

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Con. Res. 463. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a Spanish edition of "Infant Care"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. Res. 534. Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 6183, as amended, to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in years 1966 and 1975 and every ten years thereafter; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 536. Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 10281, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 537. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SISK:

H. Res. 538. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the milling and baking industry and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. CUNNINGHAM presented a memorial of the Nebraska State Legislature urging the calling of a convention to propose an article of amendment to the Constitution providing for a fair and just division of the electoral votes within the States in the election of the President and Vice President, which was referred 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. BELCHER:

H.R. 10596. A bill for the relief of Adel Lessert Bellmard, Clement Lessert, Josephine Gonvill Pappan, Julie Gonvill Pappan, Pelagie Gonvill Franceour de Aubri, Victore Gonvill Pappan, Maria Gonvill, Lafleche Gonvill, Louis Laventure, Elizabeth Carbonau Vertifelle, Pierre Carbonau, Louis Joncas, Basil Joncas, James Joncas, Elizabeth Batcherute, Joseph Butler, William Rodger, Joseph Cote, four children of Cicili Compare and Joseph James, or the heirs of any who may be deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 10597. A bill for the relief of Antonio Penna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 10598. A bill for the relief of Maria Scinmone Perrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10599. A bill for the relief of Antonio La Spesa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10600. A bill for the relief of Victoria Laczko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 10601. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of N. V. Philips' Gloeilampenfabrieken, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and having its principal office in Eindhoven in that country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 10602. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jesus F. del Pozo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

261. The SPEAKER presented a petition of William F. Miller and others, Mountain Park, N. Mex., relative to the impeachment of the President and Vice President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 19, 1965

(*Legislative day of Wednesday, August 18, 1965*)

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

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

Father of all, whose righteous laws condemn, and at last break, whatsoever bars Thy children from abundant life, we thank Thee for the legions of the uncoerced who even now in the name of freedom are marching, to blast a way for all Thy threatened children to escape tribulation.

We thank Thee for the clear call to all freemen to help build a highway to a realm and a reign of peace and good will, to a kingdom of human rights where mouths shall not cry for bread, where hands and feet shall not be shackled, where speech shall not be silenced, where eyes shall not be bandaged, and where truth shall not be distorted by lies which hide the light. Save us from the fatal folly of being unwilling to pay the price of better things.

As we destroy the worst things, to make ready for the fairer earth of our dreams, treading the winepress of sorrow and sacrifice, even though we are called to walk through the valley of the shadow of death, may we fear no evil because Thy rod and Thy staff comfort and strengthen us.

We ask it in the name of that One whose truth makes free. Amen.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the question is on agreeing to the pending amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to the committee amendment. Debate on the amendment is limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided, and controlled by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 18, 1965, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, August 19, 1965, he signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 1291. An act for the relief of the children of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski;

H.R. 7181. An act to provide for the commemoration of certain historical events in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by Stanford Dam, Canadian River project, Texas, as "Lake Meredith."

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. NELSON, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Judiciary Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

AUTHORIZATION TO HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO ACCEPT A FOREIGN DECORATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 605, H.R. 10132.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10132) to authorize the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of the Military Order of Christ with the rank of grand officer.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an except from the report (No. 622), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill will authorize the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of the Military Order of Christ with the rank of grand officer tendered by the Government of Portugal, together with any decorations and documents evincing this award, and will give the consent of the Congress to such acceptance as required by section 9, article I of the Constitution.

BACKGROUND

The Constitution provides in article I, section 9, paragraph 8:

"No person holding any office of profit or trust under [the United States] * * * shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state."

An Executive order of April 13, 1954, applicable to employees of the executive branch, further provides that no department is to request congressional approval for acceptance of such gifts by any employee until that employee has retired and that each agency transmit to the Secretary of State a list of its retired personnel for whom the department is holding decorations, etc., and directs the Secretary to compile an omnibus list of such retired persons for submission to every other Congress. This order does not apply to the legislative and judicial branches.

Since the end of World War II, Congress has authorized the following incumbent Members to accept foreign decorations: Speaker Sam Rayburn (1956), Senator William F. Knowland (1956), and Representatives JOHN W. McCORMACK and John J. Rooney (1957). All of these bills were passed in the Senate without reference to the committee.

Since 1957 it has been the practice of the Committee on Foreign Relations not to act favorably on bills authorizing the acceptance of awards by incumbent Members of Congress. In fact last year the Senate adopted a committee amendment striking from omnibus foreign decorations legislation the name of one incumbent Congressman. The committee's report at that time (S. Rep. 1520, Sept. 1, 1964) explained that—"this action constitutes no reflection on the individual involved or the donor government, but merely represents the committee's traditional views in matters of this kind. On at least 13 occasions, the committee has refused to approve the delivery of decorations, awards, or presents to incumbent Members of Congress."

This still remains the policy of the committee. The committee stresses that its approval of H.R. 10132 does not constitute a precedent for future such approvals, but is recognition of the high and distinguished office of the Speaker of the House of Repre-

sentatives, which the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., filled with great distinction.

Because of this factor, the committee voted to report H.R. 10132 favorably to the Senate and recommend that the Senate enact the bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Charles R. Simpson, of Illinois, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Stephen Potkay, and sundry other persons, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service; and

Douglas L. Johnson, and sundry other persons, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 15 brigadier generals and 40 major generals for temporary appointments in the Air Force. I ask that these names be printed on the Executive Calendar.

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

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Brig. Gen. William E. Creer, Regular Air Force, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointments in the Air Force.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably the nominations of 51 officers for appointments in the Regular Air Force in grades not above that of captain. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

John D. Best, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

Walter D. Alexander, Jr., and sundry other distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for appointment in the Regular Air Force.

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

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John E. Maguire, Sr., of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Florida for a term of 4 years.

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

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Anthony J. Celebrezze, of Ohio, to be U.S. circuit judge, in the Sixth Circuit.

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

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in relation to the elevation, if such it is, of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze, to be a U.S. circuit judge for the Sixth Circuit. I suppose now he should be referred to as Judge Celebrezze. He has made an outstanding record as Secretary for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He has been of inestimable benefit to the leadership in considering proposed legislation which came from his Department. He has shown a sure touch, a common touch, and a recognition of the needs of the people of our country, which I believe speaks well for a man of his caliber.

Personally, I do not like to see him leave the Cabinet of the President, but I feel that he is entitled to this new position. I wish him well. All those who come before him can be sure that they will receive fair, impartial, and just consideration.

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.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time necessary for the quorum call to be taken from the time allocated to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] will permit me to do so, I should like to yield 4 minutes to my colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to have the Senator from Montana proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. METCALF. I thank my colleague, and I thank the Senator from Vermont.

From time to time I have read editorials and seen articles criticizing the operation of the Economic Opportunity Act with respect to the American Indian. I have had prepared a general statement as to how the act has operated for these impoverished areas of America and these impoverished individuals.

At times Indian tribes have worked with their local communities in local operations such as Project Head Start or community action programs. At other times, under the special provisions of the act that goes through all the various titles, they have had an opportunity to work as a tribal council, and they have had their own programs and their own organizations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the general summary to which I have referred, together with a table of the various Indian organizations, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I point out, however, that encouraging as is the picture so far as Indians and Indian tribes are concerned, a statement from a Montana member of the tribal council has brought into focus the fact that even though we have better schooling for our Indian people through Operation Head Start and we have in operation a program which has the possibility of enabling these people to help themselves, the people on the Indian reservations need jobs. For example, we have a report that more than 60,000 of the labor force of 116,000 Indians on the reservations are currently unemployed. So these programs, desirable and as worthwhile as they are, and working as well as they have worked, still do not reach the primary trouble on Indian reservations—the need for jobs on reservations to put 60,000 people to work.

Welfare is fine and keeps the Indians from starving, but welfare is not the answer to people who have demonstrated ability to handle difficult problems, such as the manufacture of chemicals, the manufacture of electronic equipment, and so forth, once given the opportunity.

I am grateful that the program has worked so well and has done so much for the Indians and the reservations. I am glad to be able to put this report in the RECORD. But we have only begun

to take care of a serious American problem.

I thank the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Vermont.

EXHIBIT 1

GENERAL STATEMENT: AMERICAN INDIANS—ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

Indians have generally responded well to the opportunities provided under the Economic Opportunity Act. Most of the programs provided under the various titles of the act are complementary to Bureau of Indian Affairs' programs, and Indian applicants are familiar with the benefits to be derived.

The work-training program, title I-B, has made possible a tremendous expansion in summer program activity for Indian young people. Indian communities have submitted more than 50 Neighborhood Youth Corps proposals, to cost more than \$6 million, and to employ and train more than 9,000 Indian young people.

Work-study funds, under title I-C, will be available at many colleges and universities next school year, and many of the 3,600 or more Indian students who will be enrolled in colleges next fall will be eligible to supplement their income through employment on the work-study program. Colleges and universities are also being encouraged to establish off-campus work-study programs on Indian reservations, and assign Indian and non-Indian students to employment at these locations during the summer months.

More than 60 Indian communities have submitted community action programs under title II, with emphasis on extending educational programs of various types and at all grade levels. These communities have requested more than \$10 million for these programs. Approximately half of the programs have been approved, but regrettably, only a half dozen have been funded and are operating at this time.

The Head Start program for preschool youngsters has gained response from communities with predominantly Indian population which was prompt and gratifying—if all the requested programs are approved and funded, more than 10,000 Indian children will enroll in this program this summer, at a cost of more than \$1½ million.

Encouraging as this picture is, a statement by a member of the tribal council on a Montana reservation brings into sharp focus a need which is not being met by the anti-poverty program.

"Better schooling and training for our young people is all right, but what we really need is jobs here on the reservation *** if our people have to leave the reservation to work this summer, the kids won't be here for these programs they are talking about."

A member of a South Dakota tribe says, "I believe if they create some nonskilled labor projects so all can work in such projects." A Sioux girl writes, "If some kind of project were set up at the reservation for Indian men and women to work at and earn their financial needs, they would send more of their children to school."

Family counseling, employment counseling, and motivation toward self-sufficiency through employment, all become rather meaningless when conducted in the deadly apathy of the reservation where earned income is the exception. In a situation where efforts are being made to establish a strong family base from which youngsters can emerge equipped to compete for an adequate living, a father with no job—or who earns less than his son earns on a high school work-training program, is usually not the model on which the children will mold desirable attitudes and motivations.

Unearned income—public assistance—is a necessity for some, but without constant attention and drive toward motivation, it can be self-perpetuating.

In March 1965, preliminary tabulations show Indian reservations reported a labor force of some 116,000 of whom more than 60,000 were unemployed. Yet, these same people respond well when work opportunities are immediately available.

If each reservation had approved work projects to which workers—male and female—of all age groups, depending only on their need for a job, could be employed, the counseling, training, and motivation programs could be conducted in a meaningful and realistic atmosphere.

SUMMARY STATEMENT: AMERICAN INDIANS—ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

American Indians are participating in all programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The extent of Indian participation may be summarized as follows:

Job Corps

Ten conservation centers have been approved for construction on Indian reservations. They are: Winslow in Arizona, and Mexican Springs in New Mexico, on the Navajo Reservation; Poston, Colorado River Reservation, and San Carlos, San Carlos Reservation in Arizona; Eight Canyon, Mescalero Reservation in New Mexico; Chippewa Ranch, White Earth Reservation in Minnesota; Kicking Horse, Flathead Reservation in Montana; Swiftbird, Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota; and Neah Bay, Makah Reservation; and Fort Simcoe, Yakima Reservation in Washington. An amount of \$5,243,775 has been allotted for the construction of these centers and \$2,506,346 for equipping and operating them for a total of \$7,750,129. Two centers are in operation—Winslow on the Navajo Reservation in Arizona, and Neah Bay on the Makah Reservation in Washington. The size of the centers vary from 100 to 250; the Swiftbird Conservation Center in South Dakota is planned for 250.

Neighborhood Youth Corps

The Neighborhood Youth Corps program provides work-training opportunities for young men and women aged 16 to 21 while in school and out of school. Fifty-five Indian communities have submitted programs; of these, 27 have been approved for an amount of \$3,500,000. More than 9,000 Indian young men and women will participate. These young people will work part-time in hospitals, schools, libraries, Government offices, and with private, nonprofit agencies while completing high school.

Operation Head Start

This program assists communities who will organize and operate preschool programs that will ease the adjustment of young children entering school for the first time this fall. Health services, as well as verbal skills, development and identification of special abilities are the purposes of the program. Of 20 applications for funds submitted by Indian tribal groups, 18 have been approved to serve more than 1,600 children at a total cost of \$271,000, in addition, more than 65 local school districts in predominantly Indian areas are sponsoring Head Start programs to include over 9,000 children. More than \$2 million has been committed for these programs.

VISTA

Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA)—the Domestic Peace Corps—have already 18 workers assigned to Indian reservations and have scheduled classes to train several hundred more volunteers requested by Indian groups. More than 400 requests have been received from the Indian people and it is anticipated that more requests will be made.

Community action program

Indian communities have submitted 66 requests for community action programs, totaling more than \$10 million. There have

been 26 programs approved for an amount of more than \$2,500,000. Included in the proposals, have been requests for adult enrichment programs; evening study halls for students; nursery schools and day-care centers for children of working parents; family counseling and guidance clinics; preemployment training for service jobs; homemaker's service; manpower availability surveys of reservations, and a proposal to preserve for posterity Indian legends, folklore, tribal and family

histories on recordings prepared by tribal elders.

Title III, small loans to individual families

About 150 individual loans have been approved. It is estimated that loans average \$1,700, ranging from a minimum of \$300 to the maximum of \$2,500.

Title IV, loans to small businesses

One loan has been approved to an Indian logger on the White Earth Reservation for an

amount of \$7,500. With this loan, he expects to be able to employ an additional five to ten men.

Title V, work-experience programs

Title V of the act offers unemployed adult Indian workers an opportunity to be employed and trained for permanent employment. Two work-experience programs thus far have been approved. These are at Turtle Mountain, N. Dak., for \$458,400 and at Fort McDermitt, Nev., for an amount of \$180,700.

	Aberdeen	Anadarko	Muskogee	Billings	Gallup	Juneau	Minneapolis	Phoenix (California 1 NYC program)	Portland	Central office (Seminole and Cherokee)	Total
Community action programs:											
Number submitted	9	None	2	4	11	2	14	14	8	2	66
Amount of funds	\$2,038,256		\$90,000	\$439,942	\$2,327,887	\$61,422	\$2,411,654	\$1,423,531	\$753,445	\$571,010	\$10,117,147
Number approved	4		None	None	7	None	7	5	3	None	26
Amount of funds	\$360,246		None	\$1,060,407	None	\$61,371	\$327,070	\$91,115	None	\$2,450,209	
Head Start (tribal sponsored):											
Number submitted	6	None	1	2	1	None	3	2	4	1	20
Number of students	468		120	221	60	None	242	376	142	16	1,645
Amount of funds	\$92,414		\$20,125	\$30,577	\$13,441	None	\$36,346	\$53,061	\$21,879	3,647	\$271,490
Head Start (community proposals that include Indians):											
Number submitted	4		35	6	8	10	1	2	1	2	69
Number students	256		2,032	315	2,418	2,377	60	260	20	1,575	9,913
Amount of funds	\$44,214		\$400,083	\$58,140	\$396,728	\$1,044,699	\$11,658	\$37,372	\$3,548	\$249,937	\$2,246,379
Work training, Neighborhood Youth Corps:											
Number submitted	14	2	6	4	3	3	1	15	6	1	55
Number of workers	1,429	97	3,317	242	945	625	40	1,817	329	149	8,990
Amount of funds	\$679,786	\$79,195	\$1,613,075	\$131,167	\$603,395	\$1,383,522	\$47,344	\$1,058,940	\$109,003	\$145,900	\$5,871,327
Number approved	7	1	5	1	2	1	None	7	3	None	27
Amount of funds	\$366,057	\$49,600	\$864,820	\$43,890	\$215,160	\$1,179,700	None	\$812,300	\$25,635	None	\$3,557,162
VISTA workers:											
Number requested	56			40	37	51	51	96	60	16	407
Number approved	33	None	None	None	0	0	49	10	None	0	92
Number assigned	6			None	0	0	8	4	None	0	18

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is recognized. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The amendment would permit the Governor of each State to veto title I and title II projects, which would promote abuses and prevent the proper execution of such projects.

The amendment would not restore the full Governor's veto in existing law which the committee deleted, but it permits the Governor of each State to veto projects which would promote or permit outrageous abuses.

Under the amendment, a Governor could disapprove a plan where such a plan would—

First. Provide for or permit the payment of excessive salaries greater in amount than the annual salary of the highest State welfare official, thereby denying a proper proportion of aid to the poor.

Second. Permit political exploitation of the poor.

Third. Ignore or deny the rights of poor people to adequate participation in the planning and administration of projects.

Fourth. Ignore or deny the rights of poor people to effective representation on the governing or policy advisory boards of community action agencies.

Fifth. Permit a person convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude to become or remain an officer or employee of an agency conducting a community action program if such person would have an unwholesome influence on the poor people to be served by such agency.

Sixth. If executed, create great social unrest and serious disturbances of the peace.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it seems to me that we are reaching the point where we are losing count of the number of times we have voted on this precise issue in principle.

It is true that the language of each amendment that has been offered in the past 2 or 3 days on the subject of the Governors' veto is somewhat different from the previous amendment, but in each case the intent is the same.

The Senate thus far has turned down each of the amendments by a very close margin. Nevertheless, I believe it is obvious that the will of the Senate is to accept the present committee position.

I hope that each Senator, regardless of his position on the basic issue, will study the language before he decides whether or not to have his name recorded in favor of the provisions of this amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. It will be a live quorum.

Mr. PROUTY. I do not desire a live quorum at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am greatly disappointed that the Senate has rejected by very close margins various amendments which would retain in whole or in part the Governor's right of veto under various projects in this program. The defeat of these amendments will substitute for the judgment of the Governors the opinion of remote bureaucrats in Washington who have little contact or knowledge about the problems of the poor in a local situation.

At a recent Governors' conference, a resolution urging Congress to keep the Governor's veto was adopted with but one dissenting vote.

My own convictions are clear. I firmly believe that the chief executive of each State should have the right to disapprove any project or activity if he feels this project or activity is not in the public interest.

However, those of us who hold this view have been defeated by the narrowest of margins and I now submit an amendment which permits a Governor to veto projects only where they would promote or permit outrageous abuses.

Under this limited veto proposal, a Governor could veto a plan which provides for or permits the payment of

excessive salaries greater in amount than the annual salary of the highest State welfare official, thereby denying a proper proportion of aid to the poor.

Certainly a veto in this type of situation is absolutely justified. A man who heads up a neighborhood agency or a local or citywide project should not be paid a salary greater than the chief State welfare official whose authority and responsibility cover a great deal more territory and people.

Where excessive salaries are paid, the poor are denied their proper proportion of aid, and the Governor certainly ought to be able to disapprove such flagrant abuses.

The second situation in which my amendment would permit a Governor to exercise his veto power would be where a project is not designed to elevate the poor and give them a fair chance to succeed, but is instead designed to exploit the poor for political purposes.

We have seen many instances of the distortion of the antipoverty program for political purposes. Jobs have been passed out to ward heelers and political bosses who know how to exploit the poor, while worthy applicants trained in social work have been shunted aside.

"Giant fiestas of political patronage." These are the words used by Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of the House Education and Labor Committee in describing the actual operation of the war on poverty.

Indeed, one Chicago clergyman said:

How do you think we poor feel when we know that men who drive Cadillacs, eat 3-inch steaks, and sip champagne at luncheon meetings, discuss our future while we are pushed off the highways of self-help and told to keep our hats in hand.

When a Governor sees that a project is designed for political exploitation of the poor, should he not have the full authority and power to stop such outrageous activities?

Another case in which the Governor would be permitted to have the power of disapproval would be where a particular project is so drawn as to ignore or deny the rights of poor people to adequate participation in its planning and administration, or where the plan is so drawn as to ignore or deny the rights of poor people to effective representation on the governing or policy advisory boards of community action agencies.

We have seen case after case where political hacks from wealthy suburbs sit on the governing boards of community action agencies while able poor folks who know the people and problems of a given area are silenced and kicked out of the decisionmaking process.

When we have a farm program, we consult the farmers. When we have a housing program, we seek out those who know something about housing. How then, in Heaven's name, can we have projects and programs that will effectively aid poor people without giving any voice to those who were born in poverty, who have lived in poverty, and who want to escape from poverty.

Mr. President, my amendment would also permit a Governor to veto a project

which would permit a person convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude to become or remain an officer or an employee of an agency conducting a community action program if such person would have an unwholesome influence on the poor people to be served by the agency.

One Governor brought to my attention an antipoverty program headed by a man who had been engaged for a long time in all kinds of shady operations, in collecting or extorting money from various groups. In fact, this racketeer had collected fees from hundreds of war veterans under the phony guise that he could be of assistance to them.

How is the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington to know about shady individuals such as this? Do we want men such as the one I have just mentioned, who have a record of cheating veterans or poor people, to run the antipoverty programs? Or do we want a Governor to be able to nail a known thief in his tracks and require that he be ousted before project approval is given?

In his minority views, cosigned by Senators FANNIN and MURPHY, the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) points out that in Arizona a man was hired to serve in a community action program. Among his qualifications were two convictions for grave offenses. These were not old crimes but recent ones. In 1960 the individual was jailed for violation of election laws, and in 1964 he was imprisoned for falsifying documents.

My limited veto amendment would permit a Governor to disapprove a plan if an exconvict heads up or works for an agency conducting a community action program, if he feels that the exconvict would have an unwholesome influence on the project.

Moreover, my amendment would allow a Governor to disapprove a plan which, if carried out, would cause great social unrest and serious disturbances of the peace.

Nothing can ruin a program quicker than public dissatisfaction. And if a project tends to divide rather than unite people, or if it is calculated to divert aid away from those for whom aid was intended, then certainly we are going to have great social unrest and serious disturbances of the peace.

We cannot raise the hopes of poor people—lead them to believe they are on their way out of a rut into a new life—and then present them with a project that they know is a hoax from start to finish.

Such a project will only result in upheaval and strife among our people, and a Governor should have the right to strike at trouble before trouble begins.

In summary, Mr. President, my amendment would not permit a Governor to veto a title I or title II project for trifling or petty considerations. But it would allow him to stop projects which would promote and permit abuses of the antipoverty program.

The amendment would give the Governor of a State the power to veto a plan only if the plan would:

First. Provide for or permit the payment of excessive salaries greater in amount than the annual salary of the highest State welfare official, thereby denying a proper proportion of aid to the poor;

Second. Permit political exploitation of the poor;

Third. Ignore or deny the rights of poor people to adequate participation in the planning and administration of projects;

Fourth. Ignore or deny the rights of poor people to effective representation on the governing or policy advisory boards of community action agencies;

Fifth. Permit a person convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude to become or remain an officer or employee of an agency conducting a community action program if such person would have an unwholesome influence on the poor people to be served by such agency;

Sixth. If executed, create great social unrest and serious disturbances of the peace.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized. How much time does he yield himself?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the six provisions listed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont as grounds for a Governor's veto of any plan, contract, or agreement, would cover every conceivable circumstance. Since the Governor would be the one to make the decision, he could decide in any case that a plan would create social unrest or a serious disturbance of the peace. I believe that perhaps it would be better to shorten the amendment and provide that the Governor could, at his whim, decide whether to veto a plan. That would accomplish the same purpose. It would allow the Governor to veto any plan that he saw fit to veto, for any reason that occurred to him, particularly since item No. 6 would leave it in his discretion to make a decision as to whether social unrest would be created as a consequence of the proposed action. There would be no appeal from that action.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I point out that this amendment would merely establish certain criteria which the Governor would have to follow. The Governor of any State would be conscious of the problems within that State. He would be concerned with the problems and interests of the voters and constituents of that State.

I am sure that the Governor would not take any advantage of the authority granted under this limited veto approach.

I believe that this is something that is desperately needed. We have seen many examples in the administration of the program in which politics has raised its ugly head. The poor have been ignored in some cases, and many other things have happened which could not be justified.

It is only in the hope that we can prevent these things from happening in the future that we attempt to place the responsibility in the hands of the Governor. However, by the same token, the Governor must be guided by these criteria. No Governor would take action contrary to the general interests of the State over which he is presiding.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, under title VI the Governor might require that any agreement, plan, or contract be amended to comply precisely with whatever his wish might be. If such amendment were not made, the Governor would be able to say that such plan, contract, or agreement would create social unrest and that he would therefore veto it.

I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from Vermont is.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am not prepared to yield back the remainder of my time. I shall perhaps suggest a live quorum at this time.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask that I be permitted to speak for 3 minutes.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

SPECIAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES SERVING IN COMBAT ZONES

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the third reading of S. 2127 and the vote by which the bill was passed, and proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2127) to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment. I have cleared this matter with both the author of the bill, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and with the Senator in

charge of the bill, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new paragraph.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, but that it be printed in the RECORD. I shall explain the amendment.

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

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

At the end of the bill add a new paragraph, as follows:

"(6) Section 3107 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) If the surviving spouse of a deceased person covered by indemnity insurance has remarried, or if any of such person's children are not in the custody of a surviving spouse, all or any part of the indemnity insurance otherwise payable to such spouse may be apportioned on behalf of surviving children or parents as may be prescribed by the Administrator."

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, this is an amendment to the bill that was passed on the call of the calendar yesterday. It deals with indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces killed in combat zones, specifically Vietnam at the present time.

Under the present law, any pension, compensation, or indemnity payment can be divided between a widow and the children, or in any way that the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration chooses to divide it.

A young man who was married and had 2 small children was killed in Vietnam. At the time of his death, he was legally separated from his wife, but she had the children. He had made her the beneficiary of anything that would accrue to his estate as a result of his death. Subsequently, she had remarried. The children are now with the grandparents, the mother and father of the boy who was killed. The boy's father is a retired lieutenant colonel in the Air Force. The grandparents are raising the children.

The issue is how to divide the \$10,000. Under all existing laws, the money could be divided as the Administrator wished to divide it or as he considers proper and just. However, under the bill that was passed yesterday, it would be mandatory that the money go to the widow who has remarried and has adequate support, but who is not supporting her own children. The children are in the hands of the grandparents.

This amendment would permit the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, if, in his judgment, he thinks it is right, to divide the amount in such manner as he considers is just.

I have discussed this amendment with the author of the bill, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and with the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. They have both agreed to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill was passed, as follows:

S. 2127

An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 739. Special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones

"(a) Any person on active duty with the Armed Forces in a combat zone shall, as provided in this section, be automatically insured by the United States, without cost to such person, against death in the principal amount of \$10,000. Such person shall be insured during the time that he serves in a combat zone, and shall be deemed to have been serving in a combat zone at the time of his death if he dies outside of a combat zone and (1) his death is determined by the Administrator to have been the direct result of an injury or disease incurred while serving in a combat zone, and (2) the injury or disease from which such person died was incurred not more than two years prior to death.

"(b) Upon certification by the Secretary of the military department concerned of the death of any person automatically insured under this section, the Administrator shall cause the indemnity to be paid as provided in subsection (c) only to the surviving spouse, child or children (including a step-child, adopted child, or an illegitimate child if the latter was designated as beneficiary by the insured), parent (including a stepparent, parent by adoption, or person who stood in loco parentis to the insured at any time prior to entry into the active service for a period of not less than one year), brother, or sister of the insured, including those of the half-blood and those through adoption. The insured shall have the right to designate the beneficiary or beneficiaries of the indemnity within the classes herein provided; to designate the proportion of the principal amount to be paid to each; and to change the beneficiary or beneficiaries without the consent thereof but only within the classes herein provided. If the designated beneficiary or beneficiaries do not survive the insured, or if none has been designated, the Administrator shall make payment of the indemnity to the first eligible class of beneficiaries according to the order set forth above, and in equal shares if the class is composed of more than one person. Unless designated otherwise by the insured, the term 'parent' shall include only the mother and father who last bore that relationship to the insured. Any installments of an indemnity not paid to a beneficiary during such beneficiary's lifetime shall be paid to the named contingent beneficiary, if any; otherwise, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries within the permitted class next entitled to priority, but no payment

shall be made to the estate of any deceased person.

"(c) The indemnity shall be payable in equal monthly installments of one hundred and twenty in number with interest at the rate of 2½ per centum per annum.

"(d) In the event any person was covered at the time of his death by automatic indemnity under this section and was also insured against such death under a contract of national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance, the indemnity authorized to be paid hereunder shall be a principal amount equal to the difference between the amount of insurance in force at the time of death and \$10,000.

"(e) The Administrator is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with this section, as are necessary or appropriate to carry out its purposes.

"(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section for the payment of liabilities under this section.

"(g) Any person guilty of mutiny, treason, spying, or desertion shall forfeit all rights to an indemnity under this section, but restoration to active duty after commission of any such offense shall restore all rights under this section. No indemnity shall be payable for death inflicted as a lawful punishment for crime or for military or naval offense, except when inflicted by an enemy, as defined by the President.

"(h) As used in this section the term 'combat zone' means any area outside the United States determined by the President to be an area in which units of the Armed Forces of the United States have engaged in combat operations on or after January 1, 1962, and before such date as may be determined by Presidential proclamation."

(b) The analysis of subchapter III of chapter 19 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"789. Special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones."

SEC. 2. Title 38, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 417(a) is amended—

(A) By deleting therefrom the words "under section 724 of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "in effect on January 1, 1959, and continued in effect under section 724(a) of this title".

(B) By adding at the end thereof the following: "The prohibition against the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation contained in this subsection shall not apply to insureds who on or after the effective date of this amendment die while on active duty in a combat zone as defined in section 789 of this title, or within 120 days after duty in such a zone, or (1) whose death is determined by the Administrator to have been the direct result of an injury or disease incurred while serving in a combat zone, and (2) the injury or disease from which such person died was incurred not more than two years prior to death."

(2) Delete from the last sentence of subsection (c) of section 704 the words "or section 725" each time they appear and insert in lieu thereof the words "section 725, or section 726".

(3) Subsection (b) of section 724 is repealed and the following new subsections are added to section 724:

"(b) After the date of enactment of this subsection any person who is on active duty with the Armed Forces in a combat zone, as defined in section 789 of this title, for a continuous period of 30 days or more and any person hereafter ordered to such duty under orders for 30 days or more in such a combat zone, who is insured under National Service Life Insurance or United States Government

Life Insurance shall be entitled, upon written application, to a waiver (with the right to a refund after termination of such duty) of all premiums paid on term insurance and that portion of any permanent insurance premiums paid representing the cost of the pure insurance risk, as determined by the Administrator. All premiums due during the period the waiver is in effect must be timely paid to maintain the insurance in force. Such waiver shall apply to premiums becoming due after the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment of this subsection, or the first day of the first calendar month following entry on active duty with the Armed Forces in such a combat zone, whichever is the later date, and during the remainder of such continuous active duty in a combat zone for 120 days thereafter; however, no premium becoming due prior to the date of application for waiver under this subsection shall be waived or refunded. Any premium waiver granted under this subsection on a participating contract of insurance shall render such insurance nonparticipating during the period such premium waiver is in effect. Upon certification of the period of combat zone duty by the Secretary of the military department concerned, and upon application by the insured, or in death cases by the beneficiary of his insurance, the Administrator shall refund to the insured or to the beneficiary the amount of premiums waived under this subsection. Premiums on term insurance waived under this subsection shall be refunded with interest as determined by the Administrator.

"(c) Whenever benefits become payable because of the maturity of such insurance while under the premium waiver provided by this section, liability for the payment of such benefits shall be borne by the United States in an amount which, when added to any reserve of the policy at the time of maturity, will equal the then value of such benefits under such policy. Where life contingencies are involved in the calculation of the value of such benefits, the calculation of such liability or liabilities shall be based upon such mortality table or tables as the Administrator may prescribe with interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum as to National Service Life Insurance which was participating before waiver was granted, and 3½ per centum per annum as to United States Government Life Insurance. The Administrator shall transfer from time to time from the National Service Life Insurance appropriation to the National Service Life Insurance Fund and from the Military and Naval Insurance appropriation to the United States Government Life Insurance Fund such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(4) Subchapter I of chapter 19, of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 726. Post-service insurance for persons serving in combat zones

"(a) Any person entitled to indemnity protection under section 789 of this title who is ordered to active duty with the Armed Forces in a combat zone as defined in such section for a period of 30 days or more, or who served in such zone for 30 days or more, shall, upon application in writing made within 120 days after separation from active duty and payment of premiums as hereinafter provided, and without medical examination, be granted insurance. The insurance granted under this section shall be issued upon the same terms and conditions as are contained in standard policies of National Service Life Insurance except (1) term insurance may not be renewed on the term plan after the insured's 50th birthday; (2) the premium rates for term or permanent plan insurance shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Mortality Table; (3) all cash, loan, extended and paid-up insurance

values shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Mortality Table; (4) all settlements on policies involving annuities shall be calculated on the basis of the Annuity Table for 1949; (5) all calculations in connection with insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on interest at the rate of 3½ per centum per annum; (6) the insurance shall include such other changes in terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be reasonable and practicable; (7) the insurance and any total disability income provisions attached thereto shall be on a nonparticipating basis and all premiums and other collections therefor shall be credited to a revolving fund established in the Treasury of the United States and the payments on such insurance and total disability provision shall be made directly from such fund. Appropriations to such fund are hereby authorized.

"(b) The Administrator is authorized to set aside out of the revolving fund established under subsection (a) of this section such reserve amounts as may be required under accepted actuarial principles to meet all liabilities on insurance issued thereunder and any total disability income provision attached thereto. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest in and to sell and retire special interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the account of the revolving fund. Such obligations issued for this purpose shall have maturities fixed with due regard for the needs of the fund and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average market yield (computed by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of market quotations as of the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of issue) on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt which are not due or callable until after the expiration of four years from the end of such calendar month; except that where such average market yield is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest of such obligation shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum nearest such market yield."

(5) The analysis of subchapter I of chapter 19 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"726. Post service insurance for persons serving in combat zones."

(6) Section 3107 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) If the surviving spouse of a deceased person covered by indemnity insurance has remarried, or if any of such person's children are not in the custody of a surviving spouse, all or any part of the indemnity insurance otherwise payable to such spouse may be apportioned on behalf of surviving children or parents as may be prescribed by the Administrator."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1196) for the relief of Wright G. James, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the

committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5519) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize language training to be given to a dependent of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps under certain circumstances.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5768) to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. KEOGH, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. UTT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7969) to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. KEOGH, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. UTT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 1319) for the relief of Joseph Durante, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 1319) for the relief of Joseph Durante, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and it will be a live quorum. I hope the attachés of the Senate will notify Senators on the respective sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 226 Leg.]

Aiken	Bible	Carlson
Allott	Boggs	Case
Anderson	Brewster	Church
Bartlett	Burdick	Cooper
Bass	Byrd, Va.	Cotton
Bayh	Byrd, W. Va.	Dirksen
Bennett	Cannon	Dodd

Dominick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pearson
Douglas	Kuchel	Pell
Eastland	Lausche	Prouty
Ellender	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Ervin	Long, La.	Randolph
Fannin	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Fong	Mansfield	Robertson
Fulbright	McClellan	Russell, S.C.
Gore	McGovern	Russell, Ga.
Gruening	McIntyre	Saltonstall
Harris	Metcalf	Scott
Hart	Miller	Simpson
Hartke	Mondale	Smith
Hayden	Monroney	Stennis
Hickenlooper	Montoya	Symington
Hill	Morse	Talmadge
Hoiland	Morton	Thurmond
Hruska	Moss	Tower
Inouye	Mundt	Tydings
Jackson	Murphy	Williams, N.J.
Javits	Muskie	Williams, Del.
Jordan, N.C.	Nelson	Yarborough
Jordan, Idaho	Neuberger	Young, N. Dak.
Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore	Young, Ohio

person would have an unwholesome influence on the poor people to be served by such program.

Sixth, the Governor would have the right to change a plan if, in his judgment, its execution would create social unrest and serious disturbances of the peace.

Mr. President, I should like to quote from "Conversations with Saul Alinsky, Part II," published in Harper's magazine for July 1965:

EXCERPTS FROM CONVERSATIONS WITH SAUL ALINSKY, PART II

The most important lesson is that people don't get opportunity or freedom or equality or dignity as a gift or an act of charity. They only get these things in the act of taking them through their own efforts. Nearly every American city still needs to learn the same thing.

That's why the poverty program is turning into a prize piece of political pornography. It's a huge political pork barrel, and a feeding trough for the welfare industry, surrounded by sanctimonious, hypocritical, phony, moralistic hogwash. For instance, in Chicago one of our top poverty officials is dragging down \$22,500 and before that he was making 14 grand. That's what I call really helping the poor. Directors of the baby city halls which are called Urban Progress Centers are getting about \$12,400. Before that they were averaging between \$8,000 and \$9,000. A police detective who was making \$7,000 is now a Credit Education Consultant (you figure out what that means) and he is getting \$10,000. People like that really know right down to the guts of their billfold what Johnson means by the Great Society. Across the country, city halls have their committees on economic opportunity to identify what they call positive and negative programs and leaders. Positive means you do whatever city hall tells you to do and negative means you are so subversive that you think for yourself.

Mr. Alinsky is certainly not a right-winger by any stretch of the imagination. He describes himself as a radical, a radical who is dedicated to help the poor.

I should like to quote from this morning's Washington Post:

In a telegram to Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Republican, of California, Yorty spoke of "a reckless effort to incite the poor for political purposes," adding that the funds held up by Washington "are our tax funds."

Meanwhile, the New York Herald Tribune News Service reported that Yorty wired President Johnson on May 24 and asked: "Does OEO really want to fight poverty or fight your friends?"

Yorty told the President, according to the report, that Los Angeles regional director for the Office of Economic Opportunity issued directives which he described as "confusing, changing, and chameleonic."

Shriver, at a Washington news conference, said he considered it "unfortunate that a few local officials in Los Angeles" were impeding the development of an antipoverty community action program for the city.

The people who are being helped under this program to a great degree are those who are administering the program. It seems to me that no Senator wishes to perpetuate this type of thing.

Therefore I hope very much that the Governors will be given a limited veto power. If the Governor of California had been aware of the situation in Los Angeles, perhaps the problem might

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce

that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr.

McGEE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official

business.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent because of death in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, inasmuch as few Senators were able to be in the Chamber during the explanation of my amendment, I should like to go over it again briefly, and for that purpose yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment grants to a Governor a limited veto. The Governor could disapprove a plan if such plan would—and I should like to emphasize this point—provide for or permit the payment of excessive salaries greater in amount than the annual salary of the highest State welfare official, thereby denying a proper proportion of aid to the poor.

I wonder how many Senators can conscientiously object to that proposal.

Second, it would outlaw political exploitation of the poor. Can any Senator, in good conscience, oppose that provision?

Third, it prevents antipoverty officials from ignoring or denying the right of poor people to adequate participation in planning and administering antipoverty projects. We have heard a great deal of discussion along that line, and it seems to me that in good conscience every Senator should support that part of the criteria.

Fourth, a Governor can veto a plan when it will ignore or deny the rights of the poor people to effective representation on the governing or policy advisory boards of community action agencies.

Fifth, a person convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude cannot contrive to be an officer or employee of an agency conducting a community action program if the Governor finds that such

never have arisen. No one can be sure about that, of course. But under the existing law he could have exercised sufficient influence to make sure that the Los Angeles program would be effective and would be highly valuable to the poor people of that city, for whom the program was designed. It seems to me that this is a reasonable and honest approach.

We could cite example after example in which great latitude has been taken by some of the people administering the program. It seems to me that in establishing these criteria we are in a position to say to a Governor, "It is your responsibility to see that these programs will be carried out effectively and primarily in the interest of the poor, and that the poor people will have representation on policy advisory boards."

The amendment is worthy of our serious consideration. I hope very much that the Senate will approve it.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. With regard to the remarks of the Senator from Vermont about Los Angeles, and to expand on the remarks made by the Senator, the mayor of Los Angeles and the members of the supervisory board of Los Angeles, and members of the assembly who had been working to put into operation a poverty program all agreed in my presence, as of last Monday, that there had been a continuing change of criteria on the part of the head of the office in Washington, Sargent Shriver, and that for a period of 2 months they had begged him to let them know what the guidelines would be. They had been continually changed. After 2 months, they were able to get Mr. Berry, one of Sargent Shriver's assistants, to come out to Los Angeles. They asked me to come out, which I have done. They also asked Sargent Shriver to come out. They wanted to set up their committee. They are still in the process of setting up the committee to do the job, which very obviously has not been done. The poor have not been helped. The net result has been confusion and political partisanship. I might add that the partisanship is all within the Democratic Party.

I wish to associate myself with the Senator's amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from California. It seems to me that the people whom the program was designed to help in many instances have been exploited by those who are administering it. It seems to me that in the interest of simple justice and to bring about a workable, viable program, we should establish some guidelines. Within each State the Governor is in a position to determine far better than some bureaucrat in Washington the needs of his State and of the people who reside in the State.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NELSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to point out the fallacy in the argument that removing the Governor's veto is taking away a power that a Governor has. The Governor never had such vast power until we conferred it last year.

The Governor of my State, for example, cannot veto projects in our towns or cities. We have a home rule provision in our constitution providing that the State government cannot interfere in the affairs of counties or cities.

The majority on the committee merely proposes to return the powers of the Governor to the status in which it was before 1964. Our proposal is not an attempt to take away some powers which the Governor had before January 1, 1964; it is an endeavor to leave those powers where they were. The action in the committee applies only to locally initiated programs, the programs started by the people themselves. The provision would let the people in the State originate their own programs. It would preserve local self-government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BAYH in the chair). One minute remains on each side.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, to summarize, I wish to make unmistakably clear what the amendment would do. It would provide a limited veto for Governors.

The amendment would prohibit the payment of excessive salaries, salaries greater in amount than the annual salary of the highest State welfare official; thereby a proper proportion of aid to the poor would not be denied.

The amendment would prevent the political exploitation of the poor. It would prevent denying the right of poor people to actively participate in the planning and administration of projects. It would make it impossible to deny the rights of poor people to effective representation on governing or policy advisory boards of community agencies.

The amendment would make it impossible for a person convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude to become or to remain in office or as an employee of an agency conducting a community action program if, in the judgment of a Governor, such person would have an unwholesome influence on the poor people to be served by such agency.

Lastly, if executed, a Governor could veto a program if, in his judgment, it would create great social unrest and serious disturbances of the peace.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds. I do not wish the record to be closed with the argument of the Senator from Vermont that the veto would be a limited veto.

Mr. President, the amendment would provide an unlimited veto by the Governor, since he would be empowered to veto any program if he should think that it would create social unrest. The pro-

vision would make the Governor of a State absolute dictator over all programs under the act.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RANDOLPH (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent because of death in the family.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 48, as follows:

[No. 227 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Aiken	Fong	Prouty
Allott	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bennett	Hill	Russell, S.C.
Boggs	Holland	Russell, Ga.
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Cooper	Kuchel	Smith
Cotton	Lausche	Stennis
Dirksen	McClellan	Talmadge
Dominick	Miller	Thurmond
Eastland	Morton	Tower
Ellender	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Pearson	

NAYS—48

Anderson	Gore	Magnuson
Bartlett	Gruening	Mansfield
Bass	Harris	McGovern
Bayh	Hart	McIntyre
Bible	Hartke	Metcalf
Brewster	Hayden	Mondale
Burdick	Inouye	Monrone
Cannon	Jackson	Montoya
Case	Javits	Morse
Church	Kennedy, Mass. Moss	
Dodd	Kennedy, N.Y.	Muskie
Douglas	Long, Mo.	Nelson
Fulbright	Long, La.	Neuberger

Pastore	Ribicoff	Williams, N.J.
Pell	Symington	Yarborough
Proxmire	Tydings	Young, Ohio
NOT VOTING—8		
Clark	McGee	Smathers
Curtis	McNamara	Sparkman
McCarthy	Randolph	

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on which I shall probably not ask for a vote, if I may engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, the amendment that I have sent to the desk should be stated at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, between lines 18 and 19, in the committee amendment, insert the following new section:

JOB CORPS—PAYMENTS TO EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES PROHIBITED

SEC. 7. Subsection (e) of section 103 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out the period and adding after the word "terminated" the following: "Provided, however, That the Director shall make no payments to any individual or to any organization in compensation for the service of referring candidates for enrollment in the Corps or names of such candidates."

Renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, reference has been made on a number of occasions to the fact that the Office of Economic Opportunity is paying private employment agencies \$80 for each person recruited and sent to a Job Corps. I should like to bring this practice to an end. If this practice is going on—and I have no reason to think it is not, in view of the testimony—it strikes me that a kind of bondage or bonded-labor type of operation is being practiced. An agency is paid \$80 to recruit labor at a low wage for a job project. In many cases it is a project in which the recruits have little or no interest.

The employment agency profits by sending unskilled labor and having the Office of Economic Opportunity, for the \$80, recommend that the man be sent to the Job Corps.

I wish to make it clear that Congress does not sanction this type of operation. An investigation should be made by the Office of Economic Opportunity, and wherever that practice is going on the director should issue rules to prevent the practice in the future.

I should like to have the opinion of the Senator from Wisconsin about an amendment such as I have offered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I did not understand the Senator. Is the Senator saying that the Director has used some funds appropriated directly under the

Department to pay an employment agency?

Mr. DOMINICK. No. I make no such accusation. What I am saying is that funds have been used from Job Corps appropriations to pay a private employment agency for recruiting and sending youths, both boys and girls, to the Job Corps.

Mr. NELSON. What I am trying to get clear is what funds have been used from the Job Corps.

Mr. DOMINICK. The funds to which I refer have been appropriated in general for title I of the bill and allocated by the OEO to the Job Corps.

Out of that general fund, they have been using a part of the money for payment to employment agencies for that purpose. That is a practice that ought to stop.

Mr. NELSON. Would not the Director have to approve such an expenditure? I assume that he would be in control of the program.

Mr. DOMINICK. He is a man of great talent. However, if he can approve of every individual expenditure that is made in the individual offices or by the administrator of each Job Corps project in each State, I would be surprised. I do not believe that he would have the time to do all that.

Mr. NELSON. Was there unrefuted testimony given to that effect before any of the committees?

Mr. DOMINICK. Not to my knowledge, on this particular point. The question came up during the debate.

A series of articles has brought out the fact that this is the practice in some parts of the country. It seems to me that, if it is, it ought to stop.

If the Senator would agree that we could establish a pattern declaring that Congress does not approve of the practice and that the Director ought to take whatever steps were necessary to stop it, I would withdraw my amendment.

If the Senator from Wisconsin would listen to me for a moment, I shall read from an article from the most recent issue of U.S. News & World Report. This is on page 20650 of the RECORD. It reads as follows:

The Government, besides using the U.S. Employment Service, pays some private employment agencies \$80 per every youth accepted as a trainee.

One charge made is that some agencies, in order to collect as many \$80 fees as possible, often conceal from Government screeners the fact that some applicants have criminal records.

Standards for admission to the Job Corps—which is expected to number 40,000 by the end of this year—specifically bar criminals, drug addicts, and youths with serious emotional or psychological disorders.

Nevertheless, it is charged, hundreds of youths who have been involved in serious crimes have turned up at the camps.

Another complaint is that \$80-a-head recruiters lie to prospective enrollees about the type of training which is available and give them a false impression that life in the Job Corps is a "country club" existence.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I do not know anything about the accuracy of the assertions made there. However, as I understand, the amendment of the Senator is directed solely to the question

of paying some private organization a fee for referring somebody for placement in the Job Corps.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] proposes an amendment, as follows:

On page 20, lines 3 and 4, strike out "repealed. Subsection '(d)' is redesignated '(c)'." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "amended by striking out 'title I and title II' and inserting in lieu thereof 'part A of title II' and is amended further by striking out 'any State or local public agency or'."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this amendment deals with the Governor's veto. We have not had much opportunity to discuss this amendment. I wish to discuss it once more.

I believe that this has perhaps as much substance as any previous amendment. They have all involved a great deal of substance and principle.

My amendment would provide that the Governor retain the right to veto any community action program run by a non-governmental unit. In any case in which a community action program is headed by a governmental or quasi-governmental unit, the Governor's veto is not present. However, whenever the unit is headed by a so-called voluntary organization, a group of citizens who suddenly get together and decide that the project is of some interest to them, the Governor would have the right to exercise control by exercising his veto, or, at least, by threatening to exercise it, in order to make sure that what the private group is doing would fit in with other governmental efforts in this field.

I frankly cannot conceive of any more needed mechanism than this provision to try to coordinate the program for the aid of the deprived areas which we are trying to aid in this poverty war.

Here we have a situation in which community action programs have been under attack by Democratic mayors and Republican mayors, by Democratic Governors and by Republican Governors. We have a situation under which the existing program has been funded to the tune of \$259 million last year, and now suddenly it is proposed to expand the community action programs, already under attack, from \$259 million to \$850 million in 1 year, when the program is already subject to sharp criticism.

The only possible method that is provided in the act is the veto. The veto

has been eliminated in the committee bill. Therefore, my position is to say, "All right. You have beaten everything else down. You said that you do not want the Governors to exercise any control over certain of these programs.

"I say to you, at least let them have some control over the local organizations which are not affiliated with local or State governmental units." Let them have some control over the local voluntary groups which grow up like mushroom rooms whenever there is money available, whether or not such groups actually have the ability to accomplish anything.

How in the world are we going to be able to develop a meaningful exercise of a program of help to the poor unless we can coordinate programs, whether they are local, State, or Federal groups?

It strikes me that, with the information which has been presented on the floor in the past 2½ days, the need for this provision is crystal clear. I placed in the RECORD information with respect to the Ypsilanti township. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] discussed it. I asked the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] about it. He seemed to be somewhat confused about it.

Over \$188,000 of so-called poverty money was forced into a community that has the highest income level of any county in Michigan. When the elected official told the poverty program officials they did not know what they were talking about and asked them to take back the money and put it in the general fund so it could be used for the poor where it was needed, they refused to do it. Why? Because they had a contract. They had all kinds of research programs for study. They had all kinds of new programs they thought were going to be helpful. The local organization had chosen the program and was not about to be deterred by the discovery that there was no need for the program.

That is a typical example. Those who organized the so-called local group were professors and wives of professors at the University of Michigan, who had not toured the area and did not know that much had been done in the way of remodeling and revamping to make it a model community. Here they were talking about taking \$188,000, which does not seem to amount to much and is only peanuts when compared with some of the money being spent on programs. Nevertheless, it should go to the poor.

The same thing happened in New York, where local groups have been created, but have not bothered to coordinate their efforts with other governmental units.

I can say with conviction that, after all, the people of our country have elected officials to their town councils, county governments, and representatives and senators in State legislatures. They do this every 2 or 4 years, as the case may be. Those people are put into those positions for the purpose of trying to regulate the conduct of affairs in their community. To have the Federal Government suddenly inject money into the local area or local organizational group, without any control over them of any kind, sets up a completely separate government area to deal with problems which may not be co-

ordinated in any way with respect to what is going on in the community.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield. Perhaps the Senator is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. NELSON. For a question.

Has the Senator any information as to how many community action programs are headed or operated by private agencies?

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not have that information. There are quite a few of them. Does the Senator have that information?

Mr. NELSON. One of the staff members went to find out.

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe there are quite a few around the country, as shown by articles from daily newspapers which were placed into the RECORD, which have been doing a fine job covering the war on poverty program to see how it is operating. But I do not have those figures.

Let me make one last plea to Senators who are present. Any time a program of this magnitude and depth is created and started, it is bound to run into problems. That cannot be helped. Any big, nationwide program, I say with all deference, must involve overlapping between Federal departments and State governments. This particular war on poverty has run into more problems than any well-principled program should have. It has happened because, suddenly, masses of people have been infected with the fever of trying to do something which will be helpful so far as the poverty program is concerned, and which will be funded by the Federal Government.

There is nothing wrong with voluntary organizations using maximum efforts, in their own way and with their own funds, to try to help the poverty stricken. One of the great things in this country is the voluntary organizations that try to do this very thing.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely point out what is happening in many places through the instrumentality of supposedly aiding the poor under the economic opportunity program.

In Ohio a person who labeled himself as an expert, previously connected with the AFL-CIO, but now separated from that organization, conceived the idea of going into county after county, advising supposed civic leaders to establish a community activity in the war against poverty. He drew up the plan. He told the leaders how they should organize. In one instance he stated that the objective was to give advice to the housewife on how she should shop. They were told that if she followed the advice, financial savings would be achieved. He set up the plan and organized the community agency. In each instance his bill was from \$4,000 to \$6,000.

Those applications are pending in the Economic Opportunity Office. I am glad to say that thus far they have not been granted. However, I give this information because it clearly describes the dan-

ger of allowing programs to go on without being checked. A man has been going from county to county, submitting the same prospectus, and in each instance including his bill of about \$4,000 to \$5,000, to be paid by the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. DOMINICK. This is exactly on point and exactly the position which I have been trying to outline with my amendment, and I am sincerely grateful to the Senator from Ohio for adding this information to the RECORD. Not only is this going on in Ohio, but there have also been many instances in which the National Farmers Union has been active in creating community action programs and operating them. It has been said by many people, including members of the National Farmers Union themselves, that this provision was largely designed for political purposes, and not for the purpose of really getting down to the poor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Complaints came to me on the Ohio programs, pointing out that vacant buildings were to be used at extravagant rentals, completely unjustified by their capital value.

Mr. DOMINICK. That reminds me of the women's Job Corps camp in Florida which rented a hotel for 18 months at \$250,000, when the market value of that hotel was \$150,000 to \$200,000.

This is the kind of thing which creates so many difficult problems. That is why we have been trying to give some control to the Governors who know what the situation is in each of the States, and are better able to determine whether the local group sponsoring the program is a responsible and legitimate group, or whether it is not.

I am also reminded of the point where I yielded to the Senator from Ohio, when I was talking about voluntary associations doing such a fabulous job.

I have often thought that if we could put together their energies and the funding which they are able to get, and operate on as a joint group, they would quite possibly, be able to do far more than we shall ever accomplish under a federally directed program. Each one of the voluntary associations is doing this with funds which have been contributed to it and which it has to account for regularly. This is being done on gifts and bequests. But the Democrats and the administration would rather have a Government-dominated program paid for by Federal funds.

Actually, it is nothing but taxpayers' funds. We have a duty as responsible lawmakers to determine that this money, when it is spent, will be spent on proper causes and on something which is for the good of everyone. It does not seem to me that the examples which have been cited over and over again in the last 2½ days as to the inequities of this program will present any great shining picture of the program supposedly designed for the good of the people.

Let me say this to the distinguished Senator now in charge of the bill, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], although this, I am sure, is not going to be met with approval from him because the Senator from Texas was a leading

spirit in getting the Governor's veto eliminated entirely. With all due deference to his feelings and his principles, any time he proposes to triple or quadruple an expenditure on a program which is only beginning, and from which the bugs have not yet been eliminated, he had better have some controls or there will be scandals with which those that have previously occurred will not even begin to compare.

I say further to the Senator from Texas that unless we provide the opportunity for Governors to exercise responsible control over voluntary organizations within their own States, there will not only be scandals, but also chaos in administering the program.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I point out that the pending amendment would strike out the use of private organizations if the Governor so chose. It would give him veto power over private organizations. That is exactly why the Governor's exercise of this veto is so much a detriment to the program.

In Montana, Governor Babcock vetoed a program because the Farmers Union was one of the sponsors. He stated that he did not believe private organizations should spend Federal funds for the benefit of the poor in a community. We have had other States besides Montana where Governors have vetoed programs because some private organization participated. The purpose of the whole poverty program is private and public agencies interested in employment of the unemployed. In other words, to make this a true war on poverty.

The Senator from Colorado wholly overlooks the fact that section 209(c) which was the law last year and is in the law now, reads as follows:

(e) No private institution or organization shall be eligible for participation under this part unless it (1) is itself an institution or organization which has, prior to its consideration for such participation, had a concern with problems of poverty—

This means that we cannot form a new organization and say, "I am interested in poverty. I am going to get it organized."

Mr. DOMINICK. They have already been doing that. They have been getting the money.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Continuing to read from section 209(c):

or (2) is sponsored by one or more such institutions or organizations or by a public agency, or (3) is an institution of higher education (as defined by section 401(f) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963).

The House has added this provision, which the Senate committee left in the bill.

When the Director receives an application from a private nonprofit agency for a community action program to be carried on in a community in which there is a community action agency carrying on a number of component programs—

In other words, he shall notify the others, so that there will be no conflict. Thus, there is plenty of protection, and there are plenty of safeguards in the bill.

The pending amendment is only another effort to cripple the three-part amendment which we brought out in committee.

I point out that as the Governor's veto power was limited in these three instances only, we of the majority on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee voluntarily accepted the amendment from the other side of the aisle to include the Hatch Act in the poverty program. This had not been done before. We wished to take it out of politics; and the Hatch Act was therefore written into the poverty program. We also wrote in provisions for continuing consultations with the proper State agencies. We voluntarily included these amendments to take the program out of politics.

If, now, we reinstate the Governor's veto, after including the Hatch Act in the program, we shall be putting politics back in the bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Texas, if he will respond.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER. I had intended to support the amendment, but the Senator from Texas speaks of crippling the program. Could he tell us how many times the power of veto by a Governor has been exercised since the program has been operative?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I know personally of only four times, but I have heard from many States innumerable examples of the threat to veto. By holding this threat over the people, we would do great damage, such as making them reduce their wages, or stripping from the people the right of a local person to be a director, and would put the program into the hands of the Governor. It would mean great damage to have the veto by the Governor, who could use the threat adroitly in regard to the 30-day provision, until the program would be stripped and emasculated.

Someone telephoned me last night to say, "They have approved our project but we have only 30 days to work until school is over."

Mr. MILLER. Might it not be that the threat to veto has had a salutary influence on some programs?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have received a great deal of correspondence that said this helped the program. I get letters both ways. I have also received many more letters of complaint on the damage that has been done to county, city, or area program by the threat of the Governor's veto and by the 30-day provision.

However, there are only four instances of which I know in which the veto power has been used.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that is correct.

Mr. MILLER. How many programs have been approved?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I do not know how many have actually been vetoed, but the power has been used in hundreds of instances.

The power is used to strip down the programs and actually to abolish them.

Mr. MILLER. Out of how many programs?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I do not know.

Mr. MILLER. There have been several thousand programs.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. There are hundreds that I know of that were stripped down and cut down by the threat of the veto in many different States.

Mr. MILLER. I may say to the Senator from Texas that my own Governor, to the best of my knowledge, has not vetoed a program. To the best of my knowledge he has not threatened to veto a program for the purpose of emasculating or crippling it, or doing anything except to make it a workable program. I cannot speak for any other State. Speaking for my own State—and I am now referring to a Democratic Governor of my State—I have every confidence that he is not using the veto power to cripple the program.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I say to the distinguished Senator that there have been intimations from his side of the aisle that I oppose the idea of the use of the veto power merely because the Governor of my own State has vetoed a program. If it were only in the Heartland State that it was used, and all the other 49 States were right, I would not be arguing here. This is not a State issue. It is a national issue. It is an issue as to whether there will be one overall program or a program fragmented into 50 units. It will not work if it is fragmented into 50 units.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to add a final statement. It seems to me that if the Governor of a State is using his veto power or his threat to emasculate a program which is a good program, the people of the State will probably turn him out of office at the next election. I would suppose that the power of the people to veto what the Governor has threatened to do would serve as a very salutary influence over an abuse of such power.

I am not saying that there have not been abuses. I am not saying, either, that the veto might not in certain cases be used to cut down a program, over which there could have been a difference of opinion as to its merits. However, speaking from the standpoint of my own State, I cannot understand that the threat of a veto has caused any difficulty. If it has caused the threat of a veto, which in turn has emasculated a good program, I should think that the people of the State would retaliate at the next election.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I heard the Senator from Texas read certain portions of the act, but I must say that I did not get the reference to those portions.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. They are printed at page 38 of the report, in the third and fourth paragraphs.

Mr. DOMINICK. I see. I thank the Senator. The Senator is aware, as I am, that it is possible for any group to form a nonprofit corporation for the announced purpose of treating with a program that the bill treats with. That is what they have done in order to comply

with subsection (c)(1). What the Senator has read is actually a part of the law, but it has not solved the problem.

The problem is, as the Senator knows as well as I do, that a group of idealistic citizens can form a corporation and suddenly start working on a particular project with Federal funds, which may be wholly unrealistic so far as the State effort is concerned.

I cite the typical example of Ypsilanti, Mich. That is an absolute example. The other side had to get up an organization called REPLY, whose purpose was to return every penny left in the Ypsilanti township program. They called themselves REPLY. That is a pretty good name. What they were saying was, "We did not want it. We did not ask for it. A group of people came in and forced it on us. We are doing fine. We are a high income county. Please put the money where it is needed. Put it down in Texas, if it is needed down there, or put it in Harlem, if it is needed there." I am sure it is needed there. They said, "Do not put it in Ypsilanti County." Nothing could be fairer.

If these situations are brought to the attention of a Governor, he has an opportunity to say, "Either get in line or I will veto it." It is this threat of the veto that is some kind of red flag so far as the Senator from Texas is concerned.

The Senator from Texas has stated that the threat of the veto has crippled some programs. I do not know how many programs he has referred to. Perhaps he can give me some enlightenment on it. Does the Senator have any information on that point?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have already answered the distinguished Senator from Iowa. It ran into the hundreds, I said. I do not have the exact figures.

Mr. DOMINICK. It has crippled the program?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Certainly it has.

Mr. DOMINICK. I suppose the crippling of the program is the basis for the argument that the amount of money has been cut down. I get a little nervous—I believe that is the correct expression—when someone talks about crippling a program simply because an amendment is offered. I will say once again—then I shall be quiet and we can vote on the amendment—if there ever was a specific issue which needs to be controlled, this is it; namely, a community action program sponsored and developed by a local, nongovernmental unit, which is uncoordinated with the State effort. Suddenly a group is set up, and the wrong people get into it, and it is used for political purposes, or whatever it may be.

Some way or other we must have some governmental control. By adopting the amendment is one way in which we can do it, by giving the Governor a right to veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] to the Committee amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RANDOLPH (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent because of death in the family.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 228 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Allott	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Bennett	Hill	Robertson
Boggs	Holland	Russell, S.C.
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Russell, Ga.
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Cotton	Kuchel	Simpson
Dirksen	Lausche	Smith
Dominick	McClellan	Stennis
Eastland	Miller	Talmadge
Ellender	Morton	Thurmond
Ervin	Mundt	Tower
Fannin	Murphy	Williams, Del.
Fong	Pearson	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—49

Aiken	Harris	Monroney
Anderson	Hart	Montoya
Bartlett	Hartke	Morse
Bass	Hayden	Moss
Bayh	Inouye	Muskie
Bible	Jackson	Nelson
Brewster	Javits	Neuberger
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Cannon	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pei
Case	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Church	Long, La.	Ribicoff
Cooper	Magnuson	Symington
Dodd	Mansfield	Tydings
Douglas	McGovern	Yarborough
Fulbright	McIntyre	Young, Ohio
Gore	Metcalf	
Gruening	Mondale	

NOT VOTING—9

Clark	McGee	Smathers
Curtis	McNamara	Sparkman
McCarthy	Randolph	Williams, N.J.

So Mr. DOMINICK's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York withdraw his request for a quorum call?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 618) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli, which were on page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "\$55,000 as a gratuity for the sacrifices" and insert "\$38,114.90 for loss of compensation", and on page 2, line 15, after "2251, et seq." insert "Provided, That, she makes the required employee contribution".

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on August 3, 1965, the House passed S. 618 with substantial amendments.

I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina) appointed Mr. Dodd, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. JAVITS conferees on the part of the Senate.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I call up my amendments Nos. 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, and 401, and ask that they be considered en bloc.

FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE OF MARK TRICE IN THE SENATE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, today marks the 45th anniversary of a distinguished attaché of the U.S. Senate. I believe it is timely that we make a few remarks on this occasion. May I ask the Senator from Vermont to yield to the distinguished lady from Maine?

Mr. PROUTY. I am very happy to yield.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Vermont for giving me this opportunity to speak.

Mr. President, this is Mark Trice Day in the U.S. Senate, and I am delighted

to join my colleagues in the Senate in paying the richly deserved tribute to him on this 45th anniversary of his affiliation with the U.S. Senate. For 45 years he has given outstanding and distinguished service to the U.S. Senate.

No one has been conducting Senate business that long except our President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Arizona. And one of the most remarkable facets of this brilliant record of Mark Trice is that it has been achieved at such a relatively young age. I do not know what his age is, but, from his youthful appearance, it seems to me that Mark Trice must have been born in this Senate Chamber to have been with the Senate for 45 years.

He does so many things to facilitate and expedite the work of the Senate and he is such an indispensable executive on the minority side that it would be futile to try to list all of his indispensable activities. About the best way that I can summarize his role is to say that he is to the Republican side of the Senate what John McGraw was to the New York Giants, or Miller Huggins, Joe McCarthy, and Casey Stengel to the New York Yankees, or Knute Rockne to the Irish of Notre Dame, and Bud Wilkinson to the Sooners of Oklahoma.

For while they were not the players of these teams on the baseball diamond and the football gridiron, they were the brains of the teams and they devised the plays and the strategy. In equal manner, while Mark Trice has not been a Senator from the standpoint of actually casting votes, engaging in debate, or making motions and offering amendments, he has been the manager and coach on the Senate Republican sideline and in the Senate Republican dugout masterminding the Republican team that he fielded in the Senate.

Among the many fine things that he has done for me and which I shall never forget has been his constant vigilance to help me prevent missing rollcall votes. Without him I could not have accomplished the string of nearly 2,100 consecutive votes.

We all—regardless of political party—on both sides of the aisle—wish him well today—and another 45 years as the coach and manager of the Republican team in the Senate.

In closing, Mr. President, I should like to observe that the recognition and praise that mean the most to any one of us is that which come from our own family—particularly our children. It is in this spirit that I would like to read the letter of Mark's daughter, Linda:

VENICE, ITALY,
August 13.

DEAR DADDY: I know that August 19 is a big day in your life, for it will be then that you will have served for 45 years in the Senate. This is a most impressive service record for anyone, but it means so much to me that my father has accomplished this. I have heard it said that you would do anything for anyone—you have been faithful to your work and you have always strived to be a friend to everyone on the Hill.

More important, to me at least, is the fact that you have set a wonderful example for me to follow. I only hope that I will be able to do this and that I will never do anything

to harm you and, more important, your name.

I am so sorry that I won't be there on the 19th, for I remember your last party very well. I was so proud of you that day as I stood beside you, and I will be even more proud of you this year.

In fact, I am extremely proud to have you as my father.

Love always,

LINDA.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have often been curious about the name of Mark Trice, just as I was curious about the name of Mark Twain. Mark Twain used to be a deckhand on a barge or steamboat on the Mississippi River. His real name was Samuel Langhorne Clemens. The deckhand had to sit out in front, because the sandbars formed so quickly that he had to use a sounding line and then shout up to the pilothouse: "Mark 1; mark 2; mark 3." But instead of saying, "Mark 2," he said, "Mark twain," and soon he was known as Mark Twain, and that became his pseudonym as he wrote many durable books.

It is not generally known but I believe Mark Trice was once a deckhand on a Potomac River steamer. He used to call out to the pilot, "Mark 1; mark 2"; and then he would say, "Mark trice." I think that is the way the name stuck, because he has been Mark Trice ever since that time.

It is rather interesting to recall that when Mark Trice came with the Senate it was the year when the peace conference at The Hague was trying to get Holland to surrender the Kaiser, so that he could be tried.

It was about the year when the 18th amendment became effective. One distinguished Member of the Senate is still trying to make it effective so far as certain areas of the Capitol and Senate Office Buildings are concerned. I shall not mention his name, but I think everybody knows it.

It was the year when there was a testimonial for William Jennings Bryan in New York. It was his 60th birthday anniversary. On that occasion, William Jennings Bryan said, "The liquor issue is as dead as slavery." In the light of hindsight, he was wrong on both counts, because the 18th amendment was repealed; and it was not until recently that the voting rights bill was approved.

When Mark Trice came to the Senate 45 years ago, it was the age of moonshine; now we think of moonshots.

People were thinking of homebrew; now they think of a baseball player named Killebrew.

In those days, we knew the name Pussyfoot Johnson; now, quoting the television, it is Sugarfoot.

In those days, we talked about speak-easies; today, we talk about easy speeches on the Senate floor.

Many other things happened 45 years ago. Woodrow Wilson fired Lansing as Secretary of State. The railroads were returned to private ownership, under a heavy load of debt.

It was the year in which Jack Dempsey was indicted for dodging the draft. It was the year when eight Chicago White Sox players were indicted for throwing the World Series to the Cincinnati Reds.

Also, I believe it was about the time when the KKK went into action. It has taken us 45 years to catch up, and for the first time we are having a Federal investigation of that group. Incidentally, in that time the market for pillow slips and sheets has dropped sharply.

It was about the time when Harding and Coolidge were licking Cox and Franklin Roosevelt. The Nation's population was only 105 million; yet Harding and Coolidge won the election by 9 million votes. So when we consider the disparity of the vote in the 1964 election, really, in the light of hindsight, it was not quite so bad.

It was the year when Theda Bara, for the first time, made popular the characterizations of the "vamp" on the screen. Today, Washington and the woods are full of them.

It is rather interesting to talk about the Senate, because at that time Oscar Underwood, Cotton Ed Smith, and Tom Heflin were here. So were Joe Robinson, of Arkansas, and Hiram Johnson, of California.

Charles Curtis of Kansas was here; Hoke Smith, of Georgia and William Edgar Borah of Idaho were here; as was Jim Watson of Indiana, and Arthur Capper of Kansas, Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, and old Knute Nelson of Minnesota, whom I knew; Frank Kellogg, who later became Secretary of State; Pat Harrison; Tom Walsh, the great inquisitor from the State of Montana, who investigated the Teapot Dome scandal. George Norris was here, and I believe our friend from New Hampshire, George Moses, who once characterized a good many people around here as the "sons of the wild jackass."

So Mark has been here a long time. To this list I could add the name of Robert M. La Follette, whose portrait graces the wall in the reception room; Reed Smoot, of Utah; Carter Glass, of Virginia; Boies Penrose, of Pennsylvania; James Wadsworth, of New York, who, after being defeated for the Senate, went to the House as a Member of that body. Claude Swanson, of Virginia, was here. Claude Swanson later became Secretary of the Navy.

So Mark Trice has seen them come and go.

I shall now let Senators in on a little secret. Mark, I want you to listen to this. I am telling them a secret now. Mark is in the process of writing a number of books. The first one is going to be a dandy. Its title is going to be, "Senators Who Have Known Me." His second book is going to be even better. The title is going to be "The Stuff You Hear."

His third book is going to be "From Harding to Hubert."

I believe that we ought to salute Mark Trice for 45 years of service to the Senate of the United States. What an amazing record. [Applause, Senators rising.]

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join in the commendatory remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [MRS. SMITH] and the distinguished minority leader, the junior Senator from Illinois [MR. DIRKSEN] on what they have had to say about the secretary for the minority.

I have not known Mark Trice very long—only 13 years. I have always found him to be impartial and just in his dealings, and aware of the interest of those whom he has served so efficiently, so capably, and so well down through his period of service in this body.

As I listened to the distinguished minority leader, a great deal of history went through my mind. I was taken back to the days of my early manhood. When I think of what has happened during the course of my lifetime in the United States, I have to pause and think of what has happened in this Chamber in 45 years.

I feel quite certain that, except for the institutionalized aspects, it is quite different today from what it was in the early twenties. I wish to join in all these kind and gracious remarks toward Mark Trice. They are well merited. As a public official and a public servant, he has done his job efficiently and well, with extreme courtesy and impartiality.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I join in congratulating Mark Trice on his 45 years of service in the Senate.

The distinguished minority leader has spoken to us about some of the events 45 years ago. It does not take us 45 years to catch up on what is going on in the Senate today because Mark Trice keeps us informed. He keeps track of the issues and tells us what they are and does it in a very courteous and gentle way. He makes us feel our responsibility and keeps us on the job.

Mark should rightly be congratulated. He helps us all. He helps the minority. He helps the entire Senate.

I hope that he will be here for a long time to come so that we can come back and see what he looks like and how he is helping our future colleagues.

I congratulate you, Mark.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, although Mark Trice has been here a longer time than anyone except the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, the President pro tempore [MR. HAYDEN], he has a unique record, a record of which we can all take note. Although he is on the Senate floor every day, he has never had occasion to characterize anyone unkindly. He has never had occasion to disagree with anyone else on the floor. He has never had occasion to say anything which he would perhaps regret at some time. He has never had occasion to take anything out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which he wished he had not put in the RECORD in the first place. He has a

singularly unblemished record amongst us.

His popularity is not due to that. His popularity and the warm friendship which we all hold for him, the regard in which he is held by all Senators, is due, I am sure, to his unfailing courtesy, his enduring patience, his kindness and thoughtfulness, his readiness to help all of us when we first arrive and do not know how much help we need, and to help us even more when we begin to find out how much help is available.

For all these qualities, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join in marking the celebration of his 45th anniversary in the Senate.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I know that time is pressing, and that Mark Trice would be the last one to want every Senator to join in extended remarks. The only reason why I feel I am qualified to take 1 moment of our time is the fact that, while some of the younger Members of the Senate may not know it, though many other Senators may have more years and more seniority in this body, in one sense I claim to be the senior Senator here, because I came to the Senate in 1925, 40 years ago, as a member of the staff of George H. Moses, of New Hampshire.

I served here for 4 years as an attaché to the old Post Office and Post Roads Committee. In that capacity I had the privilege of the floor, and I well remember those men who have been named here by Senators who have spoken so eloquently this afternoon.

Mark Trice had been here 5 years when I came 40 years ago.

I believe that I can claim that I have known Mark longer, perhaps, than any other Senator, no matter how much seniority and importance other Senators may have. Mark is my friend, and I have never known a man whom I admired more. He is a man whom I value warmly as a friend.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from Iowa [MR. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Vermont. I do not want to take an undue amount of time, but I could not let this opportunity pass without joining other Members of the Senate who are expressing their friendship, gratitude, and admiration to Mark Trice for the services he has rendered the Senate and for the kind of man he is.

I have known Mark for a little longer than 21 years. In many ways he is a sort of father confessor, from a political standpoint, to most of us, and in that field he has never failed. His well of experience and the sagacity of his advice on all manner of subjects involving the Senate and situations in the Senate are among the most valuable attributes that he has and the most valuable assets that we have.

If we had the time to go into Mark's background and fully exposed the self-help which he has used since his early youth, we would learn that Mark is indeed a self-made man in every sense of the word. He has a personal integrity

of fitness and a code of conduct which could be emulated by every young man, and every older man, too.

All the encomiums we can heap on Mark are well deserved. In appreciation of his services to the Senate we can be thankful, indeed. If young people, not only those who work in the Senate, but all over the country, will take a leaf from Mark's book and emulate him in his conduct and his successes, they will have no trouble in making their way in this world under our self-responsible system. The Senate is to be congratulated for having had the services of Mark.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to my colleague from Vermont [MR. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I rise to take exception to one observation in which it was said that Mark Trice, during his term of office in the Senate, has never had occasion to characterize Members of the Senate or criticize them or speak unkindly in any way. I say he has had plenty of occasion to do all these things, but he has never done it. That is why we like him so well.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from California [MR. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not know whether 45 years ago there was a child labor law in the District of Columbia which applied to employment in the Congress, but if there was, I rather fear the U.S. Senate may have broken the law, for there is a great deal to be said for the point of view of our able friend the lady from Maine in describing the vigorous and youthful appearance of our dear friend. Here is a young man who does not look 45 years of age; and to know that on this noble day Mark Trice passes this imposing milestone, in concluding 45 years of honorable and devoted service to this country here in this Senate Chamber is a thrilling thing for all of us over here on the Republican side, but, I feel assured, for my colleagues on the other side. It is a proud thing to know that one of the unsung heroes of American Government has ever been so faithful and so dedicated. We look forward to many more years of public service on his part.

The distinguished majority leader commented a few moments ago on the great impartiality of our able friend, the secretary to the minority. That is true, but I have a constructive amendment. He does have a magnificent impartiality, tinged, nevertheless, with a proud partiality toward the Republican Party, which he has served so valiantly for so long.

So for this friend—and you have a hundred of them in this Chamber, Mark—I want to say that Mrs. Kuchel, like many other wives of Senators, is coming here later this afternoon to pay our respects to you and your wife. We look forward to shaking your hand and wishing you Godspeed for many years in the future.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas [MR. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I cannot add anything to what has been said by my colleagues about Mark Trice, but I want to associate myself with their remarks and, as the Senator from Iowa

[MR. HICKENLOOPER] said, congratulate the U.S. Senate for having had the privilege of his services for many years. Mark Trice is truly a symbol of a dedicated public servant whose dedication and service should serve as a model for the youth of our land.

Personally, I am indebted to Mark for the services he has rendered to me over many years and the kind way in which he has done it. I shall always be indebted to him. I wish him many more years of service in this body.

MR. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware [MR. WILLIAMS].

MR. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to Mark Trice as a man, as a friend, and as a public servant for whom we have great respect.

Our opinion of Mark can best be summed up by saying he is the kind of public servant we would all like to be.

MR. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey [MR. CASE].

MR. CASE. Mr. President, I cannot add anything to what has been said, especially to what the Senator from Delaware has just said. Mark is a wonderful guy. I value him as a friend and as an adviser. He has been of invaluable service to all of us as individuals and to the Senate. One thing I do not charge to him is the reduced estate of the Republican Party which has taken place during his tenure.

MR. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from California [MR. MURPHY].

MR. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by my colleagues, and pay my respects to Mark Trice. From the standpoint of a freshman Senator, I can assure him that the help he has given me and his consideration, kindness, and help which he has extended to the new Members, I shall always remember.

Beyond that, I can remember coming to Washington in 1953, when I was charged with the arrangements relating to the Eisenhower inauguration, at which time the Republican Party was the majority party. The assistance that Mark gave me on that occasion I shall also remember, and always be thankful for.

MR. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York [MR. JAVITS].

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, I know the Senate will not mind being detained on so significant an event. I, too, rise on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of the services of Mark Trice to testify to his impartiality and the fact that he has never attempted to make any moral or ideological judgments. He is as pure a servant of Senators as any Senator could be. I cherish his services and share great pride in the very constructive way in which he has served the Senate.

MR. PROUTY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Carolina.

MR. THURMOND. Mr. President, I understand that today is the 45th anniversary of the service of the capable secretary to the minority, Mark Trice. I

have had the pleasure of knowing Mark Trice over the span of the past 11 years, but only this year on the Republican side.

However, I am pleased to state that Mark Trice is one of the finest men I have ever had the privilege and pleasure of knowing. He is a man of integrity, intelligence, and initiative. He is a man full of energy, and he is always courteous and accommodating.

The Republicans are very fortunate—and I believe the Senate and our Government are very fortunate—to have such an able, fine representative as Mark Trice in the position he occupies. Mark Trice has the ability and character to fill even bigger shoes and a bigger position. I predict that some day he will.

I am pleased at this time to commend him for the outstanding job that he has done. I wish to express to him my appreciation for the personal courtesies that he has rendered to me and for his always accommodating disposition to the Members of the Senate.

MR. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the secretary of the minority, Mark Trice. This marks his 45th year in the service of the U.S. Senate. He has seen most of the Senators of past years come to the floor and go. During this entire period his cheerfulness, knowledge, skill and cooperation have been extended to every Member with whom he has had contact.

I want to express my own congratulations to him for this long period of public service, but particularly do I want to express my deep and sincere thanks for the thousand and one small ways in which he has been of help to me personally. Without his all encompassing knowledge of the Senate, its history, and I may say, its rules, life would be more difficult—particularly for the new Senators who arrive in this body.

May I again congratulate him—as well as his lovely wife Margaret—and wish him many more happy years in the service of the Senate.

MR. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is with pride that I add my congratulations to our most eminent secretary, Mark Trice, to whom we are paying tribute today.

As a freshman Senator I am particularly grateful for the counseling that has been so graciously forthcoming from a man of such great knowledge and experience.

The achievements of our party and the U.S. Senate have been greater as a result of his dedicated services.

The atmosphere of the Senate Chamber is a more pleasant one because of his friendly personality.

MR. HRUSKA. Mr. President, unselfish, loyal, and devoted service to the Senate as an institution has been the hallmark of Mark Trice for 45 years.

Many a Senator's career has been made more meaningful and more effective by reason of Mr. Trice's constant vigilance and solicitude. This Senator has often been the recipient of helpful and wise suggestions from him.

His vast storehouse of workable knowledge has always been held available to those who asked for its benefits.

His devotion to his family is well known. His wife and his daughter as well as his mother have been a part and parcel of his career here—well adapting themselves to the demands made by the rigorous and unpredictable time schedules.

For their cooperation and contribution to his success as an outstanding public servant and official, they too are deserving of recognition.

It is with deep appreciation and sincere gratitude that I add my plaudits and congratulations to Mark Trice, to those of my colleagues.

MR. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I delight in joining my colleagues of the minority in paying tribute to a fine gentleman, a selfless servant, and a man whose advice and assistance have been of immeasurable benefit to me in my short term in the U.S. Senate.

Pierre Corneille, in his work "Surena," speaks of "a service beyond all recompense." That is the type of service I have found the secretary to the minority always willing and able to render in a cheerful and enthusiastic manner. His ready hand has eased me over many hurdles in the Senate and smoothed the path before me.

Mark Trice, whose 45 years on Capitol Hill we honor today, came to Washington as a page at the age of 12. The excellence of his service and the perfection of its execution earned him an appointment as secretary to Senate Sergeant at Arms in 1919. He held that post for a decade.

Back in the tender days when Republicans were the majority in Congress, Mark Trice was elected secretary to that majority and served through that 80th Congress, after which, through the actions of the electorate, he remained on as secretary, but this time as the minority secretary to the 81st and 82d Congresses.

After service from 1953 to 1955 as Secretary of the Senate, he was reelected secretary of the minority and has held that post with distinction, honor, dedication, and zeal.

No vocal tribute could adequately explain my high regard for the secretary of the minority. May I say, as he nears the apogee of a half century of service to the U.S. Senate, that his has truly been service "beyond all recompense."

MR. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to associate myself with the statements of solicitude and commendation being made on the floor of the Senate today in tribute to a great American—Mark Trice. Mrs. Mundt and I are proud to consider Margaret and Mark Trice among our close personal friends and they are, indeed, a real addition to the Senate family.

Mark serves as every Republican's "Man Friday" here in the U.S. Senate. He is the first to greet newcomers when they enter the Senate and he is with them at the graveside when time or unhappy incident or accident brings them to the final rollcall. Of more importance, he is a trusted adviser, a walking encyclopedia of information, an archivist who keeps us consistent in our voting patterns through the years, an able

political tactician and a wise counselor in affairs of state or in the tactics of our political wars.

To have served 45 years in the Senate in one capacity or another at his early age portends that before he finally retires he will have established a new all-time high record of continuous service in this august body. I join my colleagues in the hope that he will enjoy another three decades of service and thereby establish a record of 75 years in the Senate. After that, even his stern taskmasters and supervisors in the Senate should concede that he is entitled to a peaceful and carefree retirement.

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 amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5401) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes.

The letter also 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. 8639) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of the day and also tomorrow, and to inquire whether or not there could be an arrangement made this afternoon with reference to the pending bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first let me try this one.

I ask unanimous consent that there be an hour on each amendment to be considered in relation to the bill, and that the time be equally divided between the proposer of the amendment and the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, would the Senator add a little time on the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. And with 1 hour on the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. That would be all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I discussed this matter with the majority leader a short time ago. I am not going to object, but I wish to make it clear that many Sen-

ators offering amendments should be permitted to have quorum calls, or live quorum calls, without the time being charged to either side.

Mr. PASTORE. We do not want that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let it go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do so only in order to give the leadership an opportunity to arrive at an arrangement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized, but before the Senator proceeds, the Chair would like to remind the Senate that before this very pleasant exercise began, there was pending before the Senate a unanimous-consent request which was not resolved. This was the request of the Senator from Vermont that his six amendments be considered en bloc.

Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer the six amendments and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendments.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendments will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendments offered by Mr. PROUTY are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 396

On page 16, after line 6, insert the following new section:

"TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY AND OTHER AMENDMENTS"

"SEC. 9. Effective July 1, 1965, part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended as follows:

"(1) By striking out 'Director' in the first sentence of section 122(a) and inserting in lieu thereof 'Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Commissioner')' and, by striking out 'Director' wherever that word appears in the other provisions of such part C and inserting in lieu thereof 'Commissioner';

"(2) By amending that part of section 121 that follows the section designation to read as follows: 'The purpose of this part is to stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students, particularly students from low-income families, in institutions of higher education who are in need of the earnings from such employment to pursue courses of study at such institutions.'; and renumber subsequent sections accordingly;

"(3) By redesignating clauses (2), (3), and (4), of paragraph (c) of section 124 as clauses (1), (2), and (3), and by striking out so much of such paragraph as precedes such redesignated clauses and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(c) provide that in the selection of students for employment under such work-study program preference shall be given to students from low-income families and that employment under such

work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who'; and

"(4) By striking out 'June 30, 1966,' in paragraph (f) of section 124 and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1967.'"

AMENDMENT NO. 397

On page 28, after line 15, insert the following:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS"

"SEC. 29. Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS TO SECRETARY OF LABOR"

"SEC. 617. (a) All functions of the Director under part B of title I are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Labor.

"(b) So much of the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds employed, held, used, available, or to be made available, in connection with functions transferred by subsection (a) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred to the Department of Labor."

Renumber subsequent sections accordingly.

AMENDMENT NO. 398

On page 28, after line 15, insert the following:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS"

"SEC. 30. Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS TO SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE"

"SEC. 617. (a) All functions of the Director under part B of title II are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) So much of the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds employed, held, used, available, or to be made available, in connection with functions transferred by subsection (a) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Renumber subsequent sections accordingly.

AMENDMENT NO. 399

On page 28, after line 15, insert the following:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS"

"SEC. 29. Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS TO SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE"

"SEC. 617. (a) All functions of the Director under part A of title III are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(b) So much of the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds employed, held, used, available, or to be made available, in connection with functions transferred by subsection (a) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred to the Department of Agriculture."

Renumber subsequent sections accordingly.

AMENDMENT NO. 400

On page 28, after line 15, insert the following:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS"

"SEC. 29. Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS TO ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION"

"SEC. 617. (a) All functions of the Director under title IV are hereby transferred to

the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

"(b) So much of the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds employed, held, used, available, or to be made available, in connection with functions transferred by subsection (a) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration."

Renumber subsequent sections accordingly.

AMENDMENT NO. 401

On page 28, after line 15, insert the following:

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 29. (a) Section 501 and section 503 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are each amended by striking out 'Director' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare'.

"(b) Section 502 of such Act is amended by striking out 'Director' is authorized to transfer funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the purposes of this title to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable him' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to utilize funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the purposes of this title'."

Renumber subsequent sections accordingly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the hope of the leadership that action on the pending measure can be completed today. We are prepared to stay with it until a reasonable time this evening, and it is hoped that we shall be able to take up the military construction bill tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL
11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to make clear to the majority leader, as to the limit of 1 hour for discussion on the bill, that actually it will require more time for discussion on the bill. I myself have not discussed it yet, but I believe we have an agreement that the request will be made for an extension of time on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If needed, yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will pay strict attention to the discussion by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] on the amendments.

We are inclined, in the course of the hot debate we have had on one question, to overlook the fact that there are other provisions of the bill which are critically important. The Senator from Vermont has a creative and constructive series of

amendments to which I hope the Senate will give its most serious attention.

I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Vermont that he soon ask for a quorum call, which will bring Senators into the Chamber so that they can hear some of the discussion.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from New York for his suggestions, and I will do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Vermont yield himself?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 15 minutes.

ORGANIZING FOR VICTORY OVER POVERTY

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the purpose of these amendments is simply to vest complete authority for the conduct of six programs now under the Economic Opportunity Act directly in the respective agencies that administer those programs.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps provisions of the act, title I-B, now administered by the Secretary of Labor, would be assigned by statute to the Department of Labor.

The college work study provisions of the act, title I-C, now administered by the Commissioner of Education within HEW, would be assigned by statute to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The adult basic education provisions of the act, title II-B, now administered by the Commissioner of Education, would be assigned by statute to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The rural loan provisions of the act, title III-A, now administered by the Farmers Home Administration within the Department of Agriculture, would be assigned by statute to the Department of Agriculture.

The small business loan provisions of the act, title IV, now administered by the Small Business Administration, would be assigned by statute to the Small Business Administration.

Finally, the work experience provisions of the act, title V, now administered by the Welfare Administrator within HEW, would be assigned by statute to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, let us take a moment to look at history. How is it that these six programs, ranging over such a broad field of governmental activity, today find themselves a part of the Economic Opportunity Act? Let us turn back the clock to 1963, prior to the tragic events of that November.

THE SITUATION IN 1963

Here was the situation at that time:

The administration, through the Department of Labor, was asking Congress to create a Hometown Youth Corps. This program, which was to have been established by title II of S. 1, the Youth Employment Act of 1963, provided for 50-50 Federal matching grants by the Secretary of Labor to local public and

private groups conducting work training programs for needy youths between the ages of 16-21. The enrollees would have taken jobs in schools, hospitals, libraries, and recreation areas, and in private community service agencies. This bill passed the Senate in April of that year and was pending in the House.

The administration, through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was asking Congress to create a college work study program, which was to have been established by title I-C of S. 580, President Kennedy's omnibus education bill. This program authorized the Commissioner of Education to pay up to half the cost of work study programs operated by institutions of higher education. The recipients were to be chosen by the college on the basis of, first, need; second, ability to maintain academic status while working up to 15 hours a week, and third, full-time enrollment. The work was required to be of a type related to the educational objectives of the particular student.

The administration, again through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was asking Congress to create an adult basic education program, which was to have been established by title VI-B of S. 580, President Kennedy's omnibus education bill. This program authorized the Commissioner of Education to pay 100 percent of the cost of an approved State adult basic education plan for the first year, and 50 percent in subsequent years.

The Farmers Home Administration was administering a number of farm loan programs, dating back to those authorized by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act of 1937. Among these programs were some providing loans to poor farmers for land acquisition, land improvement, and equipment purchase. The various loan provisions had been reorganized and consolidated by title III of the Agriculture Act of 1961.

The Small Business Administration was administering a loan program to aid small businessmen who were unable to obtain credit on reasonable terms elsewhere, and was providing technical management assistance to those firms. This program, established by the Small Business Act of 1953, was beginning its second decade of existence.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was administering a small program under title XI of the Social Security Act, which authorized grants to the States for experimental, pilot, or demonstration work training projects to increase the employability of unemployed heads of households and other needy persons.

THE PRESIDENT'S ELECTION YEAR PROBLEM

Now, Mr. President, let us move on to 1964. The Nation had a new President, intent on securing reelection of his newly acquired office. He knew that he had only 1 year to put his brand on legislation that would win him the support of the American electorate. It was not humanly possible, in the brief time available to him, to devise an entirely new legislation program. His only hope was to collect programs already in operation,

or proposed by his predecessor, and give them some kind of new twist.

That new twist, Mr. President, was what is now known around Washington as the "poverty angle." The heart of the subsequent war on poverty was a major new venture—the community action programs of title II of the Economic Opportunity Act. In order to flesh out this idea into a superomnibus piece of legislation, the President surrounded it with an assortment of other programs quite familiar to Members of the Congress—some of them borrowed directly from the days of the New Deal.

The Job Corps arose from the corpse of the Youth Conservation Corps of 1963, which in turn emulated the Civilian Conservation Corps of the thirties.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps emerged from the Hometown Youth Corps of 1963, which emulated the National Youth Administration of the Roosevelt administration.

The college work study and the adult basic education programs were minor modifications of proposals in President Kennedy's omnibus education bill.

The rural loans program was a slightly disguised version of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1937.

The family farm corporation proposals, happily deleted by the Senate, were copied from the old Resettlement Administration of the late New Deal period.

The small business loan program was a slightly liberalized addition to the existing Small Business Administration legislation.

The work experience program merely expanded, by direct reference, an existing HEW program.

The volunteers in service to America provisions were merely renamed provisions of the National Service Corps, proposed in the 88th Congress.

It was not enough, Mr. President, for the administration to ask Congress to pass these very familiar proposals. There had to be an overriding concept tying them all together. That concept was the Office of Economic Opportunity—a special assistant to the President who would knock heads together to insure that these multifarious programs actually were operated for the benefit of the poor, and not just for people generally.

Thus I am suggesting, Mr. President, that the decision to lump this grab bag of programs under a supercoordinator arose not from a demonstrated need for coordination, but from a need for political publicity for a President attempting to build an instant record.

Down to the Hill came Mr. Sargent Shriver, urging Congress to enact the Presidential package. Naturally, Congress wanted to know why this superbureaucracy was needed on top of the existing agencies. Congress was told that it was not the intention of the Poverty Director to actually administer most of the requested programs, but that this new Office was necessary to insure that the administering agencies actually focused on meeting the needs of the poor. By implication, it was suggested that the regular heads of the affected Federal

agencies might not keep sight of the President's wishes for diligent attention to the needs of the poor, but might just administer their portions of the program for people generally. The Director of OEO, it was emphasized, would not actually knock heads; he would merely expound sweet reason to the agency heads, keep reminding them that the poor are yet with us and bother them for an occasional report on their activities.

A majority of Congress enacted the Economic Opportunity Act into law, although some of those who supported the act remained skeptical of the rationale for the superbureaucracy it created.

NOW, THE ADMINISTRATION'S ABOUT-FACE

Now, Mr. President, let us move to the present. What is happening? The administration has made the first step toward peeling off programs included in last year's war on poverty bill and vesting the authority for them directly in the operating agencies.

I refer here to the college work study provisions of title I-C. Originally, as I have noted, these provisions were requested as part of President Kennedy's omnibus education bill, and were to be administered by the Commissioner of Education. When college work study was included in the poverty bill, the administration explicitly withdrew from congressional consideration the previous provisions of S. 580 and H.R. 3000 and certain changes were made in the language.

Previously, the administration had urged Congress to limit the jobs to be taken under work study to jobs directly related to the student's educational objectives. In the Economic Opportunity version, students were allowed to take jobs off campus with private antipoverty organizations; it was required that the work either be related to the student's educational objective, or be in the public interest and not otherwise provided for. In answering questions as to why the earlier limitation on educationally related work had been so drastically broadened in the poverty bill version, Commissioner Keppel replied that the limitation of no more than 15 hours per week of work would serve the same purpose of the earlier substantive limitation—even though the earlier bill also contained a 15-hour-per-week limitation.

Previously, to be eligible for participation a student had to be in need, capable of maintaining his academic status, and a full-time student. In the poverty bill version a new criterion was added ahead of these three—that the student also be from a low-income family. This was the poverty angle.

Previously, the Commissioner was directed to allocate funds among the States on the basis of the number of students attending college in that State. In the poverty bill version, the basis for the allocation was changed to the number of students attending college, the number of high school graduates, and the number of children under 18 from families with less than \$3,000 annual income in the State, in equal weight. This third factor is the poverty angle.

Then, with the poverty bill passed and the election over, President Johnson sent

to Congress his aid to higher education bill, S. 600, on January 19 of this year. Section 441 of that bill transfers the authority for administering the work study program from the Director of OEO to the Commissioner of Education, and eliminates from the work study program the requirement that the benefits of the program go only to students from low-income families. For this latter provision new language is substituted, providing only that students from low-income families shall get preference over more affluent students.

OEO ADMITS ITS PRESENT AUTHORITY IS UNNECESSARY

In testimony on this part of S. 600, Mr. Shriver, in answer to a question from Senator JAVITS, stated that cooperation between the Office of Education and his own Office had been excellent. He went on to say that he possessed, pursuant to his coordinating authority in title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act, all the authority he needed to insure that the college work-study program, transferred out of his direct jurisdiction, would continue to be integrated with the overall antipoverty effort.

Part of Mr. Shriver's testimony on this point is worth quoting in full:

The transfer of the work-study program to the Office of Education will spur the development of a comprehensive, varied, and fully integrated range of financial assistance programs for the educationally deprived and I include in this group not just the poorest of Americans but all for whom opportunity has been withheld * * *. The transfer of this program to the Office of Education does not mean the surrender of the traditional jurisdictional line staked out by the teaching profession. Rather, the poverty program in this act marks a new era, one in which the educational needs of our entire society will be approached systematically and one in which our educational system will be enriched and transformed by a full and continuing confrontation between the academic world and the other America.

And in its presentation to Congress, the Office of Economic Opportunity asserts:

To provide further support for internal coordination, the President has recommended the administrative transfer of the college work-study program to the Office of Education.

THE RELEVANT CONCLUSIONS

Let us sum up, Mr. President:

First. It was originally intended that the college work-study program be a direct responsibility of the Office of Education.

Second. When it became necessary to flesh out the President's antipoverty package, a slightly revised college work-study program was included as title I-C, and enacted by Congress.

Third. Now that the need for an omnibus antipoverty bill—and the 1964 election—has passed, the "poverty angle" on the college work-study program is to be virtually removed, and its provisions amended to closely resemble the original Kennedy prepoverty proposal.

Fourth. The return of the college work-study program to the Office of Education is required by the principle of "internal coordination."

Fifth. Similar programs—in this case programs to aid individuals attending institutions of higher learning—should be administered together as a functional unit, instead of scattered throughout the Government.

Sixth. Ample authority exists under title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act to enable the Director of OEO effectively to coordinate the overall antipoverty effort, even though he does not actually control the operation of specific programs, such as college work-study.

Mr. President, I believe the President is right in asking Congress to transfer the programs of title I-C to the actual administering agency, the Office of Education. And that is what my first amendment is designed to do. Its language is verbatim that of section 441 of S. 600, drafted by the administration and urged by its spokesmen.

FUNCTIONAL GROUPING IS A SOUND PRINCIPLE

The administrative principle of functional grouping of programs is a sound one. I understand that the Association of Certified Public Accountants and the Acting Comptroller General have both strongly urged acceptance of this principle in testimony before the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, whose cochairman is the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

My remaining five amendments apply this sound principle to five other programs currently subsumed in the Economic Opportunity Act.

The Job Corps is not transferred to another agency because it requires a coordinated effort involving the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, HEW, Interior and Defense, and thus is actually administered by OEO.

Community action programs are not transferred because, as the heart of the war on poverty, they belong with OEO, which presently administers them. Similarly, the migrant labor provisions of title III-B, which are administered along with the community action programs, remain with OEO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 15 minutes have expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. VISTA is not transferred because it, too, is administered directly by OEO and is closely linked with the community action programs.

MAXIMUM OPPORTUNITY FOR VICTORY OVER POVERTY

If these amendments are adopted, Mr. President, the administrative principle of functional grouping—recognized by the President in his proposed higher education legislation—will be applied to strengthen the administration of all the programs now under the Economic Opportunity Act. Those programs transferred to the operating agencies will be better integrated into those agencies' plans for serving the American people. The power of effective coordination will continue to reside with the Office of Economic Opportunity, as provided by

section 611 of the Economic Opportunity Act. And freed from his needless responsibility as middleman for these six programs, the Director of OEO can concentrate his administrative talents on the operation of the Job Corps, the community action and migrant labor programs, and the Volunteers in Service to America.

In conclusion, my amendments would provide an approach to create greater efficiency and achievement within the respective departments which are now administering these programs.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Does the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] desire to use some of the time available to him, or will the Senator accept my amendments?

Mr. NELSON. Has the Senator from Vermont concluded his remarks?

Mr. PROUTY. I have reserved the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to himself?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, my remarks will be very brief. I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. NELSON. First, I should like to say that under the act the President of the United States has vested in him the authority to delegate to the appropriate agency the execution of the functions authorized by the act, so that he now has the power to shift these functions around so that the intent of Congress will be best accomplished. I think that is the way it ought to remain.

These amendments would completely scuttle the assurances now embodied in the Economic Opportunity Act that its programs will remain directly focused upon the problems of poverty and that they will complement, not compete with each other.

We certainly should not now undo a structure which has been in existence only a year and has not had a chance to show what it can do. The Economic Opportunity Act involves a kind of coordination which has not been achieved before and which cannot be achieved if the various programs in the act are operated without much regard to the part each is to play in the effort as a whole.

The Director and, ultimately, the President have a heavy responsibility for the bringing together of different agencies and different programs for the accomplishment of a single objective. If they are to be successful in carrying out this responsibility, they are going to need support from the Congress which, however critical it may be of details or day-to-day performance, is also steady and steadfast as to fundamentals. That is the real issue posed by this amendment.

Since I believe it is better to let the power reside where it is in the executive branch, with the President of the United States, I therefore hope that the amendments will be rejected.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. PROUTY. I remind the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that the President has recommended that the college work-study program be put, by statute, in the Office of Education. This recommendation is embodied in S. 600, now before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The sound logic of that request is equally applicable to all the antipoverty programs which are now being administered by various agencies and departments other than OEO. If it is good reasoning with respect to college work study it is equally good reasoning with respect to these other five programs.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. NELSON. Without considering the merits of these amendments, I point out that the Senate Subcommittee on Education is now considering Senate bill 600, the Higher Education Act, which has language transferring the work study title I-C of the Poverty Act to the Office of Education, which now administers this program.

The changes contained in these amendments, as well as other amendments to work study, are being considered in executive session of the Subcommittee on Education. In addition, I am informed that several other amendments to the work-study section would be needed in order to perfect these amendments. These amendments would more properly be considered there also, I believe. For that reason I oppose the amendments.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. PROUTY. I am perfectly willing to withdraw the work-study program from my series of amendments, if that would satisfy the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, and include only the other parts. Then we could take care of that particular problem under S. 600.

Mr. NELSON. I am glad to hear what the Senator is willing to do.

Mr. PROUTY. Will the Senator accept the other five parts if I withdraw the work-study part?

Mr. NELSON. No. I made the argument as to the other five parts, I believe.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds. At a subsequent point, I may wish to offer a one-word amendment to which I invite the attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], because it involves amendment No. 394, which he proposes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time for the quorum call to be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 229 Leg.]

Aiken	Harris	Moss
Allott	Hart	Mundt
Anderson	Hartke	Murphy
Bartlett	Hayden	Muskie
Bass	Hickenlooper	Nelson
Bayh	Hill	Neuberger
Bennett	Holland	Pastore
Bible	Hruska	Pearson
Boggs	Inouye	Pell
Brewster	Jackson	Prouty
Burdick	Javits	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Cannon	Kennedy, Mass.	Robertson
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell, S.C.
Case	Kuchel	Russell, Ga.
Church	Lausche	Saltonstall
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Scott
Cotton	Long, La.	Simpson
Dirksen	Magnuson	Smith
Dodd	Mansfield	Stennis
Dominick	McClellan	Symington
Douglas	McGovern	Talmadge
Eastland	McIntyre	Thurmond
Ellender	Metcalf	Tower
Ervin	Miller	Tydings
Fannin	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Monroney	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Montoya	Yarborough
Gore	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Morton	Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Russell of South Carolina in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who are present, let me say that it will not require much time for me to explain the purpose of my amendment, and I shall ask for a roll-call.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays at this time.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment would transfer the responsibility for conducting six programs under the Economic Opportunity Act directly to the agencies that now administer them, as follows:

First. College work-study programs—title I-C—would be transferred to HEW, where they are presently administered by the Office of Education. The administration has specifically requested this transfer by section 441 of S. 600, still before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Second. Neighborhood Youth Corps—title I-B—would be transferred to Labor, where it is now administered.

Third. Adult basic education—title II-B—would be transferred to HEW, where it is now administered by the Office of Education.

Fourth. Rural loans—title III-A—would be transferred to Agriculture, where it is now administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

Fifth. Small business loans—title IV—would be transferred to the Small Business Administration, where it is now administered and from whose revolving loan fund title IV loans are now made.

Sixth. Work experience programs—title V—would be transferred to HEW, where they are now administered by the Commissioner of Welfare.

The Office of Economic Opportunity would continue to operate the Job Corps, VISTA, and the community action and migrant labor programs—titles I-B VI, II-A, and III-B, respectively—and to coordinate all Federal antipoverty programs, as directed by the existing section 611.

These amendments recognize the sound administrative principle of functional grouping endorsed in the administration's request for transfer of the college work-study provisions and in expert testimony before the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress.

As a result of these amendments, these programs can be completely integrated into the activities of the currently responsible Federal agencies. The Director of OEO has indicated that effective coordination can still be obtained through his general coordinating authority. The Director will then have more opportunity to concentrate on the heart of the war on poverty, the Job Corps, community action, and VISTA.

Mr. President, it seems to me this is a streamlining proposal. I think the agencies which are presently administering the programs should assume full responsibility. I think eventually money will be saved and efficiency improved in that way.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendments of the Senator from Vermont. We discussed them completely in committee. As a demonstrated friend of the antipoverty programs, I should like to represent to the Senate that we in the committee are deeply concerned about the need for coordination of various governmental programs—both in the antipoverty field and in other fields. We are concerned particularly about the danger that the Office of Economic Opportunity will be spread-eagle over our entire Government structure, duplicating that structure and having layers of supervisory personnel above the operating personnel, when it is completely unnecessary to the program. The Office of Economic Opportunity should be a coordinating office.

As my turn to speak came, I was looking at some material sent to me in connection with another matter by the Office of Emergency Planning. That is one of our most important agencies. It is quite powerful. Yet its sole attention is directed toward coordinating work, with a relatively modest staff.

This is what the Office of Economic Opportunity should be in the war on poverty. Every Government agency should be used to utilize its experience, operations, techniques, supervisory per-

sonnel, and its place in the Government hierarchy. The only programs which should be operated by OEO itself are the Community Action Program, VISTA, the Job Corps, and the migrant worker program, which are unique, but everything else which fits into an existing Government department should stay in it. This would not derogate from the authority of the Director in relation to appropriations because he can coordinate, and he would have the ear of the President if there should be a dispute between his office and a department. But if there is duplication—and inevitably there must be duplication in a program of this size—it is improvident we should seek to minimize it.

I speak as a devoted friend of the program. I hope the constructive and creative aspects of the amendments will be recognized by the Senate, and that the Senate will accept them.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am looking at items 4 and 5, rural loans and small business loans. Do different considerations apply to rural and small business loans under the Economic Opportunity Act than to regular loans?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes. They are more liberal than the others.

Mr. COOPER. I would think so.

Mr. PROUTY. But, generally, they are the same.

Mr. COOPER. But I assume there is greater leeway or authority to consider special factors, or else there would not be a section in the Economic Opportunity Act applicable to them. But does this provision in any way compromise the effectiveness of the general work of these agencies?

Mr. PROUTY. I point out that these programs are administered by the same personnel.

Mr. COOPER. If these were removed, there would be left in the Office of Economic Opportunity, basically, the Job Corps, the work-training and the work-study programs, the adult education and the different types of community action programs.

Mr. PROUTY. And migrant labor programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, earlier, I responded to the proposal made by the distinguished Senator and, therefore, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Vermont to the committee amendment.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and the Senator from Florida

[Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent because of death in the family.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 230 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Alken	Fong	Ribicoff
Allott	Hickenlooper	Russell, S.C.
Bennett	Hruska	Saitonstall
Boggs	Javits	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Carlson	McIntyre	Smith
Case	Miller	Talmadge
Cotton	Morton	Thurmond
Dirksen	Mundt	Tower
Dominick	Murphy	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Pearson	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Prouty	

NAYS—58

Anderson	Hartke	Montoya
Bartlett	Hayden	Morse
Bass	Hill	Moss
Bayh	Holland	Muskie
Bible	Inouye	Nelson
Brewster	Jackson	Neuberger
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Pell
Cannon	Kennedy, N.Y.	Proxmire
Church	Kuchel	Randolph
Cooper	Lausche	Robertson
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Russell, Ga.
Douglas	Long, La.	Stennis
Ellender	Magnuson	Symington
Ervin	Mansfield	Tydings
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McGovern	Yarborough
Gruening	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Harris	Mondale	
Hart	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—7

Clark	McGee	Smathers
Curtis	McNamara	Sparkman
McCarthy		

So Mr. PROUTY's amendments to the committee amendment were rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators DOMINICK, FANNIN, COOPER, and MURPHY, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22 it is proposed to delete all after the words "striking out" on line 18 through line 19, and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "The second sentence of section 220(a) of part C thereof".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, let me state, as this amendment is not under-

standable from a mere reading of the text, that what I am seeking to do is to restore to the act what the bill would strike out, the voluntary assistance program for needy children, in part C of title II. The amendment would exclude from what I am seeking to restore one particular requirement in the law but would retain the fundamental thrust of the program.

I have a sentimental attachment to this provision, as my former colleague, Senator Keating, was the initiator and author of the amendment as it went into the act last year.

I hope that Members of the Senate will bear with us a few minutes so that the amendment may be explained, as I think the Senate ought to do, however it may feel about other issues. I rather hope that the manager of the bill will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. President, I now yield myself 5 minutes.

The meaning of the amendment can be made most clear by reading to the Senate the language which the bill would strike from the act, and which I am seeking to restore. The words themselves are so eloquent that no argument is needed to sustain them. The text is found at page 43 of the committee report. It reads as follows:

PART C—VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR NEEDY CHILDREN

Statement of purpose

SEC. 219. The purpose of this part is to allow individual Americans to participate in a personal way in the war on poverty, by voluntarily assisting in the support of one or more needy children, in a program coordinated with city or county social welfare agencies.

Authority to establish information center

SEC. 220. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this part, the Director is authorized to establish a section within the Office of Economic Opportunity to act as an information and coordination center to encourage voluntary assistance for deserving and needy children.

The next sentence in the act is deleted in my motion to restore the program. I would strike the sentence which relates to the collection of names, and so forth. Then I would include the remainder of the provisions, which read as follows:

(b) It is the intent of the Congress that the section established pursuant to this part shall act solely as an information and coordination center and that nothing in this part shall be construed as interfering with the jurisdiction of State and local welfare agencies with respect to programs for needy children.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a most desirable self-help, private initiative aspect of the war on poverty. I am really quite surprised that the administration, when it sent the bill up, sought to delete the entire program. Upon inquiry I learned that the Office of Economic Opportunity felt that it had considerable difficulty with the administration of the sentence which I am now asking to be omitted from this particular provision. That sentence requires the collection of names of persons who voluntarily desire to assist such children, and the securing from city or coun-

ty social welfare agencies of the information concerning children, which would include their names.

It was felt by the Office of Economic Opportunity that many cases involved confidential information, which could not be given to prospective donors in some States, and that therefore this requirement was very complicated to administer. I call attention to the fact that the committee report itself accounts for the deletion of this entire provision by referring to the difficulties with that one sentence.

On page 14 of the committee report, the following statement appears:

PART C—VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR NEEDY CHILDREN

The bill would delete from the Economic Opportunity Act provisions designed to establish a national voluntary assistance program for needy children. This program, as now authorized, involves collecting names of needy children in the face of established legal and policy restrictions which in many States may preclude disclosure, coupled with selection and followup problems which could be overcome if at all at a cost which would be prohibitive when measured against the benefits provided. Discussions between the Office of Economic Opportunity and representatives of welfare and child assistance organizations have indicated no way in which these difficulties could be avoided, at least so far as a national program is concerned.

Hence, the entire program was stricken out of the law. It seems to me that by striking the second sentence, which relates to the collection of names, and by leaving the rest of it, we would leave in the Office of Economic Opportunity the ability to do something with this program, without any mandate that it must. We would give them the opportunity to do something in this field, even if it were only coordinating the activities of local community action groups which seek to make such voluntary arrangements.

As this is a program which could easily involve children in one community, or even in one State, being helped by people in another community or in another State, a coordinating function in the Office of Economic Opportunity seems to me to be essential.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. It seems to me that because the OEO ran into this procedural block—obtaining and disclosing the names of children—it sought to delete the entire program, instead of being selective and retaining what was good and rejecting what was bad. The whole plan has gone out the window.

I respectfully submit that the program is a desirable one to have on the books. Even if it is slow getting started, and even if it must be implemented further, it embodies the right spirit and idea, so far as the antipoverty program, as it relates to children, is concerned.

When former Senator Keating offered this program in an amendment last year

former Senator HUMPHREY, who was then deputy majority leader, spoke most feelingly in support of this kind of program. He ardently proposed, as did a number of other Members, that it should be included in the law. And it was enacted, without any objection.

If we let the matter stand as it now is in the bill, we shall be allowing an agency, because it has trouble with one aspect of this program, to throw the whole program out the window without endeavoring to say what is good and what is bad.

So I have excised from my amendment the cause of the agency's objection in the hope that something may be made of the basic excellent and creative design, which will remain if my amendment is adopted. I believe it is the kind of amendment which ought to be taken to conference by the managers of the bill.

I am rather disheartened that that is not proposed to be done in this case, but that the lines seem to be drawn inflexibly against accepting such an amendment, no matter how desirable it may be. I believe it is a desirable amendment.

If that is the feeling of the majority, we shall have to live with it, and the Senate will have to work its will, as it has the power to do.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New York for offering a meritorious and humane amendment. It deserves the support of every Senator. I hope that the Senate will accept it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I, too, shall support the amendment.

I remember when Senator Keating offered it last year. The amendment then had wide support on the floor of the Senate.

I remember when former Senator HUMPHREY, as the Senator from New York said, ardently and enthusiastically supported it. The amendment contains an appeal to individuals over the country to assist in this program. It would involve very little in Government funds. I do not wish to be overly caustic, but perhaps that is one of the reasons it is not attractive.

This amendment is humane and appeals to individuals to assist in the program. I believe the amendment should be adopted. I would be happy if Senators of the majority party would recognize its value and accept the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I am not inflexible; I am very generous. The idea sounds good; but the Office of Economic Opportunity discussed the flexibility of this kind of program with officials of United Community Funds and Councils, the Child Welfare League, the Family Service Association of America, and the National Social Welfare Assembly, and all of them unanimously agreed that the program was not an appropriate one for the Office of Eco-

nomic Opportunity. It would involve indiscriminate relief and exceptionally high costs, compared with negligible benefits.

POSSIBLE JAVITS AMENDMENT—VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR NEEDY CHILDREN

As I understand, the amendment would retain the program but would eliminate its function. If we are really interested in securing a tight and efficient operation, it does not seem to me that this is the way to proceed. We would have an office for carrying out a program—but nothing in particular for it to do.

This program last year was conceived as one which would require only one or two employees. Those employees would collect the names of needy children from local welfare agencies and send them to potential benefactors. However, it was found that securing names from welfare agencies would be difficult or in many cases impossible. In addition, when the matter was discussed with those presently engaged in voluntary assistance efforts, it was found that even if the problem could be overcome, no acceptable program could be carried on with only a few employees. It would involve costs that would be prohibitively high in comparison with any benefits that might be expected.

I understand that the amendment of the Senator from New York eliminates the beneficiary's name.

The amendment would apparently recognize the infeasibility of the program as originally conceived. But if the voluntary assistance office is not to do what it was originally expected that it could do, what would be its function? Apparently, it would just be some kind of information and publicity center. This would simply duplicate functions of the general Information Center authorized under section 613 of the act, which is supposed to serve as a source of information with respect to any type of activity that may be employed as part of a community attack on poverty.

If Congress intends to hold OEO to a tight standard of avoiding superfluous jobs and duplication, we certainly should not specifically authorize superfluous jobs and duplication. I urge, accordingly, that the amendment be rejected.

I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this amendment was recognized as a most humanitarian amendment when it was submitted.

The amendment authorizes this function to be performed in the Office of Economic Opportunity. It does not compel that agency to carry it out. It states the intent of Congress to have information and coordination available in the war on poverty for voluntary help to needy children.

The amendment would not, as I have now amended it, impose any responsibility to obtain or to give any information which may be confidential or which cannot be disclosed because of State laws.

The antipoverty program is 1 year old. After 1 year, we propose to take out of the program something of its heart, something of its soul. It seems to me that, at the very least, this is precipitate and, at the very worst, it is thoroughly heartless. The program could really be a creative program if used creatively.

The OEO apparently is interested only in how much money can be appropriated and spent. They are interested only in programs which require the expenditure of a great deal of money. But they are not interested in using a little heart and a little of their brainpower and ingenuity.

I am known to be liberal in my views. I am very proud of it. However, I do believe a great deal can be done with brains. We do not need money for everything, it seems to me, in life or in government. It is extremely disheartening to see an agency shrug off something of this character which would not involve the spending of money. One wonders whether, if this provision had been attached to a \$10 or \$20 million price tag, they would be quite as anxious to get rid of it as they seem to be now.

That is what we are here for. Occasionally we must keep an agency's nose to the grindstone. This is one of those amendments. It would not cost them anything or do anything to them except make them use their brains.

Mr. COOPER. They would have to have a heart.

Mr. JAVITS. They would have to have a heart, as my colleague, the Senator from Kentucky, adds, so appropriately.

This is the least that we can insist on. I hope very much that the Senate will not sweep this amendment aside on the theory that they are voting against all amendments. We must be discerning. I respectfully submit that this is outside of the context of the issues and policies that we have been talking about up to now on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if this amendment were agreed to, we would be making the Department use its head, heart, and ingenuity in a matter which

does not involve the expenditure of large sums of money.

I hope that the Senate will do what is right in this matter and keep this extremely desirable provision in the law.

As one who is likely to be a conferee, I can promise the Senate that if they agree to the amendment, I will fight for it like a tiger.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent because of death in the family.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 40, as follows:

[No. 231 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Aiken	Dirksen	Jordan, N.C.
Allott	Dodd	Jordan, Idaho
Bartlett	Dominick	Kuchel
Bennett	Douglas	Lausche
Boggs	Ervin	McGovern
Byrd, Va.	Fannin	McIntyre
Carlson	Fong	Metcalf
Case	Hickenlooper	Miller
Cooper	Hruska	Montoya
Cotton	Javits	Morton

Morse	Prouty	Thurmond
Mundt	Ribicoff	Tower
Murphy	Saltonstall	Tydings
Muskie	Scott	Williams, Del.
Neuberger	Simpson	Young, N. Dak.
Pastore	Smith	
Pearson	Talmadge	

NAYS—40

Anderson	Hartke	Moss
Bass	Hayden	Nelson
Bayh	Hill	Pell
Bible	Holland	Proxmire
Brewster	Inouye	Randolph
Burdick	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Russell, S.C.
Cannon	Kennedy, N.Y.	Stennis
Church	Long, Mo.	Symington
Ellender	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Magnuson	Yarborough
Gore	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Mondale	
Harris	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—11

Clark	Mansfield	Russell, Ga.
Curtis	McCarthy	Smathers
Eastland	McGee	Sparkman
Hart	McNamara	

So Mr. JAVITS' amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

During the consideration of the Javits amendment:

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

Mr. NELSON. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, without doubt one of the most important parts of this important program is the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Nothing better could be done than to retrain and rehabilitate American youths who have left school for various reasons. Therefore I am disturbed by the fact that although the House has increased the total amount under title I of the bill, that increase actually has the effect of cutting the Neighborhood Youth Corps by some \$20 million.

This has been pointed out to me emphatically by many of the Neighborhood Youth Corps organizations, particularly in the eastern part of the State of Tennessee.

I should like to quote from a letter I received from Mr. Dalton Roberts, who is the director of the Neighborhood Youth Corps in Chattanooga, Tenn. He writes:

You can see from the attached information that our problem is not unique. The NYC situation will be critical in 28 Tennessee cities if the House bill is not changed. In Chattanooga alone, 542 enrollees will be pushed out on the dead-end street from whence they came. It appears that a minimum of four staff members will have to be released.

What will happen, Mr. President, under the present allocation that will go to Tennessee under the Neighborhood Youth Corps, is that in the city of Chattanooga, of the 900 young men and women who have now been counseled and trained and are ready to go back into

school, continuing in a vocational rehabilitation program, which will eventually make them effective citizens, 542 will now find themselves in the position of being told that they will be dropped from the program.

As has been said, "How do you tell a boy who is returning to school after months of counseling that you are dropping him?"

How do we explain to young men and women, after having them in summer work and having counseled them for all these months, that they must be dropped?

That is exactly what the situation will be if the cuts that have now been made in the bill are allowed to stand.

I am of the opinion that there is adequate money already in the bill, particularly in the House bill. Under title I there has been authorized \$525 million. Of that, only \$240 million is being allotted to the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

I should like to have the attention of the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], to express the hope that the Senator will read the insertions that I shall put in the RECORD and read the remarks that I have made, and refer to the great need that we have in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is really the heart of the entire operation. These are the people we are trying to help. These are the people we are trying to make into better citizens. I hope the allocation for the Neighborhood Youth Corps can be raised when the conference is dealing with the differences in what the Senate has done and what the House has done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD editorials from the Chattanooga Times, which deal with this problem, as well as an article which appeared in the same newspaper on August 14, in which it is pointed out in definite terms exactly what will happen if we do not restore the money that is needed in this program. I ask unanimous consent also that a letter from the mayor of Chattanooga and some telegrams that have come to me be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Chattanooga Times, Aug. 14, 1965]
CUT THREATENED FOR YOUTH CORPS—HOUSE ALLOCATION WOULD REDUCE FUNDS SEVERELY IN PROGRAM HERE

(By Springer Gibson)

The Chattanooga Neighborhood Youth Corps, which needs \$2.7 million just to maintain its present program, will be reduced to \$935,297 if the allocation for the national NYC project adopted by the House of Representatives recently is approved by the Senate.

That was the information given to Dalton Roberts, director of NYC here, by the State NYC headquarters Friday. Roberts said it would be a serious blow to the Chattanooga program. With a maximum of 989 in-school enrollees and 670 in the out-of-school program from February 9 through July the NYC here spent \$1.15 million.

Roberts said if the present enrollment remained as it is it would cost \$2.7 million for a full year's operation.

But it has been the purpose of the NYC leaders here to expand the program for the

new year starting with the opening of school, to meet the needs for those who qualify and desire to enroll.

Roberts has proposed an enrollment of 1,300 for the city in-school program and 1,200 for the county in-school program. There would be 800 in the out-of-school program and an enrollment of 1,200 next summer in the in-school phase.

SUBMITS REQUEST

To meet these needs, Roberts submitted a request for \$4,721,555, of which \$4,242,445 would be Federal funds and \$479,100 local in-kind services. The city school board approved the request last Wednesday.

Roberts said if the House allocation stands up it will mean reducing enrollees instead of giving more youths and the opportunities afforded by the NYC. It will mean reducing the staff and otherwise curtailing the program.

Roberts said the House doubled the last year's appropriation for the war on poverty, but within the poverty program it allocated only \$240 million to the NYC.

"This is actually a reduction, on a percentage basis, when compared to last year," Roberts said. "The NYC was given \$130 million for just 6 months of operation last year."

The Senate started consideration of the NYC allocation Friday, Roberts said, and expressed the hope the Senate will propose a much larger sum.

"The State office told me today," Roberts said, "that 19 projects in Tennessee will be closed out if the House allocation stands up."

Meanwhile Roberts issued a report on attempts now being made to direct 458 enrollees in the present out-of-school program into remedial education and job-training programs.

The staff is referring 210 to the evening remedial school. Of this number 152 were tested this week and are tentatively scheduled to begin classwork August 23. Another 58 live outside the city and the evening remedial school staff is considering plans to take the instruction to those enrollees, setting up classes in Soddy, Hixson, Harrison and Signal Mountain rural areas to accommodate the ones living in those sections who desire remedial study at night.

The staff will refer 79 to the Chattanooga Occupational Training Center where they will learn a marketable skill and take training in communications and math. Thirty-five were referred this week and 44 will be referred next week, to begin COTC classes August 30.

Seventy-one will be referred to adult education classes starting in September, 9 to regular manpower development training act classes, 20 to nurses aid training, at Moccasin Bend.

Of the remaining 133 out-of-school enrollees, the counselors are evaluating several for placement on the new on-the-job training program being carried out under the sponsorship of the Chattanooga Full Employment Committee Inc.

"The prospects of placing more advanced and mature NYC enrollees in this program are excellent," Roberts said. "Most of these 133 enrollees are new in our program. We consider the first 3 months an enrollee is with us as an evaluation period, since this is a work experience program. This is one type of evaluation that few of them have had—on the job evaluation. Some who have failed every other test (IQ, achievement, etc.) are passing their NYC on-the-job test."

Roberts said about 18 of the 133 have serious mental, physical and adjustment problems requiring extensive and tedious work by NYC counselors with several agencies to make the best placement for them.

"I must comment," Roberts stated, "that the average observer would find it difficult to believe how much work is involved in

placing youth in the right educational program.

"Our counselors study cumulative school records, school social worker records, enrollee work-rating records and our work counselors interview enrollees to determine their interests. Some are sent to the employment security office for extensive testing. It is not a matter of taking them by the hand when they walk in the door and leading them to the best program.

"There are many factors to consider: Age, skills, interests, intelligence aptitudes, achievement levels, emotional stability, family stability and motivational level."

[From the Chattanooga Times, Aug. 13, 1965]

NYC NEEDS SENATE'S HELP

Chattanooga needs help from the U.S. Senate, which is scheduled today to take up fund allocations for the neighborhood youth corps program. Otherwise, the city's NYC operation, one of the most promising in the Nation and endorsed by everyone from Representative BILL BROCK to the Labor World, might have to curtail work when it needs to be expanded.

In a puzzling decision, the House, while doubling the scope of the overall poverty program, has provided only \$241 million nationally for title 1B, which includes the neighborhood youth corps. This amounts to a \$20 million reduction. And it makes little sense against NYC's demonstrated ability to get more actual help to more people for less administrative cost than most all the various poverty projects.

A problem within a problem is that the Southeast as a whole has been tentatively given only \$36 million, or 15 percent of the shortchanged total for a region with 25 percent of the Nation's people and substantially the highest dropout rate in the country.

If the \$6.9 million now earmarked for Tennessee is not increased, Chattanooga might possibly have to end help to some of the 900 young people NYC is assisting to stay in school by providing part-time jobs; and 670 out-of-school persons who are receiving remedial education and job training in cooperation with 65 local agencies, public, and private.

A wealth of human reasons points to the necessity of this work. Statistically, one fact is basic: according to the 1960 census, only a little more than 36 percent of Hamilton County's adults had completed high school or more.

Probably more than on anything else, Chattanooga's very future depends upon its doing better than this (median school years completed in the South are presently 9.5, compared to 12 in the West, 10.7 in the Midwest and 10.2 in the Northeast).

Chattanooga's NYC program ought to be expanded, not placed in danger of cutbacks. Director Dalton Roberts has made an entirely convincing case for NYC's ability to materially increase the number of youth helped. A proposed budget encompasses aid to a total of 2,500 in-school people, 1,200 in the county and 1,300 in the city, as well as 800 out-of-school persons.

Chattanooga's successful and respected effort should be and overridingly is regarded as essential to the city's welfare. We know Senators GOAS and BASS will do their utmost toward fighting the reductions in the Senate and restoring an important balance to the whole poverty program.

CITY OF CHATTANOOGA,

Chattanooga, Tenn., August 6, 1965.

Hon. ROSS BASS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROSS: Newspaper reports indicate that the congressional appropriation for the poverty program has been doubled. However, Tennessee has been allocated only \$8

million for the Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

Chattanooga's proposal this year was for \$4.2 million. It was a thoughtful proposal and would have been wonderful for this community. In order to maintain our present program with the same number of enrollees and staff members, it will be necessary for Chattanooga to have an appropriation of \$2.7 million. This appears to be impossible under an \$8 million allocation for the entire State of Tennessee.

It is very poor politics to cut back on staff and to release enrollees who are very satisfactory. On Monday, I plan to write a detailed letter to Sargent Shriver with reference to our program. I will send you a copy.

It is imperative that you use your influence to see that Chattanooga receives \$2.7 million. This will at least permit us to maintain our present program.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

RALPH KELLEY,

Mayor.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.,
August 12, 1965.

Hon. ROSS BASS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We are informed that the Senate will begin debate this week on the authorization bill for antipoverty programs. We are most concerned that the House bill provides only \$240 million for title 1(b). This is a reduction from the past fiscal year on a percentage basis and has serious implications for all Tennessee NYC programs and for our local program which has been very successful. We know that OEO plans under the House bill to limit the southeast to \$36 million. Tennessee will only get \$8 million. We need \$4.2 million in Chattanooga to meet identified needs and \$2.7 million to stand still. Unless the Senate makes changes in the allotment of money among the EOA all NYC programs in the State will suffer. Chattanooga will have to drop dropouts who are now being enrolled in remedial and job training programs. We need your assistance.

BENJAMIN E. CARMICHAEL,
Superintendent, Chattanooga Public Schools.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.,
August 11, 1965.

Senator ROSS BASS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Chattanooga-Hamilton County Community action program is alarmed that the House only appropriated \$240 million for NYC next year. It is reported that Tennessee is scheduled for only \$8 million. Chattanooga is requesting \$4.2 million but it will require \$2.7 million to stand still or to maintain our program. I understand that the Senate will consider the authorization bill this week. In my opinion a higher percentage of EOA funds should be allocated to title 1(b) programs.

Any cuts below \$2.7 million in our program will definitely cripple program.

ROY E. BATCHELOR,
Executive Director, Chattanooga Hamilton County Community Action Program.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.,
August 11, 1965.

Senator ROSS BASS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Senate is expected to consider authorization of funds for the antipoverty programs Friday, August 13. This is to inform you that the House earmarked only \$240 million for title 1(b) Neighborhood Youth Corps programs. This is a percentage reduction from last fiscal year. OEO tentatively plans to provide only \$36 million to Southeastern

States where the dropout rate is highest and income lowest. Less than \$8 million scheduled for Neighborhood Youth Corps programs in Tennessee. Chattanooga alone is requesting \$4.2 million and needs \$2.7 million just to maintain its program. It is imperative that this program be expanded to meet local needs and the best way to insure improvements is to get additional money earmarked for title 1(b) when the Senate considers the authorization bill this week. Your help is urgently needed.

DALTON ROBERTS,
Director, Chattanooga
Neighborhood Youth Corps.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.,
August 14, 1965.

Hon. ROSS BASS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We must not turn 500 youngsters out on the streets again. Urge your assistance in obtaining larger allocation for Chattanooga Neighborhood Youth Corps.

ROSLINE AND JAY SOLOMON.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.,
August 11, 1965.

Senator ROSS BASS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Chattanooga Neighborhood Youth Corps served city students only during the past school year. It will take \$2.7 million to maintain that portion of the program for 1 full year. The Chattanooga-Hamilton County proposal submitted to OEO July 30 request \$4.2 million. If the proposal is approved the NYC will serve all county secondary schools from September 4, 1965, to September 3, 1966. We have identified over 1,200 needy county students who qualify for the NYC. We are alarmed that the House earmarked only \$240 million for the 1(b) of the EOA. Unless the Senate allots additional money to title 1(b) when the authorization bill is considered this week, every existing program in Tennessee will suffer and many cities will not get a program at all. Under the House bill Tennessee will only get \$8 million. This program has definitely proved itself in Hamilton County. It is holding youth in school, and over 500 dropouts are presently being enrolled in remedial job training programs. Tennessee and Hamilton County need your help when the EOA authorization bill comes before the Senate this week.

SAM McCONNELL,
Superintendent, Hamilton County Schools.

KINGSTON, TENN.,
August 14, 1965.

Hon. ROSS BASS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please assure that funds are made available for the Kingston Neighborhood Youth program. It is our understanding that considerable difficulty is being encountered for our existing submission.

CHESTER R. FULKS,
Mayor, City of Kingston, Tenn.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

Senator ROSS BASS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We at the local community level are very much concerned that the House has cut the appropriations for the Neighborhood Youth Corps. We solicit your influence in the Senate in the hopes that adequate funds might be provided for this worthwhile part of the war on poverty.

Dr. M. J. JONES,
Chattanooga Council for
Cooperative Action.

Mr. BASS. I hope the conferees will make every effort to adjust this important part of the program after the bill has been passed.

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

Mr. BASS. I am happy to yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. GORE. I concur in both the sentiments which the Senator has expressed and the facts which he has related. Like him, I have had communication and conversations with Mr. Roberts, with the mayor of Chattanooga, and other citizens.

Yesterday, after the last vote was taken in the Senate, it was my privilege to be a seat mate on a plane flight to Tennessee with Mr. Horton, a coordinator of the program in Nashville, Tenn. Mr. Horton is the fiscal officer of the metropolitan government there. He told me that some of the sad results would be experienced at Nashville.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield 3 additional minutes to me?

Mr. NELSON. I yield 3 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Similar sad experiences, only much larger, would be realized in Nashville, Tenn.

As of now, in Nashville, between 1,400 and 1,500 young men and women—dropouts, unemployables heretofore, boys and girls with problems and difficulties—are enrolled in training courses. Mr. Horton related to me some most encouraging results of their training thus far.

Moreover, he said that until recently the administration in Washington had been urging him and the officials in Nashville to increase the enrollment to 2,000. But, under the allocation that is proposed for Tennessee, he said that instead of being able to increase the enrollment to 2,000, which is greatly needed, almost one-half of the 1,400 to 1,500 already enrolled must be dropped or the program cut to 2 or 3 days a week.

I have been looking for an opportunity, as has also my distinguished and able colleague, to offer an amendment, with some hope of adoption, which would increase the funds to alleviate this sad and tragic situation. I observe—as my colleague must have observed—that we have had some difficulty holding the present amounts in the bill.

Mr. BASS. That is true. This attempt might be futile. That is the reason I pointed out, as my senior colleague well knows, that there is a difference of almost \$300 million between the authorization of the House and the authorization in the bill now before the Senate.

Therefore, I assume that the House and Senate conferees will perhaps reach as is usually the case, a figure somewhere in the middle of that authorization for title I, and that the bulk of the money which will be increased, I hope, in conference under title I will be applied to the Neighborhood Youth Corps. As the Senator has pointed out, what he has said is true in 28 cities in Tennessee. But where 25 percent of the population

in this area is involved, only 15 percent of the money is being allotted to this part of our great Nation, the part of the Midsouth and the Southeast in which Tennessee falls.

So I appreciate the remarks that my senior colleague has made in this area. I know that he, along with myself and many other Senators, is aware of the acuteness of the problem and the importance of carrying on this vital Neighborhood Youth Corps, which now comes to the first year of returning these young men and women to school. We have been counseling them all summer as to what they could do to retrain themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BASS. Certainly, we should not allow them to continue to be dropouts.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 394

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 394 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 7, strike out everything through line 6 on page 18, and renumber subsequent sections accordingly.

On page 29, line 10, change the figure "\$80,000,000" to "\$730,000,000".

On page 29, line 13, strike out the semicolon and everything that follows it down through the figure "205(d)" in line 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Vermont yield himself?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment I now offer would strike section 11 from the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965.

Section 11 is the proposal offered in committee by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and accepted by the committee. It adds new language to title II of the Economic Opportunity Act authorizing the Director to make grants to local public and private agencies for special programs which involve activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs.

If this has a familiar ring, Mr. President, it is because it is almost an exact duplication of the work experience programs now conducted under title V, the work experience title of the Economic Opportunity Act.

According to OEO, the work experience program of title V provides up to 100 percent funds for projects to help unemployed parents and other needy persons gain work experience and job training interwoven with adult education and basic literacy instruction. It is directed

primarily toward jobless heads of families in which there are dependent children.

Now, Mr. President, what does the Nelson amendment do that is not now authorized under the act? Not a single thing. It is simply rampant duplication.

The Nelson amendment is opposed even by the Office of Economic Opportunity itself. I read the statement of OEO from page 186 of the Senate hearings:

The Office of Economic Opportunity is sympathetic to the purposes of this amendment. We cannot, however, favor its adoption. If the objective is, as we assume, to provide the chronically unemployed poor with a form of temporary assistance that will permanently enhance their capacity for self-support, we believe that what is proposed can better be done under existing programs, including the work-experience program authorized under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act. These other programs, in our opinion, are better calculated to enhance the employability of chronically unemployed poor adults with poor employment prospects than a program carried on as an extension of a work-training program designed to serve youth.

There are, of course, several existing programs designed to enhance the employability of adults. Prominent among these is the Manpower Development and Training Act, which is focused upon adults and which contains statutory limitations designed to maintain this focus. To the degree that it can be effectively directed to the needs of the long-term or chronically unemployed, this program offers some clear advantages over other training or work-training programs, since it provides a kind of intensive, relatively high-level skill development that is most likely to be of lasting benefit to the individual.

For the unemployed poor adult who is otherwise unable to secure or benefit from the type of training provided under the Manpower Development and Training Act, but who can, with appropriate assistance, enhance his capacity for self-support, the program most likely to be relevant to his work and training needs is the work-experience program under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act. This program is designed to expand opportunities for constructive work experience and other needed training and is directed to those who are unable to support or care for themselves or their families. It authorizes Federal assistance covering the full cost of projects which include not only work experience, but also training. The training provided, according to the needs of the individual, may range from such things as instruction in basic literacy skills, simple arithmetic, and work attitudes, to advanced courses under the manpower development and training program. In addition, supportive social services are available to aid the family whose adult member or members are participating in the program. These may include such things as child care, medical assistance, home management counseling, and counseling in family problems that could interfere with effective participation in the program.

In our opinion, as a method of enhancing the employability of the unemployed poor, the proposed work-training program would substantially duplicate, though in a less effective way, what is already being done under the work-experience program. That program, like the one proposed, is directed to the poor. Those whom it serves are adults, and most, in fact, would fall within the same group of chronically unemployed persons with poor employment prospects who would be reached under the amendment. It is, moreover, fully possible under the work-experience program, as presently constituted,

to take advantage of conservation and beautification needs in structuring projects. Beautification and conservation activities are now being carried out as part of projects in Kentucky, Rhode Island, Colorado, Arkansas, North Dakota, and Louisiana. Many more such projects are planned.

As compared with the program proposed in the amendment, the chief limitation on the work-experience program is that it has been restricted so far to those who are receiving, or are potential recipients of, public assistance. An extension of the program to all needy persons is, however, feasible, and in our opinion fully consistent with the statutory purposes. Such an extension, we believe, will not require legislation.

Nor does the Office of Economic Opportunity want another \$150 million for the work experience program, which this proposed new program duplicates. As passed by the House, the bill now before us authorized \$300 million for the work experience programs in title V, \$150 million more than the President's request. The administration, through the Office of Economic Opportunity, came to the Senate committee and asked it to reduce this to the \$150 million figure in the President's budget, which we did. I can only surmise that OEO realistically recognizes that there is a limit to the amount of money that can be absorbed under title V at the present time, and does not want to be embarrassed with an unexpended balance or criticized for wasteful spending necessitated by a desperate attempt to get rid of the money.

It has been argued by the sponsors of section 11, Mr. President, that the new language goes beyond existing title V by authorizing the expenditure of funds on conservation and beautification projects. To this claim—and I believe it is important that Senators understand this—OEO replies that conservation and beautification projects under title V are already underway in six States, with many more such projects planned.

It has also been argued by the sponsors of this amendment that it would broaden the eligibility for aid beyond the existing criteria of title V, which speaks in terms of parents or relatives of children for whom aid to dependent children payments are made. OEO advises that an extension of title V benefits to all needy persons is feasible and consistent with statutory purposes, and no legislation is needed to effect such a change.

Title V authorizes the Secretary of HEW to make grants to the States for experimental, pilot, or demonstration projects under section 1115 of the Social Security Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, that section authorizes the Secretary to waive compliance with various other sections of the Social Security Act, notably section 402, in making the grants. Section 402(b) directs the Secretary to approve any plan which fulfills the conditions of

section 402(a), which describes State plans for aid and services to needy families with children. Thus, taken altogether and in light of the intent of Congress as expressed in the Economic Opportunity Act and its legislative history, it seems to me the law does not require that the benefits under title V be restricted to parents and relatives of children receiving ADCU benefits, but may be provided to any needy adult. If there is even the slightest doubt on this point, I would be happy to support any amendment to the act to make the point clear; but I do not think that is necessary—and obviously the administration feels likewise.

Let us see what we will have, Mr. President, if this section 11 remains in the bill.

First. We will have a program under title V, administered as a Federal-State grant program by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to provide work experience, including conservation and recreation projects, to needy adults.

Second. We will have a program under title II, administered as a Federal-local grant program, involving both public and private agencies, by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, to provide work experience, including conservation and recreation projects, to needy adults.

Mr. President, I submit that this is utterly preposterous. It is so preposterous that even OEO wants no part of it. Its enactment would not be consistent with the purpose of the Economic Opportunity Act, which is to effect maximum coordination of all Federal programs aimed at the eradication of poverty. On the contrary, this is not coordination and consolidation, but proliferation and duplication.

The Nelson proposal is wasteful proliferation and duplication, and OEO does not want the additional money for the program it is now operating under title V. My amendment would strike section 11 and the associated part of section 30 that earmarks \$150 million of the authorization for its implementation.

In short, this would leave the budget as the President requested it; namely, \$1,500 million, for the program. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. NELSON. I yield myself 5 minutes. This program was adopted by the committee to meet the need that is most critical for many of the poor, the need for constructive employment or work activity. I offered this amendment in committee. It arose out of the hearing held by the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee last year.

Section 205(d) of the act would authorize special programs directed to the needs of the chronically unemployed who have poor employment prospects and who, because of age or other reason, are unable to secure employment or training under other programs. Participants in these programs would work on projects contributing to such things as the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, parks, highways, and other lands. These programs would also have to be

conducted in accordance with standards which assure that they are in the public interest and consistent with the labor policies applied in connection with other programs under the act. The bill contemplates that \$150 million will be used for these programs during the first year, \$50 million of which is to be used for projects on Federal lands or along Federal highways.

A year ago I introduced a similar measure. That measure provided for a billion dollars for the same kind of program. This proposal is identical with the proposal I introduced a year ago, on which there were extensive hearings, except that the provision now is for \$150 million a year.

It is aimed at the chronically unemployed, the long term unemployed, the unskilled, those with poor employment prospects. Several features of it are significant, but one is of great significance, and that is that the administration of the program would be conducted by city park departments, by State conservation departments, by county conservation departments, by city street departments, and agencies; in other words, they would handle the supervision of the work to be conducted locally, where the chronically unemployed persons live.

At the time I made the proposal, I sent 2,000 letters to mayors of all the major cities of America and to the Governors of all the States.

I received more than 400 favorable replies. Those favorable replies came from every State in the Union with the exception of one. It was felt that this was a fine program, that there was a large amount of constructive and useful work to be done in the field of conservation, which would not otherwise be done; that this work would be done on programs for which they did not have the money; that they would like to have it, and that it would be applied to useful and constructive work.

I also received favorable replies from practically every major city in America, to the effect that they had large work programs of the kind proposed in the bill, and that they would like to have these employees, whom they could use for constructive labor.

The amendment was drafted by OEO, and they are satisfied with the amendment as it stands now.

The decision as to where the work will be performed will be made by the Administrator, with the approval of the President of the United States.

My view is that this kind of work should be done, and must be done, in the Department of Labor, not in HEW.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield myself 1 minute.

I merely wish to explain that the administration and OEO are opposed to the inclusion of this section. This amendment would reduce the authorization by \$150 million, to exactly what the administration requested for the anti-poverty program. That was made plain.

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. PROUTY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield some time to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to address some inquiries to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. I should like to refer the Senator's attention to section 205 of the present act which is entitled "Financial Assistance for Conduct and Administration of Community Action Programs."

I should like to ask the Senator if his amendment could not be comprehended under the terms of section 205 of the bill, with the sole exception that it adds \$150 million to the bill.

Mr. NELSON. Does the Senator mean under this section in the bill?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. The Senator's amendment would amend section 205 of the act. It refers to chronically unemployed people and prescribes training for certain activities. Emphasis is given to the beautification of highways.

My question is whether this could not be done under the language of section 205 of the act.

Mr. NELSON. I believe not. We examined this subject very carefully at the time the bill was drafted. The amendment provides that a sum not to exceed \$150 million shall be provided for work to be done on Federal lands—Federal forests and Department of the Interior land—in cities, counties, villages, and towns and on State-owned lands, for conservation purposes.

Of course, it might be argued that this could be done under title V.

It probably could not and should not be in title V under the Department of HEW certainly. I believe it is generally agreed within the executive branch that the program ought to be in the Department of Labor, although we do not specifically so provide in the amendment, since the authority to make that decision now vests under the law in the director, with approval of the President. But the question of where the program will be administered will be decided in the executive branch, as I have said. It is a work-oriented program which all logic dictates should go to the Department of Labor.

Mr. COOPER. Perhaps I did not make myself clear. Reading the Senator's amendment which was adopted in committee, and reading section 205 of the existing law, it is my opinion that the purpose of the Senator's amendment can be carried out under section 205. It would permit the same kind of program which the Senator's amendment would offer, with the sole exception that the Senator's amendment would provide an additional \$150 million. I do not think the amendment is needed.

To illustrate, the Senator's amendment is directed toward those who are chronically unemployed. Section 205 now deals with persistent unemployment

which certainly includes the chronically unemployed, and programs under the section are directed toward those who are persistently and chronically unemployed.

Again, the Senator's amendment specifies certain types of activities in which those people would be engaged. But the language in section 205 of the existing law identifies certain types of employment and activities, and includes the words "but not limited to them."

The Senator is the author of the amendment, but it seems to me that the objects of the amendment could be undertaken under the existing language of section 205, and all that is done actually by the Senator's amendment is to add \$150 million to the bill. The purpose is good but the amendment is not needed. The present act will do the job.

Mr. NELSON. I believe the Senator is correct when he uses the language that it could be done. I think that is correct. This is a directive by the Congress as to what should be done, and is similar to the provision we put in the bill in relation to self-help housing. Self-help housing grants could be made under the act. We added a section specifically spelling out appropriations for that kind of activity.

The section to which I refer specifically states that those effected shall be the chronically unemployed; it would involve long-term unemployment, with poor employment prospects, and it provides that the people shall be employed in those kinds of projects.

I think it is correct to say that there is enough flexibility in the bill so that if the Director desired to do all of those things, he probably would have the power to do so.

Mr. COOPER. Would it be a fair statement to say that the chief purpose of the amendment is to add \$150 million for those specific projects?

Mr. NELSON. For those specific projects, but with emphasis upon the chronically long-term unemployed with poor employment prospects, which was the specific language offered in the committee by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and accepted by the committee.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the OEO has said that the money is unnecessary. The administration does not want it. Why do we spend it? This amendment would bring the total figure for the poverty program down to \$1,500 million, and I think that is a great deal more perhaps than I had thought reasonable.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Which agency of the Government has said that the money is not needed and is not wanted?

Mr. PROUTY. The Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The very agency that we are considering under the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Vermont read the statement about the proposed expenditure?

Mr. PROUTY. Earlier I quoted from a part of the testimony which was given before the Senate committee during the hearings:

The Office of Economic Opportunity is sympathetic to the purpose of this amendment. We cannot, however, favor its adoption.

The following statement appears later:

As compared with the program proposed in the amendment, the chief limitation on the work experience program is that it has been restricted so far to those who are receiving or are potential recipients of public assistance. An extension of the program to all needy persons is, however, feasible and in our opinion fully consistent with the statutory purpose. Such an extension we believe will not require legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] read to me a moment ago a statement to the effect that some agency of the Government said that the expenditure is not needed or wanted. May I inquire what he read from?

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I read from the explanation sheet on the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator quoting the OEO:

As a method of enhancing the employability of the unemployed poor, the proposed work-training program would substantially duplicate, though in a less effective way, what is already being done under the work experience program.

That is a quotation from page 186 of the Senate hearings.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for an additional question?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much will the program cost in terms of money that is not needed and is unnecessary?

Mr. PROUTY. \$150 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So let us not vote to add to the authorization \$150 million that is not needed.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The testimony that is being referred to on the floor of the Senate is testimony of the OEO representatives when this provision was offered as an amendment to title I.

First, the author of the amendment to title I accepted a change in the age limitation of age 21. The limit was removed. The OEO was opposed to that. The fact is that the OEO worked with us to draft the amendment. Their representatives were in the committee meeting at the time the amendment was adopted. It was included in title II at their suggestion.

They liked the amendment. So does the Department of Labor. It is considered a constructive and useful amend-

ment. I refer to the OEO and the Department of Labor. The amendment was adopted unanimously by the committee, with the Senator from Vermont voting for it.

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

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was this particular item requested by the President, and is it in the bill proposed by the President?

Mr. NELSON. It was not. In the Senate, we put several things in bills that are not requested by the President.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin is willing to yield back the remainder of his time I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay".

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent because of death in the family.

The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay".

If present and voting the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 232 Leg.]
YEAS—41

Aiken	Fannin	Mundt
Allott	Fong	Pearson
Bennett	Fulbright	Prouty
Boogs	Hickenlooper	Russell, S.C.
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Saltonstall
Cannon	Holland	Scott
Carlson	Hruska	Simpson
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Talmadge
Dirksen	Kuchel	Thurmond
Dominick	Lausche	Tower
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Morton	

NAYS—47

Anderson	Inouye	Moss
Bartlett	Jackson	Muskie
Bass	Javits	Nelson
Bayh	Kennedy, Mass.	Neuberger
Bible	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pastore
Brewster	Long, Mo.	Pell
Burdick	Long, La.	Proxmire
Case	Magnuson	Randolph
Church	Mansfield	Ribicoff
Dodd	McGovern	Smith
Douglas	McIntyre	Symington
Gore	Metcalf	Tydings
Gruening	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Monroney	Yarborough
Hart	Montoya	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Morse	

NOT VOTING—12

Byrd, Va.	McCarthy	Robertson
Clark	McGee	Russell, Ga.
Curtis	McNamara	Smathers
Hayden	Murphy	Sparkman

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, after line 2, insert the following:

Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 617. The Director shall adopt such administration measures as are necessary to assure that benefits of this Act will be distributed equitably between residents of rural and urban areas."

ASSURING EQUITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, without implying criticism of anyone. I would like to propose an amendment to the measure before us to insure that the administrators make diligent effort to deal equitably with rural poverty.

In a colloquy with Senator McNAMARA yesterday, I quoted the President's farm message, in which he cited the difficulty of equitably distributing Federal assistance to scattered rural populations where the communities lack the specialists in Government programs found in large cities. The President declared that rural America must be effectively served in spite of the difficulties.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman underlined the problem in an address he made at the National Conference on the Poverty Program in Rural America, held at the Shoreham Hotel April 6 of this year.

The Secretary revealed that:

Rural America has qualified for somewhat less than 5 percent of the funds so far allocated in those programs where the community organization and community initiative are required.

Yet, we are told that 47 percent of the Nation's citizens in the poverty category reside in rural areas.

It is extremely easy, because of the difficulty of communication with rural areas and the lack of specialists in public programs to neglect rural America in the administration of government programs such as the Economic Opportunity Act.

It should also be noted that our American Indians are largely located in rural areas. They are the most economically depressed group in the Nation. Yet, they suffer from a lack of specialized personnel to guide them into new, complex government aid programs. In my own State, leaders of one Indian tribal group have virtually given up in despair after repeatedly being turned down when applying for approval of a community action program. They are overwhelmed by the red tape and bureaucratic complexities involved in completing an approved application. Many rural communities face the same problem.

I, therefore, propose an amendment which will charge those with administering the economic opportunity program to assure equity to the needy in rural and urban areas by adopting such administrative measures as are necessary for that purpose.

Mr. President, I would like to suggest that the urban areas may benefit greatly from increased rural assistance to the needy.

The Wall Street Journal Monday, in an analysis of rioting in Negro ghettos in Los Angeles, Chicago and elsewhere, reported:

In the absence of some radical solution, the kind of racial dynamite being built up in the Negro slums is only too clear. Take West Garfield Park, the Chicago area where 67 people were injured Thursday and Friday nights in Negro rioting and looting. The neighborhood as recently as 1960 was estimated to be only 19 percent Negro, but it has become a center of Negro immigrants from the South and today the population is believed to be nearly 85 percent Negro.

Chalmers Roberts, in a Washington Post article written from Los Angeles, yesterday told us:

The story of the riots in the Los Angeles area is the story of expectations frustrated, of hope denied. Denied specifically to the small town and southern Negro caught in an urban world he does not understand and whose fruits he cannot share.

In Watts, 65 percent come from the South, the rural communities and small towns. Today, Mississippi and Alabama; previously, Texas and Louisiana.

The urban ghetto known as Watts has long been considered the port of entry for Negroes coming to southern California.

Mr. Roberts continues that this migration did not occur during the war when there were jobs to go to, but that the Urban League estimates arrivals are now running 1,000 a month as lack of opportunity in rural areas for the Negro population starts them out in search of opportunity elsewhere.

It would be tragic if the Economic Opportunity Act, by concentrating its benefits in urban areas, and failing to make opportunities for rural Negro people where they are, should accelerate

concentration in the urban areas where unrest sometimes flares out of control.

I have discussed this amendment not only with the Senators in charge of the bill, but also with some of the senior Senators on the other side of the aisle. I believe that there is little or no objection to it. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota would provide that administrative procedure should be taken to assure equitable treatment of the rural and urban areas.

I have no objection to the amendment. I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back their time?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. An amendment is proposed by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] as follows:

On page 20, delete lines 2 through 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 15. Section 209(c) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In carrying out the provisions of part B of title I and title II of this Act, reasonable provision shall be made, pursuant to regulations issued by the Director, for an informal public hearing at the Office of the Director upon the request of the Governor of a State as to his objections to any application from such State under such provisions: *Provided, however,* That this section shall not apply to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of higher education in existence on the date of the approval of this Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from New York yield himself?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my amendment proposes that when there is a community action project which a Governor opposes—the situation in which there is now an absolute Governor's veto in the law which the bill would delete in its entirety—the Governor may then seek an informal public hearing under the rules and regulations which the director of the antipoverty program shall establish.

The amendment would except from that provision assistance to institutions of higher education, which is already an exception to the present absolute veto in the law.

My reason for offering the amendment—and I hope very much that it will be accepted by the Senators in charge of the bill—is that, although we have had a great deal of debate concerning the veto power, as the bill would now leave the Senate there is no veto provision in it, and there is no mention of a veto power of any sort. The only provision with relation to this subject concerns continuous consultation with State antipoverty agencies.

On the other hand, in the bill passed by the other body, there is a provision permitting the Governor's veto but adding that his veto can be overridden by the Director of OEO.

It is felt, in deference to the strong feelings of so many of our colleagues as to a veto, that the entire subject should be before us in conference. By adding this relatively innocuous provision for a public hearing to the particular section which in the House bill deals with the veto question, the matter would be before us in conference.

I deeply feel—and I am joined in this feeling by so ardent a proponent of the no-veto position as the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]—that we can come back with a provision which would be reasonable and would not be harmful, but which would lend dignity and respect to deeply held objections to denying the Governors the veto power.

My amendment is designed to bring the matter before the conference by proposing that a Governor who opposes a project shall have the opportunity for an informal public hearing under suitable rules and regulations promulgated by the Director.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from New York for his careful work on this amendment.

My opposition to the Governor's veto power is on the basis of a desire to see this program succeed.

I am for the program. I presume that, under the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from New York, the provision for hearings and consultations before the Governor would relate, in the main, to informal proceedings, rather than public. However, if it were thought that the Director would be arbitrary, the Governor could call for public hearings. This amendment would provide for proceeding with dignity.

However, with an absolute Governor's veto, he could disregard the wishes of the people in his district or the Office of Economic Opportunity. Now everybody will be heard. Everybody will be heard with the dignity compatible with his office. This is the first time it has been offered. We debated this question in committee. There were many different versions. I commend the distinguished Senator for his legislative skill and craftsmanship in drafting an amendment which I hope will not hurt the antipoverty bill, but will cause more cooperation and less friction between public officials at all levels.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator's amendment uses the language "public hearings." I take it the Senator is referring to the fact that if a Governor makes a request for a meeting in his office, it would be open to the public and the press if he wishes to discuss it?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; I do not have in mind an elaborate interview.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read the amendment again.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it is difficult for us to know what we are voting on. Is there a copy of it available?

Mr. JAVITS. I am asking the clerk to read it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New York will be read.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 20, delete lines 2 through 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 15. Section 209(c) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In carrying out the provisions of part B of title I and title II of this Act, reasonable provision shall be made, pursuant to regulations issued by the Director, for an informal public hearing at the Office of the Director upon the request of the Governor of a State as to his objections to any application from such State under such provisions: *Provided*, however, That this section shall not apply to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of higher education in existence on the date of the approval of this Act."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in order that Senators may read the amendment or confer with respect to it, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. JAVITS. I withhold it.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

ROBERT MANRY'S RECORD-BREAKING TRANSATLANTIC SAILING TRIP

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I hope Senators will indulge me while I discuss a matter that is not germane to the subject under discussion.

In Cleveland, Ohio, we have a Robert Manry, connected with the Cleveland Plain Dealer, who ventured on a sailing trip across the ocean, beginning at Falmouth, Mass., going to Falmouth, England.

The trip was made in a 13½-foot boat, and in it he had to be supplied with all of his food, implements of navigation, and of life protection. He was alone in the boat. For 78 days he was sometimes on the smooth, but more often on the rough and dangerous waters of the Atlantic.

The description of the sufferings which he endured stirs the emotions—the heat of the sun in the day, the silence of the night, without anything in view except the moon and the stars in the heavens.

With a sextant provided by the Air Force of the United States and the stars,

he charted his 3,200-mile course across the Atlantic. Manry arrived at Falmouth, England, and there was greeted by 50,000 enthusiastic citizens of the area.

I rise to express commendation of Mr. Manry and his wife, Virginia, and his children, a daughter of 13 and a son of 11 years of age.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD articles from the Cleveland Plain Dealer describing this heroic venture into the Atlantic from the coast of the United States to the coast of England. I express felicitations to him. I thank him for exhibiting what, in my opinion, is one of the qualities and characteristics that have made America great—the spirit of the individual to venture into dangers and to gamble with fate, even though survival of life is at stake.

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

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer
Aug. 18, 1965]

FALMOUTH STAGES RECORD CELEBRATION—50,000 WELCOME MANRY TO BRITAIN

(By George J. Barmann)

FALMOUTH, ENGLAND.—Robert Manry, riding the winds and the stars, came home last night from the sea.

In a brilliant blue evening of water and sky, with nearly 50,000 persons cheering and the late sun burning the windows of Falmouth, he came home to land after 3,200 miles of the great and lonely Atlantic.

Robert Manry was terribly tired. He could hardly walk. He was waving. He was laughing. He was happy. He was lonely no longer.

It was a fantastic transatlantic sailing achievement.

Tinkerbell, the good girl who tamed the wild ocean, brought him in, the bright red sail defiant to the end. He sat in her 13½-foot shell and he guided her in until the final moment.

Captain Manry made port here in 78 days.

He left Falmouth, Mass., on June 1, at 10 in the morning. He landed here at 7:30 p.m. (2:30 p.m. Cleveland time).

Seconds after he landed he embraced and kissed his wife, Virginia, and hugged his two children, Robin, 14, and Douglas, 11. And then Robert Manry knelt down and kissed the earth of England.

When Manry left Cape Cod, it was in the quiet of an American morning, with the sand dunes fading away and the deep and unquiet ocean ahead of him.

When he arrived here, it was in the roaring English evening, with thousands of people and scores of ships and planes in his ears and the mighty seas all behind him.

The American flag fluttered freshly from the stern.

"I am here," he said.

You could barely hear him say it: "I am here."

This harbor, one of the world's great natural havens, was jammed with boats and ships of all descriptions. The town of Falmouth (population 17,500) was tied up with traffic for 2 miles in each direction.

A total of 50,000 persons watched the drama of Manry's journey's end. They stretched along the shoreline for miles—from Pendennis Point, where they could see *Tinkerbell* first, all the way to the harbor itself.

Helicopters of the Royal Navy whirred above him as he was approaching the outer harbor. Four-engine Shackletons of the Royal Air Force, which had helped in searches to fix his positions, sped overhead as he came to a landing. Two official launches

escorted Manry in. One was the launch of the Customs House of Falmouth. The other was the boat of the harbormaster, Capt. Francis H. Edwards.

Tinkerbell was towed in the last 2 miles. It was almost impossible for Captain Manry to sail her in because of the crush. One motorboat collided with *Tinkerbell*, with no adverse effects. The green water was white with the wakes of vessels.

Whistles blew. Cornishmen yelled out: "Glad you made it, mate."

Captain Manry waved back and shouted, time and time again: "Thank you. Nice of you to come out."

People on all sides tried frantically to get close to him and shake his hand.

This reporter rode the last few miles of this epic journey across the Atlantic with Captain Manry.

Mindful of his boat, as always, the 47-year-old sailor maneuvered as best he could among the hundreds of powerboats and sails. He asked, as he held to the tiller:

"Is there anybody left in Falmouth?"

Then he landed at the jetty, or quay as it is known here. And then the crowd took him over.

Police, linking arms, held back the photographers and the crowds. Samuel A. Hooper, the mayor, in his official robes and his chain of office, welcomed him.

A line was cut through the shouting crowds, and Captain Manry and his family were taken to a press conference in Princess Pavilion, then to the Green Bank Hotel on the harbor front, where another big crowd awaited him.

He got to sleep at 1 a.m., finally.

This last day at sea for Manry began with his first sighting of land since Massachusetts. He saw the land at Lizard Point, near here, as the sun came up. He had sailed all night in the moonlight.

As boats went out to meet him, he talked for a moment with representatives of the Plain Dealer, who were aboard a chartered boat.

The press boat pulled alongside. This reporter jumped aboard *Tinkerbell*.

Manry, in his red windbreaker jacket and bareheaded, was alone in this tiny thing, but you knew he had two other passengers all this time—magnificent courage and quiet determination.

"George, how are you?" he said. He laughed. He said he didn't know what to think of all this.

"Excuse me," he said, as the boom went swinging past.

And then the harbormaster's boat came alongside and Manry put his hand out to keep her from scraping *Tinkerbell*. He was always watching out for *Tinkerbell*. Every moment.

"Mr. Manry, you are in the harbor of Falmouth," called out Captain Edwards. "We would like to tow you in the rest of the way."

The tow was attached. A 2-mile procession began.

It was 6:30 p.m.

"I won't be required to make any speeches, will I?" he asked. He had heard of the civic reception that was waiting for him.

"Not now."

"Will I ever?"

"I don't know yet."

A motorboat came close. A man handed Manry a snapshot. "I just took a picture of you," he said. "Would you like to have it?" Manry took it and thanked the stranger for it. Another boat came near. A boy wanted to shake Manry's hand. They shook hands.

"That's Pendennis Castle over there, isn't it?" Manry asked. He knew the sights of Falmouth. He had a chart before him. Two cameras, one still and one movie, held the charts down in a breeze.

The sea belongs to the dreamer. Robert Manry is a dreamer. His dream came true on this ocean he was now leaving.

"There are more boats here than there were at Dunkirk during the war," he said, picking up his movie camera and shooting some scenes of the turmoil in the water around him.

A girl on one large boat yelled, "Cleveland. Cleveland. Cleveland." He said, "Where in Cleveland?" She said: "In Parma."

"You know I first heard about all this commotion when I was listening to the Voice of America talking about me—in French," said Manry. He looked up toward the granite headlands as *Tinkerbell* came on.

"Look at those people," he said, pointing to a line that looked like statues etched against the sky. "It looks like Roman times. They're defining the battlement."

Tinkerbell passed Black Rock, a half-mile out. He was now in the inner harbor.

Bob could now begin to see the really big crowd. And the crush of boats was getting worse. The launch of the RAF and the harbormaster's boat were warning them to keep clear.

"I feel like I have just been elected President," said Manry.

FALMOUTH JUBILANT AS MANRY ARRIVES

(By Russell W. Kane)

FALMOUTH, ENGLAND.—Falmouth was a Piccadilly Circus town last night when Bob Manry was towed over the last stretch of water to complete his record-breaking transatlantic sailing trip.

Thousands upon thousands of people—both residents and tourists—jammed the narrow, brown-walled streets of this ancient Cornish seaport all day yesterday waiting for Manry and *Tinkerbell*.

Cruise boat operators ferried loads of passengers at 10 shillings (\$1.40) a head out into Falmouth Bay to wave at the conquering hero.

The ramparts of the two ancient castles at the harbor mouth were jammed with other watchers, many of them armed with telescopes, binoculars, cameras, and portable radios so that they could tune to the latest developments on *Tinkerbell's* progress.

"Well done," was the shout on most lips last night as Bob landed.

And it was well done.

The crowds were so thick that people were perched on window ledges, jammed out onto piers, swarming in the harbor in hundreds of small and large boats, hanging from trees, standing on hedges, looking out of windows, and filling every available space lining this almost circular harbor.

Manry moved up the harbor, first sailing, then being towed by the harbormaster's launch for safety's sake.

Before *Tinkerbell* pulled into sight behind the 23,000-ton *Nevada*, being pulled out of drydock for a sea cruise, the band began to play on the Custom House Quay.

It was the St. Styrian's Silver Band. They tuned up with "The Stars and Stripes Forever," went into "The Star-Spangled Banner," and finished off with "Hail, the Conquering Hero Comes."

Manry looked genuinely shocked when his face appeared from beneath the sail boom of his cockleshell as it was towed up to the quay.

His tanned face broke into a huge smile. His voice was hoarse. You couldn't hear it above the crowd noise, anyway.

It was drowned out, too, by the band, the onlookers, and a horde of newsmen, including a 50-yard bench set up for TV and newsreel cameramen.

As his boat was tied to the pier, he was helped up the steps by the police chief, Trevor Lewis, and William A. Ashbolt, Plain Dealer director of news photography.

"Everything is moving," he said, laughing as he stumbled up the pier steps. He was wobbly on his feet.

Then he saw his wife, Virginia, and his children, Douglas, 11, and Robin, 14, standing on the pier.

The newsmen pressed closer, photographers' flash units were popping right and left. The crowd, which filled the street, shouted and screamed when Bob appeared in his red nylon windbreaker.

Although he was near the edge of exhaustion, Manry waved enthusiastically at the greeters.

"My goodness, what a crowd," he said over and over, jovially, as if he had just walked out of his home after a nap.

Chief Lewis estimated the crowd at 50,000 persons after he had taken a good look at them.

The Manry family and Ashbolt were placed by bobbies into one car, the mayor, Sam Hooper, and the adult Manrys were put in another car and a few more policemen entered a third car. But the three-car motorcade was unable to move off the pier. The cars were absolutely swallowed by the crowd.

One of the first things Ashbolt did when he got close to Manry as he was helping him up the steps was give him a letter from Thomas Vail, publisher and editor of The Plain Dealer.

"Oh," said Manry. "Isn't this wonderful. Isn't this terrific. It's so flattering to get a friendly word from the boss just when I need it the most."

The motorcade slowly moved off with the black-helmeted bobbies marching along in between the swarm of cars, shouting: "Please clear the way, please, please, 5 feet on each side, ladies and gentlemen."

But the ordinarily placid Cornish just wouldn't be moved. They kept looking for the car that contained Manry. They clutched at its rearview mirrors. They clutched through the windows trying to pat him and shouting, "well done," in the windows at him. Manry's expression was a cross between exhaustion and hysteria. He looked jubilant one minute, stunned the next. But he smiled gaily and waved at the crowds and said, "Thank you, thank you, thank you," as the motorcade slowly drove up the twisting street to Princess Pavilion.

A crowning touch to the completion of Manry's journey was a five-time flyover by the Royal Air Force planes which had searched so diligently for him many times when he was unaccounted for in the North Atlantic.

Wing Cmdr. Steve Carson personally flew a huge Shackleton plane in a wing-wagging salute to the sailor hero. It thrilled the spectators, too, to see the air-sea four-engine camouflaged ship zooming low over Falmouth.

Just before his news conference Manry and his wife had tea with Mayor Hooper and chatted and relaxed a bit in a garden before he faced reporters' questions at a press conference.

As we drove back from the news conference to the hotel so that Manry could eat a secluded meal and a cup of hot tea, a bath and wash his hair and care for his salt water injured hand, he said: "This has been a fantastic day."

It certainly was. But it was one of 78 fantastic days.

BARNACLES KEEP "TINK" OFF PEDESTAL ASHORE

FALMOUTH, ENGLAND.—Barnacles kept *Tinkerbell* locked to the sea last night.

Instead of occupying a place of honor ashore, Capt. Robert Manry's boat spent one more night bobbing on the sea.

When the harbormaster's men tried to pull up *Tinkerbell's* center board, they found that barnacles had attached themselves to it. The retractable keel would not budge.

As darkness closed in, a Royal Air Force diver tried in vain to chip the tenacious crustaceans from the keel. But he could not budge them.

So the 13½-foot sailboat is riding at a mooring 200 yards from Custom House Quay, where it touched land earlier.

A guard of harbormaster's men and police has been posted to protect *Tinkerbell* from souvenir hunters.

Today, experts will be called in to clean off the barnacles and make *Tinkerbell* ready for the land.

Tinkerbell was towed into the harbor earlier. Officials feared it might be crushed or damaged by other boats.

Captain Manry at first was hesitant of the tow offer. Then he agreed. "I'm here," he said. "It won't spoil my record."

CHILDREN HAIL DAD ON PIER

FALMOUTH, ENGLAND.—Robert Manry's children were the happiest kids on the crowded pier here yesterday when their father stepped ashore.

But they were restrained in their joy. They had seen him and chatted with him earlier when Plain Dealer reporters took them a short distance to sea to say hello to their father. They had not seen him for nearly 3 months.

On that encounter, aboard a boat chartered by the Plain Dealer, Douglas Manry, 11, and his sister, Robin, 14, shouted and waved to Bob as we drew near the tiny *Tinkerbell*, which was almost obscured by circling boats that went out in this ancient harbor to greet Manry. Douglas also showed off his Beatle boots, acquired here while the family waited for Manry's arrival.

"My goodness, look at those shoes," shouted Manry when he saw them. The long, black, pointed, suede ankle-length boots seemed to be the biggest surprise for the transatlantic sailor.

Bob's face lit up with a fatherly glow when he saw his children hanging over the rail of the chartered 54-foot launch.

"Boy, am I glad to see you," he said.

He chatted also with his wife, Virginia. He had seen her Monday when we found him and *Tinkerbell* sailing along 56 miles southwest of here in the English Channel's western approaches.

There was actually not much conversation. Bob was too busy watching other boats that were circling around.

But the children were very happy to see him and, although they didn't have too much to say, they assured him that they would have dinner with him that night, "if you can make it," Robin said.

"Don't worry, I'll make it," Bob shouted back, as he veered away from our boat.

And he did.

Later Bob, Virginia, and their children were reunited in a room at the Green Bank Hotel here in Falmouth, where the family has been staying.

They were getting together after their long separation. The children are filling in Bob on what they have done in Falmouth—fishing, swimming, meeting Cornish children.

Douglas told about "Help," the new Beatles' film, which he and Robin have seen many times.

Manry, a gentle guy who looks even more fatherly in his bushy dandy mustache, made such comments as:

"Gee, that certainly sounds interesting. This is a wonderful town for children."

The children for the first time in the 2 weeks since our Plain Dealer expedition left Cleveland, seemed beside themselves with joy.

Once again they were reunited and welded into their familiar family unit.

Although they are 3,200 miles from home, the Robert Manrys are a family again.

And they show it by the happy light in their eyes.

ROBERT MANRY—A GREAT SAILOR

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the crossing of the Atlantic Ocean by Robert Manry in his 13½ foot sailboat, is one of the outstanding instances of individual heroism of our time. In this fast moving space age of change and challenge, people the world over have become accustomed to great feats of heroism in flights into space. As a matter of fact the ever increasing number of space flights have caused some people to take for granted the bravery of the individuals involved in each of them.

Robert Manry's triumph was his and his alone. On his own he sailed from Falmouth, Mass., and for 78 days braved the Atlantic Ocean alone and unaided until his arrival in Falmouth, England yesterday.

We in Ohio are especially proud of the new hero in our midst. Bob Manry resides in Cleveland, Ohio, where he is a copy editor for the Plain Dealer, one of the great newspapers of that city.

In this day of computers and automation, of space flights and probing of the ocean's depths, it is a rare thing indeed for one man to tackle the elements alone and unaided. Not since the historic flight of Charles Lindbergh has the world seen an example of this kind of individual heroism and bravery.

The world now knows that Robert Manry is a great sailor. We in Ohio have for some time known that he was a great newspaperman. May I join with millions of other people the world over in extending to him and to his family my heartiest congratulations on his outstanding achievement.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield back by time—

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, are we on the amendment of the Senator from New York?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. I am willing to yield back my time.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, while there are enough Senators present, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 393

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 393.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment (No. 393), as follows:

On page 27, line 20, strike out everything through line 24 and insert in lieu thereof:

"PROGRAMS FOR THE ELDERLY POOR

"SEC. 610. (a) It is the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under this Act.

"(b) There is hereby established in the Office a Task Force on Programs for the Elderly Poor. The task force shall be composed of nineteen members who shall be appointed by, and shall serve at the pleasure of, the Director pursuant to section 602(c) to represent industry, labor, agriculture, education, minority groups, and social service organizations. The Director shall name one such member as Chairman. The task force shall investigate the needs of the elderly poor, examine the effect on the elderly poor of programs under this and other Federal Acts, and, where appropriate, recommend modifications of existing programs and the institution of new programs to assist the elderly poor to improve their standard of living. The task force shall, among other things, examine proposals for substantial increases in monthly social security benefits, the inclusion of all persons of retirement age who do not receive public pensions into the social security system, and further liberalization of the retirement income test of section 203 of the Social Security Act. The task force shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Director for transmittal to the President and Congress on or before June 30, 1966."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment I now call up creates no new programs, involves no new expenditures, broadens no existing authority, and almost certainly reflects the intent of the great majority of the Congress. Often I wish more of the amendments voted upon by this body had such splendid credentials.

My amendment is similar to that first proposed by the junior Senator from Florida, who serves as chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging.

The first section of my proposed new section 610 of the Economic Opportunity Act incorporates verbatim the language proposed by Senator SMATHERS and adopted by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. This merely expresses the intention of Congress that wherever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct and administration of the antipoverty program.

The second section borrows from another earlier proposal of Senator SMATHERS to give statutory authority to a task force on programs for the elderly poor within the Office of Economic Opportunity. This section reads as follows:

There is hereby established in the Office a Task Force on Programs for the Elderly Poor. The Task Force shall be composed of 19 members who shall be appointed by, and shall serve at the pleasure of, the Director pursuant to section 602(c) to represent industry, labor, agriculture, education, minority groups, and social service organizations. The Director shall name one such member as chairman. The Task Force shall investigate the needs of the elderly poor, examine the effects on the elderly poor of programs under this and other Federal Acts,

and, where appropriate, recommend modifications of existing programs and the institution of new programs to assist the elderly poor to improve their standard of living. The Task Force shall, among other things, examine proposals for substantial increases in monthly social security benefits, the inclusion of all persons of retirement age who do not receive public pensions into the social security system, and further liberalization of the retirement income test of section 203 of the Social Security Act. The Task Force shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Director for transmittal to the President and Congress on or before June 30, 1966.

Mr. President, this amendment is, very simply, a tangible manifestation of the intention of Congress that the elderly poor get an even break with younger persons under the antipoverty program.

Now, Mr. President, the question is properly raised, do the elderly poor get an even break now under the antipoverty program? Are the problems of the more than 15 million Americans over 65 who have incomes below the poverty line being given the urgent consideration they deserve from the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Here is what Mr. Shriver had to say on this point to the Senate Special Committee on Aging this June:

First of all, it seems to be extremely difficult to find efficient, economical ways of actually helping the very elderly poor to get out of poverty. Congress already has a magnificent record through the Social Security Administration, through the proposed medicare bill, and through other programs, for bringing effective help to the aged, but when you get the problem of how do you actually help the aged help themselves to get out of poverty, it is more difficult.

This is not to say, however, that it is impossible. I just want to make the firm point that we are not satisfied with what we have done and I am not satisfied with what I am able to report to you and the other members of the committee today.

In order to remedy this situation, on June 14 Mr. Shriver appointed a task force within his office to grapple with the problems of the elderly poor. I commend him for it, although I think it could well have been done some months earlier. This amendment would give the prestige of specific statutory authority to this task force.

It will be seen that the language of the amendment makes special reference to possible changes in the Social Security Act which have a direct relationship to poverty among the elderly.

The relationship of the social security laws to the aged poor has been clearly recognized by the Office of Economic Opportunity. In a statement to the Senate Committee on the Aging, OEO stated:

No employment program can go to the heart of the problem of poverty among these aged people. Such a program thus cannot substitute for basic income maintenance arrangements, operating through the social security system, the tax structure, or otherwise, which will provide those aged who must or want to retire with the income they need in retirement.

Accordingly, my amendment directs the task force to consider changes in the

Social Security Act, and three proposals in particular:

First. Substantial increases in social security benefits; second, broadening the social security system to include more retired persons who have no public pensions; third, further liberalization of the retirement income test under the social security laws.

It is not, of course, intended that these be the only subjects of consideration by the task force. They are mentioned only to insure that the task force give them special consideration. I should like to point out that I proposed amendments along each of these three lines when the social security bill was before us last month—amendments which went beyond the version eventually enacted into law in respect to aid for our retired citizens. Careful study of these proposals by this task force should help the Congress give them due consideration when they next are proposed.

My amendment goes beyond the mandate of the existing task force by requiring it to make a report to the Director for transmittal to the President and Congress on or before June 30, 1966. This guarantees that the efforts of this exceptionally well qualified group will be readily available to the Congress as it continues its discussion of measures to aid our senior citizens.

I must say that I am among the first to recognize the difficulties inherent in trying to devise programs to specifically aid the elderly poor under the Economic Opportunity Act. The principle beyond the Economic Opportunity Act is that a sensible outlay by the Government can convert people who are now tax eaters into taxpayers. With those who are beyond normal working years there is a serious problem in putting this principle into practice. But, I suggest, there are ways that the lives of the elderly poor can be made more constructive and meaningful. Mr. Shriver has already suggested a foster grandparents program, to utilize the talents of our older citizens in enriching the lives of neglected and unwanted children. This is an excellent idea, and I hope the task force on the problems of the elderly poor will spell out in detail how this program can be put into operation in the very near future.

I know I believe the Senate should pass this amendment and fight to hold it in conference, so as to put certain elements at OEO on stern notice that the elderly poor deserve the very best from the war on poverty.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. This provision, I take it, would give a statutory status to the committee that has already been appointed.

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct, and it would also require that the report be submitted to Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why does this provide for a special study of the elderly poor when the Senate has a committee on it and the House has a standing committee on it? The Senator states that he is going to investigate the elderly poor.

Does not the Senate have a Committee on Aging and does not the House have one also?

Mr. PROUTY. This would be in the executive branch, and the study would be in relation to the poverty program. The amendment does not add anything new. It merely gives statutory authority to a task force presently in existence, and requires that the Director submit its report to Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON. Do I understand correctly that Sargent Shriver's office is now studying substantial increases in social security benefits? Is that not what the resolution calls for?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes, that is what this amendment calls for.

Mr. ANDERSON. He does have?

Mr. PROUTY. OEO has rightly recognized the close relationship between social security benefits and poverty among the elderly poor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like the Senator to answer it this way. Does Sargent Shriver's office now have a committee studying substantial increases in social security benefits?

Mr. PROUTY. He has a task force studying the problems of the elderly poor.

Mr. ANDERSON. He does have?

Mr. PROUTY. It is studying the whole broad area of poverty among the elderly. I do not know whether it is specifically studying the relationship between social security benefits and poverty among the elderly, but I believe it should.

Mr. ANDERSON. Social security is not necessarily a whole broad study of poverty.

Mr. PROUTY. No, but any meaningful study of the poverty problems of the elderly necessarily involves social security benefits and coverage.

Mr. ANDERSON. Ordinarily, this is a province of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. I am wondering why Sargent Shriver is going to begin a study of social security benefits.

Mr. PROUTY. The only purpose is to consider the poverty problems of the elderly, and those problems are in part related to social security.

Mr. ANDERSON. It states here, "(c) further liberalization of the retirement income test under the Social Security Act." That is the function of the Standing Committee of the Senate and the Standing Committee of the House.

Mr. PROUTY. This amendment merely gives statutory authority to a task force which is already in existence, and requires that the Director of OEO submit a report to Congress. If legislation is involved, it would be referred to the appropriate legislative committees of Congress.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, let me say at this point that the OEO does have a committee studying conditions of the elderly poor. It is a committee appointed by the Director. This gives it statutory status. I am willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the Senator in charge of the bill answer a question or two about that?

Mr. NELSON. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator has just stated that the OEO has a committee now making a study of social security?

Mr. NELSON. No, I did not say that. I said that a committee is studying, I understand—I am informed—I am advised—that they have such a committee studying problems of the elderly poor. What aspects of those problems they are going into, I do not know. This provides for a study of a substantial increase in social security benefits.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is the function of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. Therefore, is that subject not receiving adequate attention at the present time by these committees? I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the Finance Committee had 30 days of hearings, and 25 days in executive session covering problems of the elderly poor and elderly care.

Mr. NELSON. I believe that the Senator from New Mexico is directing his questions to the wrong source.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Wisconsin indicated that he would accept the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. NELSON. All I said was that the director already has appointed, I understand, an advisory committee to consider special problems of the elderly poor, to make recommendations for their inclusion in programs under the act.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Social Security Act does not come under this act, but the pending amendment does.

Mr. NELSON. Perhaps the Senator from New Mexico should offer an amendment to strike out the specification of "social security benefits."

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know about that. I wonder why the Senator would take this amendment to conference without knowing what is in it.

Mr. NELSON. We accepted it for various reasons, one of the reasons being that it is getting very late.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand correctly that the Senator will accept the amendment in order to take it to conference?

Mr. NELSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The term "take it to conference" has the usual Senate connotation, does it not?

Mr. NELSON. Well, we can continue with additional amendments, let me say.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe that the Senator from Vermont is probably making a mistake in including social security benefits in his amendment. It is perfectly proper to direct attention to problems of this kind, if the OEO has such a committee. I wish the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] were in the Chamber, to hear what he would have to say if someone were to walk into his territory.

Mr. NELSON. Would the Senator from Vermont be willing to strike out the specifications of the words "social security"—that would be on lines 9 through 15 on page 2?

Mr. ANDERSON. I invite the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to section (c) where it states, "further liberalization of the retirement income test under the Social Security Act."

This matter was, as the Senator from Illinois has just put it, just accepted and taken to conference.

Mr. PROUTY. Let me say to my friend the Senator from Wisconsin that I am willing to delete those lines, but it would be done with the understanding that he is doing something more than simply taking it to conference. I thought that the Senator had already accepted my amendment a few minutes ago.

Mr. NELSON. I told the Senate that I would accept it. I do accept it. I am merely substituting for the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], who will be the one to take it to conference.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking out the sentence that begins on page 2, line 9, and ends on page 2, line 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment. If there is no objection, the amendment is so modified.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I should like to make this inquiry as to whether the amendment, as modified, is subject to the same deprecatory comment of the Senator from Illinois about being "taken to conference," or whether we really mean to accept it now?

Mr. NELSON. I believe that the amendment as modified is a very fine amendment.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I express my appreciation to the Senator from Vermont. I appreciate very much what he has done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time now yielded back?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

The amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, before third reading, let me say that I have no amendment to offer, but it was suggested that we have a quorum call before third reading, and on that basis 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. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted 5 minutes to express my views on the bill generally. I do know that 1 hour of debate has been allocated on the bill, but there are other Senators who wish to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection—

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate voting against the bill and should like the record to show my reasons for doing so.

In fiscal 1965, \$793 million was spent by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The administration asked for \$1,500 million for fiscal year 1966, or about 100 percent more than was spent in fiscal year 1965.

The bill which the administration sent to the House, for \$1,500 million, was raised to \$1,895 million. The bill as it is before the Senate calls for \$1,650 million, which is \$150 million more than the administration requested. I cannot go along with this unjustified, unreasonable lifting of the expenditure in this program. I cannot understand how, in face of our general problems around the world and the expenditures that are incident to them, we can go on the spending spree contemplated in the bill.

I point out a few aspects of the spending with which I do not agree. It is conceded that for every boy or girl taken into the Job Training Corps there will be spent an average of \$4,400 for a period of 9 months of training. The advertisements calling upon these boys and girls to enlist state "Join this Corps. Travel, study, work, with pay."

For each enrollee there is spent \$4,400. The enrollees are the dropouts from our normal schools. My query is, How can we justify spending \$4,400 for a 9-month period, to take care of a dropout, when in Ohio it is possible to send a boy or girl to practically any college within the State—and it has 54 colleges—on an expenditure that averages about \$2,100?

For the dropout it is \$4,400 a year. For the enrollee in our colleges it is about \$2,100 per year.

For 2 days we have been listening to arguments. The arguments have not been about the poor, but about who is going to control the loot. The Governors of the States and the mayors of the municipalities begged to have the right to say what the Washington Government might do within the States and the municipalities. Their request was fair and reasonable. Washington wants full and unlimited control without the States or cities having any word in the matter. Washington's position is wrong and that of the States and cities is right.

It has been pointed out that all but one Governor voted for the veto power in the Governors. After 10 years of attendance at Governors' conferences, my experience shows that nowhere do the Governors speak the truth with greater

intensity, free from politics, than they do at the Governors' conference. There they are free from political domination. There they express their individual views. All but one Governor said the Governors should have the veto power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When they asked for the veto power and asked for the responsibility, it was not rejected by Washington. For a Governor to say, "I turn down an application for Federal money" requires great courage and integrity. Governors took that position. In my whole political career I have never seen a program so loaded with the ability of political manipulation and deviousness. The programs general objective is good but its cost of administration is indefensibly extravagant. I cannot vote for it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 2 minutes before the third reading, in order to simplify the time of the Senate later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have great respect for the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who has pointed out the real, basic problem in the bill as it is presented to us. We have not had any fruitful amendments accepted to cure the defects that were mentioned. We are ballooning—not merely expanding—the proposed expenditures on this program without solving the administrative problem.

For these reasons, plus the statement which I understand the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], our great leader, will make on the bill, I merely wish to say that I cannot support the bill in its present form.

In order to outline clearly one of the reasons, I refer to an editorial published in the Denver Post of August 13. It is headlined "Brighter Side of Poverty Program." It discusses one of the Job Corps camps in our State:

Of all the boys received at Colbran, about one-fourth have quit and gone home—some because of homesickness, some because of family emergencies, some because they just didn't like it.

One youth who beat up another corpsman, without provocation, was discharged. He happens to live in Denver, most corpsmen are from outside Colorado.

There have been occasional problems: a fight between two corpsmen in Colbran; attempts by underage boys to buy beer and liquor; the heterogeneous racial composition of the camp. But the project supervisor, R. W. (Bob) Jennings of Grand Junction, is "well pleased."

I say to Senators that until we can do better than that, I am unwilling to see

\$1,650 million of taxpayers' funds spent without curing the problem.

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

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

BRIGHTER SIDE OF POVERTY PROGRAM

The war on poverty has both ups and downs and, by the nature of things, there is bound to be more griping about failures than cheering about successes. It seems appropriate, then, to note that a once-controversial poverty project in Colorado has achieved at least tentative success.

The Office of Economic Opportunity opened Colorado's first Job Corps camp near Collbran, in Mesa County, late in May. The site was picked by OEO in Washington and approved by Gov. John Love in spite of some protest in the community.

Now, as the end of the third month approaches, the camp seems to have shaken down quietly and started its important duty: teaching in the classroom, training in job skills, creating recreational areas for public enjoyment, inspiring young men to break the old bonds of poverty and ignorance.

There are now about 90 youths, ages 16 through 21, at Collbran. Half stay in camp for construction work and classes while the others work, under direction of the Bureau of Reclamation, on public recreational facilities on Grand Mesa.

Of all the boys received at Collbran, about one-fourth have quit and gone home—some because of homesickness, some because of family emergencies, some because they just don't like it.

One youth who beat up another corpsman, without provocation, was discharged. He happens to live in Denver; most corpsmen are from outside Colorado.

There have been occasional problems: a fight between two corpsmen in Collbran; attempts by underage boys to buy beer and liquor; the heterogeneous racial composition of the camp. But the project supervisor, R. W. (Bob) Jennings of Grand Junction, is "well pleased."

Jennings, a veteran reclamation engineer, meets regularly with a community committee to talk over problems and "try to head off any new ones."

Murray Durst, camp director, thinks the camp is gaining support from the community, though "there are still some questions on people's minds—you don't just put 90 boys down in a community without having some impact."

A random sampling of the Collbran community tends to confirm this feeling: that the camp has gained in acceptance, ranging from tolerance to good will, but nearby residents still have some reservations.

A minister just arrived in Collbran, the Reverend Max H. Webster, brings with him some related experiences in Vermont, where as an administrator for the United Church of Christ, he participated at the State level in the poverty program and is familiar with it.

The outlook at Collbran is optimistic. Colorado's second Job Corps camp is scheduled to open near Pagosa Springs this fall. We hope the young men at Collbran and their good neighbors will continue to make the experiment work.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DRKSEN] will wish to speak before the third reading of the bill. Under an arrangement with him I agreed to speak first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is under control.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It makes no difference whether I speak before or after the third reading. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, during the debate several Senators have placed in the RECORD statements indicating that the Economic Opportunity Act—known widely as the Antipoverty Act—has been used in some counties and communities for political purposes.

I have recently received several complaints from Pike County, Ky., stating that some programs are being used for political advantages in that county. I do not know all the facts, but I have asked the Director, the Honorable Sargent Shriver, to make an investigation of these complaints and make a full report.

I was one of the original supporters of the bill and its programs. I voted for the first bill, and I shall vote for the bill before us. But I want to see it used for the benefit of the poor, the needy, the unemployed, the young men and women, and the aged, and I want the program to be run without waste, duplication, and politics.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, certainly we all know that there are people in our country who need help in raising their standard of living and in preparing themselves for jobs, and we know that our Government has a responsibility to assist them. In helping them we help our whole country; it is as simple as that.

But while I think we all share a deep concern for the welfare of all Americans and are determined to assist them where assistance is called for, we must see to it that the money we vote is going to be used in a meaningful way to help the economically disadvantaged for whom it is intended. We must see to it that the programs for which the money is authorized and appropriated are well conceived and carried out, and that they will actually contribute to a solution of the problem which disturbs us all.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, I know very well that the \$1.7 billion which the Appropriations Committee voted yesterday for the Vietnam war emergency fund, in recommending a total of nearly \$47 billion for support of the Armed Forces during the current fiscal year, is only the beginning of what is going to be required. Our increased commitments on the international scene do not mean that we should ignore our problems here at home. Of course we should not do that. But we should look at our programs carefully and make sure we are spending funds wisely and making every dollar count.

In this connection, I think it is important to point out that the program before us is not the only one which the Federal Government is operating to aid the less fortunate citizens of our Nation. Already this year we have passed the elementary and secondary education bill aimed at help for our disadvantaged

children, the social security amendments bill providing a program of medical care for our older citizens and other types of public assistance, and a \$7.5 billion housing bill giving special aid to persons who are unable to obtain decent housing for themselves for one reason or another. We must consider this proposal to extend the Economic Opportunity Act as but one part of the overall effort being made at all levels of government—local, State, and Federal—to assist persons who are unable to help themselves.

Two main considerations lead me to vote against this bill in its present form.

First, I think that it is not wise to double expenditures for a program which has been as widely criticized as this one has, and which, it is generally conceded, has revealed many flaws. It is true that this is a relatively new program which has had many problems to resolve before it could operate smoothly and efficiently. But that is more reason to move slowly. Certainly it is not time to double the program which to date has received mixed reaction at best. Rather we should continue it at its present level, with an eye to making improvements where they should be made. Once there is evidence to show that improvements have been made, then we can consider broadening the scope of the program. To double the money first and then try to improve its administration, is to put the cart before the horse. Again I emphasize the prospects of sharply increased requirements for Vietnam and the necessity for holding the line and making every dollar count in our various domestic programs.

Second, I am much disturbed by the action of the committee and of the Senate in eliminating the power of the Governor to veto projects in his State which he thinks unwise. The Senate has been evenly divided on this point, indicating that there is a good deal of support for the veto power, which was deleted by only one vote in committee and which has failed to be put back into the bill on this floor on a tie vote. Last year, as my colleagues will recall, the Senate voted 80 to 7 in support of an amendment giving the Governor the authority to veto certain projects under title I and title II of the act.

We have discussed this issue at length here, and I shall not go into it again, except to say that this power has been exercised only four times to date by the Governors of Alabama, Florida, Montana, and Texas. I have seen no evidence to indicate that any of these disapprovals was made irresponsibly. Then, too, we must remember that the Governors themselves have expressed their support for the veto power, because it helps to insure that programs carried out at the community level will be coordinated with other local, State, and Federal efforts to combat poverty and to avoid unnecessary waste and duplication. The Governors are more familiar with State and local problems than are Washington-based administrators, and therefore are in a position to make a helpful contribution to an evaluation of proposed programs within their State. Certainly they

should have an opportunity to participate meaningfully in the decisions to be made.

To summarize my position: I agree wholeheartedly with the objective of combating poverty. We all want to do that. But agreement with the general goals of the bill does not mean agreement with the means by which it is proposed to reach those goals. Huge sums are going to be needed to carry out our obligations in Vietnam and thus to build, we hope, our security here at home. That requires close scrutiny of other proposed expenditures. Many other existing major Government programs are assisting our citizens who are worthy of our help, and what is proposed here is not a continuation of this program at the same level, but a doubling of the program authorization, even though reaction to the on-going program has been mixed at best. For these reasons, and because I am deeply distressed by the removal by the Senate of the veto power of the Governor over most programs, this power to date has been used neither often nor arbitrarily; thus I feel that I must vote against the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Where are we as to time on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the adoption of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, preliminary to third reading and passage of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thought that earlier in the day a 1-hour target was established as a limitation for discussion on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator now has 23 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, by agreement with the distinguished majority leader, could that time be expanded if necessary?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I expect to take a little longer, and therefore I hope that the time limitation can be lifted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I make that unanimous-consent request.

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

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it appears to me that what is proposed today is probably the fourth or the fifth layer of frosting on the poverty cake.

Frankly, I am not intrigued by the title that is appended to the hearings

in connection with the bill: "Expand the War On Poverty." That is not a very felicitous term. How can we talk about war on a domestic situation in our own country?

Today the world is pretty well beset with war. There is Vietnam. The California imbroglio is referred to as war. There is an untoward situation in the Dominican Republic. Things are not tranquil and quiet in the Congo.

And somehow the word "war" is being used indiscriminately on both the domestic and foreign fronts in connection with the problems and challenges that are before us.

I am willing to vote untold sums to eliminate poverty. But I am not willing to vote untold sums for any kind of program that is unorganized, disorganized, unbalanced, and which, from the standpoint of results, has not yet demonstrated its worth.

The bill is not our first effort in the so-called campaign against poverty. We started with the Area Redevelopment Act. As I recall, we expended \$302 million for that purpose. Everyone knows that the program was deficient. It became a bit of a scandal. The reason it became a bit of scandal was that such a large percentage of the available money was devoted to the business of building hotels, motels, and ski jumps that no one, honest with himself, could ever say was a very efficient operation in dealing with the question of poverty.

Then we came to layer No. 2 in the way of frosting on the cake. That was the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962. When we were through, we had expended \$863 million. The idea was to make inducements to accelerate public works to provide jobs for people. When we were through with that expenditure, nobody was prepared to demonstrate that it was an effective operation.

Then we came to the third layer of frosting on the poverty cake in the form of the so-called Appalachian Regional Redevelopment or Development Act. That act was finally approved in this year of 1965. We have approved for that purpose \$1 billion. Up to this good hour, I have heard very little about the results. I became extremely curious today about letters that have been coming to me from the suburban areas of Chicago and from Chicago itself. One letter in particular from a friend of mine said:

We are having a great influx of people from the Appalachian area, and our problem is how to urbanize these rural people and fit them into the scheme of things here.

If anybody has anything to offer by way of a tangible demonstration of efficient results, I am prepared to wait for it, but frankly I have not seen it.

So after \$302 million, \$843 million, and \$1 billion, it is no wonder that the title on the hearings on the bill that is before us: "To expand the war on poverty."

The phrase "To expand the war" has a familiar ring, Mr. President. We started with a few hundred people in Vietnam. Then we added to them.

Then it was said the action there had to be expanded. We are beginning to fill the coastal plain of Indochina, and heaven knows how many youngsters from America will have to be used in the so-called expansion program.

In that same spirit, I begin to wonder how much more we shall have to do in the expansion of the campaign on poverty.

Now we come to the next layer, the next frosting layer on the poverty cake, and that is the subject that is before us now.

Title I of the original bill to combat poverty and develop economic progress in this country is now in the House of Representatives. It provides for grants—not loans—from 50 to 80 percent on a 5-year basis at the rate of \$400 million a year, which brings the total to \$2 billion. At the rate of \$400 million a year, it makes \$2 billion, according to the way I learned my arithmetic long ago.

Title II of that bill provides for loans for public works and development facilities and guarantees for industrial and commercial development on a 40-year basis at 3½ percent. It calls for \$170 billion during a 5-year period, or a total of \$850 million.

Title III of that bill deals with technical advice and research and provides \$25 million a year for 5 years, or a total of \$125 million.

Title V, which is very engaging, provides for regional planning commissions at \$15 million a year for 5 years, or \$75 million.

What is the total amount provided in the measure that we considered earlier? It was not \$302 million, as in the Area Development Program. It was not \$843 million, as set forth in the Public Works Acceleration Act. It was not \$1 billion, as we provided in the Appalachian regional development. Instead, it was a total of \$3,015 million.

So today we come to the fourth or fifth layer on the cake. Once upon a time, this Republic could afford to waste its resources. It cannot do so today, in a competitive world and under the conditions that prevail in this country at present. It is about time for us to become mindful of our responsibility and of what the economy of the country can finally bear.

I suppose everybody who went to grade school must have heard the stories of Chicken Little and about the sky falling in. That is what bothers me. We have been raising these programs through the Senate and through Congress, and the question is: When does the sky fall in?

This administration, the Great Society, will be held to accountability. Even though we vote for these programs on my side of the aisle, let me make it abundantly clear now that I do not propose to vote for this bill.

I will spend any amount of money if it is efficiently spent. I will not spend a dollar of the taxpayers' money for an inefficient and disorganized enterprise. Before I am through with my remarks, I propose to prove that this is an inefficient and disorganized enterprise.

If anything, this is a time for frugality and responsibility.

Mr. President, when this is called a war to expand the war on poverty—

(Mr. LONG of Louisiana entered the Chamber.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Louisiana would come in right now. That is good. I hope he will be seated.

Whether we call this a cold war or a hot war or a lukewarm war does not make much difference. The question is whether this is a campaign for the benefit of the politicians, whether it is a campaign to keep the incompetents who administer it, whether it is a campaign for amateurs, whether it is a campaign for the legion of irresponsibles, or whether it is a campaign for the social misfits—and I use the term rather advisedly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since it is my friend, the junior Senator from Louisiana, who has always been so agreeable, I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest to the distinguished minority leader that I did not think we had anything in the program calling for social misfits. I thought that was going to be in next year's program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how naive can the majority whip be—the ranking Democrat on the Senate Committee on Finance? Do not leave, my friend, the junior Senator from Louisiana. The Senator has no business leaving.

Let me read something. I want to provide some evidence now. One does not make assertions without offering the evidence.

I read from a news dispatch:

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has announced today the start of a special program for hiring 2,152 college graduates to study the culture of poverty.

Mr. President, I ask my friend the junior Senator from Louisiana, what does he mean by "the culture of poverty." We have agriculture. We have horticulture. We have silvi-culture. We have social culture. Now we have the culture of poverty, according to the Secretary of Labor. I continue to read:

The cultural training will help qualify them to counsel disadvantaged youths.

Is that not wonderful? Some 2,152 fine young college graduates, looking like and Arrow collar ad, coming down here to get the culture of poverty. And they will go abroad in the land, in the hinterland, and in the metropolitan centers. They will talk with people, and they will say, "Don't you know the culture of poverty?"

The people will say, "All we know is that we don't have jobs. All we know is that we owe the grocer. All we know is that we owe the meat market. All we know is that we owe an installment on a secondhand automobile." So what is this business about the culture of poverty?

It would be like that expert from the Department of Agriculture who went out

on a farm in Kansas, and looked at a little creature out there and said, "How do you expect to get any wool off that animal?" The man said, "I don't, because it is not a sheep. It is a goat." That is all the expert knew about it. He did not know the difference between a sheep and a goat.

The culture of poverty is a fine sounding phrase, but it will not fool the American people.

I now introduce my second bit of evidence. This is from the Sun Times of Chicago, one of the really liberal newspapers of the country. This was printed on the editorial page. It is dated Saturday, August 14.

I first refer to the editorial itself, which is entitled "View From Poverty Row" because the editorial refers to a little weekly paper. This is what the editorial states, in part:

Reprinted below is an editorial by Chester R. Carter that appeared in a recent issue of the Pembroke Herald Eagle, of Hopkins Park, Ill.

Hopkins Park is just out of Chicago. It is a small town with 7,000 people. Hopkins Park is predominantly Negro. The editorial states further:

Hopkins Park is a predominantly Negro unincorporated community in Pembroke Township, southeast of Kankakee. The rural township has a population of 7,000, about 90 percent Negro. Some residents commute to Chicago for work.

I do not need to read the remainder of the editorial. But that is what was written in the Pembroke Herald Eagle. Incidentally, the man who edits the Pembroke Herald Eagle is a dining car steward, I believe on the Rock Island or the Santa Fe Railroad. He is a very humble individual who got himself a little newspaper. He titles his editorial "How To Waste \$30,000."

The editorial reads in part:

The evening of Monday, July 26, marked a new foolish era for Pembroke Township. At the school, plans were made to hire an out-of-town stranger at \$200 a week to tell Hopkins Park residents why they are poor.

Is that not marvelous? They need an expert from away off somewhere, hundreds of miles, to come to the town and tell people why they are poor.

The editorial continues:

Robert Creamer, field representative for the Illinois Office of Economic Opportunity, stated that this \$30,000 must be spent by counting the number of people who live here, surveying the road conditions, and asking people why they are poor.

That requires a brain. That requires almost the last word in computers, to go out there to ask people why they are poor.

The editorial continues:

Any fool walking or riding around Hopkins Park can see why the people are poor. They are poor because there is no payroll here.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the entire 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:

VIEW FROM POVERTY ROW

Reprinted below is an editorial by Chester R. Carter that appeared in a recent issue of

the Pembroke Herald Eagle of Hopkins Park, Ill.

Hopkins Park is a predominantly Negro unincorporated community in Pembroke Township, southeast of Kankakee. The rural township has a population of 7,000, about 90 percent Negro. Some residents commute to Chicago for work.

We have reprinted the editorial as an example of the opinion of persons close to and concerned about nonurban poverty and what is needed to abolish it. The owner of the paper, Ozroe Bentley, Sr., is a steward on the Santa Fe Railroad.

The people of Hopkins Park have been trying to interest officialdom, State and National, in their plight. They need better roads to attract industry. They hope for help from the Federal Area Redevelopment Administration. Now they are about to be exposed to the bureaucracy that goes with such help.

The war on poverty can't be won in Washington or with Washington dollars alone. It needs the spirit of old-fashioned individualism expressed in the Pembroke Herald Eagle, and we call attention to this particular instance in the hope that publicizing it might help.

The editorial follows:

"HOW TO WASTE \$30,000"

"The evening of Monday, July 26, marked a new foolish era for Pembroke Township. At the school, plans were made to hire an out-of-town stranger at \$200 a week to tell Hopkins Park residents why they are poor. Robert Creamer, field representative for the Illinois Office of Economic Opportunity, stated that this \$30,000 must be spent by counting the number of people who live here, surveying the road conditions, and asking people why they are poor. Any fool walking or riding around Hopkins Park can see why the people are poor. They are poor because there is no payroll here. This \$30,000 could be better spent by buying land and offering it on a 10-year tax-free basis as a lure for several corporations to locate plants and factories here, the same as the Southern States do.

"With 800 or 900 men and women from the Hopkins Park area making \$75 or \$100 a week, poverty would vanish in this community. Gary, Ind., was nothing but a mudhole until the steel mill located there. Hopkins Park will forever be a mudhole until there is a \$50,000 or \$60,000 payroll here. What eliminates poverty? Nothing but money, money, money. How can people have money? By working. How can people work? By having a job to go to that pays a decent wage.

"We need a foreign director at \$200 a week like we need a hole in the head. What we need to do is to buy land and send one or two men over the country to tell companies the advantages of locating here, then, the money will be well spent. If, after this grant is spent, the people of Hopkins Park are still eating beans and the kids are just as raggedy, it will have all been in vain.

"The men and women working for this grant are well meaning, but do not understand the crux of this problem. The problem is to get money into the pockets of people who live in this area on Friday nights, not building day schools and clinics.

"First things first—roads, factories, bank, then a day school, etc. This \$30,000 looks like a pork barrel, with more to come.

"This community needs a man that knows how to go out and bring business here."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, \$30,000 is to be spent in Hopkins Park to ask the people why they are poor.

They did not ever have to come around and ask me back in the days when we were an orphan family because my father died when I was 5, and there were four

of us kids. Believe me, the going was difficult. We did not go to the Government. We did not go to the State. We did not go to the supervisor and say, "You ought to build a recreation hall here, and then all of us kids can get jobs, even if it is nothing more than bearing water to those who mix the mortar and lay the brick, and we will get out of this mess."

We did not ask anybody. We made it on our own. And we did not ask anybody to shell out \$30,000 of the taxpayers' money to come around, my friend, and say, "Why are you poor?" Is that not marvelous? That is a ducky thing—tied up with the Office of Economic Opportunity—and that is the bill that is pending before us at the present time.

Let me take a look at something else, because I see that my distinguished friend from Kentucky is present. This letter I received from a very distinguished lawyer in Illinois. He wrote it to a citizen who, for all I know, may be a trustee of Southern Illinois University.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the entire letter in the RECORD.

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

PEORIA, ILL.,
August 13, 1965.

The Honorable JOHN G. GILBERT,
Cardondale, Ill.

DEAR SENATOR GILBERT: I am writing you in a matter which you probably ought to discuss with President Morris of Southern Illinois University. I have learned that Southern Illinois University has entered into a contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity to operate a Job Corps project at Camp Breckenridge and furnish legal services to the Job Corps members.

Would you ascertain if the charter of the university permits it to practice law, for that is precisely this situation. I know you are a "fan" of the university by residence and family connections, but it seems to me this is a flagrant violation of the prohibition against any corporation, including Southern Illinois University, from practicing law. I think this is a matter that should be considered thoroughly by the Illinois State Bar Association with the end in view of taking the most extreme action in the courts or otherwise, or through the trustees of your university, or any other lawful means, to prohibit this socialistic practice of law.

Let me have your comments on this matter after you have had an opportunity to present the matter to Dr. Morris. I am sending a copy of this letter to Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, a member of our Illinois State Bar Association and duly licensed to practice law in Illinois, for I feel that perhaps, as busy as he is, this situation may have escaped his careful attention. The Government has now proscribed the medical profession and this kind of invasion is just a foot in the door. The Federal Government, it should be said, is not above the law, either. The larger principle involved is the taking over by the executive department a supposedly independent judiciary.

Very truly yours,

HUDSON R. SOURS.

(Copies to Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and Peter Fitzpatrick, Esq., president of Illinois State Bar Association.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the question he raised is this: The University of Southern Illinois has been given a contract by the Office of Economic Opportunity to

operate a Job Corps project at Camp Breckenridge and to furnish legal services to the Corps members.

I thought these were young fellows. About the only interest they would have in a lawyer would be how to get out of the place, if they wanted to, and how they could break a contract and still collect from the Government.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no; this is too good.

I wish they had had that in World War I, when I was slogging through the mud of the western front, so I could say, "Where is my lawyer?"—knowing my lawyer was hired at public expense to look after me, to see that I was paid what was owed me, and to see that I did not have any onerous burdens put upon me as a soldier that were not called for.

But the Job Corps boys are going to have legal advice at the cost of the Government.

Did Senators ever hear of anything so ducky? Never in any of the halcyon days of Kansas was there anything so sweet and grandiose as this.

Now my evidence is in the form of a release from the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Public Affairs Division:

July 21, 1965, Gary, Ind. (Conduct and Administration)—

Then the telephone numbers appear on this release, in case one wants to call them.

It states:

A \$52,018 Federal grant will give 480 teenagers from needy Gary, Ind., families an intensive "preview of occupations" this summer.

Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, announced the community action award today to the Lake County Economic Opportunity Council.

Mr. President, I shall put the rest of the release in, but let me read this part:

Trustees to let the boys and girls, 13 to 15 years old, watch employees at work in a wide range of occupations and help the youngsters arrive at tentative but realistic career goals.

The previewed occupations will embrace fields varying from trucking to choreography and from graphic arts to oil refining.

Four hundred and eighty teenagers, boys and girls, are to go.

"Boys and girls, we are going to take you out and let you look at the work."

I remember the fellow who said, "I am fascinated by work. I can sit here and look at it all day."

So they are going to preview trucking. That is going to be good for a 13-year-old girl, is it not? Whoever is there will say, "Sugar, take a look now. You are age 13. How would you like to be a truck-driver?"

As to the little boy, they have instructions now to show him choreography. If the dictionary is right, choreography means dancing, but particularly ballet dancing. So one of these officials will say, "Now, we are going to take you somewhere to show you how they dance, and you will see them up on their tiptoes. This is a preview of an occupation."

Do not forget that the Federal Government is paying \$52,000 for it, but they

are going to preview those occupations, whether it be truckdriving or ballet dancing, or whatever. They are going to say to them, "Maybe you would like to get into the graphic arts or oil refining."

Mr. President, I know industry can be talked into supporting this kind of thing, but fancy spending public funds for it.

I ask unanimous consent to have the release printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Office of Economic Opportunity,
Public Affairs, Washington]
CONDUCT AND ADMINISTRATION

GARY, IND., July 21, 1965.—A \$52,018 Federal grant will give 480 teenagers from needy Gary, Ind., families an intensive "preview of occupations" this summer.

Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, announced the community action award today to the Lake County Economic Opportunity Council.

More than 50 major businesses, industries, and public agencies in the Chicago-Gary area have been enlisted by the Gary Board of School Trustees to let the boys and girls, 13 to 15 years old, watch employees at work in a wide range of occupations and help the youngsters arrive at tentative but realistic career goals.

Daily field trips will be supplemented by vocational counseling sessions.

The previewed occupations will embrace fields varying from trucking to choreography and from graphic arts to oil refining.

Among the cooperating companies are United States Steel, American Oil, Shell Oil, General Motors, John Deere Tractor, Ford, Zenith, Motorola, Carbon & Carbide, Coca-Cola, Continental Bakery, Swift Packing, IBM, Illinois Bell Telephone, NBC-TV, the Chicago Tribune, the Chicago Sun-Times, Hart, Schaffner & Marx, and Marshal Field.

Haron J. Battle, general supervisor of secondary education in Gary, and Louis A. McElroy, administrative director of adult and vocational education, will be program codirectors.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is too bad that one has a memory of things in this town. I was in the House of Representatives when we approved the Works Progress Administration—WPA. They had everything. Finally, they decided something had to be done for unemployed actors and actresses and singers and people in the performing arts, and they got them started. They did it in tents throughout the country. I remember when they came to Peoria, in my country. There they were putting on popular plays. Guess what was the really popular play then. In the University of Michigan there was a playwright by the name of Avery Hopwood, I believe. The really popular play at that time was entitled "Getting Gertie's Garter." So they played it all over the country. The second most popular one was "Up in Mabel's Room." That was entrancing for rural audiences. They did not know what to make of this business. I do not know how much money we spent on it, but they had to be employed, and that is how we wasted our money.

Then, for good measure, we decided to employ all the artists in the country, good, bad, and indifferent. I am not much of an artist, but I know art when I see it. I remember the little sticker someone put across a work of art in a

London museum, "Don't touch with a cane." Some wag added the words, "Use an ax." He had a better appreciation of art than probably some of the other people did.

I lived to see the day when I went down on the esplanade, at one of those temporary buildings, and looked at mountains of art to be given away. Some of it would make an egg curdle. I had some of it hanging in my office, and so did every Representative in those days. I do not know what became of the rest of it. We employed the artists, but their work has faded away as a zephyr in the evening, with nothing to show for it.

So, now, we have a preview for the teenagers—13 to 16 years of age: "Boys and girls, sit down. We are going to show you how to operate a trucking enterprise. Get yourself a good look. We will show you choreography. Get yourself a good look. You may be allergic to ballet dancing, or driving a truck, or operating a filling station, but have a look, anyway. Be fascinated just to look at work."

That is in the official release from the Office of Economic Opportunity, published under the aegis of none other than Sargent Shriver.

Our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania alluded the other day to the "Inside Report," written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, under the title, "Poverty and Politics."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

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

INSIDE REPORT: POVERTY AND POLITICS
(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Just how antipoverty funds can find their way into partisan political action can be seen in a seemingly trivial incident recently outside the office of Gov. William Scranton in Harrisburg, Pa.

While the legislature debated a motion to override the Governor's veto of an appropriation in an adjoining wing of the capitol, 200 demonstrators supporting the bill were stationed at the door of the Governor's office chanting: "Show your face, show your face."

What makes this demonstration far from trivial in importance is the fact that the leader of the demonstrators (all of whom had bussed their way to Harrisburg from Philadelphia) was Charles Bowser—the aggressive head of the Philadelphia antipoverty committee.

Poverty officials in Washington had no knowledge whatever that Federal poverty funds were used to pay for the buses. But in Harrisburg, several of the demonstrators openly admitted that the Philadelphia antipoverty committee financed the political expedition.

Strangely enough, the target of this particular lobbying expedition was the "item veto" by the Governor of an issue that had no connection whatever with the Federal antipoverty program. The two items vetoed by the Governor, adhering to a constitutional ban on deficit spending, were \$10 million for public assistance and \$7 million for child welfare.

For months, the Governor and Democratic State legislators had jockeyed back and forth over these and other appropriations. The Democrats stayed up nights seeking some way to embarrass Scranton politically and make him look like an Ivy League scrooge.

When Scranton confronted the Democrats with his veto, the antipoverty fighters in Philadelphia organized their excursion to Harrisburg to coincide with the legislative debate to override the veto.

Significantly, the demonstrators' first stop in the capitol was not the Governor's office but the Democratic caucus room. They held a rally there and heard Democratic Representative Joshua Elberg, the house majority leader, deliver an emotional attack on Scranton.

The demonstrators next moved into the ornate, mahogany corridor outside the Governor's office and began chanting, "Show your face."

In due course, Bowser and a couple of other demonstrators were invited into Scranton's office (actually they never had asked for an appointment). Scranton again explained the constitutional reasons why he had to veto the two items. Whereupon the buses were loaded and returned to Philadelphia.

Sargent Shriver, the antipoverty chief, knew nothing about this until he received a telegraphed complaint on August 3 (the day of the demonstration) from Pennsylvania's Secretary of State John K. Tabor.

Acting on Scranton's orders, Tabor declared:

"We fully support the right and duty of the people, rich or poor, to support or oppose any State action, but we strongly object to antipoverty personnel, paid with Federal funds, mobilizing and leading such an effort."

Tabor noted that Shriver's own regulation No. 23 prohibits the use of poverty funds, "for any partisan political activity or to further the election or defeat of any candidate to public office."

Shriver's answer to Harrisburg, sent last Tuesday (August 11), denied that antipoverty funds financed the bus trip. Poverty dollars had been requested for the buses, his telegram said. This was rejected, he continued. Shriver stated strongly that he never would condone such use of poverty money.

But his reply skirted the question of Bowser's leadership in the demonstration. Bowser (who gets \$17,000 a year) clearly was violating Shriver's regulation No. 23. (Bowser said privately later he felt it was his duty to lobby against the veto.)

Shriver, of course, cannot be held responsible for every infraction of regulation No. 23 in hundreds of projects in progress all over the country.

That's just the point. Both in the congressional act authorizing the program and in the administrative policy of Shriver's office, the dogma of "local control" is enshrined. Local leaders, sagacious or not, are given a free hand in dispensing a major Federal program. The ludicrous political expedition from Philadelphia to Harrisburg once again shows the danger of this policy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, they got a crowd who were identified with the Office of Economic Opportunity to go down and call on Governor Scranton. The reason for the call was that he had intended to veto a bill. They did not wish any part of it.

The leader of the crowd was a man by the name of Bowser. They gathered at the Governor's office. What was said? Did they go in with the proper respect which citizens should have for their Governor and say to his secretary, "We should like to see the Governor"? That is not what they said. They walked into the State House and shouted, "Governor, show your face."

The matter was taken up with the Office of Economic Opportunity as to

whether the political vendetta was on OEO. Is that not wonderful—OEO? I have encountered all the alphabetical combinations since we had the New Deal back in 1932 and I never encountered OEO. There is something cryptic about it. It sounds musical. Who knows, it may be insinuated into the consciousness of the American people.

But, the crowd went down and said to the Governor, "Show your face."

When my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], was the Governor of his great State, what would he have done had it happened at that time?

I know what I would have done, and it would not have been pleasant, but it would have been necessary in the interest of respect and law enforcement—which, by the way, is beginning to diminish in this country.

But here was the leader of this group for the Office of Economic Opportunity, going down to Harrisburg and trying to intimidate the Governor of that great State by saying, "Governor, show your face."

Mr. President, I will not vote a dollar for a crowd so lacking in courtesy, so lacking in respect for the institutions and traditions of this great country.

What is the rest of the story?

Out in Rock Island, Ill., a representative of the Office of Economic Opportunity came to say to the citizens there, in so many words, "Come right up to the trough. It is for free."

The citizens were not particularly impressed. Finally, this man lost his patience and he said to them, "What is the matter with you? Are you not interested in free dough? If you do not take it, they will take it in Chicago."

We sent a shorthand reporter out there and he made a transcript of the meeting. I therefore know what I am talking about. I am not guessing.

"Are you not interested in free dough?" Dough—that is a good term, is it not, I ask my friend the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]?

Having been a baker at one time, I know just what that means. Imagine—under this kind of program.

Now we come to the situation in Ypsilanti, Mich. One of the articles I placed in the RECORD myself and the other was inserted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], a statement written by Arthur Amolsch, of Ypsilanti, Mich., on June 8, 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have both statements printed in the RECORD.

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

A PROSPEROUS TOWN IS FORCED TO ACCEPT U.S. POVERTY MONEY—ZEALOUS POVERTY FIGHTERS SAY MICHIGAN'S YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP NEEDS \$188,252 TO GET ON ITS FEET—AND THEY WON'T TAKE NO FOR AN ANSWER

YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP, Mich.—On January 17, 1965, speaking at Johnson City, Tex., the President of the same name announced the approval of 88 new antipoverty grants. One of them, in the amount of \$188,252 was for a demonstration project in the Willow Village area of southeastern Michigan.

On January 18, a slim, soft-spoken fellow named Roy Smith picked up a newspaper and stared at it incredulously. He had no connection with the war on poverty. He was and is supervisor of Ypsilanti Township, which lies in Washtenaw County, the highest income county in Michigan. To be sure, the subdivisions of Smith's district weren't comparable to some of the prestige neighborhoods of nearby Ann Arbor, where the University of Michigan is located. A good share of his constituents were hourly rated employees or lower grade executives in the automobile industry. But he was certain his township could boast average family earnings of more than \$7,000 a year. So he had no connection with any impoverished area, either.

Even so, he had good reason for being stunned upon learning Willow Village had been designated an official poverty area to the tune of a sizable hunk of the taxpayers' money. For one thing, there wasn't any such place as Willow Village. For another, where most of Willow Village had once existed, the recently built homes and schools, parks, and glistening new shopping center stores of Ypsilanti Township were now standing.

Ironically enough, Roy Smith had been warned of what was coming. He'd simply refused to believe it was possible.

Some 8 weeks earlier, he'd received an inch-thick manuscript in the mail, along with a letter from Mr. Hyman Kornbluh of the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations—one of the numerous research groups supported by Michigan's tax-supported universities. "Under separate cover, I am sending you a copy of the proposal we have submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington," the letter had explained. And it had gone on to request the township's cooperation in a project of mutual interest.

Roy had begun reading the manuscript. And in doing so he'd also begun what was to be, for him, a long, lonely journey into a bureaucratic-academic fantasyland—a world where reality was regarded as of so little importance by officious sounding officials that he would more than once find himself doubting his own sanity. What was labeled a report to the Federal Government from a famed and respected university sounded more like some amateur novelist's attempt to write a Michigan version of "Tobacco Road."

"By almost any standards," the script insisted, "Willow Village is an impoverished community." Actually, Willow Village was the name of a World War II housing project erected for the workers at the big Willow Run bomber plant, a project the Federal Government had abandoned to be torn down by Ypsilanti Township and replaced by privately built housing. The name still existed only on some low-rent but extremely attractive apartments that lay just over the line in Superior Township. And by any standards whatsoever, income for the designated area ran well above the national average.

Industry had "passed by the core" of this "depressed community," the report continued, and the few folks fortunate enough to find work "were in service and menial jobs." The truth was that the smoke of five gigantic automobile factories could be seen from the area's center, and the personnel manager of one of them had recently commented that anyone who could pass a physical could find employment there.

"Willow Village is a community without social services," the report went blithely on. "There is no medical facility, no newspaper, no self-government, no recreational or cultural or even entertainment facility. There are no stores in the area, and schools are a bus ride away."

Roy Smith had to shake his head hard and wipe his glasses before rereading that passage. The area not only received the social

services of all Ypsilanti Community Chest agencies but even contained the headquarters of some of them. Ridgewood Hospital was just 1 mile to the north, and 3 miles to the southwest was the Beyer Memorial Hospital to which the township had paid \$58,000 last year to guarantee that none of its residents could be denied a bed. Furthermore, a busy doctor's office shared the new Sunrise Shopping Center with a supermarket, a discount department store, and several other shops, all within sight of a library and a bowling alley and some of the parks where the township's \$10,000 summer recreation program had been carried out. Four different newspapers were delivered daily in the area. All but a few of the children walked to school because they lived so close they were specifically prohibited from receiving bus rides under Michigan law. And if there was no self-government, Roy was forced to wonder, just who the hell had elected him?

Even more fantastic was the constant flow of phrases like "the present ghost town appearance" or "brush has overgrown the streets and roads." The report never quite claimed the inhabitants of this brush-choked ghost town were starving. Instead, it suggested "establishing a community vegetable field—to be run by the residents on a co-operative basis—with the produce available to the residents for their own consumption."

Starving or not, the manuscript noted, the impoverished people had formed a "self-help" group of "about 400 to 500" members called the Willow Run Association for Neighborhood Development—WRAND, for short—and immediately appealed to the University of Michigan to help them. After a thorough study, the university was submitting a proposed budget covering the community's needs. What the poor people needed most, it seemed, was the services of some "professional directors" with salaries up to \$11,000 a year. Except for such items as \$8,970 for the first year's publication of a "community newsletter" the only thing clear about the vaguely worded budget, all of which was subject to "university overhead" was that it was just the beginning. The report suggested, for example, that Willow Village apartments be granted enough further "title IV" funds to permit the building of "several hundred additional units."

Wondering whether to laugh or cry, Roy Smith closed the book of 90-odd pages and stared dully at the plywood walls of his office. He vaguely remembered hearing of WRAND. Someone had buttonholed him for a \$20 donation the summer before and, believing the group to be a normal community-betterment organization, he'd thoroughly approved of the idea. But the WRAND headquarters were over in Superior Township and, as far as he knew, so were its members. Yet all but a small portion of the area designated in the report was in Ypsilanti Township. Since the accompanying letter said "a proposal we have submitted," it was apparently too late to keep the university from making an incredible and perhaps embarrassing blunder. But he telephoned the man who'd written that letter anyway.

"Mr. Hyman Kornbluh? This is Roy Smith out in Ypsilanti Township. If you're going to write about this area, why don't you drive the 10 miles out here and look at it? That report of yours is just plain garbage."

The voice on the telephone sounded extremely upset, but it finally said something about "a matter of opinion."

"No, it's not," Roy asserted. "If you'd said there were 'few' stores of 'inadequate' facilities and so forth, that might be a matter of opinion. When you say there's no this, that, and the other thing—all of which are located in the area—there's no question of opinion involved. Look, you come out here, any time, at your convenience, and I'll drive you around. I want you to try defend-

ing that report while you're seeing what's here with your own eyes."

Hyman Kornbluh finally agreed and promised to call back soon. But that call never came. Roy showed the weird manuscript to several citizens allegedly living in a grown-over ghost town. And it brought laughter instead of indignation from everyone who read it.

"Why, there isn't an unpaved street in any of these three subdivisions of ours they've listed," they said. "There isn't a house in the entire area more than 10 years old."

"Why worry about it?" everyone chuckled. "They'll read that in Washington and toss it in the nearest wastebasket. The war on poverty is for places like Appalachia. If they send someone out here from the Federal Government, then some professors will have some fast explaining to do. But that's not your problem."

Running into the same reaction everywhere, Roy Smith soon began wondering if he wasn't taking the ridiculous report too seriously. By the time the new year began, the manuscript was lying forgotten in his crowded files.

But on January 17—without any attempt at prior investigation, with entire sentences from the ghost town report being repeated word for word in a White House press release—Willow Village was awarded an antipoverty grant.

For 4 full days, Roy remained silent and did some soul searching, chiefly while walking the streets of what was now an official poverty area. He didn't dispute the fact that there were a few scattered folks on those streets, as on almost all streets, who were not very well off. Roy wasn't opposed to the antipoverty program; he was all in favor of the Government helping poor people in any way it could.

Back in the depression, as a kid on a Tennessee farm, Roy Smith had eaten Government sowbelly the same as everyone around him was doing and had been plenty glad to get it. He'd come a fair distance from that Tennessee farm, though. He'd been in the Marines in World War II and after the war had attended the University of Michigan on the GI bill. Then he'd worked in the automobile industry and, in 1959, had entered politics where he'd been quite successful. He is a moderate Republican and along with George Romney, was one of the few members of his party to survive the 1964 Johnson landslide.

But Roy Smith had never forgotten the depression. If there was the slightest chance that any portion of that \$188,252 might eventually filter down to help folks who needed it, he certainly didn't want to ruin that chance.

For 4 straight evenings, at home, with his wife sensing a crisis and hushing his three children, he went over the proposed budget again and again. And absolutely nothing was really being promised there. Beneath all the long winded description of what might be done, the hard fact was that some nonteaching fellows at the University of Michigan were being given a good sized piece of public money to do with as they pleased—as a reward for branding his township a poverty area. On January 22, he finally telephoned the nearest newspaper and mentioned some of the falsities in the institute report.

The local papers, published in the shadow of the powerful university, were extremely wary of the story. They mentioned only a few of Roy's charges, then answered them with institute statements that "some errors of detail in describing the physical elements and population statistics of the area did occur, but none of these errors were fundamental."

"Willow Village is, of course, not totally impoverished," Hyman Kornbluh was quoted

as saying. "But it does contain pockets of poverty."

Smith couldn't help wondering if this was the same Kornbluh who'd sent him the report saying: "By almost any standards, Willow Village is an impoverished community." But press objectivity seemed to be picking up in direct ration to the distance from Ann Arbor. "Federal Government says it's impoverished; area says it's thriving," the Detroit Free Press reported. And the little Redford Record put it even more bluntly: "U. of M. dreams up poverty ghost town." But it was a Detroit TV commentator, Larry Carino of WJBK, who got to the heart of the matter.

He made a very sensible suggestion: "Let the University of Michigan explain exactly what it intends to do with the \$188,000—or send it back with apologies."

But the institute purred even this thrust. "The program has not yet been spelled out," Hyman Kornbluh explained, "because the cardinal point of a demonstration project is to demonstrate that the community can assess its own needs." Whether the community had assessed a need for them or not, it was also announced that the hiring of a staff of about 12 would begin immediately.

Supervisor Roy Smith had understandably expected a cry of outrage to come from the folks who were being branded impoverished. But the issue had been so clouded and confused by academic doubletalk that only 10 people brought complaints to a township board meeting on February 2, and most of these were merely ladies who were miffed because friends were phoning and offering to send them CARE packages. Furthermore, their young township clerk, Tilden R. Stumbo, kept urging them to wait and see.

"Sure, they got the grant by falsifying a document," he argued. "But some good could still come of the grant itself—new roads or parks."

Roy Smith could only hope that none of the youngsters who might play in such parks was listening to his elders' moral logic, and he said as much 2 days later when he got off a letter to Dr. Harlan Hatcher, president of the University of Michigan. After listing two pages of the fraudulent claims made in the institute report, then adding that this was only a sampling, that the entire report lacked reality, he invited Dr. Hatcher to tour the area with him at any time and make his own comparison. "We teach our children to tell the truth," he mentioned. "If funds have been received on the basis of false statements, those funds should be returned."

Word of the controversy had reached Washington, but there was still no hint that any investigation would be made. "We didn't force that money on those people," an Office of Economic Opportunity spokesman told newsmen, "They themselves asked for it. Four or five hundred of them formed this WRAND organization and requested the University of Michigan to apply for and administer the grant in their behalf."

Thus assured, the demonstration project proceeded as scheduled. The planting of the communal vegetable garden couldn't begin until the spring thaw, of course. But calling itself the WRAND Roundup, the "community newsletter," for which \$8,970 of anti-poverty money had been allotted in the proposed budget, appeared immediately—with headlines saying "Who Says We're Impoverished," above a story insisting the grant was only an expression of admiration for local initiative. WRAND further explained on February 8, that the grant was needed because the designated area, although not really impoverished, was not being served by the Ypsilanti Community Chest. On February 9 WRAND announced that yesterday's press release was "in error" since the area had always been served by the community chest.

It seemed strange to Roy Smith, reading the next day's papers, that an organization of area residents could make such a mistake. But before he could carry this curious inconsistency to its inevitable conclusion, he was interrupted by something even stranger. Three gentlemen from the university were ushered into his office. One was introduced as a full dean. Another described himself as merely an observer and was actually, Roy later learned, a recognized authority on, of all things, syphilis research. The third, a plump man wearing the look of a fellow being forced to endure petty indignity, was the long-awaited Hyman Kornbluh.

Instead of discussing the matter in his office, Roy loaded the delegation into his 3-year-old Chevrolet and spent more than 2 hours touring every street of the alleged poverty area. He didn't run into any brush, but he did stop regularly to read aloud, sentences from the report for comparison with what lay outside the car windows. The dean made a gallant attempt at keeping the interview genial and friendly, under formidably difficult circumstances. Chain-smoking nervously, Mr. Kornbluh remained silent most of the time, as did the syphilis expert. Not until they'd returned to the township hall did Roy hear anything resembling an admission that the area wasn't a ghost town after all.

"Suppose instead of 'no' stores, we say 'few' stores?" Hyman Kornbluh offered then. "Suppose instead of 'no' facilities, we say 'inadequate' facilities?"

"Suppose you apologize to the people here and return the grant" Roy suggested instead. "If you can get another one by writing an honest report, the best of luck to you."

Kornbluh countered with the accusation that the whole affair was a political publicity stunt, asserted that he himself wouldn't be in politics for anything, and walked out. That was the last Roy Smith saw of him.

Roy Smith had some questionnaires made up to be circulated in the designated poverty area, requesting residents to return them unsigned. He wanted some statistics on the average income, and to learn what percentage favored the grant and how many were members of the mysterious WRAND organization that had requested it in the first place.

On February 16, a surprise resolution was introduced at a township board meeting, and Roy found himself standing totally alone. Five to one against him, his fellow board members voted to condemn the poverty label but to welcome the poverty money.

Everyone seemed to be saying exactly what Clerk Tilden R. Stumbo had said: "Sure, they got the grant by falsifying a document, but let's keep it anyway," including, fantastically enough, the Federal Government itself. Because a tall, distinguished-looking man named William Lawrence was ushered into the township hall the next day and introduced as a consultant to the community action program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. And he soon made it clear that he'd come not as an investigator but as a peacemaker.

"I've already been around the area," he insisted declining the offer of another tour in Roy's Chevy. "Now I want to know what sort of proposal, satisfactory to you, I can take to the university. What would satisfy you, Mr. Smith?"

"Why didn't you make the 2-hour flight out here before the grant was given?" Roy couldn't help wondering.

"We're tremendously understaffed," Lawrence explained. "But I want to assure you and every citizen that no antipoverty grant will ever again be given without an on-the-spot inspection of the area."

"Michigan has a State antipoverty director," Roy Smith persisted. "Couldn't his of-

fice have been asked to check out the proposal?"

William Lawrence further explained that the poverty program permits the Federal Government to deal directly with universities. After all, he reminded Roy, the original appeal had come from the area residents themselves. By reporting on the area and offering to administer a grant, the University of Michigan was, in effect the agency checking out the appeal for the Federal Government.

"Well, now that you've seen the area," Smith asked, "What are you going to do about it?"

Lawrence launched into an involved dissertation on the intricacies of antipoverty grants. Contracts had already been offered to professional directors it seemed, and other commitments had been made. But the Office of Economic Opportunity would most certainly demand that the university correct the "errors" in the report, "redefine" it and "update" it before "activating" the project. "Would that satisfy you?" he asked hopefully.

"All that will satisfy me," Roy Smith told him, suddenly feeling very tired "is the return of any poverty money intended for Ypsilanti Township and a public apology to the people here."

William Lawrence went away worriedly predicting that "the university won't go for anything like that." And the university didn't.

Meanwhile, the Willow Village demonstration project had already demonstrated one thing—the ease with which antipoverty funds could be obtained. And predictably enough, what followed was like a run on the bank. The Washtenaw County Committee on Alcoholism decided to try for \$39,900; everyone knows poor people drink too much.

The local chapter of the Planned Parenthood League wanted \$26,290 because statistics show the impoverished do something else too much. The Ypsilanti public schools decided to go all out and ask \$375,000 for providing compensatory education for everyone from deprived preschoolers to the indigent aged. Before long, fully 20 poverty money requests were being feverishly prepared, and a 36-member citizens committee was itself requesting \$54,501 merely for acting as a clearinghouse for other requests. All this was going on in just one county, the highest income county in Michigan, one of the 10 wealthiest States in the Union.

Nor was the national picture particularly different. The controversy was bringing Roy Smith a surprising amount of mail from people in some farflung places. Ministers and other citizens of Chicago and Cleveland and New York were claiming that their own antipoverty grants had served no purpose except as patronage plums for local political machines. West Virginians were writing to ask if Roy saw anything strange about the way the poverty money was being parceled out. After all, the late President Kennedy's shock at what he'd seen upon carrying his primary campaign into that State had been one of the prime factors in creating the national mood that resulted in the war on poverty. Why then, West Virginians were wondering, had their antipoverty allotment so far been little more than \$400,000, while the high-income State of New Jersey had already received \$12½ million?

But folks from New Jersey were writing as well, and they weren't happy with all that money. People in Monmouth County, for example, had received a \$67,000 grant, only to learn that \$52,000 of it had already been budgeted for the salaries and "administration expenses" of the professional directors. The whole State had been startled to hear that Antipoverty Director John C. Bullitt would be getting a salary of \$25,000 a year and would have a pair of \$19,000 assistants. But Bullitt had insisted these wage rates were "not out of line," and in a sense he was right.

This was less than his poverty-official superiors in Washington were getting and slightly more than was being paid city poverty officials. In Newark alone there were seven poverty fighters in the over \$10,000 bracket, but the top wage was just \$23,000. Hearing of this, the corps of poverty fighters assigned to Paterson, where the highest salary was a mere \$18,500, were about to request a pay raise, but they finally decided against it. After all, the mayor of Paterson was getting only \$17,500.

Even so, Roy's chief concern was his own township, and he was pinning a large share of his hopes on the president of the University of Michigan. He still expected Dr. Harlan Hatcher to make a personal comparison of the fraudulent report and the area it supposedly described, then crack down on those responsible with all the righteous wrath that might be expected of so distinguished an educator. But on March 2, when Roy Smith finally received an answer to his letter of nearly a month earlier, it was the most mystifying and disappointing development of the entire nightmarish affair. Dr. Hatcher described himself as "satisfied that the University of Michigan and its representatives acted in good faith and in accordance with recognized procedures, both in submitting the program and in accepting the grant," because "many of the alleged errors to which reference has been made occurred in a background document which was not submitted to Washington."

Numb with amazement, Roy searched his files for the original letter from Kornbluh, dated November 25. It still read, "I am sending you a copy of the proposal we have submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington," just as it always had. For fully 6 weeks the report had been the subject of incessant public controversy, mentioned in both news stories and editorials, and Roy himself had discussed it with both university and Federal Government officials. At no time in those 6 weeks had there been the slightest suggestion from anyone that the background document hadn't been submitted.

"We didn't force this money on those people," the OEO was still telling newsmen. "They themselves formed this WRAND organization and requested the university's assistance in getting a grant."

Pondering that statement that he'd heard and read so often, Roy Smith suddenly realized there was something very strange about it. Some 257 of the questionnaires he'd distributed had been returned by them, showing average family income so far of \$7,961 in the depressed community and turning up just 10 people who approved of the antipoverty grant. But more interesting yet, only four people had identified themselves, even unsigned, as members of WRAND. Roy had met the president and current spokesman of the group—a young junior high school teacher named Gerald Foley. But Foley himself admitted he'd joined the group months after its formation and had taken no part in the original request to the university. And the few other WRAND members who could be located locally said exactly the same thing. Who, then, had made that request? Who had started WRAND in the first place?

There was a way to find out. Any such organization had to file articles of incorporation with the county clerk, and any citizen had a right to examine those articles. Roy Smith availed himself of that right. And all of a sudden, the whole puzzling business wasn't so puzzling any longer.

The Willow Run Association for Neighborhood Development had been founded by just six people—not one of whom lived anywhere near the neighborhood they intended developing, all of whom were well-to-do residents of Ann Arbor. The self-help group that had asked the University of Michigan to help it help itself to some antipoverty money had

been formed by one University of Michigan official, one University of Michigan professor, two wives of university professors, one prominent lawyer and the manager of the Willow Village apartments—for which additional title IV antipoverty funds had been suggested in the resulting proposal.

At this writing, with the university already privately estimating its overhead at 32 percent, the antipoverty grant gained by the invention of an imaginary ghost town is still in effect. In fact, on April 27—speaking at Detroit, Mich., and still quoting the falsified phrases and statistics of a report that was supposedly never submitted to Washington—War on Poverty Director R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., threw his personal prestige behind the Office of Economic Opportunity's attempts to save face in the controversy by publicly praising the Willow Village demonstration project. (If he'd ventured just 30 miles farther, he might have seen what he was calling "an urban-fringe pocket of poverty." But he didn't.) And the OEO is still stubbornly sticking to its story that the erroneous background material was not germane to a proposal that "clearly met the criteria for demonstrations as developed by this office."

But Government glibness no longer bothers Roy Smith the way it once did—chiefly because his struggle isn't a lone one any longer. Roused by the realization that the entire scheme was both conceived and carried out by outsiders, the people of the designated area have begun battling back with every bit as much ingenuity as was used in calling them impoverished in the first place. A group of them have decided to play the alphabet game themselves by forming a rival self-help group called REPLY—which stands for Return Every Penny and Leave Ypsilanti-Township. Petitions making the same demand have so far been signed by 80 percent of the area's residents, and a similar resolution received an 87 1/2-percent favorable vote at the annual township meeting. Recognizing the fact that as leaders of the people they'd do well to follow them, four of Roy's fellow township board members, Tilden R. Stumbo included, have reversed their earlier stand and joined him in demanding the return of the grant.

To dramatize the situation, signs have been erected informing visitors that they are entering an official poverty area where their tax dollars are hard at work. And a young man named Gordon Mattson, chairman of REPLY, even rented a horse and a Paul Revere costume, then braved a late snowstorm to go galloping through the streets shouting, "The bureaucrats are coming." He was followed by both a honking motorcade and what seemed an apt symbol of the incredible affair from its clouded beginning to its as-yet-undetermined end—a circus clown.

"Maybe that's the only answer for this kind of insanity," Roy Smith laughingly reflects. "A good sense of humor. But you know what worries me most? The way that fellow from Washington acted when he came out and saw for himself how the Government had been taken. He didn't get mad, and he didn't seem surprised. He wasn't even interested. All he kept asking was what would satisfy me—which meant what would shut me up, I guess. Do you think what happened here could be the rule and not the exception? That this sort of thing is going on all over the country?"

That's an interesting question.

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR AMOLSCHE,
YPSILANTI, MICH., JUNE 8, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by stating the obvious: It is a tribute to our country and our form of government that the minority party in our highest legislative council can, on its own, search out relevant testimony on public issues. It is, however,

unfortunate that the minority party should have to go outside usual legislative channels in order to get this testimony.

To identify myself, I am Arthur Amolsch, of Ypsilanti, Mich. I teach American history and English at Edmundson Junior High School, which is about a quarter mile from Willow Run Village. With me is Gordon Mattson, who is a resident of Willow Run Village and is the chairman of REPLY (Return Every Penny, Leave Ypsilanti). He is in charge of material followup with the Fisher Body Division, General Motors, at its Willow Run plant. We represent at least 75 percent of the residents of the Ypsilanti portion of Willow Run Village. We are shocked at the high-handed methods employed by the OEO in our community.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt that the Ypsilanti war on poverty—financed initially with almost \$200,000 of the taxpayers' money—is a fraud and a disgrace. It is a fraud because the money was granted under false pretenses. It is a disgrace because (a) those who perpetrated the fraud have shamelessly played on the understandable desire of the American people to help the unfortunate by indulging in a fantastic giveaway; and because (b) it reveals extremely sloppy management and administrative procedures on the part of those who are charged with dispensing public funds under the avowed aim of promoting economic opportunity. Let me expand on these charges in the order in which I stated them.

Even a cursory study of the 88-page report on which this grant is based reveals it to be possibly the greatest swindle since the Donation of Constantine. This report, entitled a "Demonstration-Training Community Action Project for Willow Village, Mich.," was prepared by the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, which is a combined operation of the University of Michigan and Wayne State University. In the report's own words, it was submitted to the Federal Government by the institute "in cooperation with the Willow Run Association for Neighborhood Development (WRAND)." This report is divided into four parts, the first of which I want to discuss this morning because it is in this section of the report that the institute and WRAND make their case for Federal funds.

According to this report, the people in Willow Village are "socially isolated. The normal infrastructure (sic) of public facilities, local government and community organizations on which self-help depends is (sic) either absent or highly disorganized." Further, "Willow Village is a depressed community * * * (which, after World War II) rapidly became a center of hard-core poverty." "The Village," says the report, "is an unincorporated, urban-fringe area * * * a pocket of poverty dissociated from the surrounding, relatively prosperous area."

We submit, Mr. Chairman, that Willow Village is not a center of hard-core poverty, is not a depressed community, and is not an urban-fringe area—whatever that is—and that the people who live there are not socially isolated. About the only true statement in the general fiction which I just quoted you from the report is that Willow Village is unincorporated. Actually, no such place legally exists any longer and a great many of the residents of the area resent being reminded of what they call "a ghost." What we shall call—for the purposes of this discussion—Willow Village, is primarily located in Ypsilanti Township, a thriving, growing community in southeastern Michigan. Heavy industry in the form of General Motors Corp. and Ford Motor Co., among others, are located in Ypsilanti Township. It lies within 10 miles of two major State-supported universities.

As soon as the institute report was made public, volunteers circulated questionnaires

in the area to determine some of the economic characteristics of the areas and its people. Questionnaires were circulated to 524 homes in the area. Two hundred and eighty-nine responses were received. This is, I believe, an overall 55 percent response rate. In some of the streets canvassed, the return was as high as 87 percent, but unfortunately we were later informed that in one street a member of WRAND followed the volunteers and told the residents not to fill out the questionnaires. As a result of this blocking of data gathering, in one area only 13 percent of the questionnaires were returned. Nonetheless, the returns which we have, give, I think, a fair picture of the area. These answers show that 268 own their own homes, while 20 rent; 259 wanted to return the grant to the Government, while 12 wanted to keep it; 129 own 1 car, 73 own 2 cars, 13 own 3 cars and 2 families owned 4 cars; 145 families own 1 television set, 67 own 2 sets, 5 own 3 sets and 1 family owned 4 television sets; only 11 people living in the area felt themselves to be impoverished, while 29 did not think they themselves were impoverished, but thought the area was impoverished. No person or family who was unemployed returned the questionnaire—although I am sure that there are some unemployed in the area—and the average family income of those who returned their sheets was \$7,942 (sic). If the committee wishes, I can break these figures down by street later on.

Two members of the Ypsilanti Township Board of Trustees (including the former chairman of the board of WRAND who now has a well-paying job administering the grant) live in Willow Village. The area is served by the Willow Run public school system—where I am employed—which employs over 170 teachers, about half of whom have advanced degrees, and which has a budget of approximately one and a half million dollars a year. According to the report, "the schools are a bus-ride away," yet a brandnew elementary school on the edge of the area has just been opened this year.

According to the WRAND report, "Willow Village is a community without social services," yet WRAND was ostensibly organized here; the United Fund operates in the area and the school system provides a school nurse, an immunization program, etc. The WRAND report claims that there is no newspaper serving the area but both Detroit dailies and the Ypsilanti Press and the Ann Arbor News are delivered in the village. The report states that there is no medical facility but the fact is that Ypsilanti Township belongs to the People's Community Hospital Authority which operates a hospital less than 3 miles away. The report blandly states that there is no recreation or cultural or even entertainment facility, but the township and school district operate recreational facilities including public use of the high school swimming pool; the two universities in the area of course operate full-time cultural activities and there is among other things, a major chain motion picture theater approximately 2 miles away.

The report alleges that there are no stores in the area, yet there is a modern shopping center right in the middle of the village. As a matter of fact, a neighborhood grocer closed his store recently because of a lack of business: suggesting that retailing facilities are at least adequate.

The WRAND report claims that urban renewal "demolished * * * the community buildings * * * the community center (which is now located in a former school-building), the schools (there are several) the gas station (there are three), the grocery (there is still a small grocery right across the street from the shopping center), the medical and dental clinics (both of which are less than 5 minutes away by car)." This inaccurate report on which the grant was based

claims, on page 7, that many houses are standing vacant for lack of anyone to move into the area; yet, on the same page, it says that "old residents of the village * * * are still waiting for a chance to move back." Which is it? And anyway, why should anyone want to move into a depressed area, if it really is one?

In the synopsis of the report, the writers claim that the so-called poverty in Willow Village has produced "a social adjustment to marginal life: passivity, dependency, and mistrust in relation to public agencies, withdrawal from the political and cultural life of the wider community, and an unwillingness the energy and hope in self-help." But on page 8 of the report, the writers admit that "The community spirit of the old village remains" and that "there is a reservoir of leadership talent in the area." And on page 12, the report adds that the WRAND projects in the area "demonstrate the remarkable will of a group at the bottom of the social, economic, and cultural ladder to invest both energy and money in their own future."

It occurs to me that such blatant contradictions could only be written into a report by a writer who had not the slightest idea of what he was doing or else knew that he had contradicted himself but didn't expect anyone to read his report thoroughly before they granted these requested funds.

On the basis of those contradictions, Mr. Chairman, the institute report concludes as follows: "The institute believes that Willow Village is an area of substantial poverty which should receive Federal assistance under the terms of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964."

It is a disgrace that the Government has gone ahead and given away \$188,000 of the workingman's money to the institute without, apparently, verifying either the details of the report or the credentials of those responsible for it. According to those responsible for this hoax, the Willow Run Association for Neighbor Development, a local community action group, was the source of this project. The report implies that WRAND is a local group formed by local citizens with approximately 500 members. Actually, WRAND is nothing more than a front group formed by 6 Ann Arbor social planners with a local membership that we have been able to find about 6—not 600, just 6. I have a list of the incorporators if the committee is interested in their names. One of them is a Mr. Henry Alting, manager of a group of cooperative apartments which lie within the area known as Willow Village. When these apartments were opened for occupancy, an advertising brochure extolling their virtues was published. I would like to quote from that brochure, a copy of which I have with me:

"Near recreation areas with—fishing, swimming, boating * * * easy access to shopping * * * 4½-acre parksites adjacent * * * quiet, safe streets * * * protected play areas."

"In the Willow Run school district—which provides elementary, junior high, and high school—recreation and athletic programs—adult education—year-round swimming * * * library facilities."

Mr. Chairman, it is not enough just to know that a fraud has been committed. It is not even enough to indict those responsible for the fraud. Responsible leadership should seek to find the conditions which enable the fraud to be committed and then try to correct them. I suggest that fraud occurred in this case because we have been taking the wrong approach to solving the complex problems of today which demand our attention. Like ancient alchemists, we have sought the magic ingredient which will yield us instant wealth and guaranteed happiness. We have, of course, failed, for there is no magic ingredient, no supernatural incantation which when pronounced will do

away with poverty and need. But out of the experimentation of the past 30 years, we should at least have learned what sorts of things will not work. We have tried out the ingredients of what President Kennedy caustically referred to as the Leviathan state. It is time we learned that not everything can be solved by a government spending program: that, indeed, government spending may often cause more problems than it cures, not the least of which may be an inefficient or arrogant bureaucracy. Unless we are willing to believe that the President and the Office of Economic Opportunity conspired to throw away the taxpayers' money—and I for one am not ready to believe it—then a rational alternative suggestion as to how all this money was poured down the rathole is that a large centralized bureaucracy simply is not capable of coping with the problems which arise at the local level. What we need, then, are programs which recognize this fact and proceed to handle problems at the local level.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, someone out there wished to help Willow Village. Senators remember the Kaiser Willow Run project during World War II. Willow Run disappeared. Willow Village sprang up in its place as a fine community, with paved streets, many homeowners, schools, and hospitals—and with the largest per capita income of any place in Michigan; namely, \$8,000 a year.

So, down here someone said:

We have a letter from someone up there signed by 600 people and they feel that the community has social services.

When the facts were run down, it was six persons who felt that way, not 600.

However, in due course a grant was made, originally \$88,000.

Mr. Amolsch writes: "It is a fraud and a disgrace." I remind the Senate that Mr. Amolsch is a teacher in the schools in that area and he should know something about it.

But, there is the whole story. It is unbelievable. They tried to force money upon Willow Village.

Meanwhile, I received a copy of a small brochure entitled "A Prosperous Town Is Forced To Accept U.S. Poverty Money—Zealous Poverty Fighters Say Michigan's Ypsilanti Township Needs \$188,252 To Get On Its Feet—And They Will Not Take No for an Answer."

Now they have a supervisor. Mr. Amolsch heard about this and he could not believe his ears. They began to make an exploration. He finally got hold of the chairman of the group who was trying to force this \$188,000 on them.

If I remember correctly, it happened to be a doctor. He was a specialist in syphilis. I might as well tell the whole story. I do not know why I should not. He called him up and said, "You come over here." The application said grass was growing in the streets, that they had no services; not anything; that the town was impoverished.

He could not get him to come over. He forced him to come over. For 2 hours he drove these people around to what they thought was an impoverished area. There was not an unpaved street in the place. I do not know how it is possible to grow grass on pavement. Perhaps it is possible to grow Kentucky Blue Grass on pavement. I have never succeeded at

it. They have schools, they have hospitals, they have everything they need. It is one of the prized communities in Michigan. However, they were compelled to take the \$188,000 whether they liked it or not.

Why? Because downtown in Washington it was said that every county in the United States is entitled to at least one program.

That is a great way to run a railroad, I must say. Believe me, I am not going to vote for that kind of business, so help me.

We have another thing going on here. In connection generally with these things I have here an article entitled "We're Training Them To Train Us." It was published in the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., on July 11, and reported that the United States is training five persons from India for work in Volunteers in Service to America—that is, VISTA. It is a part of this program. The article reported that these Indians will train for 3 months at St. John's College, then work about a year in our domestic Peace Corps, receiving the usual living allowance and \$50 a month. Harris Wofford, Associate Director of the Peace Corps, said:

The program is a pilot experiment which could lead to an international peace corps. While the United States brings foreign students here to train them to train us, we are sending 93 Peace Corps volunteers to India.

I say to Senators, do not be surprised if a Hindu shows up in North Dakota to tell you what is wrong with your community, why you are poor, and why you should take this free money.

I cannot think of anything sillier. It has these ramifications. It grows better as time goes on.

There must be one note of humor in all this. Bob Hope is quite quick on the trigger. Bob Hope's latest comment on poverty is:

From now on it's against the law to be poor, unless you are a Republican, and then it is expected of you.

When comedians on the stage start flipping around that way, look out. I have a great deal of material here relating to what the Comptroller General said about all these things over a period of time.

Some of the analysts would never have been any good in prohibition days, when near beer was so popular. A wag once said that the inventor of near beer was a poor judge of whisky.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD at this point "Appendix 1 to Minority Views on Senate 1648, Summary of Reports of the Comptroller General of the United States on the Public Works Acceleration and Area Development Programs."

I shall let these speak for themselves, because I shall not detain the Senate too long. However, we see here an estimate made of how many jobs will be provided by some of these projects. In some cases they missed it by 83 percent. In some cases they missed it by 94 percent.

I ask my friend from Wyoming, How wrong can they be? They had only 6

percent to go and then they would have been out of church in estimating the number of jobs. That is the way it is now in this program. In many communities they cannot get together to find out who is going to whack up the political pelf before they are through.

The clock says 7 o'clock, and I suppose I should stop. Here are all the reports from the General Accounting Office. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this material may be made a part of my remarks.

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

**APPENDIX I TO MINORITY VIEWS ON S. 1648—
SUMMARY OF REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER
GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE
PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION AND AREA
REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS**

(Between May 1964 and May 1965, the Comptroller General submitted a total of 17 reports to the Congress criticizing various aspects of the administration of the Area Redevelopment Act and the Public Works Acceleration Act. Following is a brief summary of each of these reports.)

**MAY 1964—OVERSTATEMENT OF NUMBER OF
JOBS CREATED UNDER THE PUBLIC WORKS AC-
CELERATION PROGRAM**

The General Accounting Office reviewed 190 public works acceleration projects handled by the Community Facilities Administration. It was originally estimated that these projects would create 21,814 man-months of onsite work. The General Accounting Office's review showed that actually only 9,553 onsite man-months were worked. Thus, the estimates were overstated by 12,261 man-months or 128 percent. If what was found in the 190 projects is true for all of the 2,842 projects approved by the Community Facilities Act as of November 1, 1963, it would appear that the estimated 663,911 man-months (55,300 man-years) of work reported for these projects by the Area Redevelopment Act is overstated by about 373,000 man-months (31,000 man-years).

The General Accounting Office also reviewed data relating to 497 of the 128 Community Facilities Administration projects under construction as of November 1, 1963. This review disclosed that the 50,853 actual onsite man-months of work reported for these projects by the Area Redevelopment Administration Directory was overstated by 23,008 man-months or about 83 percent.

The General Accounting Office report points out that the Area Redevelopment Administration is responsible for the evaluation and coordination of the public works acceleration program and the summary tables of its directory are the only readily available measure of the accomplishments of the public works acceleration program with respect to the creation of employment. It was noted that the data contained in the September 1, 1963, Directory of Approved Accelerated Public Works Projects was used extensively in the Area Redevelopment Administration's testimony before the House Public Works Committee to demonstrate the progress and accomplishments achieved under the Public Works Acceleration Act.

**JUNE 1964—ASSISTANCE UNDER THE PUBLIC
WORKS ACCELERATION ACT TO AREAS NO
LONGER BURDENED BY SUBSTANTIAL UNEM-
PLOYMENT**

A review by the General Accounting Office indicated that about \$21 million in public works acceleration funds were obligated for about 85 projects in areas which were no longer eligible at the time the grant agreement was consummated or which were due to become ineligible shortly thereafter. Ter-

mination of eligibility of the areas was because of improved employment conditions, and the report comments that it appears that the Community Facilities Administration or Public Health Service (which handled the project) were aware at the time Federal funds were obligated for the projects that the areas were no longer burdened by substantial unemployment. Specific examples are cited concerning projects at Bridgeport, Conn., the Youngstown-Warren, Ohio, labor market area, the Canton, Ohio, area, and Livingston County, Mich.

**AUGUST 1964—UNAUTHORIZED ASSISTANCE TO
SEEMINGLY NONDEPRESSED AREAS UNDER THE
PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT AND THE
AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT**

About \$7.4 million of the fund authorized by the Public Works Acceleration Act and the Area Redevelopment Act for assistance to depressed areas were approved for projects in seemingly nondepressed areas. The areas involved were in Hawaii (Hawaii County), New Hampshire (Grafton, Coos, and Carroll Counties), Vermont (Orleans, Caledonia, and Essex Counties), and Delaware (Sussex and Kent Counties). In designating these areas as being eligible for assistance, there was no determination by the Area Redevelopment Administration that the areas met the specific unemployment or underemployment criteria prescribed by law. The designation was made on the basis that the law permitted at least one area in each State to be designated as an unemployment area. The General Accounting Office stated that, in its opinion, designation on this basis is not authorized by the Area Redevelopment Act.

**OCTOBER 1964—PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION
ACT ASSISTANCE APPROVED FOR AREAS UNDER
CONSIDERATION FOR TERMINATION OF ELI-
GIBILITY**

The General Accounting Office found that about \$26 million had been spent or committed for public works acceleration projects in areas of the Nation which the Secretary of Labor had found were no longer burdened by substantial and persistent unemployment according to the criteria of the statute or regulations. These areas received assistance because the Area Redevelopment Administration policies permitted the approval of public works acceleration grants during the 7- to 13-month period when the Area Redevelopment Administration was considering whether to terminate the depressed area designations.

**OCTOBER 1964—EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN
FEDERALLY AIDED PROJECT GENERALLY RE-
STRICTED TO INDIVIDUALS HAVING FUNDS TO
INVEST IN BUSINESS VENTURE**

This report involved a \$140,000 industrial loan under the Area Redevelopment Act to the Cowlitz Forest Products, Inc., Chehalis, Wash. The borrower generally required prospective employees, as a condition precedent to employment, to make substantial investment in the business venture through the purchase of shares of stock. Prospective employees were generally required to buy shares of both common and nonvoting preferred stock with a total investment per employee of about \$2,040. The borrower and associates maintained the majority of the voting common stock, thus retaining management control. Although information was available to make it evident that financial investment was a possible prerequisite to employment, this information was not considered by the appropriate Federal officials, and, on September 4, 1962, the Area Redevelopment Administration approved a loan of \$140,000. In October of 1962, the Area Redevelopment Administration became aware of the situation and advised the borrower that "such a requirement is not consistent with the primary intent and purpose of the ARA program since it tends to eliminate

employment opportunities to those persons who lack financial funds to invest in the company." Despite this, the loan was disbursed, apparently on the basis that a refusal to do so would constitute a breach of faith and that it was too late to reexamine the entire loan application.

NOVEMBER 1964—IMPRUDENT ACTION TAKEN IN APPROVING LOANS TO ASSIST THE ROUSTABOUT CO., FRACKVILLE, PA.

The Roustabout Co. applied for loans to assist in financing a plant for the production of a three-wheel light vehicle. The Small Business Administration reviewed the overall feasibility of the project and recommended that the Area Redevelopment Administration decline to make a loan to the Roustabout Co. because there was no basis for a determination, as required by the statute, that repayment of the loans was reasonably assured. This recommendation was made on the basis that there was a lack of (1) assurance that the product could be successfully marketed, (2) assurance that the project could be operated at a rate of successful profit, (3) adequate working capital, and (4) adequate collateral to secure the loan.

Despite the existence of these adverse conclusions by the Small Business Administration and despite the statutory requirement that repayment of loans must be reasonably assured, the Area Redevelopment Administration approved loans in the total amount of \$342,000.

On March 28, 1963, the loans were disbursed, and in June 1963, the borrower ceased production, and in November 1963, the borrower filed a voluntary petition of bankruptcy. The reason for the borrower's failure was its inability to market its product as had been warned by the Small Business Administration. On the basis of the Small Business Administration's estimates this may result in a loss to the Government of \$230,000.

DECEMBER 1964—INADEQUATE ANALYSIS OF EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES TO BE PROVIDED BY A FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROJECT

The Plant Food Center, Inc., Post Falls, Idaho, applied to the Area Redevelopment Administration for an industrial loan and reported that the project would create 7 jobs initially and 23 jobs at the end of the first year of operation. The Area Redevelopment Administration accepted the estimate of the borrower as to employment to be created and approved a loan for \$53,000. As a matter of fact, it now appears that no more than six full-time employment opportunities will result from the project. The General Accounting Office report states that "appropriate recognition of the available information would have shown rather convincingly that the borrower's estimate of employment opportunities was unrealistic."

DECEMBER 1964—INEFFECTIVE ACTIONS TAKEN IN APPROVING AND ADMINISTERING A LOAN TO VINELAND AND SOUTH JERSEY COOPERATIVE EGG, AUCTION AND POULTRY ASSOCIATION, INC.

The Area Redevelopment Administration approved a loan of \$42,250 to Vineland and South Jersey Cooperative Egg, Auction & Poultry Association, Inc. The principal finding of the General Accounting Office was that in processing the loan for approval, neither the Area Redevelopment Administration nor the Small Business Administration adequately examined into the number of employment opportunities which could reasonably be expected to result from the project. Although the loan was approved in May 1962, on the basis that existing employment would be maintained and 27 new jobs would be created, an adequate analysis of information available or obtainable at the time the loan was processed for approval would have shown that no new employment opportunities could reasonably be expected. In fact, as of March

1964, there had been a reduction of eight jobs since loan approval.

In addition to this, the General Accounting Office found that the Small Business Administration improperly disbursed about \$18,000 of Federal loan funds in excess of the amount permitted under the terms of the loan authorization.

JANUARY 1965—INADEQUATE EVALUATION OF EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES TO BE CREATED BY TWO INDUSTRIAL AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

First case: In June 1962, a plastic manufacturing plant applied for Federal financial assistance. The applicant stated that 50 persons would be employed at the start of operations and estimated that 100 persons would be employed at the end of 1 year of operation. However, estimates of projected income and expenses submitted by the applicant indicated that between 31 and 39 persons would be employed, depending upon sales volumes. In its formal loan application, the applicant indicated that the proposed project would create 58 new jobs and that in addition 10 existing jobs would be saved.

The Area Redevelopment Administration approved a loan of \$325,000 and in its public announcement stated that the loan would help create 100 direct new jobs. Except for the applicant's estimate contained in the project proposal, the General Accounting Office could find no evidence to support the Area Redevelopment Administration's announcement that the project was expected to create 100 new jobs. Since this estimate was contradicted by information submitted with the applicant's project proposal and loan application, the General Accounting Office concluded that "Neither the ARA nor the Small Business Administration was particularly concerned with the extent to which the project could be expected to alleviate unemployment and underemployment in the area in which it was to be located."

Second case: In August 1961, a seafood cannery company applied for an ARA loan for constructing and equipping a seafood processing plant. In the proposal, the applicant stated that 350 permanent new jobs would be created by the venture during the first year of operation. In January 1962, the Area Redevelopment Administration approved a loan of \$632,135 which was later increased to \$756,294. In a public announcement, the Area Redevelopment Administration reported the 350 new jobs the applicant had initially estimated as the number of new job opportunities which would be created by the project. However, a review of the projected expenses by the borrower and other available information indicated that the estimated number of new employment opportunities considered by the Area Redevelopment Administration in evaluating the loan should have been reduced from 350 to about 126.

JANUARY 1965—DEFICIENT FINANCIAL ANALYSIS WHICH RESULTED IN APPROVAL OF UNNEEDED GRANTS

Section 8 of the Area Redevelopment Act authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to make grants for the construction, etc., of public facilities within a redevelopment area, if he finds that (1) the applicant for the grant proposes to contribute to the cost of the project in proportion to its ability; and (2) there is little probability that the project can be undertaken without assistance of a grant.

In December 1962, the Pueblo of Laguna, an Indian tribe, applied for an ARA grant in connection with the construction of a new industrial plant which the Pueblo planned to build for lease. In the project proposal submitted to the ARA for grant assistance, the grantee stated that it was unable to finance the facility. Although the project proposal form submitted to the

ARA called for a current statement of financial condition, none was submitted, but in the application the Pueblo did submit a summary of cash receipts and disbursements covering the preceding 3 fiscal years. Apparently on the basis of this material, a grant was approved in the amount of \$118,000. It was later learned that the Pueblo was "one of the wealthiest Indian tribes in the country due to the income received from the lease of that portion of the reservation upon which uranium had been discovered and was being mined." Twelve days after the grant was approved, the Bureau of Indian Affairs was asked for certain financial information concerning the Pueblo. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior, advised that for calendar years 1960, 1961, and 1962, the grantee's income was \$1.6 million, \$1.7 million, and \$1.5 million; that the Pueblo cash balance at the end of 1962 was \$1.2 million; and that the market value of the Pueblo's investment in stocks and bonds at the end of 1962 was \$9,867,685. The General Accounting Office review revealed that the Community Facilities Administration and the Area Redevelopment Administration had available considerable evidence as to the prosperity of the Pueblo, including two credit reports received more than 6 months before the grant was approved. The Deputy Administrator of the ARA agreed with the General Accounting Office that it was clear that a more thorough analysis of the financial condition of the Pueblo would have been desirable. He attempted to justify the grant by saying, "The lack of sophistication of the Laguna people in commercial affairs has made Government participation essential" and that it was the opinion of those familiar with the project that without ARA assistance, the project would probably have been rejected by the tribal council.

The report of the General Accounting Office states that:

"In view of the rather favorable financial condition of the grantee and the intent of the Congress with respect to the making of grants, it seems highly doubtful that the ARA would have authorized a grant had the responsible Government employees more accurately evaluated the grantee's financial requirements and needs."

MARCH 1965—NEED FOR BASIC IMPROVEMENT OF ACCOUNTING SYSTEM TO ENABLE THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADEQUATE FINANCIAL INFORMATION

The General Accounting Office found that the Area Redevelopment Administration's accounting system did not provide for the development of costs by activities and functions. These and other deficiencies described in the report were of such significance as to preclude approval of the Area Redevelopment Administration's accounting system by the Comptroller General. The Area Redevelopment Administrator has advised that the Administration would, in accordance with the proposals of the General Accounting Office, begin to design an accounting system which could be approved.

MARCH 1965—UNNECESSARY GRANT APPROVED TO ASSIST IN FINANCING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE KEYSTONE INDUSTRIAL PARK OF THE SCRANTON LACKAWANNA INDUSTRIAL BUILDING CO.

The Scranton Lackawanna Industrial Building Co., is a private, nonprofit corporation owned entirely by the Scranton Chamber of Commerce, a nonprofit corporation. In August 1961, the company submitted proposals requesting financial assistance for developing the Keystone Industrial Park. In late 1962, the Area Redevelopment Administration approved a grant for \$424,000 which was later reduced to \$322,000 because of an overrun in project costs. The General Accounting Office's review of the data available at the time the request was approved clearly

shows that had a careful examination been made of such data, it would have been evident that the project could be undertaken without the assistance of a Federal grant. The report of the General Accounting Office indicates that it does not believe there was compliance with the statutory requirement "that there be little probability that a project could be undertaken without the assistance of a grant," and that the Area Redevelopment Administration's determination that this requirement was met was not supported by information available prior to the grant concerning the grantee's financial condition. The General Accounting Office concludes:

It appears that the review [by the ARA] was designed to determine only whether in the absence of a grant, the grantee's future projects might be adversely affected rather than whether the project in question could have been completed without grant funds and that in this respect neither the Community Facilities Administration, in making its review, nor the Area Redevelopment Administration, in reviewing the Community Facilities Administration's conclusions, gave sufficient consideration to the intent of the pertinent provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act.

APRIL 1965—POSSIBLE NEED FOR CLARIFICATION OF STATUTORY PROVISION LIMITING THE AMOUNT OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL PROJECTS

Section 6(b)(9) of the Area Redevelopment Act provides that loans to assist in projects for industrial or commercial usage—shall not exceed 65 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities (including, in cases of demonstrated need, machinery and equipment), and of construction, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project.

H.R. 6991, the proposed Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 contains a similar provision.

The Area Redevelopment Administrator has interpreted this provision to permit, under certain circumstances, the inclusion in project costs of all or a part of the value of the applicant's existing land and facilities. The GAO reviewed nine industrial or commercial area projects, under section 6 of the act, which involves the expansion of existing and operating facilities and for which loans totaling \$160 million were made. It was disclosed that Federal financial assistance ranged from 76 to 100 percent of the actual cost of expanding the facilities, because of including existing assets of the borrower as a cost of the project. Furthermore, the total appraised value of all such assets were not included in all cases. Instead, only that amount was included which maximized the amount of Federal financing and minimized or eliminated the amount of other financing required by the project.

The General Accounting Office believes that it may have been the legislative intent to limit Federal financing to 65 percent of the new capital expenditures for a project, and that the applicant's previously acquired and existing assets should not be included in determining project costs. In fact, the ARA initially established a policy in line with this, but later modified its policy.

The report recommends that the Congress in considering H.R. 6991 and S. 1648 consider clarifying this situation.

APRIL 1965—FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN UNNECESSARY PROJECTS COSTS RESULTING FROM FAILURE TO PROPERLY RECOGNIZE EFFECT OF INTERCORPORATE OWNERSHIP

The Area Redevelopment Administration approved and disbursed a loan of \$355,000 to Farwest Fisheries, Inc., Anacortes, Wash., to assist in financing the purchase and improve-

ment of an existing salmon cannery, although \$500,000 of the \$700,000 total project cost was to be paid by the borrower to its parent corporation for the plant which was owned and then being operated by the parent corporation, and only \$200,000 was to be expended for purchase of additional machinery and equipment. Notwithstanding the fact that both the ARA and the SBA, which is responsible for the performance of certain functions and duties under the Area Redevelopment Act, were aware that an intercorporate relationship might exist which would negate the justification for Federal assistance in financing the total project as proposed, and although the borrower was not yet incorporated at the time of loan approval, neither agency made a sufficient review to disclose the true relationship between the two corporations.

The General Accounting Office brought this matter to the attention of the Congress because a large part of the Federal funds made available for the project did not serve the objective of the Area Redevelopment Act through the creation of new employment opportunities, but assisted in the purchase of an operating plant by the borrower from its parent corporation.

The GAO also pointed out to the Area Redevelopment Administrator and the Small Business Administration that officials of both agencies were negligent in disbursing Federal funds without first reasonably establishing that the project was essential to carry out the purposes of the statute and noted that this situation emphasized the need for a greater sense of personal responsibility on the part of Government employees. The Small Business Administration admonished its staff members and issued remedial instructions to prevent reoccurrences, but the Area Redevelopment Administration did not agree that its officials were negligent.

The General Accounting Office feels that in addition to remedial instructions issued by the Small Business Administration, the Administrator of the ARA should request the Administrator of SBA to establish procedures to prevent the reoccurrence of the above and that the Administrator of ARA should cause to be included in loan authorizations, executed prior to the incorporation or organization of the prospective borrower, a provision making a positive finding by the SBA as to the relationship of a borrower to any interested party a condition precedent to disbursement of loan funds.

MAY 1965—LACK OF COMPLIANCE WITH STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS FOR LOCAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION IN AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Section 6 of the Area Redevelopment Act requires that not less than 10 percent of the aggregate cost of a federally assisted industrial or commercial project be supplied by the State, an agency, or political subdivision thereof, or by an Indian tribe or area organization which is nongovernmental in character as equity capital or as a loan repayable only after the Federal financial assistance has been repaid in full. The legislative history of this provision shows clearly that the intent was to insure that each project had the active support of the community as evidenced by its willingness to invest funds and assume financial risks in regard to the project.

A review by the General Accounting Office disclosed a number of projects for which all or part of the required State or community financing was, in fact, supplied by the borrower or its principals. Under the policies adopted by the Area Redevelopment Administration, this was permissible provided a "bona fide effort is made [by a local development organization] to raise funds on a broad base." The General Accounting Office is of the opinion that such financing arrangements are not consistent with the objectives

of the statute and their approval by the Area Redevelopment Administration was improper.

The General Accounting Office reasoned that the mere channelling of funds of a borrower or others having an interest in the project substantially identical to that of a borrower through a local development organization and back into the borrower's project without such organization's undertaking a bona fide financial risk does not constitute compliance with the terms of section 6 of the act.

The report of the GAO points out that, under the provisions of H.R. 6991, the required State or community financial participation in industrial or commercial projects would be reduced to 5 percent of aggregate project costs. H.R. 6991 also permits this requirement to be waived if the Secretary determines that the funds are not reasonably available from State or community sources because of economic distress or other good cause. The report points out that the failure of a community to respond to a fundraising drive for the benefit of a project is not necessarily evidence that the community is not able to participate, but rather may evidence lack of community support for the project.

The report recommends that the Congress in studying H.R. 6991 give consideration to this situation and to the need for providing criteria for the Secretary in determining whether State or community funds must be contributed to a project.

MAY 1965—OVERSTATEMENT OF JOB OPPORTUNITIES ESTIMATED TO BE CREATED IN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

Since the inception of the area redevelopment program, the ARA has maintained statistics showing the total number of job opportunities expected to be directly created or saved as a result of assistance extended under the ARA. ARA has used these statistics extensively in testimony before congressional committees and subcommittees as evidence of the expected accomplishments of the area redevelopment program. Department of Commerce and ARA officials have repeatedly assured various committees of the Congress of the validity and reliability of the job estimates.

During hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, ARA officials informed the subcommittee that as of February 1964, ARA had approved a total of 285 loans under section 6 of the act (loans for industrial or commercial usage). These loans represented a commitment of approximately \$120 million for Federal assistance and ARA estimated that 34,168 jobs would be created after the projects had been in operation 1 full year.

The GAO reviewed the analyses made by ARA of the employment opportunities expected to be created by the 285 projects referred to above. The review disclosed that the analyses by ARA were inadequate, were not consistent with the type of analysis described to the Congress, and that ARA generally accepted the representations of the applicant without making an adequate analysis of the applicant's payroll projections to evaluate the reasonableness of the applicant's representations.

The GAO then reviewed the 80 projects (out of the 285) which had been completed and in operation for 1 full year. The ARA had estimated that these 80 projects would create 9,539 jobs. The GAO found that only 4,912 jobs were actually created—an overstatement by the ARA of approximately 94 percent. The report states that if what was found in the 80 projects is true for all 285 projects, then the ARA estimate of 34,168 jobs was overstated by approximately 16,600 jobs.

The report points out that on September 18, 1964, ARA revised its procedures for

evaluating the number of employment opportunities to be created. The GAO concluded that if these revised procedures are effectively implemented and administered, they would result in more reliable estimates. The GAO has not, however, yet evaluated the accuracy of the administration's current estimated employment figures developed under these different procedures.

MAY 1965—FEDERAL LOAN ASSISTANCE FOR PLANT ACQUISITION AND IMPROVEMENT RESULTED IN NO NEW EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES WITHIN REDEVELOPMENT AREA IN WHICH THE PLANT WAS LOCATED

The General Accounting Office review of the circumstances under which the Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, included \$494,000 in an industrial loan to Josephine Plywood Corp. (formerly West Coast Plywood Co.), Portland, Oreg., to acquire and improve an industrial facility at Happy Camp, Calif., disclosed that the loan was approved despite the existence of adverse information relating to the effect which the project would have on employment. Further, the Area Redevelopment Administration permitted disbursement of loan funds without having evaluated firm plans and specifications for the plant improvements in the light of their effect upon proposed plant employment.

The borrower originally applied for an industrial loan for its own facility and advised of a contractual relationship with a second plant (partly owned by borrower's principal) to assure adequate raw materials. Subsequently, the borrower requested an additional loan to purchase the above-mentioned second plant to assure raw material supply and advised that production would be increased by making certain improvements and operating two shifts in this veneer plant—this, in spite of the fact that representatives of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, advised it could not certify favorably that there existed the necessary timber to support the two-shift operation.

ARA first refused the combined project and authorized a loan on the first application, conditioned upon satisfactory evidence of ample raw material supply. Attorneys for the borrower declined the loan and advised would accept only combined loan due to disagreement of participating bank for separate project—this in spite of the fact that the bank advised ARA it was willing to participate in either separate or combined projects.

The Area Redevelopment Administrator questioned the employment advantage of the second plant and asked for illustrations. In fact, ARA project analysis reflected no appreciable increase in employment and even no adequate source of raw materials. Nevertheless, loan was authorized with the requirement that plans and specifications for improvements of second plant must be submitted, but without making this requirement a condition precedent to loan disbursement, thereby removing ARA from the position of being able to evaluate the effect of the improvements upon proposed plant employment before disbursement of the loan.

The \$494,000 loan created no additional employment in the redevelopment area in which the plant was located.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I conclude where I began. I will vote untold sums to cure the disease of poverty; not to make war on it, but to cure the disease, if that is the better term for it; but I will vote nothing for the kind of program that has now been diffused all over America and that will become probably the greatest boondoggle since bread and circuses in the days of the ancient Roman Empire, when the republic fell. I will be no party to it.

I am ready, as the great Bard has said, to accept all the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. I am ready to accept the criticism. I am ready to have people say, "You are against the poor."

The only answer I shall have is, "I am not against the poor. I was impoverished once, without a father, and the best that I could do was to go to school in overalls, and to work, peddling milk, berries, fruit, and honey from the bees I kept, in order to keep the family going.

I will vote it, but I will never vote it for this kind of program, which is the very acme of waste and extravagance and unorganization and disorganization; and, as the man from Michigan said, a colossal disgrace, and, in some cases, an absolute fraud upon the taxpayers of this country.

I have done. I have seen enough. When the roll is intoned, I expect to vote "nay," and to be able to justify that vote.

Mr. President, the day will come, I am afraid—and probably not too long from now—when there will be those standing at the wailing wall weeping for America. Our destiny has been extremely good. In this generation we have trifled with it. All we need see are the clouds of challenge and provocation that are on the horizon of the world, the refuges and sanctuaries that we have to crawl into.

Before this session is over, we shall have a so-called tax equalization act. We must stop the foreigners from raiding our money. We passed a Gold Act because Charley de Gaulle was raiding our gold supply.

How long will the rest of our gold reserve last at the rate we are going?

We are committing untold sums in Asia. That supplemental appropriation bill will have \$1.7 billion in it before we get out of this Congress and before the curtain of adjournment comes down. Wait until the deficit of our country is chalked up. Let this program run a little while and then watch it.

I have tried to be helpful to this administration, and I shall continue to do so. But I say to the Senate tonight what I said at a meeting in Chicago. I shall support the President. Then I shall try to hold him to strict accountability. Believe me, when the elections come next year, as they will, and men in public office must go to make their peace with the electorate, I shall be there, too, to say, "Tell them how we got into this fix." If it must be the political line, I accept it. If it must be the economic line, I accept it, because I believe the position that we assert is one that can be sustained before the American people.

I read the signs. Never in the history of the Federal Reserve Board have they owned so many Government securities as they do right now. Never have time deposits gone up; and those are available for bank loans. Never have demand deposits risen to such proportions. Never have there been so many transfers from the demand side of the ledger to the other side.

Mr. President, we are on a binge. It cannot last. We are blithely throwing, not millions, but billions into a program in the hope that it will be sustained. God willing, I hope it will be sustained.

But I cannot summon the requisite faith to believe that we are serving our country when we pass this kind of bill with such a euphemistic title—"To expand the war on poverty."

Mr. President, I am ready for the third reading of the bill.

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

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

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, today, while the Senate continues its consideration of H.R. 8283, the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965, I wish to add some cautionary words.

I feel I must state, in all frankness, that I am not presently an enthusiastic supporter of this particular legislation. I intend to vote for the bill, and I have voted against proposals which would have reduced the authorization below that of the original administration request. I did, however, vote for the amendment, offered by the junior Senator from Vermont, to reduce the authorization by \$150 million, inasmuch as the item was not requested by the administration, either through the Office of Economic Opportunity or the Bureau of the Budget.

I realize that this is a relatively new program. Perhaps it has not yet had a chance to fully prove itself. Furthermore, the President feels it is important within the framework of his economic strategy planning.

There have, nonetheless, been a number of unfavorable reports on the Office of Economic Opportunity's operations, including, particularly, charges of heavy political favoritism, which I find disquieting. What the true facts are in these situations, I do not know, but the reports have been widespread and there must undoubtedly be some substance to some, if not all of them. The concept of the goals of the original legislation appeared worthy; however, I am beginning to wonder if the moneys appropriated for the various programs covered by the legislation are really being as advantageously and efficiently used as was initially planned.

This is not intended as any reflection on the Director, Mr. R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., whom I personally respect, and who has always impressed me as a person of high integrity.

Nonetheless, there have been reports of waste and maladministration in some areas, although the program appears to have worked well in my own State. I am, however, concerned about some of the things reportedly developing in connection with this program in other parts of the country.

Moreover, I think that we are making a serious mistake in changing the present law to remove the Governor's veto. Time and time again, during the debate, I have supported every amend-

ment which had as its purpose the recognition of the rights of the States and the status of the Governors of the States. I happen to believe that the States still have some rights under this republican form of Government, and I think that this basic principle has been involved here. In my estimation, the chief executive in a State, who, as the chief executive, has been named by his people, and who knows the problems of his State better than individuals and agencies outside its boundaries, should have the authority to reject projects under this program which, in his judgment, would not be beneficial and in the best interests of his State. As to whether the Governor of a particular State is a Democrat or a Republican, I do not feel that this makes any difference, in view of the fact that the people of that particular State have spoken by a majority in selecting their chief executive. Last year, the Senate, by a vote of 80 to 7, took the position that the Governor should have a veto. I think that position was the right one. I look with concern upon our continuing impingement upon the rights and responsibilities of the States, because if we are to preserve this American form of Government we are going to have to preserve some recognition of State independence and State responsibility. Here again, I am not aware of any instance in which the Governor of my own State has found it necessary to use the veto, but I think he and all other Governors should continue to have recourse to the veto if it is needed in the future.

For these reasons, and related ones, I have reservations about this program.

Furthermore, I fear that the time is coming that the demands of the Vietnam hostilities will make themselves felt on the American taxpayer's pocketbook in a manner not yet evident. When that time comes, the question as to whether or not we can have both "guns" and "butter" will have to be answered.

Perhaps we can continue to have some of the "butter" as represented by this multi-faceted legislation, but we certainly must have the guns to support our Nation's military efforts calculated to be in the interests of its own security.

I believe that the American people should take notice that the future monetary costs of the war in Vietnam may require some changes in funding this program and possibly others. Efforts should be made now to insure that full value is being received from the Federal appropriations being heavily poured into programs designated to alleviate our domestic economic ills. The siphoning off of funds designated for this purpose, either through laxity, or for promotion of political objectives, or even personal aggrandizement, as has been reported from some areas of the Nation, should not be tolerated.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I am concerned that the buildup of our Nation's armed services, to meet requirements of the expanded hostilities in Vietnam, will present a heavy price tag later on this fiscal year. With this in mind, I wish now to provide these cautionary remarks, so that the American public may be on

notice as to the decision it may well have to make and as to the importance that present opportunities and moneys be wisely and effectively utilized. The time may come when our accelerating defense costs may necessitate a tightening of our belts in regard to certain spending programs, especially if there are continued reports as to inefficiency and improper use of funds in the administration of those programs.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote for the bill, which would extend the authorization for the programs of the Economic Opportunity Act. This bill authorizes funds to finance these programs, and it will enable the Office of Economic Opportunity to continue the effort to reach the causes of poverty. As I have said several times during the debate, the administration of the programs under this office must be improved if the program is to be effective. I hope very much that the administration will give attention to the debate in the Senate, and in the House, so that abuses and waste can be eliminated.

I was one of the original supporters of this bill in 1964, when the Congress passed the law to establish these programs. I have followed closely the application of the provisions of this act in my own State of Kentucky, and it is my conviction that these programs can be important in offering greater opportunity to our citizens, and particularly to our young people, who have much need.

Even with the good beginning in Kentucky, complaints have been voiced from time to time over individual programs and projects. These complaints have been particularly directed at the duplication of work and the establishment of too many different offices and organizations for planning and running similar programs in one area. There has also been concern over the inflated wage levels prescribed by the Department of Labor for youth training programs, and there have been complaints over political usage of some of the plans being organized. Nevertheless, there is strong support for the programs, but our people want improvements to be made, and they want the programs run without waste, without duplication, and with the objective of helping those who need help.

I have reviewed the most recent statistics compiled by the Office of Economic Opportunity, and I find the following status of the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity in Kentucky this summer:

Over 40 grants for community action programs have been made to communities and community organizations, and almost 25,000 Kentucky children are participating in the Head Start program.

Almost 9,000 young men and women have been at work in Kentucky under the work-training program, enabling them to continue or to resume high school education.

Announcement of the location of 5 Job Corps centers in Kentucky has been made during the past year, and close to 900 young men and women are on the job at the 3 centers which are open. Additionally, there are almost 9,000 Ken-

tucky applicants who are eligible for assignment and have been so notified.

In addition to existing programs of the Farmers Home Administration and the Small Business Administration, some 450 special loans have been made in rural areas and to small business in Kentucky under the provisions of this act.

Special programs have also extended basic educational training to 7,200 adult citizens in a number of Kentucky communities, where classes have been established locally for this purpose under this act.

More than 6,600 families with thousands of dependent children are participating, through the employment of the head of the family, under the work experience program in 19 counties in Kentucky. I am well acquainted with this program, as the basic authority was originally provided by an amendment to the Social Security Act in 1961. I supported this amendment, recommended by the 1959 Special Senate Subcommittee on Unemployment on which I served, and I worked with officials of my State to establish one of the early demonstration projects of this type.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has made a hopeful start. Waste, duplication, and political use must be prevented. The emphasis on providing basic education and training to enable those assisted to enter into employment must be continued. In particular regard to the Job Corps, I believe it very important that training in these centers lead to specific placement in jobs. As I said in the Senate on the first day of debate, the real purpose of enrolling young men and women in Job Corps centers—and in other programs under this act—is to provide the means by which they can learn to work and to be productive in life. The Office of Economic Opportunity ought to give greater and special attention to directing those undergoing training toward a particular job or occupation.

I do not believe that this act was designed to provide simply a work program or a relief program, and I have noted that President Johnson and Mr. Shriver have agreed with this interpretation. I also think it of note that the House approved an authorization of some \$400 million more than the amounts requested by the administration. In the Senate, I have voted to reduce this authorization to a level of \$1.1 billion, well under the House bill and less than the bill reported by the Senate committee, but over \$300 million above the appropriation made last year. I thought this sum sufficient for the second year of the new program, considering the need for improving its effectiveness, and with our budget deficits and the growing cost of the war in Vietnam.

The bill now before the Senate, for which I will vote, and which I believe will be passed, includes extensions of the programs which are now at work in Kentucky. Funds are authorized for the Job Corps, the work-training program used in our high schools, and the work-study program used by our colleges. The community action programs will be expanded and I call particular attention

August 19, 1965

to the change which would enable unemployed members of low-income farm families to participate in work-experience programs on public projects in their local areas.

I was a county judge in Kentucky during the depression days some 30 years ago, and I saw at first hand the problems and needs of people who are unemployed, and who lack education and training. In the intervening years, during my service in the Senate, and in my travels through every county of my State, the lessons of those days have come to mind. I think this education and training are needed to enable people to help themselves.

But more is needed also. Local communities, and their officials and citizens, must provide assistance, direction, and interest, and the initiative, the ambition, and the faith of the individual must be stimulated.

I support this program and hope that it will succeed. It would be tragic if this vast effort with its programs in the millions of dollars does not succeed in helping people to help themselves and lift people and children toward great opportunities and hope in life.

PROGRESS REPORT ON THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently Gov. Karl F. Rolvaag made his progress report on the economic opportunity program in the State of Minnesota. He pointed out that a total of \$16,109,752 of Federal funds have been provided to the State, in a wide range of programs including Job Corps camps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, work-study programs, community action programs, project Head Start, programs to combat poverty on Indian reservations, and progress in the other areas open under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

One of the brightest areas of our efforts in the State of Minnesota has been that undertaken by the citizens and leaders in Hennepin County, and in the city of Minneapolis.

To date, Minneapolis has received \$749,653 from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity to help break the cycle of poverty in which poor children find themselves, having an inadequate diet, poor housing, poor education, little job training, and limited outlook. The Community Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County is waging an impressive array of programs on all the fronts of the poverty-stricken child. These programs involve a summer school program for over 3,000 children, a Neighborhood Youth Corps program for jobs for potential and real high school dropouts, vocational and educational counseling assistance for unemployed dropouts and graduates of high schools, and a summer work camp, a project Head Start grant for prekindergarten pupils, and the Project Motivation, in which University of Minnesota students tutor elementary schoolchildren and try to boost their interest in education.

The actions by Hennepin County and the city of Minneapolis are notable for their efforts to fulfill the pledge made by President Johnson, "to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty

in this Nation by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity."

As an example of what these programs are doing, and the public acceptance of their fine efforts, I ask unanimous consent that the following articles from the Minneapolis Star of July 19, 1965, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, as well as a letter from the capable and distinguished president of the Community Health and Welfare Council, Mr. Marvin Borman.

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

MASLON, KAPLAN, EDELMAN,
JOSEPH & BORMAN,
Minneapolis, Minn., July 26, 1965.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: It occurs to me that one of the most important aspects of the war on poverty is the manner in which the various programs are understood and accepted by the community. I was, therefore, pleased by the enclosed article which appeared in the Minneapolis Star on July 19.

In my opinion this article reflects a positive attitude on the part of the press which is gratifying as well as serving to better inform the community at large of the current status of our efforts.

We at the Community Health and Welfare Council take a great deal of pride in the success we have had to date in our efforts to combat poverty in Hennepin County, and hope that you will concur in our feeling that the attitudes of the community as expressed in the enclosed article give promise for continued success of the program.

Sincerely,

MARVIN BORMAN,
President, Community Health and Welfare Council.

[From the Minneapolis Star, July 19, 1965]

WAR ON POVERTY—A PROGRESS REPORT

(By Carol Honsa, Jim Shoop, and Ben Kaufman)

PLANS FOCUS ON YOUNG TO SNAP POVERTY CYCLE

"In the past, poverty was accepted as an unpleasant but ever present reality of life. There really was no thought of eliminating poverty * * *. Such an idea was inconceivable." (Community Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County.)

In an affluent society that likes to think it can identify and solve its problems, the "inconceivable" idea has given way to a nationwide "war on poverty."

The war is being fought on many fronts, from prekindergarten classrooms to Job Corps camps to birth control clinics. In Minneapolis, antipoverty programs can mean anything from art museum field trips for deprived youngsters, dental examinations for poor preschoolers, to part-time jobs for needy students in danger of dropping out of high school.

And if the poor are to be always with us, so too will the antipoverty programs designed to improve their lot, according to the hard-headed idealist responsible for directing \$750,000 in Minneapolis antipoverty efforts.

Joseph H. Kahle, director of the Economic Opportunity Committee of the Community Health and Welfare Council, believes the United States will concentrate ever-increasing amounts of public spending on welfare programs as it comes to realize the futility of the arms race.

"A certain amount of money has to be spent to keep the economy going," Kahle

said in an interview. "Antipoverty will be an important part of this public spending."

"You can see it now, in public works, park development * * * the whole 'Great Society' bit," Kahle said. "Fortunately, we're in the situation today where we can afford this kind of spending."

"I don't mean that this is going to happen tomorrow," he added. "To get at deep-rooted poverty, it'll take 10 to 15 years to break the cycle."

To date Minneapolis has received \$749,653 from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity to help break this cycle of poverty in which poor children with inadequate diet, housing, education, job training, and limited outlook grew up to be poor adults.

The logical place to start, according to Kahle, is with children whose future lives have not been entirely hemmed in by their environment.

With the exception of a \$33,240 grant for antipoverty administration and program development, all the Minneapolis programs are aimed at children and youths, from preschoolers to 22-year-olds who hold dead-end jobs at the bottom of the wage scale.

The largest is a \$296,642 summer school program for 3,360 poverty area children designed to give them cultural experiences they have missed because of their poor backgrounds.

Next in size is the \$167,270 Neighborhood Youth Corps program which provides after-school and summer jobs for 475 dropouts and potential dropouts, primarily from South, North, Central, and Vocational High Schools.

Unemployed dropouts and graduates of these four poverty area high schools can also seek the help of post high school counselors for vocational and educational advice under a \$89,544 antipoverty program.

A \$71,824 Federal grant is helping to finance a summer work camp for 120 junior high school boys considered likely to drop out of school. Training in work skills and good work habits, plus counseling and remedial reading courses, is the focus of the YMCA-operated camp near Monticello, Minn.

In Project Head Start, 840 prekindergarten pupils are getting medical and dental examinations, inoculations, and enrichment classes this summer at 16 Minneapolis elementary schools.

The smallest Federal grant, \$19,307, went for Project Motivation in which University of Minnesota students tutor elementary school children and try to boost their interest in education. The university's YMCA operates this program.

The health and welfare council's Economic Opportunity Committee, which screens and submits antipoverty program applications to Washington, has also applied for \$1.4 million more in Federal funds for nine additional programs.

These include three programs now operated by the Minneapolis Youth Development Project, a Minneapolis health department birth control clinic, and a Minneapolis park board work program.

Other program applications would provide part-time jobs for high school students in the Mound, Brooklyn Center, and other suburban Hennepin County schools similar to the Neighborhood Youth Corps jobs available to Minneapolis students.

Other proposals, still under consideration at local levels, would establish neighborhood service teams in poverty areas, an educational program for Minneapolis workhouse inmates, and a basic education program for near-illiterate adults.

POVERTY FUNDS TO RURAL AREAS \$5 MILLION

More than \$11 million in Federal funds has been allocated to fight the war on poverty in Minnesota, \$5 million of which is being used to mount the offensive in rural areas outside Hennepin and Ramsey Counties.

Vladimir Shipka, director of the State office of economic opportunity, said the biggest rural project is the \$1.5 million State conservation department project to put 2,200 youths 16 to 21 years old to work pruning trees, clearing underbrush, and maintaining State parks and forests.

The present program expires August 1 and the conservation department has submitted another proposal for \$5.9 million to continue the project beyond that date.

The second largest out-State project, approved in late June, is the \$1.3 million work and training program of the St. Louis County Welfare Department. It is designed to train 300 unemployed relief recipients as auto mechanics, metalworkers, landscapers, janitors, and hotel and motel housekeepers.

Head Start

Twenty-one project "Head Start" programs to give children of prekindergarten age from poor families better preparation for school have been approved for school districts in 15 counties outside the Twin Cities area.

These Head Start programs will involve about 3,000 children at a price tag of about \$350,000.

To apply for antipoverty funds, a county or group of counties acting together must first form a "community action council." This is usually made up of about 35 persons active in the fields of welfare, employment, education, health, agriculture, business, labor, law enforcement, and the clergy, plus representatives of the poor such as unemployed fathers or relief clients.

To date, community action councils have been approved in Hennepin, Ramsey, and St. Louis Counties and the city of Duluth, plus one multicounty setup composed of Sherburne, Stearns, and Benton Counties.

Shipka said a community action council area should have a population of at least 50,000.

FIFTEEN OTHERS

Fifteen other applications, ranging from 2 to 7 counties each and comprising a total of 48, are on file in Washington awaiting approval, Shipka said, and 13 others involving 34 counties are in the talking stage.

Typical of the rural proposals now under consideration in Washington is one recently approved by the Tri-County Council (Sherburne-Benton-Stearns) for the Holdingford School District.

The proposal will put 80 youths between 16 and 21 to work at \$1.25 an hour building picnic areas, shelters and lavatory facilities in parks, planting trees and building tennis and basketball courts on the school grounds, learning how to lay floor and ceiling tile, and helping janitors, librarians and school cooks.

Total cost of the proposal is \$48,698. The Federal share is \$39,408.

The tri-county group has submitted similar projects—all approved now—for St. Cloud, Sauk Rapids, Foley, Albany, Big Lake, Becker and Elk River Schools, worth \$238,687, to 600 youths.

Projects totaling \$712,353 have been approved for seven Minnesota Indian reservations.

Typical is the one for the Leech Lake Reservation, where only 40 of the reservation's 559 families have a yearly income over \$4,000 and 208 earn less than \$1,000.

A \$231,405 project will attempt to set up a health education, eye and dental clinic; establish community libraries; provide adult education in cabinet-making, carpentry, masonry, mechanics, shorthand and typing, and homemaking, and provide half-day preschool classes.

THIRTEEN PERCENT OF CITY FAMILIES IN POVERTY

How extensive is poverty in Minneapolis?

Federal Government figures for 1959 and 1960, the most recent available, show that

in the city 13.9 percent of all families—or 16,861 families—had incomes of less than \$3,000, the "poverty line" set by the Federal Government; 5.2 percent of the men in the labor force and 3.1 percent of the women were unemployed; 15.8 percent of all housing units in the city were deteriorated or dilapidated.

Comparable percentages for Hennepin County, including Minneapolis, are somewhat lower because of the relative affluence of the suburbs.

The Hennepin County Community Health and Welfare Council, which administers local programs under the Federal war on poverty, found that lower income families, adults with little education and substandard housing, are concentrated largely in 38 census tracts that ring downtown Minneapolis, extending south as far as Lake Street and north as far as Dowling Avenue North.

Thomas F. Brinton, research director for the council, said he believes the proportion of low-income families in the city and county has remained relatively constant in the 5 years since the last census figures were compiled.

ANTIPoVERTY WORK IS INITIAL SUCCESS IN GLENWOOD AREA

When Mrs. Roland Tweeter said, "I do not have any trouble getting them to go," she captured the spirit underlying the initial success of this summer's antipoverty projects for children and teenagers.

"Oh, they're excited all right," Mrs. Tweeter said, over the din raised by some of her 12 children in their 5-bedroom Glenwood housing development apartment.

"Brian keeps talking about his trip to the zoo. They like the field trips best."

Brian and his 4-year-old twin Brenda are enrolled in Project Head Start at nearby Harrison school where two older brothers are in summer school.

"You know, he's had as many as 4 half-pints of milk in one sitting," a teacher's aide in the school lunchroom said of Brian, who sat shoveling in his second bowl of cereal in the pilot breakfast program.

Brian, blond and husky, seemed to need the extra energy, because he hauled the aide toward a parked bus later en route to another "exciting" field trip.

"Last year, there would have been no one to help me," the attractive 18-year-old high school graduate said in her counselor's office.

Together, they are trying to determine if nursing is her field and can a training place be found.

The girl lives with her grandmother:

"My dad said as long as I was living under his roof, I did not have to go to college, or anywhere for that matter."

Some days she lacks bus fare, but she is seeking work by going from business to business, in addition to the help the antipoverty programs are offering.

Kathy Merchant knows where to find the "kids who just hang around."

At 16, she is a staff assistant in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, seeking out young people and bringing them to job finders and social workers for aid.

She was involved in the program originally because she needed a summer job but was asked to take a promotion (and pay raise) to work as a scout for the Youth Corps.

GETTING POOR TO REACT IS KEY POVERTY PROJECT

"Frankly, I don't see how we can lose. When you pay enough attention to people, they react."

Listening to poor people express their needs—and having them react by participating in the planning and execution of antipoverty programs—is the key point of the Minneapolis antipoverty effort, according to Joseph H. Kahle, its director.

"For the first time," Kahle said, "we're really going all out to listen to, to solicit, the opinions of the people who have been ignored, sometimes deliberately ignored by society."

"I don't see how you can help but get a positive response."

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 requires that the poor themselves must take an active role in shaping programs for their own benefit.

This marks, according to many social welfare leaders, an effort to move away from benevolent welfare programs imposed from above on poor persons who may not want or see the need for such programs.

Accordingly, the economic opportunity committee of the Community Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County, the local antipoverty agency, includes 4 residents of Minneapolis poverty areas among its 42 members. Two of these can actually be considered poor, according to Kahle.

In addition, the committee's 4 task forces on health, education, employment, and social services include 20 poor persons among their 84 members.

Agencies submitting an antipoverty proposal for task force and committee approval are required to show that poor persons who would be expected to fit in their programs have been consulted in the planning process.

But the economic opportunity committee faces a problem in getting more poverty area residents in on its work, according to Kahle.

"It's just hard to find poverty area people who are willing or who have the time to meet with the committee or task forces," he said. "The person with time and money can afford it. But the man who can't leave his job for an afternoon meeting can't."

A second problem, Kahle said, is reaching the inarticulate poor—the apathetic person with a hopeless outlook on life who don't speak up about their needs or seek out welfare agencies to help them.

But Kahle said he hoped that one of the antipoverty programs under consideration by the committee—a \$160,000 neighborhood service team proposal—could lick the problem by employing poverty area residents to reach their neighbors and link them with welfare agency services.

"The real advantage of neighborhood workers is that they can get to the ones we don't even know about," said Kahle. "They can talk to them far more effectively than we can."

"Our goal: An America in which every citizen shares all the opportunities of his society, in which every man has a chance to advance his welfare to the limit of his capabilities.

"We have come a long way toward this goal. We still have a long way to go."

"The distance which remains is the measure of the great unfinished work of our society."

"To finish that work I have called for a national war on poverty. Our objective: Total victory." (President Johnson, Mar. 16, 1964.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on the bill prepared by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLARK

I have for many years been of the view that the Federal Government should provide the impetus, along with private and civic groups, to develop birth control programs and family planning facilities.

I am happy to note that the idea of population control is on the move at last. It has

become acceptable to admit that there is a crisis in the world and a serious problem in the United States.

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson called for "new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population."

Again, on June 25 this year, at the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, President Johnson called upon the world to face up to the challenge of the world population crisis.

On that occasion the President stated: "Let us in all our lands—including this one—face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of the world. Let us act on the fact that less than \$5 invested in population control is worth \$100 invested in economic growth."

While the population problem of the United States may not be so serious as it is in other parts of the world, it is nevertheless connected with the world population crisis.

This connection is most apparent in two respects: first, the attitude of the United States toward its own problem is logically related to its attitude toward the more acute problem elsewhere, and will, therefore, influence the world's attitude on the impending crisis; second, the economic measures which the United States will have to take to meet an uncontrolled growth of its population will limit our capability to provide the economic aid which the rest of the world has to call on in the quest for stability.

Population growth rates have already reached drastic proportions in many countries. Here at home, the problem is hardly less significant.

SOME DEMOGRAPHIC FACTS

The present level of fertility in the United States is approximately 3.4 children per woman. In 1964, the number of live births per 1,000 of the total population was 21.2. Both these figures represent a slight tapering off of the birthrate over the past few years, but there is no sustained trend of significant reduction.

As the following table indicates, the Census Bureau's projections of population growth show that, even if the average fertility is reduced by one child per woman, there will be a drastic increase:

U.S. population, 1960, and projection to year 2010, at 4 levels of fertility

[In millions]

Year	Population level, measured by children per woman			
	3.35	3.23	2.78	2.45
1960	179	179	179	179
1970	211	209	206	206
1980	252	245	236	233
1990	301	288	271	262
2000	362	338	308	291
2010	438	399	352	322

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, July 1964.

There is more than prophecy to depend on. In 1960, there were 11 million women in the prime reproductive ages of 20-29. Now that the postwar babies are reaching these ages, there will be 15 million women between 20 and 29 in 1970, and 20 million by 1980. This is not prophecy, because the girls have already been born. The question is, at what rates will they reproduce? If they do so at or near the present levels, they will be the mothers of a new baby boom in the following two decades that will make the population increase of the fifties look very small.

As the above figures show, reproduction at present levels will produce a population at the turn of the century of 362 million—twice the 1960 figure. In the 10 years following 2000, another 76 million would be added—

almost three times the increase of 1950-1960. A decline in rate of 1 child per woman (2.45), would yield 291 million people in the year 2000, about 100 million, rather than 160 million, more than we now have.

These gross figures have most serious implications for the domestic economy. The problem reaches to the heart of the questions of employment, education, welfare, and the conservation of resources, with frightening implications for many aspects of our lives.

EFFECT ON EMPLOYMENT

Perhaps the best way to understand this is to look at projected employment needs and contrast them with the projected growth of the economy.

The average annual growth of the labor force from 1957 to 1962 was 800,000. That average increased between 1962 and 1964 to 1,200,000. The projected average annual growth of the labor force between now and 1970 is 1,500,000. This means that 9 million extra jobs will have to be created by 1970 merely to keep up with the growth.

These figures compare with the annual average growth in jobs between 1947 and 1964 of 750,000.

While it has been estimated that in 1964, 1.5 million jobs were provided under the stimulus of the tax cut, this figure has never been sustained. Our gross national product grew at the rate of 4.75 percent. The Labor Department estimates that the average rate of growth must equal that figure for the next half dozen years if the unemployment rate is to be kept below 5 percent.

This is enough to show that the United States has a vital interest in the rate at which today's children, if not today's women, will reproduce. Do we want to double our population in the next 35 years?

POPULATION AND POVERTY

But consider the special impact on the poverty program.

The correlation between poverty and high fertility is amply established. The following facts cannot be controverted:

The poor are more likely than any other group to have large families: (1 in 3 families with 6 or more children have an annual income of less than \$3,000; 1 in 7 families with 4 or 5 children have an annual income of less than \$3,000; 1 in 10 families with 2 or 3 children have an annual income of less than \$3,000).

The median income of those with large families is very substantially lower than the median income of other families: The median annual income of two-children families is \$6,900; the median annual income of four-children families is \$6,500; the median annual income of six-children families is \$5,000.

Since large families exist most frequently among those who can least afford to maintain them, they become a burden on the State. A population increase which could be largely sustained by those who produce it would bring problems enough. A population increase whose major incidence is among those who cannot individually afford it could spell disaster. One-third of the poor are children—about 10 million children.

High fertility among the poor is the prime cause of multigenerational poverty. When a family which lacks the resources to sustain a single child has to try and rear six children, their upbringing is totally inadequate to the task of fitting them for a productive role in society. They remain destitute to the nth generation.

Poor and unemployed fathers, besides siring more children than the affluent and wage earning, also desert their wives more often. The families are left to the aid of dependent children section of welfare programs.

Aid to dependent children has increased, and is increasing instead of diminishing. In the last 10 years, its burden has grown

104 percent; and the 4 million people on its rolls outnumber the combined total of all others on relief, the old, blind, disabled, etc.

High fertility deepens the poverty of the poor, and spreads and intensifies the worst accompaniment of hopeless poverty: violent crime, juvenile delinquency, child abuse and neglect, malnutrition, slum housing, social alienation.

There is no reason to believe most of the poor are more anxious than most other people to have large families. Many do not want all their children; nor, to use another yardstick, do all Negroes want all theirs. The only difference, in this respect, between the poor and the middle classes is that they cannot always exercise their choice because they are not sufficiently aware that there is a choice. Many studies have shown this, and have also shown that poor families are eager to have more instruction in family planning.

A private study in 1960 entitled, "Growth of American Families," found that the average family wants between a minimum of 3.1 children and a maximum of 3.4 children (with the poor wanting slightly fewer children than the rest).

Differences were found between white and nonwhite wives. White wives, the survey found, want a minimum of 3.1 and a maximum of 3.5 children, while nonwhite wives want a minimum of 2.7 and a maximum of 3 children.

Since the poor are reproducing themselves faster than the population as a whole, any war on poverty which ignores the matter of fertility is reducing automatically the impact of its investment. No one would suggest that family planning is the solution for all problems of poverty. But all, surely, would agree that programs aimed at reducing poverty cannot possibly achieve their objective unless impoverished families are helped to have only the number of children they want.

Fortunately, population control is not the scare word it used to be. Talk about family planning has become more candid and less controversial lately. More than discussion, however, is taking place.

Tax-supported birth-control assistance in the form of advice, drugs, and devices is increasing in all parts of the country.

Before 1959, only seven States—all in the Deep South—included family planning as a regular part of their public health services. By summer 1964, this had risen to 20, and by now has risen again—together with a spread of private affiliates with some State support.

Public facilities for giving information and materials have been set up or are in the process of being organized in cities and counties of at least 33 States and the District of Columbia.

And the Federal Government has been expanding its role, and in a few areas, supporting local birth-control activities.

The initiative has been taken by various agencies of the Federal Government, including the Departments of the Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This spate of interest, however, needs direction. More explicit encouragement to the State and communities is needed from Washington.

A population policy should be defined, with national goals.

The facts show that a policy of family planning has got to be advocated, and facilities for family planning made available, especially to the poor who have them least and need them more. Government policy is still a thing of confusion. The policies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity must be clarified and extended.

While in HEW there has been an increase of interest and involvement—especially in the area of research—there can and should be improvements.

In 1965 about \$9 million is being spent by the Government on research into reproductive biology, sterility, fertility, and population dynamics. Of this, about \$800,000 is directly relevant to fertility control. Of course these other areas of research are most important, but one wonders whether the allotment to fertility control is fully reflective of the President's state of the Union address.

Without going into detail on the population activities of HEW, it is fair to say the Department is not giving a firm enough lead. It should make a clear and explicit policy statement, governing its health and welfare programs: to give strong leadership to State and local health departments, encouraging them to include family planning services in the regular medical care which they provide or purchase. Standards for such services need to be established, and help given in training personnel. Also, it should advertise the matching grants which it will make available as part of the maternal health service, if the State requests it.

The Office of Economic Opportunity will consider requests for funds for family planning services in community action programs. Many such requests have been made.

Eight projects, so far, have been funded. Among the communities who have received grants are Corpus Christi, Oakland, St. Louis, Buffalo, Nashville, and Austin.

Our largest cities, however, New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, and others, are not among the recipients.

I am afraid that the guidelines of the Office of Economic Opportunity for birth control aid do not fulfill the President's promise in the state of the Union message or at the United Nations:

OEO funds are not allowed to be used to advertise the availability of a family planning program funded by an OEO grant.

The emphasis on local initiative is so strong that the notion of positive encouragement from Washington is precluded. OEO ought to encourage the inclusion of family planning services in community action and other poverty programs.

OEO should modify its rules to assure that doctors in the program do not feel restrained from advocating family planning, and suggesting a particular method as being most suitable for a particular patient provided it does not conflict with the patient's religious beliefs.

OEO precludes giving contraceptive devices and drugs, funded by its money, to unmarried women or women not living with their husbands. Yet—unmarried or separated mothers are an important part of the childbearing, impoverished class: they add materially to the costs of poverty program and aid to dependent children. If a public health clinic is to be set up to minister to the poor, why should these categories be excluded? If our aim is to attack one of the great causes and sustainers of poverty, we should not be deterred by dubious moral judgments from fully carrying out the aim.

It is to be hoped that these restrictive policies will be removed, and OEO, HEW and other Federal agencies will actively encourage local communities to establish family planning services throughout the country.

To this end, H.R. 8283 was amended by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to include family planning among the projects to be included as components of community action programs.

This will mark the first time that there has been an explicit congressional authorization for Federal encouragement of birth-control activities in the States.

The activities of the Federal Government in this field need further encouragement.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the

Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] in response to a question raised by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McNAMARA TO REPORT REFERRED TO BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

Yesterday, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] referred to a report which he stated had recently been issued by the OEO relating to Federal antipoverty laws.

The Senator was referring to a catalog of Federal programs for individual and community improvement—of programs related to the war on poverty. The reason this catalog is not yet available is because it has not been completed. What the Senator saw is a draft—which is being circulated among the various Federal agencies for their comments, additions, and corrections. I understand that when the catalog is completed, it will be made generally available. There is already a large advance demand.

Under section 613 of the Economic Opportunity Act, provision is made for an information center through which information on all Federal programs related to the purposes of the act may be made available to local officials and other interested persons. The idea here is very simple—those engaged in planning, implementing, or carrying out local antipoverty programs need a single source of information concerning available Federal assistance that may contribute to the elimination of poverty. This is essential to comprehensive, coordinated programs.

The catalog is one phase of OEO's effort to carry out section 613. It attempts to list the various programs according to purpose—the needs they serve. It provides a brief description of each—what it does, who is eligible, who administers it, and how further information can be obtained. In view of the number of complaints that have been made about the confusion of Federal programs as seen from the local level, such a catalog should prove a remarkably useful and helpful document. It represents something that has never been done before—something that will help communities to do some rational planning as opposed to hit and miss efforts to take advantage of this or that program providing Federal funds. And it should help Federal officials and the Congress as well.

And I might add that the problem is not just a matter of Federal programs being unknown. The real problem is seeing how they can be made to fit together—how one can be used to supplement another, for example, or how one can be used to do a little more effectively what could also be done some other way.

This is a matter of great importance for the war on poverty. It is the whole idea behind the coordination provisions of the act. I think it is a good thing that OEO has started on it right in the beginning. The cost of the draft—\$80,000—includes not only the catalog but also a planning scheme under which a start can be made toward eliminating duplication and overlap and achieving standards which will permit us to determine whether new programs—proposed by any one of dozens of Federal agencies—are really needed. I need hardly elaborate upon the savings that can ultimately be derived from such an effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from

Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent because of death in the family.

The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay" and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 29, as follows:

[No. 233 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Aiken	Ervin	Kuchel
Anderson	Fong	Long, La.
Bartlett	Fulbright	Long, Mo.
Bass	Gore	Magnuson
Bayh	Gruening	Mansfield
Bible	Harris	McGovern
Brewster	Hart	McIntyre
Burdick	Hartke	Metcaif
Byrd, W. Va.	Hayden	Mondale
Cannon	Inouye	Monroney
Case	Jackson	Montoya
Church	Javits	Morse
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Moss
Dodd	Kennedy, Mass.	Muskie
Douglas	Kennedy, N.Y.	Nelson

Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph

Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Scott
Smith
Symington
Talmadge

NAYS—29

Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Fannin

Hickenlooper
Hill
Hoiland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt

Pearson
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saitonstall
Simpson
Stennis
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—10

Clark
Curtis
Eastland
McCarthy

McGee
McNamara
Murphy
Smathers

Sparkman
Tower

So the bill (H.R. 8283) was passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. NELSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair) appointed Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. NELSON, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. PROUTY conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask that H.R. 8283 as amended by the Senate be printed.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we have just completed final action on another significant and substantial piece of legislation, the antipoverty bill. We owe much credit to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] who, with the able assistance of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], so ably and skillfully managed the bill.

All Members of the Senate deserve credit for the patience and cooperation in bringing this measure to a conclusion. The opposition to the measure was strong, sincere, and demonstrated great perseverance in pointing out what they claimed to be the administration's shortcomings in any new program of this magnitude. However, the Senate has demonstrated its faith in the program and voted to continue the thrust and purpose of the program with the expectation that if there are rough edges, they will be worked out in short order.

To the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who presented his opposition so eloquently, to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] who presented their opposition so thoroughly and to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who presented his modifications so effectively, we owe a special thanks.

I hope that the Senate will continue the momentum gained today and will cooperate in assisting the leadership in completing the remaining legislation so that we may adjourn around Labor Day.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION ACT, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 603, H.R. 10323.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10323) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no further voting tonight. I do not believe there will be any discussion, even on the military construction appropriation bill.

As I recall, unanimous consent has been obtained to have the Senate convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. It can be stated that the military construction appropriation bill will be the first order of business following the transaction of morning business. Very likely it will be followed by the J.F.K. film measure.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, can the majority leader say whether that will be all the business for tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is all there will be tomorrow, so far as I know at the moment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to know if the Senator is asking for unanimous consent to take up House Concurrent Resolution 285, Calendar No. 302?

Mr. MANSFIELD. What measure is that?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The motion picture measure, Calendar No. 302. If it is to be taken up, I wish to make some remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I merely announced that it was likely to be taken up. The Senator from Iowa will have an opportunity to speak on the measure.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Committee on Agriculture has unanimously reported a bill that I would like to have taken up sometime tomorrow if there is no objection. If there is objection, I shall be glad to have its consideration postponed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will obtain clearance on the Republican side, I shall be glad to try to accommodate him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 9544. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period of approximately 620,000 long tons of natural rubber from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 626);

H. Con. Res. 453. Concurrent resolution expressing the approval of Congress for the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 628);

H. Con. Res. 454. Concurrent resolution expressing the approval of Congress for the disposal of diamond dies from the national stockpile and nonstockpile bismuth alloys (Rept. No. 627); and

H. Con. Res. 455. Concurrent resolution expressing the approval of Congress for the disposal of hyoscine from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 629).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H.R. 6007. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the promotion of qualified Reserve officers of the Air Force to the Reserve grades of brigadier general and major general (Rept. No. 633).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

H.R. 4152. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 630).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H.R. 4170. An act to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system (Rept. No. 631).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 9220. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 632).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. METCALF):

S. 2435. A bill to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Natural Resources and to transfer certain agencies to and from such department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2436. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Snake or Palute Indians of the Oregon area (area III of the Northern Paiute Nation), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2437. A bill for the relief of Mr. Parviz Azad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2438. A bill for the relief of Yong Cha Yang and Norwood Fitzgerald Dennis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 2439. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, so as to authorize the establishment and operation of sea grant colleges and programs by initiating and supporting programs of education, training, and research in the marine sciences and a program of advisory services relating to activities in the marine sciences, to facilitate the use of the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf by participants carrying out these programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

REDESIGNATION OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AS THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on the 1st of July of this year, I addressed the Senate, setting forth my reasons for believing that major changes must be made in the structure of the executive agencies if they are to manage adequately our natural resource conservation programs.

I pointed out that we in the Congress recognize the importance of America's natural resources. The 88th Congress earned the name, "The Conservation Congress." The 89th is continuing diligent work on resource legislation.

While thus expanding our programs, however, we have failed to modernize the organization of the Federal departments that must administer them. We are piling new tasks of great magnitude on an old executive structure. Through inertia, we continue to divide responsibility among many departments, and to seek coordination through a proliferation of interagency committees. We do this because neither Congress nor the people have faced up to the size of America's resource management task.

In my July 1 statement, I urged the creation of a Department of Natural Resources. Today, I offer, for myself and Senators METCALF and CLARK, a bill to accomplish that purpose.

The bill provides for a Secretary of Natural Resources and a Deputy Secretary. It provides for two Under Secretaries—one for water and power, and one for lands and forests.

The jurisdiction of the Under Secretary for Water and Power would include: the functions now exercised by the Bureau of Reclamation; the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers in the Department of the Army; the work of the Soil Conservation Service under the Watershed Protection and Flood

Prevention Act; the Water Pollution Control Authority, which, I am confident, will be established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the water resources planning activities of the Federal Power Commission; the functions of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration; and all agencies in the Department of the Interior that have water resources matters as their principal concern.

Reporting to the Under Secretary for Water and Power could be two Assistant Secretaries, one with primary responsibility for water matters, one with primary responsibility for power.

It would appear logical to divide the responsibility of the Under Secretary for Lands and Forests into three branches, each headed by an Assistant Secretary.

The Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management could report to an Assistant Secretary for Lands and Forests. The National Park Service, the Fish, and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation could report to an Assistant Secretary for Recreation and Wildlife. The Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, the Office of Coal Research, and the several other agencies in the Department of the Interior with responsibility in the fields of minerals and fuels could report to an Assistant Secretary for Minerals and Fuels.

Three agencies now in the Department of the Interior would be transferred to departments other than Natural Resources: the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Territories would go to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Alaska Railroad would go to the Department of Commerce.

The portions of this bill that raise the most questions are those which place the Federal Power Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Department of Natural Resources.

I recognize the difficulty of combining the functions of these agencies with that of an executive department. I know that there are reasons why they should be left out of such a consolidation. The Federal Power Commission exercises quasi-judicial functions concerning the granting of licenses for the construction of natural gas pipelines and hydroelectric dams. This it must continue to do. The independence of the commissioners to render decisions affecting consumer rates in the gas and electric power fields must remain unimpaired.

Both of these agencies, however, exercise resources planning and management functions. I have therefore considered it better procedure to include the TVA and the FPC in this bill so that these functions may be fully discussed and explored in the reports and the hearings.

It may well be that the committee having jurisdiction and the Congress will determine that both would better remain independent agencies.

It is also possible that only the water resources planning functions of the FPC can be transferred to the new department, but this will take a rewriting of the Federal Power Commission Act.

Let us remember, however, that there are precedents for placing boards which exercise judicial functions within a department. There is now in the Department of the Interior an Oil Import Appeals Board. I have cosponsored legislation to establish within the Department of the Interior a Public Lands Appeals Board, whose decisions would be independent of the Secretary of the Interior, and from which appeals would go out of the Department and into the courts.

It is perfectly possible to place an independent agency within a department for purposes of administration and yet leave its judicial functions unimpaired.

It is also clear that every duplication of authority, every overlapping of function, cannot be eliminated. For instance, the Geological Survey will continue to measure both land and water areas, and to classify lands for mineral content, whether it is under an Assistant Secretary for Land, an Assistant Secretary for Water, or an Assistant Secretary for Minerals.

Outdoor recreation involves reservoirs as well as forests. Wherever the Bureau of Recreation is placed for administrative purposes, it must deal with those who build dams, with those who protect wildlife, and with those who manage land.

Contamination of the Nation's waters will continue to be of concern to the Public Health Service. That agency must always have a hand in determining acceptable levels of foreign matter in our streams, whether or not it also allocates grants to the States or engages in river basin planning activities.

While the creation of a Department of Natural Resources will be a major task, and while it will require major alterations, we should not read into this bill more than is there, nor lose our sense of humor while discussing it. It is neither the purpose nor the intent of this legislation to deliver your favorite resource agency into the hands of its bureaucratic enemies.

The Forest Service, for example, will not be sunk without trace in a bureaucratic morass, nor its 60 years of service to conservation forgotten. Our fight to overcome the pollution of our lakes and streams and to strengthen the agency responsible for this program will not be abandoned.

What the bill will do is enable one executive department to coordinate, at the levels of Under Secretary and Secretary, the activities of all agencies dealing with natural resources. It will enable one executive department, the President, and the Congress effectively to evaluate the Nation's resource requirements and the investment needed to meet them. It will provide the data and the management structure on which long-range planning can be based. It will enable us to consider with sufficient leadtime the raw material requirements of our industries. It will make it easier for the States, counties, and cities to carry out their expanding responsibilities in the natural resource field.

The creation of a Department of Natural Resources is long overdue. In by-gone years, it may have been adequate

to attack conservation and development needs on an individual resource or a regional basis. Today, 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 does not require wise management on a national basis if it is to be maintained in needed scope and vigor.

This legislation is introduced because the structure of our resource agencies is unnecessarily fragmented; because this fragmentation is preventing the quality of conservation and management the public interest requires; and because the Congress has failed to give this question the attention it deserves.

I recognize that the nature and complexity of the issues raised by the bill impose considerable burdens on the departments that will be asked to prepare reports on it. I do not expect such reports to be made while Congress is in session this year. I would hope, however, that such reports will be ready at the beginning of next year's session. I urge my colleagues to devote a portion of this year's recess to a study of this bill and of the state of America's natural resources. I urge you to come back next year prepared to give this bill serious consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair.) The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2435) to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Natural Resources and to transfer certain agencies to and from such department, introduced by Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGES AND PROGRAM ACT OF 1965

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish at this time to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the establishment and development of national sea grant colleges and an educational program geared to the beneficial use of our vast marine resources. The short title of this bill is the National Sea Grant Colleges and Program Act of 1965.

This proposed legislation is directed toward three related problems in the marine sciences: problems which even now are threatening this Nation's position as a world leader in the peaceful exploitation of the marine environment for economic purposes. The bill would provide for a greatly increased educational program in the practical side of oceanography, aquaculture, marine mining, and related fields. It would also expand research leading to results of a direct and practical nature, of immediate value to those working in the marine sciences. Finally, it would create an extension service to spread useful information regarding the exploitation of the immense marine resources available to this Nation.

The need for this program is clear. In the early years of this great country, a

large part of our strength was derived from the sea. American vessels in the clipper ship era roamed the globe in search of new trade opportunities, bringing wealth and employment to the United States. The world whaling industry was dominated by American interests. The U.S. fisheries were able to provide for local needs and then export quantities of fish. Our merchant marine played an indispensable role in the opening of the West, conveying men and materials around the Horn. Today, a description of our ocean-based industries paints a much grimmer picture. Our fishing fleet is aged and obsolete, and our share of the world catch is slowly but surely shrinking away. American-flag vessels are no longer competitive in a market controlled by price. Our whaling industry exists only in history books.

Yet, in spite of the general decay of our ocean resource-utilizing industries, we have continued as a first-rate sea power, and as a leader in oceanography—the study of the oceans. Our naval architects are exploring many imaginative methods of using the ocean to transport people and material swiftly, safely, and economically. Scientists have found vast mineral deposits on the ocean floor, and are hopeful of even more exciting discoveries within the Continental Shelf and on the deep sea floor. Diving experts and engineers have combined their talents to find ways for men to live and work underwater for months at a time. Biologists are aware of unexploited species of fish available in commercial quantities. Thus the peculiar situation has developed where the science basic to harvesting the oceans is growing rapidly, but the actual technology and the industries related to the gainful use of marine resources are withering away. This situation is not in the national interest, and it should not be allowed to persist.

I believe that our marine resources, including animal and vegetable life and the untold mineral wealth of the seas, constitute a far-reaching and largely untapped asset of immense potential value to the United States. We very much need to educate and develop the skilled manpower—the scientists, engineers, and technicians—to avail ourselves of the opportunities which the seas abundantly offer. These opportunities are limited only by the scope of our imagination to grasp them and of our knowledge to make use of them.

Recently, the Senate culminated many years of effort by passing S. 944, oceanographic legislation introduced by Senator MAGNUSON transmitting it to the House. This bill, of which I am privileged to be a cosponsor, will provide for the first time a clear statement of the national goals in oceanography, and a means to determine how the Federal program can be most effectively organized to achieve these goals. I am hopeful that the House of Representatives will approve this measure, and I highly commend Senator MAGNUSON for his initiative and wisdom.

The large number of bills, now before the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, would indicate strong

concern with problems in oceanography development. However, my contacts with oceanographers, educators, fisheries experts, and similar groups interested in harvesting the oceans have convinced me that there is another way, first suggested by Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, in which we can combat this peculiar situation of a growing technology and a decaying industry—national sea-grant colleges.

I believe my proposal comes at a most appropriate time, with the expected enactment of the Magnuson bill as provisions of that bill will, in defining the national policy and interest, give direction and meaning to all future legislation in the field of oceanography in our Nation. There is no conflict between our bills, I believe, since mine would provide the manpower and techniques needed toward development of our resources under a national program to be guided by the National Council for Marine Resources and Engineering Development, contained in Senator MAGNUSON's important proposals.

The National Sea Grant College and Program Act is written with the express purpose of using some of the Federal rents and revenues from marine source for sponsoring three programs of importance to our country.

First, a portion of the funds would be made available to colleges and universities for the purposes of expanding practical education in the marine sciences. In some cases, particularly where the economy of a region is closely tied to the sea, the participants under this program may decide to incorporate their marine programs into a sea grant college. These sea grant colleges would play a key role in the development of our ocean resources. They could grow into local centers of excellence in the marine sciences, stimulating the regional economy to reap the harvest of the seas. Their graduates would provide the leadership and the manpower to carry out the potential economic boom in oceanography. In most instances these sea grant colleges would be expansions of existing schools, like the ones in some of our great sea-coast States, although it might be desirable to create a sea grant college by itself. The bill also provides for those areas that have a limited, yet legitimate interest in ocean science and technology. In this latter case the sea grant educational program may be integrated into existing educational programs.

Emphasizing the need for this kind of educational program, in recent testimony before the Oceanography Subcommittee of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Dr. Donald F. Hornig, Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, clearly indicated that one of the major problems in the U.S. oceanography program is the lack of an adequate amount of trained manpower. This situation applies to all levels—from technicians up to senior scientists and project managers. To date the need is being recognized at only a few schools in the United States. An excellent example is the University of Rhode Island, which has an outstanding graduate school of oceanography.

This year, programs were created at the University of Rhode Island leading toward engineering degrees in oceanography at the graduate level. The university is also attempting to create a 2-year school to train fisheries technicians. This last program will have two very desirable results: it will provide a trained fisheries work force, and it will upgrade the level of the fisheries work force by increasing technical skills and improving understanding of the structure of the fisheries industry and of conservation practices. Recognizing that the fisheries industry in the United States is now almost a billion dollar business, and that the total value of oceanography to the economy could rise to 5½ billion in the next decade, it is clear that the Government should encourage the kind of programs being developed at the University of Rhode Island on a national scale. My bill would provide this assistance in the form of grants to and contracts with accredited academic institutions.

The second program of national scope is the creation of a source of funds available for the express purpose of supporting research that will lead to results of a direct and practical nature in the marine sciences. This applied research program is needed in many cases to translate the findings of basic research scientists into results that can be immediately incorporated into the operation of companies utilizing marine resources. This program would provide support as well as encouragement for research programs into the economic potential of the deep sea red crabs, manganese nodules, and the Indian Ocean fisheries, to name a few examples. The program would also sponsor applied research in fields of marine conservation, aquaculture techniques, including harvesting marine farms, pollution control, desalination, and similar areas. My bill would authorize a substantial program of grants and contracts, and so fill this pressing need.

The third major program created by this bill is a system of extension services designed to bring the latest developments in the marine sciences to the attention of workers in the field, scientists, and the interested public. The bill would accomplish this objective by sponsoring programs originating at the local level. To give an example, fishermen at Point Judith, R.I., who are interested in learning about midwater trawl methods, could initiate a program of lectures and demonstrations. Such a program, perhaps conducted in cooperation with the University of Rhode Island, might include sending a few Rhode Island fishermen to the west coast as observers, bringing in Bureau of Commercial Fisheries experts, and trial operation and evaluation afterward of the equipment and techniques in east coast waters for a season. The cost of this program would be repaid many times over if the development of a new fishery were the result.

The bill would also come to the immediate aid of schools and research institutions already in being but unfortunately small in number, like Oregon State University, the Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences, and the University

of Rhode Island. These institutions, and others currently like them involved in oceanography, are virtually besieged with requests for technical aid and advice in the marine sciences.

Finally, the bill recognizes that the participants in the sea grant program need to reserve portions of the Outer Continental Shelf for experimental programs. The bill allows for the setting aside of such portions of the sea floor and the associated resources as may be required for the purposes of the overall program. In this way, for example, scientists interested in developing different aquaculture techniques can acquire such seabed as may be necessary, and be assured that the experimental program will not be interrupted by conflicting operations in the same area.

In the years ahead, we must turn our attention and our energies to aquaculture, which can be defined as the beneficial cultivation and harvesting of the seas—both fresh and salt water and including the Great Lakes.

The legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to set aside seabed areas for any participants, including educational institutions and States, ocean-bordering and interior. It may be that some seacoast States may want to permit the use of underwater areas within their 3-mile limits for marine developments outlined in this act.

The funds for the bill represent only a small percentage of the income that this Nation already realizes from the utilization of the resources of the ocean environment. Since 1955, the Federal Government has realized over \$1.5 billion in bonuses, rents, and royalties for the use of marine areas bordering our coasts. It seems only reasonable to return 10 percent of this portion of the Nation's wealth into a program developing the knowledge and ability of our citizens in marine science. This must be done if we are to regain leadership in the harvesting of the seas' great resources. To use a small percentage of these sea revenues with the express purpose of advancing practical marine knowledge and technology would seem to me both appropriate and very much in the national interest.

The bill assigns the administration of the National Sea Grant College and Program Act to the National Science Foundation—an organization with an enviable scientific and administrative record. The foundation is unquestionably qualified to administer the provisions of this measure with a very capable oceanographic staff, although I intend to explore other possibilities for administration of these proposals.

It may be noted that there is a certain similarity between this measure and the two Morrill Acts, which created the land-grant schools; the Hatch Act, which first sponsored practical agricultural research; and the Smith-Lever Act, which created the Extension Service. The similarity is intentional. If this Congress can provide the same impetus to the marine sciences that the acts cited provided in agriculture, the leadership of the United States in developing the ocean resources is assured.

The history of agriculture in the United States has been one of rapid, almost explosive continued progress that has done much to make our Nation strong and great. Contour plowing, crop rotation, hybrid plants, and modern farm equipment all stand witness to American agricultural strength.

When the cause of the development of agriculture in the United States is sought, three main primary factors are noted. First, a strong educational program at the college level both graduate and undergraduate. Second, a program of applied research and development directed toward improving current practices and techniques. Finally, an extension service that brings the latest results to the workers involved.

The national sea grant college program, if enacted into law, would bring these three key attributes to the general field of marine sciences; and the impact of this measure would provide a great boost to our economy and world trade. It would increase employment, result in an expanded source of natural resources, and improve the welfare of the general public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I have introduced, the National Sea Grant Colleges and Program Act of 1965, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2439) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, so as to authorize the establishment and operation of Sea Grant Colleges and Programs by initiating and supporting programs of education, training, and research in the marine sciences and a program of advisory services relating to activities in the marine sciences, to facilitate the use of the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf by participants carrying out these programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2439

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1965."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(a) that marine resources, including animal and vegetable life and mineral wealth, constitute a far-reaching and largely untapped asset of immense potential significance to the United States; and

(b) that it is in the national interest of the United States to develop the skilled manpower, including scientists, engineers and technicians, and the facilities and equipment necessary for the exploitation of these resources; and

(c) that aquaculture, as with agriculture on land, and the gainful use of marine resources can substantially benefit the United

States by providing greater economic opportunities, including expanded employment and trade; new sources of food; new means for the utilization of water, both salt and fresh; and other valuable substances, such as those contained in the vast mineral deposits of the marine environment, advantageous to United States citizens and to the Nation's position in the world; and

(d) that, in order to implement these findings, the Federal Government should support sea grant colleges and programs by—

(1) initiating and supporting programs at sea grant colleges for the education and training of participants in the marine sciences;

(2) initiating and supporting necessary research and development programs in the marine sciences resulting in the acquisition of knowledge of a direct and practical nature, with preference given to programs that translate the findings of basic research to practices, techniques, and equipment applicable to the marine sciences;

(3) encouraging and developing programs consisting of instruction, practical demonstrations, publications, and otherwise, with the object of imparting useful information to persons currently employed or interested in the marine sciences, to the scientific community, and to the general public;

(4) encouraging the development of the marine resources by facilitating the use by participants under this Act of such portions of the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of clauses (1), (2), and (3); and

(5) encouraging and facilitating the expansion, development, or creation, of regional "centers of excellence" in the various fields related to the marine sciences, while retaining the traditional interests of the existing regional institutions and laboratories.

GRANT AND CONTRACTS FOR SEA GRANT COLLEGES AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 3 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1862) is amended by striking out the period at the end of clause (9) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding after clause (9) the following new clause:

"(10) to initiate and support programs of education, training, and research in the marine sciences and a program of advisory services relating to activities in the marine sciences."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 17 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1875) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, 10 per centum of all bonuses, rentals, royalties, and other sums (excluding amounts refunded under section 10 of such Act) paid to the Federal Government after June 30, 1965, for leases under such Act shall be deposited in a special account in the Treasury to be available only for appropriations to the Foundation, which are hereby authorized, to carry out the purposes of section 3(a)(10)."

(c) The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) is amended by inserting the following new section at the end thereof:

MARINE SCIENCES

"SEC. 18. (a) In carrying out the provisions of section 3(a)(10), the Foundation shall consult with scientists and engineers engaged in pursuits in the marine sciences and with agencies of the Government interested in, or affected by, activities in the marine sciences.

"(b) The Foundation shall exercise the authority derived from section 3(a)(10) in a manner consistent with the declaration

of policy stated in section 2 of the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1965.

"(c) Programs to carry out the purposes of section 3(a)(10) shall be accomplished through contracts with, or grants to, suitable public or private agencies, public or private institutions of higher learning, museums, foundations, industries, laboratories, corporations, organizations, or groups of individuals, which are engaged in, or concerned with, activities in the marine sciences, for the establishment and operation by them of such programs.

"(d) In order to facilitate the carrying out of programs engaged in pursuant to contracts or grants made under the provisions of section 3(a)(10), the Foundation is authorized to enter into agreements with the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the use, jointly or exclusively, by participants in such programs of such areas of the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf as may be appropriate, which will not cover any part of the outer Continental Shelf needed for national defense or interfere with or endanger any operations under any lease maintained or granted pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

"(e) For the purposes of section 3(a)(10) and this section—

"(1) The term 'marine sciences' means oceanographic and scientific endeavors and disciplines, engineering, and technology in and with relation to the marine environment, including, but not limited to the fields oriented toward the development, conservation, or economic utilization of the physical, chemical, geological, and biological resources of the marine environment; the fields of marine commerce and marine engineering; the fields relating to exploration or research in, the recovery of natural resources from, and the transmission of energy in, the marine environment; and the fields with respect to the study of the economic, legal, medical, or sociological problems arising out of the management, use, development, recovery, and control of the natural resources of the marine environment.

"(2) The term 'marine environment' means the oceans; the Continental Shelf of the United States, the Great Lakes; the seabed and subsurface of the submarine areas adjacent to the coasts of the United States to the depth of two hundred meters, or beyond that limit, to where the depths of the superjacent waters admit of the exploitation of the natural resources of the area; the seabed and subsurface of similar submarine areas adjacent to the coasts of islands which comprise United States territory; and the natural resources thereof.

"(3) The term 'sea grant college' means any suitable public or private institution of higher learning supported pursuant to the purposes of this Act."

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

AMENDMENT NO. 408

Mr. STENNIS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 9221) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, after "\$238,600,000" on page 4, line 24, insert the following: "Provided, That the Army Reserve shall be maintained at an average strength of not less than 270,000 during fiscal year 1966".

Mr. STENNIS also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 9221, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT NO. 409

Mr. STENNIS also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill H.R. 9221, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, on page 6, line 12, after "Code" insert the following: "Provided further, That the Army National Guard shall be maintained at an average strength of not less than 380,000 during fiscal year 1966".

Mr. STENNIS also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 9221 making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year, ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN CASUALTY LOSSES ATTRIBUTABLE TO MAJOR DISASTERS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 410

Mr. HARTKE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 7502) relating to the income tax treatment of certain casualty losses attributable to major disasters, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 2409) to prevent loss of veterans pension benefits as a result of increases provided under the Social Security Amendments of 1965 in monthly insurance benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act, the name of Mr. JACKSON and Mr. TYDINGS be added as cosponsors.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

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

Authority of August 11, 1965:

S. 2394. A bill to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States: Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. HARTKE.

Authority of August 12, 1965:

S. 2406. A bill to amend part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include payment for the costs of hospital inpatient professional services in the field of pathology, radiology, physiatry, and anesthesiology furnished by a hospital or by others under mutually agreeable arrangements between the persons providing such services and the hospital: Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MOSS, and Mrs. NEUBERGER.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON FEDERAL SALARY LEGISLATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wish to announce that the committee will resume the hearings on Federal salary legislation at 10 a.m., Monday, August 23, 1965.

Scheduled to testify on Monday are Mr. John A. Gronouski, Jr., the Postmaster General, and Mr. Marion B. Folsom, chairman of the President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries.

Further hearings will be announced at a later time. Anyone wishing to testify may arrange to do so by calling 225-5451.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Government Operations Committee will hold hearings on a number of bills designed to expand or clarify the law authorizing the donation of surplus property to schools, colleges, public health, and other related users.

Six bills are now pending before the subcommittee, on which it intends to receive testimony and recommendations. They are S. 525 and S. 707, introduced by Senator QUENTIN BURDICK and cosponsored by Senators ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BIBLE, CHURCH, CLARK, FULBRIGHT, INOUYE, JAVITS, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, McGEE, McGOVERN, MOSS, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota; S. 1066 by Senator LEE METCALF; S. 1362 by Senator CARL CURTIS; S. 1947 by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH; and S. 2015 by Senator MILTON YOUNG.

The hearings will be held in room 3302 of the New Senate Office Building on Thursday, August 26, 1965. I am making this announcement and wish to take this opportunity to invite the sponsors of the bills to appear and testify in behalf of these measures.

Anyone desiring to testify on any or all of these bills, should notify Mr. Glenn K. Shriver of the committee staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Orville H. Trotter, of Michigan, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of Michigan, term of 4 years (reappointment).

Richard P. Stein, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of Indiana, term of 4 years (reappointment).

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the Committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, August 26, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

HEARINGS ON NOMINATION FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF INTERIOR

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to announce that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold a public hearing next Monday, August 23, on the nomination by President Johnson of J. Cordell Moore, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources. The hearing will be at 2 o'clock in the committee hearing room, 3110 New Senate Office Building.

Mr. Moore has served as Administrator of the Oil Import Administration under Secretary Udall in the Department of the Interior for the past 4 years. Prior to this post, he had been Director of Security and Mobilization Activities in the Interior Department. He holds the rank of Captain in the Naval Reserve, serving in North Africa during the war.

The development of our mineral resources in the United States is a matter of deep interest and concern to all Members of the Congress and, indeed, to all Americans. I am pleased that the Interior Committee is taking speedy action on the President's nomination to fill this important post, from which John M. Kelly, of New Mexico, recently resigned.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a biographical sketch of Mr. Moore prepared at the time of his appointment as head of the Oil Import Administration be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

J. CORDELL MOORE

J. Cordell Moore, of Washington, D.C., was appointed Administrator of the Department of the Interior's Oil Import Administration, on August 18, 1961.

Prior to his appointment, Mr. Moore, a career employee of the Department, had been Director of the Division of Security, Office of the Secretary, and also had been staff Director of Defense Mobilization Activities of the Department.

Mr. Moore succeeded Lawrence J. O'Connor, Jr., who was appointed to the Federal Power Commission in 1961. As Oil Import Administrator, Mr. Moore is responsible for the administration of the mandatory oil import program.

From 1942 until 1946, he served on active duty in the Navy. Since returning to inactive duty he has been active in Reserve activities involving petroleum. He currently holds the rank of captain in the U.S. Naval Reserve.

Born in Winchester, Ill., on July 20, 1912, he attended public schools there. He was graduated from Illinois College in 1936 with a bachelor of arts degree, received his LL.B. degree from Georgetown University and did graduate work in geology at American University. He is a member of the Tennessee and Federal Bar Associations.

Prior to his appointment as Director of the Division of Security in 1952, he served 2 years as Assistant Director of the Department's Division of Property Management.

In the immediate postwar period, Mr. Moore was Executive Director, Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner (OFLC) for Latin America with headquarters in Panama. This agency was responsible for the disposal of all surplus U.S. property throughout South and Central America.

His other Government service, from 1936 to 1959, included the Department's National Park Service, the office of Congressman James N. Barnes, of Illinois, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Office of Alien Property, and the Department of Justice.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION FAVORING ENACTMENT OF THE FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association on August 10 favoring enactment of S. 1592, the bill which I have proposed to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

That resolution adopted by a vote of 184 to 26 was recommended to the bar by their section on criminal law and thus I request that their report be included following the resolution.

I commend the American Bar Association for its forthright action and I am confident that its endorsement will be a significant factor in moving S. 1592 through Congress for enactment into law.

I believe that its deliberative action recognized the constitutional rights of the individual, and the rights guaranteed to business and industry in the normal conduct of their affairs.

It is readily apparent that the bar has carefully weighed the effect which S. 1592 would have in curtailing the indiscriminate misuse of firearms against the minor inconvenience which it would cause the far more numerous law abiding citizens in the purchase of firearms. This resolution and report is in the public interest, and I mean by that, the best interest of the American people.

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

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION SECTION OF CRIMINAL LAW

RECOMMENDATION

Be it resolved, That the American Bar Association support the enactment of S. 1592, 89th Congress, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act, or similar Federal legislation.

Be it further resolved, That the section of criminal law be authorized to present the views of the American Bar Association on such legislation to the appropriate committees of Congress.

REPORT

Federal action directed at the control of firearms originated, for modern purposes of criminal control, in the National Firearm Act of June 26, 1934, which is now set out in sections 5801-62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This act, passed in reaction to the gang wars of the prohibition era and the post-prohibition crime waves, was directed at preventing criminals from obtaining firearms, such as machine guns, cane guns,

sawed-off shotguns, silencers and similar weapons, which were particularly suitable for criminal use. The act provides for special licensing taxes on importers, manufacturers, dealers and pawnbrokers dealing in such arms, imposes heavy transfer taxes on the transfer of such arms, requires the registration of such arms upon transfer and the registration of persons possessing such arms. Although written as a revenue measure, it was clearly intended to control the criminal commerce in firearms of a criminal character and provided penalties of up to 5 years' imprisonment.

The Federal Firearms Act of June 30, 1938, 15 U.S.C., sections 901-09, was designed to suppress crime by regulating the traffic in firearms and ammunition, and applied to all firearms. Its legislative history shows particular concern with "roaming racketeers and predatory criminals who know no State lines—a situation beyond the power of control by local authorities to such an extent as to constitute a national menace." *United States v. Platt*, 31 F. Supp. 788, 790 (S.D. Tex. 1940); see hearings on H.R. 9066 before House Committee on Ways and Means, 73d Cong., 2d sess. (1934). The act requires a dealer to obtain a Federal dealer's license by filing an application with the Internal Revenue Service and paying a fee of \$1. However, because of the simplicity of this requirement and of the other recordkeeping required by the law, this act has been called a "mail-order operation" in itself. Hearings before the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 88th Cong., 1st sess., pt. 14, at 3209 (1963).

The assassination of President John F. Kennedy on November 22, 1963, with a rifle reported to have been purchased by the accused assassin through the mails, brought public and congressional scrutiny to bear on the availability of firearms in the United States through mail orders and other uncontrolled channels of distribution. However, consideration of this problem had preceded that tragic event; concern with juvenile crime in which the use of mail-order weapons was an increasing factor led to hearings by the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary during early 1963, and legislation directed at the types of weapons and by juvenile criminals was introduced in August 1963 by Chairman Donn and other members of the subcommittee. The assassination brought the introduction of numerous other bills, the expansion of the Dodd bill, and greater concern about this problem.

S. 1975, 88th Cong., 1st sess., was introduced on August 2, 1963, by Senator Donn for himself and other members of the juvenile delinquency subcommittee, but this proposal was not enacted. Other legislation proposing varying techniques for controlling the interstate shipment of firearms was introduced in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. In addition, resolutions were introduced in the House of Representatives authorizing an investigation of the sale of firearms in interstate and foreign commerce.

On March 22, 1965, Senator Donn introduced S. 1592, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act. A copy of this bill is attached. Basically, the proposed legislation is designed to accomplish the following:

First. It would prohibit the shipment of firearms in interstate commerce, except between federally licensed manufacturers, dealers, and importers. This provision would have the effect of prohibiting the so-called mail-order traffic in firearms to unlicensed persons. It would leave to each State the responsibility and authority for controlling the sale and disposition of firearms within its borders. There are several important exceptions to this general prohibition against

interstate shipment. Sportsmen could continue to take their shotguns or rifles across State lines. Pistols could be carried in interstate commerce but only for a lawful purpose and only in conformity with State laws. Further, firearms could be shipped to a licensee for service and returned to the sender. However, a nonlicensee could no longer buy weapons from out-of-State mail-order dealers. Sales would be made by retail dealers and would thus be subject to record-keeping requirements. These records would then have new meaning; they would not be rendered futile by an unrecorded flow of mail-order guns.

Second. Licensed retail dealers would be required to limit sales of handguns to residents of their State who are 21 years of age or older; they would be prohibited from selling any firearm to a person under the age of 18. In accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, licensed dealers would be required to ascertain the identity and place of residence of a purchaser. Further, it would be unlawful for a dealer to sell a firearm to any person when he knows or has reasonable cause to believe that such person is under indictment for or has been convicted of a felony, or is a fugitive from justice. These provisions of the proposed legislation do not address themselves to the question of permits to possess or to use firearms, leaving it to the States and local communities to decide what they need and want in that regard. Thus, for example, while the bill limits the sale of shotguns and rifles to persons who are at least 18 years of age, it does not preclude such persons from using guns if such use is permitted by State or local law.

Third. The bill would raise the annual license fees for a dealer from the present token of \$1 to \$100. It would also establish a license fee of \$250 for a pawnbroker who deals in firearms. Specific standards are established under which an application for a license shall be disapproved after notice and opportunity for a hearing. The purpose of this provision of the proposed legislation is to limit the issuance of licenses to bona fide dealers. Under existing law, anyone other than a felon can, upon the mere allegation that he is a dealer and the payment of a fee of \$1, demand and obtain a license. According to the Secretary of the Treasury, some fifty or sixty thousand people have done this, some of them merely to put themselves in a position to obtain personal guns at wholesale. There would be nothing to prevent them from obtaining licenses in order to ship or receive concealable weapons through the mails, or to circumvent State or local requirements.

Fourth. The bill would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to curb the flow into the United States of surplus military weapons and other firearms not suitable for sporting purposes. However, weapons imported for science, research, or military training, or as antiques and curios, could be allowed.

Fifth. The importation and interstate shipment of large caliber weapons, such as bazookas and antitank guns, and other destructive devices would be brought under effective Federal control.

The Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Judiciary Committee has been holding hearings on S. 1592, commencing shortly after the introduction of this legislation. The testimony of witnesses appearing before the subcommittee has generally favored enactment of the legislation, particularly the testimony of witnesses who are concerned with any facet of law enforcement. The principal objections to the legislation seemed to stem from the National Rifle Association and its members. The position of the NRA was commented upon by Attorney General Katzenbach in a

statement to the subcommittee on May 19, 1965, excerpts of which appear below:

"This measure is not intended to curtail the ownership of guns among those legally entitled to own them. It is not intended to deprive people of guns used either for sport or for self-protection. It is not intended to force regulation on unwilling States.

"The purpose of this measure is simple: it is merely to help the States protect themselves against the unchecked flood of mail-order weapons to residents whose purposes might not be responsible or even lawful. S. 1592 would provide such assistance to the extent that the States and the people of the States want it.

"There is demonstrable need for regulation of the interstate mail-order sale of guns. This bill is a response to that need. It was carefully drafted; it is receiving detailed attention from this subcommittee.

"But nevertheless, S. 1592 now has itself become a target for the verbal fire of the National Rifle Association and others who represent hunters and sporting shooters. These opponents feel their views most deeply, as is evident from the bitterness and volume of their opposition. It is no secret to any Member of Congress that the NRA sent out a mailing of 700,000 letters to its membership urging a barrage of mail to Senators and Congressmen.

"There is no question that the views of the NRA should be heard and given full weight. There is no question that so many people with an interest in gun legislation should have every opportunity to express it. But those views, also, need to be evaluated, and thus I would like now to turn to analysis of the opposition arguments.

"It has been suggested, for example, by Franklin Orth, executive vice president of the NRA, that S. 1592 gives the Secretary of the Treasury unlimited power to surround all sales of guns by dealers with arbitrary and burdensome regulations and restrictions.

"I fear this is an exaggeration flowing from the heat of opposition. The Secretary's regulations must be reasonable. I should think that the reasonableness of the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury under the existing provisions of the Federal Firearms Act would contradict the assumption of burdensome regulations.

"Further, the Administrative Procedure Act assures all interested parties of an opportunity to be heard before the issuance of substantive rules and regulations. The NRA and other gun interests have, in the past, taken full advantage of this opportunity and clearly could do so in the future. And still further, the regulations are subject to review and reversal by the courts and by Congress should they be felt arbitrary and capricious.

"It has also been suggested that S. 1592 requires anyone engaged in the manufacture of ammunition to pay \$1,000 for a manufacturer's license. The bill does not do so. It does not cover shotgun ammunition at all, and the license fee for manufacturers of other types of ammunition is \$500.

"It is true that anyone selling rifle ammunition, even .22 caliber, would be compelled to have a \$100 dealer license. Why shouldn't he? He is dealing in ammunition for a lethal weapon. The many dealers in ammunition who also sell firearms would not, however, be required to pay an additional ammunition fee. Nor is there anything in the legislation that would, as has been stated, require a club engaged in reloading for its members to obtain a manufacturer's license.

"A further specific objection raised against this measure is that it would forbid a dealer to sell to a nonresident of his State. The objection is stated in a misleading way. The bill does not forbid such sales of handguns, but

it specifically excepts weapons like rifles and shotguns most commonly used by sportsmen and least commonly used by criminals.

"A similar objection is made on the grounds that the measure would prohibit all mail-order sales of firearms to individuals. While this is an accurate description of the measure with respect to interstate and foreign commerce, the bill would not foreclose now allowable shipments within a State. Any control of such commerce is left to the States.

"One last comment on the specific NRA objections, as expressed in the letter sent to its membership. The letter described this measure as one which conceivably could lead to the elimination of 'the private ownership of all guns.' I am compelled to say that this is not conceivable. I am compelled to say that there is only one word which can serve in reply to such a fear—preposterous.

* * * * *

"More generally, I really cannot understand why the legislation we are talking about should seem a threat at all to sportsmen, hunters, farmers, and others who have a productive or necessary or enjoyable interest in the use of rifles, shotguns or sporting hand guns. Nothing that we propose here could intelligently be construed as impairing the enjoyment they derive from shooting.

"This legislation would, indeed, make some changes in the distribution of firearms. It would, indeed, by outlawing mail-order sales of firearms between States, bring about changes in the commercial firearms world. It would, indeed, challenge interests which have thrived on the present state of unregulated chaos. But such a challenge is tragically overdue.

* * * * *

"Which is more significant, the right not to be slightly inconvenienced in the purchase of a firearm, or the right not to be terrorized, robbed, wounded, or killed?

"As the chief law enforcement officer of the United States, I come before you today to ask you to supply the only conceivable answer to that question. I come, with all the urgency at my command, to ask the subcommittee to report this measure favorably and to ask the Congress to enact it without delay."

Two further objections have been made to the proposed legislation. The first that it is unconstitutional, and the second is that, even if enacted, the criminal will still get guns by the simple process of stealing them or buying them from a "gun bootlegger."

With respect to the constitutional issue, both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General of the United States have affirmed that the bill was carefully drafted to insure its constitutionality. It is the view of the section of criminal law that there is no merit to an objection to the legislation on constitutional grounds. The vast body of authority under the commerce clause supports Federal control of the distribution of firearms by means of interstate commerce. Further, it seems clear that the right to bear arms protected by the second amendment relates only to the maintenance of the militia; that amendment does not prevent the reasonable regulation of interstate commerce in firearms in the interest of public safety. It should be noted that the legislation does not apply to agencies and departments of Federal, State, and local governments.

With respect to the second objection, viz, that, even if the legislation is enacted, it will not prevent the criminal from obtaining a gun, the statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury to the subcommittee is illuminating. Excerpts follow:

"Mr. Chairman, I am happy to appear before your committee in association with my

colleague, the Attorney General, and other representatives of the administration in support of S. 1592 to amend the Federal Firearms Act, because I feel that enactment of this piece of legislation is of great importance to the welfare of this country and its citizens.

"S. 1592 is designed to implement the recommendations which the President set forth with respect to firearms control in his message to the Congress of March 8, 1965, relating to law enforcement and the administration of justice.

"The President, in that message, described crime as 'a malignant enemy in America's midst' of such extent and seriousness that the problem is now one 'of great national concern.' The President also stated, and I quote from his message, 'The time has come now, to check that growth, to contain its spread, and to reduce its toll of lives and property.'

"As an integral part of the war against the spread of lawlessness, the President urged the enactment of more effective firearms control legislation, and cited as a significant factor in the rise of violent crime in the United States 'the case with which any person can acquire firearms.'

"The President recognized the necessity for State and local action, as well as Federal action, in this area and he urged 'the Governors of our States and mayors and other local public officials to review their existing legislation in this critical field with a view to keeping lethal weapons out of the wrong hands.' However, the President also clearly recognized in his message that effective State and local regulation of firearms is not feasible unless we strengthen at the Federal level controls over the importation of firearms and over the interstate shipment of firearms. The President advised that he was proposing draft legislation to accomplish these aims, and stated, and I quote, 'I recommend this legislation to the Congress as a sensible use of Federal authority to assist local authorities in coping with an undeniably menace to law and order and to the lives of innocent people.'

"Anyone who reads the papers today or hears the news on radio and television cannot help but be appalled at the extent of crime and lawlessness in this country and at the extent of the loss of lives through the use of weapons in the hands not only of criminals but also juveniles, the mentally sick and other irresponsible people. Every day the lives of decent American citizens, our greatest national asset, are being snuffed out through the misuse and abuse of firearms by persons who should not have access to them.

* * * * *

"What the bill does is to institute Federal controls in areas where the Federal Government can and should operate, and where the State governments cannot, the areas of interstate and foreign commerce. Under our Federal constitutional system, the responsibility for maintaining public health and safety is left to the State governments under their police powers. Basically, it is the province of the State governments to determine the conditions under which their citizens may acquire and use firearms. I certainly hope that in those States where there is not now adequate regulation of the acquisition of firearms, steps will soon be taken to institute controls complementing the steps taken in this bill in order to deal effectively with this serious menace.

"Since a bureau of my Department is responsible for the administration of the Firearms Act, I am particularly anxious that the changes proposed in the bill with respect to the issuance of licenses to manufacture, import and deal in firearms be adopted. Under existing law, anyone other than a felon can, upon the mere allegation that he is a dealer

and payment of a fee of \$1, demand and obtain a license. Some 50,000 or 60,000 people have done this, some of them merely to put themselves in a position to obtain personal guns at wholesale. The situation is wide open for the obtaining of licenses by irresponsible elements, thus facilitating the acquisition of these weapons by criminals and other undesirables. The bill before you, by increasing license fees and imposing standards for obtaining licenses, will go a long way toward rectifying this situation.

"One misconception about this bill which has been widely publicized is that it will make it possible for the Federal Government to institute such regulations and restrictions as will create great difficulties for law-abiding citizens in acquiring, owning, or using firearms for sporting purposes. This is absolutely not so. Sportsmen will continue to be able to obtain rifles and shotguns from licensed dealers and manufacturers subject only to the requirements of their respective State laws. Indeed, they can travel to another State and purchase a rifle or shotgun from a licensed dealer there and bring it home with them without interference. Only two minor inconveniences may occur for the sportsmen of this country. They will not be able to travel to another State and purchase a pistol or concealable weapon, and they will not be able to obtain a direct shipment from another State of any type of firearm. On this latter point, the inconvenience is more apparent than real because the large mail-order houses have outlets in most of the States and the bill will permit mail-order shipments to individual citizens from these outlets.

"These minor inconveniences have been found to be necessary in order to make it possible for the States to regulate effectively the acquisition and possession of firearms. Obviously, State authorities cannot control the acquisition and possession of firearms if they have no way of knowing or ascertaining what firearms are coming into their States through the mails or, in the case of concealable weapons, by personally being carried across State lines.

* * * * *

"Today, the people of the United States are living under the most ideal conditions which have ever existed for any peoples anywhere on earth. Yet much of this is threatened by the spreading cancer of crime and juvenile delinquency. It is absolutely essential that steps such as those proposed in this bill be taken to bring under control one of the main elements in the spread of this cancer, the indiscriminate acquisition of weapons of destruction. In concluding my statement, may I say that the Department's experience with the existing Federal Firearms Act has resulted in a feeling of frustration since the controls provided by it are so obviously inadequate in the ways that I have indicated. In drafting S. 1592 we have had in mind these inadequacies and now have, we believe, a bill, which, when enacted, will provide effective controls without jeopardizing or interfering with the freedom of law-abiding citizens to own firearms for legitimate purposes. I strongly support the enactment of S. 1592."

For a number of years, the section of criminal law has considered that the loose and ineffective controls on the sale of firearms, particularly handguns, has been a contributing factor to the increasing crime rate. At the midyear meeting of the American Bar Association in February 1964, the section recommended to the house of delegates that action should be taken by the association "to draft a uniform State firearms statute and appropriate Federal legislation." During the annual meeting in August 1964, the section presented a program on the subject, "The What, When, and Why of Gun Legislation." Distinguished speakers, including a law enforcement officer, a judge, a private citizen,

and representatives of the National Rifle Association explored the subject in depth and detail. Although no formal action of the section followed this panel program, it was clear that the sentiment of the large majority of the members attending the session favored more effective firearms controls.

In summary, in determining whether the American Bar Association should support the enactment of S. 1592, or similar Federal legislation, the following specific questions and answers should be considered:

First. Does the relatively free interstate traffic in firearms contribute materially to the increasing crime rate in the United States?

Answer. The available evidence indicates clearly that a considerable number of crimes are committed by persons who have been able to acquire firearms easily, particularly handguns.

Second. Is it within the constitutional power of the Federal Government to establish controls on the interstate movement of firearms?

Answer. No lengthy legal brief is necessary to show that the Federal Government under the commerce clause is empowered to establish reasonable controls upon the interstate movement of firearms.

Third. If the States and local governments enacted stringent controls on the purchase, possession, and use of firearms, would it be necessary or desirable for the Federal Government to legislate in this area?

Answer. Although stringent State and local control of firearms would assist materially in reducing the possession and use of firearms for unlawful purposes, State and local controls cannot be effective unless the Federal Government prevents the relatively free and unimpeded flow of firearms into the several States through the channels of interstate commerce.

Fourth. Are the controls contained in S. 1592 reasonable?

Answer. Few persons will interpose reasonable objections to the purpose or to the major provisions of S. 1592. Reasonable men might differ as to the necessity for certain of the specific provisions. For example, it can be argued that the provisions which preclude a licensed retail dealer from selling rifles and shotguns to persons under the age of 18, or from selling handguns to persons under the age of 21, are an unwarranted usurpation of the power of the States and local governments to decide who may possess and use firearms. However, almost everyone would agree that these restrictions are reasonable if firearms are to be kept out of the hands of irresponsible juveniles. Further, it is clear that the control of such sales, even though local in nature, can best be established by Federal insistence, through licensing procedures, that dealers adhere to fixed standards in all of the States. Otherwise, it would be difficult to prevent a juvenile from purchasing a firearm in a State where the sale is permitted, and carrying it to a State where such a sale is prohibited.

The council of the section of criminal law is of the opinion that S. 1592 represents a reasonable and desirable step forward in law enforcement. Although this legislation will cause minor inconvenience to the law-abiding citizen who desires to buy a gun, it will not prevent him from acquiring one. This minor inconvenience is the price that must be paid if the Federal Government is to do its part to assist the States in maintaining effective control over firearms.

For the above reasons, the section of criminal law, acting through its council in accordance with section 6, article VI, of its bylaws, recommends that the American Bar Association support the enactment of S. 1592, or similar Federal legislation.

KENNETH J. HODSON,
Chairman.

EFFECTIVE FEDERAL FIREARMS LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TYDINGS AT THE CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS before the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, meeting in convention in Miami, Fla., on August 10, 1965, concerning the need for enactment of S. 1592, a bill which I introduced and he cosponsored to amend the Federal Firearms Act. This measure was introduced at the request of the administration.

Senator TYDINGS' interest in and concern for the problem of firearms misuse in this land is clearly evidenced in his remarks before the American Bar Association. I am personally familiar with his concern for the youth of America because of his efforts as a member of the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

I know that the sincerity of his position was reflected in the overwhelming support given the bill (S. 1592) by the bar, and I commend him in this regard.

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

EFFECTIVE FEDERAL FIREARMS LEGISLATION—A MODERATE RESPONSE TO A CRITICAL PROBLEM

I understand that the house of delegates will this week consider a resolution in support of Senate bill 1592, which would amend and greatly strengthen the Federal Firearms Act. I am, together with Senator THOMAS J. Dodd, of Connecticut, and others, a sponsor of this legislation. I am also a member of the subcommittee that has been holding hearings on the bill. I, therefore, welcome this opportunity to explain the reasons I support it.

This bill has been the target of heavy fire from one of the most intense pressure campaigns I have ever seen. I have received thousands of letters, most of them based, I am sorry to say, on misleading propaganda and misinformation.

If I thought the heavy mail I am receiving represented the informed opinion of my constituents, it would give me great pause. But, it is clear that the overwhelming majority of writers do not understand what the bill would really do. In the case of one group of several hundred letters, obviously inspired by the National Rifle Association, the writers uniformly misspelled my name. Now, my wife says that is a good way to cut a junior Senator down to size. But, I can tell you it is not the way to impress him that the writer is well informed.

I wish to make clear at the outset that this bill would not interfere with the legitimate use of firearms. I, myself, am a hunter. There is nothing I enjoy more than a morning in the duckblinds with Major, our Chesapeake Bay retriever. I am also an enthusiastic, if not accurate, skeet shooter.

If I thought this bill really interfered with bona fide hunters and sportsmen, I would oppose it with all my force.

Rather, I am persuaded after careful study and extensive hearings that the bill as drawn, with only a few minor amendments, is a reasonable and moderate response to a serious national problem.

We read daily of shootings, murders, and armed felonies. We all are aware that crime has become a problem of crisis proportions.

I am convinced from the facts that the uncontrolled distribution of guns is contributing to our crime problem.

The particular evil which is the target of the firearms bill is uncontrolled interstate mail-order traffic in guns and destructive devices. This traffic is placing lethal weapons in the hands of minors without the knowledge or consent of their parents. It is allowing criminals and the mentally unstable to obtain weapons they could not get legally on the local market. It is stocking the private arsenals of secretive extremist groups—the Ku Klux Klan, the Black Muslims, and the so-called Minutemen. Above all, it is undermining the firearms laws and regulations of our States and cities.

The bulk of the mail-order trade, and especially of that part which this legislation is intended to choke off, consists of cheap foreign weapons—mostly military castoffs—which are being dumped on our shores by the millions. Most of these imported guns are of inferior quality, often to the point of endangering their owners. Most are unsuited for hunting, sport shooting, or any other legitimate activity. Even the National Rifle Association professed itself willing to see these imports curbed.

Law enforcement agencies can cite case after case in which mail-order weapons have been used in the perpetration of crime, incident after tragic incident of accidental injury or death caused by mail-order guns in the hands of minors.

On the west coast recently, two ex-convicts robbed banks in four cities and finally shot a police officer in Los Angeles. They obtained the guns they used by mail order under a false name. The dealer's principal place of business is Los Angeles, but the guns were shipped from Nevada in order to circumvent California law.

Last winter a boy from Baltimore shot and killed his father, mother, and sister with a foreign revolver purchased from a Los Angeles firm. As he was arrested another weapon was on its way.

Many of you will remember last year's attempt by anti-Castro Cubans to shell the United Nations Building in New York City. The weapon was a German World War II mortar which had been imported into the United States by a New Jersey firm.

Aggregate figures demonstrate that these are not isolated cases. These are the facts:

Fact 1: Law enforcement agencies estimate that approximately half of all firearms used in the commission of crime are obtained through the mail-order trade.

Fact 2: Every year thousands of Americans are cut down by gunfire. Five thousand and ninety were killed by guns in 1964 alone. A great many of these deaths need never have happened if the guns had not been easily obtainable and in the hands of the wrong people.

Fact 3: Guns are simply deadlier than other weapons. In 1963, 1 out of 20 assaults with a weapon in the United States ended in death. Where guns were used, however, one out of five assaults ended in death.

Fact 4: Ratios of homicide by firearms to all homicides drop sharply in areas where strict firearms controls are in effect. In Dallas and Phoenix, for example, firearms regulations are virtually nonexistent. In 1963, 72 percent of homicides committed in Dallas were committed with guns, and 66 percent of homicides committed in Phoenix were committed with guns. By contrast, Philadelphia and New York City have strong firearms controls. In Philadelphia 36 percent, and in New York 25 percent, of all 1963 homicides were committed with guns. Since assaults with guns result in death far more often than assaults with other weapons, it is reasonable to conclude that the New York and Philadelphia gun laws have saved many lives.

Fact 5: Of 225 law enforcement officers who have been killed by criminals in the last 4 years, 95 percent were shot to death. Seventy-three percent of the killers had been convicted of crimes before acquiring the murder weapon.

I agree with the critics who say that crimes are committed by evil or misguided people, and not by guns. Of course, we cannot make people law abiding by restricting their access to guns. But we can make their antisocial actions less serious.

We must remember that we are not only concerned with the deliberate, scheming, professional criminal. I concede that we probably cannot keep guns from his hands. But we seek also to halt juvenile gang warfare, emotional crime sprees, and spur-of-the-moment crimes of passion.

It is for such people that the mail-order trade is a particularly attractive source of supply. Four thousand Chicagoans received weapons from just two mail-order dealers over a 3-year period. One thousand of them had criminal records.

This is not really surprising. The mail-order gun trade, and particularly the part of the trade against which the firearms bill is directed, is calculated to appeal to the juvenile and the criminal. Advertising, which appears primarily in mail-order catalogs and cheap pulp magazines, is couched in lurid language geared to lower impulses and bound to incite the impressionable.

The primary advantage of mail-order purchase from the point of view of juveniles and criminals is the anonymity it affords them. The prospective purchaser simply clips an advertisement and forwards it together with his deposit. He gets back an order blank on which he must certify that he is over 21 and has never been convicted of a crime of violence. The form is returned to the dealer, who ships the gun via common or contract carrier.

The mail-order trade circumvents the law even within some States. California, for example, prohibits the mail-order sale of concealable firearms within the State. But certain mail-order firms simply send an ordered firearm to an out-of-State mail drop, where it is rewrapped and forwarded to the California purchaser. The State is powerless against this blatant evasion of its public policy.

The firearms bill is, in my judgment, an essential but moderate response to the problems I have outlined. Let me describe the provisions of S. 1592.

S. 1592, if enacted, would prohibit interstate traffic in firearms except between licensed dealers, manufacturers and importers. This provision would prevent the interstate retail purchase of guns by mail. But it would not prevent any law-abiding adult from walking into a local store and buying or ordering a gun. A man living in a remote area could still order his gun by mail or phone from any dealer in his State. Nor would the bill prohibit any persons from taking his gun across States lines for a lawful purpose.

Further, S. 1592 would prohibit sale of pistols and revolvers to persons under 21 and of rifles and shotguns to persons under 18. But it would not prohibit sale of guns to adults for youngsters. They would remain free to use, though not to buy, such weapons. Nothing in the bill would prevent a boy from learning to hunt and shoot. The purpose is to insure that a youth use these dangerous instruments only with the consent, and hopefully, the supervision, of his parent or guardian.

S. 1592 would also prohibit sale of pistols and revolvers to persons who do not reside in the State where the dealer does his business. In other words, a person could not cross State lines to buy a pistol. But an out-of-Stater could go into any store and buy a sporting rifle or shotgun.

S. 1592 would restrict the importation of firearms into the United States. But it would not prohibit importation of sporting and hunting weapons or of antiques.

S. 1592 would also establish a more effective system of Federal licensing. It would severely restrict sale and transport of sawed-off shotguns and rifles, which are not used, I need not tell you, for hunting. And it would impose controls on traffic in destructive devices and ammunition such as grenades, mines, machineguns, and bazookas.

But S. 1592 would not require Federal registration of firearms. And it would not permit confiscation of firearms from any law-abiding citizen.

The administration has proposed several technical amendments to the firearms bill which meet several legitimate criticisms made during the course of the hearings. These are amendments designed expressly to protect antique gun collectors, to exclude altogether from the provisions of the bill all ammunition except for destructive devices, and to lower certain license fees. These amendments are likely to be accepted by our subcommittee.

Only the Federal Government, as all of you know, has the power to regulate interstate commerce. If the States are to carry out their police power responsibilities for public health and safety, the Federal Government must exercise its power. I believe it has a duty to do so.

The gun lobby and their friends attack the firearms bill on the ground that it violates the second amendment of the Constitution. As I understand the second amendment, their argument lacks merit.

The second amendment provides: "A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

The history of the second amendment, as well as its language, indicate that it was intended to protect the right of the States to organize and maintain a militia. The provision has been so read by courts and commentators alike.

Misleading quotation of the second half of the amendment by gun-lobby publicists has injected a red herring into the debate. Every lawyer knows that firearms legislation in nearly every State, as well as the National Firearms Act, and the existing Federal Firearms Act, have been repeatedly upheld by the courts against constitutional challenge.

In addition to the constitutional question, the gun lobby has attempted to create an emotional concern around the erroneous contention that the bill would disarm the law-abiding citizen. As a study of the bill will reveal, it does nothing of the sort.

Ladies and gentlemen, the proposed State Firearms Control Assistance Act of 1965 is a most significant piece of legislation. I know that the house of delegates of the American Bar Association will study it carefully and will make known to the Congress and to the American public its recommendations for specific changes.

I hope that this association will throw the weight of its very considerable influence behind this bill. We have a responsibility to the victims of crime and violence, a responsibility which in my judgment far outweighs any petty inconveniences the firearms bill would cause to sportsmen, collectors, and other legitimate gun users.

SELLING WHEAT TO THE SOVIETS FOR GOLD

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last week the Canadian Government announced the sale of 4.6 million tons of wheat and 400,000 tons of wheat equivalent in flour to the Soviet Union.

It is estimated these transactions involved \$450 million.

It is little wonder that Prime Minister Pearson is reported as describing this latest wheat sale as "exciting" and "spectacular." Not only will it have a stimulating effect on that nation's economy but also it will lighten the deficit in Canada's international balance of payments.

Secondary benefits may flow to the United States as a result of this Canadian sale.

As an editorial in the *New York Times* stated:

If the Russians pay for a good portion of their purchases by selling gold in London, the (U.S.) Treasury will not have to supply as much gold from its own dwindling stock to meet the demands of private and official sellers of dollars.

A second advantage which would accrue to both countries concerns the St. Lawrence Seaway. American and Canadian officials estimate that the 187 million bushels wheat and flour deal with the Soviet Union will add between 4.5 and 5 million short tons of business to the locks and channels of the St. Lawrence Seaway during the current season and a portion of the 1966 season. This traffic will add \$2 million to Seaway revenues that have been insufficient to pay off the capital outlay of the waterway since its completion in 1959.

We can take some solace in these indirect benefits to us and heavy direct benefits to Canada. But, looking to the future and the potential wheat needs of Russia, it should be made clear to the American public why the American wheat farmer was foreclosed from competing for this latest sale.

The average U.S. yearly export of wheat for dollars from 1957 to 1961 was 172 million bushels. In 1962, 151 million bushels were exported for dollars. In 1963, the year we sold to Russia and France, the figure rose to 352 million bushels.

One hundred and sixty-five million bushels were exported for dollars in 1964. Thus, with the exception of 1963, the Canadian sale of 187,000 bushels last week exceeds our total yearly export of wheat for dollars in every year from 1957 through 1964.

Wheat sales to the Soviet bloc have been declared in the national interest. Studies indicate that liberalization of East-West trade of nonstrategic materials serves a useful purpose. I refer to the report of the President's Special Committee on U.S. Trade Relations with Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union; also to the statement issued by the Committee for Economic Development.

In this connection, an editorial appearing in the *Washington Post* of May 20, which compares these two opinions, is of interest; and I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

TRADE WITHOUT ILLUSION

With the simultaneous appearance of two thoughtful policy statements, this is a time for introspection on East-West trade. The

Committee for Economic Development (CED), a group of prominent American business executives, joined with its counterparts, the European Committee for Economic and Social Progress and the Japanese Keizai Doyukai, to issue a statement on "East-West Trade: A Policy for the West." And the White House released the report of the President's Special Committee on U.S. Trade Relations and East European Countries and the Soviet Union. Both statements reflect the views of private business interests.

The common trust of both statements is that trade in nonstrategic goods between Communists and non-Communist countries should be expanded. Both the CED and the President's committees, as distinguished from their European and Japanese counterparts, would bar trade with Communist China and Cuba. But aside from this predictable and very significant difference of opinion, the two sets of recommendations are essentially alike.

Where the two reports differ is in setting forth the motives for increasing trade with the Communist bloc. According to the President's committee: "Political, not commercial or economic, considerations should determine the formulation and execution of our trade policies." The CED and its counterparts state that: "In trade with Eastern countries we hope to realize the same kinds of economic benefits we expect in trade among ourselves." Juxtaposing these two statements admittedly exaggerates the differences between the two reports. Yet it serves the useful purpose of contrasting two views of East-West trade.

Those who uphold the political view seek goals which, in our opinion, are unrealistic. Some of its proponents see international trade as a means of winning Communist countries over to the liberal principles of free-enterprise capitalism. Such hopes are hardly justified. Some of the European Communist countries can conceivably gain a greater measure of independence from Soviet Russia by increasing their trade with the West. Yet it is difficult to envisage international trade as a prime mover in the process.

A second politically motivated group would join the AFL-CIO representative on the President's Committee in emphasizing the necessity for "political quid pro quo concessions." It is all very well to argue that the Communists should give way on Berlin or some other issue in return for the expansion of trade. But if increased trade were so important to the Communists as this view assumes, concessions would have been made long ago.

The question of East-West trade should be approached without illusions. Trade with the Communists will result in neither political concessions nor ideological conversions. It will confer economic benefits upon the West, hopefully greater than those realized by the East. That, in the final analysis, is the soundest reason for expanding it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the estimated price per bushel of No. 3 Manitoba sold by Canada to the Soviets is \$1.83. This grade compares with U.S. No. 1 Northern Spring, 15 percent protein, which sells at a price of \$1.82 a bushel. Both prices are f.o.b. St. Lawrence. Thus U.S. wheat is competitively priced with Canadian wheat.

Nevertheless, because of the requirement that 50 percent of wheat sold to Russia must be carried in vessels under the U.S. flag, we are not competitive in wheat sales for dollars.

That fact is demonstrated by a comparison of freight rates. From St. Lawrence to Odessa, the foreign-flag ship rate per long ton is \$10 while the U.S.-flag ship rate is \$17.50. From the Gulf to

Odessa, the foreign rate is \$10.50, but the U.S. rate is \$18. This means that the price of U.S. wheat is increased 12 to 15 cents a bushel by the 50-50 requirement.

This 50-50 requirement, as applied to commercial grain sales, is an exception to the general rule that cargo preference acts are inapplicable to strictly commercial sales. It is also a fact that no other U.S. commercial export sales are subject to this limitation. Cargo preference acts actually apply only to cargo generated by the U.S. Government.

This unusual requirement on commercial export sales of grain has been imposed by the Office of Export Control of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

On April 7, Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles S. Murphy, testifying before the Subcommittee on Federal Procurement and Regulation of the Joint Economic Committee hearings concerning discriminatory ocean freight rates and the balance of payments, stated:

It is important to draw a sharp distinction between the requirement for use of U.S. shipping in this case of commercial sales, on the one hand, and the requirement, on the other hand, for use of U.S. shipping in the case of Government-aided sales where the additional shipping costs are paid by the Government. In the former case, the commercial sales, the requirement for use of U.S. shipping is not a statutory one; in the latter case, it is. Also, in the latter case, the Government-aided sales, the requirement for using U.S. shipping does not prevent the export business from occurring because the Government pays the additional costs. In the former case, the commercial sales, the shipping requirement prevents the export business from occurring at all because the importing country turns to alternative sources of supply.

In short, there is no advantage to this country when potential commercial sales of agricultural products for dollars are stifled and impeded by a requirement that half the cargo be carried in U.S.-flag vessels, for as Secretary MURPHY pointed out to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee earlier this year:

The actual effect of this requirement is—not to provide additional business for the U.S. Merchant Marine—but to prevent U.S. longshoremen, U.S. exporters and U.S. farmers from having employment and earnings that would otherwise accrue.

If then it is in the national interest to export wheat for dollars, if further the 50-50 requirement impedes possible sales at the same time affords no benefit to the troubled U.S. Merchant Marine, I again recommend that the Secretary of Commerce remove this barrier to export sales of farm commodities for dollars. Such action on his part would not only aid the farmers of America, but also would be a major contributing factor to improvement in one of our most serious problems—the continuing unfavorable balance of payments.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. FONG. Mr. President. This Saturday, August 21, marks the 6th an-

niversary of Hawaii's admission into the Union as a State. On that day in 1959, President Eisenhower proclaimed Hawaii the 50th State, the culmination of a long and arduous campaign by Hawaii's people and their friends for political equality.

In elevating the Hawaiian Islands to a State, the 86th Congress and the President reaffirmed our Nation's dedication to the principles of self-determination and self-government.

It demonstrated to the people of the Pacific and the world—that regardless of race, color, or creed—citizens of the United States, when they inhabit an incorporated territory which has political and economic maturity, will be accorded all the privileges of citizenship.

The people of Hawaii cherish deeply these privileges of citizenship—all the more because they were so hard-won after so many years. Hawaii's people value highly first-class citizenship—all the more because they were relegated to second-class citizenship for more than half a century.

While Hawaii enjoys the many blessings of statehood today, its island neighbors in the western Pacific, the 88,000 inhabitants of the Pacific Trust Territory, remain in a state of uncertainty as to their future political status.

Under an agreement with the United Nations Trusteeship Council, the United States has assumed the responsibility of promoting self-government or independence for the trust territory, more commonly known as Micronesia.

Nearly 2 decades have passed since the trust territory was entrusted to our Nation's care. For various compelling reasons which I discussed in this Chamber yesterday, our country must come to grips with the question of our future policy toward these farflung islands. For we are, in effect, acting as a colonial power without a colonial policy in our relationship with the trust territory at present.

The time has come to start exploring this question in depth. That was my intention in introducing yesterday a resolution proposing that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands be made a part of the State of Hawaii.

On the eve of the sixth anniversary of Hawaiian statehood, I wish to call attention to two timely editorials which appeared in the past few days in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, one titled "Faster Than Statehood," the other "First Step—Citizenship."

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorials printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Aug. 16, 1965]

FIRST STEP—CITIZENSHIP

The United States is a colonial power without a colonial policy.

This situation has developed in the main because we have been smitten with the idea that our wars were not fought for territorial gain.

True enough, but we have taken over the Trust Islands of the Pacific and Okinawa from Japan since World War II, and we have held ownership of Guam, American Samoa,

Wake, Johnston, and other islands for far longer periods.

The current interest in a Pacific State is making us think about a policy for the Pacific, and getting our wards to think about it, too.

We can be encouraged that even if they don't seem to be jumping at the suggestion that they join the State of Hawaii, they at least show no disposition to leave the U.S. fold.

All the alternatives suggested so far by the island people themselves have been proposals for a future as part of the United States—with U.S. citizenship high on the priority list.

The grant of such citizenship to the Pacific peoples seems like one of the easiest first steps.

It hardly needs to await resolution of the other problems, though it will amount to a commitment to find solutions under the American flag, thus making official the common denominator in all present discussions.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Aug. 31, 1965]

FASTER THAN STATEHOOD

Sixty-seven years ago—on August 12, 1898—the American flag was raised over Hawaii as annexation became official.

The annexation resolution had been approved by Congress on July 7, but it took 5 weeks for a certified copy finally to reach here and be presented to President Sanford Dole of the Republic of Hawaii.

Today we can see in fascinating parallel how much changed communication has speeded the tempo of affairs.

A similar 5-week period has elapsed since Governor Burns advanced his endorsement of the Pacific State concept on July 5.

Washington leaders reacted to the idea the next day. It has since been discussed on the floor of the Senate. A House committee has about decided to inquire into the subject.

Japan and Russia have made official inquiries about it. The Nation's press has discussed it.

The Guam Legislature has expressed a desire for a political entity separate from Hawaii and has sent a delegation to Saipan to discuss with the Congress of Micronesia its idea of affiliating Guam and the trust territory.

The pace of events in the Pacific in the early 20th century was such that 61 years passed between Hawaiian annexation and statehood.

The political future of the Pacific islands won't be decided today or tomorrow, but, neither—we may be confident—will the situation wait 61 years for a resolution.

THE REDEEMERS ARMS SENIOR CITIZENS HOME IN ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I was privileged to attend and speak at the dedication on August 1, 1965, of the Redeemers Arms Senior Citizens Home in St. Paul, Minn. The home will be occupied by 192 senior citizens when filled, and with its 160 apartments, has offices, conference rooms, lounges, and recreational facilities.

Its completion is a tribute to the perseverance and initiative of Pastor R. W. Langhans, to the board of directors of the Redeemers Arms, and to fine cooperation by all persons with Federal and local officials in providing financial assistance. It represents 5 years of hard work, overcoming obstacles, and faith in God.

Those who had the foresight to carry this project through to completion, know that the physical well-being and health of our aged citizens must be cared for as well as their spiritual well-being. I wish that we could see more of this both in the State of Minnesota, and across the Nation.

WATER SHORTAGES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, we in the West have been fighting over water almost since the West was won. Perhaps I should say that this is how the West was won. The early settlers fought to the death over the ownership of water holes. In more recent years our fight has been on the broader issues of upstream and downstream ownership of river flows, and this battle has known no county or State boundaries. We have begun to take the massive measures necessary to divide up the water we have, to assure its conservation and reuse, and to seek new sources of the water supplies we must have if the West is to prosper and grow. But the question of water rights still remains almost more controversial and explosive in the West than civil rights.

This year we have seen the pattern of Western water shortages and controversies repeated in the great northeastern section of our country—the area of our densest centers of population and our biggest concentrations of industry. A searing drought—one of the worst in history, has brought the whole area to the edge of water disaster, and has produced grave conferences at all levels from the Federal Government to the town council.

We of the West have read with concern of the fight between New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania for the waters of the Delaware River, and with dismay the headlines in New York newspapers, "Water War Looms"—headlines indicating Mayor Wagner may have to break commitments with neighboring States on the Delaware's water to keep taps in Manhattan from running dry.

We have also noted the charges of water management naivety and shortsightedness and of despoiling water resources with pollution, which have been flying back and forth among groups trying to find a solution to the immense problem the entire area faces. An excellent summary of "The People-Water Crisis" is contained in the August 23 issue of *Newsweek*.

The northeastern water crisis has brought home to this country, as never before, the fact that we must assume a more aggressive attitude toward water planning. The report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources never had the impact in the Northeast that it had in other sections of the country because for years the Northeast felt it had enough water to be prodigal with it. Now the drought has shown them that if they are to have enough water in their cities to meet their expanding populations and their voracious industries, they must about-face in their thinking and habits, and begin some serious planning. Water development re-

quires leadtime. There will not be enough water in the eighties to go around unless we lay practical plans in the sixties.

Planning to make best use of our present supplies of water is not enough. We must seek on a nationwide basis new supplies which can be developed, and new ways of making better use of the supplies we have.

But even nationwide planning is not enough. Just as water runs over county and State boundaries, it runs over international boundaries. I am convinced that we will never really lick our water shortage problem in this country until we plan to make the best use of all of the water resources of the North American continent. The answer is, of course, the North American Water and Power Alliance—the NAWAPA plan—to bring unused water down from Alaska, northern Canada, and other water surplus areas to water-short areas in the United States. This is continentwide planning—it is doing on a continental basis what we are now beginning to do on a basinwide basis in the United States.

As background for the studies and consultations which must be undertaken to implement the NAWAPA concept, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the *Newsweek* article on the 1965 water crisis in America's great Northeast.

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

[From *Newsweek* Magazine, Aug. 23, 1965]

THE PEOPLE-WATER CRISIS

Turn on the tap and out it comes in a cool, clear, constant stream. In the Middle East, Arab and Israeli may fight over it; in California, Angelenos have to pay for it, but for 8 million New York City residents, water is as free and as plentiful as the air they breathe.

And why shouldn't it be? They live, as the four-color map in their old geography books informed them, in a region blessed with 50 inches of rain a year, and in a country where enough water courses through streams to provide every man, woman, and child with 7,500 gallons daily. With such a seemingly infinite source at the other end of the tap, is there any wonder that New Yorkers consume 1,200 million gallons on a typical summer day, wasting (by not fixing leaks or by letting faucets run in order to cool baby's bottle) 300 million gallons or so in the process? By way of contrast, the 7 million people in the London water district use only 365 million gallons daily.

Then, this summer, someone pulled the plug. In New York City, chief water engineer Kenneth Clark predicted last week that the city's huge upstate system of reservoirs—supposedly designed to be drought proof for the next 50 years—were down to 43 percent of capacity and would be dry by next February. The situation looked so gloomy that President Johnson called Governors and mayors of the afflicted region down to Washington to exchange ideas.

ON THE BRINK

The New York metropolitan area, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall grimly announced later in the week after a tour of the parched Northeast, was "walking on the edge of disaster." The picture of an area of 20 million people—already crowded and chafed by urban irritations—deprived of water even for a morning was chilling.

The truth is, however, that both the image of plenty and the specter of water starvation are illusions. Water may seem limitless to an eastern urbanite, out of touch as he is with nature, but it is limited not so much by nature but by his own planning. And due to the reckless pollution of the Hudson River, New York cannot tap this source which flows right through the hardest-hit area.

On the other hand, even if the fall rains and winter snows are so sparse that they produce no runoff to replenish the reservoirs—an unlikely prospect, according to weathermen—New York still will not run out of water. It can keep cutting back on water consumption; the city, for example, can order air conditioners permanently cut off—their use was further curtailed last week—and enforce restrictions on use through fines or by simply turning off the violator's water. There will be more water-saving measures, Mayor Robert Wagner assured Udall last week, after he charged the city had one of the Nation's "leakiest" water systems. A starter: fixing a single leak costing New York a million gallons a day.

If the visions of both water feast and water famine are inaccurate, there is nonetheless a crisis in the Northeast. It is a crisis of distribution, or, as one hydrologist put it, a people-water crisis.

"It isn't that the East is short of water," explains Dr. Roger Revelle, former science adviser to the Department of the Interior and now head of the Center for Population Studies at Harvard. "It's just that the East doesn't have it where it wants it—in the cities."

The best example of the current water-people crisis centers on the Delaware River Basin system, where the cities of New York and Philadelphia are now on a collision course over its waters.

FAIR SHARE

Four States—New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware—helped develop the 296-mile-long Delaware into a vast watershed. It took a U.S. Supreme Court decision in 1954 to straighten out rights to the Delaware waters, but New York received the right to take 490 million gallons a day from the Pepacton and Neversink reservoirs, in exchange for guaranteeing that the flow rate past a check station at Montague, N.J., would not drop below 11,407 gallons a second. This would assure a sufficient waterflow so that the Atlantic Ocean's salt water would not back up the river and reach the river-water intakes for Philadelphia and the wells that supply Camden, N.J., its 22 million gallons daily. Now water-short New York wants to stop its contribution, and Pennsylvania and New Jersey are panicky. In Camden, for example, no less than 40 percent of the water supply is consumed by the Campbell Soup Co. plant and some of the water finds its way back to the Nation in cans of chicken noodle. Since the giant plant employs some 4,000 men and women, Camden's interest in New York's actions is understandable. "Water War Looms," concluded the New York Daily News, over a story about Mayor Wagner's warning that New York might have to break its commitment.

The immediate reason for the panic is easy to assess. Over the past 4 years, the prevailing westerly winds that flow around the Northern Hemisphere in a gently undulating S-curve have been moving in wider S's. These winds, moving at 10,000 to 40,000 feet, drag lower weathermaking air along with them as they wander, and the weather any region gets at a particular time depends largely on which way the winds are blowing above them. If the winds above are on a northerly swing, they may drag warm southern air along, which cools as it moves north. It also rises in altitude and this increases the cooling again; the effect of the

double cooling is to lower the air's capacity to hold moisture. Clouds form, and it rains. If the winds are on a southerly flow, the reverse happens. Cool, dry northern air sinks, warms, retains its moisture and produces no rain.

The Northeast has been beneath a southerly swing of the westerly wave much more than normal in the past 4 years; paradoxically, the Midwest, beneath a northerly swing, has been suffering from floods. To make matters worse for the East, the warm, wet Gulf of Mexico air that often flows over the Northeast of its own accord has been pushed eastward by the strong and persistently off-course westerly wave. The Atlantic has been getting the rain.

The total effect of the wandering westerlies has been that the Northeast has received 25 percent less rain than usual since 1961. Instead of 200 inches, it has gotten about 150; in effect, 1 year's worth of rain is missing. Also, the shortage tends to perpetuate itself: less rain means drier ground. When rain did fall, proportionately more soaked into the ground, instead of running off into streams and ultimately into reservoirs. As a result, 25 percent less rain has resulted in 33 percent less runoff.

DOWN THE DRAIN

Still, as recently as June 1, 1964, after 3 years of subnormal rainfall, the 476 billion-gallon capacity system was 88 percent full, only 7 percent below normal. But the summer and the winter of 1964 were dry. The spring runoff was meager. By June 1, 1965, the reservoirs were 55.4 percent full. June and July together produced only about 4.55 inches of rain, most of it soaked up by the parched slopes of the Catskill watershed area. Last week, the westerlies shifted momentarily, and in 3 days, moist gulf air moved over the Northeast, dropping 2 inches of rain, and adding 3 billion gallons to the reservoirs. But by the end of the week the reservoirs were headed down again, inexorably dropping by two-tenths of a percent daily toward the predicted dry day in February.

Even if rains returned to normal tomorrow, it wouldn't help much. Under normal circumstances, the ground absorbs 71 percent of all rainfall, and returns it to the sky by evaporation and transpiration through plant leaves. What is needed from nature is something more than normal rain. "It will take a hurricane or a series of sod-soaking rains to sharply increase the stream runoff," Udall declared last week.

But weather alone is not the reason for the East's current crisis. The blame must also be shared by naive water managers and the despoilers of the region's natural resources. Water planners exist chiefly to insure against the vagaries of weather. In fact, as a benchmark for its water system, New York City went back through 100 years of records taken at the Croton watershed area to determine the region's worst drought. The years 1930-31 turned out to be the worst, and the 18-lake system was designed to meet that unprecedented—until now—weather pattern. The planners even provided a 600 million-gallon-a-day cushion.

SWEET BUT SHORT

They also chose, as President Johnson's Water Resources Council dryly notes to "rely on the flow of small streams of high quality rather than that of the larger streams with better sustained flow." As a result, New York's drinking water is of undeniably high quality—pure, clean, with low mineral content and no off-taste. It will be good to the last drop, so to speak. Economist Robert Dorfman, a member of Harvard University's water-study group, also points out that New York was foresighted enough to begin developing the headwaters of the Delaware River before Philadelphia did.

But the water managers were shortsighted on two counts. First, they were prodigal

with the water supply available. New York City, for example, has a "free water" philosophy; industry pays a nominal 22 cents per thousand gallons for water; private citizens and commercial establishments pay nothing. Until now, no New Yorker would have hesitated to flip a cigarette butt into the toilet and flush away 5 gallons or to wash half a load of laundry in a 30-gallon cycle—something that would appall water-conscious westerners. As Abel Wolman, professor emeritus of Sanitary Engineering at Johns Hopkins and one of the country's leading experts on water, acidly notes, nothing promotes waste so much as removing the penalty to pay. Free water? he says. "Well, go out to the reservoir and help yourself to all the water you can cart back each day."

WATER MEASURES

For its part, the city's water department has always favored the notion of water meters in all private residences; it would, engineers estimate, save 100 million gallons a day at the least. But it is too late now; it would take 5 years to install meters throughout the city, and would cost \$84 million. And the Democrats, in any event, are not likely to institute a meter program until after the mayoral election.

Second, the managers neglected to build a back-up system to insure against any failures in the reservoir system. "Water crises vary inversely on money spent," says Seattle-born Revelle. "Eastern cities need water now. They should have spent the money 5 years ago." But on what? Both scientist Revelle and economist Dorfman agree that more reservoirs are not a sound answer. The tremendous outlay for extra dams and aqueducts to guard against a once-a-century drought would be voted down by any State legislature in the Union. A more sensible solution for any city is to have a back-up supply of water that can be called into action when needed.

The Hudson River is the obvious answer despite its pollution and politics. In 1954, in an earlier water scare, a pumping station was built at Chelsea, 60 miles up the river. When the drought ended, so did the plant. It was dismantled to save costs.

CALCULATED RISK

The plant is being rebuilt to produce 100 million gallons of water a day. Luna Leopold, chief hydrologist of the U.S. Geological Survey, says: "It's amazing how the risk goes down with a small increment of dependable water. You could get by the bad times for a reasonable amount of money." The trouble is, Chelsea isn't expected to be ready until early next year.

No Californian would have been foolish enough to abandon Chelsea. But then if the East had understood water planning as the Western States do, there might never have been an emergency.

"I don't understand the situation here," Revelle noted wryly in Cambridge last week. "You see, I'm from California, a semiarid land. You have more water in the East than we do."

In Los Angeles, where 15 inches of rain falls a year in the good years, the lawns are green, backyard swimming pools are brimful, and air-conditioning units operate continuously. In New York, which is getting twice as much rain in its "year of the drought," citizens are urged to take showers rather than baths. Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy of the U.S. Reclamation Bureau notes: "In the West, where we are perpetually short of water, we have learned to harness our rivers and to store their waters in times of plenty and of high runoff, for use during periods of drought. We have also learned to conserve water by metering and by careful use."

In Los Angeles, the brainwashed citizens passed \$24.5 million in bond issues 60 years ago. In those days that was a lot of money.

By 1913, 2,992 gallons a second were flowing across 238 miles of desert from the Owens River in the Sierra Madres to Los Angeles. Without that water, the city could not have grown past 500,000 population.

However, the citizens of the Owens Valley wanted the water, too. In 1924, there was a real water war. Armed guards from Los Angeles patrolled the entire aqueduct, but could not prevent 17 dynamitings. But Los Angeles got its water. By then the city had set its sights on the Colorado River, the most reliable source of water for the Southwest. It took 40 years and a Supreme Court decision to settle the varying claims. Now California is guaranteed 4.4 million acre-feet annually, Arizona, 2.8 million, and Nevada, 300,000. Even before that issue was settled, southern California was already eying northern California's plentiful supply of water. By 1972, thanks to another passed bond issue, the south will receive 1.3 billion gallons of water daily from the Feather River project.

Southern California is now looking 800 miles to the north to Washington, where the Columbia's runoff into the Pacific is a colossal 151.2 billion gallons a day and is used mostly for power generation, which of course doesn't consume any water at all.

PAYOUT

The West's water planning has paid off: California is the fastest growing, richest State in the Union. Arizona, with a meager annual rainfall of 7.2 inches, is in a better water position now than the humid East.

President Johnson's home State of Texas learned about water from a 4-year drought in the mid-1950's. Mr. Johnson, for one, still remembers; he recalled last week how President Eisenhower came to the rescue. Now the State water commission is studying water needs until 2010, and creating reservoirs and building systems to transfer water from the rain-rich eastern sections to the arid West. Next year, a 322-mile pipeline will bring water from the Saford Dam near Amarillo to 11 cities in the Panhandle. Three years from now, the Trinity River project will begin yielding 1.2 billion gallons of water a day.

While there are encouraging signs around the country that Americans are recognizing that water is one of the Nation's most precious natural resources, the United States is still destroying water sources faster than it is developing them. In the Great Lakes, for example, which contain a quarter of the world's fresh-water supply, water levels are dropping and the pollution levels rising. "To fly over Lake Erie and look down into the cloudy mess of murderous pollution," Udall said recently, "is like reading the flyleaf of a book on the end of civilization." The message seems finally to be getting through. Just last week, the five States involved in the destruction of Lake Erie agreed to try to save it, to try to cut back on the tons of chemical waste that pour into it each minute of the day.

What worries some about the current crises is that complacency in the East threatens to be replaced not by planning, but by hysteria. It is fed by dire projections about future growth in water consumption. These projections show that, by 1980, water consumption will be double what it was in 1950—totaling three-fifths of all recoverable surface waters. And all of this will be tapped by the year 2000. Such predictions may serve to encourage advance planning, but Luna Leopold, among others, questions them. "It seems inconceivable to me that we are going to double land under irrigation," he says by way of example. "Irrigation simply cannot continue to grow at the old rate." Other officials complain that the present emergency in the East is being used to increase the flow of Federal funds out of Washington and into the States and municipalities. "People," says

one hydrologist, "are using this drought to sell a bill of goods."

The search for the panacea must, in the experts' opinion, be tempered by the realities of economics, and the possibilities as they exist now. Weather modification is one such grand solution, and authorities such as Revelle consider it worth intensive research. But it would be a mistake to count on it. Rainmaking, for example, has so far been a total failure. President Johnson's desalination bill is designed "to free mankind from Nature's tyranny," but salt-free ocean water can only be transported to inland States at great cost. "The idea that desalination will end all our water problems is just nonsense," says one official.

HIDDEN RESOURCES

The answer more likely lies in the simple, if tedious and undramatic, process of learning more about water supply. There hasn't been a full census of water in the United States since 1954; every current figure is a projection or an estimate, and could be far off the mark. The estimated water underground is equivalent to 150 years of rainfall in the United States—3,000 times more than is in streams and rivers. Yet it supplies only one-fifth of all the water used in the United States. Where it is brackish in the Midwest, President Johnson's desalting bill can really help. Small community plants employing new techniques could make water available at reasonable costs. At brackish-water plants, such as the one at Freeport, Tex., the technology is being developed, and experience in nuclear desalting techniques will be gained at the proposed reactor in Riverhead, N.Y., which will serve 10,000 people.

Somehow, too, the tangle of local, State, regional, and Federal responsibilities and rights that water involves, must be straightened out. President Johnson illustrated the complexities when he said in one sentence that "this is a time for Federal action," then added that "Federal action is no substitute for local responsibility." There is no central control over the country's water, no coordinating body. Up-to-date figures on the country's water consumption simply don't exist.

THE LESSON

The formation of such new groups as the President's Water Resources Council and the Department of the Interior's Office of Water Resources Research should certainly help. They may have come into existence none too soon. "Within the next 5 years," predicts Dr. E. D. Eaton, associate director of the office, "the Nation will have to make decisions on water projects running into hundreds of billions of dollars. We just don't know enough about the economics of water right now to do that."

But some knowledge has been gained in the water crisis of 1965. Easterners have learned the hard way what citizens of the arid West have always known. Water is a resource to be cherished, conserved, and fought for if necessary. Like a crop, it must be harvested and used with care and foresight. The alternative is to remain at the mercy of an inconstant Nature, to rely on the unreliable, and sooner or later to run dry.

THE CASE AGAINST THE CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH RUSSIA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has favorably reported a proposed treaty with the Soviet Union to establish consular relations between the two countries. The treaty is now resting on the Executive Calendar where it could be called forth at any time.

Newspaper reports indicate, however, that the Senate Democratic leadership

has abandoned its plans to seek Senate ratification of this treaty at this time. I welcome this decision.

For this is a shameful measure which has been shamefacedly handled by those who support it.

How else can we see this proposal when even the administration which gave it birth has acted so as not to expose it to close scrutiny for more than a year?

It was signed in Moscow in June of 1964. President Johnson urged Senate ratification 11 days later. And what has happened since then? Very, very little.

There has been a public hearing, if you care to call it that. One administration witness appeared.

All of this has been discussed in great detail in the minority views filed with the Committee on Foreign Relations and elsewhere.

The point remains and cannot be avoided: this treaty is a foundling that has lain on our doorstep for nearly 400 days. And now even its embarrassed parents seem unwilling to ask that we take it in.

When word of the proposed ratification got out—even in a most subtle manner—mail started coming to congressional offices almost totally in opposition to the scheme. This cannot be sloughed off as the outpourings of a small but vocal minority of the radical right. If my mail is any indication of public sentiment on this question, there is a genuine concern—indeed a revolt—against the treaty at the grassroots.

When the American people learn the facts concerning this scheme, there can be no other reaction.

There are so many reasons to say "No" to this request, that each Member of this body could produce a separate one if he wished to do so. Many Senators on both sides of the aisle have done so. For the opposition is not the voice of partisanship. It is a reasoned opposition—a many, many reasoned opposition.

I have not heard one note of opposition that was purely partisan. I have not heard one note of opposition that was purely a quibble or a disgruntled tactic of delay.

No, Mr. President, I have not heard one note of opposition that did not carry with it, beyond all other sounds, the deep note of sincere concern for the Republic and the freedom which we are sworn to protect on its behalf.

The seeming reluctance with which the administration has let this treaty trickle to the doorstep of the Senate is in itself a sign that there is no enthusiasm for the treaty at either end of Pennsylvania Avenue although there seems to be some friendship for it in Foggy Bottom in the precincts of the State Department.

What have we heard on behalf of the treaty? We have heard that it may aid commerce between the Soviet Union and the United States.

But what have we heard against it? We have heard the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—certainly a knowledgeable administration spokesman—characterize it as the realization of a long-sought goal of Soviet intelligence operations.

We have heard a distinguished member of the administration's own party recount the abuse after abuse of Soviet diplomatic privileges in this country.

We have heard representatives of the oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe, such as the Lithuanian American Council and others, implore us to make clear that this treaty is not to be interpreted to mean that the newly extended consular privileges permit Soviet actions which would legitimize the Soviet conquests of the captive nations.

We have heard other members of this body speak of the incredible immunity granted Soviet personnel, under this treaty, immunity from prosecution for any crime, no matter how treacherous or dangerous.

We have heard ample debunking of that favorite excuse for such dismal exercises; the excuse that says that we will reap as much advantages from a few isolated consulates in the Soviet Union as they will from consulates in many of our major cities. We should not need the examination of this treaty to remind us of the differences between permitting the agents of tyranny to work freely in a free country and permitting the agents of freedom to work in the police state maze of a tyranny.

Here again, when only such slender and feathery arguments as that can be used in defense of such a treaty, we can see that the weight of clear need and clear justification is altogether missing.

This treaty seems just a chance gesture, hardly defended, scarcely wanted, and beyond any sensible and searching discussion. It is one of those sometimes gestures of appeasement which we have been known to make before and which—every time without exception—we have come to regret for good and sufficient cause as communism continues to violate its word, violate territory, and violate civilized political behavior around the world.

Mr. President, this treaty carries with it, in its words and scope, so many disadvantages that volumes could and, I hope, will be spoken on them. My hope is to speak of the treaty beyond its own details; to implore its defeat on the basis of the single, overriding basis of the long-term security of the Republic and the long-term cause of freedom throughout the world.

This treaty cannot be ratified in ignorance of what it does to these long-term concerns. This treaty must not be ratified because of those concerns.

This is the wrong treaty, at the wrong time, and it is advocated for all the wrong reasons.

If put before the American people, it would resoundingly be defeated and rejected. If put before the representatives of all the people, it should receive the same answer.

It is an essential function of the Senate that it pull back from the brink of disaster, those administration moves made in silence and often in secrecy which may serve some special and vested departmental interest but which do not serve the interest of the people at large.

We are charged by the Constitution with the balancing of such acts. It is

our duty to say "Yes" when the national need is clear and it is our duty, just as loudly to say "No" when the national need clearly is being miserved or even disserved.

It is not wisdom or courtesy that should impel a Member of this body to vote against his conscience and good sense in advising on such a treaty as this. Conscience and good sense both have been examined on this treaty and neither can we there find any friends for it. No. To vote for such a treaty against sense and sensibility would not help this administration. Far from it. It would plunge it, bound by a false solidarity, into a drowning sea of error.

This treaty does not deserve the support of this administration, which has shown its colors so well in opposing communism on other fronts. Indeed it has had very little support. And this administration does not deserve the stigma of being parent of this treaty. This is why, Mr. President, I say and say again that this treaty is not partisan in sponsorship or in opposition. We are joined, despite party, not so much in opposing simply a treaty as in supporting those principles which this treaty so grievously would weaken.

Let me enumerate. First, and we can never forget it, we are at war now with communism. Only technicalities and diplomatic bowing and scraping keep the dread word itself from official recognition. But the truth is that we are at war with communism. And the equally dreadful truth is that the men with whom some would have us observe this treaty are the same men whose power supports the war against us.

Who in this body honestly can believe that the espionage which we know beyond peradventure would be committed under this treaty would not serve directly or indirectly the forces who are killing our soldiers in Vietnam today?

Who is there in this body who would care to explain this treaty and the espionage which it fosters and protects—explain it to the widow or parent of a marine or paratrooper slain in Vietnam?

No. This treaty is wholly wrong when we are so beleaguered by communism. It is totally wrong and, should it be ratified against the best conscience of the people and their representatives, then not an ocean of blood will wipe out the folly.

This is not a time, as some say who would see this treaty slide past us like a thief in the night, when the Soviet sincerely is seeking new conciliations with us.

Have they moved to extinguish the fires in Latin America; fires fed by the Soviet incursion in Cuba?

Have they moved to end the slow human sacrifice of the Berlin wall?

Have they moved to ease the tensions throughout those corridors and ways of Germany which communism controls?

Have they pinched off the logistics of death flowing into Vietnam?

Have they stilled the shrill voice of domestic communism anywhere?

Have they slowed the clandestine traffic in treachery and spying which is the principal weight of their diplomatic

pouches and the chief cargo of their political exports?

They have not. They have not and do not seek friendship in this consular treaty. They seek advantages and opportunities.

They have not and do not seek easing of the tensions between us—they seek ways to work beyond those tensions and to be protected from them, as this treaty would protect them.

Slam the door on this treaty and we do not slam the door on hopes for easing the tensions between us. We would only slam the door on the illusions and the wishful thinking which always have proved so tempting to communism.

Indeed, it is such encouragement which prolong the tensions. Communism, given an inch, always has wanted a hundred miles.

President Johnson sees in Vietnam precisely a test of our will to resist. He sees in a failure of that will a failure in our efforts to keep the peace. For only the will to resist can keep the peace against aggressors. We all know that.

I see in this treaty a similar test of our will to resist. If this golden gift of espionage and immunity—condemned by utterances from within the administration itself—if this open door to treachery, this one-way street to privilege abused, if this treaty is ratified we will again leave communism convinced that Americans will give, and give, and give, bend, and bend, and bend. And where is the service to peace in that?

God knows that if they thought we would bend and give in in Vietnam we could expect to fight there forever, bleeding endlessly. Our hope on every front is that finally communism will realize that America cannot be bent forever over any tyrant's knee.

Then we can talk of bargaining for we will have something with which to bargain.

Then let this treaty be considered anew along with the thousand and one other gestures that civilized nations can make to form and forge a friendship.

What sort of day would that be? Well, it would be a day in which Communist leaders renounced their creed's worldwide plans for political subversion and dismantled the machinery for it. How can we talk of consular treaties when the Soviet by past performance regard them as only vehicles for unlimited espionage and subversion?

It would be a day when the last Soviet technician and the last Soviet missile had been withdrawn from Cuba. For how can we speak of a consular treaty with Soviet guns still aimed at our shores and from a conquered base in our own hemisphere?

It would be a day in which peoples conquered and held captive could vote freely and openly to establish their own national destiny. For how can we speak of a consular treaty to promote commerce when millions are the victims of a commerce in captivity?

Mr. President, it would be a far different day from this day. And that is why this wrong treaty comes at the wrong time as well as for the wrong reasons.

Ratify this treaty and error is ratified, and communism once again advantaged. Ratify this treaty and we will pay a price in history—and in blood.

Such a consular treaty is to promote the civilized commerce and traffic between nations. Let us pray for the day when such a time will call for such a treaty. But that sort of time must proceed the treaty. And this is not the time.

THE RIOTS IN LOS ANGELES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the recent riots in Los Angeles have given every American cause to wonder about the good and evil forces which are afoot in this country and indeed in the world.

My friend, Mr. Clyde Reed, Jr., editor and publisher of the Parsons (Kans.) Sun, has dealt with many of the questions that arise from the smoke and ruins of Los Angeles.

In his editorial of Tuesday, August 17, 1965, entitled "Seaching Our Souls," he has, I believe, displayed keen insight into the causes rather than the symptoms of the unrest which exists in America today.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

SEARCHING OUR SOULS

The inevitable post mortem has begun, and well it should. The Los Angeles riots will be examined for causes and many already have been advanced.

The breakdown of Negro family life is cited widely as a major factor, together with a rising birth rate in broken homes. Lack of parental authority has given rise to contempt for society in general when coupled with idleness, hot weather, frightful living conditions, and pent-up racial frustrations.

Those are by now orthodox assumptions, available for any diagnosis of violence in our troubled cities. They are valid as far as they go. Do they go far enough?

Riotous behavior and defiance of the law are not confined to the slums (and even the Los Angeles riot area, by accurate description, hardly fits the regular slum pattern) and to deprived families. Nor to the Negro race.

White college students have rioted on the beaches and at lake resorts. Those students are not products of the slums. They come from middle and upper class homes; they are economically privileged by any measuring stick.

The seashore and resort riots differed from that of Los Angeles only in degree and the absence of racial overtones. They involved mass disorder and contained an equal disregard for the law. Troops had to be called to quell them, too, you will recall.

Don't the common elements suggest a common cause? We believe they do.

It can be described as an alarming and still growing lack of respect for law and order, bred by varied developments. We hardly consider it illiberal to propose them as the starting place for the search for what has gone wrong.

You can begin with the U.S. Supreme Court. In its commendable zeal for the rights of the individual, it has gone so far as to jeopardize the rights of society as a whole and to infer that the latter must be subjugated to the former at nearly any cost.

In doing so, the court has unwittingly downgraded the policeman who, for better or worse, is our leading symbol of the law and its principal contact with the greatest num-

ber of people, young and old. He has been turned into a target of bitterness and hate, an enemy instead of a protector, and we intend no defense of the Bull Connors and the Jim Clarks.

Many of our leading clergymen, white and black, have taken it upon themselves to choose the laws they will obey and those they will violate. They have exceeded all discretion in their fools' game. Their examples have been widely copied if for nothing else than as an excuse for breaking the law.

The misguided among our affluent citizens suggest by their actions they are above or beyond the law. Only Monday it was revealed that the Federal Government has issued 250 gaming—or, more explicitly, gambling—stamps in Kansas.

Most of these stamps have gone to private clubs where a quaint but completely fallacious notion prevails; namely, that membership somehow exempts its holders from laws applicable to others.

Or take the minority of professors who abuse the legitimate role of dissent and push tactics upon impressionable minds which destroy respect for law and produce violations on a wide scale. Obscenity on the campus is defended in the name of free speech.

Who stands up for law and order? Only a few. The pressures are running strongly against law and the system founded upon it. We seek to rationalize and explain in all manner of psychological and sociological terms which, when pursued to their ends, result only in more of the same if not worse.

Murder, arson, and looting must be dealt with severely in Los Angeles. Violence, as all are correctly saying, has no place in America.

It should be noted that more than 300,000 other Negroes in Los Angeles refrained from mob action and many of them also fall into the deprived category, hinting again that economic and social status alone cannot explain violent behavior.

The white college students who storm the beaches as mixed-up kids, which they are, see scorn for law all about them and hear disobedience extolled in the classroom and on the campus, not to mention the pulpit. How can they be expected, in this context, to develop respect for the law?

It is too much to say that anarchy threatens the Nation. The stress and strain are there, however, and must be recognized and treated accordingly.

When a citizen cannot enter the Department of State's main building in Washington in broad daylight without identification or reference because of recent sexual molestations there; when our big city streets, day and night, are turned into jungles; when firemen are shot as they seek only to put out fires that threaten life and property; when all of these facts and others are at hand, the time has arrived for soul searching on a national scale.

We had best make certain we come up with the right answers. We can be certain, from the record to date, we haven't found them yet.

PROPERTY TAX REFORMS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, two well-written and penetrating articles have come to my attention in the last few weeks. Both appeared in the Wall Street Journal and both discuss State and local taxes.

The first analysis, by Joseph Mathewson, probes the dimensions of the continuing debate over property taxes. It demonstrates that more State and local governments must institute far-reaching reforms if taxes are to continue to yield

increased revenue without being oppressive. As the author points out:

Given such improvements, the property tax could yield much greater revenue without becoming unduly burdensome. *** According to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, if all States taxed at the average effective rate in New England, property tax yields would be increased about 50 percent.

Many States, however, view property tax levels as already reaching a dangerously high level and have moved to reduce State reliance on them.

The second article highlights an unexpected byproduct of the Johnson administration's successful effort to keep our economy moving. In State after State, the continued prosperity has produced budgetary surpluses. Some States, however, have used this as an excuse for further delaying the much-needed overhauling of their tax structures.

I strongly recommend to my colleagues these two well-documented reports and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 17, 1965]

SURPRISE SURPLUSES: STATE TAX COLLECTIONS SOAR ABOVE ESTIMATES, EASING FISCAL SQUEEZE—SHARP REVENUE RISE, CREDITED TO BUSINESS BOOM, HELPS SOME AVOID TAX INCREASES—BUT CRISIS WARNINGS REMAIN

That traditional fiscal weakness, the State treasury, is looking surprisingly robust these days—thanks in no small measure to the curative effects of a 4-year business boom.

So high have State tax collections been running this year that State after State reports it is in the best fiscal shape in a long time. Indeed, the projected deficits are being converted into unaccustomed surpluses so rapidly as to make persistent past warnings of impending State fiscal crises seem at best considerably exaggerated—and in some cases, perhaps, like a case of crying wolf.

The warnings haven't faded away entirely. Most States regard their current prosperity as a momentary thing, and expect rising costs and citizen demands for more and more services to land them back in the financial soup again before long—or at least to make future tax boosts inevitable. But that doesn't make their current budgetary turnaround any the less impressive.

MICHIGAN'S COMEBACK

Michigan is a striking example. From the edge of fiscal collapse only a few years ago, the Wolverine State now finds itself with an accumulated surplus of more than \$122 million. State officials attribute it almost entirely to a booming State economy, fueled by a record pace of auto production.

In Pennsylvania much the same story is unfolding. Without even one new tax or tax increase, the Keystone State wound up its fiscal year June 30 with a record surplus of \$105 million. The big surplus, built up despite a \$91 million rise in State spending during the year, is credited to an economic pace which far exceeded the fondest hopes of Pennsylvania's budgetary officials.

The surge in tax payments, in some States, is helping to head off, or at least delay, tax increases that once seemed inevitable. In Connecticut, spending rose from \$710 million in fiscal 1961-63 to \$874 million in the 2-year fiscal period just ended, and is scheduled to rise even more sharply to \$990 million in the current biennium. Yet since 1963 State legislators found it unnecessary

to raise any taxes except for two 1-cent-a-pack increases in the cigarette levy.

"We certainly assumed 2 or 3 years ago the (other) tax increases were unavoidable," says Leo V. Donohue, deputy commissioner of finance and control. "But the general growth of the State's economy has been so swift that they have proved unnecessary."

AN UNFAMILIAR PROBLEM

Such good fortune, however, is not without its problems—at least for State fiscal officers and legislators. Long accustomed to an unending and often unequal struggle to make ends meet, they are now being forced, however temporarily, to grapple in many States with a problem for which few guideposts can be found in recent experience: What to do with the money that is now piling up?

In some States, the solution comes easily. Florida, which finished the latest biennium with the highest gross surplus in a decade (\$44 million), figured the time was ripe to build up its retirement trust fund, so \$6.5 million was transferred there. State legislators also approved an "emergency" appropriation of \$1.5 million to help prop the sagging financial structure of its giant pavilion at the New York World's Fair. The rest, \$36 million, is being carried into the current year's account.

In industrial Illinois, where tax revenues are far exceeding original projections, State officials also are planning to carry a \$100 million surplus into this biennium's account. Gov. Otto Kerner in a proposed budget hasn't earmarked the surplus for any special project but has chosen to use it to help finance general spending in the next 2 years.

TAX RELIEF IN WISCONSIN?

In neighboring Wisconsin, however, taxpayers have some hope of benefiting directly from a treasury surplus built up in the past 2 years. For the biennium ended June 30, the State wound up with \$35.9 million in excess funds. No plans have been announced officially on how the surplus will be spent, but there's growing speculation that it may bring cancellation of an income tax increase which State legislators voted this spring.

In working out Wisconsin's budget for the current biennium ending in 1967, State authorities originally projected a deficit of more than \$70 million. To raise the needed money, the legislature passed bills increasing income tax rates, boosting the cigarette level, and instituting a new franchise tax which mainly affected banks. But the high rate of tax collections may convince the lawmakers, when they meet again this fall, that the income tax increase, at least, isn't needed; though the higher rates were made retroactive to January 1, they could be rescinded easily.

Most often, though, State officials are giving almost no thought to a tax cut. They contend the money is needed by the State—somewhere. Just where is another question which has touched off controversies in several States.

In Texas, a \$108 million surplus—the largest in nearly 20 years—led to a major political battle last spring. Many legislators wanted to appropriate the excess funds for pet pork-barrel programs, or to raise welfare payments, but Gov. John Connally strongly fought such moves. He feared such spending would boost State costs on a permanent basis—and he was horrified at the thought of having to come to the legislature 2 years from now and ask for a major tax increase because the State's surplus had been consumed.

Governor Connally instead urged lawmakers to spend the money on projects of a one-shot nature, such as capital improvements for schools. The battle raged for several weeks and finally was settled only by compromise. Some \$20 million was earmarked for programs of a permanent nature and the rest went into capital expenditures.

Some statehouse executives are still critical of the compromise. "If something should go sour with our sources of revenue, we could be faced with a politically explosive situation when the time for the next budget rolls around," says the Governor's budget director, William Cobb.

A similar struggle ended in Ohio last week only after a threat of a bitter Governor-vs.-legislature showdown. Ohio emerged from its biennium June 30 with a \$17.4 million surplus, well above the original estimate of \$3.6 million. So the legislature boosted appropriations for public education in the new biennium \$9 million above Republican Gov. James A. Rhodes' budget recommendation and drew an immediate threat of a veto. The Governor insisted such an increase in school spending would force a tax boost; he pointed out that his budget had already provided for a \$100 million boost in State education outlays over the next 2 years, and said this figure took the bigger-than-expected treasury surplus into account.

CUTS BALANCE INCREASES

Though many politicians doubted the Governor actually would veto an education bill, the battle ended last week in a compromise: School spending in the current biennium will be raised \$6 million above Governor Rhodes' recommendation, but this will be balanced by cuts of \$6 million in other State outlays. Among other things, the State's emergency fund is being clipped \$2.5 million below the Governor's recommendation.

Interestingly, Governor Rhodes is relying heavily on continued economic expansion to sustain State spending, even at his budget figures, without a tax increase over the next 2 years. His budget counts on continued booming business to lift collections a sharp 14 percent during the current biennium under the State's current tax structure.

Ohio is hardly alone in this counting on a continuation of the business boom to help balance its budget. With an election this fall, New Jersey State legislators have passed a budget calling for increased spending but no tax boosts. In preparing the fiscal 1966 budget, State officials estimated tax revenues would climb to \$623 million from last year's estimated \$574 million. All but \$11 million of the rise is expected to come from growth of the State's economy; the rest would come from acceleration in collections of insurance taxes.

LOW SPENDING

New Jersey's tax structure, however, is still the focal point of the current Governor's race. While the State faces no financial crisis in the form of huge deficits, there's a major debate over its lagging spending. The Garden State ranks last in the Nation in per-capita tax revenues but also ranks low in spending—it's 49th in per-capita aid to education, 49th in per-capita highway spending and 48th in per-capita welfare spending.

The low ranking could soon end. Both candidates for Governor, Democratic incumbent Richard Hughes and GOP challenger Wayne Dumont, have lined up for higher taxes in the future. Governor Hughes is plugging for an income tax and Mr. Dumont is supporting a sales tax. New Jersey is one of the few States without a general income tax or a sales tax.

In Michigan, too, new future taxes are considered necessary by both parties. Despite the State's huge current surplus, State authorities warn soaring costs, particularly for education, probably will bring a \$37 million deficit in State operations in the current year. That deficit, they think will go much higher next year—enough so, quite likely, to wipe out the \$122 million surplus by the end of 1967.

But the size of the current surplus is hindering efforts to get taxes raised in time to head off trouble; neither the Republican

State administration, headed by Gov. George Romney, nor the Democratic-controlled legislature, is eager to take the political consequences of raising taxes while the State appears so prosperous. The Democrats last fall won control of the legislature for the first time in 30 years, and "if we pass an income tax while there's a big surplus we may take another 30 years to get (back) control," says one party leader. Michigan now has no income tax; its general fund is wholly dependent on revenues from a sales tax and a patchwork of nuisance taxes.

[From the *Wall Street Journal*, Aug. 9, 1965]
PROPERTY TAX DEBATE—PROTESTS MOUNT
THAT SUCH LEVIES ARE INEQUITABLE, TOO
HIGH

(By Joseph Mathewson)

CHICAGO.—Are property taxes too high? Around the country protests by homeowners, farmers, and businessmen are giving new impetus to an old debate over whether the age-old property tax is still a fair and adequate means of raising public revenues. The discussion is more than academic now, for many States are easing the ever-upward pressure on these levies and turning more to other revenue sources.

Property taxes cover mainly real estate, and also business inventories and machinery, livestock, and such personal goods as autos and furniture. They are levied primarily by local governments, but by some States, too, the money going mostly to public schools. Last year property taxes reaped a hefty \$22 billion, and no one expects such productive levies to be swept away, but there are many who argue that they're not fully geared to an industrial society where much income and wealth aren't derived from property.

"At the turn of the century," says Gov. William H. Avery, of Kansas, "75 percent of Kansas income was from the land or improvement in land. Now it's only 25 percent, yet our ad valorem (property) tax is continuing to carry approximately 75 percent of the load in education."

Critics point out that much modern property, such as securities and bank accounts, escapes property taxation and so the burden falls inequitably on tangible property. Also, according to economics professor, Reuben A. Zubrow, of the University of Colorado, "the property tax base does not grow with the growth in need for public income and development. We need a more flexible source."

In some places property taxes are believed to have reached their practical limit, or gone beyond. Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California, feels real estate taxes are unnecessarily excessive in most areas of California. Gov. Carl E. Sanders, of Georgia, declares, "The property tax rate has just about reached the saturation point. We're going to have to open up additional revenues for local government."

A BRAKE ON BUILDING

In the business realm, the lack of new building in downtown Boston in recent years is generally attributed to unusually high property taxes. Gov. Calvin L. Rampton, of Utah, says the State's tax on business property "is getting to the point where it's discouraging new industry from locating in Utah." He feels a business income tax is better because a new venture doesn't have to remit such a levy "until the business starts to pay." Iowa's inventory tax, according to Gov. Harold E. Hughes, is "certainly unfair to businesses that need large inventories and can't turn them fast," such as lumber and hardware firms, "and it makes liars out of 90 percent of them."

On the other hand, many tax experts contend property taxation is not excessive. They point out that property levies still produce nearly half of local government reve-

nue and this amount can't readily be raised from other sources. "You'd need a 20-percent sales tax to replace the property tax," says John Shannon of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in Washington, D.C.

These experts concede the property tax has shortcomings, but they insist it can be improved and equitably increased to meet rising revenue needs.

The principal improvement sought is the assessment of all property at the same percentage of true value. This could be almost any percentage; 75 percent is considered a good level, while many States now stipulate 100 percent (but don't enforce it). "If the law says 50 or 100 percent of market value, all property should be assessed that way," says Lynn F. Anderson, assistant director of the Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Texas. Though some property-tax changes, such as one proposed by Gov. Otto Kerner, of Illinois, would permit taxation of homes at a lower rate than income-producing business property, Professor Anderson feels the business and residential rates should be equal. "You have to remember," he says, "that the owner of a home also has income and taxpaying capacity."

Defenders of the property tax also favor eliminating taxes on securities and other assets which are difficult to subject to assessment and they strongly urge putting assessment work in the hands of professionals rather than untrained elected officials or political appointees.

Given such improvements, the property tax could yield much greater revenue without becoming unduly burdensome, the authorities contend. According to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, in 1960 property tax rates in individual States ranged from about 0.5 percent to about 2.4 percent of actual property value, and this wide variation indicates an "untapped property tax potential." The Commission figured that "if all States taxed at the average effective rate in New England, property tax yields would be increased about 50 percent."

Efforts to improve property tax administration are being made in many States, but progress is slow. One problem, asserts L. Laszlo Ecker-Racz, assistant director of the Advisory Commission, is that "local communities compete in property tax exemptions," giving special relief to old people, farmers, or other groups and thus increasing the burden of other taxpayers. The only way to prevent this, he feels, "is for the State to see that property is fairly assessed." However, Mr. Ecker-Racz adds, State governments receive little of their own revenue from property taxes (though State laws generally govern property taxation by local governments) "and if the States have no revenue stake in the property tax, it's hard to get them interested in policing."

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

As the arguments go on, property taxes continue to rise, by about \$1.5 billion a year, and political pressure against them also is mounting. This year several States took steps to curtail property levies and provide instead revenue from sales, income, or other taxes, usually collected by the State and passed on to local governments.

The Utah Legislature increased corporation and personal income taxes by \$12 million partly to permit a reduction in the State-level property tax rate equivalent to \$1.7 million in revenue. Illinois and North Dakota lawmakers voted to drop personal property taxes, instead establishing an income tax in Illinois and increasing various taxes in North Dakota. These plans will be submitted to the voters in each State. The Idaho Legislature approved a sales tax which would require ending the State-level personal and real property taxes; the plan has gone into effect but voters will make the final decisions next year. Similarly, an in-

come tax approved by the Nebraska Legislature would eliminate State-level property taxes, and petitions are now circulating to put this on the ballot next year.

In Wisconsin, Kansas, Indiana, Wyoming, Iowa, and Idaho the legislatures reduced property taxes on livestock, household goods, business inventories and machinery, moneys and credit, and warehoused goods. Gov. Robert E. Smylie of Idaho says that as a result of new exemption for goods in transit through the State (a freeport law), "some cold-storage people—handling fruits and vegetables—already have announced plans for expansion of their capacity."

STATE AID TO COMMUNITIES

Furthermore, Georgia, Colorado, Idaho, and Oregon began new programs of State payments to local governments in hopes of alleviating the need for property tax increases. A similar program already existing in New York was doubled to a whopping \$197.6 million in grants this year. Gov. John A. Volpe of Massachusetts has proposed a 3-percent sales tax which would be distributed to local governments and, according to the Governor, "definitely" would pave the way for actual reductions in local property taxes.

Looking ahead, more potshots will be fired at property taxes. Unsuccessful reduction proposals made this year by the Governors of Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, and Texas will be revived in future legislative sessions. "I want to eliminate personal property taxes if we can," says Gov. Warren P. Knowles of Wisconsin. Special property-tax studies are underway in Arizona and Iowa, and they're likely to produce recommendations for change.

New revenue devices undoubtedly will assist these efforts. In one State-tax innovation, per capita annual credits of \$6 in Indiana and \$7 in Colorado have been introduced to help offset the State sales tax, thus blunting the frequent charge that such levies bear too heavily on low-income families. Professor Zubrow of Colorado believes "this is a technique by which local governmental units can move into the sales tax field."

But as some cuts will be made, so also, at least for the foreseeable future, will total property taxes continue to rise. And the debate over "how high is up?" will go on—in the State capitol, in the university, and most certainly in the assessor's office.

SHORTAGE OF EXPERIENCED LABOR IN THE NEW HAMPSHIRE APPLE PICKING SEASON

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the apple growers of New Hampshire are in desperate straits. Unless the Secretary of Labor permits the bringing in of Canadians to supplement the domestic labor force to work during the apple picking season, which starts September 7, if not earlier, and runs for approximately 6 weeks, a large portion of the State's \$5 million apple crop will be destroyed.

Harvesting an apple crop is a hair-trigger operation. Every apple that is allowed to fall to the ground becomes instantly unfit for marketing and can be used only for cider. In these days of effective cold storage, the apple industry is a 10-month process. Apples that are bruised in the slightest degree as they are picked will come out of cold storage unfit for marketing. It is estimated that unless an adequate and efficient labor force is available at the start of the picking season, the loss will run \$200,000 each day.

Apple growers, assisted by the Employment Service Bureau of the New Hampshire Department of Employment Security, and by the Federal Labor Department, have done everything in their power to secure the last available domestic employee. They have advertised in the press, had spot announcements over the air, and placed signs in stores and public places. They have secured the part-time services of off-duty military personnel, as well as students from high schools and colleges. I doubt if they did resort to one expedient suggested by representatives of the Federal Labor Department that they seek workers from inmates of the State's mental institutions.

The apple growers face a diminishing number of unemployed. At this period in 1963, the unemployment percentage in New Hampshire was 3.3 percent; in 1964, 3.1 percent; this year, 2.2 percent. Added to this is an increased apple crop. In 1964, 1,200,000 bushels were harvested. This year it is anticipated that 1,500,000 bushels are ready for harvesting.

To harvest this crop, a thousand pickers must be working every moment of every day during the short, crucial period. The New Hampshire Department and the apple industry estimate that a work force of 1,650 will be required. This is because of the fact that most of the local labor is available on only a part-time basis.

In 1964, 214 migrants—American—were employed, of which about 160 stayed on the job; 361 Canadians were used. These are peculiarly adapted to the work, like it, and are efficient at it; 450 are needed this year if substantial loss is not to result.

Incidentally, it should be noted that apple pickers in New Hampshire—local, migrant, and foreign—receive high wages, operating under a piece work system with a minimum wage specified by the Department. The State Employment Service Bureau reports that workers average \$1.85 an hour and \$104.30 a week. Some workers earn as high as \$35 a day. Imported workers are excellently housed and the work, though it requires physical fitness and agility, is clean and pleasant.

August 24 is D-day for obtaining permission to import Canadian workers. They cannot be processed and brought in by September 7, unless the start is made on or about this date. It is to be noted that the Labor Department finally has permitted the importation of some 4,000 braceros to aid in harvesting California's tomato crop. It is contended that this was too little and too late and that a substantial portion of that crop will be lost. However, if the law as interpreted by the Secretary of Labor has permitted the bringing in of these foreign workers in California, it certainly would permit the bringing in of Canadians to harvest New Hampshire's apple crop.

Many days ago I contacted and urged Secretary Wirtz to permit this desperately needed aid to New Hampshire apple growers. To date, I have received no satisfactory answer from him. In justice to him, I must hasten to add that we are all aware that he is immersed in the

task of trying to settle the maritime strike and that it is understandably difficult for him to deal personally with all these problems.

However, in justice to myself, I must also hasten to add that the Secretary found no difficulty in reaching me when the Labor Department appropriations were being marked up by the subcommittee of which I am a member and that his requirements received my sympathetic cooperation. Neither have I, nor so far as I know any other of New Hampshire's Senators and Representatives, been given reason to believe that Secretary Wirtz' subordinates, charged with dealing with this problem, are impressed or deeply concerned with our New Hampshire situation. Indeed, the Administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security has been unaccountably absent from his office during the last 2 days and has failed to return repeated telephone calls.

I mention these facts because if we cannot get action from the Department of Labor by ordinary means, I hope I can get through to them by what I have to say now and shall have to say each ensuing day on the floor of the Senate. Obviously, I shall be able to learn the reason why Department officials—and I am not now referring to the Secretary—seem so indifferent to New Hampshire's crying need when they next appear before our subcommittee.

The telegrams and letters I have received from New Hampshire apple growers would indicate to any fair-minded person, and I am sure would convince this Senate, that they are as I said in the beginning in desperate straits and are doing and have done all in their power to meet their emergency with all local labor available.

At this point, I want to quote a telegram received from one of our largest and most reputable apple growers last night. It is typical of what I am hearing from them:

We are getting desperate. I never figured that in this free country that we could not hire help to harvest our crop. We have put in ads in the papers, but the response is terrible. Calls come in from 12 to 14 year old children to pick. I am appealing to you for help for Canadian pickers.

I also desire to quote one of the many letters which I believe sets forth the situation exceptionally well and should challenge the attention of the Senate. I know it challenged mine.

DEAR SENATOR COTTON: We desperately need your help. The start of our apple harvest is less than 2 months away. At this moment we have no idea as to how, who, or when we may get men to help harvest our crops.

I won't go into detail as to our individual needs because I am sure you are aware of the whole situation. It seems imperative to me that we be allowed to bring Canadians into the country to help with our harvest. Without these men as a nucleus, our harvest will be utter chaos.

I do not agree with the Secretary of Labor's view that Public Law 78 was intended to stop the importation of all foreign labor.

I am a college graduate, served as a Navy pilot during World War II, received three D.F.C.'s, seven Air Medals, etc. I thought I

was fighting for a democracy. For 20 years my brother and I have been trying to build a business. I hate to see the rug pulled out from under us now.

We employ the following:

1. Fourteen women 9 months a year packing apples.
2. Nine full time men.
3. Five high school or college boys during the summer.
4. Fifty migrant Negro pickers.
5. All local labor that we can find during harvest (including drunks, ex-convicts, etc.).
6. For the past few years we have also used 50 Canadians to help with our harvest.

Thank you for reading this letter. I hope that you can help us.

I might also add that I have received many letters from local applepickers who are concerned for this industry which they know so well and which they serve so skillfully.

The Governor of New Hampshire, my colleague Senator McINTYRE, and myself, as well as both of the State's Congressmen, are deeply concerned with this pressing problem. The Governor held a conference with the New Hampshire Fruit Growers Association, attended by representatives of all members of our congressional delegation, at Concord as far back as April 22. At that conference the applegrowers presented a well-documented case, which enlisted the efforts of everyone of us, although it has apparently had little effect on the Department of Labor. I ask unanimous consent to insert at the close of my remarks an excellent statement made at that time by Mr. Edward C. Leadbeater, of the New Hampshire Fruit Growers Association.

Mr. President, I hope we shall receive favorable action by the Department of Labor before it is too late. Until we do so, I feel it my duty to continue to inform the Senate and the country of this grave injustice, even if it necessitates my taking the time of the Senate each day we are in session.

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

STATEMENT BY EDWARD C. LEADBEATER, NEW HAMPSHIRE FRUIT GROWERS ASSOCIATION, AT GOVERNOR KING'S CONFERENCE WITH THE NEW HAMPSHIRE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

New Hampshire apple growers and some other farmers who harvest seasonal crops have been greatly disturbed by the attitudes and regulations of the Department of Labor since the expiration of Public Law No. 78 (the bracero act). We feel that we have paid good wages for pleasant work and have provided good housing, all of which is confirmed in the Annual Farm Labor Report for 1964 of the Department of Employment Security. It appears to us that we are going to be made to suffer for abuses that may have been heaped upon agricultural employees in other parts of the country.

Our apple industry has been developed around the McIntosh variety because it has proved to be the variety most adaptable to our climatic and soil conditions. It is a variety generally eaten out of hand which means that the individual apple must be good quality and appearance in order to have consumer acceptance. Unfortunately the McIntosh is a tender fruit; its quality and appearance can be speedily downgraded and its value destroyed unless it is carefully and skillfully handled. Until recent years the optimum time for picking McIntosh was

compressed into a period of 10 days, but new storage techniques and the use of "stick-on" sprays have extended this time element. All growers have other varieties too, but substantially the bulk of the commercial crop should be picked within a period of 4 weeks.

Not every Tom, Dick, and Mary Jane is qualified to be or to become an apple picker, but the person with the right attributes and attitudes can quickly become an earner of very good wages. A good apple picker must have many of the characteristics of a good athlete: he should have strength and stamina, good coordination, quickness of hand and eye, and a willingness to keep plugging. Unfortunately for us, anyone who has these qualifications is employable and locally, at least, he is employed in a full-time job from which we could not hope to wean him and enough others when we can offer no more than 4 or 5 weeks work.

"Apple time" in New Hampshire is a beautiful time of the year; foliage is gorgeous and the crisp, cool air is wonderful to breathe. It is also a period of frosty mornings and rapidly cooling twilights and occasionally cold, drizzly days, but the picking must go on. Experience has proved that the migrant picker from the southern part of the country is not generally adaptable to these climatic conditions; and, too, the migrant who has the right attitudes to make him a good picker would in most cases have found employment elsewhere in the country where a longer harvest season and warmer temperatures would be more to his liking. Contrariwise, many of us have found that Canadian apple pickers are able to cope with the vagaries of our weather. Economically it will be a terrific blow to our industry if we are denied this type of harvest labor in the future.

The Secretary of Labor has indicated there would be no shortage of harvest help "if decent working conditions are provided and if it is paid for on terms in line with those for other work that is equally hard and unpleasant." Apple picking is not easy work but, on the other hand, the working conditions are certainly decent and, for those willing to work, it is pleasant work. As to pay, the opportunity for the qualified worker is certainly comparable to that available to the average day laborer in about any industry. The Farm Labor Report for 1964 states that "all apple pickers in New Hampshire averaged \$1.85 per hour and \$104.30 per week."

We must commend the aims of Government to reduce unemployment and to alleviate poverty, but why should agriculture be singled out to do this job? Is it not because there have been many jobs in farming which would be performed by the unskilled or the handicapped, and because over many years agriculture has given employment to these unfortunates? (Farmers have been able to employ this type of help as long as wages were in line with the amount and quality of the work performed; but the establishment of minimum hourly or daily wages can only result in increasing the unemployability of such persons.)

We have little to fear from the establishment of minimum wages for the competent worker, but we can't afford to pay transportation from some distant city or State, to furnish housing and then pay wages to someone who cannot or will not do our work. Under the proposed "voluntary recruitment" plan the incompetent would be replaced, but can he be replaced in time to pick the apples that should have been picked yesterday? If the Department of Labor can properly screen applicants from the rolls of the unemployed or poverty-stricken so as to assure us that they will be competent applepickers, we will be happy to employ them. Since the aim of the Depart-

ment of Labor is to improve the lot of the unemployed and impoverished, should not the Government at least pay for the transportation of these workers? The possible margins of profit for apple growers in this day when the price of our product has not advanced anywhere near as rapidly as have all of our costs, including labor, simply do not permit us to absorb all of the extra costs it is proposed to saddle upon us.

It appears to me that the application of all of the criteria proposed by Secretary Wirtz can only result in business failure for many apple growers. A resultant shortage of apples might result in an increase of apple prices which would permit the few growers remaining in the business to meet the demands of labor. Is it the real objective of the Department of Labor to add the farmers themselves to the unemployment rolls?

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to lay before the Senate and the Nation a charge of irresponsibility against an agency of the U.S. Government.

The Department of Labor, in an ill-advised effort to protect itself and to conceal serious difficulties which have arisen in connection with an otherwise commendable program, has taken the extreme step of refusing to even listen to the legitimate requests of the people and the authorized representatives of a State of the Union.

Mr. President, I make these charges with reluctance. The record will show that I have been a staunch supporter of the domestic policies of the present administration. But the facts compel me to stand here today.

I have followed this specific problem in the Department of Labor for some 6 months now, and have tried to be reasonable. My reasonableness has been met by unreasonableness. I have tried to be patient. My patience has been met by arbitrariness. I have tried to be realistic. My realism has been met by fantasy, by an "Alice in Wonderland" view of the situation, by a blindness to reality.

The basis of this problem lies in the policies of the Department of Labor with respect to foreign agricultural laborers. As the Senate well knows, present Department policy in this field has as its goal the extension of agricultural employment opportunities to Americans, and the marked preference for American laborers over foreign laborers. I support this policy. I voted to abolish the bracero program last year. I believe that Americans should have the first chance to work on American farms.

However, when Americans cannot be found to work on a certain crop in a certain area, when Americans are unwilling to work there, or when Americans in fact do not exist who will work there, then I believe that foreign laborers should be allowed to do the work. It is true that some claims that Americans are unavailable or unwilling to harvest certain crops have in the past turned out to be only the spurious claims of growers who, for other reasons, have been unwilling to employ domestic workers. But it is equally true that, in the case of the New Hampshire apple crop, these claims are founded in certain fact.

It is not possible to find sufficient American workers, at a reasonable cost, to harvest this year's apple crop. It is not possible to find them in New Hampshire, in New England, or in the Northeast. It may be possible to find them in Hawaii, if the New Hampshire apple producers wish to pay the cost of air transportation from Honolulu to New Hampshire; it may be possible to find them among the U.S. military dependents in Iceland. But it is not possible to find them within a reasonable distance of the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I would like to discuss some of the background of our specific problem. The apple industry is important to the State of New Hampshire. Last year, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, New Hampshire produced some 1,180,000 bushels of apples. This year, the U.S. Department of Agriculture expects an even larger crop, some 1,250,000 bushels. The industry is even more optimistic, and estimates that our State will have a crop of 1,400,000 bushels. In any event, both the Federal Government and the apple industry agree that this year's crop will be greater than last year's, and thus a larger labor force will be needed.

The labor force for New Hampshire's apple harvest has traditionally been composed of a majority of American workers. New Hampshire's apple producers, unlike some other employers of agricultural labor, have not relied for the bulk of their work force on foreign labor. But they have used Canadian labor in the past to fill the relatively few positions for which no Americans, either New Hampshire residents or migrant laborers, were available.

Look at the statistics. According to the U.S. Department of Labor figures, the 1964 apple work force totaled 1,600 workers. Of this number 1,250, or over three-fourths, were Americans. No one can accuse New Hampshire apple growers of being unwilling to hire American workers.

The figures provided by the State of New Hampshire Department of Employment Security are even more meaningful than the figures which I have just quoted. According to that department's survey, 361 jobs will have to be filled by Canadian workers. Two hundred and fourteen may be filled by American migrant workers, and the remainder will be filled by local workers. These facts do not raise the policy issues which the U.S. Department of Labor is supposed to be concerned with. These facts show only that the New Hampshire apple growers have historically been more than willing to employ Americans if they are available.

It might be in order at this point to mention that apple pickers do not receive substandard wages in New Hampshire. Estimates of the average wage for a New Hampshire apple picker range from \$1.80 to \$1.95 per hour. The issue of an adequate wage scale has never been raised by any opponent of New Hampshire's efforts to obtain a few Canadian workers to harvest the apple crop, not even by the Department of Labor.

The Department of Labor claims that local workers can be found to harvest the crop. To my way of thinking, this is the most ridiculous statement which I have ever received from a Government agency. The unemployment statistics of New Hampshire tell a simple story—there is no excess labor force. The statewide unemployment figure most recently available shows unemployment down to 2.2 percent. This is even lower than last year's figure of 2.7 percent, when some 360 Canadian workers were needed. In view of the combination of increased crops and decreased unemployment, it is only reasonable to expect that more Canadian workers will be needed this year than last year. But the apple producers of my State are prepared to make superhuman efforts to obtain American workers. They are prepared to, and in fact already have, redoubled their efforts to obtain Americans. They have succeeded to the point where they might not need more Canadians than they were able to obtain last year. But they feel, in good faith, that they will at least need as many as they were able to obtain last year.

I stated that the statewide unemployment in New Hampshire had reached a low of 2.2 percent. The State figures do not show the conditions in the areas immediately adjacent to the bulk of the apple orchards. The figures for these regions are as follows:

	Week ending Aug. 14	[In percent]
		1965 1964
Portsmouth	2.2	2.9
Nashua	1.9	2.9
Keene	1.3	2.0
Manchester	3.0	3.9
Concord	1.5	2.4
Claremont	2.3	2.5
Dover	2.3	4.8
Laconia	1.8	2.5
Littleton	1.7	2.2

Mr. President, you cannot squeeze blood out of a rock. And you cannot squeeze more apple harvesters out of the State of New Hampshire. Our neighboring States are in similar positions.

Mr. President, the Department of Labor tells us that they will be able to find American workers to do the job. I wish them all the luck in the world. I hope they are successful. But I doubt that they will be.

I have been told by the Department of Labor that new recruiting techniques will be successful. What are these techniques, which, so I was told, had not been tried in the past? One of them consists in approaching off-duty servicemen at nearby military installations to work on the crop. This sounds like a good idea, but when I mentioned it to some New Hampshire apple producers as an example of the new ways in which labor could be found, my optimism was sharply set back.

"Why," I was told, "that is a wonderful idea. We would like to use servicemen. But the fact is that we have been using them for years. We are counting on using servicemen, but even then we will need more workers." And so the great new plan of the Department of

Labor turns out to be an old, worn expedient which our New Hampshire producers have been using for years.

Then the Department of Labor told me that they were recruiting among the labor force at New Hampshire's many vacation resorts, who will be out of work after Labor Day. I passed this information along to New Hampshire and was told that this form of recruitment had also been going on for years. The problem is that most of the eligible workers are college students, and studies at out-of-State universities have a way of conflicting with picking apples in New Hampshire.

Now, Mr. President, I am certain that the Department of Labor could, if it wished to make the supreme sacrifice, find 350 more Americans to help bring in New Hampshire's apple harvest. I am certain of this because I have done some research in the statistics of the budget. In the office of the Secretary of Labor himself there are 227 permanent employees, ranging from one Secretary of Labor down through two individuals classified as grade GS-2. I am certain that the remaining 123 applepickers could easily be found among the 2,301 employees of the Manpower Administration, or the 714 employees of the Labor-Management Services Administration, or the 75 employees of the Bureau of Labor Standards, or even the 1,331 employees of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. If things became very difficult, perhaps some volunteers might be found among the 92 permanent employees of the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, although perhaps their preoccupation with foreign interests might make them ineligible.

I am equally certain that, by the expenditure of unwarranted amounts of the taxpayers' money, the Department of Labor may be able to import American workers at great expense and over long distances in an ad hoc effort to supply pickers for this year's crop. I have heard rumors to the effect that Manpower Administration funds might be used to subsidize such a venture. But this is a far cry from a realistic answer to the legitimate needs of the citizens in the apple business in my State.

Now, Mr. President, it should be very clear that the New Hampshire situation is not the same as the California situation. The New Hampshire problem is not the bracero problem. The facts show that historically, the overwhelming majority of New Hampshire applepickers have been American citizens, both local and migratory workers. The facts show that New Hampshire applepickers have been well paid. The facts show that New Hampshire applepickers have been well housed. And the facts show that the national labor policies established by the Congress have been ignored in this case.

Mr. President, the situation grows more serious daily. If more labor is not found, and found soon, the State of New Hampshire will suffer an estimated daily loss of \$200,000. This is a great deal of money in our small State. Our apple producers grow more and more upset

as they wait for some sign of assurance from the Department of Labor that their crops will not rot. If domestic workers cannot, in fact, be found, they want an indication that Canadian workers will be allowed in.

During the past week, the apple producers of New Hampshire, with the co-operation of the State department of employment security, have been preparing applications for Canadian laborers. They are aware that, at the present time, such applications cannot be approved. They are aware that they have an obligation to continue to look for American workers. But they feel that, since time is of the essence, they should have the application forms ready.

The New Hampshire commissioner of employment security was told Monday that he could not submit the applications. He was told that the U.S. Department of Labor would refuse to accept the applications; if submitted, the applications would be either mailed back to New Hampshire or else disposed of in a Federal wastebasket. Now this is unreasonable. If American workers in fact cannot be found, there is no reason in the world why the Department of Labor cannot prepare itself to set in motion the administrative machinery to bring Canadian workers in. In fact, it would be very reasonable to make such preparations.

When I was informed of the Department's refusal to even accept the applications I frankly did not believe it. I checked with the Department of Labor here in Washington and was told that not only was it so, but that it would continue to be so. The Department of Labor will not even receive applications for Canadian help, even when all the parties understand that the applications represent only a standby measure to help prevent a catastrophe.

The facts are clear. What is at stake in New Hampshire is not the future of a program to increase employment opportunities for Americans. What is at stake is not the bracero program. The issue here is whether innocent New Hampshire farmers, acting in good faith, are going to be put out of business by an incorrect administrative decision.

Mr. President, I understand that the present Secretary of Labor has a deep personal, emotional commitment to his cause. I sympathize with him as he undergoes the burdens of his office. But I do not feel that any public official has the right to allow his emotions to interfere with his duty to administer the law in an impartial manner. The policy questions which are involved here have been resolved by the Congress of the United States, and there is no reason to ignore this resolution through administrative action. I am hopeful that Department of Labor policy may change in the near future.

NATIONAL DRUM CORPS WEEK

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues in the Senate in observing National Drum Corps Week. August

15 through August 22 has been set aside to honor the more than 1 million participants who perform in this worthwhile activity.

The drum and bugle corps makes a significant contribution to community spirit and national pride by their music and precision marching.

I extend my heartiest congratulations to the drum and bugle corps of America and wish them continued success.

THE PEACEFUL ATOM AND THE INDUSTRIAL SOUTH

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, one of America's foremost public servants and best-informed Senators is the Honorable ALBERT GORE of Tennessee. His contribution in the fields of finance and foreign affairs has been a constant source of strength to our Nation and an inspiration for our youth.

In another field the efforts and wisdom of Senator ALBERT GORE will probably change the course of human conduct and make life all the more interesting and better. Senator ALBERT GORE as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has no superior. One of the finest tributes that can be paid to him is to say that he is helping the world to understand the flowers of atomic energy as well as its ashes. Senator ALBERT GORE's speech at Oak Ridge, Tenn., on August 18, 1965, at the Conference on "Nuclear Application" entitled "The Peaceful Atom and the Industrial South" is another example of the educational work of this distinguished American.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE PEACEFUL ATOM AND THE INDUSTRIAL SOUTH

Ladies and gentlemen: less than a quarter of a century ago a talented group of scientists under the direction of physicist Enrico Fermi demonstrated that the fissioning of uranium could be made continuous.

A few years later came the bomb. And then peace—but a peace so precarious that it necessitated a Government monopoly on the atom and the continued devotion of our nuclear facilities to purposes of atomic armament.

Finally, there came a relaxation—of a sort—of international tensions. This, together with an unparalleled American nuclear arsenal, permitted us to devote a greater proportion of our time, money, and efforts to fostering the benign uses of atomic energy.

This combination of circumstances also permitted the atom to enter the marketplace. In 1954 Congress enacted a new atomic energy act which terminated the Government's virtual monopoly on this revolutionary new energy source and allowed private industry to enter the field.

Now, little more than a decade after the passage of that act, and despite a somewhat halting start, the civilian atom has quickened its pace and lengthened its strides to the point where, in many areas, it is about to march onto the profit side of the financial ledger. More importantly, the peaceful uses of atomic energy have progressed to the stage where they are assuming a large role in

bringing a more healthful and abundant life to all Americans.

I would like to describe for you this evening some of the medical, agricultural, and industrial uses to which the atom is being put—and in the foreseeable future will be put—and to discuss with you the part these applications of atomic energy can play in the industrial development of the South.

First, however, I wish to pay my respects to our hosts this evening—the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board, the Oak Ridge operations office of the Atomic Energy Commission, and its contractors. Your invitation to speak to this distinguished gathering was a welcome one, and I thank you.

It is no exaggeration to say that we stand on the threshold of a tremendous program for the commercial application of atomic energy. It was just 19 years ago this month that the Atomic Energy Commission made the Nation's first shipment of a radioisotope to a private user for peaceful purposes (a shipment, I might add parenthetically, which was made from Oak Ridge); today in the United States, there are more than 10,000 State and Federal licenses for radioisotope use in a wide variety of fields.

And we have just begun to discover the amazing versatility of these unstable isotopes.

The use of atomic energy for the production of radioisotopes is, of course, merely one of the varied adaptations of the atom—but it is one of the most important. Many of the medical uses being made of radioisotopes are well known to you, I am sure. Some 30 different radioisotopes are now being used by over 3,000 hospitals and medical groups in this country. Their uses range from thyroid, metabolic, and organ-function studies to blood cell research, tissue transplant experiments, and cancer therapy.

While radiation applications in the field of medicine have become a major factor in the elimination of disease, equally important is the progress in disease prevention. Through the destruction by radiation of many types of micro-organisms in food, clothing, and the physical environment it is hoped that the incidence of disease will be considerably reduced.

The obvious interest of the South in developments in food processing and preservation is manifested by the fact that a Government food research irradiator is now in operation in Gainesville, Fla., and a pilot plant irradiator for research into means of protecting stored grain and other agricultural products from insect attack is now under construction at Savannah, Ga.

Important work in this connection is being done by the University of Tennessee, which is engaged in comprehensive studies of the effects of radionuclides and radiation on domestic farm animals and radiation effects on plants, plant breeding, and soils.

Perhaps the most spectacular gains in connection with food are being accomplished in the area of food preservation through irradiation. Extensive research has shown that the shelf life of a wide number of foods can be greatly extended by subjecting the food to radiation. It can be done safely, and at only slight increase in cost.

Radiation, in its basic terms, consists of the sending of energy from a source to an absorber. Heat, too, is a form of radiation; to this extent, then, ordinary cooking is a form of radiation processing.

However, radiation processing of food differs from cooking in that X-rays, gamma rays, or electrons are used to effect the changes normally brought about by the application of heat.

Drying, smoking, freezing, and other standard methods of food preservation are as old as civilization. The advantage of

radiation, as compared to canning, is that it permits the preservation of foods in a fresh state.

What this will mean in the relatively near future to processing, storage, distribution, and marketing techniques for a great many food products should be readily apparent to you.

The Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, on which I have been privileged to serve for a decade, has been keenly interested in the development of irradiated food products for more than a dozen years.

As a result of the Army's continued activities in the field of food irradiation, the world's first authorization of a radiation-sterilized food was achieved on February 15, 1963, when the Food and Drug Administration cleared irradiated bacon for public consumption. In the opinion of many knowledgeable observers this marked a milestone of the pathway to perfecting what may well turn out to be the most far-reaching qualitative advance in food preservation since the invention of canning during the days of Napoleon.

More recently, irradiated wheat and wheat products have obtained Food and Drug Administration sanction for public consumption. Irradiated potatoes, given low-dose irradiation to inhibit sprouting, have also been approved. In the next few years we confidently expect that we will have clearance on a broad spectrum of foods, including chicken, pork, ham, beef, shrimp, carrots, peaches, strawberries, nectarines, oranges and other fruit.

None of these irradiated food products is as yet available for general distribution; Army testing is continuing in order to determine broad consumer acceptance information. However, it will not be long before some of the realities of the irradiated food programs express themselves on your dinner table and mine.

A number of these food products, you will have noted, are indigenous to our region, and I am happy to observe that many of the food producers in this area have been quick to recognize the implications which radiation food processing holds for products of immediate interest to them.

The shrimp industry's interest in the potential of radiation processing is especially noteworthy. A program on shrimp was started at Louisiana State University in early 1962, and results to date are quite favorable. Irradiated marine products are among the nearest to commercialization.

Citrus growers in Florida have watched the excellent results achieved at the University of Florida with radiation of oranges.

Dramatic breakthroughs have been made in radiation-sterilized beef. Beef irradiated while frozen has gotten the highest scores in army acceptance tests. This is of utmost importance to the Army since more beef is bought by the Defense Department than all other meat items combined.

One of the world's largest poultry producers has indicated strong interest in utilizing this process. One basic reason for this attention is the limited shelf-life problem that continues to plague the poultry industry.

For commercialization of these new processes, industry must be involved at the earliest possible time. It is gratifying to me, therefore, to see that a number of southern companies are in the vanguard of what unquestionably will be an exciting new commercial venture.

There is one major obstacle that remains to be overcome before industry participation in radiation food processing really begins to accelerate. The obstacle is wide public acceptance, and it arises from the many inaccurate and unpleasant ideas associated

with the word "radiation." We believe, however, that these impediments can be overcome by the dissemination of accurate promotional materials and a vigorous educational program by various interested Government agencies and industry.

In the area of industrial application, radiation and radioisotopes have found more immediate acceptance. Radioisotopes are already widely employed in tracing and gauging materials for thickness, density, durability, and so forth, and they are now being exploited for sterilization purposes.

There is a variety of interest within our own region in the development of industrial applications involving nuclear materials. Coal-rich Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia have much at stake in the potential use of nuclear energy's high temperatures and radiation for the gasification and liquefaction of coal, as well as for the extraction of raw chemicals.

So too, the petroleum industry stands to benefit from the improvements in oil refining operations being made through the use of these materials.

One of the most striking applications of radiation—the manufacture of radiation-processed wood-plastic combinations—is being developed in the South and holds great promise for large parts of the region. The new process, developed by West Virginia University under contract with the AEC, involves impregnating wood with a liquid plastic and then treating it with ionizing radiation. The resulting wood product has many of the desirable characteristics of natural wood plus the strength and moisture resistance of plastic. By varying the plastic and species of wood, many different properties can be obtained.

Many southern wood-product manufacturers, alert to what this process can mean to their industry, have taken an active interest in the program.

Our region is somewhat behind some others in development of the foremost use of atomic energy—namely, the generation of electrical power. The main reasons, of course, are well known to you: For one thing, there is in most of the region an abundance of power, thanks in a large part to TVA; for another, parts of the region are blessed with plentiful supplies of coal, which can be delivered to neighboring areas at relatively low costs.

Nevertheless, some of the States of the South have no fossil fuels and are rather far removed from the major coal-producing areas. I am thinking particularly of Florida and the southern coastal States.

Advances in the desalting of water will inevitably attract southern firms in water-poor areas into the nuclear business, because it is believed that atomic energy will be the most economical method for producing the large quantities of heat necessary in the desalination process. Plants used for this purpose, moreover, can also be used for the production of electrical power.

Experience obtained with desalting units such as the experimental plant at Freeport, Tex., which has been scooping up seawater and turning out a million gallons of fresh water a day for the last 4 years, has resulted in improved techniques and steadily diminishing costs.

Further gains can be expected in the near future as a result of legislation passed by Congress a fortnight ago, legislation designed to expand and accelerate the saline water conversion program. The enactment provided authority and funds for an enlarged research and development effort, an important part of which, I might add, is being conducted at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Inextricably linked with the industrial development of the South is educational opportunity, and I am happy to be able to say that, insofar as training in the nuclear art is concerned, southern universities have few, if any, peers. The Southern States, through their colleges and universities, have made important contributions to nuclear education, training, and research.

Here in Oak Ridge, some 40 southern universities and colleges have combined to form the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies. The concentration of sophisticated machinery and human talent found here is a vital regional resource, offering tremendous opportunities for intellectual "spin-off" to its neighbors.

Illustrative of the South's eagerness to exploit atomic energy as a tool for improving its economy was the formation of the Southern Interstate Nuclear Compact.

It was my privilege to act as principal sponsor in the Senate of the legislation in 1962 which approved the formation of this compact and authorized Federal agencies to award contracts to the Southern Nuclear Interstate Board, agent for the compact.

The inspiration for this compact was the recognition by the signatory States that nuclear energy can contribute substantially to the industrialization of the South and to the development of a balanced economy for the region. To this end the party States created the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board, whose purpose, simply put, is to stimulate the utilization of atomic energy within the region. Your attendance at this conference is living testimony to the board's dedication to its task.

The board has been most effective in carrying out its function of channeling nuclear information to its member States and alerting them, as well as their citizens, to potential local applications of nuclear energy.

All of our efforts, however, will not come to full fruition until the southern business community translates opportunity into achievement. The dynamics of free enterprise must pick up the tools where Government and promotional agencies leave off. Happily, as I have indicated tonight, there are clear signs that these opportunities are not being lost upon the South.

On my part, I have enlisted in this exciting venture and I shall continue to do whatever is necessary and appropriate in the Halls of Congress to promote the well-being of all our people.

THE APPOINTMENT TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ABE FORTAS

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, when Mr. Justice Goldberg resigned from the Court recently to respond to President Johnson's call to the United Nations, the President was presented with his first opportunity to make an appointment to the Supreme Court. His choice of Abe Fortas was widely accepted as a wise one. A recent article and editorial in the New York Law Journal reflect this wide respect for Mr. Justice Fortas. These pieces deserve further circulation and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

ABE FORTAS, THE NEWLY APPOINTED JUSTICE, FREQUENT PLEADER BEFORE COURT IN PAST

Abe Fortas, senior partner of the Washington law firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter, is about as well known in advance to his prospective brethren of the U.S. Supreme Court

as any lawyer the President could have named to that eminence.

For nearly 20 years Mr. Fortas has been actively engaged before the Court. Both as the representative of his own clients and by appointment of the Court he has appeared again and again as an advocate.

Following President Johnson's announcement Wednesday of his appointment to succeed Justice Goldberg, the American Bar Association office in Chicago gave him the endorsement of "highly acceptable from the viewpoint of professional qualifications."

Mr. Fortas in 1933, at the age of 23 and just following his graduation from the Yale Law School, came to Washington as one of the bright young lawyers drawn in by the beginning New Deal. His first assignment was to the Legal Division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. When the present Justice William O. Douglas was Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, he brought over Mr. Fortas to his legal staff. Numerous official assignments followed.

Notable in recent years was Mr. Fortas' part in the famous Gideon case in which the Supreme Court gave new emphasis to the provision of adequate counsel for all defendants whatsoever.

Mr. Fortas was appointed to the case. In the popular volume, "Gideon's Trumpet," based on this landmark case, the author, Anthony Lewis, remarks that, "When Abe Fortas started to work on the Gideon case, he recognized that the current of legal history was moving with him." Nevertheless, he continued, "the Court had chosen someone of more than ordinary experience and ability to represent Gideon, and the honor carried with it a special responsibility."

From Mr. Fortas' address to the Supreme Court in this case, the author quotes this passage of special professional interest:

"I believe this case dramatically illustrates that you cannot have a fair trial without counsel * * *. I think there is a tendency to forget what happens to those poor, miserable, indigent people—in these strange and awesome circumstances * * *. I was reminded the other night as I was pondering this case of Clarence Darrow when he was prosecuted for trying to fix a jury. The first thing he realized was that he needed a lawyer—he, one of the country's great criminal lawyers."

During the McCarthy period of Communist witch-hunting, Mr. Fortas was conspicuous and bold in defending the accused. In one of the earliest cases, the Friedman case of 1946, the Supreme Court turned down a plea for a writ of certiorari. Mr. Fortas' law partner Thurman Arnold, speaking of this case in his current memoirs, "Fair Fights and Foul," comments that, "Had the Supreme Court agreed with us, the power that McCarthy achieved later would have been impossible, or at least impeded * * *. And Abe's prediction of the disastrous results that might follow the court's refusal to protect an individual under these circumstances from penalties imposed after trials that had no semblance of due process of law proved all too true."

JUSTICE FORTAS

When the U.S. Supreme Court decided in 1961 that the time had come to reconsider and possibly reverse its own 20-year-old ruling in *Betts v. Brady*, it reached out for counsel best equipped to present a constitutional question of increasing import to the Court. It chose, from the Washington Bar, Abe Fortas, to act without fee for Clarence Gideon. His assignment was to prove without doubt that the right to counsel in criminal cases in State courts was a right guaranteed under the 14th amendment even though *Betts v. Brady* had denied it.

Quite obviously, when the Court decided to hear *Gideon v. Wainwright*, it was because it wanted to be convinced that *Betts v. Brady*

had been unduly limiting and was by now archaic. Equally obviously, it wanted a fine lawyer who could give the Court the constitutional arguments vital to success, strong enough to convince that Court that it had been wrong 20 years before. So when it picked Abe Fortas, it was already expressing the view of the Supreme Court itself on the man who is now to be its newest member.

Mr. Fortas is President Johnson's first appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court, to succeed Arthur Goldberg. It had been obvious for years, long before Lyndon B. Johnson became Vice President or President, that he had faith and confidence in the active and activist member of the Washington Bar. The Supreme Court made its confidence obvious in the Gideon case. The public and the membership of the bar in particular unquestionably share that confidence, and have every right to do so.

Politically and governmentally, the nomination was a "natural." Abe Fortas and Lyndon Johnson together had spanned the years from the New Deal into the Great Society; they were in what might be called the second wave of reformers who came to Washington, those who held and expanded the beachheads of progress made in the first flush of the first term of F.D.R. Fortas' first post of importance came in 1942, when, at the age of 32, he was Under Secretary of the Interior under Harold L. Ickes.

When he resigned in 1946 to enter private practice it was in association with Thurman Arnold and Paul Porter, two other New Dealers who were quick, able and knew their way around. And in that firm, Fortas rapidly established himself as one of the outstanding appeals lawyers in the Nation. He worked in antitrust litigation and for big corporations as well as small. He won in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia the Durham case with its new view of criminal insanity.

From the point of view of future rulings by the U.S. Supreme Court on matters of governmental powers and obligations, there is no reason to believe that Abe Fortas does not share the views of the man he is scheduled to succeed, or that he will somehow change the balance of power in the Court.

It is almost a cliche to note that no President is ever sure how an appointment to the Supreme Court Bench will work out. Woodrow Wilson hardly anticipated the economic rulings of James Clark McReynolds, his own Attorney General, when McReynolds went on the Bench; certainly Dwight Eisenhower has manifested public surprise and disagreement with Earl Warren, whom he appointed Chief Justice.

But in the case of Abe Fortas, the pattern is too clear and unwavering. It is the type of nomination the public and the bar had the right to expect from Lyndon Johnson. It is a fine one in these days of need for expansion and implementation of the highest standards of justice by the top men in the field of bench and bar.

The hearings which start in Washington today on the Fortas nomination will confirm to the Senate and the public the esteem in which the nominee is held by those best in position to know.

BIG BROTHER—INVASION OF PRIVACY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, today's Big Brother item is in the form of a letter from the Winter Park Chamber of Commerce, Florida, proposing certain legislative changes to deal with snooping problems. The letter is excellent. As it is also short, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

WINTER PARK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Winter Park, Fla., July 26, 1965
The Honorable EDWARD V. LONG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: After a study of a Senate and two House bills with regard to the invasion of privacy, our congressional action committee urged that you consider the following:

We strongly feel that these proposals would serve the dual purpose of protecting the citizens' right to privacy and provide working tools (with adequate safeguards against their abuse) to the Federal law enforcement agencies.

1. Declare the use of all electronic and/or concealed "snooping" devices by private and corporate persons to be a criminal offense as well as proper grounds for civil suit.

2. Declare that no person, corporation, official or Government agency may tamper in any way with first class mails for any reason. Subject to criminal and civil offense.

3. Declare that the use of all electronic and/or concealed "snooping" devices and mail cover lists by Federal law enforcement agencies be a criminal and civil offense; except when used after obtaining proper court authorization under the "search and seizure" provision of the U.S. Constitution, and used only for investigation of major Federal offenses such as narcotics smuggling, kidnap, subversion or espionage.

Thank you for considering our proposals. Please keep us informed of any action you take concerning this matter.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP F. GABLER,
Executive Director.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY CARLOS P. ROMULO AT THE WORLD CONGRESS OF WORLD FEDERALISTS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, 2 months ago, a World Congress of World Federalists was held in San Francisco to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Charter of the United Nations. At that time, the Honorable Carlos P. Romulo, president of the University of the Philippines, former president of the Philippines, and a delegate at the signing of the charter, delivered an excellent address to the assembled federalists from all over the world.

It is an address filled with the hopes of the last 20 years and the courage to face the next 20 years. Mr. Romulo's speech is one which I highly recommend to my colleagues for both the feeling with which it is written and for the excellent suggestions which he makes to improve the efficacy of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD Carlos Romulo's address.

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

UPDATING THE PRE-ATOMIC UNITED NATIONS
(Address by the Honorable Carlos P. Romulo, President, University of the Philippines at the opening banquet of the World Congress of World Federalists, San Francisco, June 20, 1965)

On this, the 20th anniversary of the United Nations Charter, I salute the World Congress of World Federalists.

You have ever supported the United Nations—for that I respect you. And I respect you, too, for your efforts to strengthen and improve that last great hope for a peaceful world.

It is timely that you meet here in San Francisco, the birthplace of the U.N., to celebrate its 1st 20 years. It is important that you look ahead at the next 20 years of this great world organization.

Yet, at this critical hour, our delight over the progress so far is dimmed by the need for serious examination of the U.N. and the responsibilities it must be able to assume in the years ahead.

Such is your exciting and important mission at this World Congress.

Let us begin with a look back:

It was an exuberant and hopeful response we all had to the U.N. 20 years ago. Some think that enthusiasm has turned, in places, to cynicism.

A Portuguese newspaper, in words as harsh as a newly carved tombstone, wrote recently:

"The United Nations has begun its death throes * * *. The problem now is not how to save the paralytic. It is how to bury the deceased with decency."

But we are not here to bury the U.N. The U.N. is not ready to be buried. The peoples of the world are not ready to bury it.

Some of the mourners left early—Indonesia, for instance. Ironically, Indonesia's action in not even waiting for the corpse to die may strengthen the U.N., not destroy it. For the nations of the world must see that a structure so weak that it cannot prevent one nation from jeopardizing all nations, is a structure that needs strengthening.

In the United Kingdom, the Economist, striving to explain a growing disenchantment with the U.N., writes:

"The real crisis arises because after 20 years the nations still have only a hazy idea of what it is really for; and, therefore, whether they really need it * * * many are still unaware whether its existence makes any real difference."

To us, and to any man who uses his brain to think, it makes a life and death difference:

Here in the United States I again hear the words "Get the United States out of the U.N. and the U.N. out of the United States." These are not the Americans I know—these are a paltry few extremists.

Yet it is true that when belief in the U.N.'s effectiveness declines, anti-U.N. sentiment increases, everywhere in the world.

Yes, the United Nations is in trouble—for the United Nations is a world organization, and reflects the shape of that world. So let us be neither surprised nor disheartened. Let us, however, face reality.

That reality is this:

The General Assembly is paralyzed over peacekeeping finances. Progress toward arms control and disarmament seems invisible. The nuclear weapons club grows apace—some experts say there could be another 10 members in the next 10 years.

Despite the real and dramatic contributions of the many specialized U.N. services, the U.N.'s assault on poverty, hunger, and disease is having trouble bridging the moat that separates the "have" from the "have not" nations. Sadly, the moat grows wider every day.

But above all, the U.N. appears to be impotent when the major powers quarrel. The formal veto stifles the Security Council. The silent veto—the refusal to pay dues, the failure to comply—undermines the entire organization.

What, then, is left to the U.N.?

The right to suggest, to recommend, to persuade. The right to deliberate.

Our serious examination, then, indicates that the U.N. has fallen short of the goals we set so hopefully in the Preamble to the Charter:

"Reaffirm faith in the fundamental human rights to promote social progress, * * * to

unite our strength and maintain international peace and security * * * to save succeeding generations the scourge of war."

I remember those hopeful days. I had pride in my privilege to represent my country when the United Nations Charter was written. The end of World War II was near. Hitler and Mussolini had been toppled from their seats of power. A devastated Europe had barely begun to restore itself. Even before the bombs stopped falling, we resumed our search for peace.

It was 3½ years after Pearl Harbor. The tide of war in the South Pacific had been turned back by the bulwark of the undying spirit of freemen.

We midwives who came to San Francisco to help in the U.N.'s birth were sent by a tired and weary world. Yet the thought of peace—real, lasting peace—gave us new strength. Our millions were dead; our millions maimed and wounded; our fields torn by alien plows. But our hands were eager to ring down the curtain on man's greatest tragedy. We saw in the U.N. that we were fashioning the final act of the drama.

I had left the battlefield but a few weeks before. As a member of General MacArthur's staff, I had participated in the campaign to free my country. I knew war. I hated it. I wanted no more of it—not for me and mine, nor for the world and mine.

To all of us, the drafting and signing of the United Nations Charter was the culmination of our struggle. It was the hope and determination of all the nations of the world that World War II should be World War Last. In letters of blood we wrote our hope that weapons of war would never again be turned by man against man. Mankind, after thousands of years, would be guaranteed those fundamental human rights: justice, social progress, and a better life.

Yes, my friends, that was a great event, the creation of the United Nations in 1945. I pay tribute to those who labored here to write its words; I pay tribute to their vision. I pay tribute to those who have tried, in these 20 years, to make those words live.

Maybe the U.N. we created wasn't the best organization that mankind could create. Trygve Lie expressed it: we built "as strong an organization as all of them could agree upon, and as, in their judgment, could in practice be effective at this stage in the history of the world."

His words were prophetic.

Today, history's stage is different. The drama is changed. There are scenes in it that we never wrote.

No one had heard of Hiroshima.

An atomic editor revised our script. Our golden words were transmuted into leaden skies of fear and destruction.

We who met in San Francisco had not yet seen the mushrooms over Hiroshima and Nagasaki. We could not imagine the poisonous toadstools of hydrogen bombs. We could not know then that our charter would not withstand those poisons. How could we know that the ink we had used, like the bodies of the man who had made our writing possible, would wither in the awful radiation?

In mankind's desperation to end one war, we had begun the destruction of that charter which we thought would end all wars.

And now, unless we truly end war, war will end us.

There were many things we didn't know then: We thought the five great powers would keep the peace. We entrusted it to them, by making them permanent members of the Security Council—with the right to vote.

We thought our unity would last. That, too, proved false. Now we have duality: two mighty nations around which a divided world is polarized.

And now, new centers of power are emerging.

No longer is there such a thing as a great power. Any nation, large or small, if it spends enough money and hires enough scientists to make the bomb, is a great power.

And with great power goes great danger. One man's mistake, one man's wrong judgment, one moment of madness can plunge us all into the final war.

Nor did that preatomic charter anticipate the collapse of Western colonialism. Little did we think there would be 60 new, independent nations in so short a time. Who could have dreamt that we would have 114 members now, when only 51 signed the charter 20 years ago?

We did not foresee that in 1965 the world would be clamoring for more freedom, more education, more of the better life. Nor could we picture the despair and disillusionment the failure of many of the world's nations to achieve even a minimum of these goals would bring.

Nor did we think that the little progress we would make would only add to our woes—our exploding populations. Even too little must be divided among too many.

The outlook for peace and freedom is grim. Desperate people turn to "isms"—communism, or any other "ism" that seems to promise a better life.

Our fine, hopeful charter of 1945 seems inadequate in hard, ugly 1965.

Time is ruthless with living beings who cannot or will not adapt to change. It is equally cruel with institutions which freeze in the mold of the past.

The dinosaur and the dodo bird are extinct. The bow and arrow are a toy—the spear a museum piece. The jetplane will be replaced by atomic drive. Colonialism gives way to independence and self-determination. The outmoded Charter of the U.N. must be replaced by a timelier constitution for mankind.

Is not the lesson of history crystal clear? Unless we change it, will not the United Nations follow the League of Nations into extinction? We must give the U.N. modern power to deal with a modern world.

If we do not, oblivion will come. Gradually, by erosion, or suddenly, in the heat of crisis. Each major decision made outside the U.N. by U.N. members could make the U.N. more puny and insignificant. We dare not let it go any further, for even now it drowns in the residue of mankind's quarrels.

In your Congress, you Federalists will be discussing the three major freedoms in the context of the next 20 years of the United Nations—freedom for diversity. These are great freedoms, and closely related. But none can be achieved unless we achieve enforceable world law through a strengthened United Nations.

We cannot wait for greater understanding and brotherhood to bring us these freedoms. We must begin now.

I had the privilege of meeting for 4 days last week with a group of 14 distinguished colleagues from all over the world. This group was brought together in a "Conference in the United Nations of 1975." Let me quote what these friends of the United Nations said regarding changes within the United Nations:

NECESSARY CHANGES IN THE UNITED NATIONS

The U.N. must be greatly strengthened to provide these essential requirements for peace:

Complete and enforced disarmament of all nations, in carefully controlled stages. When the disarmament process is complete, each nation would retain only strictly limited and lightly armed police forces for internal order. Significant progress in disarmament will not be possible without parallel progress toward the provision of international security through the United Nations.

A permanent U.N. peace force to maintain international peace and security; and an effective U.N. inspection system to supervise disarmament.

A General Assembly empowered to adopt binding rules and regulations in respect to the peacekeeping functions of the strengthened U.N. and implementing the disarmament plan; and in the opinion of most but not all of the conferees, a revised voting system appropriate to the strengthened U.N., including abolition of the present veto power in the Security Council.

A strengthened International Court of Justice empowered to interpret the U.N. Charter and decide all international legal disputes; a system of regional courts; and other tribunals and agencies to settle international disputes which are not capable of decision upon legal principles. Membership in the U.N. should carry with it the acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court in all international disputes.

A world development program. As a matter of human survival, the world must use a substantially larger share of its resources to promote the economic and social advancement of the less developed nations. Expansion and better coordination of existing development programs are urgently needed. A major part of the savings from disarmament should be used for a large-scale development program administered by the U.N.

A reliable and adequate revenue system for the strengthened U.N.

Safeguards to prevent abuse of power by the strengthened U.N., and a clear reservation to the member states and their peoples of all powers not granted to the U.N. under the revised charter.

Eligibility of all nations for membership in the United Nations. Disarmament will not be possible unless all nations are subject to the enforcement system.

These are the unanimous recommendations of our conference on the U.N. of 1975. I subscribe to them, not only because I was a member of the conference, but also because they express my long-held convictions. These, to me, are the minimum essentials for peace.

The question, therefore, is not, "Shall we give the U.N. a decent burial?" Rather, it is: How shall we revise and strengthen the United Nations so that it can maintain international peace and security?

I said, in September 1954:

"We are compelled to admit that under the present charter, the United Nations is incapable of performing the service that it should for the peoples of the world in this atomic age, and it is the most important single element of that service to save humanity from the menace of atomic destruction. The question remains whether the good sense and good conscience of humanity will be asserted effectively and in time to forestall a war of annihilation with atomic and hydrogen weapons."

Nothing has happened since then to alter my conviction. The need that was present in 1954 has been intensified, yet the U.N. still has neither the power nor the structure to prevent war.

It probably cannot survive another 10 years unless it is strengthened. The needed major surgery can scarcely be delayed any longer.

I shudder to contemplate the decade ahead should we fail to operate. We must graft on sufficient but limited powers to control armaments and prevent the use of force by nations.

I have faith that humanity will not consent to its own annihilation. I have faith that it can create a world of law and order. I reject the blind despair that cries, "Man is doomed, man is helpless."

I again call upon the peoples and the governments of the world to face themselves. I call for action now, while there is still time.

Because I believe that drastic changes must be made in the U.N. Charter, I call for an early charter review conference under article 109 of the charter. Such a conference would formulate the necessary amendments

for submission to the member nations. But such a conference will not come about by itself; it must be made to happen. We must make it happen.

We must have the will to equal the task, in spite of criticism, lethargy, or opposition to change.

I call upon every individual, every free citizen of the world who shares my conviction, to impress this need on his government. Let us demand it, until our demands become irresistible.

I call upon every national government which shares this view to press for a charter review conference—now—in diplomatic circles, at the United Nations, at every meeting place where nation speaks to nation.

We smaller nations of the world have a unique opportunity to lead this irresistible demand. We have in the past compelled greater powers to move. In the 1950's we persuaded the reluctant giants to admit the new nations into the U.N. Only recently, we smaller nations in concert, led the way to the charter amendments which are now in process of ratification.

If we can increase the members of its councils, we can increase its powers and authority.

None in the world needs a strengthened U.N. and world law more than the small nation. It is our protection. A weak U.N. leaves us in grave danger.

Clearly, the smaller nations have the opportunity and the duty to lead. I will exert my full influence to encourage the smaller nations, particularly those of Asia and Africa, to accept this challenge. We must create a powerful worldwide demand for a charter revision conference.

While nations and individuals must do their part, organizations such as yours must continue the battle. You, and we, must not falter.

Charter revision is not a utopia for the future. We cannot wait for the next generation to achieve it—there may never be a next generation. The need is essential—the time is now.

Do not tell me it is a great idea, but it cannot be done. I have heard all the reasons, and I am not impressed. It must be done. This is the only way I know for enforceable world law to replace international anarchy. Without such law, there can be no peace. It must be done; it shall be done. We will do it.

Certainly the task is difficult. But a world without it is impossible.

I refuse to give up. I will not quit. I speak with optimism. I am optimistic for the world. I am optimistic for mankind. I speak for the great idea, because the great idea speaks for me.

This is the time of the great idea.

There is no higher calling for you and me than to dedicate our whole beings to this one great cause.

Together, we will succeed.

TRIBUTE TO LAWRENCE O'BRIEN, SPECIAL PRESIDENTIAL ASSISTANT FOR CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, many a vexing problem has been solved in Washington by a simple telephone call to a gentleman at the White House by the name of Lawrence F. O'Brien, special assistant to the President in charge of congressional liaison.

I do not profess to know how many of my colleagues saw their problems fade away after a little chat with Larry O'Brien, but I do know that they always found a willing ear, plenty of straight talk, and a quick response.

Larry O'Brien's record is too well known for me to review in this Chamber.

His primary task was to establish effective liaison between the White House and the Congress. In the intervening years he has performed with masterful precision.

Larry O'Brien rewrote the book on White House relations with the House and Senate and his achievements have benefited an entire people—the citizens of this Nation.

Mr. Robert E. Thompson of the Los Angeles Times reviewed Larry O'Brien's remarkable record in an article published August 15 in the Los Angeles Times. If there are no objections, I respectfully request that the article be reprinted in full in the RECORD.

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

TOP KENNEDY, JOHNSON AID DUE TO STEP DOWN—PRESIDENTIAL ASSISTANT LAWRENCE O'BRIEN MAY RUN FOR SENATE FROM MASSACHUSETTS

(By Robert E. Thompson)

WASHINGTON.—As Congress strides toward adjournment, the door appears to be closing on the remarkable White House tenure of Lawrence F. O'Brien, last of John F. Kennedy's pre-1960 associates to remain in Lyndon B. Johnson's intimate service.

After nearly 5 years, O'Brien is expected to step down this autumn as special Presidential assistant in charge of congressional liaison.

He may enter private business or, more likely, he may seek his own political fortunes in Massachusetts, taking aim at the Senate seat now held by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts.

LEAVES GOOD RECORD

But whatever his future route, O'Brien will leave behind a record of unprecedented accomplishment in his maneuvers between the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government.

Working first with Mr. Kennedy and then with Mr. Johnson, he has since 1961 been able to win congressional approval for almost every major legislative objective of the New Frontier and the Great Society.

He also transformed the makeshift White House congressional relations operation of the past into a viable, permanent agency within the executive arm.

The task has been a difficult one. The pressures have been brutal.

While Mr. Kennedy lived, O'Brien was confronted with Congresses in which numerical Democratic control was highly deceptive. He constantly faced the turmoil of winning legislative victories against a powerful coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans. Sometimes he lost.

HOLDS TOUGH JOB

With Mr. Johnson, he has been charged with conducting the congressional operations for a President who probably knows more about the inner workings of Congress than any other living man.

But, in the past year, there has been a new and more personally vexing pressure on O'Brien.

For his loyalty to Mr. Johnson has been interpreted by some of his close associates of the New Frontier as disloyalty to the memory of Mr. Kennedy.

While he has worked ardently to achieve legislative goals which were handed down to Mr. Johnson from Mr. Kennedy, O'Brien has been the target of bitter innuendo from individuals who once were his closest friends. But he has withstood the ordeal in soldierly fashion.

JOHNSON GRATEFUL

No man was more dedicated to Mr. Kennedy or more bereaved by his assassination. Yet no man who was deeply involved in Mr. Kennedy's public life has done more to assist the late President's personally chosen successor.

Mr. Johnson is cognizant of the torment heaped upon O'Brien by old friends and allies. He also is appreciative of the services performed for him by O'Brien.

When he signed the medicare law in Independence, Mo., on July 30, the President publicly described O'Brien as "the White House's best legislator."

When he affixed his name to the Voting Rights Act 2 weeks ago, Mr. Johnson summoned O'Brien to his side and threw an arm about him to demonstrate his appreciation.

These were not idle gestures. For Mr. Johnson knows, as do most Members of Congress, that O'Brien is the closest thing to a political genius that the Democratic Party has discovered since James A. Farley.

He was the architect of the organization which helped Mr. Kennedy defeat Henry Cabot Lodge in the 1952 Massachusetts Senate race, to win an amazing reelection victory in 1958, to capture the Democratic presidential nomination in 1960 and to defeat Richard M. Nixon in the election of that year.

The handbook of Democratic organization which O'Brien wrote a few years ago has become the campaign bible for both parties. Senator Barry Goldwater admitted to O'Brien last year that he borrowed heavily from the handbook in charting his successful campaign for the Republican Presidential nomination.

The fact that Goldwater could enjoy a friendly chat with O'Brien amid the heat of an acrid campaign was not unusual. For a while O'Brien has been shrewd and tough in combat, one of the marks of his White House service has been that he has made few enemies.

A gregarious, articulate Irishman, O'Brien enjoys friendships on both sides of the aisle in Congress. It would be difficult, even after 5 years, to find a single legislator who bears personal animosity toward the director of the White House liaison operation.

HE OFTEN WINS

Yet O'Brien has defeated some powerful men on some vital issues, beginning with his successful move in January 1961, to enlarge the House Rules Committee and thus dilute the authority of its conservative chairman, Representative HOWARD SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia.

Even those who disagree sharply with the ideology of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations agree that O'Brien has helped put together a monumental record of legislative accomplishment.

Mr. Johnson, of course, has exerted tremendous personal persuasion on Congress, sparing no effort to win passage of his program. But he has counted heavily on O'Brien.

During O'Brien's years at the White House, Congress has established the Peace Corps and the Alliance for Progress. It also has approved such far-reaching measures as the nuclear test ban treaty, the \$1.25 an hour minimum wage, the International Trade Expansion Act, the \$11 billion income tax cut, the \$4 billion slash in excise taxes, the first Federal program of aid to education, Medicare, the war on poverty, aid to Appalachia, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and expansion of the housing, desalination, natural resources, health, and mass transportation programs.

With this record behind him O'Brien is considering returning to his native State to seek the Democratic Senate nomination and then run against Senator SALTONSTALL.

If he pursues this course, O'Brien could be in for the toughest battle he has faced.

THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE AND EXPORT TRADE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Commissioner George H. Hearn, of the Federal Maritime Commission, was recently in my hometown of Everett, Wash., speaking before a meeting of the Northwest Rivers and Harbors Congress.

What Commissioner Hearn had to say concerning our merchant marine and our export trade situation is of interest to all Americans, particularly those of us who come from States that are involved in maritime trade.

Commissioner Hearn has been a member of the Maritime Commission since July 23, 1964. He is an admiralty lawyer, a former city councilman in New York City, and a former counsel to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I ask unanimous consent that Commissioner Hearn's remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER GEORGE H. HEARN BEFORE THE 40TH CONVOCATION OF THE NORTHWEST RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, EVERETT, WASH., ON JULY 22, 1965

Gentlemen, it is a pleasure to return to our great Northwest and an honor to address this 40th Convocation of the Northwest Rivers and Harbors Congress at the invitation of Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, here in his hometown of Everett.

As some of you may know, this is my second visit to the Northwest since my appointment to the Federal Maritime Commission a year ago. On my first visit, I was struck by the spirit of you here in the Northwest to be able to get things done. And that spirit and ability I must say, is exemplified in the Nation's Capital by the fact that each of the Senators who represent the State of Washington serves as chairman of an important committee: Senator MAGNUSON as chairman of the Commerce Committee, and Senator JACKSON as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I know that we are familiar with the truly effective work of both these dedicated Senators in commercial and port projects. And you can all be proud of the record that Congressman FLOYD MEEDS is quickly establishing as an adroit and able Member of the House of Representatives.

The Federal Government's concern with the development of our rivers and harbors is a matter of public record. Huge sums of money have been spent in the development and maintenance of these great national assets, and it is significant I think, that in addition to the expenditures on these projects by State and local governments as well as by the Federal Government, private capital is also being invested in these and ancillary endeavors. And this is as it should be. For in the ever-increasing competition which America faces in having our products being requested and demanded in the world marketplaces, highly efficient and modern ports are a necessity. And they are essential as well, as adjuncts to our American merchant marine if that fourth arm of our national Defense Establishment is to function at its maximum efficiency. Just recently our international peacekeeping obligations in the Far East have required the breaking out of mothballs a portion of our reserve fleet of over 15 vessels. Last May, in Boston I observed that our unexcelled airlift capabilities might not be as economically feasible or as logically desirable as merchant ships for meeting these farflung obligations, especially a prolonged mission. These mothball vessels, I am sure, will make a substantial

contribution to our efforts. The point I wish to make, however, is that our reserve fleet is called upon from time to time, and the most modern and most efficient ports and terminals that we can reasonably afford must be available for expeditious loading of vessels working in furtherance of our moral commitments throughout the world.

Further, from the standpoint of trade, up-to-date ports and terminals are mandatory if our gateways are to function effectively as clearinghouses in international commerce. This Nation is a producing colossus; we have no equal. Our agricultural products, or exploitation of our national resources, and our manufacture of finished and semifinished goods are the envy of the world, and our efforts have given us a high and costly standard of living. An unfortunate result of this excellence, however, is that our products delivered in foreign markets, by and large, are more expensive to the purchaser in these foreign markets than those goods of our competitors. This problem, of course, is occasioned in large measure by the fact that foreign producers have not kept pace with us and as a result their standards of living, and consequently their ability to pay our goods, has been inhibited. Nevertheless, we have been suppliers to the world, but the foreign competition is catching up with great strides, and it is imperative, that if we are to maintain our preeminence, manufacture a superior product, make a better mouse-trap and deliver it to be competitive in the foreign marketplace, we must redouble our efforts. In effect, we must trade or fade, and we must use every device to insure that our goods are not priced out of the market. We cannot afford to lose any market. All of us must strive, therefore, to keep our goods competitive. Earlier this week, President Johnson succinctly noted "Expanding our overseas trade is a matter that this Nation must give the highest priority. It is very important to all of our economic well-being." One area where much can be done, and an area, I am happy to note, where great strides have already been accomplished, particularly here on the west coast, is port and terminal modernization and efficiency. Obviously, great ports and terminals need well-maintained river and harbor projects.

Much has been said, and done, these past few years about our balance-of-payments problem. The "Sell American" goal of the Trade Expansion Act is achieving results. Less than 1 year ago, I noted with pleasure that nine "E's" for excellence had been awarded to Washington firms under the trade expansion program. That number has now been increased to a total of 10. I congratulate each of these recipients and urge others to follow their lead.

A startling and sad statistic, I think, is the fact that less than 10 percent of American manufacturers export their products. The President himself has characterized this unhappy fact as "A great wasteland of unfilled economic opportunity that is open." If we are to realize only a normal growth in world commerce we will have to improve this figure. If we are to realize that level of

economic well-being that the Great Society envisages, we all must do considerably better. In this vein, our new harbors, ports and terminals, as well as our existing facilities, must, along with the rest of the maritime community, generate new and different cargoes, by new and different exporters, with new and different efficiencies. I know that port and carrier groups here on the Pacific coast have embarked upon programs to attract new shippers and new products with some success. The marketing concepts envisaged by these programs are indeed encouraging, and they augur a substantial increase in the number of American firms who now sell their goods in foreign lands.

And here, Gentlemen, is where the Federal Maritime Commission has a role. Unlike the Maritime Administration, we have no subsidy program. Unlike the Corps of Engineers, we do not promote port or harbor improvements. Our mission, through the administration of the shipping act, is to insure that American importers and exporters are treated fairly and squarely by carriers, terminal operators, and freight forwarders. The Commission and its predecessors have long extended protection to competing shippers and consignees in this country so far as the shipping act has permitted. We have now embarked on a program to insure that our own importers and exporters will be so treated as regards their foreign competitors. This program, as is well advertised, has met with uncommon opposition by nations the world over. But our congressional mandate is clear, and I am happy to report that the Commission has the President's strongest support for continuing all efforts to eliminate all the barriers to U.S. trade now presented by discriminatory freight rates." I, for one, want the record to show that the Maritime Commission has no intention of interfering with foreign governments or with their relations with their own carriers. Our ports are open to vessels of every flag, and we welcome their services. The shipping act, as you know, does not contemplate regulation as to flag. The doors of the Commission's quasi-judicial forum are open to foreign-flag vessels as well as to American shipowners and shippers. Indeed, on several occasions foreign-flag vessels have obtained favorable judgments from us. Our jurisdiction is clear: common carriers by water in the foreign commerce of the United States. And he who undertakes to provide such service, American or foreign, does so subject to the explicit conditions laid down by Congress in the Shipping Act.

We are the world's greatest trading house, yet the preponderance of our ocean trade is carried by foreign-flag vessels. Congress, in its wisdom, has enacted the shipping act to insure that our trade be protected from the predatory devices and discriminatory schemes rampant in ocean shipping at the turn of the century. It is our sworn duty to administer that statute. It is not unreasonable, I submit, that Congress has taken measures to protect American trade and has attempted to insure fair play in the foreign commerce of the United States. Nor are we the only nation to do so. Just recently,

the Fair Trade Commission of Japan has tentatively struck down, as contrary to its anti-trust laws, a proposed triple rate system in its oceangoing foreign trade. In South America, several nations have unilaterally acted to protect their own carriers (as opposed to their trades in the broader sense, and in the sense that Congress has used the term). Again, in Canada, very recently, the Government has taken steps to protect its trade in the matter of freight rates.

In meeting the competition of his foreign counterpart in world markets, the American businessman must have, as he is entitled to, the lowest total transportation costs possible, due regard being had for the requirement of compensatory rates down the line tempered by enlightened managerial discretion. We at the Federal Maritime Commission are striving to make this goal a reality.

Gentlemen, our business is trade. And, as a nation, we have every right to make sure that it is allowed to prosper, we at the Federal Maritime Commission are determined to administer the shipping act in a manner that will enhance the international trading posture of our Nation. You in the maritime and related commercial fields have an obligation to facilitate the movement of that commerce which every American businessman must undertake to generate.

Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, August 20, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 19 (legislative day of August 18), 1965:

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Charles R. Simpson, of Illinois, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1956.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 19 (legislative day of August 18), 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

John E. Maguire, Sr., of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Florida for the term of 4 years.

Anthony J. Celebrezze, of Ohio, to be U.S. circuit judge, 6th circuit.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I doubt there is one among us who has not felt

the thrill of excitement and the surge of patriotism when he hears the stirring notes of a drum and bugle corps as it passes in a gay parade. The inspiring music brought forth by these groups is about as exciting as any we can ever hear.

The week of August 15 to 22 has been set aside as National Drum and Bugle Corps Week, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to salute the 1 million young men and women who are members of the

corps. These fine, clean-cut American teenagers set a fine example to all of us, young and old alike.

There is not a week in the year when members of these corps do not work hard and long to assure a high quality of performance at parades, civic celebrations, and sports events.

More and more, the drum corps of our country are taking their places as indispensable parts of our communities. No one can resist the temptation to watch