly, I wish to say a word or two about the subject now.

I also note, although I did not have the privilege of hearing his address, that the able senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] reverted again to the Vietnamese situation and made a number of specific suggestions for ways of settling that controversy. Without committing myself to supporting the views of the senior Senator from Oregon, I point out that at the United Nations 20th anniversary celebration in San Francisco, which I had the pleasure of attending last week, the President of the United States invited the members of the United Nations, individually and collectively, to interest themselves in the situation in Vietnam.

The President called on all members of the United Nations, and, in particular, on the Secretary General, Mr. U Thant, to use their good offices to bring the aggressors to the conference table so that the shooting and the bombing can stop and some peaceful way can be found to neutralize Vietnam, so that it need no longer be a cat's paw between two great powers, China and the United States of America.

I am delighted that the President made that speech. I am delighted that he called the attention of the United Nations to the Vietnamese situation. Yet, we must note very carefully a definite limitation on the possibilities for any successful United Nations intervention in Vietnam. In the first place, Russia is undergoing what I suppose the late John Foster Dulles would refer to as an "agonizing reappraisal" of its position in the Far East.

Russia is a permanent member of the Security Council, and, as such, it has the right to veto any proposals we or any other member of the Security Council may make with respect to Vietnam. I doubt very much whether at the present time any constructive result could be obtained by bringing the Vietnamese situation before the Security Council.

Almost inevitably, it would put the United States into direct opposition to Russia. Our friends would take sides with us. The members of the Communist block would side with Russia. Unless we are able by diplomatic contacts to work out some basis for settlement in Vietnam, I do not believe that the United Nations, acting through the Security Council, would be helpful.

Let us turn then to the General Assembly, in which there is one vote, and only one vote, for every nation in the world which is a member of the United Nations. It would be wishful thinking to hope for a constructive solution of so complicated a matter as the controversy in Vietnam to emerge from this body.

Moreover, by reason of the controversy over article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations, the General Assembly presently is so immobilized that it cannot even take a vote. Until the article 19 controversy is resolved, the General Assembly, in my judgment, can be of little assistance in helping to resolve in the Vietnamese situation.

Therefore, I believe that the President acted very wisely indeed in suggesting in general rather than in specific terms that the members of the United Nations individually and collectively interest themselves in the Vietnamese situation.

He was wise indeed in not directing the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Vietnamese matter before either the Security Council or the General Assembly.

However, there remains one area in which the United Nations might well be of substantial assistance. That is through the good offices of the extremely wise and capable Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, the distinguished Burmese statesman. One may hope that through his manifold connections with the statesmen, diplomats, and politicians of the nations of the world, both Communist and free, Mr. U Thant would be able to formulate a meaningful proposal under which we could meet the aggressors at the conference table and begin to work out a just and honorable settlement of the Vietnamese situation. I hope very much that that will be done.

After I left the 20th anniversary celebration of the United Nations in San Francisco, I went to White Sulphur Springs, Va., where Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker, the able former Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, made an intensely stimulating and interesting address on the subject of China and the world.

It was my privilege to introduce Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker at that meeting. The occasion was the annual convention of the corporate secretaries of the largest corporations in the United States, a group which one would think would tend to take a conservative position on issues of foreign policy. Yet, during the question period which followed Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker's address, individual after individual arose to indicate agreement with the general position which he took in his speech.

That general position was that a way must be found to avoid following policies which have the effect of throwing a reluctant Russia into the arms of a smiling and triumphant China.

It was his view that in the Vietnamese situation we should be prepared to engage in discussions with anyone, and that this should include representatives of the Vietcong.

Mr. President, it is difficult for me to see, when we are engaged in fighting a bitter and bloody war which we want to settle, how we will be able to settle it without talking with the people who are fighting, shooting, and killing our soldiers. To me, the rather strange position which is being taken by the State Department in this regard is quite untenable. Relying on the already discredited White Paper, relying on intelligence sources which, to my way of thinking, are highly suspect, the State Department takes the firm position that it will negotiate only with Hanoi and that really there is no civil war going on in South Vietnam.

Even those of us who follow the war from Washington and who must depend for information on briefings from individuals charged with the responsibility of carrying out our policies there, are by now well convinced that while Hanoi and the North Vietnamese are granting substantial assistance in terms of material and equipment to the Vietcong, while replacements from Vietnam have filled the ranks of the Vietcong that have been decimated by the war, while it may be that regular army units of the North Vietnamese Army are presently, during the monsoon season, engaged in fighting side by side with the Vietcong against the South Vietnamese and the Americans, there is not a shadow of a doubt that there is massive opposition to the Saigon government in South Vietnam from South Vietnamese, many of whom are not Communists at all, but who have merely allied themselves with the Vietcong.

Mr. President, this is a dirty war. It is a horrible war. Outrages which affront civilized man have been committed

time after time by the Vietcong. I regret to say that similar atrocities have been perpetrated by our allies, the South Vietnamese.

The desire of all civilized and humane men and women all over the world is to stop the carnage and atrocities, and to bring peace to that troubled area, which scarcely deserves to be called a nation.

I would hope that Secretary Rusk would press ahead boldly with the suggestion, made the other day, that we are ready to talk to anybody Hanoi wishes to bring to the conference table, so as to make it possible to begin negotiations for ending the carnage.

We should realize, further, that within the complex and complicated political structure of Vietnam, there are, inevitably, a great many people who are fighting against the Vietcong, or perhaps participating in the government of South Vietnam, who have friends or even relatives among the Vietcong. Assuredly there are individuals in the Vietcong who have friends, and possibly relatives, among those who support the Saigon government. What harm would there be if the Ky government were to begin discussions, on its own, through those who may have friends or relatives in the Vietcong, in an effort to determine whether the Vietnamese cannot settle this bloody war themselves? Why need the great powers be the only ones attempting to bring peace? Why should we look for a signal from Peiping? Why should we look for a signal from Moscow? Why, indeed, should we look for a signal from Hanoi? Why should it not be an important part of our diplomacy to encourage negotiations between the two Vietnamese groups which are now fighting each other?

It occurs to me that if this suggestion were carried out, we might find it possible to avoid a confrontation between Russia and Red China and the United States, which if it results in a direct military clash might well escalate into a nuclear World War III.

So I would hope our diplomats would try to take over from our military men so that, through the normal channels of diplomacy in Saigon, we would be able to encourage the South Vietnamese to talk with representatives of the Vietcong.

After all, it is their country. It is their war. We are there by their invitation. They are the people who are primarily responsible for settling it.

While we are doing this, I hope there will be no further escalation of the bombing. It has had nothing but harmful effects for our interests. We must avoid the possibility of confrontation with Russia and Russian missiles near Hanoi.

Having said this, I am keenly aware that hopes for a prompt settlement in Vietnam are not bright. I agree with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I agree with the President when he says that we cannot scuttle and run. My opinion is that we are going to have to fight it out until after the monsoon season, in order to persuade Peiping and Hanoi that we are not going to scuttle and run. But like many other Americans, I am of the strong view that the emphasis must be on stopping the war as quickly as it can be stopped. I hope the suggestion I have made this afternoon might have some bearing on the end result.

CRITICAL ISSUES IN THE INTERNATIONAL FIELD

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, turning briefly to a third and final subject, to my way of thinking there are three immediate controversial and critical issues in the international field which confront the United States of America right now and for which we are going to have to find answers in the immediate future.

When I speak of three issues, I am excluding Vietnam, which, of course, is a critical one—I have just spoken on it—and I am excluding the Dominican Republic, where we are far from arriving at a solution.

With respect to every one of these three issues, we in the Congress, and in the country at large, are in my judgment unable to come to a sensible, well-considered consensus on policy because of excessive executive secrecy.

The first issue has to do with a proposed treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons which the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], with the support of 17 colleagues, including myself and the Senator from Maryland, whom I see on the floor, urged so eloquently a few days ago. I said during the course of that discussion that we are never going to get a nonproliferation treaty with Russia, and we are kidding ourselves if we think we will, unless we abandon the utterly obsolete concept of a NATO multilateral nuclear force, or even an Atlantic nuclear force, conceived for the purpose of keeping West Germany happy by giving her a finger on the nuclear trigger.

I repeat today that we must get rid of the multilateral nuclear force concept in order to get to the conference table to work out an agreement with Russia and the other members of the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva.

In the New York Times of this morning there is a story which indicates that the top-secret Gilpatric report takes exactly the same position I took on the floor of the Senate last week at the time of the speech of the Senator from New York. We do not know what is in that report. We have every right to know. That report should have been made available to the Armed Services Committees of both Houses, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. It should have been made available months ago. I do not believe these reports should be kept in secrecy. In my opinion, they should be made available. In the pluralistic democracy in which we live free speech and public discussion upon issues brought before the people are essential. It seems to me that our policies on such issues should be hammered out on the anvil of free discussion.

What excuse can the State Department have for not giving us this report? Is it being withheld merely because it is critical of the outmoded and harmful concept of MLF? I note that Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker, former Foreign Minister of Great Britain, in his speech at White Sulphur Springs and in conversations he has had since he came to Washington, has likewise urged the desirability of a treaty for the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

In the second place, to my way of thinking, we need to face up to the vexing problem of article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations. It is well known that we are in direct confrontation with both France and Russia regarding the assessment of dues for certain peacekeeping activities of the United Nations.

This dispute will have to be resolved not later than early September, or the General Assembly of the United Nations will again be immobolized, will again be prevented from taking any votes, and will again be prevented from acting in any way except by unanimous consent, as has been the case during all of 1965 to date.

I regret very much that our Government was not prepared at the commemorative session of the United Nations in San Francisco last week to give some indication to the other nations of the world gathered there for that historic event, as to what we propose to do about article XIX.

I believe that the need for debate on this subject on the floor of the Senate is no less urgent than the need for continued debate on Vietnam. I believe that the House of Representatives should likewise join in. I hope we can get some guidance from the executive branch as to what we intend to do on that vexing question, which must be answered not much more than 60 days from now.

I shall have something more extensive to say on the subject later this month.

Finally, Mr. President, there is a cloud not much bigger than one's hand growing on the horizon, but it is growing fast. The source of that cloud is this question: What are we going to do about maintaining an adequate liquidity of internal monetary resources to finance world trade?

The cloud becomes bigger every day, as we achieve new successes in bringing our balance of payments into surplus. For the months of March, April, and May, our balance of payments was in surplus. I am one who is convinced that we must keep our balance of payments at least in equilibrium and preferably in surplus. But with each successful effort—and may they continue—we will also succeed in decreasing the liquidity necessary to finance growing world trade.

Yet, we in Congress are unable to get the facts. The people are not being given the basic facts about the critical discussions now going forward on proposals to increase the capacity of the International Monetary Fund to deal with this vexing problem.

We are unable to know whether the Treasury Department is seriously thinking—as I am confident it should be—of converting the International Monetary Fund into something not much different from our own Federal Reserve Board.

We are unable to know what is in the Ossola report.

All we know is that it is a report which was made to the chief central banks of the world by a distinguished Italian monetary expert, at their request. It has been in the Treasury Department for months. It has been in the central banks of all the great industrial nations of the world for months.

But, can we get it in the Congress? No.

Can we have intelligent discussion as to what to do in this regard, if the bureaucracy is going to classify as top secret, information which is necessary to make a judgment of some wisdom in connection with it? No.

I close, Mr. President, with a plea to the executive branch to disavow this executive secrecy, to overcome this phobia which usually starts low down in the bureaucracy, and stems from an inherent timidity.

Let us give the people the facts.

Let us bring out the Gilpatric report.

Let us bring out the Ossola report.

Let us give the country some guidance as to what we are going to do about article 19.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

REAPPORTIONMENT: THE BALANCE OF POWERS SHIFTS TO THE SUBURBS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on two previous occasions I have risen to discuss the "rotten borough amendments." These proposed amendments to the Constitution, sponsored by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and others, would permit one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on the basis of factors other than population. On June 2, in my first major speech on this floor, I tried to cover as comprehensively as I could the major difficulties with the pending amendments. On June 21, I discussed the implications of the proposed amendments with respect to civil rights. Today I should like to discuss the effects of reapportionment upon the cities, the suburbs, and the rural areas.

Proponents of the "rotten borough amendments" often contend that a fairly apportioned legislature would be dominated by a cohesive bloc of urban legislators controlled by a powerful political machine. They claim that minority interests outside the metropolitan areas will be ignored and their needs submerged to the demands of city dwellers. Such fears are not justified either by fact or by experience.

It is simply not true that cities would dominate fairly apportioned State legislatures. There is no State in which the residents of a single city could elect a majority of the legislature. Even New York City contains only 46.4 percent of the people of New York State; Chicago has 35.2 percent, Baltimore has 30.3 percent, Minneapolis-St. Paul has 23.3 percent, and Detroit has 21.3 percent. No other major city contains more than 20 percent of the State's population.

Moreover, there are only five States in which the combined population of the three largest cities constitutes more than 40 percent of the population of the State.

In only two of these States, New York and Arizona, is it theoretically possible for the residents of the central cities to join together to elect a majority of the representatives to the legislature. In Arizona an alliance between Phoenix and Tucson would be needed to produce this majority and in New York a majority could be produced only by an alliance of two or more upstate cities with New York City.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that it frequently happens that when there are two or more major cities in a State, they often fight each other in the legislature tooth and nail. Examples are Fort Worth and Dallas, upstate cities in New York versus New York City, Kansas City and St. Louis, and Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Equally significant is the fact that for 30 years our major cities have been losing population as compared to the rest of the State. In 1930, New York City contained 55.1 percent of the State's population. In 1960, it contained only 46.4 percent. Chicago declined from 44.2 to 35.2, Detroit from 32.4 to 21.3 percent. Indeed, from 1950 to 1960, 15 of this country's 23 largest cities suffered an actual loss in total population and only 5 of the 23 were able to grow as rapidly as the statewide average.

The major increase in population has been and will continue to be in the suburbs. Of our 23 largest cities, only 3—Houston, Dallas, and Atlanta—grew faster than their suburbs in the years from 1950 to 1960. For example, New York City's population declined by 1.4 percent from 1950 to 1960 while its suburbs witnessed a 75-percent increase. Los Angeles-Long Beach grew by 27.1 percent but their suburbs increased by 82.6 percent. Chicago's population dropped by 1.9 percent while its suburbs grew by 71.5 percent. The National Municipal League estimates that by 1980 New York, Dallas, and Houston will be the only major cities containing more population than their surrounding suburbs.

It is perfectly clear that reapportionment based solely on population will have its greatest effect in increasing suburban representation. The result will be that in any clash between the cities and the rural areas the suburbs would hold the balance of power.

It is frequently assumed that representatives from the cities and the suburbs will be constant allies in the legislature. Certainly suburbanites share common problems with city dwellers. However, the suburbs are made up of people who have fled the crowded cities in their desire for lawns and trees and who thus hold different aspirations than their former neighbors. There is constant tension between city and suburb over such fundamental matters as taxation (for example, the earnings tax dispute), highway location, rapid transit, annexation, sewer and water interconnections and charges, and many other matters. Astute rural legislators have exploited and will continue to exploit these differences to obtain passage of legislation of peculiar interest to them.

Cooperation between the suburbs and the countryside can also be expected on account of party cohesion. Residents of both areas have frequently tended to vote Republican. It can be assumed that, rather than supporting the predominantly Democratic groups from the cities, suburban Republicans will often prefer the policies of their Republican brethren from the country.

Moreover, even in States where representatives from urban areas would constitute a large percentage of the legislature it cannot be assumed that they would vote as a bloc. Prof. David R. Durge has studied the urban-rural conflict in the Illinois Legislature. After the 1955 reapportionment in the Illinois House the representatives from Cook County and Chicago had a numerical majority in the House. Nonetheless, Professor Durge found they did not vote as a bloc. In fact, in only 4 of the 332 rollcall votes was there a cohesion of more than 67 percent among the Chicago Cook County representatives. In other words, two-thirds of the urban oriented group of legislators managed to vote together only 1 percent of the time.

The reasons for the lack of cohesion among urban representatives are not difficult to understand. As Prof. Royce Hanson of American University has pointed out:

> Urban and suburban citizens are not a homogeneous mass of humanity. An urban senator * * * must deal with bankers and laborers, segregationists and freedom workers, research biologists and the antivivisection society.

Professor Hanson concludes:

> Majorities and minorities are more likely to rest on temporary coalitions of interests than on urban-rural cleavages.

The competing pressures on an urban representative make it unlikely that he and his colleagues can combine unfairly to disadvantage rural interests.

Experience demonstrates that urban legislators deal fairly with their rural brethren, perhaps more fairly than they have been dealt with. The highly respected Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has found, for example, that during the 1950's both houses of the Legislatures of Massachusetts, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin were apportioned substantially on the basis of population. Over 50 percent of the population in each of these States was regarded as urban. Nonetheless each of these States allocated funds for education and highway purposes to local governments according to formulas that clearly benefited rural areas. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations concludes:

> Thus, urban representatives appeared to recognize certain special needs of rural areas in the States with apportioned legislative seats substantially in accordance with population.

Indeed there is reason to believe that in certain circumstances urban legislators may, in the long run, give rural citizens greater consideration than these citizens receive at the hands of their own legislators. One dramatic example of this is found in my own State where the shortsightedness of certain rural legislators with respect to the problems of pollution and development of the Chesapeake Bay has led to a serious deterioration in the shellfish industry. Ironically, the Maryland Legislature will have to be reapportioned in order that the urban and suburban legislators can exert influence in the development of the Chesapeake Bay, and thus save the rural-centered shellfish industry from steady depletion and erosion as a result of inaction by the representatives from the very area where the shellfish industry is located.

Another argument raised by the supporters of the "rotten borough amendment" is that large cities are often run by corrupt political machines which seek only to increase their own power at the expense of the citizens of the State. This argument contains more drama than truth as the editors of Fortune magazine have demonstrated in their book, "The Exploding Metropolis." It shows that American cities today are, on the whole, efficiently run by honest political leaders.

The fears conjured up by the image of the political machine are particularly unfounded when applied to the suburbs. The fact that suburbanites are generally well educated and comfortable makes them an inappropriate spawning ground for an all-powerful political machine. As the balance of political power will rest with the suburbs, there is thus no risk that it will be exercised at the dictates of a small and irresponsible group of big-city party leaders.

As the foregoing analysis has indicated, the often voiced fear of urban domination is wholly lacking in substance.

An act as serious as amending the Constitution should not be undertaken in the absence of a clear and urgent need. Such a need is not now evident and the increasing significance of suburbia strengthens the belief that this need is unlikely to arise in the future. I might add that this would be the first time that the Constitution of the United States would have been amended to limit the franchise since the founding of the Republic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD a booklet published by the National Municipal League, written by William J. D. Boyd, senior associate of the league, and entitled "Suburbia Takes Over."

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

SUBURBIA TAKES OVER

(By William J. D. Boyd)[1]

The suburbs, and, in the long run, only the suburbs, will gain in the upheaval resulting from reapportionment of State legislatures on the basis of population. Rather than being dominated by the big cities, as is commonly supposed, the new legislatures will see suburban representatives increase the most in number.

Actually, there will be very few States in which one segment of the population will have a clear-cut majority. Where this does happen, it will continue to be the rural population that prevails, as in Mississippi, the two Dakotas, South Carolina, and Vermont. In other States, suburbanites will hold the balance of power between rural and big-city forces.

Analysis of population trends in recent decades discloses the following facts:

1. All suburban areas are gaining in population.

2. Most big cities are losing population.

3. Almost one-half of the big cities already have less population than their suburbs; by 1970, the overwhelming majority will have less.

4. No city contains as much as 50 percent of the population of its State.

5. All cities which contain as much as 15 percent of their States' population have shown a percentage decline over the last 30 years.

Table 1 shows the 23 metropolitan centers in the United States that have populations of a million or more (Washington, D.C., not being located in a State, is not included). In six of these, the metropolitan area spills over into at least one adjoining State, so only that metropolitan-area population as shown is within the same State as the central city. Because of such adjustments, both the Cincinnati and Kansas City, Mo., metropolitan areas fall below a million in population.

From 1950 to 1960, the suburban areas around every one of these 23 cities increased in population, even in those States such as Massachusetts in which population increased less rapidly than the national average. Fifteen of the central cities had an actual loss of population and only 5 of the 23 managed to increase as rapidly as the statewide average.

In addition, during the decade 1950 to 1960, suburban growth was so rapid that 11 of the 23 cities are now smaller than their suburbs which are located within the same State. Population trends indicate that by 1970 about a half-dozen more will become smaller than their suburbs. By 1980, only New York, Dallas, and Houston should remain more populous than their surrounding suburbs.

Continued growth of central cities in Texas is easily explained, for they may readily annex any adjacent unincorporated territory. In this way, they swallow their suburbs almost as fast as the latter are created, unless the new areas rapidly incorporate as municipalities. Politically, this has had the advantage of keeping available to a city the business and professional leadership which so many of the older cities of the eastern seaboard have long since lost to the suburbs.

New York City, while steadily losing population to its suburbs, is so situated that its metropolitan area covers parts of three States. Therefore, although it is steadily declining in relation to its suburbs, including those within the State, the total population of the city will probably remain larger than those New York suburbs for some years.

When the New York Legislature is reapportioned on the basis of population, however, New York City will gain only four assemblymen. Suburban Nassau County alone will gain six and still more will go to Suffolk and Westchester Counties. In percentage terms, New York City will gain about 6 percent more in representation, Nassau and Suffolk Counties will each make a 100-percent gain. Following the 1970 census, the city should lose more seats than the number gained in 1965.

Table 2 and the chart dramatically show what has happened to central cities since 1930. They list all those from table 1 which contain 15 percent or more of the total population of their States. Only 10 cities fall into this category. Without exception, the percentage of the State's population living within the city's borders has declined. The 30-year downward curve is so uniform and so pronounced that it establishes beyond question that the danger of big-city dominance is gone forever.

New York City presents one of the most interesting examples. The city presently contains a smaller percentage of the State's population than it did in 1900. Since World War II, the trend has been so consistently downward that in the last decade the city actually lost in absolute population terms as well as in percentage terms. This phenomenon is unlikely to continue, but all indications are that, in percentage terms, the decline of the city may become more rapid than in past decades even if the city does increase in absolute population once more. (Note that Los Angeles, while gaining 500,000 during the last decade, actually declined in comparison with total statewide growth.)

There are a few cities not shown on either of the tables (cities in metropolitan areas with less than a million population or those which have less than 15 precent of their States total populations) that are continuing to grow. Here, too, however, suburban areas are growing more rapidly than the central cities. This development is most common in States experiencing major growth, such as California, Florida, and Arizona. Arizona's annexation laws, like those in Texas, allow central cities to annex so much of their suburban areas that the former did outstrip the areas beyond their new limits for a time. This trend, however, seems to have halted. While Phoenix and Tucson continue to grow, incorporated areas outside their limits are expanding at an even more rapid rate.

The vast open spaces within the boundaries of the new cities of California and Florida are filling up. The great boom, therefore, is taking place beyond city limits. In both of these States, every one of the metropolitan areas, even those of rather insignificant size, is characterized by big suburban rather than urban populations.

Finally, not only the intense rivalry between the central city and its suburbs but also intercity rivalry works to block any power grab by big-city machines. Historically, San Francisco and Los Angeles, St. Louis and Kansas City, Phoenix and Tucson, Dallas and Fort Worth have provided the greatest enmities and jealousies in their respective State legislatures. (The recent bitter squabble in the New York State Legislature among its new Democratic leaders even shows a division within New York City.)

No central city contains the necessary 50 percent of the people to dominate the State. It is now apparent that no city will ever attain that dominance. The United States is an urban nation, but it is now a big-city nation. The suburbs own the future.

Under current reapportionment changes, many large cities will gain some additional representatives in their State legislatures but in most cases their own suburbs will gain more, and after the 1970 census, almost all central cities will lose some of the seats gained now. Without exception, those seats will go to the suburbs. Big-city politicians, rather than dominating future State legislatures, are going to find they have more numerous and articulate opponents in their new suburban rivals than ever before.

[1] Mr. Boyd is senior associate of the National Municipal League and for the last 3 years has been in charge of its activities on apportionment. Author of the league publication, "Patterns of Apportionment," and of an article in the National Civic Review last November (p. 530), he is also editor of the Review's representation department.

TABLE 1.—*1960 population, 23 largest metropolitan areas*

Metropolitan area	1960 total population	Central-city population	Percentage increase or decrease since 1950	Suburban population	Percentage increase since 1950
New York City	[1] 10,694,633	7,781,984	−1.4	[1] 2,912,649	[1] +75.0
Los Angeles-Long Beach	6,742,696	2,823,183	+27.1	3,919,513	+82.6
Chicago	[1] 6,220,913	3,550,404	−1.9	[1] 2,670,509	+71.5
Detroit	3,762,360	1,670,144	−9.7	[1] 1,589,011	+48.4
Philadelphia	[1] 3,591,523	2,002,512	−3.3	2,092,216	+79.3
San Francisco-Oakland	2,783,359	1,107,864	−4.5	1,675,495	+55.0
Boston	2,589,301	697,197	−13.0	1,892,104	+17.6
Pittsburgh	2,405,435	604,332	−10.7	1,801,103	+17.2
Cleveland	1,796,595	876,050	−4.2	920,545	+67.2
Baltimore	1,727,023	939,024	−1.1	787,999	+72.9
Newark	1,689,420	405,220	−7.6	1,284,200	+24.7
St. Louis	[1] 1,572,905	750,026	−12.5	[1] 822,879	+73.5
Minneapolis-St. Paul	1,482,030	796,283	−4.4	685,747	+115.7
Buffalo	1,306,957	532,759	−8.2	774,198	+52.1
Houston	1,243,158	938,219	+57.4	304,939	+44.8
Milwaukee	1,194,290	741,324	+16.3	452,966	+41.7
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic	1,186,873	279,710	+6.9	907,163	+47.6
Seattle	1,107,213	557,087	+19.1	550,126	+45.9
Dallas	1,083,601	679,684	+56.4	403,917	+30.7
San Diego	1,033,011	573,224	+71.4	459,787	+108.7
Atlanta	1,017,188	487,455	+47.1	529,733	+33.9
Cincinnati	[1] 864,121	502,550	−.3	[1] 361,671	[1] +64.4
Kansas City, Mo	[1] 730,206	475,539	+4.1	[1] 254,667	[1] +96.5

[1] Includes only that suburban population located within the same State as the major central city (or cities).

TABLE 2.—*Percentage total State population (1930 to 1960) of central cities on table 1 containing 15 percent or more of their State's total population (ranked according to the size of the central city)*

City	1960	1950	1940	1930	Change since 1930 in percentage of total State population
New York City	46.4	53.2	55.3	55.1	−8.7
Chicago	35.2	41.6	43.0	44.2	−9.0
Los Angeles	15.8	18.6	21.8	21.8	−6.0
Philadelphia	17.7	19.7	19.5	20.3	−2.6
Detroit	21.3	29.0	30.9	32.4	−11.1
Baltimore	30.3	40.5	47.2	49.3	−19.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul	23.3	27.9	27.9	28.7	−5.4
St. Louis	17.4	21.7	21.6	22.6	−5.2
Milwaukee	18.8	18.6	18.7	19.7	−.9
Seattle	19.5	19.7	21.2	23.4	−3.9

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, 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. 6453) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9497) to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1966, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 9497) to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1966, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO FILE REPORTS DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE THROUGH FRIDAY, JULY 2

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be authorized to file reports during the adjournment of the Senate through Friday, July 2, 1965.

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

CONGRESS AFTER 6 MONTHS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate will take a short and well-earned holiday over the Fourth of July weekend. I would hope that this break will serve to restore the vigor of the Senate for the many tasks ahead.

On Tuesday, the Senate will dispose of the conference report on presidential inability and will then take up the hospital insurance program and amendments to the Social Security Act. After that there remains such major legislative items as the omnibus housing bill, nine appropriation bills, higher education, the President's labor recommendations, Department of Urban Affairs, numerous recreation bills, the farm program, home rule, immigration reforms, an extension of the Interest Equalization Tax Act, the high-speed ground transport bill, and others. So if we are to contemplate a pre-Labor Day adjournment with any degree of realism, I hope that Senators will return on Tuesday prepared to continue to operate with the deliberate speed and effectiveness which has characterized the proceedings of the Senate during the past few months.

As I stated on June 17, the Congress has done a most creditable job so far this session. It has worked in a consistent and orderly fashion and has accomplished a great deal in the way of constructive legislation. Again I want to express my gratitude to each Member on both sides of the aisle for the patience, understanding, and restraint which has been the primary factor in this achievement.

The report which I presented to you on June 17 has now been updated for the convenience and information of the Senate. As related to the Senate, this report shows that Congress has received from the President 33 special messages and 12 Executive communications which contain numerous legislative recommendations. Of the recommendations, Congress has completed action on 34, 5 more are in conference, 4 have passed both Houses amended, 16 more have passed the Senate, 20 others are on either the Senate or House Calendars ready for early action, others are about ready for reporting by committees, and hearings are in progress on all but 11 of the remaining recommendations.

Before giving you a complete summary of activity, let me repeat, this July 4 respite is well earned and is a scheduled part of the plan for a more consistent and orderly and predictable procedure which the leadership laid before the Democratic conference and in conjunction with the distinguished minority leader, before the Senate, early in the session.

Of the recommendations received to date, Congress has completed action on the following:

The three appropriation supplementals, including Vietnam; and three fiscal 1966 appropriations for Interior and related agencies, District of Columbia, and Treasury-Post Office.

A proposed constitutional amendment fixing conditions and procedures for succession of the Vice President to the Presidency in the event of the Chief Executive's disability, and providing for filling a vacancy in the Vice-Presidency—conference report to be adopted July 6.

A $1.1 billion measure to aid the economically underdeveloped 11-State Appalachian region.

A $2.5 billion atomic energy authorization.

A major reform in the Bureau of Customs placing some 53 collectors under civil service.

An authorization of $1 million to replace the bombed-out chancery in Saigon.

A $114.2 million Coast Guard authorization.

A bill implementing the International Coffee Agreement.

A 3-year, $30 million extension of the Disarmament Act.

An authorization of $1.344 billion in Federal aid for fiscal 1966 for elementary and secondary schools, a bill which the President described as "the most significant step of this century to provide widespread help to all of America's schoolchildren."

A 1-year extension of the National Commission on Food Marketing established in 1964 to study and appraise the marketing structure of the American food industry.

A bill repealing the requirement of 25-percent gold backing of commercial bank deposits held by the Federal Reserve banks, but retaining the 25-percent requirement against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation.

An authorization of a $750 million increase in the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank—over a 3-year period at the rate of $250 million a year.

A bill reducing excise taxes by approximately $4.7 billion.

An increase of $1,035 million in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund.

A 4-year extension to June 30, 1969, of the Export Control Act of 1949.

A bill authorizing the appointment of a military man as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

A bill setting the duty-free allowance at $100 based on retail value that American tourists can bring back from abroad.

A 1-year extension of the juvenile delinquency program.

An extension of the Manpower Development and Training Act to June 30, 1969, and $454 million for fiscal 1966.

An annual authorization of $15.4 billion for military procurement to assure an adequate defense posture.

An annual authorization of $5.2 billion for the space program.

An increase in the temporary national debt ceiling to $328 billion through June 30, 1966.

A bill supplementing the acreage allotment with the establishment of poundage quotas for all farms producing Flue-cured tobacco to reduce surpluses in this commodity, improve quality, and increase exports.

A bill establishing prospective standard guidelines on the allocation and reimbursability of recreation, fish, and wildlife costs on Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects.

A 4-year extension of the President's authority to reorganize the executive branch.

A bill authorizing Federal grants of $5 million a year in matching funds to States for State project planning over a 10-year period; setting up a Cabinet-level Water Resources Council to coordinate river basin planning, and authorizing creation of river basin commissions for regional planning—conferees agreed June 30.

Amendments to the Charter of the United Nations increasing the membership of the Security Council from 11 to 15 and the Economic and Social Council from 18 to 27.

One-year extension, to July 31, 1966, of the International Wheat Agreement.

Bills now in conference are:

A 5-year extension of the authority for grants to States and communities for mass immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and measles.

A bill providing for the initial staffing of community mental health centers, and an extension and expansion of the Mental Retardation Act.

A bill extending the program of matching grants for health research facilities for an additional 3 years.

A $1,721,352,000 military construction authorization for fiscal 1966.

The foreign aid authorization for fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

Bills passed both Houses amended:

A bill creating an Administration on Aging to be a coordinating center for information and service to State and local governments, to administer grants, promote research, gather statistics, and prepare and publish other data.

A bill vesting authority to establish purity standards for water pollution control and authorizing $80 million in new grants.

A bill increasing the fees payable to the Patent Office so it may recover a reasonable part of its costs.

A bill providing for increased controls over the distribution of barbiturates, amphetamines, and other drugs having a similar effect on the central nervous system.

Senate bills pending in the House:

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, guaranteeing Negroes their right to register and vote, which passed the Senate by a 4-to-1 vote.

A $665 million authorization in grants for public works and development facilities in economically distressed areas.

A bill providing for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia.

A $355,000 authorization to establish the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in Montana and Wyoming.

A bill providing for research programs relative to controlling air pollution resulting from gasoline-powered and diesel-powered vehicles.

A $364,310,000 authorization for the Federal construction of a third powerplant at Grand Coulee which will add 3.6 million kilowatts of generating capacity to the 2 million kilowatts of the two existing plants, making it the largest single hydroelectric development in the world.

A $115 million fiscal year 1966 authorization for the Peace Corps.

A bill establishing a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

A revision and consolidation of laws governing management of national stockpiles of critical and strategic materials.

A bill authorizing the VA to extend aid to distressed homeowners.

An expansion of the Water Research Act of 1964.

A bill providing for an expansion of the Federal program of research and development in the field of saline water conversion through the authorization of $200 million in appropriations for the period ending fiscal 1972.

A bill authorizing the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Recreation Area.

The Regional Medical Complex Act of 1965.

A bill providing for reducing the amount of silver used in the Nation's coinage to alleviate a silver shortage.

A bill granting the President wider discretion in appointing top-level personnel of the U.S. mission to the United Nation.

For those who desire a complete summary of activity, I include such a report containing all major Senate activity through July 1.

The tally sheet so far:

SENATE ACTIVITY

Days in session: 101.

Hours in session: 512 hours, 33 minutes.

Total measures passed: 391.

Confirmations: 35,912.

Public laws: 63.

Treaties: Two.

AGRICULTURE

Food marketing: Extended for 1 year the date on which the National Commission on Food Marketing shall make its final report to the President—Public Law 89–20; Presidential recommendation.

Tobacco: Provides an extension of time for filing 1965 tobacco allotment leases—Public Law 89–29.

Tobacco acreage-poundage marketing quotas: Supplements acreage allotment program with establishment of poundage quotas for all farms producing Flue-cured tobacco to reduce surpluses in this commodity, improve quality and increase exports—Public Law 89–12; Presidential recommendation.

APPROPRIATIONS

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

Second supplemental, 1965: Appropriated a total of $2,227,563,977 with $349.7 million of this amount allocated for Appalachian aid—Public Law 89–16; Presidential recommendation.

Vietnam supplemental: Appropriated $700 million for airfields, military installations, ammunition, and aircraft—Public Law 89–18; Presidential recommendation.

FISCAL YEAR 1966

District of Columbia Appropriation: Appropriated a total of $360,228,500 for

fiscal 1966. H.R. 6453—Public Law 89–75; Presidential recommendation.

Interior Department and related agencies: Appropriated $1,212,739,070 for fiscal 1966—Public Law 89–52; Presidential recommendation.

Treasury-Post Office: Appropriated a total of $7,669,444,000 for fiscal 1966—Public Law 89–57; Presidential recommendation.

ATOMIC ENERGY

AEC authorization: Authorizes $2,555,521,000 for AEC appropriations for fiscal 1966 construction, operations, and capital equipment; includes $704 million for weapons program, $2.5 million for merchant ship reactor program—Public Law 89–32; Presidential recommendation.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Voting Rights Act of 1965: Guarantees Negroes their right to register and vote—S. 1564 passed Senate May 26; H.R. 6400, House floor action July 6; Presidential recommendation.

CONGRESS

Arts and Antiquities Commission: Establishes a Commission on Arts and Antiquities of the Capitol and authorizes $15,000 for annual expenses—Senate Joint Resolution 65 passed Senate May 24.

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

Joint Committee on Organization of Congress: Established a 12-member bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to make a complete study of the organization and operation of Congress and to recommend improvements. Rules changes are not included in the study. Authorizes $150,000 through January 31, 1966, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. First report to be submitted 120 days following effective date of the resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 adopted March 9, 1965; House March 11, 1965.

DEFENSE

Coast Guard cutters: Authorizes $6,260,000 to replace 17 Coast Guard cutters taken from domestic service and sent to Vietnam—Public Law 89–21.

Coast Guard procurement: Authorized $114.2 million for U.S. Coast Guard for fiscal 1966 for procurement of vessels, aircraft, and construction of shore and offshore installations—Public Law 89–13; Presidential recommendation.

Military construction: Provides construction and other related authority for the military departments, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, within and outside the United States and authority for construction of facilities for the Reserve components in the total amount of $1,721,352,000 consisting of $1,711,529,000 in new authority, and an increase in prior years' authorizations of $9,823,000—H.R. 8439; in conference; Presidential recommendation.

Military procurement: Authorized a total of $15,402,800,000 for fiscal 1966 with $8,958,300,000 allocated for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels and $6,444,500,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation—Public Law 89–37; Presidential recommendation.

ROTC: Extends the statute of limitations for filing claims for mustering-out payments to January 30, 1966, and repeals the authority for such payments on July 1, 1966—Public Law 89–50.

Special allowances to Armed Forces dependents: Authorizes payment of special allowances and dislocation allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services when the dependents are evacuated from an oversea danger area—Public Law 89–26.

Stockpile Act: Revised and consolidated laws governing management of national stockpiles of critical and strategic materials to provide Congress and the public with pertinent information; made procurement contracts subject to the Renegotiation Act, and facilitated disposal of surpluses—S. 28 passed Senate February 9; Presidential recommendation.

Zinc, lead, and copper: Authorized the disposal of 200,000 tons each of zinc and lead and the sale of 100,000 short tons of copper to producers and processors—Public Law 89–9.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Board of Parole: Authorizes the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia, subject to the approval of the Board of Commissioners, to promulgate rules and regulations under which the Board of Parole, in its discretion, may discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced—Public Law 89–24.

Bond requirements: Authorizes the court to set bond in an amount twice the value of the property being attached in the District of Columbia in any case in which the plaintiff states in his affidavit that the value of the property to be levied upon is less than the amount of his claim—S. 1321 passed Senate May 11.

Public day care services: Authorizes the District of Columbia Commissioners to establish and administer a plan to provide for the care and protection of children through public day care services, and to provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to certain dependent children—S. 2212 passed Senate June 30.

Work release program: Authorizes the District of Columbia courts to release selected offenders from prison confinement at specified hours of the day to obtain or engage in gainful employement—S. 1319 passed Senate May 11.

ECONOMY

Aid to Appalachia: Authorized $1.1 billion in aid to the 11-State Appalachian region and established the Appalachia Regional Commission; $840 million of this amount will be in form of Federal grants for a 5-year highway construction program and a 2-year authorization of $252.4 million for a variety of economic development projects—Public Law 89–4; Presidential recommendation.

Debt ceiling increase: Increased the temporary national debt ceiling to $328 billion through June 30, 1966—Public Law 89–49; Presidental recommendation.

Disaster victims: Directs the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make an immediate study of alternative programs which could be established to help provide financial assistance to those suffering property losses in flood, earthquake, and other natural disasters, including alternative methods of Federal insurance as well as the existing flood insurance program—S. 408 passed Senate January 1928.

Duty-free tourists' limit: Set at $100, based on retail value, the amount of duty-free purchases an American tourist can bring back from abroad; it ends the privilege under which a returning tourist can apply part of his unused exemption to articles shipped separately; it applies the 1-gallon duty-free liquor allowance to the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Samoa; and makes the bill effective October 1, 1965—Public Law 89–62; Presidential recommendation.

Gold cover: Repealed the requirement of 25-percent gold backing of commercial bank deposits held by the Federal Reserve banks, but retained the 25-percent requirement against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation—Public Law 89–3; Presidential recommendation.

Manpower Act of 1965: Extended the Manpower Development and Training Act to June 30, 1969, authorized $454 million for fiscal 1966, and provides up to 2 years' training in classrooms or on the job for persons unemployed because they lack education or skills—Public Law 89–15; Presidential recommendation.

Metal scrap extension: Continues to June 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap, and the existing reduction of duties on copper waste and scrap—Public Law 89–61.

Pacific Northwest disaster relief: Provides assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, California, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged in December 1964 and January and February 1965 as a result of catastrophic floods unprecedented in terms of high water and subsequent damage to roads, farms, residences, and industries—Public Law 89–41.

Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965: Authorizes a total of $665 million in grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions—S. 1648 passed Senate June 1; House Calendar; Presidential recommendation.

SBA disaster relief: Amends the Small Business Act to provide for an increase in the maturity of Small Business Administration disaster loans from 20 to 30 years; provides for a suspension of up to 5 years on the payment of principal and interest on disaster loans at the discretion of the Administrator; and increases SBA's revolving fund by $50 million—Public Law 89–59.

Silver coinage: Reduces the amount of silver used in the Nation's coinage so there will be an adequate supply of coins to carry on business and trade in spite of the growing needs for silver and the increasing shortage in its supply—S. 2080 passed Senate June 24; House Calendar; Presidential recommendation.

Export Control Act extension: Extends for an additional 4 years to June 30, 1969, the Export Control Act of 1949, which authorizes the President to prohibit or to curtail exporting from the United States, its territories, or possessions to Communist nations any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data—Public Law 89–63; Presidential recommendation.

EDUCATION

Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Authorized $1.344 billion in Federal aid for elementary-secondary schools for fiscal 1966; a 3-year program of Federal grants to States for allocation to school districts with large numbers of children from low-income families; a 5-year program of grants for books and library materials; a 5-year program of grants for supplementary educational centers and services; a 5-year, $100 million authorization for construction and operation of regional facilities for educational research; a 5-year program for grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their State educational agencies and a 2-year extension—through June 30, 1968—of Federal aid to impacted areas—Public Law 89–10; Presidential recommendation.

Institute for the Deaf: Establishes a National Technical Institute for the Deaf for the purpose of providing a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for successful employment—Public Law 89–36.

Juvenile delinquency program extension: Extends the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 for an additional year to June 30, 1967, and authorizes $6.5 million for fiscal 1966 and $10 million for fiscal 1967—H.R. 8131; Public Law 89– ; Presidential recommendation.

School construction: Authorized aid for school construction in certain impacted areas outside the continental United States—H.R. 5874, passed Senate, amended June 11.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Annuity increase: Clarified the application of annuity increase in the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962—Public Law 89–17.

FAA Administrator: Authorizes the appointment of Gen. William F. McKee, U.S. Air Force, retired, as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and authorizes General McKee to retain the rank, grade, and emoluments of his retired military status while holding the Office of Administrator—Public Law 89–46; Presidential recommendation.

Government employment of aliens: Authorized Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity—S. 905 passed Senate April 21.

Maritime Commission: Provides the Commissioners of the Federal Maritime Commission shall be appointed for a 5-year term—Public Law 89–56.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Bank Merger Act Amendments, 1965: Amends the Bank Merger Act to require that future bank mergers should not be consummated until 30 days after the date of approval by the appropriate banking agency—S. 1698 passed Senate June 11.

Construction in Guam and Virgin Islands: Improved facilities for enforcement officers of the Customs and Immigration and Naturalization Service on Guam and the Virgin Islands—S. 956 passed Senate April 21.

Dr. Jonas Salk: Designated April 12, 1965, to honor Dr. Jonas Salk and the National Foundation March of Dimes on the 10th anniversary of the announcement of the world's first effective vaccine against polio—Senate Concurrent Resolution 30 adopted April 7; House adopted April 8.

Father Jacques Marquette: Established a tercentenary commission to commemorate the advent and history of Father Jacques Marquette in North America—Senate Joint Resolution 53 passed Senate June 14.

Goddard Day; Designated March 16, 1965, as Goddard Day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern-day rocketry—Public Law 89–5.

Golden Spike National Monument: Authorizes $1,168,000 for the establishment of the Golden Spike National Monument at Promontory in Box Elder County, Utah, to commemorate the first transcontinental railroad across the United States and completed May 10, 1869—S. 26 passed Senate June 16, 1965; House Calendar.

Jefferson National Expansion Memorial: Authorizes an increase from $17,260,000 to $23,250,000 in the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Mo., in commemoration of the concept of westward expansion, the Louisiana Purchase, and all it has meant to the growth of America—S. 1576 passed Senate June 17.

Movable Property Act: Authorized the Secretary of Interior to transfer title to movable property to municipalities which assume operation and maintenance responsibilities for project works serving municipal and industrial functions under the same conditions and on the same terms as title transfer to irrigation districts or water users' organizations which assume operation and maintenance responsibilities for project works serving irrigation functions—Public Law 89–48.

Patent Office fees: Increased fees payable to the Patent Office in connection with patents and registration of trademarks—H.R. 4185 passed Senate amended June 15; Presidential recommendation.

Postal rates for volunteer fire companies: Includes volunteer fire companies within the group of qualified nonprofit organizations entitled to use preferential second- and third-class postage rates for bulk mailings—S. 390 passed Senate March 29.

South Pacific Commission: Authorizes the appropriation of up to $200,000 a year, for payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the South Pacific Commission and its auxiliary and subsidiary bodies—Senate Joint Resolution 71 passed Senate June 25; House Joint Resolution 503; House Calendar.

Textile Fiber Products Identification Act: Permits the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product—Public Law 89–35.

United States-Puerto Rico Commission: Extends the date for final reporting of the Commission to September 30, 1966, and increases the authorization to $465,000—S. 2154 passed Senate June 28; House Calendar.

Wool Labeling Act: Authorizes FTC to exclude any headwear from the labeling requirements of the Wool Products Labeling Act if labeling is not necessary for the protection of the consumer—S. 836 passed Senate May 11.

HEALTH

Cigarette labeling: Requires that every package and carton of cigarettes display on the front or back panel in conspicuous and legible type, the following: "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health." Prohibits any other warning requirement on the package or carton by any Federal, State, or local authority—S. 559; conferees agreed July 1.

Clean air: Requires standards and proposes regulations to control pollution from gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles. Establishes a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory. Authorizes grants for research to improve methods for disposal of solid waste—S. 306 passed Senate May 18; Presidential recommendation.

Community health services extension: Extended for 5 fiscal years, 1966–70, authority for grants to States and communities for mass immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and adds measles. Extends for 1 year general and special health services, including those for migratory workers, chronically ill and aged, and grants for research to improve such services—S. 510 in conference; Presidential recommendation.

Drug control: Provides for regulation and control of manufacturers of depressant and stimulant drugs—H.R. 2 passed Senate amended June 23; Presidential recommendation.

Gorgas Memorial Laboratory: Increases from $250,000 to $500,000 the authorization of appropriations for the support of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory—S. 511 passed Senate June 25.

Health Research Facilities Act: Extends this act of June 30, 1968, and authorizes an additional $280 million in construction grants—H.R. 2984; in conference; Presidential recommendation.

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

Mental health centers: Authorizes aid in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers—H.R. 2985; in conference; Presidential recommendation.

Regional medical complex: Authorizes $650 million over a 4-year period, 1966–69, to assist in establishing and operating regionally coordinated medical complexes for heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases—S. 596 passed Senate June 28; Presidential recommendation.

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

Water pollution control—Federal installations: Provides for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution—S. 560 passed Senate March 25.

HOUSING

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

INDIANS

Indian adult education: Increased by $3 million—$15 million—the authorization for Indian adult vocational education—Public Law 89–14.

Pueblo Indian irrigation charges: Extended to 1975 the authority initially granted the Secretary of Interior by the act of August 27, 1935, to enter into contracts which the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, New Mexico, for payment of operation and maintenance charges involved in the irrigation of some 11,000 acres of Pueblo Indian lands within the district—S. 1462 passed Senate March 29.

Quinaielt Tribe of Indians: Provides for the disposition of $205,172.40 awarded by the Indian Claims Commission to the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians in settlement of their claim—Public Law 89–28.

INTERNATIONAL

Coffee implementation: This bill implements the International Coffee Agreement ratified in 1963 and authorizes the President to require all coffee entering U.S. markets and all exports of coffee to be accompanied by a certificate of origin or a certificate of reexport. Limits imports of coffee from countries which have not joined in the agreement; and requires certain recordkeeping—Public Law 89–23; Presidential recommendation.

Disarmament Act amendments: Authorized $30 million for fiscal years 1966–68 for the Disarmament Agency—Public Law 89–27; Presidential recommendation.

Foreign Agents Registration Act amendments: Strengthened the basic purpose of the original act by requiring complete public disclosure by persons acting for or in the interests of foreign principals where their activities are political in nature or border on the political. Such public disclosure will permit the Government and the people of the United States to be informed as to the identities and activities of such persons—S. 693 passed Senate April 5.

Foreign aid authorization: Provides authorizations for the current program in fiscal years 1966 and 1967; ends the foreign aid program as presently constituted on June 30, 1967, and, in the meantime, provides for a searching inquiry as to the best means of formulating and operating a program of foreign assistance after that date—H.R. 7750; in conference; Presidential recommendation.

Greek loan: Authorizes the Secretary of Treasury to conclude settlement of a U.S. loan to Greece in 1929. Under the settlement Greece will repay at interest $13,155,921 in 82 annual installations—S. 1760 passed Senate June 25.

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and International Finance Corporation articles of agreement: Authorizes the U.S. Governor—Secretary of the Treasury—of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to agree to an amendment to permit loans to the International Finance Corporation—S. 1742 passed Senate June 30.

International Monetary Fund: Authorizes an increase of $1,035 million in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund, from $4.125 to $5.16 billion. Public Law 89–31; Presidential recommendation.

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

International Cooperation Year: Expressed the sense of Congress with respect to the 20th anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year—Senate Concurrent Resolution 36; Senate adopted June 16; House adopted June 22.

Peace Corps authorization: Authorizes an annual appropriation of $115 million for fiscal 1966; provides two additional Associate Directors; and provides that the Director of the Corps shall hold no other additional office of an equal rank while serving as Director of the Corps—S. 2054 passed Senate June 2; House Calendar; Presidential recommendation.

Religious persecution: Expresses the sense of Congress against persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of religion—Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 adopted by Senate May 14; House Calendar.

Saigon chancery: Authorizes $1 million for the construction of a chancery in Saigon—Public Law 89–22; Presidential recommendation.

U.S. domestic fishery resources: Authorizes the President, whenever it is determined that fishing vessels of a foreign country are operating to the detriment of U.S. conservation programs, to raise the duty on fishery products of the offending nation—S. 1734 passed Senate May 19; returned to Senate May 20.

U.N. Participation Act: Grants the President wider discretion in appointing top-level personnel of the U.S. mission to the United Nations, and gives the U.S. representative discretion to assign personnel to various organs of the U.N. in accordance with workload and other considerations; and authorizes the President to appoint a representative to the U.S. mission to the European office of the U.N.—S. 1903 passed Senate June 25; Presidential recommendation.

TREATIES

United Nations Charter amendments: Increases the membership of the Security Council from 11 to 15 and the membership of the Economic and Social Council from 18 to 27, to be elected on a geographic basis—Executive A ratified June 3; Presidential recommendation.

Wheat Agreement extension: Extends the International Wheat Agreement to July 31, 1966—Executive B ratified June 15; Presidential recommendation.

JUDICIAL

Additional circuit and district judges: Creates additional circuit and district judgeships throughout the United States where the need for such judgeships has been found to be most urgent—S. 1666 passed Senate June 30.

Alaska judges: Provides that service as a judge of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska shall be included in computing the aggregate years of judicial service of a U.S. district judge for the district of Alaska for purposes of retirement—H.R. 5283; Public Law 89–70.

False information: Reduces the existing penalty against pranksters and jokesters who falsely report the presence of bombs and the like, aboard aircraft, motor vehicles, railroads, or vessels, but do so without malice or evil purpose, by substituting a civil penalty of not more than $1,000 to be recovered in a civil action brought in the name of the United States—H.R. 6848; Public Law 89–64.

Illicit traffic in child adoption: Imposed Federal criminal sanctions on persons engaged in interstate or foreign commerce in the illicit traffic of placing children for adoption or permanent free care—S. 624 passed Senate March 22.

Travel in aid of arson: Penalizes interstate travel and transportation in aid of arson, in the same manner as the existing antiracketeering law penalizes interstate travel and transportation in aid of

other racketeering enterprises—H.R. 6507; Public Law 89–68.

PRESIDENCY

Presidential succession: Proposed constitutional amendment fixing conditions and procedures for succession of Vice President to the Presidency in event of Chief Executive disability; provides for filling vacancy in the Vice-Presidency—Senate Joint Resolution 1, conference report to be adopted July 6; Presidential recommendation.

REORGANIZATION

Bureau of Customs: Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 provides for the modernization of the Customs Bureau by abolishing the offices of all presidential offices and establishing these positions on a career basis. Offices abolished are 45 collectors of customs; 6 comptrollers of customs; and 1 appraiser of merchandise and 1 surveyor of customs. Effective May 25, 1965; Presidential recommendation.

Reorganization Act extension: Extended to December 31, 1968, the authority of the President to transmit reorganization plans to Congress—Public Law 89–43; Presidential recommendation.

RESOURCE AND RECREATION BUILDUP

Agate Fossil Beds National Monument: Authorized $355,000 for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in Nebraska—Public Law 89–33.

Assateague Island National Seashore: Provides for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia—S. 20 passed Senate June 17; Presidential recommendation.

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area: Authorized $355,000 to establish the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in Montana and Wyoming to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of the proposed Yellowtail Reservoir, and for the preservation of the scenic, scientific, and historic features of the area—S. 491 passed Senate February 10; Presidential recommendation.

Federal Water Project Recreation Act: Established prospective standard guidelines on the allocation and reimbursability of recreation, fish, and wildlife costs on Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects—S. 1229; Public Law 89–72; Presidential recommendation.

Fisheries Loan Act: Extends the fishery loan program for an additional 5 years; expands its scope to permit a loan to be made regardless of whether the vessel to be acquired will replace an existing vessel; and removes the present minimum annual interest rate of 3 percent and substitutes a formula for establishing it—S. 998 passed Senate June 16.

Flood protection: Authorizes the Federal Government to bear up to 5 percent of costs of utility relocations on projects covered by the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act when the local organization is unable to bear such costs or cannot do so without undue hardship—S. 199 passed Senate May 25.

Grand Coulee—Third powerplant: Authorizes $364,310,000 for Federal construction of a third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River in the State of Washington, which will add 3.6 million kilowatts of generating capacity to the 2 million kilowatts of the two existing plants making it the largest single hydroelectric development in the world—S. 1761 passed Senate June 16; Presidential recommendation.

Indiana dunes: Authorizes $23 million for the acquisition of land for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Recreation Area—S. 360 passed Senate June 21; Presidential recommendation.

Kaniksu National Forest: Authorized up to $500,000 from the land and water conservation fund to extend the Kaniksu National Forest to include lands necessary for the protection and conservation of the scenic values and natural environment of Upper Priest Lake in Idaho—Public Law 89–39.

Mann Creek reclamation project: Authorizes an additional $690,000 to complete the Mann Creek project in Idaho which, upon completion, will provide a supplemental water supply to 4,465 acres and a new water supply to 595 acres—Public Law 89–60.

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

Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho: Authorized $630,000 for the purchase of 1,500 acres of land to establish the Nez Perce National Historical Park to commemorate, preserve, and interpret the historic values in the early Nez Perce Indian culture, the tribes' war of 1877 with U.S. cavalry troops, the Lewis and Clark Expedition through the area early in the 19th century, subsequent fur trading, gold mining, logging, and missionary activity—Public Law 89–19.

Pecos National Monument, N. Mex.: Provides for the establishment of the Pecos National Monument in New Mexico to preserve the remains and artifacts of a 17th-century Spanish mission and an ancient Indian pueblo—Public Law 89–54.

Pesticides: Amends the act of August 1, 1958, by continuing 3 years a study by the Secretary of Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides, on fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource—S. 1623 passed the Senate on April 29.

River basin authorization: Authorizes an additional $944 million for fiscal years 1966–67 for 13 river basin plans previously approved by Congress—Public Law 89–42.

River basin planning: Authorized Federal grants of $5 million a year in matching funds to States for State project planning over a 10-year period; sets up a Cabinet-level Water Resources Council to coordinate river basin planning; and authorizes creation of river basin commissions for regional planning—S. 21 in conference; Presidential recommendation.

Saline water conversion: Provided for an expansion of the Federal program of research and development in the field of saline water conversion through authorization of an additional $200 million in appropriations for the period ending fiscal year 1972—S. 24 passed the Senate June 16; Presidential recommendation.

Small reclamation projects: Broadens and strengthens the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, an act designed to encourage State and local participation in developing and improving reclamation projects in their own localities, by increasing the authorization for funds available for the loan-and-grant program from $100 million to $200 million; and raising the limitation on loans or grants for single projects to $7.5 million—S. 602 passed Senate July 1.

Southern Nevada water project, Nevada: Authorizes $81,003,000 for the Federal construction of the southern Nevada water supply project, a single-purpose municipal and industrial water supply development to furnish water from Lake Mead to the cities of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, Boulder City, and Nellis Air Force Base—S. 32 passed Senate June 17.

Tualatin project, Oregon: Authorized up to $23 million for Federal construction of the multipurpose Tualatin reclamation project in Washington County, Oreg.—S. 254 passed Senate April 1.

Water Resources Research Act: Amends the 1964 Water Resources Research Act to authorize grant, matching, and contract funds for assistance to educational institutions in addition to State land-grant colleges, to competent private organizations and individuals, and to local, State, and Federal agencies undertaking special research in water resource problems. Authorizes $5 million for fiscal 1966 and increases the authorization by $1 million annually until the level of $10 million is reached. The ceiling of $10 million will remain thereafter—S. 22 passed Senate March 25; Presidential recommendation.

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

SPACE

NASA: Authorized a total of $5,190,396,200 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1966 as follows: "Research and development," $4,536,971,000; "Construction of facilities," $62,376,350; "Administrative operations," $591,048,850—Public Law 89–53; Presidential recommendation.

TAXES

Excise taxes: Reduced excise taxes by approximately $4.7 billion—Public Law 89–44; Presidential recommendation.

Motor fuels taxation compact: Grants the consent of Congress to New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact relating

to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity—Public Law 89–11.

TIME

Uniform time: Establishes uniform dates for commencing and ending daylight saving time in the States and local jurisdictions where it is observed—S. 1404 passed Senate June 3.

TRANSPORTATION

Intercoastal Shipping Act: Changes the penalty provisions in the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933 to conform with similar penalty provisions in the Shipping Act of 1916, relating to requirements for water carriers to file tariffs with the Federal Maritime Commission—H.R. 3415; Public Law 89–71.

Mobile trade fairs: Provides for a 3-year extension of the authority to develop American-flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs—H.R. 4525; Public Law 89–66.

Navigation: Increased authorizations for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of Congresses of Navigation—S. 1501 passed Senate April 21.

Oceanographic vessels: Exempts oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws—S. 627 passed Senate April 29.

VETERANS

Reopened insurance fund: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to transfer up to $1,650,000 from the veterans special term insurance fund, for the purpose of providing administrative expenses in connection with the reopening of national service life insurance—Public Law 89–40.

VA hospitals: Expresses sense of Congress on increasing the authorized bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals—Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 adopted June 4.

WELFARE

Older Americans Act: Creates an Administration on Aging, under direction of a Commissioner, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to be a coordinating center for information and service to State and local governments, administer grants, promote research, gather statistics, and prepare and publish other data—H.R. 3708 passed Senate, amended May 27; Presidential recommendation.

National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities: Establishes a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to develop and promote a broadly conceived national policy of support for the arts and humanities throughout the United States—S. 1483 passed Senate June 10; Presidential recommendation.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 a.m., tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, July 2, 1965, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 1, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

David R. Baldwin, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice Herbert W. Klotz, resigned.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be Federal Maritime Commissioners for the terms indicated:

James V. Day, of Maine, for the term expiring June 30, 1969. (Reappointment.)

John Harllee, of the District of Columbia, for the term expiring June 30, 1970. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. George Baird Bennett, O398135, Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. Edward Donald Walsh, O422743, Adjutant General's Corps.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Joe Ahee, O363984, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Ross Holland Routh, O287602, Adjutant General's Corps.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

Lieutenant Colonel to Colonel

Line of the Air Force

Aagaard, Emmert M., 13574A.
Abbott, Woodrow A., 12763A.
Accola, Jacob P., 33051A.
Adams, Charles J., 22656A.
Aderholt, Harry C., 13592A.
Allen, Donald W., 12715A.
Anderson, John B., 12964A.
Anderson, Norman C., 33170A.
Angel, Ralph E., 12278A.
Apgar, Paul D., 12832A.
Arnold, William B., 18091A.
Arnold, William R., 48718A.
Atchley, Kenneth L., 33813A.
Atkinson, Ivan C., 10935A.
Atwater, William E., 9646A.
August, Jack W., 9704A.
Aust, Abner M., Jr., 20631A.
Bailey, William D., 13522A.
Ballweg, Lawrence H., 10800A.
Barefoot, Selwyn J., 33394A.
Barley, John N., 11428A.
Barnidge, William H., 12915A.
Barns, William F., 20630A.
Barry, Billie J., 10001A.
Bass, Thomas E., 10060A.
Beall, Max T., 13814A.
Beck, Howard G., 13020A.
Bell, John A., 12627A.
Bellows, Clyde L., 13088A.
Benner, John G., 8303A.
Bennett, Frenchy D., 13538A.
Benton, Robert I., 33754A.
Berger, Raymond J., 8392A.
Berschel, Donald F., 33900A.
Bestervelt, Harold J., 9785A.
Bevard, Franklin B., 13041A.
Bigum, Alfred C., 12796A.
Biles, James L., Jr., 12342A.
Biretta, Albert A., 8990A.
Black, William H., 11203A.
Blanck, Eugene L., 21433A.
Bockelman, Frederick, Jr., 13396A.
Bogan, John W., 10027A.
Bohannon, James R., Jr., 18146A.
Bohart, Chester H., 13091A.
Bowlan, Kent G., 33518A.
Boyd, Earl W., 33889A.
Brainerd, Jackson W., 8527A.
Breeze, William A., 33297A.
Breeze, William H., 8655A.
Brennan, Gerald W., 10206A.
Brewer, Lonnie C., 9940A.
Briesemeister, Edward E., 33316A.
Brooks, Charles L., 9886A.
Brothers, James T., 10045A.
Brown, Chester L., 33511A.
Brown, Milton M., 33656A.
Brown, Walter J., 13179A.
Broyles, Roy L., Jr., 51711A.
Bryant, Ernest D., 12292A.
Buchta, Joseph, 20036A.
Buel, Joseph G., 9255A.
Bumm, William C., 33941A.
Burns, Robert J., 11586A.
Burton, Charles R., 8522A.
Bush, Russell L., 22654A.
Bynum, Jess L., 33674A.
Bynum, Willis A., 13425A.
Caliendo, Lorenzo, 33948A.
Canestrari, Gisto, 13495A.
Carey, George F., Jr., 13104A.
Carlson, Donald C., 13339A.
Carlson, Roy D., 13447A.
Carlyle, James H., 13373A.
Carraway, Wilbur C., 33658A.
Carson, Charles R., 10934A.
Cavoli, William J., 11005A.
Chapman, John M., 17700A.
Cherry, Clyde S., 12952A.
Christopher, Albert M., 13278A.
Clark, Robert S., 12565A.
Clymer, Harvey C., 11310A.
Coberly, Theodore S., 33954A.
Coleman, Alphonse J., 33834A.
Coleman, Thomas P., 13283A.
Collins, John J., 12244A.
Collins, Perry V., 18156A.
Conklin, William D., 13873A.
Connor, Edward H., III, 10157A.
Cook, John W., 33238A.
Coons, Merle M., 33581A.
Cotton, Joseph F., 10232A.
Cresto, Joseph L., 12373A.
Crim, Harry C., Jr., 8707A.
Crocker, Gage H., 10091A.
Crone, Douglas A., 13072A.
Cronin, William R., 9317A.
Crutchfield, Wilfred B., 9941A.
Cummins, Frank R., 11633A.
Cushman, Henry R., Jr., 33342A.
Daniel, Charles L., 33190A.
Davidson, B. H., 22575A.
Davis, Jack T., 10142A.
Davis, Woodard E., Jr., 33914A.
Dayton, Earl R., 33956A.
Dearment, Harry F., 33436A.
Deimling, Paul L., 12312A.
Deluca, Joseph R., 33749A.
Dickey, Thomas P., 33806A.
Dietrich, Fred H., 13671A.
Dineen, Richard C., 33570A.
Dolby, William F., 9856A.
Dotson, Herbert F., Jr., 20587A.
Dubose, Edward E., Jr., 8600A.
Dudley, William B., 10176A.
Duke, Claude L., Jr., 8488A.
Duncan, Bruce G., 33687A.
Dunlap, Ronald E., 33744A.
Eagleston, Glenn T., 9438A.
Ebelke, William H., 13235A.
Ebert, Rembert A., 9917A.
Edington, Leonard E., 11875A.
Egan, James C., Jr., 13638A.
Ellen, Cicero J., Jr., 33350A.
Ellett, Darwin E., 51757A.
Ellis, Samuel W., 10802A.
Emrich, Daniel C., 11824A.
Erickson, Orin H., 12772A.
Evdokimoff, Dmitri, 9896A.
Ezell, William O., 22649A.
Farrell, Thomas D., 16200A.

Farrington, Raymond F., 12493A.
Fenlon, Peter C., 51746A.
Ferrari, Victor J., 33507A.
Filley, Oliver D., Jr., 9933A.
Finnerty, William J., II, 12957A.
Fisher, Max L., 11436A.
Fisher, Orvill L., Jr., 13193A.
Flavin, Kenneth A., 9656A.
Fletcher, Henry M., Jr., 13693A.
Flynn, Thomas G., Jr., 11294A.
Ford, Ross C., 9969A.
Fremouw, Gerrit, D., 33710A.
French, George E., Jr., 13063A.
Friedrich, Roy E., Sr., 13154A.
Frymire, William D., 11741A.
Furrie, Frank G., 33852A.
Galas, David E., 13695A.
Garlitz, William B., Jr., 13837A.
Garrett, William A., 10858A.
Gazzaniga, Louis A., 10064A.
Gelwix, Joe M., Jr., 10051A.
Genez, Victor M., 8466A.
Giannini, Jack L., 11600A.
Giffin, Charle W., Jr., 8854A.
Gillespie, Leonard V., 33299A.
Good, Marvin H., 13162A.
Grant, Bayard V., 33566A.
Green, Milton C., 33920A.
Greenwood, William, 33873A.
Griffin, Ralph O., 12648A.
Grottle, George T., 12776A.
Hagemann, Joseph A., 22657A.
Hall, Harvey P., 20674A.
Hall, James H., 12254A.
Halliday, Robert W., 13098A.
Halloran, James P. S., 11955A.
Hamblen, William, 10856A.
Hamby, Malcolm C., 11880A.
Hamlin, Robert W., 18084A.
Hammack, Charles R., 13669A.
Hammond, Fred B., Jr., 19774A.
Hammond, Walter S., 33723A.
Handy, Paul, 13031A.
Hardy, Preston B., 11969A.
Harmon, William A., 21438A.
Hart, Gordon L., 10849A.
Hart, Raymond J., 11440A.
Hartnett, Bernard F., 33851A.
Hawes, Warren H., 18160A.
Heisler, William F., 8979A.
Hendrick, Andrew J., 33820A.
Henke, Arnold W., 13217A.
Herbert, John J., Jr., 10000A.
Hoban, Richard M., 23658A.
Hobbs, Harold W., 12609A.
Holland, Mark F., 33801A.
Holmes, Douglas I., 12237A.
Holmes, Elwin F., 11097A.
Horne, Claude G., 9131A.
Howell, James R., 12933A.
Howell, Selah H., 33192A.
Hudson, Ulin L., 10120A.
Hughes, Paul A., 13663A.
Hullar, Robert J., 33849A.
Hunter, Jack C., 33793A.
Huntley, James C., 9854A.
Huston, James L., Jr., 11132A.
Iovine, Guy T., 11648A.
Isbell, Thomas W., Jr., 11956A.
Jacobs, William P., 13052A.
Jacobsen, William L., 9889A.
Jameson, Dorence C., 51709A.
Jane, Edwin G., Jr., 13085A.
Jarvis, Melvin E., 11261A.
Jess, Edward O., 33426A.
Johnson, Earl L., 33837A.
Johnson, Forrest D., 12463A.
Johnson, George A., 20672A.
Johnson, Howard C., 13219A.
Johnson, Isham M., 11322A.
Johnson, Lionel F., 33844A.
Johnson, Louis M., 33967A.
Johnson, Merle, 9962A.
Johnston, Ruby E., 51719A.
Jonas, Gordon E., 12812A.
Jones, Albert W., 13603A.
Jones, Henry L., 12891A.
Jones, Robert L., 13251A.
Judas, Maxwell V., 11667A.
Kahn, Leroy, 21787A.
Kearney, John L., 12357A.
Keely, George J., 33535A.
Keish, Frederick C., 12738A.
Keller, Howard W., 10857A.
Kelley, Carroll W., 22992A.
Kemp, Ridgely D., 33775A.
Kemper, George A., Jr., 11443A.
Kennedy, Thomas B., 12723A.
Kerr, Kenneth J., 9287A.
Kester, Clifford D., 18163A.
Kille, Wesley G., 13001A.
Kincaid, Norris R., 33371A.
King, James W., 9103A.
Kirchoff, Ralph E., 33029A.
Knaus, John V., 9155A.
Knowles, Harold F., 13678A.
Koenig, Sebastian B., 10039A.
Korbol, Clifford O., 12929A.
Kougias, George C., 23682A.
Krause, Arthur F., 12532A.
Krause. Francis R., 12983A.
Kremer, Emil A., 9171A.
Krysakowski, Joseph E., 19791A.
Laberge, Vincent R., 11915A.
Ladd, Roy E., 33961A.
Laedtke, Elmer C., 13890A.
Lafko, John W., 8968A.
Lamb, Hal W., 9344A.
Lambert, Raymond E., 33628A.
Lambertson, Norman F., Jr., 11330A.
Lane, Ralph H., Jr., 13279A.
Lannon, James J., 13653A.
Larson, Jack A., 33715A.
Larson, Leon H., Jr., 10827A.
Leaser, Earl R., 13036A.
Ledig, Richard G., II, 33633A.
Lee, Raymond C., Jr., 12261A.
Lee, Richard D., 13414A.
Lee, William W., 9373A.
Lehner, Albert M., 13554A.
Levine, Howard M., 33300A.
Lewandoski, Joseph W., 11493A.
Lewis, Armit W., 8506A.
Lewis, Melford W., 13882A.
Lien, Arthur M., 22574A.
Linebaugh, John H. M., 11268A.
Long, Raymond W., 13541A.
Loveless, Philip M., Jr., 33742A.
Lovell, Carl E., 10237A.
Lowman, Raymond P., 13049A.
Lucas, Henry E., 8342A.
Lyle, Vernon J., 12759A.
MacCauley, Hugh B., 13819A.
MacDonald, Douglas L., 13660A.
Manbeck, Lester E., 9136A.
Mangerich, Walter E., 8971A.
Mansfield, Cliff D., 13849A.
Marsh, Frederick H., 8626A.
Marsio, James W., 51795A.
Martin, Herbert W., 13426A.
Mason, Wallace A., 12045A.
Mason, William H., 10030A.
Masters, Edgar J., 12886A.
McAdam, Richard C., 13679A.
McAuliffe, Richard G., 33892A.
McBridge, Elmer T., 12799A.
McCabe, John J., Jr., 33558A.
McCarroll, Billy J., 12504A.
McCaskill, Roderik E., 33408A.
McCooe, Christopher T., 51751A.
McDonald, Allen K., 33586A.
McFadden, Robert W., 51764A.
McFall, Dana F., Jr., 9959A.
McGrew, Kenneth G., 12813A.
McIver, Claud L., Jr., 33950A.
McKinzie, William M., 13661A.
McKittrick, Richard G., 33499A.
McNulty, Gerald M., 33970A.
Meibohm, Winfred H., 13083A.
Meier, Clifford H., 11783A.
Meline, Ralph E., 13848A.
Merkel, Ellsworth L., 9387A.
Mestemaker, Joseph E., 10081A.
Miller, Louie, Jr., 33564A.
Miller, Thomas B., 10036A.
Moelich, William E., Jr., 12725A.
Moffat, Harold L., 11931A.
Monaco, Anthony W., Jr., 20605A.
Monroe, Thomas G., Jr., 10229A.
Montgomery, Beverly O., 33908A.
Moody, Edgar W., 11971A.
Moore, Robert B., 13781A.
Morgan, Emory C., 12112A.
Morgan, Thomas E., Jr., 13840A.
Morphew, Mario C., Jr., 33776A.
Moses, Larrie E., 13280A.
Moss, George H., III, 33894A.
Mouat, John C., 13045A.
Mullin, Robert E., 13130A.
Murray, John E., 23656A.
Murray, Loren P., Jr., 13055A.
Myers, Joseph R., 9992A.
Nave, Elza W., 33243A.
Naylor, William E., Jr., 13690A.
Neff, James M., 33827A.
Ness, Patrick J., 13227A.
Nesselbush, Louis K., 10131A.
Neuer, John J., 10100A.
Nicholls, Ben H., 33612A.
Nicholson, Clifton L., 13452A.
Norton, Ross D., 33447A.
Norton, William J., 10008A.
Norton, William R., 13140A.
Ogden, Harold A., 8883A.
Ogletree, Robert C., Jr., 9981A.
Olsen, Sumner M., 9205A.
Orr, Jack P., 11978A.
Orr, Wayne P., 33526A.
Overton, William W., 13555A.
Owen, Arthur W., Jr., 12166A.
Pappas, Thomas R., 11373A.
Parker, Richard H., 13687A.
Parramore, William W., Jr., 33863A.
Parsley, Wayne M., 8776A.
Parsons, Robert P., 12553A.
Patterson, John V., Jr., 13788A.
Patton, Phil M., 9658A.
Patton, Roderick R., 13625A.
Payne, George N., 33589A.
Peck, Fred R., Jr., 8268A.
Peck, Warren K., 13916A.
Pedersen, James C., 8530A.
Peebles, Farley E., 13756A.
Perkins, Donald F., 12711A.
Personeus, Lester, Jr., 9164A.
Peterson, Howard W., 24307A.
Phillips, William L., 13478A.
Philpott, Jammie M., 13694A.
Pivarnik, Michael, 11349A.
Poe, William E., 10961A.
Pollen, Milton T., 12875A.
Polve, James H., 11597A.
Porter, Frederick S., Jr., 12848A.
Provancha, George J., 11696A.
Pugh, James R., Jr., 13711A.
Pullen, Howard V., 12884A.
Quayle, Gerald D., Jr., 12078A.
Rader, Thomas O., 10946A.
Ragsdale, Roy D., 11369A.
Randels, James B., 13258A.
Rankin Robert J., 9996A.
Raynor, Walter J., 33527A.
Reavis, Cecil L., Jr., 12909A.
Reiter, Jack, 11982A.
Rentmeester, Lester F., 13352A.
Rhodes, Charles W., 51766A.
Richards, Donald W., 13362A.
Richardson, Bill M., 13435A.
Richmond, George M., 8644A.
Rickert, Walter K., 9495A.
Roberts, Charles A., 12948A.
Robertson, Hugh B., Jr., 33773A.
Robertson, John A., 8376A.
Robertson, Thomas D., 12751A.
Robinson, Michael F., 33421A.
Rogers, Ellard T., 33383A.
Rollman, Robert O., 22823A.
Rorrer, Marvin T., 13070A.
Ross, Richard H., 13163A.
Russell, LeRoy G., 10127A.
Russell, Walter J., Jr., 33760A.
Ryan, John A., Jr., 33884A.
Ryhlick, Lawrence T., 19654A.
Sagert, Stanley A., 10065A.
Sams, Monroe S., 9743A.
Sandbach, John O., 13437A.
Sanford, Douglas F., 12256A.
Schnabel, Robert E., 13532A.
Schutten, Bernard J., Jr., 9995A.
Scott, George W., 11412A.
Scoville, Curtis L., 11765A.
Seal, Earl D., 9637A.
Segura, Wiltz P., 23681A.

Seith, William F., 33619A.
Shaber, Bert, Jr., 13021A.
Sharpe, Carl L., 9529A.
Sheffield, James R., 11013A.
Sherman, Fred P., 11653A.
Sherrill, Stephen H., Jr., 10196A.
Shultz, Charles Y., Jr., 13476A.
Slater, Hugh C., 33573A.
Smith, Charles C., Jr., 10937A.
Smith, Elmer F., 8259A.
Smith, John W., 11623A.
Smith, Kenneth A., 11108A.
Smitherman, Julia E., 13276A.
Smotherman, Benjamin F., 12007A.
Smutko, Leonard S., 9320A.
Snipes, James C., 9008A.
Sommers, Harold L., 12999A.
Souleyret, Kenneth, 10009A.
Spain, Frank H., 33163A.
Speer, Marvin L., 51792A.
Spencer, Robert V., 13230A.
Stanfield, Donald N., 13870A.
Stanley, Marvin M., 13109A.
Staylor, LeRoy W., 12530A.
Steen, Clarence H., 12823A.
Steinhauer, Raleigh F., 9649A.
Stephens, Lawrence E., 9149A.
Stephens, Robert L., 13581A.
Steves, Walter T., 22581A.
Stewart, Dale F., 13255A.
Stewart, Thomas E., 12945A.
Sullivan, Robert, 13081A.
Summers, Charles L., 8406A.
Summers, Clifford C., 33057A.
Sunde, Robert J., 33698A.
Sutton, John L., 11572A.
Taylor, David M., 13618A.
Taylor, Emery D., 10033A.
Taylor, Joseph T., 20611A.
Taylor, Robert A., 9705A.
Tennant, Charles W., 9049A.
Thompson, John R., Jr., 11655A.
Timmermans, Henry L., 12817A.
Tisdale, James W., Jr., 13778A.
Torpey, Robert F., 11591A.
Totten, Jerry M., 8608A.
Trojan, Joseph E., 11665A.
Tucker, Albe S. J., Jr., 10182A.
Tucker, Hugh O., 33905A.
Tull, Levin P., 33548A.
Turnquist, Roy H., 13195A.
Twomey, Thomas A., 12441A.
Tyndall, Elmer N., 33713A.
Tyrrell, Robert L. F., 10020A.
Underwood, William S., 13651A.
Urban, John A., 11034A.
Vandebogart, Warren M., 10953A.
Vansickle, Philip H., 13043A.
Vaughn, Jasper M. P., 8508A.
Voightmann, Frank L., 13469A.
Voss, Kenneth W., 12976A.
Waage, Amos E., 13887A.
Wagner, James, 33911A.
Waid, Elwood J., 13579A.
Walior, John T., 8986A.
Walker, James O., Jr., 11804A.
Walker, Samuel A., 11807A.
Ward, Albert M., 8957A.
Wathen, Roy D., 13439A.
Wear, Thomas O., 13438A.
Weaver, James W., 8839A.
Weddle, Walter M., 20024A.
Weed, John B., 12765A.
Weinmeiste, C. J., III, 13655A.
Weniger, Robert L., Jr., 9278A.
Werner, Crowell B., 10944A.
Wheeler, Richard V., 13702A.
White, Edwin J., Jr., 33779A.
White, Richard J., 33804A.
Wickman, Vernon E., 33125A.
Wilcox, Grover C., Jr., 8436A.
Williams, Burl R., 13646A.
Williams, Herndon F., 13619A.
Williams, James A., 13605A.
Williams, Lewis H., 12963A.
Wilson, Stephen C., 13883A.
Wilson, William M., 9920A.
Winn, Otis E., 10013A.
Winneshiek, William S., 9337A.
Withers, Raymond R., 13015A.
Womack, Jack E., 11405A.
Wood, George R., 11860A.
Wood, Herman C., 33805A.
Wood, Horace D., 13076A.
Wood, Robert E., 11545A.
Wood, William P., 10865A.
Woolf, Simpson M., 20569A.
Yarbrough, Leonard H., 13172A.
Yeoman, Edwin T., 11325A.
Yockey, Donald J., 13921A.
Yopchick, Michael P., 9732A.
Young, Kenneth A., 33189A.
Zimmerman, Arnold E., 12385A.

Chaplain

Albert, John F., 48575A.
Mattheson, Raymond T., 20861A.
Minor, Earl W., 20855A.
Schumacher, Bernard F., 48573A.
Sharbaugh, Cornelius A., 18808A.
Smith, Meredith P., 48582A.
Stillwagon, Grove E., 20851A.
Tindall, Robert W., 18804A.

Dental Corps

Book, William H., 22395A.
Chapman, John A., 19618A.
Copeland, Henry I., Jr., 22396A.
Hombs, Roger, 18950A.
Hoskins, Sam W., Jr., 25695A
Morgan, Howard H., 20835A.
Thompson, Robert L., Jr., 20523A.
Wyatt, James L., Jr., 19847A.

Medical Corps

Barnum, Ferdinand, 22544A.
Caris, Timonthy N., 21854A.
Dawson, Robert G., 24115A.
Dean, Guy W., Jr., 19287A.
Dewey, Walter W., 22958A.
Flinn, Don E., 23582A.
Gibbs, Charles E., 24111A.
Goltra, Evan R., Jr., 27480A.
Hines, Henry L., 24201A.
Holcomb, Thomas M., 22404A.
Lofton, Joseph E., 19844A.
Lutz, Stanley, Jr., 19958A.
Marriott, William R. V., 24648A.
Nauert, Nicholas H., Jr., 19606A.
Peterson, William F., 19913A.
Quinnell, Robert K., 19323A.
Smith, Dasil C., 20542A.
Stein, Ignatius J., 19963A.
Swindell, Herbert V., 25328A.
Thompson, William W., 24122A.
Vanpelt, James F., Jr., 24124A.
Watts, Charles C., Jr., 20010A.

Medical Service Corps

Burke, Charles S., 19514A.
Henry, James E., 19517A.
James, Raymond E., 48904A.
Johnson, John A., 21611A.
Martindale, Robert W., 19483A.
Sangster, Maynard A., 19471A.
Schwartz, Seymour, 19518A.
Skewes, Kenneth W., 48905A.
Turnipseed, Lawrence L., Jr., 19468A.

Veterinary Corps

Nelson, Robert K., 19010A.
Nettles, William D., 19845A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

Line of the Air Force

Achin, Raymond R., 82633A.
Ackerman, James L., 70543A.
Ackert, Bruce, 75335A.
Adams, Donald L., 70441A.
Adams, William E., 71019A.
Alenius, John T., 82636A.
Allan, Donald F., 77260A.
Altick, Stephen F., 70687A.
Altman, Edgar A. Jr., 70486A.
Ambrosia, Frederick H., 70494A.
Ammerman, Alan H., 75475A.
Anderson, Kenneth L., 70729A.
Anderson, Lawrence B., 70506A.
Andreoni, Alan J., 70510A.
Andrus, James G., 70492A.
Arnaiz, Donald R., 79206A.
Arslan, Charles R., 77504A.
Ash, Thomas G., 73484A.
Ashy, Joseph W., 77884A.
Averhart, Jesse M., 79999A.
Baber, James J., Jr., 70686A.
Bailey, Charles H., 71020A.
Bak, Edmund J., 70447A.
Baker, Bobby L., 70470A.
Ballard, Bobby D., 82647A.
Barker, John L., Jr., 77586A.
Barnes, Elliot B., Jr., 70648A.
Barnes, William J., Jr., 82648A.
Barnett, Clyde E., 70643A.
Barreire, William, 70688A.
Bass, Thomas L., 78149A.
Batson, Thomas S., Jr., 73485A.
Baum, Carl E., 70673A.
Baumgardner, Larry J., 75481A.
Baun, Raymond J., 82652A.
Beaky, Charles M., Jr., 71151A.
Beattie, James W., 70646A.
Behrens, Dennis D., 75341A.
Bender, Arthur, 73486A.
Bergen, John K., 82657A.
Berlin, Martin S., 70453A.
Berry, Gene A., 75342A.
Bettex, Leonard C., 79961A.
Betts, Carlton L., 78150A.
Biehumko, Robert L., 70685A.
Bikker, Arthur W., 70677A.
Bingham, Billy J., 70585A.
Bissonnette, Donald K., 73487A.
Bittorf, Norman G., 75343A.
Bjornstad, Eugene N., 78282A.
Black, Franklin J., 70471A.
Blackstock, Jimmy D., 72204A.
Blair, Albert W., 70616A.
Blake, John, 70690A.
Blakley, Norman L., 82664A.
Bleau, Robert A., 71152A.
Boersig, George R., 82668A.
Bohler, Donald M., 70676A.
Boles, Billy J., 82669A.
Bolinger, Bobby G., 76543A.
Bolls, Larry R., 82670A.
Bomber, Thomas M., 73488A.
Bookhamer, Robert H., Jr., 70455A.
Booth, Frederick E., 71153A.
Botner, Clarence E., Jr., 72205A.
Bower, Larry E., 77886A.
Bozeman, Tandy K., 70664A.
Bradley, Thomas P., 73489A.
Bragaw, Robert A., 77887A.
Bramble, Harold K., 70623A.
Branch, Robert H., Jr., 78001A.
Brandt, Karl F., Jr., 70716A.
Breault, Robert P., 71154A.
Brennan, John E., 77506A.
Breslin, Richard D., 71068A.
Bridges, John D., 79214A.
Briner, John G., 75909A.
Broening, Gerald F., 73491A.
Brooks, Donald A., 77508A.
Brooks, Jerry C., 73492A.
Brown, Phillip R., 70681A.
Brown, Robert M., 79295A.
Brown, Samuel, 78284A.
Broxson, Barry D., 82684A.
Bruce, Nelson E., 75486A.
Bruton, Elwood D., 70491A.
Bryan, Garry H., 82689A.
Buchanan, George W., 73493A.
Buchenauer, Robert L., 70534A.
Buecker, William H., 77509A.
Bullock, Lawrence J., 72207A.
Burbage, Paul H., III, 70689A.
Burkhart, Joseph A., II, 79299A.
Burres, Keith E., 73494A.
Burrus, James C., 70529A.
Burton, Walter L., 80011A.
Bussell, Robert L., 70603A.
Bussman, William F., 79962A.
Byerly, Kirk L., 82698A.
Byrne, Philip M., 70592A.
Cain, James E., 70469A.
Calvaresi, Anthony I., 79671A
Calvez, Clifton A., 77888A.
Campbell, Ronald P., 75794A

Canfield, John M., 70662A.
Cannon, Marvin L., 70533A.
Cannon, William R., 82704A.
Cantrell, Terrell N., 70439A.
Carey, Edward H., Jr., 75350A.
Carlsen, Edward, Jr., 70682A.
Carlson, David R., 79672A.
Carlson, William R., 72208A.
Carpenter, Daryl M., 72209A.
Carpenter, Peter F., 70526A.
Carr, Edward J., 82710A.
Carstensen, John R., 77510A.
Carter, Allen R., Jr., 70684A.
Carter, Bruce R., 70680A.
Casey, David R., 79166A.
Catherall, Michael H., 71021A.
Cavender, Dwight B., 70514A.
Chase, Duane B., 73474A.
Chatwood, Gerald L., 73495A.
Chelette, Herman E., Jr., 71022A.
Chichester, Gerald C., 72210A.
Church, James B., Jr., 78208A.
Ciplickas, Algima J., 77264A.
Clark, John G., 77511A.
Clark, John W., 70474A.
Clark, Robert C., 80141A.
Clary, James R., III, 70678A.
Clay, James C., 70624A.
Clopton, Wilbur R., 72211A.
Coalson, Raeburn V., 70527A.
Coates, Dennis C., 72212A.
Cobb, Jerry R., 77512A.
Cohen, Marshall A., 77265A.
Cole, Gordon E., 79111A.
Cole, Ned M., Jr., 72213A.
Colligan, John J., 78286A.
Condit, James C., 77892A.
Conely, James H., Jr., 79088A.
Conrad, Dale D., 71023A.
Cook, Daryle D., 70498A.
Cooper, William T., 70668A.
Cooper, William W., 72214A.
Cope, William L., 70530A.
Corbin, Richard C., 71024A.
Cox, John E., 73496A.
Cozzens, Stuart G., 70443A.
Craig, Gary L., 71070A.
Cranos, Roger L., 78287A.
Crispe, Ronald E., 75492A.
Crooks, Thadis W., 77893A.
Crosby, Thomas A., 70528A.
Crosta, Leo, 73497A.
Crouch, Dennis E., 70602A.
Cruger, Sterling R., 70429A.
Crump, Herschel W., 82739A.
Crumpler, Nathan D., 73498A.
Crunkleton, Jerry H., 70520A.
Cummings, Jan G., 70674A.
Curtis, Carl R., 77513A.
Curtis, James A., Jr.,71097A.
Curtis, John E., 79097A.
Dagley, Larry K., 70448A.
Daigle, Robert V., 71025A.
Dalton, Charles F., Jr., 73499A.
Danforth, George S., III, 77514A.
Daniel, Robert P., 71071A.
Danielson, Eric W., Jr., 75560A.
Darby, Donald B., 77267A.
Davidson, Jo E., 75356A.
Davies, Joseph E., 70476A.
Davis, Jon L., 75932A.
Davis, Robert L., 70502A.
Declerck, Robert P., 70463A.
Deinhammer, Richard A., 71026A.
Delaney, Joseph F., 78288A.
Delaveaga, Richard A., 77894A.
Denny, Robert F., 73500A.
Deporter, Elden L., 73501A.
Dibell, David L., 70622A.
Dillinger, Jay A., 79689A.
Dipaolo, Salvatore M., 78151A.
Dixon, Darryl D., 70667A.
Dixon, George R., 71155A.
Donald, Robert K., 82751A.
Dosher, Frederick G., III, 70465A.
Doublier, Rene M., 78446A.
Dressen, Pete C., 70640A.
Driscoll, John J., 70669A.
Dubois, Robert L., 79193A.
Duffy, Lawrence, 70507A.
Dulevitz, Alexander, 75360A.
Dunbar, William F., 72215A.
Dunne, Edward J., Jr., 79693A.
Durham, Lester B., 70675A.
Durnin, John H., 80029A.
Duston, Arthur G., IV, 79167A.
Early, Ross F., 72216A.
Eastburn, Early T., 75630A.
Eathorne, Frank G., Jr., 77897A.
Edmunds, Rance S., 79632A.
Egerton, James S., 70724A.
Ehmig, William A., 75362A.
Elder, Paul W., 79698A.
Elliott, John R., 78289A.
Elliott, Leland R., 79215A.
Elliott, Robert J., 71027A.
Elliott, Warren G., 71028A.
Engel, John E., 80135A.
Engstrom, Wayne A., 77898A.
Entsminger, Joseph E., 77367A.
Epstein, Howard M., 72217A.
Erickson, Alan W., 77515A.
Ertz, Ernest J., 82772A.
Eubank, Francis L., Jr., 73502A.
Evans, Gwil O., 73503A.
Fabian, John M., 75496A.
Fabian, William H., 70701A.
Fairfull Douglas T., 70634A.
Fanelli, Matthew J., Jr., 78447A.
Farley, Joseph N., 73504A.
Faulknerb, Jack C., 82774A.
Fausto, Peter F., 70467A.
Ferm, Rodney E., 77516A.
Fink, Fred M., 70459A.
Finkbiner, Ronald R., 72218A.
Finkle, Gary D., 73505A.
Flechtner, Robert H., 73506A.
Foley, Peter K., 70742A.
Foster, Theodore P., Jr., 79704A.
Fountain, Woodson M., 70496A.
Fox, Edward H., 78290A.
Fox, Joseph J., 73507A.
Frampton, Gene D., 77517A.
Frese, Gerald W., 82783A.
Frymire, Robert C., 70483A.
Fujishige, Ken T., 83212A.
Fulgham, Frank M., 73508A.
Gabel, James A., 75562A.
Gainer, Jere A., 70950A.
Galland, Stuart B., 79158A.
Gallo, James S., 70440A.
Gallo, Robert E., 70755A.
Gallop, Jon L., 82788A.
Garbutt, Stuart E., 73509A.
Garner, Thomas L., 78449A.
Garrity, Frank O., Jr., 70606A.
Gassmann, Joseph, 79633A.
Gemelli, Glenn G., 78292A.
Gentry, Frederick R., 82789A.
George, Paul L., 82790A.
Gibbs, Richard L., 83213A.
Gibson, James E., 70519A.
Gibson, John W., 82793A.
Gilbert, Thomas M., 77518A.
Gilden, Robert C., 71007A.
Girod, Lowell D., 79626A.
Girouard, Raymond P., 73510A.
Gleason, Kemper J., 70484A.
Godard, Gary A., 70501A.
Goddard, Wesley H., 70511A.
Goins, Elmer E., Jr., 70489A.
Goldenstein, Arthur, 75367A.
Golke, Leonard R., 73511A.
Gompf, Thomas E., 79159A.
Gordon, Gerald D., 75369A.
Gorley, Joseph E., Jr., 82798A.
Gornell, Daniel R., 77633A.
Gouette, Peter A., 75564A.
Grady, Sanders W., 76341A.
Graham, Larry J., 71029A.
Granville, Robert C., 70600A.
Greeley, Philip J., 78019A.
Greene, Jack D., 72219A.
Greenstein, Sanford, 73512A.
Greenstine, Robert B., 80185A.
Griffith, John G., Jr., 70508A.
Griffith, Ritchie, L., 70473A.
Grimm, Richard W., 70642A.
Gross, Larry R., 77519A.
Grosskopf, George K., 77520A.
Grow, John A., 70650A.
Guarracino, Charles P., 70947A.
Guerrieri, Ronald E., 82811A.
Guy, Alden R., 78152A.
Hager, Harry J., 75376A.
Haggard, Robert D., 72220A.
Hairston, James J., Jr., 82817A.
Hale, David L., 82819A.
Hale, Richard E., Jr., 70715A.
Hall, Jack R., 70647A.
Halligan, John E., 75378A.
Hallock, David B., 75379A.
Hammons, Thomas M., 71030A.
Hamner, James H., 70431A.
Hanus, Robert G., 70472A.
Harlan, Robert H., II, 77901A.
Harms, Frederick G., Jr., 77902A.
Harrington, Frank A., Jr., 77903A.
Harrington, Timothy, Jr., 70731A.
Hartman, Charles C., Jr., 78477A.
Harvey, Larry E., 70750A.
Hassing, Thomas E., 70427A.
Hastings, Charlie W., 75509A.
Hauth, Floyd F., 73513A.
Hayes, Richard H., 79209A.
Healy, Raymond G., 77270A.
Hentosz, Jon N., 75653A.
Hermann, Sigwulf, 70725A.
Herzik, Aubrey M., 80053A.
Hess, John M., 73514A.
Hetrick, Dean A., 72221A.
Higbee, Paul N., 75385A.
Higgins, Andrew L., 71031A.
Higgins, Bobby J., 73515A.
Hill, Franklin G., 82834A.
Hinkle, Richard E., 77904A.
Hockenberry, E. D., Jr., 77521A.
Hockensmith, William R., 75386A.
Hohman, Robert L., 70461A.
Hoke, Russell M., 78451A.
Hollrah, Wayne I., 70751A.
Hooks, Kenneth R., 77522A.
Hope, John L., 81377A.
Horton, Claude R., Jr., 70754A.
Houtary, Richard H., 72222A.
Howard, Joseph C., 77523A.
Howard, Robert M., Jr., 70671A.
Howe, John A., 79210A.
Howell, John F., 72223A.
Howell, Neil T., 82847A.
Howo, William Y., 77271A.
Hubbard, Phillip M., 73516A.
Hugie, John R., 70468A.
Hull, John L., Jr., 72370A.
Humphreys, Robert E., 71157A.
Hunter, Jack J., III, 73517A.
Hunter, Morgan, 73518A.
Hutzelman, David W., 79720A.
Hyder, Anthony K., Jr., 80161A.
Ivory, Reginald E., Jr., 73519A.
Jackson, Grover E., 70428A.
Jacobs, Arthur D., 72224A.
Jacobs, Carl E., 82853A.
Jacobs, Michael F., 77905A.
Jacobs, Robert M., 75391A.
Jacobus, Kenneth H., 77906A.
James, Bobby L., 73520A.
Jameson, Arlen D., 70434A.
Jameson, Jerry W., 70449A.
Jansen, Carl A., 78294A.
Jarboe, Daniel J., 73476A.
Jarman, Larry E., 82857A.
Jedlicka, Richard A., 78295A.
Jefferson, Jack J., 77524A.
Jensen, Fred C., 77525A.
Jerrick, Thomas F., 80162A.
Johnson, Gene H., 77907A.
Johnson, George A., 75395A.
Johnson, Ralph K., 77527A.
Johnson, Thomas P., Jr., 77909A.
Johnson, Wesley I., 79411A.
Johnston, James M., III, 82865A.
Jones, Howard, Jr., 70590A.
Jones, Jerry P., 77528A.
Jones, Patrick L., 70500A.
Jones, Robert B., 71032A.
Jonke, Frank J., 77529A.
Jourdenais, George H., 82862A.
Kane, Jay W., 75400A.

Karr, Charles L., 70605A.
Kauffman, David, 70719A.
Kautz, Ronald E., 82866A.
Keeler, Kenneth E., 72225A.
Kelley, Virgil K., Jr., 70748A.
Kelly, John P., 77423A.
Kemp, John E., 82874A.
Kennedy, Arthur D., 70631A.
Kenny, Thomas E., 70704A.
Kerbel, Waldemar K., 70490A.
Kerkman, Dennis J., 77910A.
Kieser Robert F., 75402A.
Kimsey, Forest M., 70666A.
Kincade, Claude G., Jr., 70481A.
King, James M., 73521A.
Kirsch, James A., 71033A.
Kirschman, Richard H., 77911A.
Klehr, Edward E., 71034A.
Klein, Mark A., 75405A.
Kleiser, Eugene V., Sr., 70737A.
Knight, Roger H., 70437A.
Knighton, Earl M., Jr., 70665A.
Knox, David B., 73477A.
Kohlmann, Dennis, 77530A.
Kovalenko, Virgil N., 76009A.
Krach, Thomas H., 78296A.
Kreis, Peter M., 73522A.
Krumrey, Gardner D., 70708A.
Kuefner, Robert E., 77304A.
Laacke, Robert J., 70727A.
Labarge, Peter D., 70942A.
Lair, Jerry L., 82908A.
Lambert, Robert W., 70524A.
Lang, Paul M., 70466A.
Lape, Gary D., 77531A.
Lattig, Kent W., 70607A.
Laugen, Elwood N., 71101A.
Laurie, Richard L., 78382A.
Lawrence, Dennis T., 75332A.
Layton, Daniel E., 77532A.
Lee, Gregory A., Jr., 77533A.
Lee, James A., 71035A.
Lehman, Donald R., 70628A.
Lehman, Samuel R., 71036A.
Lehner, William B., Jr., 75328A.
Lehtola, Donald E., 82915A.
Leighton, George P., 82916A.
Lemieux, Joseph D. W., 82918A.
Lemont, Charles J., 79732A.
Lepage, Godfrey W., 75515A.
Leslie, Darrell J., 70505A.
Levine, Morris B., 70430A.
Lewis, John E., 79890A.
Liles, Robert L., Jr., 70672A.
Lloyd, Ronald G., 78428A.
Lockhart, Johnny G., 77534A.
Long, Albert W., Jr., 71037A.
Lord, Morton A., 82930A.
Lottmann, Donald C., 70713A.
Lotzbire, Bruce J., 70464A.
Louis, David F., 72226A.
Lowther, Roger L., 70482A.
Lucas, James H., 77913A.
Lucas, John R., 82934A.
Luke, Terry R., 70452A.
Lynch, Graham D., 70516A.
Lynch, Valentine F., 70509A.
Maas, John A., 72227A.
Mackenna, David W., 70512A.
Macomber, Marshal A., 76203A.
Madden, Dennis P., 77914A.
Magee, John G., Jr., 71103A.
Magmer, John R., Jr., 73524A.
Mainord, William R., 82941A.
Malloy, Joseph E., 72228A.
Manning, Glenn R., 70753A.
Manolis, George, 72229A.
Marshall, Anthony G., 79148A.
Martin, Don M., 70944A.
Martin, Jerry J., 73525A.
Martin, Julius C., 73526A.
Martin, Robert K., 82947A.
Madson, Samuel L., III, 73527A.
Massirer, Van D., 70432A.
Mather, Dean L., 71038A.
Mauro, John G., 73528A.
May, Denny L., 73529A.
May, William B., 75333A.
Maynard, Egbert D., Jr., 70943A.
McCaffrey, John T., 70591A.
McCallon, Larry K., 70444A.
McCarthy, Michael E., 70442A.
McCarthy, William R., 78297A.
McClain, Robert C., 71158A.
McCleery, Samuel R., Jr., 70458A.
McClure, David O., 71012A.
McConnell, Allan D., 77276A.
McConnell, Robert J., 70739A.
McCormak, James M., 79973A.
McCormick, Micheal B., 77681A.
McCoy, Albert G., 73530A.
McCracken, Robert J., 82956A.
McCubbin, John D., 73531A.
McElroy, Stephen M., 75421A.
McEwen, James A., 70597A.
McFadden, Daniel H., 72230A.
McGhan, Standley A., 70445A.
McGrath, John T., 72231A.
McHargue, Patrick H., 71039A.
McIntyre, David E., 79746A.
McKenna, George W., 77917A.
McKinney, Charles C., 82963A.
McLaughlin, Robert G., 77918A.
McNichols, Charles W., III, 79747A.
McNitt, Gary N., 70700A.
Meade, Lawrence K., Jr., 73532A.
Mellen, John A., 79748A.
Merrell, Robert H., 77537A.
Merryman, Paul D., 75424A.
Merz, Douglas B., 82969A.
Meyer, Cletus D., 70457A.
Meyer, Richard A., 70696A.
Michels, Gary A., 70757A.
Midyett, Charles L., 80083A.
Millar, Charles M. Jr., 82974A.
Miller, John W., 82981A.
Miller, Robert J., 82983A.
Miller, Thomas K., Jr., 73533A.
Miller, Wayne C., 71159A.
Misirowski, Ronald L., 78298A.
Monaco, Michael, 71040A.
Monkres, Donald D., 71041A.
Montulli, Louis T., 79754A.
Moore, Clinton C., Jr., 75428A.
Moore, Robert L., 70426A.
Morgan, Richard G., 70495A.
Morris, Ronald D., 72232A.
Morrison, Roger A., 77920A.
Morton, Fred L., 70734A.
Morton, Robert M., 70749A.
Muckstadt, John A., 79477A.
Muldowney, Frank W., III, 77538A.
Mullen, James V., 70703A.
Mulligan, Michael E., 70594A.
Murphy, James R., 71042A.
Muzio, David L., 75430A.
Narbut, Leon A., Jr., 79966A.
Neblock, Charles E., 73534A.
Nelson, Marshall D., 77921A.
Newton, Robert L., 70587A.
Nichols, George W., 71160A.
Nicholson, Daniel A., 83003A.
Nicola, Kenneth L., 75519A.
Nusspickel, Francis T., 70756A.
Obermeyer, Ronald W., 77922A.
O'Brien, John L., Jr., 70744A.
Odegaard, Donald C., 83009A.
Odell, Lawrence W., 73535A.
O'Keefe, Barry J., 70711A.
Olansen, John B., Jr., 72233A.
Oliver, George M., 77924A.
Olson, Alan E., 83010A.
Olson, David S., 70717A.
Oswald, James R., 70450A.
Overgard, Jon T., 73536A.
Owen, Walter L., 72234A.
Owens, Paul R., 83020A.
Ozment, Charles M., 70670A.
Pack, James D., 75436A.
Palmer, Donald S., 71044A.
Panus, Joseph M., 72235A.
Parker, Evans T., 70736A.
Parker, Gary L., 70497A.
Parker, John L., 70752A.
Pate, Allen C., 70487A.
Paul, John M., 70454A.
Peacock, Richard A., 71104A.
Pendergast, Thomas N., 83023A.
Pendleton, Winston K., 80172A.
Percy, Donald G., 72236A.
Perkins, James H., 70499A.
Petelin, John A., Jr., 70728A.
Peterson, David W., 70460A.
Peterson Edward A., 79772A.
Peterson Ernest R., 70683A.
Petty Arthur P., III, 75523A.
Phillips, Maxey, J., 79217A.
Phillips, William R., 71162A.
Phillips, William W., 79628A.
Picard Richard L., 71046A.
Piccolo, Sam, 79909A.
Pieri, James J., 70422A.
Pietila, John D., 76210A.
Pignone, Francis X., Jr., 77539A.
Pill, Garlin D., 71163A.
Pitner Robert B., 70710A.
Pittman, James C., Jr., 76064A.
Piver, Charles R., 70531A.
Placko, Jerry S., 77925A.
Platteborze, Louis A., 71047A.
Plummer, Ernest L., 78299A.
Pocsik, James M., 73479A.
Pokorny, Otto T., 79112A.
Polk, John E., 70702A.
Pollak, James E., 77540A.
Pollard, Thomas J., 75438A.
Pooser, Lucius B., 83039A.
Pourciau, Richard A., 78471A.
Powell, James D., 78050A.
Price, Steven E., 77278A.
Prince, Donald F., 72237A.
Proctor, William A., 78153A.
Proudfit, Robert L., 70598A.
Pullium, Jerry C., 83048A.
Pulver, Jeannette C., 71048W.
Pustis, Joseph E., 77851A.
Pye, William I., Jr., 70544A.
Quinn, John A., 78300A.
Quist, Peter P., 75440A.
Radoy, Charles H., 72238A.
Rampy, Johnny M., 79113A.
Randolph, Donald D., 78453A.
Rappold, Robert A., 77541A.
Ratterree, Thomas W., 70532A.
Reagan, Norman W., 77926A.
Reaver, Russel, J., 70475A.
Reddel, Carl W., 73537A.
Redmon, Hubert L., 83052A.
Reeves, Jerry D., 73538A.
Reeves, Manford J., 75574A.
Reilly, Ronald W., 75575A.
Reiman, Robert F., 70741A.
Reimuller, David P., 75443A.
Renick, Joseph D., 75036A.
Rhodes, Robert B., 72202A.
Rice, Arthur W., III, 77927A.
Richards, James C., 70699A.
Richburg, Dennis B., 70638A.
Riddle, George E., 77928A.
Riffel, Paul F., 79920A.
Riley, Robert F., 73539A.
Risch, Gregory M., 78154A.
Ritchie, William J., 70743A.
Rizek, James F., 83060A.
Roberson, Joseph E., 70706A.
Roberson, Van B., 83062A.
Roberts, Clyde H., 83063A.
Roberts, Paul A., 79963A.
Robinson, Irl D., Jr., 70595A.
Rodgers, James A., 77542A.
Rodriguez, Virgin L., 76075W.
Romstad, Terry D., 73540A.
Roome, Lewis M., 75576A.
Rooney, John P., Jr., 71050A.
Rosenthal, William C., 70517A.
Ross, Craig A., 73541A.
Ross, Donald E., 75449A.
Ross, Douglas O., 75577A.
Rosselli, Patrick H., 73481A.
Rost, Paul F., 70745A.
Rowley, Thomas E., 71051A.
Rozeboom, Victor E., 83071A.
Ruggia, Mario, 75450A.
Rush, Hughey A., III, 78301A.
Rutherford, Alan S., 71052A.
Ryan, James A., 72239A.
Ryan, Robert L., 71164A.
Sabo, Francis, 70733A.

Sanchez, Fidel N., 83077A.
Sanders, Robert J., 71053A.
Sandvik, James E., 77473A.
Santamaria, John, Jr., 83080A.
Savage, Charles A., Jr., 71054A.
Schell, Roger R., 70718A.
Schibler, Mark C., 77929A.
Schichtle, Casper J., Jr., 70714A.
Schiller, Harvey W., 70730A.
Schmidt, Walter K., 77930A.
Schoder, Barry E., 72240A.
Schrock, Derel D., 72241A.
Schulte, Richard J., 70436A.
Scott, Randall F., 83086A.
Sculley, Jay R., 79098A.
Sealy, William F., 78155A.
Sebren, William E. III, 83087A.
Serina, Gerald, 71017A.
Shapek, Raymond A., 71055A.
Sharp, Jimmy R., 75529A.
Shaw, Lawrence G., 70945A.
Shelton, Harold A., 77481A.
Sherrard, William A., 72242A.
Shinol, Henry E., 70523A.
Showers, Rodney E., 72243A.
Shupp, Richard W., 80137A.
Sidebottom, Harold W., 77543A.
Simons, Robert K., 75455A.
Singleton, Ivan J., 70485A.
Sitarz, Richard J., 70949A.
Skarke, Richard J., 75456A.
Sloan, James E., 76089A.
Smedley, Robert R., 70735A.
Smith, Alan T., 70446A.
Smith, Bruce N., 71165A.
Smith, Donald N., 70525A.
Smith, Douglas B., Jr., 77932A.
Smith, Dustan T., 70627A.
Smith, Graham M., 71166A.
Smith, Gregory H., 78302A.
Smith, Maurice M., 71092A.
Smith, Richard C., 70478A.
Smith, Stephen B., 70521A.
Snell, Clyde A., 72244A.
Snyder, Terry W., 70456A.
Sorensen, Donald N., 77545A.
Souhrada, James, 71105A.
Spanberger, Lloyd R., 77933A.
Spencer, James D., 75533A.
Spradlin, Don M., 78156A.
Sproul, Parker D., 72245A.
Stachurski, Richard J., 70614A.
Staley, Henry A., 83117A.
Stamets, Leigh E., 80113A.
Stanovich, Robert, 73542A.
Stedman, Raymond E., Jr., 70515A.
Steininger, Warren L., Jr., 71106A.
Stephan, Brian G., 80115A.
Stevens, Bruce U., 72246A.
Stewart, Laymon D., 73543A.
Stiles, Thomas L., 70698A.
Stine, Terrence P., 80917A.
Stonemark, Richard D., 70593A.
Strawn, Leon F., 72247A.
Strojny, Dennis J., 78489A.
Sturniolo, Lawrence R., 79630A.
Suggs, Jon C., 73544A.
Sullenberger, Don S., 83127A.
Sundstrom, David E., 70596A.
Sutter, Edward L., 71058A.
Switzer, Harold K., II, 71167A.
Talbot, Grady E., 77547A.
Talley, Robert J., 70488A.
Tarpley, Charles A., 72203A.
Taylor, Terry K., 83132A.
Terkuile, Roger C., 71168A.
Terlep, Anthony J., Jr., 71059A.
Terry, Jack O., 79947A.
Theberge, Royal R., 73545A.
Thomas, William A., Jr., 70503A.
Thomasson, David E., 77548A.
Thompson, Barry L., 70480A.
Thompson, Donald J., 83141A.
Thompson, Donald L., 77549A.
Thompson, Mark E., 70707A.
Thomssen, Darrel D., 70738A.
Thorne, John W., Jr., 75460A.
Thorp, Charles B., 79571A.
Throldahl, Bobby D., 75581A.
Tilbury, Brian, 75334A.
Tillman, Joe A., 78455A.
Toth, William J., 70740A.
Townsend, Blaine F., 71169A.
Tracy, Peter W., 79573A.
Tremblay, Douglas S., 70462A.
Triplett, Eugene B., 83152A.
Trojanowski, John W., 70746A.
Trouy, Victor R., 71170A.
Tschirhart, Leslie H., 77550A.
Turner, Frank V., 70451A.
Tuttle, William C., Jr., 73546A.
Ueland, Richard S., Jr., 71060A.
Varn, Benjamin F., Jr., 75535A.
Vasilik, Michael V., 79579A.
Vasques, Louis R., 83159A.
Venables, Rodney E., 73547A.
Veraldi, Dennis L., 70477A.
Verhees, Donald L., 75461A.
Verhoef, Robert W., 72248A.
Vipperman, David E., 75537A.
Wagner, Fredrick A., 71062A.
Wagner, Richard E., 79645A.
Wagoner, Joseph L. C., 70697A.
Waitley, Damon R., 70435A.
Walker, Robert G., 73548A.
Wallace, Larry W., 80981A.
Watson, Roger C., 73549A.
Webb, Roy G., 70493A.
Weber, David C., 70747A.
Weiland, William J., 71063A.
Weiss, Walter A., Jr., 70720A.
Welde, Francis J., 78457A.
Weldon, Jo Ann, 71100W.
Wells, Peter C., 77551A.
Welsh, David R., 71064A.
Welton, David L., 79818A.
Wennerstrom, Arthur J., 77552A.
Werner, James K., 77934A.
Whitaker, William L., III, 70599A.
White, Donald V., 72249A.
White, Robert E., 78458A.
Whitescarver, John P., 70479A.
Wigginton, Harold E., 71171A.
Wilkerson, Danny F., 78210A.
Wilkins, Donald A., 70641A.
Williams, Francis F., Jr., 70663A.
Williams, Merle E., 73550A.
Williams, Walter M., III, 75331A.
Willis, Richard P., 77936A.
Wilson, Arthur J., III, 77279A.
Wise, Robert M., 83190A.
Wittnebel, Robert F. J., 83191A.
Wilff, Warren W., 71172A.
Wrenn, James E., 70504A.
Wright, David R., 75468A.
Wrinkle, Frederic R., 70589A.
Yeager, Kurt E., 77938A.
Young, George C., Jr., 75471A.
Young, Thomas W., 71065A.
Younkin, Gary D., 83201A.
Zehrer, Frederic A. III, 70661A.
Ziebold, Ronald J., 83205A.
Zieg, Duane H., 80136A.

Medical Service Corps

King, Thomas W., 75404A.

Biomedical Science Corps

Eiles, Richard R., 71098A.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 1, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Homer Thornberry, of Texas, to be U.S. Circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

Joseph F. Radigan, of Vermont, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Vermont for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 15, 1965.

William Marion Parker, Jr., of Alabama, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Alabama for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 22, 1965.

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

Arthur H. Behrens, of Washington, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The words inscribed on the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia: Leviticus 25: 10: *Ye shall proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof.*

Almighty God, we rejoice that we are drawing nigh to that sacred day in the annals of our American history when the Founding Fathers signed the Declaration of Independence in which they had stated in verbal form their faith and their deepest convictions.

May our minds expand with the spirit of pride and patriotism, of gratitude and renewed consecration as we contemplate and reflect upon the meaning of that significant day.

We pray that our President, our Speaker, and our chosen representatives may be men and women whose manhood and womanhood can match the mountains of difficulty which are now confronting our Republic.

Penitently we confess that we are filled with apprehension and fear for there is so much of disobedience and disrespect for law and authority in our national life and we greatly feel the need of cultivating those finer feelings and aspirations which will make our country truly strong.

Kindle within us the spirit of brotherhood that in these times of peril we may sustain one another and minister to one another's needs.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Bradley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 853. An act for the relief of Charles N. Legarde and his wife, Beatrice E. Legarde;

S. 1098. An act to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes;

S. 1666. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes;

S. 1742. An act to authorize the U.S. Governor to agree to amendments to the articles of agreements of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; and

S. 2212. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish and administer a plan to provide for the care and protection of children through public day care services, and to provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to certain dependent children.

(Omitted from the RECORD of June 30, 1965:)

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3415. An act to equalize certain penalties in the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may be permitted to sit while the House is in session today.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the subject matter on which the committee is sitting?

Mr. ALBERT. This is on the cotton bill, as I understand it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

VOTING RIGHTS BILL—COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the voting rights bill.

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

There was no objection.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 9022.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader about the legislative program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will my friend yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. First of all may I announce that we will have finished, or hope to finish within a short time, the legislative program for the week. It will be our purpose to meet tomorrow and to adjourn over until Tuesday.

The program for next week is as follows:

H.R. 6400 which is the Voting Rights Act of 1965, under an open rule with 10 hours of general debate.

This, of course, 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, if the gentleman will yield further for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT OVER FROM FRIDAY TO TUESDAY

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

AUTHORIZING IDENTIFICATION CARDS FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 261), with a committee amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 261

Resolved, That, upon the request of any Member or the Speaker or any other elected officer of the House of Representatives, or the chairman of any standing or select committee of the House, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall furnish cards of identification as to their employment to such employees under the jurisdiction of each of the foregoing officers as such officer may designate. Each such card shall be signed by the officer concerned and shall not be valid for a longer period than the duration of a Congress. The expenses of carrying out this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives until otherwise provided by law.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

"That, upon the request of the Speaker, a Member, elected officer of the House of Representatives, or the chairman of any committee of the House, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall furnish cards of identification to such employees under their jurisdiction as they may designate. Each such card shall be signed by the Speaker, Member, officer, or committee chairman concerned, and shall not be valid for a longer period than the duration of one session of a Congress."

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York, the author of the resolution.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] and to thank the Committee on House Administration and its Subcommittee on Printing for having brought H.R. 261 before us today. This is a measure I introduced on March 9 to provide the issuance of appropriate identification cards for those whom we employ as congressional staff members.

At the time of introduction, I called attention to the fact that at present the House provides no means of official identification for those who work in the offices of Members, are on the staffs of the various committees with certain exceptions, or are otherwise in an employment position attached to the House. It was, and is, my belief that such identification should be provided for purposes of security and also for the convenience of staff personnel in being able to instantly establish their official relation to the House and the business of their employers.

I am very pleased with the reaction this measure received. Many of our colleagues contacted me to express their support and, I understand, many of them also contacted members of the Committee on House Administration and Mr. HAY's Subcommittee on Printing to endorse the purpose of the resolution.

Of course, when I learned that the subcommittee had agreed to take up the resolution for official consideration, I was even further heartened. I know that its members gave many hours of thorough and thoughtful consideration to all areas applicable to this resolution.

Certainly, the amended form in which this measure now comes before us represents the work of the subcommittee in deciding on a very practical mechanical means of handling the assignment of the identification cards sought by my resolution. I find that the controls both on issuance and return at the time an employee no longer is in a situation requiring an ID card are very effective and should impose no burden at all on those responsible for the assignment of this identification.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a distinct pleasure to work with the subcommittee and committee on this matter. I believe all of us are fortunate that these colleagues serve us in these important areas of House administration.

Again I commend the gentleman from Ohio for reporting this resolution.

If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to ask whether the card which is to be issued will have a photograph of the employee included?

Mr. HAYS. I say to the gentleman, that will be a matter to be determined

between the clerk and the Committee on House Administration. There was some thought it would be difficult to have a photograph. That would cost more money, and there is considerable turnover of employees. However, this has not been finally adjudicated. It will be decided on the basis of what can be done the best, the cheapest, and in the most convenient manner.

We did amend the resolution to make the cards good for only one session, because we feel there is a danger they might get into the hands of unauthorized people, those who either are not employees or who are no longer employees of the Congress.

Mr. HORTON. I certainly want to indicate my agreement with the gentleman, as to having cards for only one session of Congress. I do have a card which was issued to the members of the Committee on Government Operations which does include a picture. I would hope that the committee, in its further consideration of this matter, would give due consideration to the use of photographs to identify the persons involved. I believe this would be helpful. It would be similar to the type of card we as Members of the House now have.

Mr. HAYS. I can assure the gentleman we will go into that situation. We will get copies, and look into the cost.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that the amendment covers all employees of the Capitol?

Mr. HAYS. No. It covers employees specifically of the Speaker, a Member, or an elected officer of the House, or the chairman of any committee of the House. It does not cover all employees of the Capitol, only employees of the House of Representatives generally, and specifically the ones I have mentioned.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. 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. 165]

Addabbo	Bonner	Dow
Annunzio	Bow	Evins, Tenn.
Ashbrook	Brown, Calif.	Farnsley
Ashley	Brown, Ohio	Farnum
Ashmore	Byrnes, Wis.	Flood
Battin	Clancy	Fogarty
Belcher	Cramer	Foley
Bingham	Dawson	Fraser
Blatnik	Dent	Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.	Martin, Ala.	Scott
Gibbons	Martin, Mass.	Shipley
Grabowski	Mathias	Sikes
Griffin	Mize	Skubitz
Griffiths	Morton	Teague, Tex.
Grover	Passman	Thomas
Harsha	Pool	Toll
Harvey, Ind.	Powell	Tupper
Holifield	Roberts	Watkins
Holland	Rostenkowski	Watson
Johnson, Pa.	Roybal	Weltner
Jones, Ala.	Ryan	Willis
Keogh	St Germain	Wilson,
King, N.Y.	Scheuer	Charles H.
Latta	Schisler	
Lindsay	Schweiker	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 365 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore tomorrow.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on S. 559, the Senate version of H.R. 3014.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6453) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, 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 pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 568)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6453) "making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, 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 13, 14, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 15, 17, 18, and 19; 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 "$43,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$75,457,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,703,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$79,813,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$51,800,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,580,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,377,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 9.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
NEAL SMITH,
JOHN J. MCFALL,
GEORGE MAHON,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
CARL HAYDEN,
E. L. BARTLETT,
THOMAS J. MCINTYRE,
CLIFFORD P. CASE
(except amendments Nos. 16, 22, 26),
NORRIS COTTON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
(except amendments Nos. 16, 22, 26),
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. 6453) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommend in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $43,000,000 instead of $41,000,000 as proposed by the

House and $46,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 2—General operating expenses: Appropriates $20,112,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,323,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4—Public safety: Provide for the purchase of 112 passenger motor vehicles of which 98 are for police-type use as proposed by the Senate instead of 76 passenger motor vehicles of which 62 were to be for police-type use as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5—Public safety: Appropriates $78,663,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $76,998,000 as proposed by the House.

The managers on the part of the House with the concurrence of the Senate conferees are agreed that the additional funds provided to finance a sixth day of work for saturation patrols is of a temporary and emergency nature and in no way constitutes a precedent for future budget estimates for this purpose. The conferees also urge that the Department exert every effort to recruit up to the permanent authorized strength of 3,100. It is the opinion of the conferees that continuing overtime work by existing personnel destroys the efficiency and flexibility of the force and detracts from its ability to respond to emergencies. Further the conferees do not share the attitude of acceptance of overtime as a substitute to a fully manned department, a practice that has gone on far too long.

Amendment No. 6—Education: Provides for the purchase of two driver training vehicles as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—Education: Appropriates $75,457,600 instead of $74,740,000 as proposed by the House and $75,953,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Education: Provides that $124,000 shall be payable from the highway fund as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9—Education: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10—Parks and recreation: Appropriates $10,703,700 instead of $10,555,000 as proposed by the House and $10,709,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Health and welfare: Appropriates $79,813,800 instead of $79,485,000 as proposed by the House and $80,106,247 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 12, 13, 14, and 15—Health and welfare: Provide that the inpatient rate with the exception of Children's Hospital shall not exceed $34 per diem and the outpatient rate shall not exceed $5.75 per visit as proposed by the House and that the inpatient rate and outpatient rate for Children's Hospital shall not exceed $40 per diem and $6.75 per visit as proposed by the Senate.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Amendment No. 16: Deletes proposal of the Senate for Shaw Junior High School replacement.

Amendment No. 17: Inserts the proposal of the Senate for Thomas Elementary School addition.

Amendment No. 18: Inserts the proposal of the Senate for Emery-Eckington Elementary Schools replacement.

Amendment No. 19: Inserts the proposal of the Senate for Brent Elementary School replacement.

Amendment No. 20: Deletes proposal of the Senate for Deal Junior High School addition.

Amendment No. 21: Deletes the Senate language regarding the school for severely mentally retarded. Funds are included in the bill for site acquisition.

Amendment No. 22: Deletes the proposal of the Senate for Chevy Chase Community Center. Any future requests concerning this and the Fort Reno project should contain additional justification.

Amendment No. 23: Deletes the proposal of the Senate for construction of community health centers.

Amendments Nos. 24 and 25: Delete the proposals of the Senate for a storage building and a school and activities building at the Junior Village.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $51,800,800 instead of $50,521,900 as proposed by the House and $55,136,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Provides that $8,580,000 shall not become available for expenditure until July 1, 1966 instead of $8,530,000 as proposed by the House and $9,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Provides that $2,377,900 shall be available for construction services instead of $2,130,600 as proposed by the House and $2,999,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Highway program: The managers on the part of the House are not in agreement with the statement in the Senate report which reads as follows:

"Accordingly, the committee directs that all future budget estimates for the District of Columbia highway program be presented on the basis only of prior authorization by the respective District legislative committees."

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 29: Deletes language proposed by the Senate setting certain salaries.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
NEAL SMITH,
JOHN J. MCFALL,
GEORGE MAHON,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the House considered budget estimates totaling $387,467,800 for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1966 and approved the sum of $356,300,500. The bill provided for a Federal payment of $41 million which was $9 million below the budget estimate.

The Senate considered estimates totaling $389,346,800 and approved a bill containing the sum of $364,358,347, and the Federal payment approved by the other body amounted to $46 million.

The Federal payment approved in conference and now recommended to the House is $43 million. The total amount provided for in the conference report for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1966 is $360,228,500. This is $4,129,847 below the amount approved in the Senate bill and $3,928,000 more than the amount approved in the House bill. At this point in the RECORD I will insert a tabulation showing the various stages of the bill by appropriations:

District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1966 (H.R. 6543)

Item	Appropriations, 1965	Budget estimates, 1966	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1965	Budget estimates, 1966	House	Senate
FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA									
General fund	$37,500,000	$50,000,000	$41,000,000	$46,000,000	$43,000,000	+$5,500,000	−$7,000,000	+$2,000,000	−$3,000,000
Water fund	2,047,000	[1] 1,973,000	1,973,000	1,973,000	1,973,000	−74,000			
Sanitary sewage works fund	1,173,000	[2] 1,149,000	1,149,000	1,149,000	1,149,000	−24,000			
Total, Federal payment to District of Columbia	40,720,000	53,122,000	44,122,000	49,122,000	46,122,000	+5,402,000	−7,000,000	+2,000,000	−3,000,000
OPERATING EXPENSES									
General operating expenses	19,391,900	[3] 21,326,000	20,323,000	20,112,000	20,112,000	+720,100	−1,214,000	−211,000	
Public safety	73,707,800	[4] 79,462,600	76,998,000	78,663,000	78,663,000	+4,955,200	−799,600	+1,665,000	
Education	71,755,300	[5] 77,984,000	74,740,000	75,953,900	75,457,600	+3,702,300	−2,526,400	+717,600	−496,300
Parks and recreation	10,038,200	11,087,000	10,555,000	10,709,500	10,703,700	+665,500	−383,300	+148,700	−5,800
Health and welfare	75,964,500	81,319,000	79,485,000	80,106,247	79,813,800	+3,849,300	−1,505,200	+328,800	−292,447
Highways and traffic	13,628,000	14,013,000	13,989,000	13,989,000	13,989,000	+361,000	−24,000		
Sanitary engineering	22,005,900	[6] 22,974,000	22,498,000	22,498,000	22,498,000	+492,100	−476,000		
Metropolitan Police (additional municipal services, inaugural ceremonies)	283,000					−283,000			
Metropolitan Police (additional municipal services, Imperial Shrine Convention)		221,200	221,200	221,200	221,200	+221,200			
Personal services, wage-board employees	1,118,200	[7] 1,279,000	1,279,000	1,279,000	1,279,000	+160,800			
Settlement of claims and suits	14,028					−14,028			
Total, operating expenses	287,906,828	309,665,800	300,088,200	303,531,847	302,737,300	+14,830,472	−6,928,500	+2,649,100	−794,547

See footnotes at end of table.

District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1966 (H.R. 6543)—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1965	Budget estimates, 1966	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1965	Budget estimates, 1966	House	Senate
REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND INTEREST									
Reimbursement to the United States	$5,364,000	$5,690,400	$5,690,400	$5,690,400	$5,690,400	+$326,400			
CAPITAL OUTLAY									
Capital outlay	59,633,000	[5] 73,990,600	50,521,900	55,131,100	51,800,800	−7,832,200	−$22,189,800	+$1,278,900	−$3,330,300
Grand total, District of Columbia funds	[9] 352,903,828	389,346,800	356,300,500	364,358,347	360,228,500	+7,324,672	−29,118,300	+3,928,000	−4,129,847

[1] Reflects decrease of $227,000 submitted in H. Doc. No. 114.
[2] Reflects decrease of $186,000 submitted in H. Doc. No. 114.
[3] Includes increase of $5,000 submitted in H. Doc. No. 114.
[4] Includes increase of $27,000 submitted in H. Doc. No. 114 and $1,879,000 in S. Doc. No. 23.
[5] Includes increase of $305,000 submitted in H. Doc. No. 114.
[6] Includes increase of $22,000 submitted in H. Doc. No. 114.
[7] Submitted in H. Doc. No. 114.
[8] Reflects decrease of $881,000 submitted in H. Doc. No. 114.
[9] Includes $11,430,500 in second supplemental bill, Public Law 89-16.

Serious crime in the District climbed to new levels during the fiscal year 1965. Our committee believes that the people in Washington and the visitors in our Capital City are entitled to a system of law enforcement which will insure them the right to transact their business and traverse the streets at any time without fear of assault. As pointed out on many occasions, our committee believes that the Police Department has the right to expect full cooperation from the citizens of our Capital City and especially from the courts. When criminal charges are preferred and clearly established, adequate sentences should follow. Any deviation from this process makes a mockery of law enforcement and justice.

We recommend an increase of $1,665,000 for additional police protection. This amount will be used to pay officers for work on their days off and for additional scout cars, additional crossing guards, and an expansion of the footman radio system. As is stated in the statement of the managers on the part of the House with the concurrence of the Senate conferees, the additional funds provided to finance a sixth day of work is of a temporary and emergency nature.

The highway system in the District of Columbia, with emphasis on the interstate system, is one of the major long-established activities of the District of Columbia. Any effort to bring important highway projects in the District to a complete halt is a serious mistake.

In order to meet the tremendous day-to-day growth of traffic in Washington we must carry our highway programs along with any and all proposals concerning a rapid transit system. This conference report clearly shows the attitude of our committee in this matter and emphatically states that we disagree with the language contained in the Senate report.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, on page 4 of the conference report you find the following:

> The managers on the part of the House are not in agreement with the statement in the Senate report which reads as follows:
>
> "Accordingly, the committee directs that all future budget estimates for the District of Columbia highway program be presented on the basis only of prior authorization by the respective District legislative committees."

This statement is not to be construed to mean that the committee is opposed to proper authorization for the various projects, but we are of the opinion there is already sufficient general authority for the highway program and we feel that future budget estimates should be submitted in accordance with current procedures.

The conference action allows an increase of $717,553 for 22 additional teachers; 28 librarians; 23 counselors and several related positions, including an expansion of the driver training program with the cost to be paid from fees for learners' permits.

This conference report provides for funds for the continued operation of the John F. Kennedy Playground, but does not include a new site for the Shaw Junior High School. We also recommend funds for a recreation center for the mentally retarded.

In conference, we agreed to an increase in the student nurse program at D.C. General Hospital and allowed the full request for the Children's Hospital.

This conference report, in addition, provides for five additional school construction projects.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking minority member of this committee, and I would like to say to the Members of the House, one of the outstanding Members of the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our subcommittee for yielding to me so that I might say just a few words in connection with this conference report.

I think that every Member of this House should be grateful to the gentleman from Kentucky, for he has done his job as the chairman of the conferees in a manner that we would want every group of conferees that goes from this House to meet with Members of the other body to perform.

I know that sometimes we receive criticism of the competence and the ability of the Appropriations Committee to perform its functions. But I submit that those who on yesterday committed us to about $8 billion, with the Appropriations Committee finding itself in future years completely unable to do anything about it, should be the last to criticize the procedure of the Appropriations Committee of this House.

I am not completely happy with this conference report any more, I am sure, than the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, is completely happy about it. But we were able to control some of the flagrant violations of responsibility which had crept into this appropriations measure in the course of its travail.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members of this House can congratulate themselves and certainly owe a great deal to Members such as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] for the restraint which individual Members of this House exercised and the restraint which members of the Committee on Appropriations in key positions, such as the gentleman from Kentucky, exercised with respect to this bill.

Mr Speaker, there are two items that are not in this conference report that should be in it, on the grounds of need and on the grounds of justice.

One of them is the Shaw Junior High School. The other is the planning funds for the Fort Reno Recreation Center. However, the conferees from our side were too proud of our responsibility to this House, and too proud of a sense of responsibility that ought to be exercised, to insist that these funds be included.

Mr. Speaker, the Shaw Junior High School could not possibly be included and can never be included so long as responsible men in this body will stand against the kind of tactics that deprive the District of Columbia of the site which was already selected for the erection of Shaw Junior High School.

Mr. Speaker, until we find some comparable sense of responsibility in other places with respect to items of appropriations of this committee, I am sure men like the gentleman from Kentucky and others who serve with him as conferees will never stultify themselves to the point of permitting this kind of a tainted appropriation, tainted by considerations other than its merit to be included.

With respect to the Fort Reno planning funds here, again, the money should be here included, but the price in terms of pride and responsibility would have been too great to permit the funds to be included in the funds covered in this conference report.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] mentioned to the Members of the House the additional funds that are

in here for the Police Department, for public safety, here in the District of Columbia.

In my opinion these funds will not be completely used. Some Members can take some gratification in that fact. But I believe that a matter of more grave concern in connection with it is that I fear, to some extent at least, we have attempted to substitute money, to substitute dollars, for a more thoroughgoing concern with the overall matter of crime prevention and detection here within the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have done everything that men can do sitting on this committee to provide for the public safety of the District of Columbia. However, I do suggest that there are other things which need to be done rather than simply the appropriation of money.

There are some ridiculous things contained in this bill. They are not scandalously expensive, thank goodness, but they are simply just plain unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is fair to say that the only justification for some of the smaller items that are included in this conference report happens to be the identity of the author of the amendment over at the other end of this Capitol.

We did succeed in cutting out this unsound practice of attempting to set salaries for individuals, which the other body had included. We did succeed in nullifying that practice insofar as this bill is concerned.

In my opinion, in spite of the weaknesses that may be in it, overall the House conferees have done the kind of job you would want us to do. In the 5-hour conference session which took place a couple of days ago we did much better than we could do if there was to be a second or third session, or a fourth round of negotiations. So I am here to follow the chairman of the House conferees, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] in recommending this conference report to you, and in sustaining the motions which he will make in connection with this conference report.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask one of my favorite questions in connection with a District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Was there any money put in this bill in conference to further subsidize the District of Columbia Stadium?

Mr. NATCHER. There were no additional funds added for that purpose, but I want the gentleman to know for the District of Columbia you will find under the appropriation, "Repayment of loans and interest," $831,600, together with a $10,900 payment on interest on the District of Columbia Stadium bonds.

As the gentleman knows, none of the bonds have been retired, and the interest payment due each year is $831,600. The Board of Commissioners is forced to borrow this money from the U.S. Treasury each year—that is, $831,600—and in addition to that sum they have to repay $10,900 interest on interest.

Mr. GROSS. This is the financing operation which Members of the House of Representatives were told would cost the Federal taxpayers nothing. We were assured that at no time in the future would the Federal taxpayers be called upon to finance construction of the stadium.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is entirely correct. I recall distinctly I was on the floor when the gentleman from Iowa propounded certain questions concerning the value of the stadium and the cost of the stadium. At that time we were led to believe this stadium would cost from $6 million to $8 million. The stadium cost a little over $20 million. Now they are paying $831,600 in interest on the bonds. None of the bonds have been retired up to this date.

Mr. GROSS. One other question:

I would like to ask the gentleman, does he know the per-day patient cost for indigents at the Children's Hospital, whether it is $40 a day, and if so, why $6 per day more than the $34 at other Washington hospitals?

Mr. NATCHER. The conference report, I may say to the gentleman, provides for a $40-per-diem payment to Children's Hospital with the other hospitals receiving $34 a day. The other body increased the $34 which we had in our bill to $36. We refused to yield, and the figure was put back to $34 for all contract hospitals with the exception of Children's Hospital. I may say to the gentleman I think we did right as far as this one contract hospital is concerned. Here we have a nonprofit institution that is losing money every year; that has to take all of the overflow from the District of Columbia General Hospital to Children's Hospital. These are indigent patients. I have been out to this hospital, and it touches your heart to see the children out there. We believe that this increase for this one hospital is proper in every respect. But we would not yield on the others.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his explanations to both questions.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think the attention of the House should be brought to the fact that this is not the only appropriation of money or the spending of money. This does not finish the fiscal problem for the District of Columbia because very shortly there is going to come before this House a $488 million bill to start a subway system in the Nation's Capital. Under the bill the District of Columbia is going to be asked to provide $50 million as a grant and the Federal Government $100 million. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, if this bill is passed is there any money that the District of Columbia has by which they could pay this $50 million grant?

Mr. NATCHER. I would say to the gentleman that the District of Columbia does not have any funds on hand at this time for that purpose. The $50 million would have to come out of tax moneys derived here in the District of Columbia, out of the Federal payment, and from other sources.

I want to say I appreciate the gentleman directing this question to me at this time, and further, I would like for the gentleman to know that here in the District of Columbia there may be a place for both a rapid transit system and the highway system that we now have underway. But our committee under no circumstances is willing to permit those advocates of a rapid transit system to stop the highway program in this city just to see that the District of Columbia gets a rapid transit system.

The gentleman has been here longer than I have and I am sure that the gentleman on many occasions has seen a lot of projects authorized where funds were never appropriated.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am glad to hear the gentleman take that stand because every Member of the House ought to acquaint himself with this bill that is going to come before the House very shortly. If you will read the Washington Star of a couple of days ago, it bears out the fact; and remember this is just the first bite of a possible $3 billion subway system in the Nation's Capital to be paid for by the taxpayers all over the country, and I admonish the House and warn you to take a good look at that bill, because it will be before this House very shortly, and the time will come, if this bill passes, when the taxpayers of the United States are just going to support the Nation's Capital and their transit system.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, a member of our subcommittee and another great Member of the House [Mr. GIAIMO].

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this appropriation measure. I believe it represents a diligent effort of all the members of the subcommittee and of all the conferees on both sides of the aisle to meet the pressing needs of the District government. I believe it will accomplish the job of conducting the business of the District of Columbia for the coming year.

It does not represent all of the moneys asked for, but it represents what we thought to be an adequate amount with which the District officials can complete their job of conducting the government. We think they could make progress in many areas, particularly the area of education.

We have not appropriated all of the moneys requested for new schools, but we do have a substantial number and we are making great progress in replacing some of the old, outmoded schools with new and efficient schools.

However, there is one particular item that I believe should be brought to the attention of the House and about which I feel very strongly and I know many of the Members do. That is the item of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents. For 2 years now the House has passed this legislation authorizing and enabling the District of Columbia to set up this program as it exists in many of the other cities in the United States.

For 2 years this appropriation and this item has been deleted by the other body. As is well known here to the Members of the House, this past year there was considerable controversy over this item in the other body and there was a close vote on it. But the program was deleted from the appropriation bill. There is an innovation this year, however, and that is that the other body instituted in its place an amendment, or as an attempt to meet the problem with a new approach and one concerning which I am not fully convinced, but one about which I am reasonably hopeful, to wait a year or so and see how it works, and that is to try to resolve this problem of assisting the children of unemployed parents through title V of the economic opportunities act, the poverty program.

There is in the bill as adopted by the conferees an authorization to engage in this method, which would mean that these children could be helped through grants under the poverty program.

What concerns me is that families and children in this category would qualify in a more stringent manner than under the usual welfare provisions which the House had in the original bill. For example, it would have to be tied to training. It would have to be tied to a specific period of time. This concerns me.

I repeat, I am not convinced that the program will work in this manner. However, I believe we should watch this program very carefully during the next year. If we see that it does not solve the problem, if we find that children of unemployed parents are not taken care of this year, then this House should make greater efforts next year to make certain that we initiate in the District of Columbia a program to help children of unemployed parents. I believe this has been much too long in coming. Frankly, I do not consider it proper to deny the program in the District of Columbia when it is available in many other major cities of the Nation.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], another able member of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the morning newspaper a little statement by Superintendent Hanson to the effect that a new Takoma elementary school and an addition to Beers elementary were the most vital needs in the school budget.

It is rather interesting that at this time the Superintendent of Schools comes forward and indicates which are the highest priorities. During the course of the hearings, time after time after time, the chairman of the committee asked the Superintendent of Schools to state which items were the most important, and he failed to take the responsibility at that time. He would not indicate which items were most important and should have the highest priority.

As an attorney for school boards, I sat in on hundreds of school board meetings where school boards would be making up budgets. They would call in the administrative officers. They would ask them for the highest priorities in a long list of items submitted. I have never once seen those school administrators fail to make decisions and exercise responsibility in this respect.

Unless the school superintendent here is willing to come into these meetings, and tell us what the highest priorities are, he will not be doing his job. He will not be fair with the citizens and children of the District of Columbia. We need the advice at the right time as to what are the highest priority needs.

There is one other item I would like to call to the attention of the House. We are appropriating this year again a considerable sum of money for school buildings in which we know air conditioning will later be placed. For several years, school districts around the United States have been building air-conditioned buildings. It has been found that if the building is designed a certain way at the time it is built, it does not cost any more to build an air-conditioned building than one which is not air conditioned.

Those in charge here have failed to come up with plans and specifications of this nature. Now we are building buildings not designed for air conditioning. Later we will put air conditioning in them. Not only will it cost more money for the building, but in addition this will cost more each year to operate the air conditioning, because there will be too much wall space, too much window space and less efficiency.

One way to approach this problem is not to appropriate any money for school buildings for 1 year, to place pressure on them to come in with the kind of plans needed. This committee dislikes going that far, but I believe the people of the District of Columbia should know they are not getting as much as they should for the dollar, because the school administrators are failing to come in with better plans for these schools.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I can agree with much the gentleman has said. As I understand it, there is some $10 million to go into the school system of the District of Columbia, which is not included in this bill, to be made available for the so-called impacted area school aid. I would hope that the subcommittee which handles that appropriation would insist the spending of the $10 million be as carefully scrutinized as does this subcommittee and in the same way this subcommittee is looking to the future.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman is quite right. There is $9.9 million that the District will be able to spend on schools that is not in this budget due to the fact that it comes directly to the school district from other sources and other funds. We are hopeful, however, that in future years this can be coordinated so that we will have some way to have closer and more effective coordination with the spending of that money.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 6, line 3, insert:

"Section 301, subsection (c) of the Dual Compensation Act (78 Stat. 488) shall not apply to compensation received by teachers of the public schools of the District of Columbia for employment in a civilian office during the period July 1, 1965, to August 28, 1965."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 9: Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which action was taken on the motion was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTEND TIME FOR REFERENDUM WITH RESPECT TO NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA FOR WHEAT

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 9497) to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1966, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9497

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision hereof the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1966, may be conducted not later than thirty days after adjournment sine die of the first session of the Eighty-ninth Congress."

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

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE EFFECTS OF AN UNWISE AND UNWARRANTED GOVERNOR'S VETO

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, within a few legislative days the House will be considering the extension of the poverty program on which my committee, the Committee on Education and Labor, and the ad hoc committee on which I have been serving have been working for some years. I think that the House in its wisdom should look today to the front page of the New York Herald Tribune and see what can be the effect of an unwise and unwarranted Governor's veto.

This was more than a veto. The Governor of New York did a stomp on the poverty bill in our city. The city of New York stands to receive $18.1 million, the largest grant in the country, under this bill. But the Governor, by his 11th-hour veto of a piece of legislation designed to effect this grant, did nothing more than simply leave the city hapless and fundless, facing into the long, hot summer. It was a totally irresponsible veto.

When, in his energetic dedication, Mr. Sargent Shriver, Administrator of the program, attempted to reach the Governor and work something out to save the city's fund he was able to reach city officials, but could not reach the Governor because the Governor was "out dancing" as related by an aid at his Pocantico Hills estate. While the Governor was dancing the poor in New York desperately need this program.

I say that if the poverty program in my State fails, it lies at the door of the Republican Party. I have heard statements recently by a mayoralty candidate on the Republican side, or a part-time Republican mayoralty candidate on the Republican side, that "the congressional delegation from New York is ineffective," and he, by way of a minor conceit, "energetically represents his constituents."

Where was that candidate while the Governor was busy burying the poverty program in New York State? Thankfully, by reason of Mr. Sargent Shriver's intercession, a plan was worked out with the acting mayor of the city of New York and we are going to get the $18.1 million over the Governor's veto. Whatever kind of Watusi he is doing, up in Albany—while the Governor is dancing—we are going to get the money in New York without the help of the Republican administration in my State.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the article from the Herald-Tribune to which I referred:

CITY'S FANTASTIC POVERTY CRISIS

At 6:20 p.m. yesterday, Jack Conway, top assistant to Federal poverty chief Sargent Shriver in Washington, received a call from Governor Rockefeller.

The Governor told Mr. Conway that he had just vetoed a legislative bill to create a New York City Economic Opportunity Corporation, an agency that would administer millions in poverty funds in the city.

Mr. Conway, astounded, immediately relayed the message to Mr. Shriver. The Federal chief quickly called New York City Council President Paul Screvane, who is head of the city's antipoverty program.

For the next 5½ hours, the two men and their aids struggled against the clock and confusion to try to save the $18.1 million that Mr. Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity had planned to give the city for a wide range of programs to meet the needs of New York's poor.

Finally, at about 11:45 p.m., just 15 minutes before the fiscal year deadline by which the Federal Government had to approve—or reallocate to another city—the New York City funds, Mr. Shriver and Mr. Screvane came up with a solution to save the money: they changed one word in the name of the antipoverty unit; from economic opportunity corporation to economic opportunity committee.

A spokesman for the Governor said the veto came so near the fiscal year deadline because time had been needed to study and evaluate the bills.

The sudden sequence of events was another—and most fantastic—chapter of the brief political history of the city's antipoverty program, which has been battered by protests from representatives of the poor, congressional leaders, and politicians of both parties.

The Governor explained his veto to Mr. Conway and to city antipoverty officials in this fashion:

He said the bill creating the corporation would "supersede all State laws which are inconsistent with its provisions."

He said the sweeping powers the city sought for the corporation would be in conflict with State "labor laws, antidiscrimination laws, social welfare laws, and laws relating to education, slums, consumer protection, civil service, health and mental health."

But at the same time he made the veto known, he disclosed that he had signed a second bill—passed quietly by the legislature—which would authorize "all municipalities in the State, to conduct and participate in the Federal anti-poverty program."

And he noted that the city could transfer to "an appropriate agency of the New York City government any pending application for Federal funds made in the name of this nonexistent corporation."

But the harried city and Federal antipoverty officials didn't realize the import of this phrase at first.

Mrs. Anne Roberts, staff director of the New York City program, was in despair at the news. "We've worked months," she said, "and we get right down to the wire—and this happens. It's too much for a human being to take."

Mr. Screvane said simply: "I'm shocked."

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, who has been a militant figure in attempting to bring about a larger role for the poor in the program, called a hasty press conference in Washington and denounced the Governor's move as "heartless and cruel politics."

A top Shriver aid called the action "bizarre and baffling."

Mayor Wagner said he was "mystified."

But as the clock ticked on toward the end of fiscal 1965—and the fund cutoff deadline—Mr. Shriver, on an open line to New York, and Mr. Screvane finally saw a way out.

They looked closely at the second bill and realized that simply by changing the name of the corporation they could guarantee the city's allocation.

And so, at 11:45, the economic opportunity committee was formed.

Mr. Shriver and Mr. Screvane reasoned that the same setup would still fulfill all the Federal requirements—and that the name change would be all that would be needed to qualify under the law that the Governor had signed.

But the question remained, would the change be acceptable to Governor Rockefeller?

The answer couldn't be determined immediately: an aid at the Governor's Pocantico Hills estate said Mr. Rockefeller was out dancing.

The final outcome might not be known until July 10. That's the Governor's deadline for action on the antipoverty funds under the Federal law.

If Mr. Rockefeller's past actions are any indication, there will be more complications.

Only 5 days ago the Governor had indicated he might veto the $9 million community action section of the city's program because, he said, it lacked necessary participation of the city's poor.

But it quickly became apparent that his objections had already been met. Two days before, the city's council against poverty had revised its program to include a greater role for the poor.

Mr. Shriver, noting this, on Sunday in effect gave the Governor an ultimatum to approve the community-action program by yesterday—or else lose the money for the city.

At an afternoon press conference here yesterday afternoon, Mr. Rockefeller, in a snappish mood, yielded to this demand, with the provision that the program not be turned into a "political pork barrel."

Then came the 6:20 phone call from the Governor to Sargent Shriver.

WATER PROBLEMS

Mr. McCARTHY. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, our water problems are becoming more and more serious.

Pollution in the Great Lakes has reached an alarming degree. The water level of the lakes is dangerously low. New York City and much of the northeast are in the midst of a drastic drought.

A plan conceived by Thomas W. Kierans, a distinguished engineer of Sudbury, Ontario, could provide long-range solutions to all three of these problems.

It calls for diverting Hudson Bay-bound rivers into the Great Lakes.

This plan provides for an integrated, computer-controlled system for regulating flows and levels on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River that could supply adequate water for our foreseeable, consumptive needs.

Our dependence on the Great Lakes for water for various needs continually increases, but normal rainfall is far from sufficient to keep t he lakes at the "normal" level.

The problem of pollution is closely linked to that of low water levels. The greater inflow of water that would result from the diversion plan would cause a faster turnover of water in the lakes,

and this in turn would help to flush out pollutants.

This plan could also provide a new source of water for the New York City metropolitan area. An abundance of water for New York could be assured if, as part of the diversion plan, water was in turn diverted from the Great Lakes into either the Hudson or Delaware River watersheds.

The United States and Canada, which share a border on the Great Lakes, also share the problems of pollution and low lake levels. But only Canada has the abundance of water that both nations need.

Time is running short. I hope that Secretary Rusk will act to speed up the studies of Great Lakes pollution and water levels now underway by the international joint commission.

I also hope that both the United States and Canada will give serious consideration to the great replenishment plan of Mr. Kierans. Such a vast scheme undoubtedly would involve enormous economic, political, and technical problems. The costs would be massive, although they could be shared by the United States and Canada in proportion to the benefits each would receive.

But if the obstacles are gigantic, so is our need to find solutions to an impending water crisis.

MAJ. GEN. PERRY M. HOISINGTON II

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, fortunate indeed is that rare man who is placed in a job for which he is perfectly suited. Such is the case with Maj. Gen. Perry M. Hoisington II, as Director of Legislative Liaison for the Air Force. A man with a great natural gift for diplomacy, he was a natural for the difficult job of conducting liaison between separate but equal branches of the Government. We are not so fortunate, however, for we are losing him. This fine officer and old friend ended his distinguished Air Force career with retirement on June 30.

To know Perry Hoisington is to like him; to know him well is to develop a deep affection for a warm and colorful personality. To know him well is also to appreciate the vigorous life, for he is renowned as a sportsman. He is as good on a bobsled as he was at the controls of a B–29 in the dark days of World War II.

Perry Hoisington was literally bred in the military system. He was born at West Point, the son of an Army colonel. He was also educated at West Point, following study at Johns Hopkins University, and got his wings at Kelly Field, Tex., in 1940. He served with the 20th Bomber Command, the first B–29 organization, in the Pacific in World War II and participated in the first daylight and night missions against the Japanese mainland. He saw combat action against the Japanese flying from India, China, and the Mariannas. He flew 22 combat missions and 400 combat hours in superfortresses. Before his 30th birthday, he had achieved the rank of colonel.

Following World War II, he held important assignments as the first commander of the Atomic Test Center at Kirkland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex., and with the Air Force Office of Atomic Energy in the Pentagon. He was one of the first officers assigned to the Air Research and Development Command when it was organized in 1950. He attended both the Air Command and Staff School and the Air War College.

After a tour with NATO's Southern European Command in Naples, General Hoisington spent 5½ years with the Strategic Air Command where he commanded the 818th, 57th, 820th, and 6th Air Divisions, respectively. As we all know, he has been head of Air Force legislative liaison for the Air Force since July 1, 1962.

General Hoisington holds the Silver Star, the Distinguished Flying Cross with oak leaf cluster, the Air Medal, the Distinguished Unit Badge, the Commendation Ribbon, and numerous other citations. He has just been presented with the Distinguished Service Medal for the exemplary manner in which he has filled his last billet and I would like to include the citation accompanying that award at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, Perry Hoisington takes with him the greatest legacy a man can have, the legacy of true friendship. We will miss him on the Hill.

But, since he is the father of three fine sons, we may look forward to some day having another Hoisington in legislative liaison.

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL TO PERRY M. HOISINGTON II

Maj. Gen. Perry M. Hoisington II distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the United States in a position of great responsibility as Director of Legislative Liaison, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, from July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1965. Throughout this time, the forceful leadership and the outstanding and dedicated efforts of General Hoisington were instrumental in furthering the effectiveness of the Air Force in its relations with the Office of the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress. Through his initiative, resoluteness, and outstanding professional ability, a wide range of legislative actions have been enacted which will contribute materially to the future effectiveness of the U.S. Air Force throughout the world. General Hoisington's devotion to duty, sound judgment, and understanding of congressional-military relationships have been of inestimable value in assisting the Air Force to meet its national and international commitments. He has been most effective in creating an environment of congressional and public understanding of the Air Force role in the national security structure. The singularly distinctive accomplishments of General Hoisington reflect the highest credit upon himself and the U.S. Air Force.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE BOROUGH OF QUEENS, NEW YORK CITY, VOICE OF QUEENS BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, at a time in this Nation when increasing emphasis is being placed on gainful employment of our youth, as a deterrent to juvenile delinquency and social unrest as well as a positive contribution toward the economic development of the United States generally, I believe that credit should be given to any organization which assumes a position of leadership in this laudatory endeavor.

Such an organization is the Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens, New York City, which is recognized as the voice of Queens business and industry.

This past February, the Queens Chamber published an intensive booklet entitled "Want a Job?" as a guideline for today's younger generation in search of employment. In keeping with this chamber's policy of trying to attain the best for its youth, its booklet follows the applicant from the moment he first decides to search for a job to the day he decides to leave. It numbers for the reader ways of finding a suitable job, placing the application, how to handle him or herself at the interview, knowing if this is the right job, and so forth.

It stresses for the applicant a good appearance and applying alone and lists questions for the aspirant to ask the interviewer.

While its original audience was graduating students, it is also being used as a "training tool" for potential school dropouts. The pamphlet has been distributed to numerous schools, employment agencies, job placement bureaus, and divisions of the Department of Labor, as well as the members of the Queens Chamber. It has received praise from all who have used this pamphlet, including the New York City Board of Education.

I feel the Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens, which I consider one of the most progressive and stimulating of its kind in the United States, deserves recognition and credit for the publication of the "Want a Job?" booklet which is proving such a valuable assistance to today's youth in looking for and finding jobs in our highly competitive labor market.

WIDE WORLD OF WYOMING

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, as Wyoming's only Congressman, I take particular pride in noting the national attention directed to my State in the pages of this week's Time magazine and U.S. News & World Report.

Both of these excellent publications have chosen the Rocky Mountains in general and my home State of Wyoming in particular as examples of the discovery more and more Americans are making—the West is a vacation wonderland.

With the special emphasis being placed on seeing America, I can only ask my colleagues and the millions of Americans who vacation every year to see Wyoming first.

As these articles indicate, the State of Wyoming is blessed with bountiful spaces and spectacular mountains that have fascinated travelers since the explorations of Lewis and Clark.

In a nation where 70 percent of our citizens live in urban areas, Wyoming offers the last true wilderness in America where natives appreciate the blessings of nature and welcome every opportunity to share them with visitors.

These words of welcome are extended to all who can appreciate the diversified geography of my State; mountains, plains, deserts, streams and rivers unmarked by industrial spoilage.

We in Wyoming are celebrating our 75th anniversary of statehood and extend an invitation to every citizen to see an energetic, growing State offering unlimited opportunities in obtaining the "good life" Americans have traditionally sought.

THE NATIONAL PARTY CONVENTION MESS

Mr. MONAGAN. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read the recent strictures of General Eisenhower on the conduct of the Republican National Convention.

As a delegate to the Democratic Convention I must admit that our convention was even more of a mess from the standpoint of the manner in which it was conducted.

I regretted, for example, seeing prominent delegates such as the mayor of New York, Mayor Wagner, along with former Senator Benton, of Connecticut, trying in vain to gain admission to the convention hall because it was already packed with television technicians and young people as well as other hangers on who really had no business being on the convention floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to say that Chairman Bailey of the Democratic National Committee has indicated substantial agreement with General Eisenhower to the effect that something should be done to improve the conduct of our conventions.

The delegate is gradually becoming a mere incident to the phenomenon of the convention and is losing all identity, while television crewmen and producers are creating issues, influencing the convention and controlling its image in the national consciousness. I have no desire to become a delegate again.

The important thing about it is this: If we debase these important democratic institutions, we will soon find that the liberties which they involve will be gone from us permanently.

Mr. Speaker, I believe one other important reform would be to shorten our presidential campaigns. However, with reference to the conduct of the conventions themselves, I am convinced that we should soon go back to the old and tested routines.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate General Eisenhower and say that I support his proposals.

SEVENTY-FIVE PERCENT OF U.S. GOVERNMENT CARGOES SHOULD BE SHIPPED IN U.S. VESSELS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to require that 75 percent of the total U.S. Government generated cargo shipped abroad be carried by American ships. The present requirement of 50 percent has proved insufficient if this Nation is to maintain a strong American merchant marine.

The American shipping industry now carries only 9 percent of this Nation's total overseas traffic. So serious is the state of America's merchant marine, and particularly when compared to Russia's, that urgent action is needed. Maritime experts predict that Russia is estimated to overtake U.S. marine strength within 2 years if she continues her present rate of expansion. The Soviets, for example, are building some 15 times more ships than we are.

It is clear that the Communists are engaged in an all-out effort to dominate the world's sealanes by 1970. Russia may try to "bury us at sea." The importance of shipping strength, vital to national defense in time of war, and economic strength in time of peace, should give every American cause for concern in view of today's Communist maritime buildup.

It should be noted that U.S. Government cargoes constitute about half of the total shipments carried by American ships. Increasing the requirement of Government cargo preference for U.S.-flag vessels would be a first step toward rebuilding America's once proud commercial shipping fleet.

The U.S. Government ought to be the first to ship American.

Furthermore, for the U.S. Government to ship cargoes aboard foreign-flag ships, then pay for the freight in U.S. dollars, only worsens the problems of outflowing U.S. dollars. In effect we are also shipping dollars abroad.

A large number of foreign nations have laws restricting shipments aboard ships of their own registry. Many of these countries favor their own vessels over American ships, and this restriction applies to private commercial cargoes as well as government shipments.

The least we can do is require more Government cargo to be moved by Americans. Since America sends some 24 million tons of foreign aid foodstuffs abroad each year, this would be one good place to start shipping American.

BATTLE OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great chapters in the history of World War II was the battle to clear German submarines from the sealanes of the North Atlantic. In order to track down the Nazi U-boat, the U.S. Navy organized a number of task forces, consisting of five or six destroyer escorts and one escort aircraft carrier. These forces, known as hunter-killer groups, proved to be extremely effective.

Recently I was sent an interesting and graphic account of a naval engagement that took place in the North Atlantic between a member of such a task force, the U.S.S. *Baker*—DE–190—and a 1,600 ton German submarine, the *U–233*. July 5, 1965, will mark the 21st anniversary of this unusual encounter and, as an officer aboard the *Baker* at the time, I can attest to the accuracy of the article which follows. I am certain it will bring back many memories to the officers and men who took part in the battle of the North Atlantic.

The article follows:

ECHOES FROM THE DEEP

(By J. Orville Nicholson, Sonarman First Class, USNR)

Victory was ours, and glory was within our grasp. Except for a tragic incident during the final moments of a naval engagement on July 5, 1944, the U.S.S. *Baker* would today be remembered as one of the two American warships that succeeded in capturing and bringing to port a Nazi U-boat during World War II; and Capt. N. C. Hoffman would occupy a place of honor alongside Capt. Dan Gallery.

For some time after our entrance into the conflict, the role of our Navy in the Battle of the Atlantic was essentially defensive. Consequently our antisubmarine efforts were largely confined to the protection of convoys supplying Allied overseas forces.

Even this was not always an easy or pleasant task, for Nazi wolfpacks haunted the sealanes and took a heavy toll of shipping.

However, by the spring of 1944 our naval strength had grown sufficiently strong to permit the launching of an all-out attack on Hitler's underseas raiders. Task forces, consisting of five or six destroyer escorts and usually one escort airplane carrier (killer groups we called them), were organized to track down the prowlers wherever they might be. The Nazi U-boat was still a crafty, dangerous hunter; but he had at last become also the hunted.

Of all the ships that took part in this phase of naval warfare, none had a more exciting and victorious, yet frustrating, experience than the U.S.S. *Baker*.

The U.S.S. *Baker* (DE–190) was a young ship, having been commissioned only 2 days before the previous Christmas. Many of its crew had been civilians less than 6 months before coming aboard that first time. In fact, only a skeleton crew could be regarded as experienced. But under the capable direction of Capt. L. B. Lockwood, his officer staff, and divisional leaders we soon developed into an effective fighting force.

Three weeks of shakedown cruise in Bermuda, a few more days of mechanical inspection and personnel training, loading of supplies at Norfolk, and the *Baker* assumed its first serious wartime duty by taking its assigned position as one member of the escort screen guarding a huge convoy en route to the Mediterranean. Zigzagging in and out on the perimeter of the creeping flotilla day and night, we searched the air, the surface of the sea, and the ocean depths for any enemy that dared threaten our precious cargoes.

For the six sonarmen aboard, two such uneventful (although successful) voyages across the Atlantic—weeks of listening to the incessant ping of our echo-ranging equipment, listening for an echo to chase and hearing none—this was utter boredom. And when, in early June we learned of our new assignment, we eagerly anticipated a more active kind of duty that should produce at least some excitement.

In the new assignment DE–190 became one of five destroyer escorts which joined the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Card* to form a new killer group. Following our second convoy voyage, Captain Lockwood had received a promotion to other duties and had turned over command of the *Baker* to his executive officer, Lt. Comdr. N. C. Hoffman.

Our first new theater of operations was the North Atlantic. So at Norfolk Navy Yard we loaded stores and ammunition, including a new type of depth charge, and headed north during the latter part of June.

On previous voyages we sonarmen had spent part of our watch duty as lookouts. But at the beginning of this cruise we requested that both of the sonarmen on watch be permitted to remain in the sound hut ready for immediate action. Call it intuition if you will, but we were sure that we were soon to see action. The officers, and especially the captain, must have felt likewise, for our request was granted.

June passed without incident. July 4 arrived and departed without any fireworks. July 5 was passing in the same peaceful way. A light breeze rippled the otherwise calm surface of the North Atlantic, and our evening bathythermograph reading indicated that echo-ranging conditions were good, as the *Baker* took its evening station 9 miles to port of the carrier and screening escorts. The enemy (as we later learned) was aware of our presence in the area but had not anticipated this maneuver. By 7:07 p.m. local time the task force was cruising near Sable Island, and DE–190 was headed on a course almost due east at a search speed of 12 knots. Larry Smith (Smitty) and I were on sonar watch. At the moment I was operating the search equipment, while Smitty, who stood by awaiting his turn, was just then writing a letter.

Whether Smitty ever finished his letter I never learned, for right in the midst of its composition we were alerted by a clear echo of slightly high doppler at 2,000 yards range almost dead ahead. We stared at each other in surprise. With the transmitter trained on the same bearing we listened again for an echo, and back it came, clear and strong.

But perhaps we were receiving the transmission signal of another ship operating on our frequency. We should soon find out. At the next automatic transmission, one of us (probably Smitty) tapped the manual key so as to send out a double ping. Back came ping-ping. We were not hearing signals from a sister ship or any other. Those echoes were coming from something big, solid, moving.

I called to the officer of the deck, "Check bearing one-one-zero, range two-oh-double-oh" (sonar lingo for 110° true bearing at 2,000 yards range), and Lieutenant Prickett replied, "Bearing clear." It was not a surface vessel. This had to be a submarine contact.

Immediately the *Baker* attacked. As the general alarm sounded, all hands rushed to their battle stations in record time as if every man knew what was happening. Smitty instantly went behind me, over me, or under me (we could never recall just how) to the recorder—his specialty and battle station—and within seconds relieved me of reporting range, which he synchronized perfectly with my reports of bearing. "Range one-six-double-oh, slight bow traces, range rate 12," came the first announcement from the recorder operator.

Attacking at a speed of 15 knots we soon covered the nautical mile to our target. As the range closed, the range rate finally reached 16; the echoes became louder and clearer; and then at short range we could hear the telltale propeller beat. The U-boat was moving slowly, without any apparent evasive maneuver—a fact almost too surprising to believe.

At a range of approximately 75 yards we lost contact, and then we knew that the sub was not deep. Because of a final slight bearing of target to port, Lieutenant Edwards, our sonar officer, ordered left rudder and 5 seconds delay in firing. Smitty properly adjusted the recorder and waited for that instrument to indicate the exact instant for firing each salvo of our lethal depth charge pattern. Believe it or not, this most important moment was determined by a sonarman operating electronic equipment, rather than by the captain or some other commissioned officer.

"Roll one," shouted Smitty through the speaker tube to the bridge phone control talker. At interval and, "Roll two," came the word from the recorder operator. Just then the excited control-talker unfroze and relayed both commands in rapid succession to the depth charge stations. Immediately six depth charges were launched almost simultaneously, two from the stern racks, four from the K-guns. Thereafter, the remainder of the pattern was launched orderly in proper response to word from the recorder operator. Caught in the middle of 13 exploding underwater bombs, any target would be lucky to escape.

Soon after we passed over the sub, sonar contact was regained on our port quarter. But when the explosive force of our 500-pound depth charges began erupting the sea like geysers, our own ship was thoroughly shaken. Deck plating bounced and rattled; electric fans fell from compartment bulkheads; and, what was worse, our sonar remote control equipment was damaged, and contact was lost again. Hurriedly all six sonarmen (Yurt, Weatherford, Judd, Meyers, Smitty, and I), along with Lieutenant Edwards, manned the emergency sonar stations, some of us descending to the lower sound room deep below the waterline, where the equipment was manually operated. By means of telephone communication with the sound hut we succeeded in regaining and maintaining contact with the submarine sufficient for the launching of another depth charge attack.

At the time we could not know that our second run was really unnecessary—that one explosive from the first attack had scored a direct hit on the submarine's aft torpedo compartment, rupturing watertight fittings and causing a precipitous descent to a depth of 300 feet before the damaged area could be closed off and peak tanks blown in order to surface.

We did not remain long in the lower sound room, for soon, over the speaker system, we heard the command, "Stand by to ram." That lower sound room was no place to be trapped during a ramming. So, without even waiting for permission, up the ladder we scrambled in double time—or faster. And, as we emerged topside, we heard our deck guns firing. Within 20 minutes of our original sonar contact, the U-boat (larger than our own ship) had surfaced 1,400 yards away, rearing its bow high in the evening sky—like Washington's Monument, as the boys who saw described it.

Scarcely had the submarine settled level on the ocean surface before Lieutenant Wilsford's gunners were wrecking it with deadly accuracy. Perhaps by accident (perhaps not) an occasional star shell was fired, making the conning tower a blazing inferno—a delayed Fourth of July bonfire.

How any enemy gunner imagined that he could man their deck gun (bigger than any of ours) is difficult to conceive. Nevertheless, one desperately attempted to do just that and nearly succeeded. One of our quartermasters, standing in the hatchway of the pilothouse, exclaimed, "Mr. Fleming, they are going to man their big gun," and handed Lieutenant Fleming a pair of binoculars.

But our executive officer never did see either that gun or the gunner. Before Mr. Fleming could focus the binoculars, all three of the *Baker's* 3-inch guns roared in unison. And, when the smoke cleared, both gun and gunner were gone—swept clean off the deck—and only broken deck cables remained to mark the spot whence they had disappeared.

Throughout the battle Captain Hoffman, a veteran and survivor of the ill-fated *Oklahoma* at Pearl Harbor, stood fearlessly bareheaded on the flying bridge and directed the action. Three times I presented him a helmet and persuaded him to put it on. Three times he removed it and laid it aside. I gave up the fruitless effort.

The surfaced submarine was soon in no position to resist—its only torpedo compartment wrecked, the big deck gun gone, its antiaircraft guns useless. So, with its rudder set on a course dead ahead, survivors began abandoning the helpless craft and awaiting our mercy in their inflated liferafts.

Our captain abandoned his plan to ram the submarine. That action had become unnecessary. The capture of such a valuable enemy naval vessel would be a victory much greater than sending the doomed craft to a watery grave. So we followed the abandoned *U–233* at a close, but safe, distance on its starboard quarter; and Captain Hoffman ordered the ship's first lieutenant and damage control officer, Lt. ARMISTEAD SELDEN, to leave his battle station and prepare a boarding party to man the abandoned submarine. Victory was already ours, and the *Baker's* prize crew was loading into her motor whaleboat when an incredible incident

prevented us from achieving the ultimate of naval success..

At the time of our intial contact on the submarine, Captain Hoffman radioed the task force commander over our TBS that we had made sonar contact and were attacking.

From their position 9 miles away the other 4 destroyer escorts and the CVE (aircraft carrier) hurried to the scene of action, with the commanding U.S.S. *Thomas* (DE–102) leading the way. But before the *Thomas* and the others arrived, the battle was over, the sub had been abandoned by its survivors, and the *Baker* was preparing to finish the task at hand in an honorable manner. We should have welcomed the assistance of the *Thomas* as well as the rest of the task force in completing the capture of our awaiting prize of war.

However, as the DE–102 drew near, it became obvious that our task force commander had no desire to cooperate with the *Baker*. And it was, therefore, bitter frustration that our crew experienced as the *Thomas* charged across our bow at a dangerously close range, heedless of Captain Hoffman's angry vehement protests shouted over the shortrange radio, and, with guns blazing at the helpless, abandoned U-boat, rammed its defenseless victim. All we could do was stand by in consternation, watch the submarine and the *Thomas* wallow about on the surface for a moment, then bid sad farewell to the dark bow of our prize as it sank stern first below the surface of the deep North Atlantic. And to the bottom went also the 66 mines it carried (intended for Canadian and United States shipping lanes) as well as the valuable military data we might have obtained from the 1,600-ton minelayer. Damage to the bow of the DE–102 was considerable, necessitating 2 weeks of shipyard repair. So it is not difficult to understand the attitude of the *Baker's* crew, who felt that the *Thomas* well deserved such reward, and more, for her meddling.

After the sinking of the *U–233*, all five destroyer escorts joined in picking up survivors. As the *Baker* approached a group floating in liferafts, many of our boys congregated on the forward deck, some unwittingly carrying handguns. One word of warning from our captain, and all firearms disappeared. Perhaps the survivors had seen the weapons. If so, that explains why those we rescued had been at first reluctant to cooperate. But, when the hand guns disappeared and Captain Hoffman stood up in the starboard lookout station on the flying bridge and beckoned to them, they eagerly accepted the lifelines tossed to them from the *Baker*. They looked more than pleased to come aboard, for they were purple with cold after their swim in the 50° ocean. We treated our captives courteously, made them comfortable in warm clothing, and, before nightfall, had transferred them to the aircraft carrier by way of a breeches buoy.

Our task force rescued a total of 29 survivors, one of whom was the skipper of the *U–233*, Kapitan Lieutenant Hans Steen, for the past 5 years one of Hitler's able U–boat commanders. Unfortunately, he had been fatally wounded by our shelling and died that night aboard the carrier en route to Boston. He cursed the crew of the U.S.S. *Baker*, we were told, to his last breath.

From survivors it was further learned that our attack caught the enemy by surprise. They were unaware that we were near until suddenly they heard our screws passing overhead, and then it was too late. At the moment of our first depth charge attack, sailors on the *U–233* were servicing torpedoes. One torpedo, rushing back into its tube as the craft upended, caught a luckless technician in the midsection and disemboweled him on the spot. Then, too, we were told that one shell from the *Baker's* guns scored a direct hit on the chief petty officer's quarters, killing everyone in that compartment at the time.

We had reason to believe that our interception of the enemy had occurred just in time. It was not an accident that torpedoes were being serviced that evening. The prowler was nearing the shipping lanes off Nova Scotia. Those missiles could have wrought havoc to unsuspecting merchantmen before another dawn. Or who could say that those torpedoes were not being prepared for sinking our own escort carrier, the U.S.S. *Card*, that very night? For a daring Nazi U-boat had sent the *Card's* sister ship, the U.S.S. *Block Island*, to the bottom off the Azores one dark night only 2 months earlier.

In the wanton destruction of the *U–233*, Captain Kellogg of the *Thomas* had achieved his goal; for, in an Associated Press release a year later (July 15, 1945), he was quoted as stating, regarding the incident, "We always had an ambition to ram an enemy submarine, and we got our wish."

Despite a measure of disappointment, the crew of the *Baker* was proud to have made this worthy contribution toward winning the battle of the Atlantic. That was our duty, that was our ambition—to fight on and on until victory and peace were ours.

And so, after a few days in Boston Navy Yard, where some necessary minor repairs were made, the *Baker* took command of our task force, leaving the considerably damaged *Thomas* in port; and we were soon again searching the trackless expanse of the Atlantic, listening for more echoes from the deep.

BURUNDI, GHANA, RWANDA, AND SOMALI

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the birthday of four of the new nations of Africa—Burundi, Ghana, Rwanda, and Somali—and to them, their governments and their peoples go our congratulations and the every good wish of the Government, the Congress, and the people of the United States.

We rejoice that to these lands in Africa has come the blessing of freedom, and we note with satisfaction the progress each has made in the brief period of its independence.

To Burundi, Ghana, Rwanda, and Somali, and all the other sovereign nations of Africa the United States extends the hand of friendship and helpfulness. As they gain in wealth and in power, as they more and more conquer the eternal foes of mankind—hunger, disease, ignorance—so will the fortresses of freedom be strengthened and our own security advanced in a world of abundance, freedom, and peace.

In that undertaking—the attainment of a better world of material substance and spiritual uplift—the United States and the new nations of Africa are linked in a precious and eternal partnership. All that we seek is the welfare of our brother, with the assurance that if all is well with our brother all will be well with us.

It is a happy circumstance, Mr. Speaker, that the Independence Day of our own country is but a few days removed from the Independence Day of Burundi, Ghana, Rwanda, and Somali that today we celebrate. All our own country and the four new nations of Africa, have emerged from the status of colonies to that of free and sovereign nations. We are reminded how much we have in common and our hope and prayer is that the good fortune with which our efforts have met will attend the efforts of our African friends.

BURUNDI

The Kingdom of Burundi, the southern half of the former U.N. Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, is situated in the heart of central Africa, 1,200 miles from the Atlantic Ocean and 700 miles from the Indian Ocean. It lies directly east of the Kivu Province of the Republic of the Congo—Léopoldville. It has an area of 10,744 square miles, slightly smaller than that of the State of Maryland.

For more than four centuries Burundi has been characterized by a stable feudalistic society with a caste system and a ruling king—Mwami. This society evolved through relatively peaceful arrangements between the invading Tutsi cattle breeders and the original Hutu farming population.

Although Burundi was visited briefly by several European explorers and missionaries, notably Burton and Speke in 1858, Livingstone in 1871, and the White Fathers in 1879, it was not until the last decade of the 19th century that this area along with Rwanda, came under European administration as part of German East Africa. Belgian troops from the Congo occupied both countries in 1916, and after World War I, Burundi and Rwanda were mandated to Belgium as the territory of Ruanda-Urundi. Following World War II, Ruanda-Urundi became a U.N. trust territory with Belgium as the administering authority.

The new government was granted internal autonomy by Belgium on January 1, 1962. In addition to granting independence, the resolution recognized the right of Burundi to make its own security arrangements and provided for the establishment of a U.N. representative in Burundi to supervise U.N. technical assistance.

The problems facing the Burundi Government are numerous and the country is in great need for foreign technical and financial assistance.

The United States expects to maintain friendly relations with the Burundi Government and people and encourage them in the use of their newly found independence so as to provide conditions which will make stable, effective government and peaceful development possible for all the Burundi people.

I am happy to congratulate Burundi and His Excellency Leon Ndenzako, Ambassador to the United States from the Kingdom of Burundi.

GHANA

Ghana became an independent state in 1957, when the United Kingdom relinquished its control over the colony of

the Gold Coast and Ashanti, the Northern Territories Protectorate, and British Togoland.

To accelerate the transformation of Ghana from an essentially agricultural, tribally oriented society into a modern semi-industralized state, the government has placed great emphasis on political and economic organization, endeavoring through labor, youth, farm, cooperative and other associations integrated with the Convention People's Party to increase both stability and productivity.

The development plans for Ghana are largely related to the Volta River project, a hydroelectric and aluminum smelter scheme which it is estimated will cost over $300 million and to which U.S. private industry, the U.S. Government and other international organizations, the United Kingdom and Ghana itself is contributing. Ghana is spending $98 million on the project and to date has fulfilled her commitments on repayments of loans made.

One other significant point I would mention is that during the hearings last week on African students and study programs, which the Subcommittee on Africa held, the Ghanian Ambassador, His Excellency Miguel Angustus Ribeiro, attended one of the sessions. Before he departed he had some interesting remarks to make including the fact that his government is very grateful to the Government of the United States and various private institutions for the assistance given to their students in Africa and this country. He graciously added that it was his feeling that students trained in this country are considered more practical and are in fact more useful than students trained in other countries.

We extend our best wishes to the Republic of Ghana on her national day, to the government and the people of one of the new nations of the world, the progress of which has been a source of satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, during the period when the Volta project was under consideration, I was one of its strong advocates and joined my recommendation with others that were presented to President Kennedy. I have been greatly pleased by the progress that has been made in the construction and give full credit to President Kwame Nkrumah, and to Chad Calhoun as well as to many others who in large or smaller measure have contributed to the success of the project.

RWANDA

The Republic of Rwanda, which constitutes the northern half of the former U.N. Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, is situated in the heart of central Africa, 1,200 miles from the Atlantic Ocean and 700 miles from the Indian Ocean. It lies directly east of the Kivu Province of the Republic of the Congo—Léopoldville. With an area of 10,169 square miles, Rwanda is slightly larger than Vermont.

The immediate problems facing the new Rwanda Government are numerous. It must provide for its own internal security by completing the training of and by maintaining a well-equipped military arm. It must concentrate on its considerable economic problems, and it must work out its eventual political relationships with its neighbors, with Africa in general, and with the rest of the world.

Some progress has been made. Rwanda has joined the African and Malagasy Union—UAM, and in September 1963 it joined the International Monetary Fund. The Parmehutu party has steadily consolidated its strength. Belgium and several other countries are considering ways to help meet the anticipated balance-of-payments deficit caused by the coffee crop failure in 1963. Belgium has continued to furnish considerable budgetary support and, with the United Nations, continues to supply technical assistance. The United States is furnishing aid under title III of Public Law 480 and has two development projects under study: a new water system and a new telephone system for Kigali. In an effort to help itself, Rwanda has adopted a real austerity program.

The United States will continue to maintain friendly relations with the Rwanda Government and will encourage them in the use of their newly found independence so as to provide conditions which will make stable, effective government and peaceful development for all the Rwandan people possible.

I am pleased to convey the best wishes of the House to Rwanda and to His Excellency Celestin Kabanda, Ambassador to the United States from the Republic of Rwanda.

SOMALI REPUBLIC

The Somali Republic, located on the northeast coast of Africa, comprises the former trust territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and the former British protectorate of Somaliland. Bounded on the north, east, and south by the Gulf of Aden and the Indian Ocean, and on the west by French Somaliland, Ethiopia, and Kenya, the country is shaped like a large seven and forms the point of the Horn of Africa. Its area totals some 246,000 miles, just slightly smaller than that of Texas.

The original inhabitants of the area were members of various Hamitic groups who mingled, particularly along the coastal regions, with Arab traders, and an Arab sultanate was founded in the 7th century, A.D., by Koreishite immigrants from the Yemen. During the 15th and 16th centuries the Portuguese landed in the Somali territories to carry out trade activities and for a while ruled some of the towns on the coast. Later, the Sultan of Zanzibar came to control certain of the coastal towns and surrounding territory.

The new Republic embarked upon its independence confronted with the task of assuring that it would have sufficient foreign financial assistance to meet its budgetary and developmental needs. As a stable country and as a working parliamentary democracy, Somalia has, among the African countries, achieved a good record.

In foreign affairs the Somali Republic follows a policy of nonalinement. It was admitted to membership in the United Nations at the 15th session of the General Assembly on September 20, 1960. One of the basic objectives of the Somali Government might be said to include support of the United Nations and all international organizations in which the Republic has a moral or material interest.

The primary objectives of U.S. policy with respect to the Somali Republic include: First, the maintenance of friendly cooperative relations; second, the preservation of Somalia's independence, within a democratic framework; and third, encouragement of and assistance in the balanced and orderly development of the economy of the Republic.

On behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I am sure the entire membership of the House I extend to the Somali Republic and to her Charge d'Affaires in the United States, the able and popular Dr. Ali Hassan, congratulations on her national holiday.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] for calling to the attention of the Congress the importance of this day to the several rising free nations of Africa. I wish to join our esteemed colleague who has shown great leadership in the recognition of our new friends in the developing but yet too little known area of our one world.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF BURUNDI ON THEIR INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago today, on July 1, 1962, Burundi became an independent state. The American people welcome the winning of nationhood and we are glad that the Kingdom of Burundi can today celebrate its third anniversary of independence.

After the Berlin Conference of 1884–85 Burundi fell under German influence, and the history of Burundi under German administration was marked by constant factional struggles and intertribal rivalry. During World War I, Belgian troops occupied the country, and in 1923 Belgium was awarded the mandate over Rwanda-Urundi by the League of Nations. In 1946 Rwanda-Urundi became a U.N. trust territory under Belgium administration. Finally, in 1961 the people of Burundi were allowed to decide their own future. Almost unanimously they expressed their desire to become an independent state.

During the 3 years of independence, the people and the Government of Burundi have proven to the world that it was indeed a wise choice. Three years of nationhood have shown that Burundi will safeguard its independence; at the same time, Burundi has chosen the laudable path of international cooperation to achieve its many worthwhile goals. May it serve as an example to the rest of the world that here a young nation decided not to isolate itself from the world, but to immediately take part in the great new effort to make this a better world to live in—for states and people alike. On September 18, 1962, only a month and a half after Burundi became a free country, no longer under the tutelage of a foreign power, it chose to become a member of the United Nations.

The economic union of Burundi with Rwanda is a further indication of its belief in the value of cooperation and coordination among states. It took Europe centuries to learn and understand the value of economic integration;

Burundi has made international understanding its goal from the very beginning.

The Kingdom of Burundi has to face many difficult tasks. It is one of the most densely populated countires in Africa, and though it is poor in known natural resources the country has achieved a measure of self-sufficiency in food. Transportation and communication systems are being improved. With the help of the U.N., a survey mission outlined a development plan for the next 10 years. Increased investment is to provide for a per capita national revenue increase of 45 percent. The people of Burundi will benefit from these programs. Public health programs have been launched against smallpox, tuberculosis, and malaria. There are social centers for women and youth. Urban centers are well planned. Education is free for children between the ages of 7 and 16, and more technical and teacher-training schools are being built.

We look with great respect to the achievements of the people and the Government of Burundi. The persevering spirit and their past experiences cannot but lead us to believe that Burundi will meet the challenges of the future with courage and success. We extend congratulations to Burundi with the greatest pleasure.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF RWANDA ON THE THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THEIR INDEPENDENCE

Mr. Speaker, today, the first of July 1965, also marks the third anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Rwanda, a small nation in central Africa once united with Burundi as a United Nations trusteeship territory of Belgium.

The history of Rwanda, ancient and modern, revolves almost completely around the relationships between the two dominant tribes, the Bahutu, of Bantu stock, and the Watutsi, of Hamitic origins. The Hutu arrived from the north and supplanted the earliest known inhabitants of the area, a pygmy tribe. During the 15th century, the tall, warrior-nomad Watutsi entered Rwanda from the north and the east; because their control of the most prized commodity, cattle, they gained supremacy over the Hutu. For several centuries the Watutsi remained as overlords of the Hutu, a nobility controlling the culture, wealth, and politics of the country, but also protecting the Hutu population from the incursions of Arab slave traders.

German explorers followed Stanley and Livingstone into central Africa during the 19th century. After the Berlin Conference of 1884–1885, the German sphere of influence was extended to include Rwanda and its neighboring state, Burundi. The German occupation was chiefly military; administration of internal affairs was left in the hands of the traditional authorities, who ruled according to traditional methods. This form of indirect administration was continued by the Belgians, who first occupied the territory in 1916. With Burundi in 1923, and later with the Congo, Rwanda was made a league mandate under Belgian administration.

In 1956 the first step was taken from feudalism to democracy when the Belgian governor allowed the electoral colleges at certain levels to be chosen by the entire adult male population. From this point on, the political influence of the Hutus grew steadily, resulting from the establishment of a coffee industry, for which they did not have to depend on their overlords, from an increase in the number of educated Hutus, and from their support by the Catholic church. Finally in 1959, the Hutus rose and insisted on holding territorial chieftainships.

In 1961, the Parmehutu—Parti du Mouvement de l'Emancipation Hutu—convened and proclaimed the abolishment of the monarchy and the establishment of a republic, with the party leader, Gregoire Kayibanda, as premier. A few months later the United Nations held elections to assess the popular support of the Parmehutu action: The result was overwhelmingly against any restoration of the monarchy. Kayibanda was soon elected President, and on July 1, 1962, Rwanda was granted full independence.

Since its independence, Rwanda has been faced with extremely grave social problems resulting from the sudden overthrow of a centuries-old nobility. It is a small, severely overpopulated country which must avidly pursue programs of economic development, through agricultural experimentation and industrial expansion. In achieving social and political stability and moderation, and in developing rapidly and expanded and stable economy, we wish the Republic of Rwanda every success.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF SOMALIA ON THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THEIR INDEPENDENCE

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago today, on July 1, 1960, the new nation of Somalia was born. Unlike most other African nations which had only one colonial power administering their affairs, the Somalis were divided up among the French, the British, and the Italians. Yet, the Somalis in the short space of 5 years have managed to create a stable and equitable fusion of at least two parts of their divided country—the former Italian Somaliland and former British Somaliland—and also demonstrate a profound and abiding commitment to democratic institutions.

Perhaps the fact that Somalia has for millenia been the object of covetous conquerors has helped to weld the Somali people into a more unified whole. It is thought by many, for example, that the fabled "Punt" of the ancient Egyptians is what is today known as Somalia. It was to this land that Queen Hatshepsut sent an immense fleet and army in order to control the ancient world's supply of such precious items as ivory, frankincense, myrrh, rare plumes, and similar valuables. Until the decline of Rome, every single power of the ancient world was interested in obtaining a monopoly of these things, and as a result, sent expeditions to conquer the land from which they believed these items originated.

When European powers once again set off to discover the world, and in the process obtain for themselves new territories, they rediscovered the eastern horn of Africa and the peoples residing there. After a long period of colonial rivalry, it was the French, the British, and the Italians who appropriated for themselves different sections of the Somali homeland. It was not until after World War II, however, that specific promises of independence were made to the Somali people. By 1956, as a result, the population of former Italian Somaliland was in nearly complete control of domestic affairs, and both the British and the Italians were laying the groundwork for 1960, the date by which the United Nations had guaranteed independence to the Somalis.

The Somalis used their period of internal autonomy well: This experience and their long tradition of individual participation in the political life of the country laid an unshakable foundation of democratic government. Unlike nearly every other country in the world—including some European ones with longer histories—the Somalis have emerged from nearly a year of governmental crisis with their democratic institutions still firm and operating.

Within this tradition, and with the help of some foreign aid and a governmental program sponsoring new and varied industrial and agricultural growth, the political and economic future of Somalia looks bright indeed. In achieving their desired goals, we wish the Somalis every possible success, and particularly congratulate them on their obvious commitment to the ideals of a free and democratic society.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, July 1 is an historic date for three of our African neighbors. To name them in alphabetical order, they are the Kingdom of Burundi, Rwanda, and the Somali Republic.

Burundi, where King Mwambutsa IV reigns, achieved independence on July 1, 1962.

Rwanda, which has as its President, Gregoire Kayibanda, also gained independence on July 1, 1962.

Somali, whose President is Aden Abdulla Osman, marks July 1, 1960, as its independence day.

I believe it may be stated as the sense of the people of the United States that our hope is to maintain friendly relations with each of these proud nations and to ever remind them of the lessons to be learned from our own history in our struggles to use our independence as a means to attain peaceful development of our talents.

Our hope today, I am sure, is that each of these nations may fulfill its destiny under freedom, with whatever assistance we may be able to render.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1960, the Republic of Ghana was born. In 1957 the United Kingdom had relinquished its control over the Gold Coast and granted it complete independence within the British Commonwealth. This gave Ghana the special distinction of being the first former African colony to achieve independence. Three years

after this historic event, the people of Ghana felt that a new constitution in keeping with the African tradition and culture was more in tune with the personality of their country, and so desired to become an independent republic. Five years ago today, the Queen of England ceased to be Ghana's Head of State and the Constitution of the Republic of Ghana delegated this function to the President. At that time, the former Prime Minister, Kwame Nkrumah, became President.

We in the United States are pleased to note that during the 1930's the young man who would eventually hold his nation's highest office was a student at Pennsylvania's Lincoln University. Many other Ghanian students are presently following President Nkrumah's example and are studying in the United States. We hope that they will continue to come although they now have many institutions of higher learning in Ghana, including a technical college in Kumasi and a university-college in Legon.

Ghana is symbolically named for an ancient West African kingdom centered about a capital believed to be represented today by the ruins of Kaumbi Saleh, 200 miles north of Bamako in the Sudanese Republic. The present inhabitants of Ghana are believed to be descendants of tribes which migrated from this area. The first migatory movement probably came down the Volta River around the beginning of the 13th century.

Ghana is the world's leading source of cocoa, producing about one-third of the world's total. An expanding timber industry produces important quantities of mahogany and other wood products. Ghana is trying to build industries which will supplement its agricultural economy.

The United States, through the Development Loan Fund and the Export-Import Bank is lending $37 million to the Volta River Authority which is constructing a dam, power station, and transmission grid. The completed project will be administered along the lines of our own Tennessee Valley Authority. A consortium of private American companies plan to build and operate an aluminum smelter which will transform Ghana's bauxite into highly valuable aluminum.

Mr. Alex Quaison-Sackey, Ghana's new Foreign Minister and the permanent representative at the United Nations, was unanimously elected President of the 19th session of the United Nations Generally Assembly. The leadership of Mr. Quaison-Sackey has received the admiration of the entire world. He very ably presided over this year's 20th anniversary celebration of the signing of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco. It was my great honor and pleasure to meet Mr. Quaison-Sackey this June when his distinguished international service was lauded by the National Capital Press Club.

We extend our greetings to His Excellency the President of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah; His Excellency the Ghanian Ambassador to the United States, Miguel Ribeiro; and His Excellency the Foreign Minister of Ghana and President of the United Nations General Assembly, Alex Quaison-Sackey.

The people of the United States are proud to congratulate our friends in Ghana on the fifth anniversary of their republican Constitution. We wish for them continued progress, prosperity, and peace.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Members who desire to do so may have 6 days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject I have just discussed.

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

There was no objection.

RURAL HOUSING GRANT PROGRAM

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has furnished me, at my request, a history of the accomplishments of the rural housing grant program. I am most hopeful that the House conferees on appropriations will go along with the Senate version of making grants available for poor people throughout America in rural areas in order that they may have funds to renovate dilapidated homes where otherwise it would be impossible for them to provide the necessary repairs.

I supported with enthusiasm yesterday, a program to subsidize rents of low-income families eligible for public housing in the cities of this country. We should not forget our rural people who will not benefit in the rent subsidy program. Many rural people on public assistance have absolutely no hope of obtaining the financing necessary to make the repairs to their homes which are essential for health and protection against weather.

The program history referred to follows:

THE RURAL HOUSING GRANT PROGRAM: A HISTORY OF ITS ACCOMPLISHMENT

In 1949, the 81st Congress passed the Housing Act of 1949. One of the notable features of this act was a provision of title V, providing for grants of $500 to poverty-level rural individuals for minor repairs and improvements to make their homes safe and free of health hazards. In 1962 the grant authority was increased to a maximum of $1,000.

There were good and valid reasons for the new rural housing grant program:

Scattered throughout rural America were hundreds of thousands of elderly and handicapped persons who had no debt-paying potential and who lived in homes that were pitifully squalid and hazardous to the health and safety of both their families and their communities.

Even under the broadest and most liberal rural housing loan program that might be conceived, most of these people would remain "unassistable." Only a grant program could help them.

For 4 years, 1950-53, the rural grant program was very modest—only 790 individual grants were made for a total of $363,600.

In 1953, the rural housing grant program was discontinued. Reasons for dropping the program remain vague and inconclusive. Among the reasons offered by those responsible for the program's administration were:

That the program was largely "unused" and therefore unnecessary.

That a "grant" was antithetical to the American concept of free enterprise.

That Government housing programs—if any—should be loan programs geared and directed to overcoming the vast backlog of housing shortages created by the material and manpower shortages of World War II.

As is usually the case, the people in poverty were voiceless during this dialog and their problem was discarded as unimportant.

But the slums of rural America didn't go away simply because they were ignored. They increased.

Recognizing this, President Kennedy and Congress revived the rural housing grant program by making funds available in the Supplemental Appropriation Act in the fall of 1961.

In the first full year, fiscal year 1963, under the newly revived program, more than 1,300 grants for a total of over $1 million were made, as compared to only 123 grants for $54,000 in 1953, the last year of the old grant program.

In 1964, grants increased to 5,841 for a total of $4.8 million. Behind these figures, is a great and heartwarming story.

The east Kentucky story

About a month before his death, late in October 1963, President Kennedy decided that the Federal Government should initiate an impact program to relieve the winter hardship of people in eastern Kentucky. This 44-county area was one of the most desperate and critical pockets of poverty in the whole distressed Appalachia region.

The Farmers Home Administration was called upon as one of the principal agencies to go into the area with its rural housing grant program and "do a job."

In less than a month, Farmers Home Administration was taking applications and making grants. To spread the word about the emphasis to be given this work, FHA personnel used every line of communication—local newspapers, radio, organizations, clergy, welfare agencies, and their own staff.

The word spread. Soon, county FHA offices were swamped with applications and additional FHA personnel had to be deployed from other areas of the State to handle the work. Every applicant had to be personally investigated to determine whether he was eligible for a grant or loan. Grants were made only in the extreme hardship cases.

Because the grant money in each individual case was small compared to the job that had to be done, great care had to be taken in the purchase of materials and constant supervision of construction was maintained during the entire program.

Criteria and limitations for making the grants were clear and simple:

Eligible were the elderly and the physically handicapped and all others whose income was at the poverty level, whose prospects for additional income was nil and whose debt-paying potential was nonexistent; and whose home was dangerous to the health and safety of the occupants and to the community.

Repairs and improvements included only the barest essentials for living:

In some cases merely making the home weatherproof from cold, rain, and wind—the application of asphalt siding on the outside and wallboard inside.

Repairing windows and doors and roofs.

In some cases installing running water and inside toilets.

From the start of the program in eastern Kentucky on November 21, 1963, until it was terminated August 31, 1964, 2,733 grants were approved for a total of $2,349,030. Average amount of grant was $852.

To give some idea of the extent of need of such a program in this relatively small pocket of poverty, more than 10,000 applications were received by the FHA. When the program was terminated, there were still more than 6,000 applications on hand.

Who did the grants go to?

Eighty-nine and seven-tenths percent had annual incomes from all sources less than $2,000.

Fifty-three and six-tenths percent were 60 years old and over—28 percent were over 70 years or older and 25.6 percent were from 60 to 69 years.

Those younger than 60 years of age were mostly physically or mentally handicapped or were so obviously and permanently unemployable as to condemn them to a lifetime of poverty.

The economic impact of the concentrated program in eastern Kentucky was dramatic. All of the $2.3 million in grant were spent within the area for materials and labor.

The program provided employment for carpenters and other laborers on more than 2,700 construction projects. The $2.3 million spent in the area increased sales in town, and increased local off-site employment. It is conservatively estimated that when new money is injected into a community it circulates at least five times before it leaves.

This means that the grant program added more than $11 million to the economy of the eastern Kentucky area in less than a year.

Impressive and as valid as these economic facts are, they are overshadowed by the inestimable human factor involving more than 8,000 people who are now living in homes providing a semblance of comfort, safety, and well-being. There is never any way to put a dollar-value on renewed self-respect, renewed spirit and health.

Reaction to program

Resistance and opposition to the FHA program in eastern Kentucky was practically nonexistent. Enthusiastic support and cooperation came from every sector of the affected communities.

FHA supervisors sought and received the finest cooperation from material dealers and they delivered low-cost but adequate materials on specification. When the program was finally discontinued, a lumber dealer in Whitesburg, Ky., wrote FHA: "We regret the discontinuing of the program * * * a great aid to old people * * * grants were given in Letcher County without regard to politics, race, or religious affiliations * * * grants aided the economic situation in this area * * * I think it has been one of the best programs ever inaugurated and the cost is negligible compared to the good it has brought about."

Bankers throughout the area had high praise for the program and were often the leaders in the community to help the program along. Typical of banker reaction was that of the cashier of the bank in Jackson, Ky.: "Programs offered by FHA are vital programs in our community * * * the recent grant program to older people has been especially helpful in this area * * * I hope these programs can be continued and should you ever need our assistance, it will be a pleasure to work with you * * * I think this reflects the thinking of all (of us) bankers."

(See attachments for additional comments on the grant program.)

ACTIVITY IN OTHER STATES

It would be a mistake to leave the impression that the FHA rural housing grant program started and ended with the eastern Kentucky concentration of effort.

Forty-two States and Puerto Rico have participated in and benefited from the program since it was revived in fiscal year 1962:

In fiscal year 1963, 1,378 grants were made for a total of $1,029,655.

In fiscal year 1964, 5,841 grants were made for a total of $4,805,435.

During the entire history of the program, more than $8 million in grants have been made to 10,500 families.

Following are some of the States which participated in the program during fiscal year 1964:

Arkansas: 284 grants for $183,680.
Georgia: 301 grants for $255,820.
Mississippi: 533 grants for $468,175.
Missouri: 250 grants for $158,160.
North Carolina: 387 grants for $328,490.
South Carolina: 147 grants for $121,240.
Texas: 149 grants for $118,570.
West Virginia: 275 grants for $257,500.

(For complete State-by-State rundown see attachments.)

Need for a grant program was pointed up by President Johnson on January 31, 1964, in his message to Congress on Agriculture, when he said:

"More than a million rural families live in houses in such poor condition that they endanger the health and safety of the occupants. Another 3 million live in homes that need major repairs. About one-third of our older citizens live on farms and in small country towns and villages—and too often their homes are poorly heated and lack bare necessities such as running water."

A FEW ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON THE FHA RURAL HOUSING GRANT PROGRAM IN EASTERN KENTUCKY

There were at least three other families in this community which were also aided by you and your department to a human decency standard of housing and none of which would ever have been possible without this assistance * * *. I wish to congratulate you for the fair and impartial manner in which you have administered this program. I sincerely hope that another such program will be designed and put into effect in the not too distant future.

HENRY A. STOVAL,
Director, Hazel Green Academy,
Hazel Green, Ky.

The Federal grant program administered by the Campton Office of the Farmers Home Administration has been a stimulant to our sagging economy, it has been a tremendous boost to our less fortunate citizens * * * (you) are to be commended for the fair, efficient, and expeditious manner in administering this program.

C. BEACH, Jr.,
Executive Vice President, Peoples Exchange Bank, Beattyville, Ky.

There is a great need for many more of these grants. It is estimated that 800 to 1,000 families (in Breathitt County) probably would qualify. The economic importance of this program is great since this releases new money in the county and many benefit from it.

SAM P. DEATON,
Breathitt County Judge,
Jackson, Ky.

"This home repair has been a great thing for our country. I just hope we can get the program extended. If I can help in any way just let me know. I'll go to Washington or elsewhere if I can help get it extended—we need it."

COUNTY JUDGE, *Barbourville, Ky.*

[From the Arkansas Democrat, Jan. 15, 1965]

EDITORIAL COMMENT: WHERE HELP IS NEEDED

About 900 farmers and rural residents of the State now have more comfortable homes as a result of funds they borrowed last year from a Government agency that specializes in that field.

The Farmers Home Administration made loans totaling $5.7 million for building or improving housing facilities for low-income people living in rural areas. This figure includes $122,500 for building rental units for senior citizens, and another portion of the money was used to build or repair essential farm buildings.

The people who borrow money from this agency are those who are unable to obtain credit from regular commercial lenders. However, there is another class of Arkansans who are less fortunate, and who may not qualify for a loan from any source.

Their income is nil and they may manage to raise only a portion of the food they need. They would starve if they did not receive welfare checks which help buy food and clothing. Their homes are pitifully inadequate and poorly heated.

Any program of assistance will be doing its greatest and noblest work if it can improve the plight of these unfortunate people.

Rural housing grants obligated, fiscal year 1964 through June 30

State	Initial number	Initial amount
Alabama	119	$92,660
Arizona	3	2,780
Arkansas	284	183,680
California	5	4,200
Connecticut	1	150
Colorado	4	3,880
Florida	96	87,720
Georgia	301	255,820
Idaho	7	4,810
Illinois	82	66,080
Indiana	15	11,950
Iowa	3	2,780
Kansas	66	47,220
Kentucky	2,325	1,994,570
Louisiana	24	16,880
Maine	115	100,930
Michigan	21	16,980
Minnesota	14	12,210
Mississippi	533	468,175
Missouri	250	158,160
Montana	8	5,330
Nebraska	3	1,610
New Jersey	2	2,000
New Mexico	45	43,960
New York	12	9,480
North Carolina	387	328,490
North Dakota	13	9,140
Ohio	2	2,000
Oklahoma	118	92,500
Oregon	2	1,900
Pennsylvania	21	17,820
South Carolina	147	121,240
South Dakota	5	4,040
Tennessee	79	62,430
Texas	149	118,570
Utah	6	5,810
Vermont	12	7,940
Virginia	8	7,690
Washington	1	1,000
West Virginia	275	257,500
Wisconsin	12	10,330
Wyoming	9	8,030
Puerto Rico	101	89,950
U.S. total	5,685	4,740,395
Average		834

CONDUCT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. DERWINSKI. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this afternoon to direct the attention of the Members to the

complete inconsistency in the administration conduct of foreign affairs in defense of our and the world's freedom against the Communist forces.

American fighting men are committed to combat in Vietnam to save that country from communism. Our troops were rushed into the Dominican Republic to save that country from a Communist takeover. Although we are now tolerating Communist control of the so-called rebel movement in the Dominican Republic, the theoretical position of the administration continues to be that U.S. troops will remain on that island until stability through the formation of a non-Communist government can be developed.

U.S. troops are stationed in Europe as part of the NATO Alliance to protect Western Europe from possible Communist invasion. Our foreign aid program is partially justified on the ground that it is a weapon against the further spread of communism.

The question then arises, Mr. Speaker, Is not subsidizing Communist governments through trade a position completely inconsistent with our actions in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, and other areas I have cited?

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that for more than a year the State Department has carried on secretive trade discussions with the Communist Governments of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union itself. The argument has been advanced by the administration that we can, through subsidized trade, "build bridges of understanding" to the governments of Eastern Europe and perhaps pull them away from Soviet control. We are also told that the Soviet Union has mellowed and by subsidizing trade with them, they might in some vague fashion give up their Communist belligerence.

Mr. Speaker, the position of the administration and the negotiations being carried on by the State Department are against the best long-term interests of the U.S. general public, our industries, our labor unions, and are against the best interests of world freedom.

Before subsidized trade is developed with any Communist government, we must work out specific conditions which would produce permanent major political and economic concessions from the Communists.

Trade is a key weapon in the cold war. It is the height of naivete to think that any Communist government has the best interest of its citizens in mind or is willing to enter into legitimate trade agreements with us. The purpose of the Communist governments seeking trade with the United States is to obtain the wherewithal to develop basic industries so that they can carry out an offensive trade against us in years to come.

What should we demand of the Communist governments before considering major trade agreements with them? Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points which I would recommend, all of which would be long overdue developments in the conduct of international relations.

Should the Soviet Union wish to be subsidized by trade agreements—such as they were in the Kennedy wheat sale 2 years ago—we should demand immediate settlement of their World War II lend-lease debt. It would be practical for us to insist that internationally supervised plebiscites be held in the Baltic States to serve the true wishes of the people there for self-determination before we subsidize the Red rulers in the Kremlin.

As the governments of the Eastern European satellites display interest in a trade agreement, we should insist that they grant their citizens freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion and that they hold free elections to prove whether or not they really have popular support of the public.

There are many other practical conditions that should be extracted from the Communist governments before we permit them to benefit by trading with the United States. We must keep in mind that trade with any Communist country helps all Communist countries, since it relieves the pressures on their domestic economies.

Perhaps one would question my continued reference to subsidized trade. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the intention of the administration merely to permit expanded trade agreements with Communist governments, but it is the specific intention to subsidize that trade. This would be a tragic development.

In recent months not only the Soviet Union but every Eastern European satellite, including Yugoslavia, has announced increased support of the Communist dictatorship in North Vietnam. Supplies from these Communist governments are pouring into North Vietnam, strengthening the determination and ability of the Reds to inflict direct losses on our troops in South Vietnam. Isn't it completely inconsistent then for the State Department to encourage U.S. firms to trade strategic materials to the Communists in return for basically nonessential goods and to add the greatest irony of all, that of subsidizing such transactions?

It is interesting to note that the propaganda drums of the administration are beating out a steady tattoo to try to convince the public that dealing with Communist governments is a lucrative, wonderful operation and should be enthusiastically followed.

Yesterday the junior Senator from South Dakota, Mr. McGOVERN, chose to criticize former Vice President Nixon who had denounced the indiscriminate sale of wheat to the Soviet Union. This is in line with the administration's propaganda barrage that to subsidize Communist governments makes them mellow, or to paraphrase Secretary Rusk, a "fat Communist is not as dangerous as a lean Communist." Such nonsense is not surprising from an administration whose foreign policy is so completed misguided, but the danger cannot be minimized.

This morning we read of the Communist attack on our air base at Danang. The Vietcong attackers are motivated by the same ideology which motivates the Communist tyrants of the Eastern European satellites, the Soviet Union, and Red China. To rush to subsidize these governments merely perpetuates their autocratic control of their captive peoples, adds to the complications facing the United States abroad and delays the development of true peace and freedom.

A pet Johnsonian phrase is "building bridges of understanding with the Communists."

The Communists are intent on building a trade bridge which would save their foreign trade from economic ruin. Arming revolutionaries in Central and South America, Africa, and Asia has been exhausting; building up underdeveloped countries on orders from Moscow has also helped to wreck normal trade. The economic system has failed and so they turn to us to bail them out.

While a total boycott of Communist countries is impossible, trading could be kept within rational bounds. There is ever present, however, the danger that high pressure lobbies and Government optimists might give the Communists not only trade but long-term credit. England has already done so.

The Communists are in serious trouble. We can bail them out, enabling them to continue to fulfill their commitments to the Soviets. Or we can use this great opportunity to weaken further the position of communism and to strengthen the forces of freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

I have referred earlier to the concessions that we should demand prior to any trade agreement. Among the conditions which I would add are rehabilitation of political prisoners, freedom of movement, removal of the Berlin wall, and withdrawal of Soviet troops from non-Russian countries.

My main purpose in discussing this subject this afternoon, however, is to again remind the Members of the inconsistent, shortsighted, dangerous, and, I must even add diabolical plot of the Johnson administration to provide blood transfusions in the form of trade to Communist regimes which, because no strings whatsoever would be attached, permit these Communists to divert other resources to activities against us in Vietnam and Latin America.

CANADA'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. PELLY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join our Canadian friends and neighbors in observance of their national holiday, July 1. Ninety-eight years ago, on July 1, 1867, Canada came into being as a new nation. It received its constitution, in the form of the British North America Act, 1867, and four of its large provinces—Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia—formed the confederation long known as the Dominion of Canada. Today the federated state of Canada consists of 10 provinces and 2 vast northern territories.

With one of these territories and with seven of these provinces the United

States shares a common boundary; and with all of them it has close ties and contacts. In fact, in so may ways are the lives of our Canadian neighbors intertwined with ours that the two countries seem more like brothers than neighbors. Our mother country, England, had a more wayward son south of the boundary which was first established after the American Revolution; but many of the ties that existed then have continued to this day.

As in most families, there have been family quarrels and misunderstandings; but for the most part the relationship has been a particularly happy and helpful one. Like most brothers, the two countries have been mutually dependent upon one another, and in a variety of ways, despite their natural tendencies to go their separate ways and assert their independence. Conflicts of interest and flareups over failure to seek or see the other fellow's point of view are not to be taken lightly or passed over as temporary aberrations; but in the long run they point up the prevailing good relationship which is enhanced by definite steps to overcome difficulties. Witness the numerous bilateral bodies which have come into being through just such efforts.

In the fields of geography, defense, parliamentary affairs, social and cultural matters, and economics—with all its multiple angles—there are Canadian-American commissions and committees, both public and private, and various organizations which have been established for the primary purpose of promoting understanding and cooperation between Canada and the United States. They recognize the inescapable interweaving of the lives of our citizens. They realize that because of the fundamental interdependence of the two countries there are just that many more problems of coordination than there would be if it were possible for us to pursue our separate ways. Since it is not possible or desirable, the happy answer is cooperation of the genuine and widespread sort that grows and is nurtured on both sides of the border.

July the First in Canada, like July the Fourth in the United States, is a time to reassert our independence, but also to note our brotherhood.

Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out in my remarks, we recognize the inescapable intertwining of the lives of our citizens. This is particularly true in my own State of Washington where we have common interests, common boundaries, and, yes, even common conflicts of interest with British Columbia and Alberta. At times we criticize each other, but the sincere respect we hold for one another always remains. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is an example which all nations of the world could follow. We are truly a showplace of nations living in peace.

REPUBLICAN POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a statement by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan, our distinguished minority leader today issued a statement on the situation in Vietnam following a meeting of the joint Senate-House minority leadership. Under unanimous consent, I include the statement by Mr. FORD in the RECORD at this point.

The statement by Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, REPUBLICAN LEADER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON VIETNAM—JULY 1, 1965

Republicans will continue to disregard partisan considerations in foreign policy. We will be guided by the national interest.

Like Senator Arthur Vandenberg at the time of the Yalta agreement, we will criticize administration policy when it fails to serve the national interest. We will make constructive recommendations that will bolster the President's firmness. No Republican has called this McNamara's war.

Several House Republicans, including myself, recently made the following points about Vietnam:

1. The objectives of our Nation's policy must be the establishment of conditions under which the people of South Vietnam may live in peace and freedom. This means a government of their own choosing. This means freedom from aggression—from within and from without.

2. We hope for negotiations to end the fighting—to assure the freedom and independence of South Vietnam. Let me clarify one point—the Communists are escalating the war. No American is. Moreover, Peiping and Hanoi spurn the negotiating table.

3. The United States cannot, without violating its word, agree to settlement which involves a coalition government with Communists. Such government makes a larger war inevitable at a later date. History proves a coalition government with Communists gives them unlimited veto power. Veto power scuttles any hope for permanent peace.

4. The administration must not sacrifice the freedom and independence of South Vietnam. To do so makes the loss of American lives purposeless. Some Democrats would abandon the free people of South Vietnam. The President must not yield to them.

5. In this crisis, some Republican leaders believe American air and sea power must be used more effectively in North Vietnam against significant military targets. We advocate greater Allied participation. We question the logic of committing U.S. ground forces on a large scale to fight a war in southeast Asia.

VIETNAM SITUATION

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, last night's Evening Star told us of another major battle in Vietnam. This morning's Post brought word of a brazen Vietcong attack on our air strip at Danang that hit at least six of our planes. So it goes, and you can expect more such stories with the regularity of your paper.

It is apparent that we have not been winning this war and that something more must be done. The question is what. We have been giving everything a try—even the use of our B–52 heavy bombers. Recently, while our Armed Services Subcommittee was in Saigon, it came to my attention that we might have yet another innovation that could be tried. I was surprised indeed to learn that there is no television communication in South Vietnam. Upon inquiry, I learned that it has been an issue of considerable debate. As a matter of fact, I am informed such recommendations were made many years ago. But nothing has been done.

At first, one might casually dismiss this with a bland "so what." But upon reflection, I am certain that it will be recognized that the suggestion is not without merit. Certainly in a struggle for the minds of men—and that is precisely what is going on today in Vietnam—we should be using every asset that is available to us. While our subcommittee was in Vietnam I made repeated inquiries, at all levels, about the desirability of establishing a television network and virtually everyone I discussed it with felt that it would be a most worthwhile undertaking. I checked further when we were in Thailand and learned that television facilities there were being effectively used to counter communistic efforts in that country.

So as I read the morning headlines, I thought I should mention this suggestion to my colleagues in the House and ask that you join me in seeking to evaluate the merits of this proposal. It is my understanding that studies have been made and I am making efforts to learn more fully about them. I have asked for a comprehensive report as soon as possible covering the background of the studies, the estimated cost, the arguments for and against creating such a television network, and the current status of the situation and any other data which would be helpful in reaching a decision as to the merits of such a program.

From conversations with our officials in South Vietnam, I am satisfied that the use of television would be of tremendous value to the war effort by simply establishing a means of communication with the people throughout the country and that such a network is feasible.

I am told that the cost of such facilities would be about what it takes to fight the war for 1 week. It is clear something more must be done, and this impresses me as being a suggestion that deserves our most serious consideration.

PROCEDURES FOR QUALIFYING TO VOTE IN THE WELL

Mr. CALLAWAY. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress, this year, I inquired of some of my colleagues on the rules of voting and was told that when a call was made for the yeas and nays that the roll would be called twice. I was further told that if I should fail to vote on the first or second rollcall, I could then go to the well of the House to vote at that time. In the early months of this Congress, I believed this to be the rule.

However, upon reading carefully the Rules of the House of Representatives, I found on page 387 that the actual rules pertaining to rollcall votes are quite different. A Member may not vote in the well unless "the Member declares that he was listening when his name should have been called and failed to hear it."

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that many Members of the House have this same misunderstanding of the rules. This has been a source of great concern to me. I have contacted the Republican task force on the Rules of the House of Representatives about this, and I have testified before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. In each instance, the Committee have shared my concern.

My concern was heightened by the vote that took place yesterday afternoon on the motion to recommit H.R. No. 7984. At the end of an extremely close vote the well was so full that it was necessary for a number of Members to line up in one of the aisles, and Member after Member recorded his vote by saying affirmatively that the Member "qualifies and votes yea or nay."

On this particular vote there were few names to be called on the second rollcall. Furthermore, the House was completely quiet at this time because of the intense interest in the outcome of the vote. I believe, under these circumstances, that it would have been almost impossible for a Member to be present and yet fail to hear his name called. Certainly, it was impossible for this to happen to the large number of Members who qualified to vote yesterday.

To me, it is extremely serious for Members of Congress to see violations of the Rules of the House and not to call them to the attention of this body. If this House is to retain the dignity and honor that it has held and deserved throughout the years, it must abide by its own rules.

I feel certain that this rule is not clearly understood by many Members of the House and I hope by calling this to the attention of all Members that there will be no repetitions of the apparent violations that took place yesterday.

I would be violating the trust that the citizens of the Third District of Georgia have placed in me if I were to see what in my opinion is clearly a violation of the rules and not call it to the attention of the Members.

FISCAL YEAR ANNIVERSARY—HOW ABOUT A BALANCED BUDGET?

Mr. DEVINE. 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. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion a number of Members have said that we should commemorate the birthday of various things, one of which is the newly emerging African nations; the other has to do, I think, with the 98th anniversary of the great Dominion of Canada.

It occurred to me also that this is the anniversary of the fiscal year and that today is the first day of the new fiscal year. The administration has been fast in putting out press releases that the fiscal year just ended has been a great year because the deficit—and you should underline that word "deficit"—is only a little more than $3 billion.

Instead of bragging about the amount of the deficit being small, how about trying for a surplus for a change?

It seems to me that we in the House of Representatives should on this occasion, on this first day of July, the new fiscal year, dedicate ourselves to bringing about a balanced budget for the American people for the first time since 1960.

CONGRESSIONAL BALLGAME

Mr. UDALL. 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, later today I will ask the President to designate the District of Columbia Stadium as a disaster area, on account of the great national disaster which occurred there last night in the baseball contest between the Republican and Democratic Members of this House.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I just want to tell the gentleman that I found out why you gentlemen lost last night.

Mr. UDALL. Will the gentleman please explain.

Mr. CEDERBERG. You had your arms so twisted you could not throw.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has alluded to the condition of my arm. I wish to say, for the benefit of my colleagues, while my arm is sore and my ego is bruised, I do have one of the lowest earned-run averages in this entire league, despite the worst won-lost record in that particular league. I might add that I intend to file suit for nonsupport at the plate and afield against some of my own colleagues and teammates.

I wish to say further that disasters sometimes produce good results. We need a two-party system. The Republican Party is badly divided, it needs harmony and unity. I will confide in the House that after communing earlier yesterday with my conscience I figured out that if I threw my "nothing" pitch in there, the Republicans might work together, hit together, run bases together—and perhaps establish a measure of unity in that party and thus preserve the two-party system for this country.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I should like to say to the gentleman, my observations of the night's festivities out at District of Columbia Stadium were that it was more fun than baseball.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman very much.

CONGRESSIONAL BALLGAME

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest that perhaps one of the weaknesses of the Democrat ballplayers last night was that they have not been drinking enough Arizona "goldwater."

EMPLOYMENT OF OLDER WORKERS

Mr. PEPPER. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a report of the Department of Labor, which is reported this morning in the Washington Post, on the subject, "The Older American Worker/Age Discrimination in Employment."

The first paragraph of the summary is:

> The Labor Department told Congress yesterday that major changes in the patterns of American life will be needed to achieve hiring on ability rather than age.

I invite the attention of all Members of the House to this study, and particularly to H.R. 7763, introduced by me in April of this year, in which I seek an expression of Congress that the full Employment Act of 1946 contemplated full employment "regardless of sex or age."

WIRTZ REPORT ASKS AID FOR OLDER WORKERS—YEAR'S STUDY CITES DISCRIMINATION, RISING PROBLEMS

(By Morton Mintz)

The Labor Department told Congress yesterday that major changes in the patterns of American life will be needed to achieve hiring on ability rather than age.

A report submitted by Secretary W. Willard Wirtz urges a clear, unequivocal national policy against hiring that discriminates against older workers. Ultimately, the policy would need legislation.

The report was based on year-long studies of unprecedented depth. It is 78 pages long. It was prepared under a directive of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Its title is, "The Older

American Worker/Age Discrimination in Employment."

The report includes some surprising findings and far-reaching recommendations—particularly those involving "almost an iron law":

Most persons with a high school education, or less, sooner or later urgently need further education and training.

But the report says "only the most limited arrangements" exist for that education and training.

The Department urges "a new system of continuing educational opportunity" to prepare older workers for the "discrimination" older workers have most to fear.

This is not employer malice. Nor is it the product of an unthinking majority in a society half of which is under 29 today and will be under 26 in 1975.

URGES NEW SYSTEM

Instead, the report says, it is the "ruthless play of wholly impersonal forces," for example, the advancing science that lengthens a person's productive life while lowering the age limit on his employment.

Although full employment is the primary goal in eliminating disadvantages to older workers, the Department says, the "new system" must be created to prepare people for the day when the lifetime work for which they have prepared "tapers off but a lot of life remains to be lived."

The new system would make it possible for workers to make up for their earlier failure to complete grade or high school. One possibility for financing such adult education would be a system of contributory insurance.

Workers over 45 might earn credits toward "education sabbaticals." Indirectly, these could create job openings for others, the report suggests.

STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

Other recommendations—none of which constitutes a proposal by the administration—include these:

A national policy against age discrimination, which would extend existing Federal policy for Government hiring and Government contractors, is needed because the resources of the States in this area have been inadequate.

To overcome employer reluctance against hiring qualified older workers because of existing pension and seniority arrangements, employers and unions should seek in negotiations to open up opportunities for older industrial employees, while protecting the seniority right of workers already employed.

New forms of annuities should be developed that leave existing pension plans intact while encouraging the hiring of older workers. This might require special tax incentives.

There should be prompt study of "portable pension credits" that would enable a worker to carry his take in a pension plan with him to a new job.

By making Federal financial aid in a form similar to that for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Government could enable the hiring of older workers to meet many unmet community needs.

CHOICE OF PAYMENTS

The report said we may face this choice: Pay, as customers, a few cents an hour of the wages of an older worker and make him a producer, or pay, as taxpayers, "the full amount of his 'welfare' upkeep" and get nothing in return.

One of the surprising findings was the extent of the difference in education among older and younger workers. Among male workers age 45 to 54, for example, one-third of the whites and two-thirds of the nonwhites have not gone beyond the eighth grade.

These educationally disadvantaged people must compete for jobs against, for example, persons 25 to 34 only a few of whom, relatively, have not gone beyond the 8th grade.

Other findings of the report include these:

In the 30 States that do not bar age discrimination, half the job openings are closed to applicants over 55 and a quarter to applicants over 45.

Many age limitations are imposed without regard to their job requirements, although older workers generally perform at least as well as younger ones.

As new technology displaces older industries, plants and methods, older workers find their training and skills of less and less use. One-seventh of the Nation's impoverished persons are over 65.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by inserting after "work," the following: "regardless of sex or age,".

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT NOVICE G. FAWCETT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Ohio State University has a very capable administrator in President Novice G. Fawcett. That great university has grown in size, capacity, and stature under his leadership for he is truly an outstanding educator and gentleman. I read with interest his very fine commencement address which was delivered to the graduating class on June 11, 1965.

I think it has merit which should be called to the attention of every Member of this body. From Maine to California, educators are witnessing serious challenge ranging from their continuing goal of improving educational excellence in their institutions to the matter of discipline, riots, and so forth. President Fawcett puts these matters in very fine perspective.

The speech is as follows:

I DARE YOU

(Commencement address by President Novice G. Fawcett, the Ohio State University, June 11, 1965)

Historically—and perhaps by premeditation—the president of this university has given the commencement address quadrennially. I have been told that the theory behind this traditional schedule is that once in 4 years—not necessarily more often than that—a president might have an idea worth exploiting.

In any case, according to Eric Ashby, master of Clare College, Cambridge, ideas entertained by college administrators are sometimes forced to follow devious paths before they reach fruition. "In British universities," says Dr. Ashby, "naked enterprise on the part of a university president is regarded with suspicion, not to say alarm. If a president has a bright idea * * * he must unobtrusively—if possible anonymously—feed it into the organization, at quite a low level, informally over morning coffee, and watch it percolate slowly upward. With luck it will come to his desk months later for approval, and he must greet it with the pleased surprise which parents exhibit when their children show them what Santa Claus has brought them for Christmas."

Surely there must be a lesson in Dr. Ashby's illustration for American university presidents as well.

Whether or not I have an idea to expound, this commencement provides me with several reasons for appearing as the speaker, although I have rather ambivalent feelings about my task. As a parent of a member of this class, I would prefer, on this joyous occasion, to sit among other parents here and, at the appropriate time, say proudly to Mrs. Fawcett, "There is our daughter."

Nevertheless, because of the excellent record of this class and because I cherish personal acquaintanceship with many of you, I have a special measure of pride and satisfaction in delivering this address, and I welcome a self-made opportunity to express a few personally valued ideas.

May I briefly but sincerely express my gratitude and that of the university to each of the graduating seniors? This June class of 1965, to complete the memorabilia of its activities here, commissioned a portrait of the president as its gift to the university, a gesture which humbled me but for which I am doubly appreciative when I consider the excellent quality of the artist's work and the fine result he achieved with so difficult a subject. I do not yet know where the portrait will be hung (parenthetically, there are some, no doubt, who wonder when the president will be hung), but perhaps eventually its resting place will be in our new center for tomorrow. Wherever it may be placed, I hope, with all humility, that it will be viewed not as a memorial to an individual but as a symbol of that individual's dedicated belief in the goal of this university—the highest peak of excellence in education. In the words of the Apocrypha, I trust that future generations of students may "consider that I labored not for myself only, but for all them that seek learning."

This morning marks the 36th commencement during my tenure at this university. In my entire career as an educator, I have attended and participated in some 200 such programs, and have had ample opportunity to study what commencement speakers try to do. I have learned that some speakers promote a vested interest. Others present the wisdom of their experience, propounding certain precepts and doctrines which they hope will guide people toward what they should be and what they should do. Still others cast before their audience a panorama of life's complexities and perversities; or they survey part of our social structure and present findings which they believe compose the mosaic of the future. And there are some who rely on inspiration to stimulate and provide an incentive for their listeners.

All of these are good techniques, and I shall probably use some of them, but, fundamentally, my objective is to present you with some challenges; to say—loudly and clearly—"I dare you." My paramount challenge to you is the challenge that confronts us as a nation and as individuals: to raise high your standards of excellence—your standards of thought, behavior, taste, aspirations; to keep ever in your mind and actions the values which will be expressive of your loftiest goals. As Paul the Apostle counseled Timothy: "Let no man despise Thy youth; but be Thou an example, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity. Neglect not the gift that is in Thee. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that Thy profiting may appear to all."

Why, you may ask, is it necessary to emphasize the importance of values? Surely we all have the intellectual and moral strength

with which to face the challenges of our maturity. And my answer is that what you think, how you think, and the personal decisions you make in the decades to come will help shape—for good or ill—the face of the future. And speaking of thinking: Let us remember that the ability to think acutely, perceptively, creatively is the most important function of man, and that the irrevocable condition of accelerating change and ever widening choices in our society will call upon all of your capability to think wisely and well.

Lucien Price pointed out that we have been catapulted into more change in the past 50 years than in the preceding 3,000 years. Our progenitors, for example, drove oxen—but so did the warriors in Homer's "Iliad." Now we travel down into the infinitely small of nuclear physics and upward into the inconceivable vastness of astronautical exploration. "In the past," said Mr. Price, "we were educated to live in a world as is; in the future we must be educated to function in a world where change comes fast and will keep on coming faster," affecting every aspect of life, including personal values.

One of your greatest responsibilities, I firmly believe, is to develop personal values which will help create some kind of order and harmony and proportion in your own lives and in a world afflicted by unrest and uncertainty, by a breakdown of many of our standards of excellence.

Let us look briefly at a few of the evidences in our society of this degradation of moral principles. Perhaps the most obvious example is the 15-percent annual increase in crime and the frightening statistic that approximately 1 person out of 75 commits a major offense. Figures from the Federal Bureau of Investigation point to a similar cancerous growth of what we euphemistically call "juvenile delinquency." For 15 consecutive years there has been a sharp increase in arrests of young offenders under 18 years of age, and it is a sad commentary on the state of our society that 4 out of every 100 young people become involved in crime.

How many delinquents are school dropouts it would be difficult to estimate, but in 128 of the Nation's largest cities the dropout rate after grade 10 stands at a shocking 30 percent. So that you may visualize what that figure means, imagine what would have happened if 30 percent of this graduating class had been dropouts: almost a thousand of you would not be here to receive diplomas today.

Alcoholism—admittedly a health as well as a moral problem—affects the well-being of our society only slightly less drastically than crime. The World Health Organization estimates that there are 5 million alcoholics in the United States and that 200,000 new cases arise annually.

Sociologists point to the epidemic proportions of divorce in our society. Consider these figures for a moment: one marriage out of every four ends in divorce, and in teenage marriages, one out of two. Marriages of college graduates appear to have a better chance of permanence—only 1 out of 20 ends in divorce—but the fact remains, as I have heard it said, that "too many people who say 'I do'—do not." According to these statistics, there could be more than 150 divorces among the members of this graduating class. This alone is an unhappy prospect, but consider also the somber situation of the children of divorce who, in their loneliness and lack of parental guidance, find themselves lost in the heterogeneity of a populace without values.

Equally and just as profoundly lost are some of today's teenagers whose parents appear to be less inclined than ever to proclaim the conventional "parental imperatives" or, denying their own values, have simply given up trying to communicate with their children. As one high school student commented, "I do not get any guidance at home. We are just a bunch of people who go about our business and live under one roof. One of these days I would like to sit down and find out from my parents what they really believe in."

And now this past year has brought a radical testing of law and order on American college campuses everywhere across the land. Students have been using their campuses as a platform not only to express dissatisfaction with what is taking place in the world but to take action against the ills of society. Student demonstrations have flared up from a wide variety of causes ranging from segregation to all the manifestations of civil rights and civil liberties; from the whole concept of academic freedom to the complex issues of free speech; and from the conduct of America's foreign policy to the conduct of administrative policies in their own colleges and universities. These groups of students seem to believe that an institution of higher learning is designed to create a new social order by direct action, by force and coercion.

In contrast to this epidemic of rebellion and protest, the great body of students in our colleges remains dedicated to the idea of orderly and democratic procedures. Many of them, no doubt, have their own strong convictions about the need to reform certain social evils. They are aware of the value of questioning, the value of sharpening the cutting edge of their minds on the difficult problems of our time, but they recognize and respect the functions of inquiry and logic and debate in the pursuit of truth.

Lest you think me a pessimist or a prophet of doom, let me assure you that I stress these negative qualities of our society only because I believe that each one of you possesses the basic values to be seriously concerned with what goes on around you. I think you will subscribe to this statement of principles from the Rockefeller report on education: "We do not believe that men were meant to live in degradation. We believe that man—by virtue of his humanity—should live in the light of reason, exercise moral responsibility, and be free to develop to the full the talents that are in him."

What, then, shall be the pattern of your service in a world plagued with frightful statistics of narcotics addiction, with waves of indecency and pornography inundating our literature, and with inequality of opportunity stifling the intellectual creativity of man? According to Dr. Samuel Miller, dean of the Harvard Divinity School, "The revolutionary changes that have been wrought in our world demand a new kind of person. Whatever form it takes, it will matter little if we, in all our suffering, cannot produce a person having such inner magnitude as to pull the mad chaos of our world into some kind of new shape, to put the impress of a larger spirit on it."

But the opportunity to impress your spirit upon the world presents also a responsibility—the responsibility of active participation, of dedicated citizenship, of service to others. For, after all, democracy in action is not a spectator sport. Each citizen is an important player. To the extent that he does not participate, he is weakening the essential fabric of society; by his silence and his apathy, he is encouraging the enemies of freedom and contributing to a further breakdown of social values. Edward Gibbon, historian of "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," said of the Athenians: "When the freedom they wished most was freedom from responsibility, Athens ceased to be free and was never free again."

Whatever form your participation may take, it will not be an easy task; it will require, on your part, the courage of conviction and commitment. So I dare you now to accept the challenges, often unspoken, which come from within yourselves. Those challenger are often easy to ignore, because you know that no one but yourself has heard them; no one will compel you to accept the dare; no one will make fun of you or call you a coward.

No one, that is, but yourself.

I urge you, therefore, to face the challenges squarely and to evaluate them in terms of your own high quality of mind and strength of character. I urge you, in the words of Emerson, "to believe your own thought, to believe that what is true for you in your private heart is true for all men."

You could illustrate this point from the literature of your own religion, but permit me to paraphrase from the story of Peter the Apostle and his denial of Jesus. Peter, history recounts, was an impulsive and generous man, impressive in physical stature and steadfast in his faith. But he had moments of weakness. When Jesus was taken from Gethsemane to be questioned by the high priest, Peter had the courage to follow; but when he was questioned three times about his identity and his loyalties, he shrank from his true self and refused to admit that he was one of the disciples. To quote the Gospel according to St. Luke: "And Peter remembered the words of Jesus, which said unto him, Before the cock crows, thou shalt deny me thrice. And he went out, and wept bitterly."

Next, my friends, I dare you to build into your lives not only strong moral values but the courage of action which will give them validity and make them work in today's world. Now why is the word "courage" so often associated with values which should be an integral part of our everyday lives? Is it because we are embarrassed to display these virtues? Or because we are afraid of pressures, afraid to say "No," afraid to be different? Fear or cynicism or conformity—not one of these is an acceptable reason for discarding moral values, or for hiding them. "One man with courage makes a majority," said Andrew Jackson. In fact, courage in its highest form—moral courage—is what makes a person indestructible, for each act of courage adds to man's faith in himself and in the purpose and dignity of life. If courage is required, then I say that you should have the determination to build ever more solidly the bulwark of values you have acquired from the great lessons of your spiritual faith and from your belief in humanity. Marcus Aurelius, in his "Meditations," admonished that "Thou must be like a promontory of the sea, against which, though the waves beat continually, yet it both itself stands, and about it are those swelling waves stilled and quieted."

My next challenge—"Dare to face the discipline of work"—may not appear to be pertinent to this occasion, for by virtue of the degrees that will be awarded to you this morning you have proved that you possess the capacity for disciplined and fruitful effort. But in the ventures that lie ahead—in business and the professions, in continued academic work and in the home—you will find that there is not only dignity to be achieved from well-disciplined work, but one of life's greatest pleasures, for work can be the delight of doing a job superbly well, the excitement of creativity, the satisfaction of being interested in everything you do and the ability to extend that interest endlessly in the never completed task of learning.

Finally, I dare you to have faith in America's free enterprise system. All of us depend upon business and industry for the houses we live in, the food we eat, the clothes we wear, the books we read—for everything that touches our daily lives—yet many of us take our free enterprise system for granted, forgetting that it is the key to our success as a nation and the foundation of our freedom. Henry R. Luce, editor and publisher of Fortune, describes our business-enterprise system as "the greatest miracle of them all. It meets the demands of businessmen that

it should provide ample opportunity for production for profit—and it also meets the demands of the welfare of all the people. It is the genius of America that it has worked out an economic system by which the public interest is continually represented, while the public enjoys the blessing of liberty and the fruits of competitive and skillful management and initiative. In most of the rest of the world you will not find anything like this."

So long as business enterprise continues to expand its responsibilities in the public interest, to that extent we will not become a welfare state, demanding security in place of freedom. I believe that a simple phrase, the right to choose, expresses well a major reason for America's great economic and cultural strength—a reason why our free enterprise system and our system of government complement one another so perfectly.

The American has always had the right to choose his job; the right to use his earnings as he wishes; the right to choose his education, his religion, his home, his public servants. He has the right to make his own decisions; the right to risk failure or gain success. This doctrine is a dynamic one, and, in my opinion, by placing your faith in a strong and free economy you will be helping to preserve one of the great forces that have given us strength individually and as a Nation.

What, in truth, are these values we have been discussing? Actually, they evolve out of a lifetime of experience of building simple meanings into complex concepts of thought and behavior. Further refined and enriched, these concepts become the values by which we live and by which we serve. Built on a discipline of the mind, our values constitute our greatest strength, giving us the power not only to discriminate between right and wrong but to experience intellectual and emotional pleasure in such things as the companionship of books, the inspiration of noble architecture and great art, the sound of music, the majesty of mountains, sea, and stars—in fact, in all things that have integrity and beauty.

I have tried to present for your consideration some standards of excellence which may serve as a guide in our world of shifting values because I so strongly believe that your sense of values and your active participation can be poignant in the transformation of life. So once more I dare you, in the spirit of Tennyson's "Ulysses": "Follow knowledge like a shining star beyond the utmost bound of human thought. Come, my friends, 'Tis not too late to seek a newer world. Push off, and sitting well in order smite the sounding furrows; for my purpose holds to sail beyond the sunset, and the baths of all the western stars, until I die. To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

It is argued that history will judge us by our culture rather than by our material accomplishments. A culture is continuously re-created, for good or for ill. For some, this re-creation will be a dreary burden; for others, it will be an invitation to greatness. In the spirit of the dare with which I began, I urge you, with your freshness of vision, to bring new vitality to values in your own behavior as you face the catastrophes of social ills, pressures, and cruelties.

What was Keats' reference to man's ability to locate the citadel inside himself? It is always difficult to deal with the interior struggle between good and evil, exhilaration and defeatism. But there will be no need for despair. Something indomitable in man wants goodness to prevail. The values you hold in trust will elevate man out of perversity into a better life.

Therefore, I say: Strive, my friends, to attain the lofty eminence of that pinnacle in life which will ennoble the mind and inspire you to nourish and exalt the human spirit.

SLAVS HERE BEFORE "MAYFLOWER"

Mr. HUTCHINSON. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the greatness of our country is based on the immigrants from foreign lands who reached our shores and often in very unique ways contributed to the healthy growth of our system of government and our free enterprise economy.

Mr. John C. Sciranka, of Passaic, N.J., is a scholar who has devoted much of his time to studying the historic contribution of Slavs to the United States. I include in the RECORD at this point excerpts from his article, "Slavs Here Before *Mayflower*," which appeared in the May 1965 edition of the Children's Friend, a publication of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America:

SLAVS HERE BEFORE "MAYFLOWER"

(By John C. Sciranka)

During the various celebrations and the Sokol Centennial which are being arranged for this historical year, we recall proudly that the Slavs were here before the *Mayflower*. The American Slovaks are proud that they belong to a family of over 350 million Slavs of whom over 35 million are loyal American citizens.

We recall that besides the famous Dalmatians, who are Croats from the present day Yugoslavia and accompanied Christopher Columbus on his voyage to the New World, it is most significant that a year before the *Mayflower* dropped anchor off the New England coast, carrying immigrants who were to establish a Puritan theocracy in the northern wilderness, Polish, Slovak, and other Slav immigrants were fighting for democratic rights in the young Virginia colony.

Before relating these historical facts, let us pause with historians and fill ourselves with pride that the doughty Capt. John Smith, of Virginia fame, implanted his name firmly in the history of New England States, a dozen years before Capt. Myles Standish appeared on the scene with the Pilgrim Fathers.

Capt. John Smith fought the Turks with the Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, and other Christian Slavs before coming to establish Jamestown, Va., in 1607. He brought the mentioned Slavs with him as craftsmen to the New World. He admired their courage for he fought with them against the Turks. After winning many decorations for bravery against the Turks, he visited as a hero Poland, Moravia, Bohemia, Slovakia, and other countries of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. And again these Slavonic warriors, when they witnessed Smith's bravery, they did not hesitate to join his expedition to the New World, where he headed the Virginia colony as its president. Although Smith was forced to quit the presidency of the colony, he put New England on the map. He was known as "Admiral of New England" for he commanded a two-ship expedition to the coast of New England in 1614. After his return to England with a cargo of codfish, Smith planned to return to establish a colony in New England. No doubt, he had Slavs, his faithful warriors on this expedition, for he had the greatest trust in them.

* * * * *

And on Thursday, July 26, 1956, the New York Journal-American published on its editorial page, under the title "Early Americans" from the pen of this writer, also the above facts, with this addition: "Slovaks took it for granted that the first Slovak to reach America was Count Maurice de Benovsky, who came to Baltimore in 1785 at the recommendation of Benjamin Franklin. No doubt, your Polish and Slovak readers will be interested in knowing that 100 years before the birth of Benjamin Franklin, two skilled Slovak craftsmen and four Poles helped to build the first permanent settlement in the New World."

In connection with these historical facts, this is what Congressman FLOOD had to say about Count Benovsky, who was born in Vrbovce, Nitra County, Slovakia, and has many countrymen in New York City, especially downtown in the Wall Street area, where they have a Vrbovciansky Kruzok (circle), meeting in the restaurant of a well known Slovak leader, John Mitacek: "And in the War of Revolution," continued Congressman FLOOD, "Slovak love for liberty was exemplified in the military exploits of Count Maurice Benovsky, who served with Pulaski at Savannah and who was born in the storied Nitra, the See of St. Methodius."

Benovsky came to Baltimore, Md., well known Bohemian settlement in 1785 at the recommendation of Benjamin Franklin, our American Ambassador, who met him in Paris and gave him letters of introduction to American businessmen. Benovsky came on his ship *Intrepid*. Later Benovsky became King of the Madagascar, where he was mortally wounded. Now, it is, indeed, remarkable that a century before Benjamin Franklin's birth, two skilled Slovak craftsmen and four Poles, helped build Jamestown, the first permanent English settlement in the New World.

* * * * *

May we be permitted to suggest at this point that we too take a lesson from the first colonists and train young folks to take our places in the Slavonic and Slovak organizations. We can see that the spirit of training future leaders was always the objective of our pioneers. We can see it also from the actions of Peter Stuyvesant, who 50 years after the Jamestown experiment, as Governor of New Amsterdam, now New York, held out allurements to a group of Slavonic pioneers.

Augustine Herman, born in 1600, first Czech (Bohemian) in America, was on his board of advisers. Herman later established Bohemian Manor in Maryland and made a first map of the State. He died in Maryland in 1686.

In 1659 a group of Poles arrived and settled near Fort Orange, now New York, where their skill as tillers of the soil soon became evident.

During the same period of the Dutch occupation, Dr. Alexander Kuriusz, a Pole, whose name has become known to history as Curtius, is credited with having established the first school of secondary education in America, which subsequently became an academy at which pioneers of more than one racial strain received their early education.

In connection with this, we wish to mention Bedrich Phillipse, founder of the Phillipse Manor, another Czech refugee from Holland, who was very influential in Westchester County, near Tarrytown, N.Y., and his beautiful daughter Marie was courted by Gen. George Washington, famous Father of our Country.

JAN A. KOMENSKY

Our thoughts also turn to the famous Harvard University, where the renowned educator, Johannes Amos Commenius (Komensky) was invited almost three centuries ago to be its rector. Komensky was born in Moravia and the University of Bratislava, Slovakia, is named for him. He spent most of his youthful years in Presov, metropolis of eastern Slovakia. Komensky's monument

stands in front of the Moravian College, Bethlehem, Pa., founded by Moravians, where we will hold our Slovak Catholic Sokol National Slet and Track and Field Meet on July 15–18, 1965 at Lehigh University.

Perusing the pages of history we find that Maj. John J. Polerecky, son of Count Andrew Polerecky of Slovakia, came to America with the French Expeditionary Army of Rochambeau to fight under General Washington. Major Polerecky remained in America after the Revolutionary War. First he resided in Boston and later settled in Maine, where he died on June 8, 1830. The famous John Hancock signed his naturalization papers as Governor of Massachusetts.

The Slavs fought in the Civil War, when the Sokol organization was established in Prague, on the side of Abraham Lincoln and in all subsequent wars.

In the volume of "Passaic and Its Environs," by late historian, William W. Scott, Rev. Henry Loskiel, a Moravian missionary, is mentioned. He was baptizing Indians in 1676 in the vicinity of Passaic. And Moravians were Slavs, who with the Czechs and Slovaks formed the great Moravian Empire, whose ruler, Rastislav, invited SS. Cyril and Methodius to his domain in A.D. 863. Christian Post, a Moravian missionary, is mentioned as one of the founders of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa. His great accomplishments were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the writer.

Polish nobleman, Zaborowski, who was an early settler in New Amsterdam, later moved to New Jersey, where he acquired large tracts of land in Bergen County, along the Passaic River, now home of countless Slavs. The family is known as Zabriskie. Poles have settled in Delaware with other Slavs as early as 1650, according to our records.

Reviewing all these facts, it is no wonder that the Slovaks are called the "Yankees of Europe." The writer quotes in his booklet "Slovaks Under the Stars and Stripes," published in 1929 by the Foreign Language Information Service, popularly known as FLIS and now as Common Council, the late President William Howard Taft, who received the American Slovaks, headed by Peter V. Revnianek in Washington, D.C., in 1910, when the question "What is your mother tongue?" was added on the census questionnaires. This same President Taft, during World War I, as President of Yale University, addressing several thousand Slovaks and Sokols in Bridgeport, Conn., stated: "The truth is, we need a little poetry among our native Americans, we need appreciation of poetic ideals, we need to have mixed with our everyday humdrum life a little bit of romance that you bring from the old country and we welcome you on that account. Slovaks are the 'Americans by choice.' They feel for America a deep gratitude. Here many of the rights denied in their native country have been theirs unquestioned. It is on American soil that the Slovak literature has largely sprung into being even the Slovak language has been shaped."

THE SOMALI REPUBLIC CELEBRATES INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, British Somaliland became independent on June 26, 1960. On July 1, 1960, Italian Somalia achieved its independence and joined with British Somaliland to form the Somali Republic.

The Somali Republic faced many problems in combining the two formerly separate areas into an effective national operation. She is to be congratulated on her achievements in establishing a stable country and a working parliamentary democracy.

The achievements of the Somali Republic are the more notable in light of the limited economic resources of the country. Though it is at present a primarily pastoral-agricultural economy, efforts are being made to diversify and expand with the help of foreign capital.

Today, the Somali Republic is celebrating 5 years of independence. I want to convey the best wishes of the American people to the people of the Somali Republic, with the hope that they will enjoy continued economic progress and political stability.

PROPOSING AN INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION TO STUDY THE NECESSARY REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations, when chartered 20 years ago, exemplified the hopeful idealism of a tired world which had suffered through two major wars in quick succession. In those past 20 years, much has happened which can be chalked up on both the debit and credit side of the ledger. And an answer to the blunt question of the Organization's success can be posed in either positive or negative terms. A strict yes or no would be impossible.

But whether we agree or disagree with the U.N.'s actions, its impact on the world scene is undeniable. This impact has been felt in the Congo, Cyprus, Kashmir, and upon the regional pacts which are an important part of the free world's defenses—ANZUS, CENTO, NATO, the OAS, and SEATO. The recognized need for such pacts can be attributed to the widespread feeling that the United Nations, when the chips are down, becomes paralyzed into inaction. The point, therefore, is not necessarily to build more regional pacts, or to rely on more extra-U.N. organizations, but to mold the U.N. into a more effective, active, and respected organization.

The experience in international organization which the world has gained from the ill-fated League of Nations, and in the past 20 years from the U.N. has provided a strong tradition in international cooperation. This tradition is being threatened by the cumbersome and generally impractical machinery under which the U.N. was chartered. In 1945, the world arena was an illusion of great power cooperation. This illusion was dissipated in record time. The conditions under which the charter was effected are no longer in existence, yet no serious advances have been made in revising it.

The past 20 years have shown the world that changes should be made; that the charter is in need of some very important and very basic revisions in the organizational and financial realms. Attempted steps in this direction within the organization have previously met with skeptical rejection from those on the other side of the ideological fence. These countries, interested in using the U.N. as an extension of their threatening foreign policy arm, should not be allowed to block honest attempts at revision.

It is clear that if the new forces which are currently entering the world arena are to be taken in stride, the United Nations organization must be flexible. If future paralysis is to be avoided, the machinery must be oiled, not left to rust. It should be remembered that when the League of Nations lost its international support and degenerated into an international debating society, incapable of doing anything relevant to the world scene at the time—incapable of censoring Mussolini in Ethiopia, incapable of repudiating Hitler in Europe—World War II resulted. What might have been is always an interesting question, and I would hope that this past experience would serve as a warning for the future.

The United Nations has been an avenue of hope for a peaceful world. And the emphasis, on this 20th anniversary, should be a hopeful look to the future, and not a dark look to the past. I would therefore urge the President of the United States, in this 20th anniversary year, to take the initiative and propose the establishment of an international commission, constituted along the same lines as the International Law Commission, for the purposes of studying revision of the U.N. Charter. It is in the best interests of the United States, the United Nations, and the entire world to accomplish this revision.

THE BLUE REDCAP

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, readers of this journal may recall that on June 24, 1965, I brought to attention the story of a 53-year-old redcap at the municipal airport at Mobile, Ala.

Clarence Robinson had been visited by agents of the Department of Labor who seemed to feel that he should be paying a minimum wage to two other redcaps even though the two are not employees. Each of the three gentlemen simply ap-

pear every day at the airport terminal and take their chances at receiving tips.

If Mr. Robinson is required to pay the minimum wage he would have to pay more than his total income.

On June 23 I wrote to the Secretary of Labor to bring this problem to his attention. On June 28 he responded, saying that the matter had been referred to the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Contracts Division.

Meanwhile, Mr. Robinson has been formally notified that he must pay $1,104.78 in "back wages" to the other two redcaps. And they say they do not want either the "back wages" or the minimum wage.

As further information on this subject, I call attention to the newspaper item appearing in the Mobile Press of June 29, and my letter of this date to the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor asking for assistance in providing help where it is needed to a deserving constituent.

[From the Mobile Press, June 29]

"BLUE" REDCAP PLOT GROWS

(By Bill Sellers)

The plot had thickened this week in the stirring drama of "The Redcap vs. the Department of Labor."

In case you don't recall, Clarence Robinson, redcap at Mobile's Municipal Airport, recently became the subject of an intense probe by the wage and hour branch of the Department of Labor.

Investigators decided that since Robinson carries the luggage of people who have crossed State lines, he is involved in interstate commerce. Therefore, they decreed, he must pay two other associate redcaps minimum Federal wages of $1.25 an hour.

HE PROTESTS

Robinson protested that he had not hired anyone and that the other two men were simply coming to the airport every day on a gamble—gambling that they would get tipped and that weather would permit flying.

A Mobile Press account of Robinson's plight was called to the attention of Congress by Representative JACK EDWARDS of Mobile who had the story inserted into the Congressional Record.

EDWARDS said the action against Robinson seemed designed "to prolong the war on poverty by adding to the list of those who are poverty-stricken."

CAN'T AFFORD IT

By poverty-stricken, he referred to Robinson who contends that he only makes $30 weekly himself and therefore cannot afford to pay the other two men a minimum wage which would amount to about $200 weekly—or $170 more than he collects.

Nonetheless, Robinson opened a real official-looking envelope from the wage and hour branch a few days ago and almost had a spasm.

He was being directed to pay one of the other redcaps back wages amounting to $919.10 and the other man a total of $185.60—a total of $1,104.78.

THEY DON'T WANT IT

And now comes the real kicker: the two men whose rights are being so zealously protected by their Government don't want the money.

Airport Manager Perry Baucum has reported to city officials that both men have repeatedly said they don't want the back pay nor the $1.25 an hour.

They say they are willing to "gamble" just like Robinson, according to Baucum.

Congressman EDWARDS has meanwhile called the case to the attention of Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz.

Robinson, however, is beginning to feel that his airport "gamble" has produced a gigantic pair of snake eyes.

JULY 1, 1965.

The Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: One day during the week of June 7 agents of the Department of Labor interviewed Mr. Clarence Robinson of Mobile, Ala., regarding provisions of the Wage and Hour Act in his association with two other gentlemen.

Mr. Robinson is a 53-year-old Negro who works as redcap at the Mobile Municipal Airport. His two associates are men who share the baggage carrying activities at the airport during hours when Robinson himself has completed his 9-hour day. They are not employees. Each of the three men simply appear at the airport and take their chances that travelers will leave tips.

Mr. Robinson pays the municipality a sum of $30 per month for the privilege of being on the scene as a luggage handler. If Mr. Robinson were to be required to pay the minimum wage to the other two men (who are not employees) he would have to pay them substantially more than his income.

On June 23, 1965, I wrote the Secretary of Labor to bring this situation to his attention. In a return letter the Department informs me the matter is being looked into.

Meanwhile, the Wage and Hour branch has formally notified Mr. Robinson that he must pay the other redcaps back wages amounting to a total of $1,104.78.

My understanding is that the two other redcaps have formally notified the airport manager that they do not wish to receive either the back payment of wages or the $1.25 an hour as a minimum wage. Perhaps it is because they realize better than the Department of Labor that enforcement of these regulations in this case will cause all three hardworking gentlemen to lose their means of livelihood.

I will very much appreciate any assistance or helpful information that you may be able to provide. Thank you.

Sincerely,

JE.

CANADA'S 98TH BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER], is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, during the past several years it has been my privilege to be chairman of the House delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group. Along with our colleagues from the Senate whose delegation has been headed by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, we have met at least annually with a group of Canadian parliamentarians to examine problems of mutual interest and concern to our two countries. I will leave to others who have served on our delegation to express their views on the values derived from these meetings. For my part I will content myself with the observation that I have gained a perspective on our relations with Canada that no amount of reading could produce.

I have asked for this special order today, July 1, for a very special reason. Today is the 98th birthday of Canada. In our diplomatic list it is designated as "Confederation Day." Others refer to it as "Dominion Day," which I believe is still the legal title. And still others are content to call it "Canada Day." The particular name is not nearly as significant as the events that have made this a day of celebration for all Canadians.

Our Independence Day marks the adoption by the Continental Congress of the Declaration of Independence, a bill of particulars against the King of Great Britain. And once we declared our independence, we had to fight for it.

In contrast, Confederation Day in Canada commemorates neither the start of a fight for independence nor the successful conclusion of a war or revolution. Rather, it is one of the more significant milestones in a steady and peaceful evolution of Canada as a sovereign state.

It may not be fully appreciated either by Canadians or by Americans that the celebration of Confederation Day is due in part to the United States. Events and attitudes in this country, particularly in the years immediately preceding 1867, stimulated both Canadians and Britishers to think how best to counter the United States.

Canada, like the United States, was a frontier country. The ideas of the American Revolution and of the Jacksonian period had their impact on Canadian thinking. The American Revolution also had its impact in Britain. It stimulated many Britishers to reappraise the value of colonies. This, together with the rise of economic liberalism, made almost all segments of British leadership willing to reexamine the relation of the mother country with its dependencies. And their thinking was fortified by the famous report of Lord Durham in 1839 that urged union for the provinces of Canada and a system of responsible government.

Our own Civil War—or War Between the States—intensified anti-British sentiment in this country. Canada as an outpost of Britain felt this sentiment more than Britain did. In 1866 we abrogated the Reciprocity Treaty with Britain. The most important result was Canada's heavy loss of markets in the United States. On the military side a series of border incursions into Canada from the United States raised problems of how best Canada would be defended. The burden was Britain's, but British opinion favored the colonies assuming the obligation of their own defense. Behind these specific and identifiable issues was the recurrent and strident theme of a minority in the United States that the only solution for our northern border difficulties was the annexation of Canada.

Like our own Founding Fathers, Canada pays its homage to a hardy band of 33 "Fathers of Confederation." Their average age was 46—and four of them were only in their 30's. Chief among these was Sir John A. Macdonald who had, in the words of one Canadian historian, "the supreme gift of leadership." A Scotsman by birth, he had come to Canada as a child, studied and practiced law, and was active throughout his life in Canadian politics. Others like Sir Georges Etienne Cartier, Sir Samuel Leonard Tilley, Sir Etienne P. Tache and

George Brown, were the Canadian equivalents of our Adams, Jefferson, Franklin and Wilson. I must make special reference to one other Canadian "Father" Sir Charles Tupper, of Nova Scotia, whose skill and determination brought that Province into Canada. One of his descendants is STANLEY TUPPER, the gentleman from Maine, who has served with distinction on our delegation of parliamentarians.

It was this small group who brought about the confederation of four Canadian Provinces—Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia— into partial self-government in 1867. Within a few years the western provinces and then the midwestern provinces were linked. The last of the 10 provinces to join the union of Canada was Newfoundland in 1949.

Since 1867 there have, of course, been many other events that mark the transformation of Canada from a self-governing dominion to a fully soverign nation. But like so many things British, these were often small precedents which the passage of time has elevated into basic principles.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any Member of this body will deny me the privilege of expressing to our Canadian friends the greetings of this House. I leave it to officials in the executive branch to convey appropriate expressions through formal and well-established diplomatic channels. But we who glory in the freedom of speech can extend in less formal phrases to our legislative opposites in Canada our own cordial and sincere sentiments on an occasion such as this. To all Canadians, from sea to sea, it is my pleasure to say "Happy Birthday." You may not always agree with us, but yours has always been an honorable course and we respect you. The House of Representatives of the United States Congress wishes for your country the continued blessings that liberty brings to men.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, which has done so much to improve working relations between our two great nations, I would like to join with my other colleagues in extending best wishes to our neighbors in Canada on Confederation Day, July 1, a day so close to our own Independence Day.

In 1867, a small group known as "Fathers of Confederation" brought about the confederation of four Canadian Provinces—Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia—into partial self-government. Within a few years the western Provinces and then the midwestern Provinces were linked. The last of the 10 Provinces to join the Union of Canada was Newfoundland in 1949.

Plans are now in progress for the celebration of the 100th anniversary to be held July 1, 1967, in Montreal, which is known as EXPO 67. I have been personally kept informed of the progress of this fine exposition through periodic reports of this program. The United States will be represented by a pavilion, which has already been authorized by Congress, and I certainly hope that I will be able to personally join in the celebration of this centennial.

Canadians have every right to be proud of the achievement of their confederation, as we are proud of our independence for which much blood was shed.

The United States and Canada share the same continent with its vast resources, potentialities, history and customs, each nation completely independent yet banded together for the protection of our shores.

It is a privilege to serve as a member of the interparliamentary group and I have gained much insight and knowledge about mutual problems.

Happy birthday, neighbors.

CANADIAN CONFEDERATION DAY—1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] 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. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today, July 1, 1965, is the 98th anniversary of Canadian Confederation. July 1 is to Canadians what Independence Day is to Americans and Bastille Day is to the French, although the Canadian nation was born not of revolution but by evolution.

Prior to 1867 the separate colonies moved from rule by royal proclamation toward responsible government. In 1867 the confederation of the separate colonies into a single Canadian nation was made possible. On July 1 of that year royal proclamation was given to the British Parliament's British North America Act establishing a confederation of Lower Canada, Quebec; Upper Canada, Ontario; Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which have been joined by the remainder of the provinces over subsequent years.

Canadians are rightfully proud of the achievement of their confederation and are already engaged in preparations for celebration of the 100th anniversary on July 1, 1967. These plans include an international exposition during that year at Montreal, known as EXPO 1967, at which the United States will be represented by a pavilion which has already been authorized by this Congress.

Recently, I had the opportunity and pleasure to attend a meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group at Ottawa and Montreal. This was an excellent meeting serving a most useful purpose. I am certain that both the Canadian and United States participants came away with a deeper understanding of the common problems and prospects that we face today. This is just one of the very many examples of close cooperation which marks our relations with our neighbor to the north.

I know that all Americans join with me in sending their best wishes to Canada on its celebration of this 98th anniversary of confederation and look forward to the continued sharing by our two countries of the bounties of this great North American Continent in neighborly cooperation.

A PROPOSAL TO PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION IN HIRING PRACTICES AGAINST MIDDLE-AGED AMERICAN WORKERS BECAUSE OF THEIR AGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the General Subcommittee on Labor, headed by Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT has agreed today to begin 3 days of hearings on amendments to the fair employment practices section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

As a member of this subcommittee I shall press for including in the amendment a provision which would bar discrimination in hiring practices against middle-aged workers because of age.

The law now bars discrimination because of race, religion, national origin and sex. The exhaustive study just concluded by the Labor Department and announced yesterday clearly indicates that until we close the loophole of discrimination because of age, countless thousands of American workers, who are otherwise fully qualified, will be denied an opportunity for new employment once they lose their original jobs, simply because of their chronological age.

It should be a source of concern to all of us when Secretary of Labor Wirtz reports that in the 30 States which now do not bar age discrimination, half the job openings are closed to applicants over 55 years of age and a quarter to applicants over 45.

It should be a further source of concern to us that the Labor Department study indicates many age limitations are imposed without any regard to job requirements, although older workers generally perform at least as well as younger ones.

In addition to the more recent Labor Department study, we have another study completed by the Commerce Department in 1962 which clearly estimated that the odds of an American worker past the age of 45, once he loses his job, of finding another one similar to it, are 6 to 1 against him.

This is a situation which actually represents a crisis among America's middle-aged workers. The situation may not be as pronounced when the country is enjoying its 5th year of economic expansion, but it may be safely assumed that the moment there is a slowdown in employment, older workers displaced by economic conditions will have virtually no opportunity to obtain other jobs consistent with their abilities because of this age discrimination.

I find it a source of great pride to know that those of us who have been urging positive action to deal with this problem now find the Labor Department and Secretary Wirtz urging a national policy against hiring that discriminates against older workers.

Admittedly, there are many problems which must be met before such a policy can become effective.

The hearings before my committee clearly indicate that there is an economic factor involved, owing to the growth of health and welfare programs and pension plans, which actually cost an employer more money to hire an older worker as against a younger worker capable of doing the same job.

The Labor Department quite properly suggests that one answer to this problem might lie in portable pension credits which enable a worker to carry his stake in a pension plan with him to a new job.

I strongly support this concept.

I have also introduced H.R. 654 which would give an employer a complete tax credit on whatever additional costs are involved in hiring an older worker, as compared to hiring a younger worker with similar skills. I shall include a copy of H.R. 654 at the conclusion of my remarks.

Before we can effectively bar discrimination in hiring practices because of age, we must give serious consideration to the economic factors involved. Industry should not be compelled to carry the full burden of these additional costs. I am firmly convinced, however, that until we add a bar against discrimination because of age in the Civil Rights Act, both industry and Government—and, yes, even the Congress—will continue to drag their feet in finding a solution to this problem.

There is no doubt in my mind that we can find a solution which will relieve industry of many additional costs if, indeed, we put our minds to it.

It is for this reason, fortified by the Labor Department report issued yesterday, that I shall press for inclusion of a prohibition against discrimination in hiring practices because of age when this matter comes before my subcommittee on July 19.

I feel confident that with this additional support, the glaring gap in fair employment practices can be closed and older workers can be helped to face the future with a greater degree of confidence.

The legislation which I have introduced would give an employer a full tax credit for whatever additional costs he may encounter whenever he hires or retains as an employee an older person. Under my proposal, the Federal Government would help eliminate one of the biggest obstacles confronting modern American industry regarding the hiring of older people and would in effect encourage industry to make employment available to our growing army of older workers.

This is a far-reaching measure which for the first time would recognize that under our modern concept of business and industry, where the employer is faced with ever-increasing costs of fringe benefits in employment, including pension plans and health and welfare programs, the hiring of older people frequently imposes additional financial burdens on the employer which he avoids merely by not hiring these older people.

The study by the U.S. Department of Labor shows that unemployment is more prevalent among older workers in this country. This situation exists not because older workers are less capable or less productive, but simply because it costs an employer more money to hire them. This is a fact which too many of our social agencies have tried to minimize.

I firmly believe the time has come when we in Congress should face this issue fairly and squarely.

I have just completed a very thorough study of this subject only to find that most social agencies—including a very distinguished citizens' committee recently appointed by the Secretary of Labor—have tried consistently to minimize this cost factor in appraising the entire problem of why industry is becoming more and more reluctant to hire older workers.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these efforts to minimize the additional costs of hiring older people—well meaning as they may be—are misdirected. The fact of the matter is that older workers have a higher rate of unemployment in America—despite our present boom—than their younger counterparts.

The Department of Labor reports that there were only 2.9 percent of people between the ages of 25 to 44 unemployed as against a total of 3.5 percent unemployed between the ages of 45 and over. More tragically, this same survey showed that older people remain unemployed for a longer period of time. Witness these figures prepared by the Department of Labor: In 1955, 30.1 percent of the people between the ages of 25 to 44 were unemployed for 15 or more weeks against 42.3 percent of those unemployed for 15 or more weeks in the age group of 45 or older.

We must recognize the fact that modern business theories are based on dollar volume and dollar profits. Because of intensive competition, the modern businessman or industrialist—no matter how considerate he may want to be—must consider his enterprise in terms of costs versus profits. Many theorists have tried to persuade industry under our free enterprise system—as we know it—to forsake its profits for more humane programs. This, of course, is a worthy cause but unfortunately fails to recognize the realities of a desire for highest profits on an investment. Why should one businessman be asked to take a loss when such action may well drive him out of business because of mounting competition from similar industries not quite as altruistic as himself?

The fact of the matter is that in actual employment practices today, as the Department of Labor points out, the age at which the job seeker encounters employment varies widely with his occupation, industry, locality, and with the general conditions of the labor market in his area. Age restrictions are applied arbitrarily by many employers—sometimes as low as 35 or 40 years of age—more often at age 45 years or older.

Changes in policies, practices, and attitudes toward the hiring, training, and use of middle-aged and older workers frequently vary among employers.

I have introduced this legislation because I believe that job opportunities should be available for all of our people who are able and want to work. Each worker should be considered for employment on the basis of his individual qualifications as these measure up to the basic requirements of the job. Every employer should be permitted to recognize that in a job it is ability that counts—regardless of age—and that in reality there is no fixed age at which a person becomes too old to work.

I have thousands of letters from my constituents who tell me they have been out of work for months or even years simply because they are told they are considered too old to be hired.

The tragedy of these people is that they are too young to claim their pensions under social security and too old to be hired by private industry.

I have tragic letters from both men and women who are either in their late thirties or early forties and cannot get employment simply because industry tells them they are too old. In many instances, these people have growing children who must be fed and educated. What are these unfortunate souls to do?

We in Congress must also recognize that the whole concept of family life in modern America has changed. When I was a little boy, it was a practice for the young people to take care of their older relatives. It was not uncommon in my home—and I am sure this was true in many of your homes—that we always found an extra room for either a grandparent, or a parent or some uncle or aunt, to put them up for a spell if they were out of work. The whole family would pitch in and help. But today, when the modern house barely has room for the immediate members of the family, when young people in these times of inflation find it difficult to make ends meet for the needs of their own immediate family, including the wife and children, they can hardly be expected to look after their older relatives. Lamentable as this may be, it is a hard and fast economic reality in modern America.

It is for this reason that I urge the Congress to approve as quickly as possible my proposal to give industry a tax credit against its income tax for the additional costs of hiring older people. I firmly believe this problem has reached the proportion of a national crisis.

I could cite a myriad of statistics to prove that middle-aged or older workers are more reliable, more productive, more dependable, and less susceptive to changing their position once they gain employment.

But I can also cite statistics to prove that the reason why employers prefer not to hire older people is because it costs them more to train an older worker and it also costs the employer more in the way of pension contributions—where a firm has a pension plan—and more for health and welfare insurance.

I must state as firmly as I can that those who have tried to minimize these additional costs—well-meaning as they may be—have done a grave disservice to the older workers of America. The businessman or industrialist who must bear the additional costs knows these indisputable facts, regardless of what the various "experts" may claim to the contrary.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to cite figures prepared by the Department of Labor as to additional costs involved in hiring older workers in the steel industry—which has an excellent pension plan. These figures clearly show that the employer's annual contribution to the pension fund for a worker starting out at age 30 is only $120 annually; but this same employer's annual contribution to the pension fund for a worker starting out at age 45 is almost double, or $214 annually. The cost per hour per worker is 6 cents an hour for the employee starting out at the age of 30 years as against 10.7 cents an hour for the worker aged 45. The cost jumps to $242 a year, or 12.1 cents an hour, for the worker aged 50. For the worker aged 55, the annual cost is $265 a year, or 13.2 cents an hour.

This is for the pension fund only. To this you must add the additional cost to the employer for health and hospitalization insurance and all other fringe benefits. This is why I am proposing this tax credit so the employer will not have to carry the extra burden of these costs and actually have an incentive to capitalize on the older workers' stability when hiring him.

My proposal will in no way hurt the younger workers of America. The population growth of this Nation along with the increase in the labor force which we will need to fulfill our needs will make plenty of jobs available for all—both young and old. However, because industry knows that it costs more to hire an older person—a cost which industry is reluctant to absorb—industry is increasing automation to eliminate the worker entirely. We all know that too much automation could well destroy the very foundation of our national economy.

The plan I have introduced would actually serve as an incentive to hire older people and serve the best interest of our entire Nation. Simply stated, it means that an employer can claim a tax credit for whatever the additional costs may be in hiring or continuing to employ an older person, as compared to what it would normally cost him to hire the youngest person who could do the same job effectively. To cite an example, an employer with 100 employees would determine what the fringe benefits cost him for his youngest group of employees doing work comparable to those of older employees. Using this figure as a base, he would compute the difference between this cost and the cost for all of his other employees in the same job classification. He could claim the total of the difference as a tax credit. Thus, the employer would not suffer the extra cost from his own profits.

Under existing law, an employer may now absorb part of this increased cost as a tax deduction in the normal course of doing business. But under existing procedures he recovers only a fraction of the added cost of hiring or retaining older people. By allowing the employer a full tax credit after he has computed his corporate tax, in addition to his normal tax deduction, he would be able to claim the entire additional cost of hiring older people against his firm's income tax.

I believe the plan is sound and I earnestly hope Congress will approve it just as quickly as possible. I have discussed this proposal with the legislative counsel here in Congress and am assured it is not in conflict with our existing revenue code.

In the name of humanity, in the name of helping our older citizens keep the jobs they now have, and help those unemployed to get employment, I urge speedy approval of this measure.

H.R. 654

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by redesignating section 38 as section 39 and by adding after section 37 the following new section:

"SEC. 38. CREDIT FOR EMPLOYMENT OF OLDER PERSONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an employer (as defined in section 3401(d)), there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount determined under subsection (b).

"(b) AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—The credit allowed an employer by subsection (a) for any taxable year shall be an amount equal to the increase in his cost of doing business during such year which results from the employment of older persons, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. For purposes of this subsection, any expenditure made by an employer in the conduct of his trade or business (including insurance premiums, contributions to pension funds, contributions to medical costs, contributions to workmen's compensation funds, and any other trade or business expense, including the increased cost of training an older worker and increased cost of maintaining an increased medical and nursing staff necessary where older persons are employed, within the meaning of section 162), whether attributable to an individual employee or to the employees of such employer generally, shall be considered an increase in the cost of doing business which results from the employment of older persons to the extent that it would not have been required or made if the age of each employee involved were the lowest age at which an employee could reasonably (and consistently with the sound operation of the trade or business) be hired to perform substantially the same duties (and no factor other than age were taken into account).

"(c) CREDIT NOT TO CAUSE REFUND OF TAX.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under the provisions of this part other than this section and sections 31 and 32.

"(d) CREDIT IN ADDITION TO DEDUCTIONS.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall be in addition to, and shall not reduce or otherwise affect, any deduction which may be allowable under this chapter."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is amended by striking out

"Sec. 38. Overpayments of tax."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 38. Credit for employment of older persons.

"Sec. 39. Overpayments of tax."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to disallowance of credits to individuals paying optional tax or taking standard deduction) is amended by striking out "and 35" and inserting in lieu thereof "35, and 38".

(b) Section 37(a) of such Code (relating to retirement income credit) is amended by striking out "and section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 35 (relating to partially tax exempt interest), and section 38 (relating to credit for employment of older persons)".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] for the presentation which the gentleman has made here today with reference to this highly important subject.

I would like to inform the gentleman that the State of Texas, two sessions ago, passed permissive legislation along those lines entitled "Jobs After Forty."

Much help was given to the members of the legislature in support by the Fraternal Order of Eagles in that State. I wish to commend the gentleman, and to offer my pledge of cooperation in his endeavors.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman. I am glad that the gentleman has brought up the question of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, because certainly this very distinguished organization has been in the forefront in America in trying to come up with ideas and programs which would eliminate the specter faced by the middle-aged and elderly workers who today find it more and more difficult to find employment, even if they are thoroughly qualified. We know there is company after company and industry after industry which, when a worker goes looking for a job, the first question they ask is "How old are you?" If he is past 40 or past 45, no matter how well qualified he may be, no matter how exceptionally good are his qualifications and experience, the personnel officer advises the applicant he is sorry, but the company has a policy against hiring people above 45. That is the end of the interview.

I thank the gentleman for his comments. I am glad the gentleman pointed out that Texas has such a program. This is not a new idea to bar discrimination against hiring practices because of age. That is now the practice in 20 States in America, and I do not see any reason why we should not make this a national policy as long as we have the Civil Rights Act that applies across the board.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman for his

statement. It is a field we should have looked into a long, long time ago. I am running into this problem every day of people over 40 years of age who cannot find a job, people who are well qualified. I am glad the gentleman is taking the lead in this matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman, and I hope he will follow our hearings with interest. I would strongly recommend we make enough copies available of the Secretary's report yesterday, because for the first time, as far as I know, the U.S. Labor Department has admitted officially that there is a practice of discrimination against hiring people in this country because of age. This is an excellent beginning and with this report now as a basis this Congress can work its will and do something about this problem.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

NEW YORK CITY'S $16 MILLION ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the expression "Nero fiddled while Rome burned." Now we have a new one to add to it: "While the antipoverty program and the hopes and dreams of millions of Americans in New York City are going down the drain, our Governor, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, was out doing the Watusi."

Last night Governor Rockefeller of New York vetoed a bill that would have established a corporation to administer the entire antipovery program in the city of New York with a budget of more than $16 million. The manner in which the Governor acted has left many people both bewildered and angry. Word of the Governor's veto reached the Office of Economic Opportunity less than 6 hours before the end of the fiscal year, the deadline OEO had to meet for the allocation of this year's funds.

The Governor knew that failure to meet this deadline would have meant the loss of over $9 million to New York City's campaign against poverty.

Sargent Shriver, Director of OEO, Mayor Wagner, and officials of the poverty program in New York City were left stunned and confused by the Governor's action, and well they should have been, because the Governor had at no time previously even hinted that he would veto the bill on the grounds that he did. There had been plenty of opportunity during the preparation and passage of this bill for the Governor to express any possible objections to it, but he did not. He waited until 6 hours before the deadline in order to do it. This action, I believe, spotlights his real attitude toward the fight against poverty. Earlier in the week, Governor Rockefeller had expressed objections to certain aspects of the program but he dropped his objections after consultation with antipoverty officials.

Only yesterday morning he informed OEO that his doubts about the program had been removed, yet that very evening he vetoed the bill, threatening to shatter the work of many people over many months, and to throw New York City's antipoverty effort into complete disruption, if not destroy it completely.

If the Governor were sincerely interested in the poverty program in New York City, would he have waited until the last minute to veto the bill? And does it not seem likely that he would have made some positive suggestions for overcoming the difficulties he expressed? He made no such suggestions. He made no constructive comments to indicate that he was even remotely concerned with the success of this necessary program. In order to overcome this completely negative behavior, Sargent Shriver discussed this crisis with New York poverty officials and arrived at a tentative solution. And while these desperate 11th-hour discussions were being conducted, what was the Governor doing? Was he seated around the table aiding the negotiation? Was he suggesting alternatives? Was he contributing ideas? No. As a matter of fact, we are told that the Governor was out dancing.

The solution was reached at 11:45 p.m. last night, just 15 minutes before the deadline. Because Sargent Shriver was dedicated to the ideals and aspirations of the poor all over the United States, New York City now has the more than $16 million it needs to attack poverty—money that would have gone down the drain.

This is the extent to which the Governor concerned himself with the war against poverty in New York City. As usual, his oft-repeated lip service to this war was not backed with appropriate action.

I am not a Congressman from New York City. I represent an upstate area. Nevertheless, I am extremely concerned over the Governor's actions with respect to the New York City poverty program, because it provides a penetrating insight into his true feelings about the war on poverty. This is just the latest in a long series of barriers and obstacles that the Governor's office has erected to prevent the smooth and efficient operation of the Economic Opportunities Act.

I have spoken out about this before. In my own district and other upstate cities and communities we have seen the Governor's office use its 30-day review period and threat of veto to delay and obstruct local antipoverty programs. We have seen the letter of the law misused to violate the spirit of the law. I am concerned over what happened in New York City because we in the smaller cities and villages of upstate New York are even more at the mercy of the Governor's office than that great metropolis. We do not have the political power or organization that they have in New York City. That is why New York State as a whole is lagging so badly in this war on poverty. We simply do not have the leadership—and we are not getting it from Albany.

This abuse of power is not necessarily limited to New York State. We have seen it happen elsewhere, for other reasons. It emphasizes the necessity for amending the law so that the arbitrary use of the veto power can be appealed to a higher authority.

I would like to take this opportunity once more to commend Mr. Shriver for the work that he has done in this particular instance. Mr. Shriver was not out dancing last night. He was working—because he knew how important this money was to help the poor people of New York City.

The Governor put the chestnuts in the fire and then left them for Mr. Shriver to pull out of the fire. And pull them out he did.

It is not too late for Governor Rockefeller to restore the people's faith in his intentions regarding New York City's war against poverty. If he erects no further barriers—if he exhibits an attitude of cooperation and concern, the program can move ahead dynamically along the path on which it has started.

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

INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARY OF BURUNDI, RWANDA, AND SOMALIA

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] 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. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today, July 1, is the anniversary of the independence of three former trust territories in Africa, Burundi, Rwanda, and Somalia. I take this opportunity to congratulate the leaders and the people of these countries and to extend to them all good wishes for their future growth and development.

I feel a particular interest in these three countries since they were all at one time under the United Nations trusteeship system. As the U.S. Representative on the United Nations Trusteeship Council, I myself participated in various proceedings in the Trusteeship Council and in the fourth committee of the U.N. General Assembly which led to the independence of Burundi and Rwanda in 1962. During my 3 years at the United Nations, I was privileged to acquire the friendship of a number of distinguished and able representatives of Burundi, Rwanda, and Somalia.

These countries face the difficulties common to most of the newly independent countries of Africa. I trust that the United Nations and its family of agencies and the United States will continue to help the peoples of these free countries to solve their economic problems and achieve a rapid pace of development within a framework of political freedom.

The American people feel a kinship for newly independent countries that have emerged from colonialism. In the legislative branch of our Government, as

well as in the executive branch, we extend the hand of friendship to Burundi, Rwanda, and Somalia and our hopes for steady progress toward the realization of their aims and aspirations.

VIETNAM

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] 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. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Vietcong blew up a restaurant in Saigon and littered the street with broken bodies of women and children and killed a number of Americans. Last week also, the Vietcong took an American they were holding in captivity and shot him down in cold blood. I mention these things to make quite clear the nature of the adversary we are facing in Vietnam.

Early this year when I returned from Vietnam I said on the matter of negotiations, let us walk in dignity to any conference table, but let us not run before anyone is there. Since that time, our President, Lyndon Johnson, has indicated his willingness to take that dignified walk but unfortunately there are those who think this is not good enough and who urge him to run before anyone else is there.

I think it would be useful in the face of this to review just what the President has done to bring the Communists to the conference table and to attempt to reach a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. Last August when Communist torpedo boats attacked our destroyers on the high seas in the Gulf of Tonkin, we took the matter to the United Nations. The President of the Security Council invited North Vietnam to participate. North Vietnam, however, responded by saying that the United Nations had no competence to deal with the war in Vietnam. The Chinese Communists seconded his contention.

Earlier this year, Gordon Walker, of Great Britain, attempted to visit Peiping and Hanoi to seek a peaceful settlement and he was refused.

On April 7 in Baltimore our President stated he was willing to enter into unconditional discussions with any of the concerned governments over the conflict in Vietnam. Hanoi and Peiping responded by calling his proposal a "hoax," "a big swindle," "a lie covered with flowers."

On April 8 the President responded favorably to the 17 nonalined nation appeal for a peaceful solution through negotiations without preconditions. North Vietnam responded by outlining four conditions which would be necessary before discussions. In sum, these conditions demanded that we accept in advance a Communist South Vietnam. Communist China responded by saying that the 17-nation appeal was perpetrated by "monsters and freaks."

The Indian Government proposed that a combined Afro-Asian force assure the peace in Vietnam and maintain the present boundaries so long as the people desire it. We stated that we were interested in this proposal and that we would give it careful consideration and have indeed had further discussions with the Indian Government on it. Hanoi, however, said that the Indian proposal was an offense for the people of South Vietnam and merely another scheme to help the United States rule over South Vietnam. Communist China denounced the proposal also and said India had betrayed the Afro-Asian countries.

Last month, we stopped bombing North Vietnam for 5 days but no indication that North Vietnam was interested in negotiations came forth. Instead, Hanoi called the suspension "a wornout trick" and Communist China denounced it as an American "hoax" and "war blackmail."

Prime Minister Harold Wilson of the United Kingdom has organized a Commonwealth People Mission to travel to the interested countries. We welcomed this initiative but it has been rejected by Moscow and Peiping, and Hanoi has shown little interest.

I think this illustrates quite clearly that the United States is sincere in its desire to settle this affair by negotiation rather than by force. I think this is clear to the Communists.

I think it is clear to the American people, but there are still those who say that this is not enough, more must be done, we must make further efforts, we must demonstrate again our willingness. Now I have no doubt that the President will, as the days wear on, make other moves in the diplomatic field. What these moves will be are tactical decisions that are rightfully in his hands. I see no purpose served by grandstand quarterbacking and by urging him to do more and more and more.

I see some danger in these urgings, however well intentioned they may be. They may well be creating the impression in the Communist world that we are eager to settle the conflict whatever the outcome. They may well be convincing the Communists that if they just hang on a little longer, the United States will grow weary and pull out. Such a miscalculation can only extend, not shorten, the conflict. For while we do not seek a continuation of the fighting, we are utterly determined to do what is necessary, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, "down to the very end."

In what ways do these people suggest that the President improve and intensify our diplomatic offensive? Some say that we must make it clear that we will talk to the Vietcong if they come as members of the North Vietnamese delegation. Let us stop right here and consider the Vietcong. Let us consider just who they are. Let us take a good, hard look at these people who massacre innocent children in cold blood. The Vietcong are nothing more than the armed agents of the authorities in Hanoi. We must be completely clear on this point. Over the years Hanoi has sent up to 40,000 armed men into South Vietnam to join those subversive agents which they left behind in violation of the 1954 Geneva accords. These people have preyed on the weaknesses of a new government and nation, and have organized an armed force in the countryside which now threatens the very existence and independence of South Vietnam. These people initiated their activities on the orders of Hanoi and they can stop them on orders from the same place.

This is aggression no less than it was aggression when North Korea threw its divisions across the 38th parallel almost 15 years ago to the day. During those 15 years the Communists have learned that such open aggression is not profitable. They have turned to a more subtle but equally dangerous kind of aggression. They have sent their thousands across the border over the years instead of doing it in just 1 day.

I am disturbed by all of this talk about negotiating with the Vietcong, recognizing their existence as a factor in the situation, because each time we say this, each time we create the impression by loose talk and sloppy language that the Vietcong are anything more than the agents of Hanoi, we encourage Hanoi to believe that we are weakening on this point, that we will indeed agree, if they just press a little harder, to accept the Vietcong as a bargaining agent. These people are no more separate from Hanoi than were those North Korean divisions from Pyongyang.

The Communists, of course, are eager to have the world and us accept these intruders as a separate entity. For then they can perpetuate the fiction that this is a civil war, that these people are not revolting against the Government in Saigon, that they are the "only true representatives of the people of South Vietnam." I must say that I am disturbed by the degree of success that they have had in perpetrating this false word outside of South Vietnam. I purposely say outside of South Vietnam, because it is quite clear that the Vietcong or the National Liberation Front have not succeeded in gathering any significant non-Communist elements into its fold. The people of South Vietnam are not fooled as to the nature of the Vietcong threat and its smokescreen, the National Liberation Front. No opponents of Ngo Dinh Diem even in the most bitter days joined the front. Let me give as an example the pilot who bombed Diem's palace in February 1954. This man would not join the front. When he was released from prison after Diem's fall, he did not join the front, he returned to the air force. He recently died over North Vietnam in a bombing attack. He gave his life striking at the home base of those who were trying to conquer his country.

Now, should we talk to these people? The administration has made itself quite clear that if Hanoi wishes to include in its delegations some of its agents operating in the south, then this is not a barrier to talks. We need go no further than this. Any more would just run the risk of misleading the Communists into thinking that we were indeed weakening in our resolve not to recognize these aggressors.

It is also said that we must improve our position by saying that we approve

of self-determination. Last week a distinguished Member of the other body stated that we made a mistake in urging Ngo Dinh Diem not to participate in the elections provided for by the 1954 Geneva accords. This ignores the fact that the Geneva accords called for free elections by secret ballot. He did not mention that President Diem at the time said he would participate in such elections but not without assurances that there would indeed be free elections in the north. It was quite clear then and it is clear now that such elections were an absolute impossibility. Perhaps there are those that feel we should atone for President Diem's refusal to commit political suicide by declaring ourselves in favor of self-determination. Here again, however, the administration has made it quite clear that we have no desire to dictate the future of South Vietnam. President Johnson said on April 11 that we seek an independent South Vietnam, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance. What political future such as a South Vietnam would work out for itself will be up to the South Vietnamese. It is quite conceivable that they will decide to have elections after Hanoi's agents have released their grasp on large parts of the Vietnamese countryside.

As to the unification of all of Vietnam, in 1954, we made it quite clear that we favored elections under effective international supervision to reunify all of Vietnam. North Vietnam, however, was not interested in such an approach and there is no reason to believe that they are interested in it now. It is conceivable that once peace is restored that North and South Vietnam might well decide to determine the reunification of the country on the basis of free elections. I do not see this in the foreseeable future, but it is something that has to be worked out after peace is restored.

I notice with considerable concern a new theme that is creeping into public discussion on this matter. Some say that we should not stand in the way of the South Vietnamese having talks with the Vietcong and Hanoi in an effort to solve the conflict. I am puzzled by this proposition. When I was in South Vietnam, I saw no indication whatsoever that the South Vietnamese were interested in anything but freeing their country from the aggressors. I have seen nothing since then which indicates that the South Vietnamese are trying to talk with Hanoi and its agents, the Vietcong. I am disturbed because it is only one step from saying let us not stand in the way of such talks, to saying let us encourage such talks. The South Vietnamese, I believe, would take this very badly. They are fighting for their very existence and they are suffering enormous casualties in doing it. They are not being forced to do this by the United States but rather they have asked the United States to aid them in this struggle. The above proposition has the ugly connotation that this is not the case. In spite of all our involvement, this is a Vietnamese war. They are doing most of the dying and it is their country that is being torn apart. I cannot see how they would not be disturbed and frightened by hearing urging from their allies in this struggle that they go off and settle this thing with the Vietcong. It seems almost as if we are saying, "Get us off the hook, go talk to the Vietcong, work something out so that we can get out of here." The South Vietnamese know full well that without us Hanoi would clamp its terrible rule on their country. As I said before, this particular line of argumentation disturbs me deeply.

Finally, let us consider the larger aspects of this conflict. We are told that the real problem is not in South Vietnam—that our real interest lies in India which must withstand Chinese Communist expansion. This, however, ignores the fact that the financial resources now used for economic development in India and Pakistan would have to be diverted for military defense if the Communists were free to turn in another direction. We are told that our safety as a nation does not depend on having American troops in South Vietnam. I should point out that the recent increase in troops in South Vietnam was required because a country to which we have been made solemn commitments asked for our assistance to help it maintain its independence against a particularly vicious form of aggression. The President has made it clear that we will pull these troops out when this aggression is stopped. Now, I do not believe that if we pull them out before that time that a flotilla of Chinese Communist junks would appear off the coast of California.

But I do believe that if we welsh on this commitment, the rest of our commitments upon which our very existence as a nation depends will be seen as worthless in the eyes of our allies. At issue is our credibility as leader of the free world. Our worldwide commitments are like a seamless fabric. We cannot tear it in one place and expect it to remain the same. I also believe that if we do not fulfill this commitment, the Communist world will be greatly encouraged to initiate these wars of national liberation in other countries that are just as vulnerable as South Vietnam.

The President has chosen to draw the line in South Vietnam. The Communist world must be under no illusions as to our determination to see this thing through. The President has steered the Nation on a prudent course through very dangerous waters. He has resisted pressures from those who would abandon South Vietnam and from those who would plunge us into a catastrophic conflict. I supported him at the beginning, and as the need for quiet patience and calm determination in the face of a long struggle is upon us, I continue to support him. His course is worthy of the support that all but a small number of Americans have given him. And it is suprising that no one in this small group of opposition has offered an alternative course short of turning over Asia to the Communists and with it the lives of millions of people who oppose communism and who have faith in our country.

WATER SHORTAGE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] 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. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, vast areas of the Nation do not have enough water. More than one-third of our population is gripped by a drought which is already in its fourth year.

In many States, deep wells that have been producing water for 50 years have gone dry. Great hardships have been placed upon rural and urban residents, farmers, and industry. At present, a fair measure of emergency relief is available to farmers in the form of low-interest, long-term loans, so that they can dig wells, install pumps and distribution equipment, and take other steps to obtain water. This is provided under the Consolidated Farmer's Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended.

However, the great majority of rural residents are not farmers, and no help is available to them under existing legislation. Emergency assistance is needed now by individual families, entire communities, and industries in rural and semirural areas afflicted by drought. Farmers also need additional assistance beyond that provided for in the act mentioned above. To help provide this emergency drought assistance, I have introduced H.R. 9459.

Briefly, this bill proposes to reduce the impact of drought, in rural and semiurban areas, on residents—both farm and nonfarm—industries, commercial establishments, agriculture, and livestock enterprises. Its principal provisions are to provide low-interest, long-term loans for the improvement or development of water resources, including technical assistance and equipment such as pumps, water transmission lines, and treatment equipment; matching grants to communities and other public and quasi-public organizations for the same purpose; and matching grants to municipalities up to 50,000 population who must haul water for distribution to their citizens.

This bill also proposes that the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized to guarantee bonds issued by water districts to obtain loan funds for farm and nonfarm families and industries in small municipalities, for the purpose of developing water resources. In addition, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to issue charters to public authorities or corporations, enabling them to provide water resources for their areas, if no public body is in existence to perform this function now, or where State laws prevent such bodies from being established for this purpose. In my own State of New York, for example, nonprofit corporations may not be formed to obtain loans for developing water resources. In 1964 both houses of the State legislature passed a bill that would have made such corporations legal. The Governor vetoed this bill, and as a result almost 800 nonincorporated communities in New York State which do not have central water systems are unable to take

the necessary steps to finance this vital enterprise.

Finally, this bill proposes that a program be established under which surplus feed and seed commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation be made available to farmers in drought-stricken areas at favorable terms.

Certain kinds of national disasters have long been recognized as requiring Federal assistance. When floods, earthquakes, storms and other acts of God occur, destroying lives and property, the conscience of the Nation is quick to respond to the need created by these emergencies. Severe drought is also a natural disaster. While it does not strike with the sudden and dramatic fury of a hurricane, it can nevertheless be more costly and dangerous. Drought is a quiet intruder. It does not announce its arrival, and we cannot predict its departure. We do not even notice its presence until it has been living with us for some time. And by then it is often too late to avoid its costly consequences.

Generally speaking, when drought strikes, its effects are felt first by our rural areas. H.R. 9459, therefore, has been written to help our rural and semi-urban areas meet the crisis which now exists in 31 States, and is still spreading.

TOLL BRIDGES: MUST THEY GO ON TOLLING?

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] 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. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this session I introduced a bill to prohibit the creation of interstate authorities having power to divert motor vehicle toll revenues to nonhighway purposes. H.R. 889 was referred to the Committee on Public Works and it has aroused considerable support from the motor vehicle users of our country, at least in the volume of mail I have received in my own office.

Although H.R. 889 does not mention any specific authority or commission by name, its foundation lay in the consistent abuses of authority of the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission which directly affects all the people in my district. This commission was established by the mutual agreement of the Legislatures of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and the consent of the Congress of the United States. It was designed, originally, to finance the construction of bridges across the Delaware River, thereby joining highways running through the two neighboring States.

When the commission was approved, toll financing was virtually the only feasible means of paying for such structures. For many years, therefore, the commission served a useful and vital function in the creation of better traveling conditions for residents of the two States and for those who travel through them.

Of recent years, however, the commission has taken upon itself plans and schemes which far outreach the wildest imaginings of either the State legislatures or the Congress which gave their original approval to the commission's stated plans for highway travel facilities on the river.

Last year, for example, in a flagrant departure from its traditional reason for existence, the commission asked the Congress to approve its construction of a port facility on the Delaware and insisted that motor vehicle toll revenues from existing bridges could be used to finance such construction. Fortunately for all concerned the measure was permitted to die in the Senate committee.

Although it sustained this defeat, the commission has not been content to continue about its business of operating existing toll bridges and, hopefully, removing tolls from them when they have paid their way and redeemed their bonds. Now the commission is back again with its announced intention to construct a new toll bridge at Bristol.

In so doing, the commission has arrogantly announced that it intends to pay for the structure through refinancing all the bridges in its system, thus extending tolls for a period of 40 years on every bridge along the Delaware except the one free bridge in the downriver section. Strenuous objections on the part of civic leaders, industries, and motor clubs have fallen on deaf and uncomprehending ears.

It seems clear that the commission, having once been established, fully intends to perpetuate itself forever, if it can possibly do so.

There is no doubt in my mind—indeed there should be no doubt in anyone's mind—that a new bridge is needed to handle traffic at Bristol, Pa., a heavily traveled area carrying large amounts of suburban Philadelphia traffic.

But there are grave, continuing doubts about the commission's means of financing such bridges, especially as this would relate to the Interstate Highway System.

There are even more serious doubts about the commission's highhanded tactics in reaching its decisions and announcing them.

On Wednesday of this week—June 30—there appeared an excellent and intelligently reasoned editorial in the pages of the Easton, Pa., Daily Express. I want to call the attention of all my colleagues to this editorial comment since I feel that the powers the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission may choose to bestow of its own whim upon itself may affect the overall attitude of every other interstate authority in the land.

The editorial follows:

RUNAWAY AGENCY?

Analyze carefully the arguments of the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission in defense of its self-perpetuating toll span construction plans, the position of the Scranton administration in Pennsylvania in opposition to continuing tolls, the inadequacy of New Jersey State fiscal management which keeps the burden for new river crossings on the commission, and at least one fact is illuminated starkly: The commission/authority concept of public works development and financing can be a serious threat to the structure of our political and governmental system.

We may take it that the Scranton administration's resistance to new toll construction, which would mortgage other toll bridges in the system decades beyond their scheduled bond amortization dates, reflects the will of the people of Pennsylvania. We are certain that it represents the attitude of business-industrial leadership in the Lehigh Valley. The Bushkill Street toll crossing in Easton has been the fiscal cornerstone for the Delaware River bridge system; it can be paid off and free of tolls in a few years if it is not indentured further for new, initially unprofitable spans.

Yet the bridge commission, almost wholly autonomous by virtue of the interstate-Federal enabling laws underlying its creation, can tell the government of Pennsylvania, a supposedly full and equal partner in its operation and regulation, that its objections are invalid, and that its representations, reflecting the will of the people of the Commonwealth, will not be heeded.

The commission, by its nature, becomes a Frankenstein monster turning on its creator. It becomes a second government more powerful than the elective government from which it drew substance and life, a super-government for all practical purposes beyond the will of the people and their elected representatives. The commission's mandate allows this—and, under the circumstances, is alien to the representative system.

To be sure, one partner in the commission's operation—the State of New Jersey—in effect has endorsed new toll construction by refusing to share with Pennsylvania the cost of additional bridges. New Jersey pleads the lack of funds (although its commission representatives say the State can find the money to pay their share of the cost of a new span at Trenton). Both political parties in New Jersey have placed partisan considerations ahead of enactment of a critically needed broad-based tax program, while the Scranton administration in Pennsylvania is concluding the fiscal year with a surplus in excess of $100 million and meeting its highway-bridge construction obligations.

One State should not be made to suffer for another's fiscal management and public service failures—yet this is, in effect, what is happening in New Jersey's inability to finance river crossings on a share basis with Pennsylvania. Frank Hollister, special assistant to Pennsylvania Highways Secretary Henry D. Harral, told the commission at its self-defense session this week that the agency's compact "is completely outmoded and should be overhauled." The legislatures ought to get busy on this.

CANADA'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY—CONFEDERATION DAY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] 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. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for Canada's neighbors south of the border to join in the celebration of her national holiday, Confederation Day, July 1—so close to our own Independence Day—is a reminder of both the independence and the interdependence of the two countries. The United States and Canada sharing the same continent with its vast resources, its incalculable poten-

tialities, and having shared so much history, so many customs, traditions, features of everyday life—language, law, and literature—and being intricately interdependent in the economic field, in defense matters, and in social and cultural affairs, have nevertheless maintained their complete independence as political entities in a changing world. It is unthinkable that they will not continue to do so—at least in the minds of all but a passing few.

Yet the happy relationship of interdependence and independence needs to be reexamined from time to time. Friendships and even the happiest of human relationships do not remain static. There is always the danger that too much will be taken for granted. Canadians have, in fact—and not without reason—complained that we in the United States have done just that—taken them for granted.

The business world, the economic world in general, is perhaps more responsible for this situation than other branches of society; although in matters of defense some are similarly to blame. The reasons are understandable; but the situation is not irremediable; and further consideration on all parts would help. The very interdependence of the two societies, with the inevitable dominance of the larger one, tends to make the people of the United States forget the mutuality of that dependence. We in the United States can no more do without our closest friend in military, economic, social, and cultural matters than Canada can do without us.

We hail the celebration of the beginning of Canadian independence, and we welcome the opportunity to remind all of the happy relationship that produced "the undefended border" and that will be maintained by a constant awareness of Canadian-American inability to get along without the benefits of our proximity.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY] 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. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, at a time when world tension and conflict is mounting and the United States is involved in two wars, we find a greater need for a neutral forum of nations committed to achieving international cooperation and peace. The United Nations has been developed as an effective means of negotiating and settling international disputes so that small-scale wars will not be escalated into big wars and international peace, security, and justice are not endangered.

In a revolutionary world in which more and more powers are able to obtain the means of mass destruction, it is becoming increasingly important to continue striving toward achieving world law so that man's aggression against man might be subject to limitations, thereby creating a peaceful environment in which the peoples of all nations might live without fear of annihilation.

The United Nations has been severely criticized for its inability to maintain peace and prevent war; the ineffectiveness of the General Assembly; and the impotence of the Security Council due to Russia's veto power.

However, a survey of the activities of the United Nations during the past 20 years will show that it has developed a variety of means for dealing with situations which threaten international peace and security.

Small U.N. peacekeeping forces have been operating since 1948 when some 30 observers from 10 nations were sent to patrol the armistice line in Kashmir. Since 1949, the U.N. truce supervision organization has kept about 150 men in Palestine. In another U.N. operation, 600 observers watched the border between Lebanon and Syria in 1958 for evidence of infiltration into Lebanon.

A large U.N. force has been sent out five times. The first time, Korea, is the only example of the use of force under U.N. control, to push back aggression and later to supervise an uneasy peace reestablished under an armistice agreement still in force. The four other forces were sent to Suez in 1956, to the Congo in the mid-60's, to West New Guinea in 1962, and to Cyprus in 1964.

These are all instances in which the United Nations, in its role as a peacekeeping force, has acted as mediator and conciliator. Its task has been to provide time in which there can be created the conditions under which political settlements can be made possible; it has not attempted to create the settlement.

But the mediation of disputes is only a segment of peacekeeping. It is also important to remove the causes of war and human suffering—hunger, poverty, and ignorance. To this end the United Nations is unequaled and irreplaceable as an instrument of positive, constructive achievement. Its many vital agencies—UNESCO, WHO, FAO, the Children's Fund, to name a few, have become the best vehicles for achieving international cooperation and understanding that the world has known.

The reality that world peace is dependent upon world law seems to receive slow acceptance in the forums of the world. However, international law, and world courts to interpret that law are, in my opinion, two of the most urgent needs of our time.

The United Nations with its many functions is the best hope for future peace this world knows. It is with this hope that I wholeheartedly affirm and support the continuation of the United Nations.

LET'S MAKE IT POSSIBLE FOR EVERY AMERICAN TO VOTE

Mr. PATTEN. 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, while we Americans loudly and rightfully proclaim and acclaim our democratic way of government, we surely do not fully evidence our belief in overt acts on election day. The poor participation of the American people in voting is a national shame. During the last presidential election, when political interest was at peak level, less than 62 percent of those citizens of voting age cast a ballot for President of the United States—in other words, 43.3 million, or worse than 38 percent of those of voting age, did not cast a ballot even for our highest office.

Several years ago, a Presidential commission drafted a series of recommendations to improve voter participation. But these splendid and widely supported recommendations have gathered dust in the files of most of our State legislatures, instead of being implemented in local and State laws.

The editor and publisher of the Christian Science Monitor, Mr. Edwin D. Canham, has recently penned some thoughtful comments on this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Christian Science Monitor article be printed:

YOU'RE ON THE LIST

(By Erwin D. Canham)

There is a fundamental difference between the voter registration practices of the United States and those of other leading Western democracies.

In the United States, it is the voter's responsibility to get on the rolls. In Great Britain, France, and other countries, it is the local government's responsibility to get him on the rolls.

Here is how a standard reference book describes the British practices: "It is the business of the state to see that every qualified person, man or woman, is put on the register in the proper constituency. Practically no burden is placed upon the electors.

"In every county and borough there is a registration officer—commonly the clerk of the council—whose business it is, under the general direction of the Home Office at London, to compile and revise the list of parliamentary, as well as that of local electors; and this he does by sending canvassers from house to house in July of each year with copies of the last previous list on which are to be entered all changes due to be made."

The situation in France is very similar: "The terms on which the suffrage is exercised are fixed by national law. Responsibility for keeping and annually revising the lists of eligible voters falls, however, to the authorities of the smallest unit of local government, the commune.

"The task of overhauling the local list is performed between January 1 and March 31 of every year by an electoral commission consisting of the mayor, an appointee of the communal council, and an appointee of the prefect of the department—the necessary information being obtained almost entirely from records kept in the mayor's office for use in connection with compulsory military service. The voter himself is put to no trouble." (Quotations from Ogg's "European Governments and Politics.")

Thus registration in Britain, France, and most other countries is a virtually automatic function of the State, making certain that basic requirements are met.

It helps to explain why such a larger proportion of eligible persons vote in Europe

than in the United States. Here, a very substantial number are not even registered. There, they are registered as an inherent right and process of citizenship and residence.

In such countries, there would be no question of disenfranchising persons because of color or any similar reason. There are various requirements, usually based on residence, taxpaying, and so on. These are reasonably applied, and if there is a question, the individual has recourse to the courts.

In the United States, not only is there the problems of keeping people off the voting rolls, but the loading of the lists with phonies.

What would happen if the United States adopted the European practices of registering citizens instead of requiring them to register? It would probably put a considerable burden on officials. But the police now are called upon to check the voting lists periodically. Would this extension of tasks be too difficult? Would not validation of the voting lists be more honest and accurate?

Why should it be left to the whim or initiative of the citizen whether he is registered? Why should not every eligible voter be registered? Granted the United States has a very mobile population, much more so than Europe, but is this an insuperable obstacle? Methods of data processing and correlating grow daily more efficient.

The responsibility could start, as it does now, with the communities and the States. Ultimate safeguard against abuse could rest in the Federal Government. The States need have no diminution in their authority or sovereignty.

Automatic registration—as much a right for people who meet the basic requirements as breathing the air—would seem to be the essence of free society. Self-disenfranchisement by apathy or human carelessness or error or ignorance would be avoided.

Why not?

BURUNDI INDEPENENCE DAY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] 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. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago today the Kingdom of Burundi emerged as an independent nation. On this proud day I send congratulations to the people of this fine new country, to their leader, King Mwambutsa IV, and to their Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Leon Ndenzako.

On July 1, 1962 the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, which had been a United Nations Trust Territory under the authority of Belgium since World War II, was divided into two independent nations. Thus did Burundi, the southern half of the protectorate, become independent.

Following a tradition of over 400 years, Burundi is headed by a Mwami or king, who acts as Chief of State for the constitutional monarchy. The king, His Majesty Mwami Mwambutsa IV, who ascended the throne in 1915 at the age of 2, has long been a stabilizing influence within the country.

Burundi, which is located in the heart of Central Africa, bounded by the Ruizi River on the west and Lake Tanganyika on the east, has primarily an agricultural economy. It produces a very fine quality of coffee, for which the United States provides a large market. Significant progress has been made in programs of agricultural research, reforestation, and cultivation of marshlands.

The people of Burundi have vigorously worked to improve their country's economy and educational facilities. We in the United States are happy to be a part of these efforts through our financial assistance and through the Peace Corps.

We are encouraging this young nation to continue to use its newly found independence to provide conditions which will foster stable and effective government and make peaceful development possible for the entire country.

Again our warmest congratulations to Burundi on her third anniversary of independence.

SOMALI INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] 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. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today, July 1, in the enterprising new nation of Somalia the people are celebrating the fifth anniversary of their nation's independence. We in the United States of America, who soon will be celebrating our own Independence Day, feel an affinity to this young country on this very important and happy occasion.

Somalia, which is located on the so-called horn of Africa has a history of over 4000 years. The land was first inhabited by Hamitic people, and later Arab traders came to the coastal areas. In the seventh century people from the Yemen established an Arab Sultanate there.

In the 15th century traders from Portugal began to arrive in the area. They were followed by English and Italian traders and settlers. Thus, throughout most of its modern history, the Somali territory has been governed by foreign powers.

In their recent political history, Somalis have much of which to be proud. In November 1949, Italian Somaliland was made a trusteeship of the United Nations, which was terminated on July 1, 1960. In the meantime, British Somaliland began to work for self-government and achieved her independence on June 26, 1960. On July 1 she joined Italian Somaliland to form the Somali Republic.

The Honorable Aden Abdulla Osman, who had served as president of the assembly which wrote the constitution for the new republic, was elected provisional President.

Since July 1, 1960, this ambitious nation has worked hard to improve her Government and economy. Today in commemoration of that date, we extend our warmest congratulations to the people of the Somali Republic, and to their fine and able leader, President Aden Abdulla Osman.

In a very short period of time, this nation has established a stable, democratic government, and has achieved remarkable success in uniting the previously separate governmental systems of British and Italian Somalilands.

The United States is proud to have the friendship of this aspiring new nation. Our Government has enjoyed working with the Somali Republic in her programs for economic development, and I am confident that the two countries will continue their close cooperation in the future. In the very near future we look forward to having with us in Washington the distinguished new Somali Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Ahmed Mohamed Adan, who has been a visitor to our country in the past while serving as a member of the Somali delegation at the United Nations.

The future is bright for the people of the Somali Republic under the admirable leadership of President Osman. Congratulations and best wishes to him and to the Somali people on their fifth independence day.

RWANDAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] 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. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago today, July 1, 1962, the Republic of Rwanda attained independence, fulfilling a United Nations General Assembly resolution terminating Belgian trusteeship of the territory of Ruanda Urundi of which Rwanda formed the northern half.

Rwanda joined the African and Malagasy Union in order to help solve some of their common regional problems. The United States is furnishing aid to the country in several ways, including the development of a new water system and a telephone system for Kigali, the capital. In an effort to help herself provide the capital which she needs for investment and development, Rwanda has adopted an austerity program.

Situated in the heart of Central Africa, only two degrees south of the Equator, Rwanda, the "Pearl of Africa," has been a leader in the efforts of the newly independent African nations in promoting education, health, social welfare, and democratic government. Although schools were not established in Rwanda until 1900, illiteracy is being eliminated due to the relentless efforts of President Kayibanda, himself a former educator. Rwanda's first university opened its doors on November 3, 1963.

In the field of public health, the Rwandan people have made great gains. The rate of infant mortality in this country is the lowest in Central Africa. A comprehensive welfare program has been developed and settlement houses have been erected in both urban and rural areas. The determination of the people of Rwanda to build a great nation which

can handle its own domestic problems efficiently is worthy of our admiration and support.

The people of the United States are proud to accept the kind of friendship shown us in the symbolic postage stamps issued by Rwanda in April 1965. These stamps bear the image of our own Abraham Lincoln. We thank the Rwandan people for this tribute and we wish them continued peace and prosperity.

To His Excellency the President of Rwanda, Gregoire Kayibanda, and His Excellency the Rwandan Ambassador to the United States, Celestin Kabanda, I extend greetings and congratulations.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] 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. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today is the first anniversary of the signing into law of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For this reason I feel it would be appropriate to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief legislative history and legal analysis of last year's bill by Prof. Harold Norris, of the Detroit College of Law. Professor Norris has done a thorough and excellent job of analyzing the various considerations which caused the bill to be introduced, how and why Congress amended the bill, and the legal questions involved.

Professor Norris has had a long and distinguished legal career of tireless activity in securing equal rights for all Americans, with particular emphasis on individual civil liberties. This outstanding member of the Michigan bar is the author of various books and articles in the fields of constitutional and criminal law. In 1961 he was elected as a delegate to the Michigan Constitutional Convention, where he served with great distinction as vice chairman of the committee on the declaration of rights. Professor Norris has also served as chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union of Michigan.

In his article Professor Norris has some very perceptive and stimulating comments on the omissions in the 1964 Civil Rights Act. I think these comments might be of particular interest to my colleagues since next week we will be considering the voting rights bill of 1965. This bill is before us because it has become clear to all that the 1964 act was not effective in securing the right to vote against obstruction and intimidation, both public and private. In addition I would like to recommend to my colleagues the final section of this article which points out that no law, however strong its provisions, can be effective if the executive branch is not determined to enforce that law:

Civil rights in the last century in the United States have not been so much a question of adequate law; they have been primarily a question of adequate will.

The text of the article follows:

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

(By Harold Norris)

(NOTE.—Harold Norris, A.B., M.A., University of Michigan; L.L.B., Columbia University. The writer, a professor of law, has long been active in the legislation and promotion of civil rights. He was of counsel in Michigan's congressional redistricting case. Professor Norris was elected as a delegate from Detroit to Michigan's Constitutional Convention in 1961–62 where he served as vice chairman of the committee on the declaration of rights and was the coauthor of the provisions setting up a civil rights commission and prohibiting racial and religious discrimination. He is the author of "Mr. Justice Murphy and the Bill of Rights," and "Casebook of Complete Criminal Trials." He teaches constitutional and criminal law at the Detroit College of Law and has served as chairman of the constitutional roundtable of the Association of American Law Schools, and as chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union of Michigan.)

I. HISTORY OF THE LEGISLATION

Early in the 88th Congress a substantial number of broad civil rights bills were introduced by members of both political parties.

On February 28, 1963, President Kennedy transmitted to the Congress a message of recommendations pertaining to civil rights.[1] This message pivoted principally upon more effective protection of the right to vote, seeking to strengthen the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, which dealt primarily with voting. The message also urged renewal and expansion of the Civil Rights Commission, and the providing of technical and financial assistance to encourage school desegregation. The message reflected President Kennedy's main thesis, "Armed with the full and equal right to vote, our Negro citizens can help win other rights through political channels not now open to them in many areas." Subsequently, on June 19, 1963, President Kennedy sent to Congress a second message containing recommendations pertaining to civil rights.[2] The message of June 19 went far beyond that of February 28, and urged the enactment of a comprehensive or omnibus civil rights bill.

Developments in the Nation between these two messages reflected the geometrically progressing impatience of the victims of discrimination with its persistence, and the overt and patent forms of resistance to change by segregationists. Crucial was the net impact of widespread participation of huge numbers of ordinary Negro citizens in direct action, nonviolent protest. This was the most significant development in the civil rights struggle since the Civil War. The ordinary Negro citizen was taking his struggle and that of democracy to the streets; it was not only the talented 10th concentrating primarily in courts.

Concentration upon the right to vote was too little and too late. The more precise question was being asked and answered, "How does a people without civil liberties secure civil rights?" It was being answered not only in the courts and legislative halls, but also by sit-ins in places of public accommodations, stand-ins in voting registration lines and pray-ins in churches. It was being answered by Rosa Lee Parks, who walked in preference to riding a segregated bus in Birmingham—who, in short, "voted with her feet." Commercial pressure was applied. Taking a leaf from American labor history, as well as from Thoreau and Ghandi, the American Negro sat down and was recognized. The Emancipation Proclamation was marked "received" by the ordinary Negro citizen and returned to the White House dated 100 years later with the injunction, "All, Here, Now." The little fellow whose birthright to full and equal opportunity it is the purpose of the Government of the United States to secure was fighting for his rights as a first-class citizen, for democracy for all, for integration into a Government by consent, and for America's nationhood.

President Kennedy's June message carefully assessed this change in method and purpose of protest and the reactions to it, and declared:

"The Negro's drive for justice, however, has not stood still—nor will it, it is now clear until full equality is achieved. The growing and understandable dissatisfaction of Negro citizens with the present pace of desegregation, and their increased determination to secure for themselves the equality of opportunity and treatment to which they are rightfully entitled, have underscored what should already have been clear; the necessity of the Congress enacting this year—not only the measures already proposed—but also additional legislation providing legal remedies for the denial of certain individual rights.

"The vulnerable code of equity law commands 'for every wrong, a remedy.' But in too many communities, in too many parts of the country, wrongs are inflicted on Negro citizens for which no effective remedy at law is clearly and readily available. State and local laws may even affirmatively seek to deny the rights to which these citizens are fairly entitled—and this can result only in a decreased respect for the law and increased violations of the law.

"In the continued absence of congressional action, too many State and local officials as well as businessmen will remain unwilling to accord these rights to all citizens. Some local courts and local merchants may well claim to be uncertain of the law, while those merchants who do recognize the justice of the Negro's request (and I believe these constitute the great majority of merchants, North and South) will be fearful of being the first to move, in the face of official, customer, employee, or competitive pressures. Negroes, consequently, can be expected to continue increasingly to seek the vindication of these rights through organized direct action, with all its potentially explosive consequences, such as we have seen in Birmingham, in Philadelphia, in Jackson, in Boston, in Cambridge, Md., and in many other parts of the country.

"In short, the result of continued Federal legislative inaction will be continued, if not increased, racial strife—causing the leadership on both sides to pass from the hands of reasonable and responsible men to the purveyors of hate and violence, endangering domestic tranquility, retarding our Nation's economic and social progress and weakening the respect with which the rest of the world regards us. No American, I feel sure, would prefer this course of tension, disorder, and division—and the great majority of our citizens simply cannot accept it.

"For these reasons, I am proposing that the Congress stay in session this year until it has enacted—preferably as a single omnibus bill—the most responsible, reasonable and urgently needed solutions to this problem, solutions which should be acceptable to all fair-minded men. This bill would be known as the Civil Rights Act of 1963, and would include—in addition to the aforementioned provisions on voting rights and the Civil Rights Commission—additional titles on public accommodations, employment, federally assisted programs, a Community Relations Service, and education, with the latter including my previous recommendation on this subject. In addition, I am requesting certain legislative and budget amendments designed to improve the training, skills, and economic opportunities of

[1] H. Doc. 75, 88th Cong., 1st sess.

[2] H. Doc. 124, 88th Cong., 1st sess.

the economically distressed and discontented, white and Negro alike. Certain executive actions are also reviewed here; but legislative action is imperative."

A bill embodying the President's proposals was introduced on the same day in the Senate (S. 1731) by Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD (Democrat, of Montana) and 45 other Senators, including 9 Republicans. It was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, of which Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND (Democrat, of Mississippi) is chairman. An identical bill (H.R. 7152) was introduced in the House on the next day by Representative EMANUEL CELLER (Democrat, of New York), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, to which the bill was referred. Hearings were held on H.R. 7152 and on 171 other bills from May 8 through August 2, 1963. The subcommittee met in executive session a total of 17 days, reported out favorably a substitute, H.R. 7182, which was adopted by a majority of the full Judiciary Committee, and by a majority of the House of Representatives on February 10, 1964, by a vote of 290 to 130.

A filibuster then ensued in the Senate. The grand strategy for both sides appeared to center in the question, "What amendments in the House bill could be debated and traded for what votes to secure cloture, that is, the two-thirds vote necessary to cut off the filibuster?" Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY and PHILIP HART were the principal Democratic strategists.

Senator DIRKSEN offered a large number of amendments and secured the favorable disposition of enough of his Republican colleagues to assure the required support for cloture and passage. On June 10, 1964, cloture was voted in the Senate, 71 to 29. On June 19, the measure was passed by the Senate, 73 to 27, a year after the Kennedy message to Congress on civil rights. Of the 73 voting in the Senate for final passage, 46 were Democrats and 27 were Republicans.

That matter was then dispatched to the House Rules Committee which reported the bill out, 10 to 5. A final vote was taken in the House, resulting in 289 in favor, and 126 against. Of the 289 favorable votes, 153 were Democratic and 136 were Republican. Ninety-one Democrats and 35 Republicans voted "no." President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 on July 3, 1964.

II. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The amended H.R. 7152, a revised Mansfield-Celler bill, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, is confined to civil rights issues. It does not include other items stressed by President Kennedy in his civil rights message as effecting the welfare of minority groups, such as area redevelopment, Federal aid to education and youth employment. It should be noted that the President partially reflected a judgment similar to that of the huge Washington demonstration of August 1963—that fair and full employment are interrelated goals. The new Civil Rights Act does not tie the two goals together. The majority of the House Judiciary Committee stated (H. Rept. No. 914, 88th Cong., 1st sess.):

"The bill, as amended, is designed primarily to protect and provide more effective means to enforce the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States. In furtherance of these objectives, the bill: (1) Provides for the appointment of a three-judge district court in voting suits and for the expeditious determination of such suits, and also provides against the discriminatory use of literacy tests in Federal elections; (2) prohibits discrimination in enumerated public establishments; (3) authorizes the Attorney General to initiate suits to desegregate public facilities, other than public schools, and to intervene in suits charging deprivation of equal protection of the laws; (4) authorizes the Attorney General to initiate suits to desegregate public schools; (5) makes the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency; (6) prohibits discrimination in any Federal Equal Employment Commission designed to eliminate discriminatory employment practices by business, labor unions, or employment agencies; (7) provides for the compilation of registration and voting statistics by race, color, and national origin; (8) makes a remand of a civil rights case from a Federal court back to a State court reviewable on appeal."

The House Judiciary Committee accompanied its legislative exposition of purpose with the following general statement which may be of significance in the future to courts as well as to the public:

"In various regions of the country there is discrimination against some minority groups. Most glaring, however, is the discrimination against Negroes which exists throughout our Nation. Today, more than 100 years after their formal emancipation, Negroes, who make up over 10 percent of our population are by virtue of one or another type of discrimination not accorded the rights, privileges, and opportunities which are considered to be, and must be the birthright of all citizens.

"Considerable progress has been made in eliminating discrimination in many areas because of local initiative either in the form of State laws and local ordinances or as the result of voluntary action. Nevertheless, in the last decade it has become increasingly clear that progress has been too slow and that national legislation is required to meet a national need which becomes ever more obvious. That need is evidenced, on the one hand, by a growing impatience by the victims of discrimination with its continuance and, on the other hand, by a growing recognition on the part of all of our people of the incompatibility of such discrimination with our ideals and the principles to which this country is dedicated. A number of provisions to the Constitution of the United States clearly supply the means 'to secure these rights,' and H.R. 7152, as amended, resting upon this authority, is designed as a step toward eradicating significant areas of discrimination on a nationwide basis. It is general in application and national in scope.

"No bill can or should lay claim to eliminating all of the causes and consequences of racial and other types of discrimination against minorities. There is reason to believe, however, that national leadership provided by the enactment of Federal legislation dealing with the most troublesome problems will create an atmosphere conducive to voluntary or local resolution of other forms of discrimination.

"It is, however, possible and necessary for the Congress to enact legislation which prohibits and provides the means of terminating the most serious types of discrimination. This, H.R. 7152, as amended, would achieve in a number of related areas. It would reduce discriminatory obstacles to the exercise of the right to vote and provide means of expediting the vindication of that right. It would make it possible to remove the daily affront and humiliation involved in discriminatory denials of access to facilities ostensibly open to the general public. It would guarantee that there will be no discrimination among recipients of Federal financial assistance. It would prohibit discrimination in employment, and provide means to expedite termination of discrimination in public education. It would open additional avenues to deal with redress of denials of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion, or national origin by State or local authorities.

"H.R. 7152, as amended, is a constitutional and desirable means of dealing with the injustices and humiliations of racial and other discrimination. It is a reasonable and responsible bill whose provisions are designed effectively to meet an urgent and most serious national problem."

III. MAIN PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

A. Voting rights

Title I consists of a single section, 101, that extensively amends the existing Federal statute providing for civil remedies to protect the right to vote.[3] That statute, originally enacted in 1870, was amended by the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. However, the Commission on Civil Rights found, for example, in 1963 that there are still 100 counties in 7 States where qualified Negro citizens are denied the right to vote by being forced to meet standards not required of white citizens.

Subsection (a) of section 101 is aimed at certain practices that have been used to exclude Negroes from voting. It does not refer to discrimination, but instead prohibits certain specific exclusionary devices. It applies to any State official or anyone else acting under "color of law" but only in the case of Federal elections. It prohibits (a) the use of different standards or procedures for different individuals to qualify for voting; (b) the denial of the right to vote because of immaterial errors or omissions by an applicant; and (c) the use of any literacy test unless it is in writing and a copy of the test and the voter's answers are available to him. A separate provision states that, for the purpose of this subsection, "'literacy test' includes any test of the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter." (It should be noted also that, under the existing statute, the term "vote" includes registration and all other steps preliminary to voting.)

Subsection (b) of section 101 amends the existing statute empowering the Attorney General to bring suits to prevent interference with the right to vote. It provides that, in any such suit "there shall be a rebuttable presumption" that any person who has completed the sixth grade in any public school or accredited private school "where instruction is carried on predominantly in the English language" possesses "sufficient literacy, comprehension, and intelligence to vote in any Federal election."

Subsection (c) of section 101 adds a new paragraph designed to give relief while a case is pending. Under the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts, the Attorney General can bring an action to halt discrimination in voting. If the court finds that a pattern of discrimination exists, would-be voters of the same race as the persons discriminated against can ask a court to register them. In this case, the court may appoint a voting referee to pass on such applications for registration.

In his civil rights message of February 28, President Kennedy pointed out that many such cases drag on for periods of a year or more, during which no action is taken. Hence, the act would add a provision allowing the Attorney General or the defendant to ask for the convening of a "court of three judges" to hear and determine the case. Contrary to the belief of some the Attorney General would not have authority to register any voters.

Section 101 adds a new paragraph designed to speed the disposition of voting cases. It provides that, in any voting case, the chief judge of the district or of the Federal circuit shall promptly assign a judge to hear and determine the case and that the case shall be "in every way expedited."

B. Discrimination in places of public accommodation

Under the 1964 act discrimination would be prohibited in specific places of public accommodation whose operation "affects" inter-

[3] 42 U.S.C. 1971.

state commerce or whose practices of discrimination are "supported by" State action. An example of the latter, says the Commission on Civil Rights, would be State or local laws requiring proprietors to exclude or segregate Negro customers.[4]

This section creates for "all persons" a civil right to "full and equal enjoyment of" public accommodations "without discrimination or segregation on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin."

The public accommodations covered include hotels and motels, restaurants, lunch counters, gasoline stations, theaters and stadiums or other facilities which are part of an establishment covered by the act. The provision would be enforced by the persons who were discriminated against. Such persons should file a civil suit in Federal court to enjoin such denial of "full and free access." The Attorney General is likewise empowered to institute such suits upon certification of the suit as one "of general public importance." The Attorney General could use Federal, State, or local public agencies to secure voluntary compliance before beginning the court proceedings. Before starting suit, it is mandatory that the Attorney General "notify the appropriate State or local officials and, upon request, afford them a reasonable time to act under such State or local laws." The Attorney General "may" before suit "utilize the services of any Federal, State, or local agency * * * to attempt to secure compliance * * * by voluntary procedures." But the Attorney General shall not be required to give such notice if he "shall file with the court a certificate that the delay * * * would adversely affect the interests of the United States or that compliance * * * would prove ineffective."

Senator DIRKSEN, however, altered this procedure. If there were a local public-accommodations law, an individual would not file a Federal suit until 30 days after he had notified local officials of his complaint. The Federal court could delay the suit until local officials completed their action. If there were no local law, he could file a Federal suit immediately. The court then would have the power to ask a newly created community-relations service to investigate and to seek voluntary compliance with the law for a period up to 120 days. These negotiations would be secret. If they failed, the suit would proceed.

Under the Dirksen amendments, the Attorney General could not institute such suits for individuals. He could ask the court, however, to intervene in such cases. If granted that would mean that Federal attorneys would help argue the case, but the complainant would have the burden of securing counsel and assuming other costs. But if the Attorney General could demonstrate a community pattern of denying free access to public accommodations, he could file a Federal suit, set forth his facts and seek relief against specific proprietors whom he considered part of the pattern.

The Civil Rights Act would not make persons or businesses licensed by a State or city subject to the act by virtue of their license. Nor are all businesses offering goods and services to the public covered. Only those establishments specifically listed in the act or physically part of a listed establishment would be subject to the act. The act does not prohibit racial discrimination in barbershops, beauty parlors and many other service establishments, retail stores, bowling alleys and other places of recreation unless such places serve food. It would not cover hotels or lodging houses which have less than six rooms for rent in a building occupied by the proprietor. Merely operating under a State regulation would not make an establishment subject to the act.

It has been suggested that the public accommodations section would be a vast extension of Federal control and that it is unconstitutional. However, business open to the public is already subject to many Federal, State, and local regulations (e.g., antitrust laws, zoning ordinances, health and sanitation standards) designed to protect the public and business itself. Also, the proposed legislation prohibiting racial discrimination by certain businesses serving the public is similar to statutes already in existence in 30 States. These statutes have been held constitutional. Discrimination supported by State action was redefined by the House to mean discrimination or segregation carried on under color of law, statute, ordinance or regulation; or carried on under color of any custom or usage required or enforced by public officials; or required by action of the State.

Finally, the committee version of the bill made it unlawful to incite, aid or abet any person to discriminate against another. The House deleted this section, but the act leaves intact the prohibition against intimidation, coercion and retaliation.

C. Desegregation of publicly owned facilities

Any individual denied equal access to a publicly "owned, operated or managed" facility, such as a park, swimming pool, hospital or library—but not a school—could file a complaint with the Attorney General. Should the Attorney General certify that the individual is unable to afford his own suit or is in fear of physical or economic harm, the Attorney General could institute a civil suit to force State or local officials to desegregate such a facility. The committee version of the bill made the United States liable for court costs in any proceeding under this title, and the House added "reasonable attorney fees" to the costs, "the same as a private person."

D. Public education

The U.S. Office of Education is directed to conduct a survey on the availability of equal educational opportunity. It is authorized to render technical assistance to school districts in the implementation of desegregation plans, to arrange training institutes for school personnel and to make grants to school boards to employ specialists for in-service training. These plans have been required by law since 1954 when the Supreme Court ruled that enforced racial segregation in public schools violates the Constitution. This provision is intended to assist school boards that wish to comply with their constitutional obligations.

The Attorney General is authorized to institute civil actions upon (a) receipt of complaints alleging the continuance of school segregation, (b) giving notice to the school of unreasonable delay in desegregation, (c) finding that such suit would "materially further the orderly achievement of desegregation in public education," and (d) finding that complainants are unable "to bear the expense," "obtain effective legal representation," or are "unable" because of a risk to "personal safety."

It has been alleged that the U.S. Commissioner of Education "could influence the transfer of children from one school to another * * * until racial balance exists." The 1964 act gives no authority to the Commissioner of Education to require or influence the transfer of children. The House redefined "desegregation" to make it explicitly clear that it does not include the assignment of students to public schools to overcome racial imbalance.

Another amendment provides that besides school boards, States, municipalities, or school districts, other governmental units legally responsible for operating public schools might apply for technical assistance.

E. Commission on Civil Rights

The life of the Commission on Civil Rights is extended for 4 years and in addition to its present functions of investigating "allegations in writing under oath," denials of the right to vote and infringements of equal protection guarantees, and appraising Federal policies, the Commission is also directed to serve as a national clearinghouse for civil rights information and to investigate general allegations of voting frauds not related to racial discrimination.

The committee version of the bill made the Commission a permanent agency, but the House limited its life to 4 years. In addition, the House specifically prohibited the Commission from inquiring into or investigating fraternities, sororities, private clubs or religious organizations.

F. Federally assisted programs

Each Federal agency which administers a program of financial assistance by grants, loans, or contracts is directed to require the elimination of discrimination under the program, "with the approval of the President."

The action of a Federal agency effectuating this requirement might include the termination of or refusal to grant assistance. If such action were taken, it would be subject to review by the courts.

This title has been attacked as an extension of Federal control beyond that now exercised as part of the normal supervision of Federal expenditures.

The Supreme Court has ruled that the U.S. Constitution prohibits the Federal Government or its instrumentalities from discriminating because of race. Other Federal courts have ruled that private or public agencies receiving Federal financial assistance cannot deny the benefits of the program to persons because of their race. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act simply states these rulings as a principle supported by Congress. It says in effect that when Federal tax moneys are collected from all citizens regardless of color the benefits derived from Federal expenditures of these moneys should be available to all citizens regardless of color. For example, this title would require hospitals constructed with Federal funds to serve all patients without regard to race, color or national origin; State employment agencies entirely financed by Federal funds to refer qualified job applicants to employment opportunities without discrimination; elementary and secondary schools constructed and maintained by Federal funds to admit children without regard to race, color or national origin; colleges and universities receiving Federal funds for the construction and operation of research centers to admit students without discrimination.

It has been alleged also that this section would apply to farmers and homeowners, implying that they will be subject to Federal control. Actually, the act simply means that when Federal money is made available to help farmers it must be available to Negro farmers as well as white farmers. It means that when the Federal Government makes funds available for the construction of homes the homes must be offered to all eligible persons without regard to race.

The procedures to be followed in the administration of this title were amended by the House to require that (1) the President approve all implementing rules and regulations, (2) a hearing be held before compliance steps are taken, and (3) Congress be notified 30 days before funds are denied (or discontinued) to a program.

Another amendment makes clear that this title would not apply to Federal programs which insure or guarantee loans by private institutions. The housing executive order remains unaffected by this amendment.

Senator DIRKSEN would specifically limit the curtailment of funds to those recipients

[4] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, memorandum on the civil rights bill, Feb. 28, 1964, p. 2.

of assistance actually found to be discriminating. For example, an entire State could not be shut out of all Federal programs if only a particular city discriminated in a Federal housing project. The position of Senator DIRKSEN is incorporated in the 1964 act.

G. Equal employment opportunity

The most warmly contested section of the bill is title VII, providing for equal employment opportunity. According to the New York Times of June 7, 1964, 25 States, where an estimated 40 percent of the Nation's Negro population resides, have statutes prohibiting racial discrimination in employment. Generally the provisions of the act would establish on a Federal level what is already provided in most of these 25 States.

An equal employment opportunity commission is created to receive or initiate complaints alleging discrimination by employers in industries affecting interstate commerce with annually graduated coverage of 100 or more employees, reduced to 25 or more in 5 years, or by labor unions or employment agencies whose activities affect interstate commerce. The commission initially would seek to eliminate any discriminatory practices by conciliation and persuasion, but where these efforts fail it is authorized to bring civil actions in which the courts would review the facts de novo. If the court found racial or religious discrimination, it would order the discriminating employer, employment agency or union to treat all persons according to their merit and ability rather than their race, religion, national origin or sex. Back pay, hiring, and reinstatement are possible remedies. A 6-month statute of limitations is placed on complaints. Cooperative agreements are required with States having fair employment practices commissions.

It has been alleged that Federal officials could tell employers "whom they shall hire, fire, promote and demote, and how they shall handle their employees"; that employers could be required to maintain a work force balanced along racial or religious lines; and that the rights of employees within a company could be destroyed.

The Civil Rights Act does not give the Federal Government these powers. It requires only that employers, labor unions, and employment agencies deal with all persons in the employment relationship on the basis of their merit and ability without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin. Employers subject to the act are free to hire, promote, or fire anyone they want provided their action is not based on the person's race, color, religion, or national origin. And, under the act, it would be unlawful for an employer to discriminate against either a white or Negro applicant because of race.

The House extended the coverage of this title in two respects: (1) Sex is now within the prohibited types of discrimination; and (2) retraining and inservice training were included as areas in which there can be no discrimination. The rest of the amendments adopted were largely limiting in nature. Atheists and Communists are excluded from coverage, a provision of dubious constitutionality, and religious institutions of learning are allowed to use religion as an employment criterion. The committee bill provided that no union or employer would be subject to coverage during the first year after enactment, only those with 100 or more workers during the second year, 50 workers the third year, and 25 or more during the fourth and succeeding years. The House modified this by adding another year and a 75-worker level to the graduated coverage, postponing coverage of employers of 25 or more until 5 years after enactment.

Title VII was further amended by several procedural provisions. To initiate a complaint the Commission must now have reasonable cause to believe a violation has occurred. A vote of two of the five Commissioners would be sufficient to initiate Commission procedures under the House bill, but the act refers to "the Commission." However, a written charge may be filed "by a member of the Commission" upon probable cause. Hence a single member of the Commission may get the procedure in motion. The committee bill had empowered the Commission to bring a civil action before exhausting its informal techniques if circumstances warranted, but this provision was deleted by the House. The investigative powers of the Commission were clarified and modified to the extent that it may now inspect records of and examine only those persons being investigated or proceeded against. The committee bill had authorized such action whenever it might add to the enforcement of the title. Regulations or orders by the Commission may now be prescribed only after a public hearing. Government agencies must still furnish all relevant information to the Commission, but the House limited this requirement to information that can be disclosed legally.

An entire section relating to employment practices of Federal agencies and Government contractors, which was essentially a restatement of an existing Executive order, was deleted from the bill but the act does declare that "it shall be the policy of the United States to insure equal employment opportunities for Federal employees without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, and the President shall utilize his existing authority to effectuate this policy."

Many of Senator DIRKSEN'S amendments apply to this section. He would extend coverage to Federal employment and to union hiring halls, and exempt Indian reservations. He would eliminate the Commission's right to file suits. Instead, the Commission would investigate upon complaint and could recommend that the Attorney General intervene in certain suits. His amendments are incorporated in the measure as passed.

Under the Dirksen procedure, now embodied in the Act, the Commission would investigate a complaint in secret and, in those States and cities that have a fair-employment-practices law, notify the local authorities, who would have 60 to 120 days to remedy the practice. If they failed the Commission would have 30 days to seek voluntary compliance. If that too failed—or if there was no local law—it would notify the person who filed the claim, and that person could then file a Federal civil suit.

The court could, if it wished, delay the suit for another 60 days to let local officials or the Federal Commission try again to resolve the matter. The court could also authorize the Attorney General to intervene in the suit. But the Attorney General could not initiate a suit himself unless he could show that a pattern of job discrimination existed in the community. Senator DIRKSEN would have required the plaintiff to prove that the violation had been "intentional," but this provision was not adopted. This title of the act does not become effective until 1 year after the enactment.

H. Voting statistics

The Secretary of Commerce is directed to conduct a survey of persons of voting age by race, color, and national origin, and to determine the extent to which such persons have registered and have voted, in such geographic areas as recommended by the Commission on Civil Rights.

I. Removal of intervention in civil rights cases

The order of a Federal court sending a civil rights case back to a State court shall be reviewable by appeal. The Attorney General is given authorization to intervene in any case that he can certify is of "general public importance."

J. Community relations service

This entire title was inserted in the bill on the House floor, after having been deleted by the Judiciary Committee. It establishes a community relations service in the Department of Commerce to provide informal assistance to persons or communities requiring help with civil rights problems. The service is limited to a director and six employees.

K. Miscellaneous

The last title in the act contains necessary miscellaneous provisions. Appropriations are authorized to carry out the act, and a separability clause provides that the rest of the act will be unaffected if any portion is invalidated. Another section preserves existing remedies under Federal law.

A new section was added by the House to insure that the provisions of the act are not construed as "occupying the field" of civil rights legislation. State laws in this area are to remain in force unless inconsistent with the act. Respect for States rights and encouragement of the processes of conciliation and persuasion are intended to be encouraged by this exclusion of Federal preemption.

IV. CONSTITUTIONALITY

Considerable discussion and opposition developed on the Civil Rights Act of 1964 on the claim that it is unconstitutional. Senator Barry Goldwater was a particularly vigorous proponent of this view. He argued that the public accommodations and equal employment titles are in conflict with the 10th amendment, the commerce power, and the 14th amendment.

The principal constitutional bases upon which the Federal power rests to pass this law are the commerce power and the "State action" conduit of the 14th amendment. The reach of the public accommodations title is found in this language:

"Each of the following establishments which serves the public is a place of public accommodation within the meaning of this title if its operations affect commerce, or if discrimination or segregation by it is supported by State action * * *.

"The operations of an establishment affect commerce * * * if it is an establishment [that] serves or offers to serve interstate travelers or a substantial portion of the food which serves or gasoline * * * which it sells has moved in commerce, * * * it customarily presents films, performances * * * or other sources of entertainment which move in commerce, * * * is physically located within the premises of * * * an establishment the operations of which affect commerce within the meaning of this subsection.

"For purposes of this section, 'commerce' means travel, trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States * * *.

"Discrimination or segregation by an establishment is supported by State action within the meaning of this title if such discrimination or segregation (1) is carried on under color of any law, statute, ordinance, or regulation; or (2) is carried on under color of any custom, or usage required or enforced by officials of the State or political subdivision thereof; or (3) is required by action of the State or political subdivision thereof."

The reach of the equal employment opportunity title is found in the following language: "* * * the term 'employer' means a person engaged in an industry affecting commerce who has 25 or more employees. * * * a labor organization shall be deemed to be engaged in an industry affecting commerce if (1) it maintains * * * a hiring hall * * * which procures employees for an employer. * * * the term 'commerce' means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States * * * the term 'industry affecting commerce' means any activity, business, or industry in commerce or in which a labor dispute could hinder or obstruct commerce or

the free flow of commerce and includes any activity or industry 'affecting commerce' within the meaning of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959."

Many memorandums were offered to the House and Senate hearings on the issue of constitutionality of the proposed measures. Less controversy attached to the validity of the use of the commerce power than to the 14th amendment. The most precise and authoritative memorandum was that submitted on request of the Senate committee by Prof. Paul A. Freund, of the Harvard Law School.[5] Professor Freund's exposition suggested the phrase "among the several States" as being broader than "interstate commerce," noted that as to the commerce power "the issue is one of legislative policy, not constitutional power" and, in reply to those who expressed concern over the rights of property and freedom of association, stated 'every exertion of power under the commerce clause has involved some restriction on the use of property or the exercise of liberty while at the same time enlarging the effective liberties and proprietary interests of others. This is true of any significant regulations enacted to promote social justice."

As to the 14th amendment Professor Freund is more cautious. He notes the basic principle of the civil rights cases,[6] that only State discrimination is proscribed, not private conduct, and indicates that a combination of uncertainties is behind the Court's rationale for its holding, uncertainties as to the class of establishments, the kinds of practices and the standards to be set. Custom is not yet equated with State responsibility, and private licensees come into reach when they take on the duties of the public licensor. But the Court may yet be persuaded to overrule the civil rights cases and it is conceivable that a "new set of constitutional standards would be formulated for private practices covered by the amendment—a set conforming neither to the code of fairness for purely private conduct nor to the constitutional code for governments and their agencies." Professor Freund concluded his memorandum in words which were representative of the submissions of many bar associations and of the proponents of the Civil Rights Act of 1964:

"From this study several conclusions are indicated:

"1. The commerce power is clearly adequate and appropriate. In fact, more extensive use of the commerce power can be made if it is desired to broaden the coverage and reduce its uncertainties in marginal cases. No impropriety need be felt in using the commerce clause as a response to a deep moral concern. Where social injustices occur in commercial activities the commerce power is a natural and familiar means for dealing with them.

"2. There is no serious question of the right of association or of property or of privacy as a barrier to the legislation, applicable as it is to commercial places of public accommodation.

"3. Whether the Supreme Court would sustain the legislation under the 14th amendment is more uncertain, because of the necessity to find principles of inclusion and exclusion in opening up a new class of constitutional claims against private enterprises. The Court may be the readier to accept this basis for the legislation if a consensus is reached as to those principles by the proponents of this constitutional approach."

V. SOME COMMENTS

A part of the history of this legislation is the great debate as to whether the act is a "blueprint for total Federal regimentation," as former American Bar Association Presidents Lloyd Wright and John C. Satterfield have characterized it or as "the most comprehensive civil rights bill ever to be enacted by the Congress" as declared by Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP. It is not the object of this exposition to enter this debate, or to describe this act as more or less moderate or otherwise. A few observations may be offered, however, as to the adequacy of some provisions to accomplish the stated purposes.

1. A most important weakness of title I is its failure to deal with the problem of outright intimidation. The deaths and repeated assaults suffered in recent months by persons active in voter registration campaigns plainly reveal the need for increased Federal protection of the basic right to vote. It will seem incongruous to succeeding American generations that the Federal Government which so potently affects the balance of power all over the world is so ineffective in protecting the right of a qualified Negro to vote in a Federal election in Mississippi. Is it a matter of laws? Or is it a matter of will? Although the Federal Bureau of Investigation may be invoked with greater effect in this respect, in the past it has proved to be an ineffective and untrustworthy instrument to protect Federal rights and to enforce existing Federal laws in relation to Negroes and trade unionists in the South.

2. Making sixth-grade education presumptive evidence of literacy is a forward step. However, civil rights forces have favored either prohibiting literacy tests altogether or making a sixth-grade education conclusive proof of literacy. As long as 6 years of schooling is treated as only presumptive proof of literacy, the officials who have used literacy tests to keep qualified Negroes from voting will be free to continue their obstructive tactics.

3. A question may be raised as to whether in the desegregation of public facilities or public schools the Attorney General should be required to judge the means or ability of complainants to carry forward the sustained litigation. To some this appears to impose a degrading means test on injured parties, and is basically unsound in theory. It rests on the assumption that racial segregation is a private wrong rather than a subversion of the democratic system. The Federal Government has a responsibility to see that public officials adhere to the basic law under which it operates. Respect for law is undermined when public-school segregation, for example, continues to be widespread 10 years after the Supreme Court held it unconstitutional. This is a problem in which the Federal Government has a direct concern. It should take action in its own name rather than merely as a substitute for handicapped citizens. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 must be seen not only as a measure to help Negroes but as a movement toward the fulfillment of the Nation's purpose.

4. The enforcement provisions of title II, public accommodations, are quite limited. Because of the absence of either criminal penalties or damages, proprietors of public accommodations may take the position that they can continue to discriminate until compelled to change their practices by order of the court. Considering the fact that thousands of separate enterprises exist, separate suits by either the Attorney General or aggrieved parties would not deter a large percentage of them—only the most prominent violators. Though many will find the standards of the bill a helpful incentive to end a distasteful practice, the recalcitrant will yield slowly, if at all.

5. The act omits one provision that has been advocated by civil rights forces and endorsed by the Democratic Party platform of 1960—a clause requiring all segregated public school districts to submit a desegregation plan and to start desegregation by a specified date. The omission of this provision must be regarded as a shortcoming.

While in several respects the act falls short of the program of some civil rights organizations, it nevertheless represents considerable legal if not factual advance. It is far more comprehensive than the civil rights acts of 1957 and 1960. Its adoption ushers in a new stage for the struggle for constitutional relationships among American citizens.

The bill would provide for substantial reforms. Its major advances would be:

1. Development of a more adequate concept of Federal Government, through all of its coordinate branches, as an instrument for achievement of constitutional rights;

2. Establishment of the administrative structure for protection of equal opportunity in employment;

3. Comprehensive prohibition of discrimination in places of public accommodation;

4. Provision of governmental services for helping local governments and schools to comply with constitutional standards;

5. The pledge implicit in title VI that in distribution of Federal benefits the President will use his executive power to curb discrimination.

On April 10, 1954, President Johnson told several hundred business leaders that the passage of the civil rights bill would leave the Nation "on the side of the hill, with the big peak still ahead of us." He said that scaling the peak would require "the cooperation, the good will, the moral courage, the determination, the good sense, and the patriotism of every single American."

On the same day Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, speaking in the U.S. Senate in behalf of the bill, declared:

"My brother was the first President of the United States to state publicly that segregation is morally wrong. His heart and his soul are in this bill. If his life and death had a meaning, it was that we should not hate but love one another; we should use our powers not to create conditions of oppression that lead to violence, but conditions of freedom that lead to peace * * * the bill abounds with reasonableness, with conciliation, with voluntary procedures, with moderate approach toward its goals. With provisions as mild as these it can truly be said that even in passing the bill, we are still relying primarily on the decency and tolerance and conscience of the American people to secure these rights for Negro citizens."

VI. A PERSPECTIVE

What is not yet adequately recognized is that generally the South has engaged in a 20th-century program of interposition and nullification—that is, civil disobedience, an official civil disobedience supported by an official police state. So encrusted is this civil disobedience that criminal justice for the southern Negro, notwithstanding the historic decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, is not much further advanced than it was a generation ago in the Scottsboro case.

Law in the South has not been an expression of equality and justice, but a weapon of power for white supremacy. Official and unofficial power, institutionalized and structured on white supremacy, has used police-state methods, the knock on the door in the night, the arrest, the detention, the assault, surveillance, the threat, the boycott, publishing of names for visitation and retribution, the denial of job or loan or mortgage to thwart not only the Negro but to silence the great mass of whites who inchoately want to "disenthrall themselves" and find their own way to decency. Indeed, the civil rights of the Negro are not only indivisible from his civil liberties, but also are indivisible from the civil liberties of the whites. The coalition and conspiracy of the

---

[5] "Constitutional Bases for the Public Accommodations Bill," report of the Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, on S. 1732, 88th Cong., 2d sess., S. Rept. No. 872, pp. 82–92.

[6] 109 U.S. 3 (1883).

police, white citizen councils and their entourage have with precision and pervasiveness intimidated the white community by a network of economic, political and physical devices to the point where a consciousness is beginning to form—a consciousness that the Negro struggle for civil rights is part of the greater enterprise, of both Negro and whites, for democracy, dignity, and decency.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 may find its significance as part of that consciousness. When schools are closed to all who evade compliance with law and integration, the desire of white people for needed education merges with the Negro's efforts for equality in education. The Negro's struggle for a job at all, as well as for fair employment, will merge with the crusade for full employment for all. The Negro's efforts for equality will indeed improve the quality of the whole and move us farther along the road toward what President Johnson has called the Great Society.

But many more mergings and connections between the Negro's need and the need of the whole community have to be recognized. Where Lincoln departed from the irrepressible conflict, President Johnson and his successors begin, begin a leadership of reconciliation, of mediating and developing an ever-growing resolution of the new irrepressible conflict—of the Negro's irrepressible assertion and the South's immovable denial, of national purpose and sectional self-determination. The Civil Rights Act is a new tool, but it will still have to be wielded. The Negro in his struggle has the National Constitution, the national law, the pronouncements of the Court, the Congress, and the Executive.

The law serves a great educational purpose, as those in the South know, for they have passed many laws to encrust white supremacy and segregation. But as Justice Jackson said "the ultimate justification of the law is to be found, and can only be found in moral considerations and not in expediency and utility." President Kennedy asked Congress to support the legislation "for one plain, proud, priceless quality that unites us all as Americans: a sense of justice * * * not for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy, and domestic tranquillity, but because it is right."

Justice and rightness will have a better chance today with electoral reapportionment that bids well to posture a political realinement that will challenge the 100-year coalition between the conservative Republicans and the southern Democrats that has influenced if not entirely shaped American policy on every issue. Justice and rightness have a better chance because this is the century of the common man and the winds of change are blowing over every latitude of the world. Domestic policy and foreign policy are two sides of the same coin. America must serve its national purpose everywhere—"to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men." An America that is true to itself, to this purpose, will not be false to any nation. A nation that is the servant of liberty will be the master of its security. The Negro's effort must be seen as part of the unfolding of the United States as one nation in the service of human rights, economic security and peace.

To serve liberty means a confrontation with the South's official and unofficial civil disobedience. The perspective with which to assay the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is in terms of political power. The power of the Nation is now expressed in law. Will it be expressed in fact? The act will afford a legal basis for continued assertion of, and demonstration for, civil rights. But equality of right rests on equality of power, and the Federal Government must be equal to its power. Dean Eugene Rostow of Yale Law School, in the Anti-Defamation League Bulletin, June 1964, has put it this way:

"Let us be clear about what this proposition means; we can hope that the President with the remarkable fervor of his being, will succeed in persuading Southern Governors to enforce the law with regard to voting, schools, juries, and public accommodations, and equally will persuade Northern Governors to enforce the law with regard to schools, housing and jobs. But we must be prepared for the situation if his mission is only partly successful. The massive resistance to law of the last decade is no longer tolerable. It will have to be recognized for what it has been and is—a movement of civil disobedience—and dealt with as such.

"We shall have to develop procedures of law enforcement commensurate in scope with the defiance of law we confront today. Take the case of juries and of voting, two of the most basic protections of the individual against the State. There is no possible doubt that jury commissioners and voting registrars are breaking the law of the Nation in many parts of the South. But the Nation is not impotent. There are remedies which can and should be invoked unless the course of disobedience is soon abandoned. I have in mind the potentials for action by the Congress which are here in two parts of the Constitution; in that momentous sentence in article IV—once called the sleeping giant of the Constitution—which provides that the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government; and in the equally momentous sentences of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments which give Congress the power to enforce each of those amendments by appropriate legislation.

"I contend that a State which systematically denies the vote to a half or a third or a quarter of its citizens does not possess a republican form of government. And I contend that the grants of power to Congress in the three great amendments which followed the Civil War permit adequate and effective national action to hold the States to high national standards in dealing with the rights, privileges, and immunities of our people wherever State action, or custom having the force of law, operates to restrict them * * *.

"It is important to avoid self-deception and self-congratulation. Opinions of the Supreme Court, however eloquent, are words, means to social improvements, never to be confused with improvement itself. I do not undervalue the power of eloquence in human affairs, nor the strength of our loyalty to the values for which the Supreme Court speaks. But in the end the Court's work will prevail only if we make it prevail, all of us, those in high positions and in little ones, our visitors from Olympus and those who labor in neighborhoods and precincts and churches and in the humble local committees meeting at night, in old school buildings or city halls, where the decisions are made that truly determine the quality of our society."

What "procedures of law enforcement" may be "commensurate in scope with the defiance of law we confront today" bids well to be an abiding question. The irrepressible Negro assertion and the immovable southern denial pose the historic question of what quality and quantity of Federal force will be necessary to nationalize civil rights in the United States. "The road to compliance," said President Johnson, "will be long and hard."

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People urged the President to consider "taking over" race-torn Mississippi. Attorney General Robert Kennedy replied that the Federal-State relationship forbids "preventive police action." Twenty-nine professors at Harvard, Yale, Columbia, New York University, Pennsylvania, and Boston College challenged Mr. Kennedy's opinion in an open letter on this pivotal question.[7]

The law professors stated that the Federal Government has been fully empowered since Reconstruction to "take protective action in the circumstances that now prevail in Mississippi." They cited section 332 of title 10 of the United States Code which authorizes the President to use State militia and Federal troops "whenever he considers that unlawful obstructions, combinations or assemblages, or rebellions against the authority of the United States, make it impracticable to enforce the laws of the United States in any State or territory by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings." It was under this statute that Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy took military action at Little Rock in 1957 and the University of Mississippi in 1962.

The law professors also cited section 333 of title 10 which further empowers the President to use "any other means"—not only troops, but also Federal marshals—"to suppress in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination or conspiracy" whenever such an event denies equal protection to any class of citizens, or "obstructs the execution of the United States laws or impedes the course of justice under those laws." Certainly, therefore, power exists to deal with Mississippi's denial of Negro voting rights as guaranteed by the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964.

Some may argue that the Constitution leaves the preservation of peace and good order exclusively to the States through the reserved police powers of the 10th amendment. The professors declare that this argument has been without merit since 1879 when the Supreme Court affirmed the Federal Government's power to command obedience to its laws "on every foot of American soil." Mr. Kennedy's critics noted that prudence may curb these powers in Mississippi. But it is, they said, "disappointing and ironic that the Department of Justice, which has been bold beyond precedent in successfully urging the Supreme Court that the judiciary possessed the broadest powers to enforce constitutional assurances of equality, should now discover nonexistent barriers to executive action."

It remains for the future to disclose whether or not a national standard of "liberty and justice for all" in "one nation," a truly United States, can be obtained without the invocation of these executive powers. Civil rights in the last century in the United States have not been so much a question of adequate law; they have been primarily a question of adequate will.

MEETING THE PROBLEM OF COLLEGE COSTS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, as America paused a few weeks ago to watch our two astronauts, Ed White and Jim McDivitt, whirl around the world in their Gemini space capsule, I think the complex nature of the kind of world we live in was brought closer to many people.

This is a world in which there is a tremendous explosion of knowledge. Eighty-five percent of today's drugs were unknown 15 years ago.

[7] See Time magazine, July 10, 1964.

This is a world where two great nations are striving to progress in conquering the unknowns of space, without first working out a climate for peace on earth.

This is a world in which a great premium is placed on intelligence. We need intelligence to live in today's world, intelligence to change it and intelligence to survive.

To many Americans, the immediate problem with respect to meeting the responsibilities of today's world, is how to pay the cost of a college education. College costs are spiraling. In the last 10 years, these costs have risen faster than the increase in average incomes. More and more students are going to college, placing a great burden on the facilities that now exist. In 1962, a report on higher education in Maryland from 1961 to 1975, the so-called Curlett report, predicted that the number of Maryland high school students entering college would rise from the figure of 10,000 yearly in 1961 to a figure of 23,000 yearly by 1975. This is an increase from 33 to 43 percent in the number of high school graduates that will attend college. Thus far, the estimates of the Curlett report have been conservative and even higher numbers of Maryland young people are seeking a college education.

Historically, the trend of higher education in America has been to encourage more and more young people from lower and middle income families to attend college. It has been necessary for many of these families to borrow large sums of money or for these students to work and attend school part time to secure a college education. I think it is in the best interests of Maryland and the Nation to increase the public investment in higher education to help keep costs down and maintain a climate which will enable every student with academic ability to secure a college education. In calling for this increased public support in terms of dollars and cents, I think we must not overlook the fact, especially here in Maryland, that brainpower brings industry. Economists estimate a return in terms of economic growth, of from 9 to 15 percent on the money we invest in education. Also, there is no room at the bottom in our complex technical society today and we must have increased public support for the cost of education, or eventually pay the social and economic costs of an uneducated people.

One proposal which we now have under consideration in the House Education and Labor Committee, is a doubling of the amount of Federal funds to be authorized next year for the construction of undergraduate classrooms and facilities. In the 1963 law we passed to aid the construction of higher education facilities, $230 million was authorized annually. Under the terms of this bill and Maryland's plan for expansion for higher education; Montgomery Junior College, Salisbury State College, University of Maryland, Coppin State College in Baltimore, the College of Notre Dame in Baltimore, and St. Joseph's College in Emmitsburg, will soon receive about $3½ million to expand their facilities. The "higher education" subcommittee has suggested a doubling of the Federal funds available for this program next year.

We are also considering the establishment of a limited number of Federal scholarships or opportunity grants as they are being called, to aid needy young people with outstanding academic potential.

We are considering an expanded federally supported work-study program in the colleges and universities permitting additional students to earn and learn and finally, we are considering the greatly expanded program of federally insured loans that would be available to college students at a lower interest rate than they can at present receive.

These are some of the things that are happening on the Federal level to meet the problem of college costs.

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. PUCINSKI, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RESNICK, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. POWELL in four instances.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in three instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 853. An act for the relief of Charles N. Legarde and his wife, Beatrice E. Legarde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1098. An act to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1666. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1742. An act to authorize the U.S. Governor to agree to amendments to the articles of agreements of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2212. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish and administer a plan to provide for the care and protection of children through public day care services, and to provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to certain dependent children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 30, 1965, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3415. An act to equalize certain penalties in the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933;

H.R. 4493. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap;

H.R. 4525. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the continuation of authority to develop American-flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs;

H.R. 5283. An act to provide for the 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;

H.R. 7105. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8131. An act to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; and

H.R. 8147. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the exemption from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 2, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1296. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of a study of the factors which might tend to result in discrimination in employment because of age, pursuant to section 715 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1297. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the Commissioner of Education's report on Public Laws 815 and 874, based on a study by the Stanford Research Institute; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1298. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further section 1011 of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1299. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of possible additional procurement costs resulting from award of subcontract for radio antenna systems on a sole-source

basis, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1300. A letter from the executive director, the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, transmitting an audit of the accounts of the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, pursuant to Public Law 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 261. Resolution authorizing cards of identification for certain officers and employees of the House of Representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 572). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 440. Resoluton for consideration of H.R. 6400, a bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 573). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1462. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 722. A bill to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy so they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force; with amendment (Rept. No. 576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 725. A bill to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters; with amendment (Rept. No. 577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 727. A bill to provide for the administration of the Coast Guard Band; with amendment (Rept. No. 578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3433. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall convey certain real property to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; with amendment (Rept. No. 579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3957. A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 7779. A bill to provide for the retirement of enlisted members of the Coast Guard Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 581). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8720. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the Government of Guam; without amendment (Rept. No. 582). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8721. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the Govment of the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 583). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 8761. A bill to provide an increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 454. Joint resolution to provide for the development of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee of Conference. S. 559. An act to regulate the labeling of cigarettes, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 586). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 9022. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9041. A bill to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 9598. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 9599. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the donation of the State of Indiana of the George Rogers Clark Memorial for maintenance by the United States as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 9600. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 9601. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct programs to reduce the impact of droughts on rural residents, small municipalities, agriculture and livestock enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 9602. A bill to protect and conserve the North Pacific fur seals, and to administer the Pribilof Islands for the conservation of fur seals and other wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 9603. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide that at least 75 percent of cargoes procured, furnished, or financed by the United States shall be transported in U.S.-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 9604. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9605. A bill to amend section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 relating to analysis of executive agencies expenditures by the Comptroller General in order to make this section effective and operable; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.J. Res. 562. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Res. 441. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that oppression of minorities in Rumania through a systematic plan launched by the Communist regime in control of Rumania be condemned and the President of the United States is requested to take appropriate steps in our relations with the Rumanian Government as are likely to bring relief to the persecuted minorities in the controversial Transylvania region of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H. Res. 442. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

333. By Mr. PRICE: Joint resolution adopted in the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois urging Congress to enact legislation incorporating the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

334. Also, resolution adopted by the House of Representatives in the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois requesting Congress to consider enactment of legislation promoting improved automobile design safety and travel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

335. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, to oppose any constitutional amendment authorizing a State with a bicameral legislature to utilize factors other than population in apportioning either house of a bicameral legislature; 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. ABBITT:

H.R. 9606. A bill for the relief of Paul H. Fuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 9607. A bill for the relief of Anastasios Andrew Kyres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 9608. A bill for the relief of Lucile B. Mahieu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 9609. A bill for the relief of Ramon Padua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9610. A bill for the relief of Saydi Issa Ghazal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9611. A bill for the relief of Anna Der Sarkissian and Meguerditch Der Sarkissian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9612. A bill to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 9613. A bill for the relief of Jermaine Jacobson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9614. A bill for the benefit of Mrs. Jean M. Koppang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Independence of Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on this day, July 1, the African nation of Ghana celebrates its 8th anniversary of independence, as well as the 5th anniversary of the 1960 constitution which officially declared Ghana to be a republic. On this memorable occasion we wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Kwame Nkrumah, President of Ghana, and to His Excellency Miguel Augustus Ribeiro, the Ghana Ambassador to the United States.

As is the case with many of the African nations, much of Ghana's early history is lost in legends and folklore, although there is evidence that Ghana was the name of an ancient West African kingdom. Again in common with other African countries, our knowledge of its recent past begins only with the period of European colonial intervention. The area which was known as the gold coast was at various times ruled in part by the British, the Danes, the Dutch, and the Germans, until it finally became a British territory in the early 19th century.

During the long periods of British rule, English customs and traditions were slowly spread throughout the territory, bringing about a gradual and perceptible unity among the population. Nevertheless, it should be added that this was only accomplished after prolonged and bitter fighting and not infrequent severe exploitation of the native population. The British also made efforts to extend elementary education to as many people as possible—unlike their policy elsewhere—and in so doing planted not only the seeds of future nationalism, but of future opposition to their continued presence.

Although the British created the conditions needed to foster national unity, the activism necessary to make this feeling an effective movement came about as a result of the work of Africans. The formation, first of the United Gold Coast Convention, and later of Dr. Kwame Nkrumah's more dynamic Convention People's Party, were the ingredients essential to the attainment of independence.

In the years since 1957, Ghana, under President Nkrumah's able leadership, has been eminently successful in dealing with at least two of the basic tasks which confront nearly all of the African nations. First, great strides have been made in mending the deep cleavages caused by tribal and linguistic diversity. English is widely spoken and is the basic language of instruction in the schools, although other Ghanaian languages are also being used in an effort to extend education and inculcate national values in the remote areas of the country. Second, Ghana has created a social and economic infrastructure unequaled by any other African nation. She has done this through a program for the development of basic industry and for increasing the efficiency of the agricultural sector of the economy.

In addition, a capital investment board has been created for the purpose of encouraging direct investment by outside firms. The board insures against expropriation by the government and allows free transfer abroad of profits after tax liabilities. One of the largest of the foreign investments which have been attracted by this program is a $280 million aluminum smelter being built by the Kaiser Corp. and the Reynolds Metal Co.

In the 5 years which have elapsed since the birth of the republic, President Nkrumah has done much to realize the aspirations of the fervent Ghanaian nationalism which he earlier did so much to develop. Ghana is now engaged in an ambitious 7-year plan designed to further realize these aspirations for economic and social progress. This gives cause for reassurance that Ghana is handling her problems in the most effective way possible, and that the past tradition of amicable relations between the Government of Ghana and the Government of the United States will continue.

Kingdom of Burundi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend greetings to the Government and to the people of the Kingdom of Burundi in this third year of their independence.

During this brief span, relations between the Burundi Government and the Government of the United States have always been friendly. Trade relations have been beneficial to both countries, and I refer particularly to coffee export.

It is evident that the Government of Burundi is dedicated to serving the true interests of its people.

No Dictation for Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in all of the maze of postmortems which have followed the election, several points remain clear through all of the smoke and dust. Most Republicans do not want our party to become a Socialist cousin of the already hopelessly Socialist Democrat Party. We must stand for those principles which are time honored and correct. It is obvious that we need to do a better selling job and many areas of self-criticism are justified. Republicans have always responded with new ideas. We must remember that the Republican Party is still the best hope for a strong America and the only hope for the preservation of the free enterprise system and our entire basis of individual opportunity and worth. While some may choose the course of expediency and collaboration, most Republicans surely stand firm in this principle.

One of the ideas which has been thrown around is to undermine the autonomous nature of our Young Republican National Federation. I well recall when I was Young Republican National Federation chairman how the Democrats operated. Chairman Butler had a very capable assistant, Dick Murphy, now with the Post Office Department, who in effect was executive director of the Young Democrats. The Democrats elected a national chairman but he was on an equal or possibly inferior basis with my good friend Dick Murphy. We want none of this in the Young Republicans. We appeal to young Americans on the basis of individuality and a flat rejection

cf bossism. Any chairman, committee, or group which advocates dictating to the Young Republicans should have the total opposition of our more than one-half million Young Republicans throughout the country. Any chairman, committee, or group who would remove the time-honored concept of independence of the Young Republicans is wrong and Young Republicans should never bow to this *type of insult*. I for one will vigorously oppose any effort to stamp the Young Republicans into a mold of oppression and dictation whatever the benevolent reasons might be. One party advocating dictation of our economic and political life and practicing it in its party operations is certainly enough.

Anniversary of the Independence of Rwanda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, on July 1, 1962, Rwanda became an independent republic. On this memorable occasion, therefore, we wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency, Gregoire Kayibanda, President of the Republic of Rwanda; and to His Excellency, Celestin Kabanda, Rwanda's Ambassador to the United States.

During the 3 short years of statehood the people of this small country in East-Central Africa have made a great and successful effort to create a viable and democratic state.

Since its independence the Republic of Rwanda has been faced with many difficult tasks in the political, economic, and social realm. As part of its historic legacy the new state inherited a complicated landholding system, which dated as far back as the 15th century. Germany extended its zone of influence over Rwanda-Burundi as a result of the Berlin Conference of 1884–85. After the First World War, Belgium administered the area as a mandate under the League of Nations and subsequently as a U.N. trust territory. Neither power changed the feudal structure of the society. It was up to the leaders of the independent Republic of Rwanda to institute the needed socioeconomic reforms, and I am pleased to note the spirit of perseverance with which the government has embarked on this complicated task.

Rwanda is one of the most densely populated countries in Africa. Despite its relatively limited natural resources, Rwanda has reached the point where it is almost completely self-sufficient in its food supply. Its agriculture was modernized, production was increased and diversified. Thus, the disastrous famines of the past were overcome.

Following a complete review of its economic policies after independence, farsighted industrial development began; the transportation system was enlarged and hydroelectric powerplants were built.

The benefits of these and other programs have reached all the people. Whereas in 1954 all education was provided by religious missions and limited almost exclusively to primary grades, Rwanda now provided free education for all children between the ages of 7 and 16. In 1962–63 its school population totaled 350,000, many in new secondary schools and technical institutes—a truly admirable achievement. At the same time, a variety of programs of great social benefit were started. Public health services were organized, and the training of doctors and nurses undertaken. Well-planned urban centers are growing, and new housing is provided for many.

In the years to come Rwanda will face many difficult tasks. Yet the experiences of the 3 past years cannot but lead us to believe that future obstacles will be overcome. Rwanda has taken the first steps with courage and success.

In pursuing a policy of international cooperation Rwanda has not only aided its own progress but has also set a fine example for the world. Agreements with the EEC, and pilot programs set up under the auspices of the United Nations give proof of Rwanda's commitment to international understanding. Though young in years, the Republic of Rwanda pursues a policy of great wisdom.

In short, the people of Rwanda can look with pride at the progressive development of their country, and Americans regard their efforts with approval. It is with the greatest pleasure that I congratulate Rwanda on the progress it has made. We admire the laudable goals and methods chosen by the people of Rwanda, and past evidence make us confident that the future will see even greater achievements.

Praise for Congressman James Haley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, and my fellow Floridian, Congressman JAMES HALEY, has received the praise of four of America's leading veteran's organizations. As chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Hospitals Subcommittee, Congressman HALEY was lauded by the Disabled American Veterans, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Veterans of World War I at a ceremony and reception staged in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee hearing room earlier this week.

Subcommittee Chairman HALEY conducted 2 months of hearings and investigation in connection with the Veterans' Administration efforts to close VA hospitals. In the wake of these hearings, 6 of the 14 hospitals and all 8 VA regional offices were eliminated from the effect of the shutdown order.

Each of the four organizations honoring Congressman HALEY gave articulate testimony to the dedication and sense of duty which has distinguished my good friend Congressman HALEY's record of public service.

Student County Government Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I introduced a resolution requesting the President to proclaim a National Student Council Week. Today I would like to again call to the attention of Congress the activities of the Nation's youth in the field of government.

For the past 7 years, the Board of Freeholders of Bergen County in my district has sponsored an annual Student County Government Day. Bergen is believed to have been one of the first counties in the United States to establish such a program and its Public Information Department has on two occasions been awarded the George Washington Honor Medal from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge for sponsorship of the project.

Student County Government Day in Bergen County involve students from the various schools taking the reins of government for the day-long period and working with their counterparts in their assigned duties. In the 1965 program, participating students met with county officials at an orientation night and were assigned specific county government projects, together with reference sources. Each student was also given an official handbook on county government outlining the duties and functions of government at the county level in Bergen.

A brief description of the day's activities from the 1965 report of the Bergen County Board of Chosen Freeholders follows:

A total of 176 students from 35 public and parochial high schools participated in Student County Government Day. This is the largest number of students and the largest number of high schools ever to participate. Students assembled in the Freeholder public meeting room and were instructed in how to use the voting machine. They followed regular voting procedures. Each student registered and received a voting slip before entering the voting machine.

Here are the two questions on which they voted and the results:

(1) Should the legal drinking age in New York State be increased from 18 to 21?—no, 101; yes, 65.

(2) Should the voting age in New Jersey be lowered from 21 to 18?—no, 110; yes, 50.

The students were then taken by their official counterparts to their respective departments to learn about the operating of county government.

At noon a luncheon was served in the cafeteria of Bergen County Vocational and Technical High School for the students and

their counterparts. From 2 to 3:15 p.m. student Freeholders and their counterparts held a caucus to arrange the meeting agenda. The public Freeholder meeting began at 3:15 p.m. with all the other nonparticipating students seated in the audience.

The meeting centered on the two questions on which all of the students had voted in the morning. A resolution memorializing the New York State Legislature to increase the drinking age from 18 to 21 was defeated 7 to 2. By the same majority the student Freeholders defeated a resolution memorializing the New Jersey Legislature to lower the voting age from 21 to 18.

All students and schools participating in the project were given awards and certificates and special recognition was given to the St. Cecilia High School student newspaper for "journalistic excellence in acquainting its readers with the aims of Bergen County Student Government Day and thereby helping foster an increased understanding of government."

High schools participating in the program included: Bergen Catholic, Bergen Tech, Bergenfield, Bogota, Cliffside Park, Don Bosco, Dumont, Dwight Morrow, Fair Lawn, Fort Lee, Hackensack, Hasbrouck Heights, Holy Angels Academy, Immaculate Conception, Immaculate Heart Academy, Leonia, Lodi, Mahwah, North Arlington, Northern Valley Regional, Pascack Hills, Pascack Valley, Ramapo Regional, Ridgefield Memorial, Ridgefield Park, Ridgewood, Riverdell Regional, Rutherford, Saddle Brook, St. Cecilia, St. Mary's, Teaneck, Tenafly, Wallington, and Wood-Ridge.

Bennett Praises Judiciary Committees on Disability Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to praise the work of the esteemed chairman and ranking minority member of the House Judiciary Committee, Congressmen EMANUEL CELLER and WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, on their work in the passage of the Presidential succession and inability amendment.

The House Judiciary Committee, working with the Senate Judiciary Committee, and its Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, chaired by Senator BIRCH BAYH, has done an excellent job in presenting this legislation to the country.

Since 1953 I have in every Congress introduced legislation calling for a solution to the problem of Presidential inability and succession, and I believe the authors of this amendment have done an excellent job in helping to solve this critical problem.

I am hopeful that the States will act favorably and speedily on the amendment, because the country and the world can little afford to be without strong and definite leadership in these times of continuing crisis.

The 250th Anniversary of Hopkinton, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged and honored to bring to the attention of the House that the city of Hopkinton, Mass., in my congressional district, celebrated its 250th anniversary over a 3-day period, this past week, of June 25, 26, and 27, with the grand finale and mammouth parade taking place on last Sunday, June 27.

Mr. Speaker, the early and most courageous settlers of Hopkinton met and conquered tremendous hardships to help establish for all America the basic institutions of a democratic government.

They helped to build a civilization, a tradition, a way of life and a proud history which lives to this very day in the heritage with which we are nationally blessed.

It is, therefore, Mr. Speaker, most fitting that this House take note of the bitter struggles and stern sacrifices of the pioneer people of Hopkinton so that we may perseveringly dedicate ourselves to the preservation and projection of the remarkable legacy of free institutions they and their heroic contemporaries passed on to us.

I am exceedingly proud that this great New England community, with its superb leaders and loyal people, is a bright part of the Fourth Massachusetts Congressional District which I am honored to serve here.

Hopkinton is without question one of the most beautiful towns in all of America and it will never be excelled in its civic spirit and patriotic fervor.

Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored here in the House a special resolution, extending congratulations and greetings to Hopkinton and its people on the occasion of their 250th anniversary and, at this point, I would like to include the resolution and extracts from the excellent newspaper article, by MacGregor Fiske and Jane Farrell, graphically describing the activities of last Sunday's closing celebration program, that appeared in the Framingham News issue of June 28, last:

[89th Cong., 1st sess.]
H. RES. 439

In the House of Representatives, June 24, 1965; Mr. DONOHUE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas 1965 marks the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the town of Hopkinton, Massachusetts; and

Whereas this town and its people have made important contributions to all aspects of the life of this Nation; and

Whereas the observance of this anniversary will be celebrated in Hopkinton, Massachusetts, on June 25, 26, 27, 1965, with public ceremonies, parades, concerts, and other public gatherings with widespread participation of not only the townspeople but guests and visitors from many places; and

Whereas Hopkinton is a beautiful community, rich in historic interest, well known for its patriotic contributions, noted for its many famous sons and daughters who distinguished themselves in many fields of endeavor and many facets of American civilization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the people of Hopkinton, Massachusetts, on the occasion of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of this community, and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of Hopkinton during the past two hundred and fifty years.

[From the Framingham News, June 28, 1965]
(By MacGregor Fiske and Jane Farrell)

HOPKINTON.—At 11 o'clock Sunday night the town of Hopkinton closed its 3-day 250th anniversary celebration with a rockets' red glare as thousands of Hopkintonians and neighboring townspeople huddled in blankets behind the high school, necks craned toward a spangled sky to watch the grand finale in fireworks ring down a perfect weekend of festivities blessed by excellent weather.

Sunday's third of the celebration brought out the biggest throngs. The day opened at 10 o'clock with an ecumenical service held at the junior-senior high school athletic field, then at 2 o'clock came the celebration's most magnificent display—a 78-unit, 7-division grand parade which produced some of the finest marching bands and drum and bugle corps in the State, interspersed with an array of floats whose imagination dazzled grownups and children alike.

It took an hour and a half for the parade to complete its route. Well over 25,000 packed Hopkinton's streets and cars were parked along Route 135 from Ashland nearly to Woodville.

After the parade the celebration moved to the high school where prizes were awarded for the best beards in town, beards that had all the splendor of months in the making.

Dignitaries addressed the celebrators and resolutions honoring the town of Hopkinton from the U.S. Congress and from the State were read.

The evening opened with a band concert, followed by choral group singing. Thousands began pouring in for the fireworks.

MAMMOTH ANNIVERSARY PARADE

The mammoth Sunday parade got started at the junior-senior high school when the smartly dressed Hopkinton High School Band struck up its first number.

Thousands lined the 2-mile route 4 to 8 deep as approximately 78 units, bands and floats moved down Grove Street, to Pleasant Street, up Main Street and into Hayden Rowe. Spectators were perched on porch roofs, yards were filled with lawn chairs, and every doorstep and wall was crammed.

The parade and anniversary officials led the marchers along the route and received hearty applause as acknowledgement of their contribution to the successful program.

Grand marshal of the parade, Joseph V. McCarthy, the only living member of the 200th anniversary, led off, followed by Francis McIntyre, coordinator, parade chairman John A. Carlberg, U.S. Congressman HAROLD DONOHUE, and State Representative Robert Belmonte.

The Hopkinton Board of Selectmen and their ladies rode in the century old Marlboro stagecoage, which looked like it could make the route today as well as it did in yesteryears.

Service units and their honor guards from the three branches of the armed services were represented by crack marching teams from the Yankee Drum Infantry, the Marine Corps, and the Navy Band from Boston Naval Base.

The Civil Air Patrol sent its 1965 State drill champions, the Massachusetts Wing, and a float to add to the military splendor of the program.

Most warmly received by all spectators were, most appropriately, the colonial units: the fifes and drums of the Progressive Club, Uxbridge; the precision drums of the Linn Village Drum Band, 1639; the Minutemen marching unit, Lexington; and Commonwealth Fife and Drum Corps, Uxbridge.

MOST ORIGINAL FLOATS

The old country was represented and rousingly cheered by spectators as skirling pipes of the Irish Barry Piper, Boston, and the Clan MacPherson played typical Irish and Scottish airs.

One of the most popular and musically skilled groups was the GOP Dixieland band beating out some hot and sophisticated "licks" from the Southland.

Chosen as the most original floats were creations from Curtis Road, Spring Hill, and Fenton Street. Curtis Road took top honors for the depiction of a colonial-clad class of children in Hopkinton's first school, 1743. The Lord Mayor of Spring Hill and his lady, relaxing on a beautifully landscaped lawn, won second prize. Placing third was Fenton Street and their representation of colonial living in a log cabin complete with gingham-dressed housewife, Indian princess, fireplace and well, and cut logs and split rails.

Judged the best floats were the oxen and covered wagon from Sutton, the Summit Chapter, No. 32, Order of Eastern Star, and the Girl Scout float and honor guard.

The Summit Chapter presented an elaborate star composed of the rainbow colors and women residents who are currently outstanding leaders in the Rainbow and Eastern Star organizations.

The Girl Scout float, decorated in green and yellow crepe paper, contained a square of dancers executing intricate maneuvers while the leader called.

The renowned National Lancers led the mounted divisions, dressed in smart cavalry and uniforms of red and blue.

ECUMENICAL SERVICE

Sunday opened with an ecumenical service attended by some 250 citizens. The service was held on the athletic field and participating clergy included the Reverend Andrew Halko, pastor, Woodville Baptist Church; the Reverend William Hogkinson, rector, and the Reverend John Foley, curate, St. John's Roman Catholic Church; the Reverend Forrest Higgins, minister, First Congregational Church; the Reverend George E. Hearn, rector, St. Paul's Episcopal Church.

Special guest speakers were the Reverend Charles Von Euw, STL, SEOP, professor of theology at St. John's Seminary, Brighton, and the Reverend Albert J. Penner, president of the Massachusetts Council of Churches and minister and president of the Massachusetts Congregational Christian Conference (United Church of Christ).

Reverend Von Euw spoke briefly on the feeling of purpose which is deep in the fiber of all individuals and communities. "We are called and drawn to a unity of mind, heart, and faith * * * a unit of all in God, our Father." This sense of oneness and faith enables the peoples of the world to remain free and will enrich the next 250 years of Hopkinton's corporate life.

Reverend Penner spoke on the need for social action of the United Christian Church. "It is the responsibility of the church to create a Christian conscience and heart" to fulfill the scriptual imperative "to build a city of God among the habitations of man." Ecumenicism in Hopkinton does much to insure that this town will be firm on foundations of Christian love and understanding.

EVENING ACTIVITIES

Hundreds of residents poured into the high school cafeteria at 4:15 for the first of four anniversary supper sittings. A typical New England buffet of baked beans, ham, potato salad, rolls, ice cream, and beverages were served. Albert Irvine was in charge of the committee who prepared and served the meal.

Johnny Archer and his orchestra provided the music for the adults in full anniversary regalia, to dance away the evening. Couples began arriving at the smartly decorated school gymnasium at 8 p.m.

At 9:15, 150 couples joined in the grand march to show off with pride their anniversary creations. Lovely and fashionably dressed in party-colored ginghams, silks, and frilly lace passed by on the arms of their distinguished gentlemen in top hats, bowlers, tricornered hats, straw hats, stetsons, powdered wigs, raccoon caps, and false and real face whiskers.

Francis J. McIntyre and Douglas Hamilton announced the evening's prizes which were awarded to Bill McMillian and Nancy Penney, most appropriate costumes; Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Creswell, most original costumes (Indians); two stowaways, Joe and Fran Mullin were given an award for being the funniest, cutest, and only kids of the evening. The best couple were Mr. and Mrs. Douglas Kenyon. The oldest residents at the dance were Mrs. Salomias Markowski and Mrs. Riega, both spry ladies in their 70's. Katherine Sullivan came the longest distance to join the festivities, from Florida.

Over 700 enjoyed a night 250 years in the making.

MARSHAL AND COMMITTEE

Joseph V. McCarthy, who took part in the 200th aniversary celebration of 50 years ago, was the chief marshal for the parade. John A. Carlbert was the capable chairman.

Division leaders were Col. Leland P. Berry, Cecil Holden, John Loncar, Vincent Wood, Seymour Wood, Walter Wood, and Leon Wilson.

Francis J. McIntyre was coordinator of the entire celebration with Ruth Chartier treasurer and Mrs. Mark C. Furber, secretary.

Committee members included Police Chief Francis X. Bowker, Richard Bartlett, John Deneen, Ernest Fecteau, Miss Adelaide Fitzgerald, Mrs. Mary C. Furber, Charles Hill, Norman C. Kimball, Francis J. McIntyre, Herman Larter, Mrs. Bernice Nealon, Robert Nealon, Thomas Russell, Joseph Spinazola, Fire Chief Arthur H. Stewart, and Robert Wilson.

Burundi's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the third anniversary of the independence of the Kingdom of Burundi. We wish, therefore, to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Majesty Mwami Mwambutsa IV; and the Burundi Ambassador to the United States, Leon Ndenzako.

The Kingdom of Burundi is a small country in central Africa which has recently received attention from the American press. In view of the importance of contemporary events we should give attention here to the history and political background of this recently independent state.

Burundi was among the last African states to come under European influence. Its first visitor from Europe was John Hanning Speke, who in 1858 traveled through Burundi in his search for the headwaters of the Nile. In 1871, Stanley and Livingstone arrived there and explored the region near the present port-capital of Usumbura, on Lake Tanganyika. In 1885, the German sphere of influence in Africa was extended to include the territory of Burundi. Although the Germans remained there until 1916, the government remained in the hands of the traditional authorities.

During the First World War, Burundi was occupied by Belgian troops; after the war, the territory was awarded to the latter as a mandate of the League of Nations. This status remained unchanged until after World War II, when Burundi, with its neighbor to the north, Rwanda, was made part of a United Nations trust territory under Belgian administration. Throughout the period of Belgian control, the traditional authorities also retained their positions. During the latter years, however, the Belgians sponsored an extensive economic development program.

By 1961, the people of Burundi had demonstrated their political maturity and responsibility by holding peaceful national elections.

Plans for independence were completed; with neither a political revolution nor a social upheaval, Burundi became a self-governing state, ruled as of old by the King, or Mwami, and his advisers. The Government, however, was now patterned on Western constitutional democracies rather than on old tribal organizations. On the 1st of July, 1962, the territory of Urundi became the independent kingdom of Burundi.

Today Burundi, under the leadership of its King, Mwambutsa IV, finds itself in a difficult political and economic situation. Improvements in medicine and sanitation have created a serious threat of overpopulation in the small country. This situation has been made more serious by the considerable influx of refugees from neighboring countries.

Yet Burundi has not been left in peace to face its internal problems and to pursue development programs in medicine, education, communications, agriculture, animal husbandry, and industry. While trying to improve its own situation in a rapidly changing area of the world, the Government must also keep under control the Chinese Communists, who, according to a recent Chinese defector there, want to use the kingdom as a base in central Africa for the encouragement and support of rebel activities in the Congo.

Recently, Burundi plainly showed its disapproval of Chinese Communist activities by severing diplomatic ties with Peiping. The kingdom has demonstrated its neutrality and its unwillingness to aid the spread of rebellion in Africa. It

wisely recognizes the importance of achieving internal stability and economic independence to complement its political independence. Under the leadership of Prime Minister Joseph Bemina, Burundi seeks moderation in politics, the integration of its rival racial and political elements, and neutrality in foreign affairs.

Today we see in Burundi a stable government and a channelling of national efforts toward common goals. In achieving political moderation and economic development, we wish the kingdom of Burundi every success.

In a Nation Blessed With Abundance, No Person Should Lack the Opportunity for Enough Food To Eat, Says Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in Launching District of Columbia Food Stamp Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of Public Law 88–525, the Food Stamp Act of 1964, and as one who has been working for a nationwide food stamp program since 1954, I was understandably proud and happy this morning to join Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia in launching a Federal food stamp program in the Nation's Capital.

Existence of such a program here in Washington will focus greater national attention on the many advantages of this form of food assistance to the needy compared to the direct method of distribution of dried and powdered and canned surplus food items still being used in most areas of the country to help 5,400,000 people in low-income families to escape hunger. As more Members of Congress see at firsthand how the food stamp program works, I am sure they will be even more anxious to have the program extended to all of the communities in their districts, as replacement for the direct distribution system, and to assure well-rounded nutritious diets for all of their constituents, no matter how poor.

Secretary Freeman promised this morning that the Department plans eventually to see the food stamp program "extended to reach every area in the area in the United States where it is needed and welcomed." At present, food stamp programs are in operation in 111 areas of the country, providing more adequate diets for more than 600,000 persons. By the end of this summer, he said, and with the higher appropriations being made available by Congress, more than 150 areas—counties or major cities—will be included, reaching more than 1 million low-income families.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ACTS TO ASSURE EXPANSION OF FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

As I told the group this morning which attended the ceremonies in the Board room of the District Building initiating the Washington, D.C., program, the project here—and many others also scheduled to start in this new fiscal year—were made possible by the action of the House in restoring to the Department of Agriculture budget the full appropriation of $100 million for the food stamp program after the Committee on Appropriations had previously recommended a $25 million reduction in the budget amount. The reduction would have prevented the start of any new projects.

Mr. Speaker, in his excellent talk this morning the Secretary of Agriculture described the close interrelationship and interdependence of the farm areas of this Nation and the urban communities. The food stamp program, perhaps more than any other program except the school lunch program, dramatizes that interrelationship and interdependence. Our abundance of food is a blessing from God; our surpluses, which are often so burdensome to manage from an economic standpoint, are a great strength to us in helping the impoverished peoples of many lands, including our own. As Secretary Freeman said:

In a nation blessed with abundance, no person should lack the opportunity for enough food to eat.

He added:

I hope and pray and believe that we will meet that challenge and the day will come when none of God's children go hungry.

But he also pointed out that we are not yet doing enough to assure good nutrition for every American, including the many children who are still not covered by the school lunch program.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks the fine talk by Mr. Freeman at the District ceremonies this morning:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, AT OPENING OF FOOD STAMP PROGRAM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DISTRICT BUILDING BOARD ROOM, FIFTH FLOOR, WASHINGTON, D.C., AT 10 A.M., EASTERN DAYLIGHT TIME, JULY 1, 1965.

Several times in the past few months I have gone to some of the larger cities in this Nation to help launch food stamp projects—a food and agriculture program enacted into law last year as Public Law 88–525, better known as the Leonor Sullivan bill.

These are especially satisfying occasions, for they illustrate better than any 10 speeches the close and indivisible relationship of agriculture to urban areas, a relationship often overlooked.

Let me assure you this relationship is difficult, if not almost impossible, to convey. Last Sunday, for example, I found it was easier to pet a tiger than to convince some hardbitten newsmen that the Department of Agriculture was concerned with the needs of all people, including farmers.

This only proves that tigers are less difficult to get along with than newsmen, or that anyone who holds the job of Secretary of Agriculture shouldn't be afraid of a tiger.

There have been times when I have almost concluded that the job of Secretary of Agriculture makes training a tiger seem like child's play.

It is ironic, for example, that the unprecedented productive success of American agriculture has far outpaced our ability to make full use of our food abundance. As a result, we have found it necessary to develop means of holding back production lest we strangle our farmers—and depress our national economy—with substandard prices and low-farm income that results when markets are glutted.

There is little joy in cutting back production, or in idling or banking cropland.

There is, rather, sadness and frustration in being unable to use effectively to satisfy human need the food we produce with such incredible efficiency.

But to make progress in getting food to those who need it both here and abroad—in this there is the joy and satisfaction of meaningful accomplishment in helping to meet the needs of our fellow man. We work much harder in the U.S. Department of Agriculture to make use of our agricultural abundance than to cut back its production.

That is why I am truly happy and privileged to be here today.

Eleven months ago, the Congress enacted the permanent food stamp program. Its guiding angel. Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN, is here today with me to help celebrate this event.

Currently, projects similar to the District program are in operation in 111 areas and cities throughout the Nation, and 67 of these have begun since the first of February.

These programs now provide more than 600,000 persons with a food budget which is a third again as large on the average than before.

By the end of the summer we plan to have food stamp projects operating in over 150 communities and areas where they will reach over 1 million low-income families. Eventually, the food stamp program will be extended to reach every area in the United States where it is needed and welcomed.

As a result, where the food stamp program goes into operation (1) local retail food store sales will increase 8 percent or more; (2) markets for farmers will be strengthened more than under any existing program; (3) families in the program will improve both the quality and quantity of the food they eat. Vegetables, fruit, meat, and dairy products will be purchased over the counter and will help brighten the lives of millions of Americans young and old.

This will happen here as the food stamp program goes into operation.

Thus, the dream which promoted President Kennedy to begin the first pilot food stamp projects in 1961, and the hope which led President Johnson in 1964 to include food stamps among the frontline troops in his war on poverty, have begun to be realized.

The dream of one President, and the hope of another, are both based on a very simple concept: It is that in a nation blessed with abundance, no person should lack the opportunity for enough food to eat.

Thus, while this ceremony marks an event of great importance to the people of the District of Columbia, it is in reality a guidepost of what we have yet to accomplish in making abundance a reality to all people.

We now distribute food directly to 5.4 million people in low-income families—and another 1.4 million in schools and institutions, but there are still communities which are unable or unwilling to afford the cost of distributing this food which is available without cost.

During the past school year, over 17 million children got a good lunch each day they were in school through foods provided both by the Department and by the local communities. The USDA contributes about 12 cents per pupil per day—about 4.5 cents in cash and the remainder in food commodities.

However, this program, as good as it is, still is not doing the job. While the Congress has consistently increased school lunch appropriations as the student population has increased, there are grave weaknesses in the current program.

No large metropolitan city today has a fully adequate school lunch program. And instead of getting better, the situation is actually getting worse.

In some cities, the program has been withdrawn from schools, while in others, the program has been severely limited.

The reason is not hard to find. No one would consciously deprive schoolchildren of food, or the opportunity to have an adequate lunch.

The reason is simply that adequate funds do not exist, either at the local level or from the Federal Government, to finance an adequate school lunch program. Thus, while none of us would consciously deprive hungry children of the food they need, all of us are failing to prevent this condition by not insuring that adequate funds are available.

Consider how ludicrous this situation appears. We are a nation which has more food available than it can consume or share effectively at home or abroad. And we have the capacity to produce nearly a fourth again as much with very little effort. Further, we enjoy the benefits of the wealthiest economy in the history of mankind.

We have the food, and we have the wealth and the capacity to distribute it. Yet, during the last school year, nearly 1.4 million schoolchildren did not have school lunches because there were no facilities by which they could be fed. The majority of these children are in the large metropolitan areas.

Here in the District of Columbia, for example, while over 8,000 children in primary and elementary schools received free lunches—most of these, however, were not even hot lunches—another 74,000 children who could afford to pay part of the cost did not have access to school lunch facilities.

What kind of a civilization is it that has everything needed to provide its children with adequate lunches except the will to do it?

Hopefully, some help may be on the way. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, when appropriations become available, will provide funds which can be used to equip school lunch facilities, and this may be of some aid to school districts with schools that do not have school lunch programs.

But, much more needs to be done.

Four years ago I urged Congress to strengthen the School Lunch Act, recognizing that this problem would continue to grow. The Congress acted to provide authority for special appropriations which would enable schools with large numbers of children from low-income families to provide lunches either free or at very nominal cost. Each year since then the President has requested funds to activate the special school lunch authority but, so far, to no avail.

Our accomplishments in using abundance demonstrate that we are capable of ending hunger, and our potential for abundance shows us we have only begun to test our capacity to use it.

This ceremony then is not so much a celebration of an accomplishment as it is a beginning of a joyous and exciting challenge—a challenge which can only come to a nation blessed with abundance.

I hope and pray and believe that we will meet that challenge and the day will come when none of God's children go hungry.

PARTICIPANTS IN CEREMONIES IN NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. Speaker, following is the list of those who participated in the ceremonies this morning in launching the food stamp program in Washington, and the schedule of events:

OPENING CEREMONY INITIATING THE FEDERAL FOOD STAMP PROGRAM, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 1, 1965

Time: 10 a.m., eastern daylight time.

Place: District Building Board room, fifth floor, Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street NW.

Principal speaker: Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

Host: District Commissioner John B. Duncan.

Guests:

Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner.

Commissioner Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke.

Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, St. Louis, Mo.

Donald D. Brewer, Director, District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare.

Alvin R. Rosin, Deputy Director for Administration, Department of Public Welfare.

Albert P. Russo, Deputy Director for Family and Children Services, Department of Public Welfare.

Aubrey Robinson, Vice Chairman, District of Columbia Welfare Advisory Council.

Schuyler Lowe, Director, District of Columbia Division of General Administration.

David P. Herman, District of Columbia Budget Officer.

Bruce Kiner, president, District of Columbia Bankers Association.

James Banks, executive secretary, United Planning Organization.

E. Wiley Stearns, Jr., chairman, Bankers Food Stamp Committee.

Henry Noon, president of District Grocery Stores, Inc.

Howard P. Davis, Deputy Administrator, Consumer Food Programs, Consumer and Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Isabelle Kelley, Director, food stamp program, Consumer and Marketing Service, USDA.

Philip B. Hearn, Northeast Director, Food Distribution Office, Consumer and Marketing Service, USDA.

John F. Conaboy, officer in charge, District of Columbia food stamp program, Consumer and Marketing Service, USDA.

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

At 10 a.m.: Opening remarks by Commissioner Duncan.

At 10:10 a.m.: Address by Secretary Freeman.

At 10:20 a.m.: Secretary Freeman and Commissioner Duncan to issue first food stamp coupons to two participating families.

At 10:30 a.m.: Press conference.

At 10:50 a.m.: Secretary Freeman, Representative SULLIVAN, and other officials depart for retail store.

At 11 a.m.: Secretary Freeman and Representative SULLIVAN shop with participating families at Carolina Market, 1420 Seventh Street NW. First food stamp transaction. Carolina Market is an independent store owned by Burnell Goodman and managed by Archie Moore.

OTHER NEW FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS ALSO BEGUN TODAY

Next, Mr. Speaker, I submit the Department of Agriculture press release today announcing the start of several additional food stamp projects as well as the one in Washington, D.C., including counties in Georgia, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, and Michigan, as follows:

[Press release of U.S. Department of Agriculture, July 1, 1965]

CURRENT NATIONWIDE STATUS OF FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Low-income people in seven areas in five States and the District of Columbia will begin participating in the expanding food stamp program during July. Two of the States—Maryland and Mississippi—as well as the District of Columbia will have food stamp programs for the first time.

The July openings will bring the food program to a total of 116 areas, which include the District of Columbia and 31 States, marking further progress on the initial year's expansion under the Food Stamp Act of 1964 announced last October.

New programs getting started in July are: the District of Columbia; Hall County, Ga.; Dorchester County, Md.; Ramsey County, Minn.; Harrison and Jones Counties, Miss.; and Wayne County, Mich. The program in Michigan is being expanded to include all of Wayne County, whose city of Detroit has participated in the food stamp program since its inception in 1961.

Under the food stamp program, low-income families certified in need of food assistance by State welfare agencies exchange the amount of money they normally spend on food for coupons worth more than they paid. The additional amount enables them to buy more and better food for improved diets. The coupons are spent like cash at retail food stores authorized to accept them by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Consumer and Marketing Service.

The latest complete reports for the month of May show that over 620,000 people were taking part in the program for that month. In the 105 areas that were operating in May, families put nearly $6.5 million of their own food money into food stamp coupons and received an additional $3.9 million—representing the Federal Government's contribution to increased food purchasing power spent in local grocery stores.

ANSWERING QUESTIONS ABOUT OPERATING DETAILS OF FOOD STAMP PLAN

Finally, Mr. Speaker, and because of the fact that so many of the Members of Congress have asked me for specific information and details about the operation of the food stamp program, indicating widespread interest in, but also much uncertainty about, these details, I include a question-and-answer summary of some of the most important features of the program's operation in the District of Columbia project, as follows:

SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOOD STAMP PROGRAM, PREPARED BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

What is the food stamp program? It is a means by which low-income families and those receiving public assistance are able to buy more food in retail stores. Their purchases are made with Federal food coupons, which permit them to buy most of the foods carried on grocers' shelves. Thus, they can buy more food for a varied, more nutritious diet, with the convenience of normal shopping practice. The program has two basic purposes: (1) safeguarding the health of the Nation's low-income families through better nutrition; and (2) increasing the flow of food from the Nation's farms through normal trade channels. The food coupons, redeemable for cash by participating grocers, are added food-buying power, thus benefiting retailers and wholesalers and stimulating the local economy.

How does the food stamp program work? Individuals or families who are certified as eligible by the District of Columbia Welfare Department exchange their food money for food coupons of higher value. This increases their food-buying power—enabling them to buy not only more food but better food as well. Coupons are spent just like cash at retail stores and are good for any food in the store, except for certain imported foods.

Who is eligible to participate in the District of Columbia food stamp program? In general, most of those who have been eligible for the Government-donated foods will be able to take part in the food stamp program. And it's important here to remember that to be eligible does not necessarily mean that you must be on relief. But, of course, a large part of the eligibles will be those receiving some form of public assistance—such as those with dependent children, the aged, the disabled, and the blind. But other families may be eligible; for example, the unemployed, and those living on small pensions.

How much do eligible recipients pay and how much additional do they receive? The amount they pay depends upon several factors. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the District Welfare Department, has worked out a sliding scale that shows how much is paid and how many free coupons are needed. Important considerations are family size and income.

Are there provisions for "hardship" adjustments? Yes. Unusually heavy or hardship expenses for medical care, rent, and child care are taken into account. Some relief and low-income families may find that the amount of money they pay for food under the stamp plan will be less than they actually spent previously, and, of course, they'll be getting substantially increased food-purchasing power in total.

Do the families get their coupons from the Welfare Department? No. Banks in the District will issue the food coupons. A family goes to the bank with an identification card showing how many coupons they are authorized to buy and how much money they are to pay. They buy coupons for 1 month at a time.

Once eligible families or individuals have their food coupons, where can they spend them? At any retail food outlet authorized by the Consumer and Marketing Service to accept the coupons. It is expected that most stores in the District of Columbia will be participating; large and small alike. Among them will be those handling groceries, meats, fruits and vegetables, and bakery goods. Established food-route operations, such as dairy home delivery, also will be eligible.

What can the eligible families buy with their food coupons? They can buy any food for human consumption, except for certain imported items and imported meat identified as ineligible by the store operator. Alcoholic beverages are not eligible. Of course, such nonfood items as paper products, soap, and tobacco normally sold in food stores cannot be bought with food coupons, either.

If the food stamp family's grocery money is invested in food coupons, how may they buy the household nonfood items such as soap and paper products? Allowance has been made for this. The amount of money turned into food coupons represents only what the family would spend for foods they can buy with coupons. Coupon shoppers will have as much cash as they ever had for other human needs; maybe even a little more.

How are food coupon purchases handled at the checkout counter? The customer identifies himself to the clerk as a food stamp shopper. Coupon foods are separated from the items which the customer cannot buy with food coupons. Each group is totaled and paid for separately.

How do customers get change for food coupons? No change in cash may be given for coupons. Unendorsed 50-cent coupons may be used in making change. If an amount less than 50 cents is required, the food coupon shopper has the option of paying in cash or accepting a credit slip from the retailer for future delivery of an equivalent value of eligible foods. A credit slip or due bill cannot exceed 49 cents when used in food coupon transactions. Examples: (a) If a customer buys $9.50 worth of food and tenders five $2 coupons in payment, he may be given one 50-cent coupon in change; (b) if a customer buys 60 cents worth of food, one 50-cent coupon may be given the cashier plus 10 cents in cash, or if the customer gives the cashier two 50-cent coupons for a 60-cent purchase, the cashier could give as change a credit slip for 40 cents. Retailers can also allow recipients to "trade out" the difference in eligible food.

Can sales tax be paid with food coupons? Yes. Food coupons may be accepted for payment of sales tax, but only for taxes on eligible foods purchased with coupons. That's another reason for separating coupon purchases from the items that are to be paid with cash.

May food coupon shoppers leave their coupon books at food stores? No. Coupon books must be kept in the possession of households to which they are issued. The books are to be presented each time purchases are made with coupons.

May food coupon shoppers transfer, trade, or sell their coupons? No. The coupons must be used only by the households to which they are issued. Anyone who misuses them, whether participant, retailer, wholesaler, or other, is in violation of program regulations and subject to penalty.

Where do people get information about the program and sign up? Individuals or families, who think they may be eligible for the program should go to 1291 Taylor Street NW., between the hours of 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday. People may call this number for information: Randolph 3-9560.

What provisions are there to help disabled people, who can't leave home, to take part in the food stamp program? The Welfare Department will arrange to register the disabled person at home. A relative or neighbor can be authorized to purchase coupons at the bank and buy food for the homebound individual. Call Randolph 3-9560.

Will anyone besides the food stamp recipients benefit from the program? Yes. The increased buying power of these customers should result in an estimated $1.5 million increase in retail food sales in the District. As the coupons are redeemed by the grocers and the money is added to the local economy the entire community will benefit.

Will families continue to receive federally donated foods? No. The food stamp program will replace the family distribution of federally donated foods here in the District. So, in order to continue receiving food assistance, it is necessary to join the food stamp program.

Where can retail food merchants get information and sign up for the food stamp program? Retailers should call 382-7413 for information. To be authorized to accept food coupons, they must apply in person at the Consumer and Marketing Service Food Stamp Field Office, 1634 I Street NW., room 405.

Somalia Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Somalia Republic celebrates its fifth year of independence today. Five years ago this new Republic faced the problem of combining different administrative, financial, and military systems of two formerly separate areas into an effective national organization. Today, Somalia is a stable country which places primary emphasis on improvement of economic and social conditions within the country, with especial emphasis in the field of education.

Independence Day of Somalia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on this date 5 years ago, the new nation of Somalia joined the world community of nations. On this memorable occasion, therefore, we extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Abdirazak Hagi Hussen, Prime Minister of Somalia; and to His Excellency Ahmed Mohamed Adan, the Somalian Ambassador to the United States.

Created by the union of former Italian and British Somaliland territories on July 1, 1960, it has in the past 5 years demonstrated an almost uncanny ability to retain distinctive and strong democratic processes, and create a viable fusion of two such separate former colonial experiences.

For a variety of reasons, Somalia has been the object of covetous powers throughout more than 3,000 years of history. For example, Somalia has for millenia been one of the very few producers of rare and exotic aromatics. In the ancient world, where frankincense and myrrh were prized as highly as gold, the areas which produced them were the object of envy and had an inevitable aura of mystery. Expeditions from the empires which ruled the Mediterranean world in antiquity spent fortunes on fleets and armies in order to control the sources of these almost priceless commodities. As a consequence, Somalia for centuries had to cope with expeditions designed to monopolize the incense trade.

In more recent times there was little demand for these aromatics, and Somalia's economic importance declined. In the 19th century, however, the powers of Europe were engaged in the struggle for empire, and every piece of unoccupied territory became an additional gem in the colonial crown. So it was that Italy, France, and Great Britain vied for territory on the eastern horn of Africa after the first wave of exploration by the Portuguese had ebbed.

As a result, the ancient "Land of Aromatics" became divided among a French, a British, and an Italian territory. In the aftermath of the Second World War, however, Great Britain administered both its own portion and the Italian section until 1950, when the United Nations trusteeship for the south was given to

Italy. In granting the trusteeship, the United Nations specifically stipulated that Italian Somaliland would receive its independence by 1960. By the end of 1956, the Somalis were in almost complete control of domestic matters—a fact which provided them with the experience necessary to conduct their own postindependence affairs with all the aplomb of a state with centuries of experience. As an indication of this, the Somali Republic recently survived nearly a year of governmental paralysis; unlike most other countries in the world, the democratic processes survived. Prime Minister Abdirizak Hagi Hussen was quite correct when he said that few other nations of Somalia's vintage could have endured so long a period of uncertainty without risking "chaos, disorder, anarchy, and the destruction of social balance."

Despite the bright political picture, there is no denying the economic difficulties which Somalia faces. Through the Planning and Coordinating Committee for Economic and Social Development the government seeks to stimulate production in all sectors of industry, agriculture, and commerce. Through various agreements with other countries, the government is obtaining assistance in founding new industries and expanding agricultural output in order to decrease and finally eliminate the present unfavorable balance of payments.

On their anniversary then, we congratulate the Somalis on their political maturity, and the government for its dedication toward providing a more prosperous life for its citizens. I feel certain of the support of my colleagues in extending our sincere best wishes for the future.

Republic of Rwanda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of this distinguished body that today is the third anniversary of the Republic of Rwanda.

This republic has expended great effort to institute technical and economic reforms. Accordingly, the people stand ready to profit from the advantage of having a government which has been able to catch a clear vision of the goals of a democratic society.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JULY 2, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT).

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Acts 22: 28: *And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was free born.*

Almighty God, may our minds and hearts be entwined to go out toward Thee in gratitude for the coming day which we shall be privileged to celebrate as our Independence Day.

We are reminded of those vast multitudes of brave men and women who gave such a tremendous sum in sacrificing and suffering for our freedom.

Give us a greater appreciation of the blessings we enjoy and a more devout determination to make our flag what our forefathers claimed it must be, "the flag of the free."

Grant that during these troublous days in our national life we may not forget what the stars and stripes signify.

Inspire us with the Declaration of Independence which declares that "all men are created equal" and "endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

May we earnestly strive to carry out that lofty purpose for the sake of the forefathers who paid such a costly price for them in days gone by.

We mourn the death of one of our beloved Members. Thou hast opened unto him the gateway to the larger life and received him unto Thy nearer presence. Wilt Thou bestow upon his family and friends the consolations of Thy grace.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CHELF. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, on June 30 I am recorded as having been absent, and I was absent. I was unavoidably delayed and detained at the White House during the presentation by the President of the United States of the Young American Medal for Bravery which I had the honor to sponsor back in 1950.

Mr. Speaker, this is the reason why I was absent, and the RECORD is correct in this instance.

CONSCIENCE OF A PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, Bishop John S. Spence, vicar general for lay organizations in the Archdiocese of Washington, was introduced by William P. Cochrane, president of the Capitol Hill Friday Club, at the club breakfast this morning. Bishop Spence's talk on the conscience of a public servant and the meaning of human dignity contains such sound reasoning that I want to share it with those who were unable to attend the breakfast meeting. The remarks of His Excellency, Bishop Spence, follow:

CONSCIENCE OF A PUBLIC SERVANT
(By Bishop John S. Spence)

A few weeks ago the State Department held an off-the-record briefing for civic and religious leaders on various aspects of U.S. foreign policy. The principal speaker was Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY.

At one point the Vice President departed from his prepared text to make a spontaneous profession of his faith in God. His remarks were so true and so inspiring that we requested, and received, his permission to quote from them.

"The real struggle in the world today," Mr. HUMPHREY declared, "is over human dignity. * * * I believe that God created man in His own image. I believe that there is a spark of the divine in every person, and I believe that that is the meaning of human dignity. * * * No man has the right to destroy that which God has given."

The Vice President's simple expression of faith reflects a declaration voiced last year by the Chief Justice of the United States that "we are a religious people." If that is so, and I believe the entire heritage of our country bears witness to it, then we must not be afraid to think and speak and act like a religious people. We do not need to apologize for our faith—we glory in it.

It is not enough, however, to see the hand of God manifested in the physical world about us, to be thankful for His favors, to worship Him and keep His commandments. Faith is a blessing, but it also imposes an obligation—and the stronger our faith, the more binding the obligation it carries.

That obligation, imposed on all believers within and without the mystical body of Christ, is to do the will of God in accordance with the dictates of an informed and upright conscience.

What is this thing called conscience? In its simplest form it is the instinctive sense of right and wrong that is present in all rational beings, regardless of faith of religious affiliation. Actually, for us of the household of the faith, an informed conscience is the voice of the Holy Spirit within us. When we call on Him for guidance, it comes through loud and clear. But even when, through the misuse of our free will, we try to stifle the voice of conscience, it is still there, striving to be heard.

Now, perhaps, you can see what I had in mind when I entitled this little discourse, "Conscience of a Public Servant." For in almost no other walk of life do the day-by-day decisions involving right and wrong come so thick and fast, or are the guideposts so few and indistinct.

You can almost feel the tensions in the air when a national crisis impends. Lights burn late in the White House, the State Department, the Pentagon, and a dozen other sensitive agencies, where experts pool their collective knowledge and judgment in order to advise the lonely figure in the great oval office. That is why, each Sunday throughout